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CHAPTER I
THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Background of the Problem

Discourse (language in use) is a primary means of defining and negotiating social situations. In many occasions both oral and written language are used in the process of social interactions. This is especially true in classrooms where students have opportunities to discuss their work as they write or read. Situations where written language plays a key role in defining participants' interactions and interpretations have been called literacy events (Heath, 1982a). The term literacy event is used to indicate the relationships between speaking and writing and addresses their co-existence and co-occurrence in social situations in which people use written language. During literacy events, participants engage in not only interpreting written texts but in also negotiating their relationships by means of their interactions with texts (Bloome, 1983; Dyson, 1989; Scollon & Scollon, 1981). Through participation in literacy events children learn about the various functions of written language as well as the attitudes, values, and beliefs that social groups hold towards literacy (Schieffelin & Gilmore, 1986). The study of the relationships between uses of oral and written language and social knowledge is called language socialization.
Language Socialization

The relationships between children's use of language and the structuring of the interpersonal worlds in which their interactions take place have recently received increased attention as researchers seek to extend their knowledge of language use and learning. Recent collections of research investigating children's language socialization demonstrate current interest on the part of researchers from sociology and anthropology (Cook–Gumperz, Corsaro, & Streeck, 1986; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986b). The study of language socialization focuses on the interrelationships between discourse and the acquisition and negotiation of social knowledge. Among the various areas of interest of language socialization research are the relationships between discourse and the acquisition of status and role, the role of interactional routines in the acquisition of social knowledge, discourse and the expression of affect, discourse and the construction of social worlds, and literacy socialization (Cook–Gumperz, 1986; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a). Language socialization is defined by Schieffelin and Ochs (1986b) as, "socialization through language and socialization to use language" (p. 2). Cook–Gumperz's (1986) alternative definition is, "how language development mediates children's acquisition of social knowledge" (p. 54).

A primary concern of language socialization studies is the investigation of language–based processes and activities by which children construct social worlds through interaction with others (Cook–Gumperz & Corsaro, 1986). The networks of social relationships in which children use
language play a key role in helping children relate language to social roles and social knowledge (Cook-Gumperz, 1986). The term social worlds is defined as the interpretive contexts created through interaction in relation to which participants' interactions make sense. Participants' interactions both create and are interpreted in light of the unfolding context. Cook-Gumperz (1986) described social worlds as being created through interactive, discursive practices in which communicative routines are used to structure interaction. As in interviews, lectures, and telephone conversations discursive practices are used to structure activities that are constituted primarily through linguistic means.

Schieffelin and Ochs (1986a) have discussed how children's interactions during literacy activities can be viewed from the framework provided by language socialization. Literacy activities, like other forms of communication, are culturally organized and vary within and across cultures. The social relationships and interactions within which children use written language help them develop orientations towards literacy that include relationships between: literacy and culturally specific notions of personhood (Kitagawa & Kitagawa, 1987; Scollon & Scollon, 1981); literacy and individual versus collective task accomplishment (Ochs, 1988); and literacy and the definition of social situations (Rafoth & Rubin, 1988; Scollon & Scollon, 1982). Those social relationships and interactions are fundamental to understanding the social and cultural processes of literacy socialization. An understanding of social interaction within literacy events helps the researcher learn about the structure and meaning that a literacy
event holds for the participants. In relation to peer culture, Schieffelin and Ochs (1986a) mention that literacy is defined, owned, and controlled by children in ways that are not always identical to the goals of schools. The peer group's use of literacy helps establish the specific definitions and functions that literacy serves the group (Gilmore, 1986).

Schieffelin and Ochs (1986a) stated the need for more research on the patterns of language use across a range of literacy events. In those studies the organization and structure of literacy events as well as the form, function, and content of the discourse would be the focus of investigation. The contributions of the study of patterns of language use in literacy events to an understanding of minority children's participation in those events has been demonstrated by research on the importance of making literacy events more culturally congruent for minority students (Au, 1980). Additional research has shown that differing conceptions of narrative style, that were made evident through different patterns of language use, became the basis for teacher's misevaluation of minority students' abilities (Heath, 1982b; Michaels, 1986).

The majority of research within language socialization has investigated the role of oral language in children's growing knowledge of their social world but a few researchers have looked at the role of written language and children's social knowledge (among them, Heath, 1982a; Ochs, 1988; Scollon & Scollon 1981). There have been few language socialization studies of bilingual children. In the two recent collections of language socialization only two studies dealt with bilingual children (Ervin-
Tripp, 1986; Eisenberg, 1986). The central concern of the present study was to study the social worlds, the dynamic realms, of bilingual children's interactions in both oral and written discourse. Consequently, the present study examined children's uses of oral and written language within a classroom literacy event, dialogue journals. The social relationships and interactions between the children, with and without the teacher, was an important part of the social world of literacy in which children participated during the event. Their interactions helped define the nature of the event and the functions that literacy served within their social world.

The following two sections will discuss the particular perspective taken towards literacy in this study and the interrelationships between talk and literacy. Literacy was defined from an ethnographic perspective, which is concerned with identifying the meaning that literacy events hold for the participants involved in them. The talk that takes place during literacy events has been seen to play a vital role in helping children learn how to interact with others during literacy events and how to interpret, use and compose written texts.

**Literacy From an Ethnographic-Sociolinguistic Perspective**

A view of literacy that is consistent with the emphasis placed on the social nature of discourse and the social worlds of children taken in this study defines literacy as a social process (Bloome & Green, 1984; Bloome, 1987). Within such a view literacy is seen as a "means to participate in and establish a community or social group" (Bloome, 1987, p.123). Literacy has also been defined as a social practice, emphasizing the need to examine
literacy as it is used by different people in historically defined times and in specific social settings (Meek, 1986; Street, 1985). The study of literacy in specific social settings has helped illustrate the point that literacy varies across social settings (Bloome & Green, in press; Heath, 1983). What counts as literacy in one setting may not in another setting. The variation of what counts as literacy from one setting to another has led researchers to use the term "literacies" to be better able to describe how literacy is related to the social settings and purposes for which it is used (Meek, 1986; Szwed, 1981).

The Oral and Written Discourse of Young Children

Early literacy researchers have identified interrelationships between reading and writing in young children's experiences with written language (DeFord, 1981; Teale & Sulzby, 1986). The few studies on bilingual children's early literacy have reported similar findings and have shown that bilingual children use their strengths and knowledge of literacy in one language to learn to read and write in the second language (Edelsky, 1986; Hudelson, 1984). Some researchers have identified the important role that talk played in children's learning and uses of written language (Cochran-Smith, 1984; Dyson, 1983, 1989; Goodman, 1980; Heath, 1983; Snow, 1983). Talk between the caregiver and child or between children during interactions with books or other print materials played an important role in children learning to compose or interpret texts. Children learn how to make sense of print materials such as picture books through question and answer routines and other forms of talk carried on with other users of literacy.
Recent research on writing has looked at how written discourse shapes social context and reciprocally how writing is shaped by social context (Rafoth & Rubin, 1988). Research from this orientation has viewed writing as a social act that plays a role in establishing and impacting interpersonal relationships (Heap, 1990; Scollon, 1988). Dyson's research on young children's writing is especially relevant to the present study because her research has focused on children's social purposes and peer interactions during literacy events. Dyson's (1988, 1989) studies of young children's uses of reading and writing have focused on investigating early literacy in relation to children's purposes. Her research has also investigated the different ways that children used drawing, talk, and writing in their journals. Their different uses of talk, writing, and drawing led to different paths in their development of literacy. Dyson also investigated early literacy in relation to how children positioned themselves in relation to others through their participation in literacy events and through their written texts. She suggested that a perspective that emphasized the students' purposes might provide more insight into early literacy than one that only looks at the forms of children's written texts. A focus on writers' purposes in research on literacy would help develop a better understanding of what literacy means to the students and what functions it served them.

Dyson's (1989) research also helped illustrate the relationships between the peer culture of young children and literacy. She found that written language was a part of the knowledge and skill that was valued by children and that it was a social tool that helped them connect with their
peers. As a peer group children were audiences and critics of one another's written stories during journal writing time. This peer group interaction helped the children develop as writers. Their talk, which first had focused on their drawing, gradually began to focus on their written stories, which reflected influences from the ongoing peer interaction.

Statement of the Problem

In spite of current interests in language socialization on the part of researchers from a variety of backgrounds, there are still few studies on the language socialization of bilingual children. There are also few studies that have examined the process of language socialization during literacy events in classrooms.

The present study will contribute to previous research in language socialization by examining the social relationships and interactions between bilingual first- and second-grade students during a literacy event called dialogue journals. A dialogue journal was a journal in which students wrote personal narratives and responded to one another's narratives both in talk and writing. Dialogue journals meet the criterion of a literacy event as a bounded unit of interaction that recurs over time. As a literacy event, dialogue journals stood out against the background of classroom activity and had characteristics that could be understood and described by both observers and participants (Gumperz, 1986).

This study was concerned with a description of the dialogue journal literacy event and with the form and nature of the students' interactions that were carried out through oral and written language. The definition of the
dialogue journal literacy event was part of the research problem. Students' uses of oral and written language provided the information used to formulate the definition and description of the event.

The following research questions were pursued in this study:

1. What is a dialogue journal literacy event? 
   What are the event's main characteristics? 
   What was this literacy event for the students? 
   How did the students interpret the event? How did they make sense of the event?

2. What are the various ways of speaking/writing that are patterned and recurring during this event?

3. How did the students use oral and written language to negotiate and construct social worlds in interaction with each other? 
   How did the students use the ways of speaking and writing to collectively construct and participate in the social worlds? 
   What social purposes did the students use reading and writing for during this event?

Dialogue journals, as they were used by the children in this study, present an interesting case for language socialization research because the students used both oral and written language to create the interpersonal contexts in which their interactions took place. Because of the interactive nature of this literacy event the students had to coordinate their participation, and they had to negotiate their interaction in order to achieve their purposes. The use of two languages by the children along with the face-to-face situation in which the journals were used helped make this
literacy event unique. The analysis of the children’s interactions as they participated in the literacy event provided valuable information regarding the social purposes of literacy for bilingual children during this specific literacy event.

Definitions of Terms

**Discourse** will be defined as, "The whole interactional sequence of speech in context and the situated judgments of interpretation and effectiveness that make up its outcomes in social action" (Cook–Gumperz, 1986, p. 48). **Culture** is defined not as a rigid set of rules but as both a frame for action and the result of interactions and negotiations between participants in social interaction (Frake, 1974; Geertz, 1972). **Appropriation** is defined as "to make one’s own what was initially ‘alien’" (Ricoeur, 1981, p.134). For the purposes of this study the term appropriation was defined as how students made the literacy event their own by making it serve their own purposes and the functions for which they used the literacy event. Two other terms that need to be defined are **dialogue** and **narrative**. **Dialogue** will be defined as turn-taking between two or more speakers in which they alternate roles of speaker–listener or in the case of the dialogue journals, writer/reader–listener. Besides looking at dialogue as turn-taking, dialogue will also be defined as a social encounter between speakers. Dialogue is not only a time to alternate roles through turn-taking but it is also interaction between participants that is socially situated. In dialogues, participants are involved in social activities, in doings that have both cultural definitions and consequences. An example are job interviews in which roles besides
speaker–listener influence the nature of the interaction. *Narrative* will be defined as the reporting of an event or events that are configured along a dimension of time (past, present, or future) (Ricoeur, 1981).

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The present study limited itself to the analysis of one literacy event, dialogue journals. This literacy event was selected for analysis because the face–to–face characteristic of the literacy event was assumed to provide a social context in which the interchange of ideas through oral and written dialogue could take place between the students. Consequently systematic data collection of this literacy event was undertaken. Systematic data collection during other literacy events did not take place.

Even though the children's use of Spanish and English was an important part of this study, code–switching (the alternation between two languages within and across utterances) in itself was beyond the scope of this study. The children's use of Spanish and English was analyzed by looking at how the choice of language was related to the different ways that speaking and writing functioned in the literacy event. A further analysis of code–switching warrants its own study.

Similarly, children's invented spellings were not a focus of this study. Research in invented spelling has demonstrated how children use different types of knowledge about sound–letter relationships and other kinds of knowledge in their writing. The focus of the present study was on the social functions of literacy and not on the children's use of their spelling knowledge in their writing.
Further, this study did not focus on children's composing of personal experience narratives, rather the focus was on the role that written texts played in mediating students' relationships and interactions. Consequently a detailed analysis of the personal narratives written by the students was beyond the scope of this study.

Only audiotapes, not videotapes, of the students' talk were collected. Consequently, nonverbal information was not available for analysis. The analysis of the students' interactions will be limited to the information that was available on the audiotapes, the students' journals and the researcher's notes.

Finally, systematic data collection began during March, 1985, of the first grade year. By that time, the students had participated in the dialogue journal literacy event since the beginning of the academic year (September, 1984). That period of time could have been sufficient for them to establish the conventions which later became the characteristics of the literacy event. Because the data collection began late in the school year, those earlier children's interactions were not documented.

Organization of the Study

The next chapter of the study, chapter two, presents a review of the most relevant literature. Chapter three presents the research methodology and the process of analysis. Chapters four and five present the results of the analysis. Chapter four presents the analysis of dialogue journals as a literacy event, and chapter five presents the analysis of the social worlds of children's oral and written discourse during the literacy event. The findings
are reviewed in chapter six, along with the implications stemming from this study and questions for further research.

Summary

Language socialization studies have investigated the relationships between discourse and children's construction of social worlds. Most of these studies have focused on oral language with preschoolers and their settings have usually been home and community. Literacy is a feature of the social worlds constructed by children who live in communities in which they have opportunities to interact with written language. The present study makes a contribution by studying children in a classroom setting who are a few years older than most of the children studied by language socialization researchers and by investigating how written, as well as oral, language was used by Spanish–English bilingual children to construct the interpersonal contexts in which their interaction took place.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature is divided into three main parts. The first part presents the conceptual basis of the present study through a discussion of the ethnography of communication, interactional sociolinguistics, and language socialization. The next part discusses topics related to oral and written discourse, and the last part discusses different studies on dialogue and dialogue journals.

Discourse and Social Life

The principal concern of this study, how oral and written language was used by students during a specific classroom literacy event was influenced by previous research in language socialization (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b; Cook-Gumperz, Corsaro, & Streeck, 1986), literacy events (Heath, 1982a; Cochran-Smith, 1984), and literacy as a social process (Bloome, 1983; Scollon, 1988). Researchers within all these areas have investigated the relations between language and the construction of social life. They build on the theoretical and conceptual basis of the ethnography of communication and a few on interactional sociolinguistics.
The Ethnography of Communication

The ethnography of communication has been defined as being concerned with "the situations and uses, the patterns and functions, of communication as an activity in its own right" and was intended to "fill the gap between what is usually described in grammars, and what is usually described in ethnographies" (Hymes, 1962, p.101). Speech in its relation to social interaction was to become the focus of study of this field.

Ethnography of communication takes the social group as its starting point. This group is called the speech community and is defined as:

a community sharing knowledge of rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech. Such sharing comprises knowledge of at least one form of speech, and knowledge also of its patterns of use. Both conditions are necessary. (Hymes, 1972, p.51)

The speech community is an important concept because it sets out the unit of description as social rather than linguistic. The researcher begins with a social group and describes the different ways of speaking of that group. The speech community, then, is conceived as an organization of diversity (Hymes, 1974a). Speakers have different access to the different subsystems of language of a speech community. Language is seen as a resource that provides options for speakers to choose from according to culturally appropriate norms for specific situations. One goal of the ethnography of communication is to determine the speech community's rules that influence ways of speaking in specific communicative events. The culturally defined constraints on verbal interaction in communicative events were called participant structures and defined as ways of arranging verbal
interaction (Philips, 1972). The social constraints on participation in communicative events became a central concern in the ethnography of communication.

The primary unit of analysis used to study the socially organized diversity of language in the contexts of its use is the communicative event.

The starting point is the ethnographic analysis of the communicative habits of a community in their totality, determining what counts as communicative events, and as their components, and conceiving no communicative behavior as independent of the set framed by some setting or implicit question. The communicative event thus is central. (Hymes, 1972, p.13)

Communicative events are patterned and recurring forms of verbal interaction, analytic units that can be identified by ethnographers and recognized by participants (Gumperz, 1986). The communicative event is used to look at the relationship between language use and other aspects of people's lives. A speech community could be defined as the combination of all its communicative events, "the focus of the present approach is on communities organized as systems of communicative events" (Hymes, 1972, p.15).

Hymes (1974a) used the phrase ways of speaking to discuss speech styles and their contexts. Related to speech styles, Hymes mentioned the norms of interaction for the use of those styles along with the attitudes and beliefs that underlie both the style and the norms for interaction. Ways of speaking show cultural patterning in speech and are both about some thing (referential) and have characteristics specific to the genre of which they are an instance (stylistic). Hymes said that speech communities differed in
number and variety of significant speech styles and that a goal of the ethnography of communication was a description of them and of their communicative function.

A speaker's knowledge of the culturally governed constraints on verbal interaction is called communicative competence. Hymes (1974b) defined communicative competence by saying:

Within a social matrix in which (a child) acquires also a system of (language) use, regarding persons, places, purposes, other modes of communication etc. —all the components of communicative events, together with attitudes and beliefs regarding them. There also develop patterns of sequential use of language in conversation, address, standard routines and the like. In such acquisition resides the child's sociolinguistic competence (or, more broadly, communicative competence), its ability to participate in its society as not only a speaking but communicating member. What children so acquire, an integrated theory of sociolinguistic description must be able to describe. (p.75)

Hymes (1972) developed the mnemonic of SPEAKING as a way of describing language in relation to social life. The SPEAKING mnemonic is a list of the components aimed at describing communicative events (see Figure 1 below). This list was intended to serve as a preliminary framework for the analysis of events. Researchers were expected to adapt the framework according to the characteristics of events that were studied by making use of information that came from the ethnographic analysis of a specific community's communicative events.
Setting
• Time and place: physical setting.
• Scene: psychological setting or cultural definitions of an occasion as a certain type of scene.

Participants
• Speaker or sender
• Addressee
• Hearer, or receiver, or audience
• Addressee

Ends
• End in view (goals)
• Ends as outcomes (purposes)

Act sequence
• Message form
• Message content (topic and change of topic, thematic cohesion of discourse)

Key
• Tone, manner, or spirit in which an act is done.

Instrumentalities
• Channels and forms of speech

Norms
• Norms of interaction
• Norms of interpretation

Genres
• Genres present in event

Figure 1. SPEAKING (mnemonic for communicative events, Hymes, 1972)

In summary, the ethnography of communication examines the relation between language and social life and describes the ways of speaking and writing of a social group (Basso, 1974). The ethnography of communication also describes the constellation of rights and obligations that hold between participants through the analysis of communicative and literacy events (Heath, 1982a; Hymes, 1972).

Interactional Sociolinguistics

Interactional sociolinguistics builds on previous research carried out within the ethnography of communication model. Gumperz (1982) lists the
valuable contributions of ethnography of communication as demonstrating that: meaning was context-based; communicative events could be observed, described, and analyzed by ethnographers; and that the concept of communicative competence was useful in talking about the cultural knowledge that people had to have in order to use language in social situations.

Gumperz’s (1982) theory of conversational inference is the conceptual basis of interactional sociolinguistics. He developed his theory of conversational inference in order to be able to account for how speakers initiate and sustain conversations. The key ideas in his theory are contextualization cues, conversational inference, and discourse strategies which are part of the interplay of linguistic, contextual, and social information. This information is signaled in face-to-face conversation through contextual cues. Gumperz (1982) defined context cues as:

any feature of linguistic form that contributes to the signaling of contextual presuppositions. Such cues may have a number of linguistic realizations depending on the historically given linguistic repertoire of the participants. The code, dialect, and style switching processes, some of the prosodic phenomena ...as well as choice among lexical and syntactic options, formulaic expressions, conversational opening, closings and sequencing strategies can all have similar contextualizing functions. (p.131)

Context cues are verbal and nonverbal signals such as prosody, pitch, stress, kinesthetics. Speakers interpret these cues based on their sociocultural knowledge. These cues are interpreted through a conversational inferential process. Based on the interpretation of cues, speakers determine what is the appropriate discourse strategy (narrating,
discussing, chatting). The process of conversational inference does not operate on a unidimensional level in which participants interpret a speakers' intentions. Rather, it operates on a multidimensional level in which speaker's intentions are negotiated, altered, and repaired rather than unilaterally conveyed.

Gumperz (1986) mentions the relationship between the ethnography of communication and interactional sociolinguistics by pointing out their complementary roles in research. Ethnography of communication is useful in identifying a set of speech events of a given social group. Interactional sociolinguists can then identify the speech events that are most relevant to their research questions and examine how those speech events are constructed and negotiated through face-to-face interaction (for a detailed comparison between the ethnography of communication and interactional sociolinguistics see Galindo, 1989).

Interactional sociolinguistics takes a more dynamic perspective on conversation than does the ethnography of communication. The ethnography of communication and interactional sociolinguistics have been used to investigate both the role that language plays in defining the social characteristics of events and the role of language in constructing the interpersonal realms in which communication takes place.

In this study children's oral and written discourse were viewed not only as being embedded in the social situations in which children participated with each other and with the teacher, but also as helping shape and define those situations. Of particular relevance to the present study are the contextualizing functions of sequencing strategies within
events, code-switching, and conversational openings and closings (Gumperz, 1982).

**Language Socialization**

The following section on language socialization first presents an overview of the principal concerns of language socialization research. Two specific interrelated areas of language socialization research, the routines of peer culture and interactional routines, that are especially relevant to the present study are then discussed. Language socialization research in relation to literacy events and participant structures conclude this section.

Language socialization is the study of the relationship between language development and social development. A primary assumption is that children learn about their social world through the language that they learn and through the manner in which language is used to structure social interaction. That assumption has been influenced by the work on language and culture by influential people in linguistic anthropology as Sapir (1961) and Whorf (1956).

Sapir and Whorf's work led to research on the relationship between linguistic structure and the organization of culture and thought. Anthropological linguists investigated the role that language played in influencing people's conception of the world because the language habits of the speech community presupposes certain choices of interpretation (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986b). Schieffelin and Ochs (1986b) mention their link to earlier research by saying "the emphasis is on presenting salient language behavior of children and others and embedding these behaviors
in broader patterns of social behavior and cultural knowledge. We take this to be a first step in understanding language in culture" (p. 8). Language socialization research, then, looks for cultural information not only in the content of discourse but in the organization of discourse as well. A goal of language socialization research is to understand how persons become competent members of a social group. The process of becoming a competent member of a social group is realized to a large extent through language, as the process of acquiring knowledge of its functions, social distribution, and interpretations in and across socially defined situations (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a).

The ethnography of communication has been the theoretical and methodological basis of language socialization studies. Schieffelin and Ochs (1986a) discuss the main contributions of the ethnography of communication to language socialization research by saying that the research framework of the ethnography of communication guides researchers to identify the range of linguistic resources in a social group. Researchers study how those linguistic resources are socially distributed and identify the relationships among them. The research focus is on the relationship among attitudes, values, beliefs, and skills that are culturally transmitted to learners as they interact with oral and written language.

In the study of the relationships between linguistic and social development, Cook–Gumperz (1986) has focused on speaking as a social practice through which children create and participate in their experiences in interaction with others. Cook–Gumperz defined language not as grammatical skills but as, "a set of speech strategies which children use to
control and effect communication." These speech strategies are used in interaction with others, and they "give rise to social knowledge which helps form a social identity for the child" (Cook–Gumperz, 1986, p. 2). Children learn at an early age that language can be used to exert power over others and for the presentation of self. Through routines, such as teasing and mocking, children learn to use language to ridicule each other. Teasing and mocking and other verbal games are examples of how discourse is used to shape the social experiences of children. Children use communicative routines, such as teasing and other verbal games, to create and maintain the social worlds in which they live.

Cook–Gumperz (1986) highlights the importance of conversation in her discussion of language socialization because she sees language socialization as part of the history of continuing conversational exchanges that make up everyday life. Conversations can provide evidence for how interpersonal actions and meanings structure the learning environment and how children's perceptions of situations are shaped by their communicative skills.

Cook–Gumperz (1986) draws upon Gumperz's (1982) theory of conversational inference to account for how speakers interpret conversational contexts. Speakers make use of contextualization cues (verbal and nonverbal signals) to set up guidelines for the interpretation of context as a speech activity. These cues are conventional and not idiosyncratic; they are learned as part of social interaction. Like other aspects of language, they are employed without conscious reflection. Cook–Gumperz states that a goal of language socialization is to look at the
relationship between language and social development. She looks to speaking activities to provide a link between the social and linguistic. The ability of speech to constitute action makes it have both social and linguistic aspects and makes communicative action a link between discourse and social action.

Language socialization studies have focused on the relations between oral language and social knowledge. A few studies have investigated the relationships between written language and social knowledge. Studies of literacy socialization have investigated: the story book reading of a working class mother–child dyad (Miller, Nemoinu, & DeJong, 1986); young children’s experiences with the interpretation of sacred texts (Zinsser, 1986); and the uses of literacy by a peer group during a board game (Gilmore, 1986).

Few language socialization studies have been carried out among bilingual populations. In the two recent collections of language socialization research (Schieffelin and Ochs, 1986b; Cook–Gumperz, Corsaro & Streeck, 1986) only one chapter in the Cook–Gumperz et al. book dealt with bilingual children (Ervin–Tripp, 1986), and one chapter in Schieffelin and Ochs dealt with Hispanic children (Eisenberg, 1986). Ervin–Tripp (1986) studied how games facilitated second language acquisition. Knowledge of the game activity supported interaction, along with support structures like turn–taking and nonverbal signals. Different kinds of talk took place in different kinds of game activity ranged from the talk essential to the accomplishment of the game to secondary talk that commented on games. Eisenberg (1986) studied pre–school children of Mexican immigrants in
California and reported the use of teasing as verbal play in their homes. In these families teasing was a way for adults and children to interact and have fun with interaction.

An early study by Genishi (1976) focused on the code-switching of young Mexican-American children. She found that Spanish-English kindergarten children were able to choose and maintain the language that their listeners spoke best in both instructional and noninstructional settings. The children also responded in the language in which they were addressed and correctly assessed each other's knowledge of language. Genishi did not find many instances of conversational, or within conversations, code-switching. Most switches were situational, between conversations, especially accommodating the listener's linguistic ability. The lack of conversational switches differentiated the children's code-switching from adult's. Subsequent studies by Zentella (1981) and McClure (1981) found conversational switching in children's code-switching as well as switching to accommodate listeners.

Language socialization research provides a useful framework for the study of bilingual children's use of oral and written language because the relationships between discourse and the sociocultural norms that guide discourse have been a central concern of language socialization research. Bilingual children's use of oral and written language needs to be accounted for in relation to their own linguistic and cultural background.
Routines of Peer Culture

The patterns of interaction between children who meet together in stable groups, such as in classrooms, has been called peer culture. Corsaro (1985, 1986, 1988a, 1988b) has investigated the role of routines in the reproduction of peer culture and has defined peer culture as, "a stable set of activities or routines, artifacts, values, and concerns that children produce and share in the nursery school" (1988a, p. 3). Corsaro's research in nursery schools led him to characterize peer culture as children's persistent attempts to gain control over their lives through the production and sharing of social activities with other children. These social activities many times followed predictable sequences of interaction and were called routines. Corsaro (1986) described routines as sharing the following characteristics: the activity is communal, it involves two or more participants; the activity is highly predictable, it follows a predictable sequence of actions; and the activity is adaptable.

Through routines children attempt to make the unfamiliar ambiguities of the adult world into the familiar and shared routines of peer culture. Peer culture routines identified by Corsaro include the protection of interactive space (Corsaro, 1985) in which a dyad establishes a play activity and resists the attempts of other children to join them. In the approach-avoidance routine, children run away from a child who had been identified as a monster or some other threatening agent (Corsaro, 1985). Recently Corsaro (1988b) analyzed a routine of peer culture called discussione that is common among Italian children. In this routine, children made claims and counterclaims that were used to present and support the their viewpoints.
These discussions were like arguments in which the students used dramatization of oppositions and disagreements in their talk in order to defend their positions.

Corsaro has been interested in how children, through their interaction in routines, become part of and collectively reproduce the interpersonal relations and cultural patterns that are characteristic of peer culture. He is specifically interested in the dynamics of discourse processes within routines through which children participate in peer culture. The production of peer culture is dependent on and contributes to the child's growing communicative competence because children develop and use elaborate communicative strategies during their participation in routines. Corsaro studies routines of peer culture in order to investigate how discourse is used by children to pursue the concerns of peer culture within specific routines. Corsaro (1988a) states that, "routines are in short, creative, innovative, productive elements of peer culture. In this sense, they are worthy of documentation, appreciation, and some degree of wonderment in their own right" (p. 13).

**Interactional Routines**

Predictable sequences of talk are referred to as communicative or interactional routines. Unlike the routines of peer culture, interactional routines are not specific to peer culture and they play a role in conversations by guiding speakers' participation through social knowledge of their expectations of appropriate behavior in conversational exchanges (Coulmas, 1981). Children use and learn language in the process of
interacting with others in patterned ways which reflect culturally formulated ways of communication. Children's linguistic and social development then, is facilitated through participation in these patterned ways. Interactional routines are related to both social and linguistic development because the predictable sequences of talk structure situations in which children use language to create and define social occasions.

Interactional routines have been defined by Peters and Boggs (1986) as,

a sequence of exchanges in which one speaker's utterance, accompanied by appropriate nonverbal behavior, calls forth one of a limited set of responses by one or more other participants. Embodied in interactional routines are participation structures. Whereas routines specify generally the content and kinds of utterances to be expected in sequences, participation structures specify who can say what to whom. (p. 81)

Speakers' rights and obligations are related to the structuring of the conversational exchanges since in some situations only adults can initiate certain routines. Examples of routines that are usually initiated by adults in adult–child interaction are lecturing and scolding.

Along with the predictability of sequences of interaction in interactional routines there is also predictability of the recurrence of "specific configurations of time, place, participants, and goals" (Peters and Boggs, 1986, p. 84). The predictability of interactional routines does not mean that they are automatic. Instead, like other kinds of conversational interaction, participants' action is necessary for their accomplishment (Jefferson, 1972).
In classrooms many learning situations are routinized, and teachers and students make use of routines to structure and predict their interaction. Routines of peer and school culture are influenced by cultural patterns of interaction. In school settings, routines are influenced by the instructional requirements set up for particular instructional activities. In schools the routines of school and the peer culture coexist (Bloome, 1983; Dyson, 1989).

A common classroom routine is the initiation–response–evaluation (IRE) routine describe by Mehan (1979). This routine is commonly found in teacher directed lessons. In this routine the teacher initiates interaction by asking a question. A student responds to the question, and then the teacher evaluates the student’s response.

Another kind of classroom routine that takes place in reading groups is known as the "round robin." In this routine the teacher calls upon students to read and answer questions. The teacher allocates turns at talk following a circular pattern. Each student gets a turn to read after the student sitting next to him/her has finished reading.

The research of Au (1980) on Hawaiian children's routines showed how the routines of turn-taking during a reading group lesson were modified in order to accommodate the routines of Hawaiian children's discourse. The Hawaiian children were not experiencing success in school and the modification of the reading group routine was an attempt to make the interaction during the reading group more culturally congruent (see p. 40 for elaboration). The modification of a classroom event helped the children be able to participate in a classroom event that formerly had been
teacher directed and followed a pattern similar to the IRE described by Mehan (1979).

Routines of peer culture have been show to be an integral part of young children's interactions and an important sense-making strategy through which children define social situations in ways that allow them to pursue the concerns of peer culture such as negotiating friendships. Conversational routines are part of everyday interaction during which predictable sequences of interaction allow speakers to predict upcoming interaction. Within classroom settings they play a role in how lessons are carried out.

The following two sections on literacy events and participant structures discuss two areas of language socialization research. The studies discussed in the literacy events section look at the patterned ways of interaction during literacy events and how those patterned ways reflect cultural patterns related to the beliefs, attitudes, and values that participants hold towards literacy. The studies on participant structures looked at how communicative interactional rights and obligations between participants of events helped structure social interaction and how the patterns of interactional rights and obligations (participant structures) helped define the event.

**Literacy Events**

The term *literacy event* was defined as, "any occasion in which a piece of writing is integral to the nature of the participants' interaction and their interpretive processes" (Heath, 1982a, p.93) and "any action sequence, involving one or more persons, in which the production and/or
comprehension of print plays a role" (Anderson, Teale, & Estrada, 1980, p.59). Like communicative events, literacy events presuppose situation-specific rules for the occurrence of events and participants' interactions within events. Speech events may describe, repeat, reinforce, expand, frame, or contradict the written materials, and participants learn whether the oral or written mode takes precedence in specific literacy events (Heath, 1982a). The concept of literacy event points out the co-existing relationships between spoken and written language and the "actual forms and functions of oral and literate traditions" of particular communities (Heath, 1982a, p. 93).

Heath (1982b) used the story book reading literacy event to show how a community's patterns of language socialization get played out in interactions around written material and how those interactions influence children's orientations to books. She stated the need for the description of the ways different social groups interact during literacy events in terms of their specific features and the feature's relationship to larger sociocultural patterns.

Cochran-Smith (1984) also investigated the interactional and interpretive demands of literacy events in a nursery school in an urban setting. The story reading in Cochran-Smith's study involved one adult reading a story to a group of children. Cochran-Smith analyzed the interactions in order to identify the meaning-making process during this event. She identified three types of interactional sequences between teacher and children. Type 1 was related to the interactional rules for physical behavior during storytime. The behaviors included correct seating
arrangement, correct visual, postural, and aural attention to the text reading. Type 2 was related to making sense of the book that was being read through the story reader's mediation that helped children use their knowledge of stories and their world in order to interpret the story and understand it. Type 3 was related to the application of a book's theme or message to the children's' lives.

In these earlier studies the specific nature of the literacy event was an outgrowth of the negotiated roles and routines around reading. The present study will seek to describe and define dialogue journal writing as a literacy event in order to relate the specific situations of the dialogue journal literacy event to how literacy was used by the students during the event.

**Participant Structures**

Participant structures will be discussed by looking at three studies (Au, 1980; Philips, 1972; Shultz, Florio, & Erickson, 1982) in which the concept of participant structures played a central role. The term participant structures was introduced by Philips (1972) and defined as a "structural arrangement of interaction" and "ways of arranging verbal interaction" (p. 377). Philips' research on the Warm Springs Indian reservation was concerned with helping account for the reluctance of Indian students to verbally participate in school. She compared classrooms on and off the reservation in order "to define communicative contexts in which Indian and non-Indian behavior differed and to describe the ways in which they differ" (p.365). Philips identified the social conditions that governed when it was appropriate to talk.
Philips (1972) identified participant structures by examining the different situations in which students spoke in classrooms. Those situations were compared with those in which they were more reluctant to talk. The differences were compared with the participant structures of learning situations outside of the classroom. She found that the participant structures in school in which children participated more were similar to those found outside of school.

Philips identified four different participant structures for verbal interaction between teacher and students. Indian students participated verbally more often in group projects and when they individually talked to the teacher. Students interacted verbally more with each other in group projects because they were able to control and direct their interaction and the differences between individual performer and audience were minimized. The students determined when they would speak. The students also chose when to individually talk to the teacher. Two structures where students were hesitant to talk and participate were when they had to speak alone in front of other students and when the teacher determined when they talked, such as in teacher-directed small group activities.

Au's (1980) study of Hawaiian children's verbal interactions during a reading lesson used the concept of participant structures in order to compare children's interactions during the reading lesson with a common speech event in the Hawaiian community called talk story.

Au investigated the cultural congruency between the reading lesson and talk story. Her hypothesis was that the reading event would be increasingly appropriate for the children the more it incorporated discourse features of talk story. Au developed a typology of nine participant structures identified in the
reading lesson that varied from least to most similar to talk story. Her criteria for the identification of participant structures was based on the number of children speaking and the roles of the different speakers.

An important characteristic of talk story is joint performance and overlapping talk in the construction of the story. Consequently, a focus of analysis in Au's study was obtaining a turn at talk. In talk story, speakers were self-selected. In reading lessons, on the other hand, turns at talk were not self-selected by speakers but were chosen by the teacher. A distinguishing feature between the two events was how turn-taking was managed. Au concluded from her study that the participant structures in the reading event were both similar to and different from those found in talk story. She also demonstrated that there were a variety of participant structures within one lesson.

Shultz, Florio, and Erickson (1982) used the concept of participant structures to compare two speech events, a math lesson with a family dinner. They compared what counted as appropriate interaction in a school event versus a home event. They assumed that instruction was embedded in interactional processes and that learning was as dependent on students interpreting the proper interactional context as it was on their knowledge of academic content.

Shultz et al. (1982) defined participant structures as, "patterns in the allocation of interactional rights and obligations among all the members who were enacting a social occasion together" (1982, p. 94). Their criteria for identifying participant structures included: the number of different people speaking, the roles of different speakers, and the different conversational floors.
In their analysis of the two events, Shultz et al. first identified the ways of interacting during different phases of the event. They then developed a typology of participant structures based on their criteria for the identification of participant structures. Students' interpretations of the shifts of phases during events were important because what was considered appropriate verbal interaction varied during different phases of the event.

These three studies in which participant structures played a central role focused on the role that verbal interaction played in the learning process. Both Philips and Au demonstrated that children participated more in lessons when participant structures were similar to the ones that they were accustomed to outside of school. These studies all operated from the anthropological principle that cultural norms guide participant's interactions. These norms help define what verbal behavior is appropriate in different situations. Knowledge of these norms is called communicative competence. These norms influence how children can bring their knowledge of patterns of interaction to instructional events. The concept of participant structures has proven useful in the identification of communicative contexts and in showing how verbal interaction in those contexts is structured. The ability to describe the ways of structuring verbal interaction has also helped make possible comparisons across events. In the present study participant structures were used to investigate the patterned ways of interacting within the literacy event. The children's uses of oral and written language were analyzed in relation to the different types of social interaction that they were used for.
An Ethnographic–Sociolinguistic Perspective on Literacy

Research on literacy from an ethnographic perspective has looked at the meaning of literacy events for those involved in them and the mediation of interpersonal relationships through written texts (Bloome & Green, 1984; Schieffelin & Gilmore, 1986; Scollon, 1988). In order to investigate these issues researchers have looked at the nature of social and communicative behavior of participants and their interpretations of those behaviors in different reading events (Bloome & Green, 1984).

Reading events may include several individuals interacting with texts and each other. The relationships between participants are influenced by their participation in the literacy event. Different types of participation during literacy events can also lead to different social reading configurations that are related to individuals or groups of students interacting with texts. Students make choices in the types of reading they engage in order to align or distance themselves from particular social groups (Bloome & Green, 1984).

Participants' interactions with written texts have been defined as a social process that is used to establish, structure, and maintain social relationships between people. Among the points summarized by Bloome (1987) as being central to a view of literacy as a social process are: knowledge of appropriate interpersonal interactions for literacy events is consistent with knowledge of appropriate interactions in other communicative events of a community; what is valued as literacy as well the roles and obligations of the participants in literacy events varies across
settings; and literacy learning in school is often defined in terms of the dominant culture's patterns of discourse.

The relation between literacy and interpersonal relationships has been a theme of the Scollons' research (Scollon & Scollon, 1981, 1982; Scollon, 1988). The Scollons have discussed literacy and interpersonal relationships in terms of focused and nonfocused interaction. They define a focused situation as one in which there are strong limitations on negotiation for the definition of the situation between participants. These limitations may be due to limits of time, size of the group, social distance, and limits on feedback due to the medium. Nonfocused situations are those in which the highest value is on mutual sense-making among participants.

The Scollons state that focusing is not a structural property of social groups or situations but rather it is the outcome of situations. For the Scollons, the important distinction is not between literacy and nonliteracy. Instead their view is that, "what is critical is the extent to which parties to an interaction assume, grant to each other, the right to make one's own sense of the interaction. If one party pushes their orientation on the other they will be blinded to the sense making of the other participants" (Scollon & Scollon, 1982, p. 195). The Scollons use the example of Athabaskan oral narrative in order to show how the text is the medium through which the speaker and listener accommodate to each other. They use school (essayist) literacy to show how the text can be primary when there is no room for negotiation. In schools, many literacy learning situations are focused, and there is little room for negotiation. Consequently some children's sense-making efforts are labeled deficient or their knowledge is
not valued in the classroom because they do not fit the narrow focus of interaction as the teacher has defined the situation (Michaels, 1986; Gilmore, 1986; Bloome, 1983).

Scollon (1988) says that literacy is a face, a set of micropolitical relationships that we try to establish with others through the medium of written text. In many types of texts, the author is removed through the use of the third person and the use of the passive voice. The orientation towards literacy that such a fictionalization of self encourages is one where the text is seen to be removed from any real world or immediate context. Both the author and reader are depersonalized. The author removes any traces of person through the fictionalization of self. Related to the issues of the fictionalization of self and the presentation of face are the questions that a reader poses of a text. Looking at texts as the medium through which interpersonal relations are mediated, the important question becomes not, "What does a text say," but "Who is telling me and why?" Scollon argues that essayist literacy is a focused situation where the situation is not open to negotiation and the identity of the authors who speak through the texts is concealed.

Research on literacy from an ethnographic perspective has suggested that a broad definition of literacy is needed in order to define reading as more than an interaction between author and reader. New definitions need to take into account that reading is part of the ongoing social world of people. As part of the social world, literacy is used to mediate interpersonal relationships. Ethnographic studies of literacy have suggested that research is needed on the students' interpretations of the literacy event as well as the interpersonal contexts of the event (Bloome & Green, 1984).
Oral and Written Discourse

The following section presents main topics of research on oral and written language that are most relevant to the present study of dialogue journals as a literacy event. This section is composed of the following subsections on oral discourse: speech play, conversational stories, side sequences, and conversational closings. The subsections on written discourse discuss early literacy, expressive writing, the social construction of written communication, and personal narratives.

Speech Play

Speech play is play with verbal resources for its own sake and is defined by Kirshenblatt–Gimblett & Sherzer (1976) as, "any local manipulation of elements and relations of language, creative of a specialized genre, code–variety, and/or style. A key word of course is 'manipulation'" (p. 1). In speech play, speakers are concerned more with the means rather than with the message. Speech play manipulates the various regularities of language form and use through repetition, rhyme, nonsense, and the inversion of meaning (Garvey, 1977; Kirshenblatt–Gimblett & Sherzer, 1976).

An form of speech play that is especially relevant to the present study is called ritualized play and is characterized by controlled repetition (Garvey, 1977). The controlled repetition can be of conversational conventions in which the content of the repetition can be common types of conversational exchanges such as assertion and counter–assertion or
question—answer. Garvey (1977) used the following exchange as an example of ritualized speech play:

First Child: I'm going to work.
Second Child: You're already at work.
First Child: No I'm not.
            I'm going to school.
Second Child: You're already at school.
First Child: No I'm not.
            I'm going to the party.
Second Child: You're already at the party.
First Child: No I'm not. (p. 116)

Ritualized play, like play in general, is enjoyable and is performed for its own sake rather than for a goal such as the exchange of information. Ritualized play is based on other behavior that could be performed as nonplay such as asking and answering questions. The exchange of questions and answers during ritualized play are marked as nonliteral by their repetition.

The repetition evident in ritualized play is a characteristic of play in general. For children interacting in a social situation, repetition provides a basis and framework for continued interaction. In the exchanges involved in ritualized play the content of the talk does not have to be elaborated, instead the children make use of the structure of conversational exchanges to keep the dialogue going. Through the ritualized pattern of the game each child is able to control the behavior of the other child and Garvey (1977) speculates that "this regulation is in itself self-satisfying" (p.120).
**Conversational Narratives**

Anthropologists have focused on the context as well as the structural and performance norms of stories across cultures (Heath & Branscombe, 1986). Stories are defined by literary theorists according to their structural elements whereas anthropologists define narratives according to a social groups' use of stories and how they relate to the social situations in which they are told. Narratives are defined by Heath and Branscombe (1986) as, "expression of experiences which have been stored in memory by the teller, are selected for attention in the telling, and are organized in knowledge structures which can be anticipated by the listener" (p. 17). Narratives are understood in discourse according to expectations of story structure and the anticipations of their use in appropriate contexts.

Rosen (1988) talks about stories as transforming experience through an active production process which constructs stories from experiences. The storyteller molds the experience and verbalizes a sequence that serves the purpose of presenting the main points of the story. Experience is transformed into a beginning that introduces the story and an end that terminates it. Stories can be about anticipated, as well as past, experiences and have been called preplays (Goffman, 1974). The storyteller also takes a stance towards the experience that shows his orientation and evaluation of the experience (Britton, 1970; Goffman, 1974). Rosen (1988) suggests a focus on everyday storytelling and not great works of literature because everyday story telling involves all speakers, "The classroom can uncover a function of narrative which the analysis of great fiction will leave untouched. A view of narrative which does not take account of its use in argument or
any kind of conversation is bound to be an impoverished view" (p. 20). Accounts of one's own experiences are often retellings adjusted to time, place, and audience. Narrative organizes the structure of events and organizes the particular telling of them. Rosen expands Bruner's (1986) discussion on culture and relates it to narrative. Bruner (1986) says that culture is a forum for negotiating meaning and explicating action. Rosen sees stories as a means through which people play an active part in making and remaking culture. Through their stories people attempt to understand their lives and communicate those understandings to others.

**Side Sequences**

A side sequence is a break in an on-going conversation. The break introduced by the side sequence does not terminate the on-going conversation; it only temporally halts it. A side sequence can metaphorically be called a time-out. Like a time-out during a game, a side sequence is shorter in duration than the ongoing sequence. It consists of a sequence with a set of parts, and it has a recognizable first and last part. Jefferson (1972) divides side sequences into three parts: the ongoing sequence, the side sequence, and the return to the on-going sequence. Side sequences are sometimes signalled in conversations by the use of a marker such as "By the way," or "Before I forget, let me tell you about". The use of such a marker signals the participants that the speaker is going to introduce something different into the conversation and communicates to the participants that the current conversation should temporarily be put on hold. A side sequence indicates horizontal movement during a conversation,
which is opposed to the vertical movement of the ongoing sequence. A return to the on-going sequence might be signaled by the use of the phrase, "Now, where were we?"

Conversational Closings

Schegloff and Sacks (1973) discussed the closing of conversations based on data derived mostly from telephone conversations. Conversations are closed through the use of closing sections in which markers such as "well" or "OK" are used to make a proposal to close. The conversational partner can agree or disagree to close. The speaker can disagree to close by introducing a new topic. If the conversational partner agrees to close then the conversational partner can reply with another closing marker such as "bye," or "OK." The second part of the exchange, the partner's "OK," shows that the first closing marker was understood as a proposal to close and that the speaker is in agreement.

Closings play a role in the closing of social occasions as well as the closing of conversations. Schegloff and Sacks (1973) say,

ending an occasion (or interaction or event) can be seen to be located in some conversational episode. That participants attend as a task or as a piece of business to bringing the conversation to close...has to do with the organization of conversation as a constituent part of an occasion or interaction. (p. 96–97)

The closing of the conversation of which a social event is an integral part is a way of bringing a social occasion to a close.
Early Literacy

Studies of young children's early literacy have increased during the past decade. Recent collections of early literacy research have brought together researchers with varying interests and backgrounds (Goelman, Olberg, & Smith, 1984; Meek, 1989; Schieffelin & Gilmore, 1986; Teale & Sulzby, 1986). These recent studies build on earlier studies that helped introduce early literacy as an area of study. The early research of Durkin (1966), Clay (1966), and Goodman (1967) indicated that young children had knowledge about reading before they received formal reading instruction in school. Other researchers built on this early work to investigate the composing processes of young children (Graves, 1975), invented spellings (Read, 1975), children's group readings of enlarged texts (Holdaway, 1979), and the family contexts of reading (Taylor, 1983). Among the findings of early literacy research that were summarized by Teale and Sulzby (1986) was that children learn about literacy by using it to get things done. The functions of literacy were as important for the child's learning as the forms of literacy.

Dyson's (1988) studies of young children's uses of reading and writing have focused on investigating early literacy in relation to children's purposes. She has analyzed the human drama of children's writing and has focused not only on the structure of their written texts but also on the development of conventions. In other words, the focus on children's writing in the classroom in which she carried out her research was on self-expression. Consequently she examined "the children's selves in their drawing, talk, and texts" (p. 255). Dyson's focus was not on writing alone
because "writing does not evolve only from writing," rather her focus was "on the meanings each child intended to communicate," and "on the symbolic worlds deliberately being formed" (p. 253). The children's talk and drawing as well as their writing revealed those worlds. Dyson locates the composing event within the social relationships that exist between children who write together. Children's sense of the functions of writing, what writing can be used for, evolves as others respond playfully or critically to their writing (Dyson, 1989). The responses of a variety of readers or interlocutors help children learn to master writing as a communicative process (Nystrand, 1990).

Dyson (1988) also investigated how children used writing to position themselves in relation to others through their participation in literacy events and through their written texts. Her research suggests that a perspective that emphasizes the students' purposes might provide more insight into early literacy than one that only looks at the forms of children's written texts. The insight gained would be related to developing a better understanding of what literacy means to the participants and what functions its served them.

Nystrand (1989) makes a similar observation to Dyson in relation to students writing and their purposes. He states that texts are not just the result of writing, but also a medium of communication and as such the features of writing are best understood in relation to the writers' and readers' interests and purposes. He says that texts function to mediate the respective interests of writers and readers. The forms of discourse are related not only to the functions that particular texts play but also to the role
and influence of the social relationships that those texts help establish and mediate.

Dyson (1988) challenges the notion that the child's task in writing is to create a disembedded text. She proposes that the task is to create and differentiate multiple worlds. These multiple worlds are related to the use of symbolic media in the ongoing social world of the composing event. The tension of the movement among multiple worlds accounts for the disorganized appearance of some texts that children work at to bring under control over time. Children made different uses of symbolic media to support their learning of reading and writing.

The few studies of bilingual children's literacy have reported that: children selected codes to communicate selected meanings, what children knew about literacy in one language was applied to literacy in the other language, children rarely code-switched in writing (Edelsky, 1986); bilingual children were able to read environmental print in English, and written language helped children develop their knowledge of English (Hudelson, 1984). Hudelson (1984) credited the positive effects of native language literacy when she observed that children were able to learn a wide variety of functions of literacy in classrooms in which they could build on their knowledge of their native language.

Based on a review of early literacy research, Hudelson (1989) recommends that the focus on writing during the early years of schooling should be on fluency and willingness to write. Students should be encouraged to express themselves through writing and to write different kinds of pieces for a variety of purposes and audiences.
The studies on the early literacy of bilingual children have tended to stress the analysis of the children's written texts (Edelsky, 1986; Hudelson, 1984). The present study contributes to research on bilingual children's early literacy by analyzing children's interactions during the time they were engaged in a literacy event.

The specific focus taken on early literacy in this study emphasizes the functions that literacy served the students and how social worlds and peer relationships were mediated during a literacy event. This focus is similar to that advocated by other researchers who have discussed the investigation of the social functions of literacy. Szwed (1981) suggested the need to ask basic questions concerning the uses of literacy and its social meaning and that definitions of literacy should be grounded in accounts of literacy in relation to social context and function. Studies of literacy should also identify the rules for the use of literacy in particular social situations. Writing as a social act is guided by and interpreted in relation to sociocultural norms and their impact on interpersonal relationships (Basso, 1974; Heap, 1990). According to this view, literacy would not be a constant but, like language in general, would be multifunctional across contexts.

Expressive Writing

Britton (1970) discussed the functions of language in relation to two roles, the participant and spectator role. In the participant role language, which Britton called "transactional," is used to get things done. In the spectator role the speaker contemplates, as a spectator, a reconstruction of events. The language used in the spectator role is called "expressive" by
Britton (1970). In the spectator role experiences are recounted that took place in a different space/time than that of the situation in which the story telling took place. Britton (1970) says that through the spectator role we "give shape and unity to our lives and extend our experiences in an orderly way" (p. 325). In retellings, spectators go over experiences in order to enjoy, savour, and interpret them. In the role of the spectator, speakers can work on past as well as on anticipated experiences. An aspect of giving shape to our experiences is to place them within an evaluative frame that expresses how we feel about the events that we are reporting (Britton, 1970). Britton's (1984) purpose in formulating the spectator role was to find an everyday form of discourse that would be a counterpart to literature and make a link between everyday language and the language of literature. For Britton, the story teller recounting the events of the past day or week-end is an everyday counterpart of the writer of literature.

Britton (1970) says that in the participant role, in which we operate during the activities of everyday life, we apply our value system. We make decisions based on our values and beliefs. On the other hand, in the spectator role, speakers generate and refine their evaluative system. The spectator role allows speakers to get some distance from their everyday activities. In reporting experiences the speaker can express an evaluative attitude towards the events themselves and in telling the story the speaker shares his evaluation of the events and compares his evaluations with those of his listeners.

Britton (1970) discussed the role of expressive uses of language in students' writing in schools. In expressive writing, the writer gives shape to
experience in order to share it. The sharing of expressive writing is important because a large incentive for the writer lies in the sharing of the writing. A sympathetic partner is important in the sharing of expressive writing because expressive writing relies on a shared context and follows the interests and preoccupations of the writer. The listener needs to be interested in the person writing as well what the person has to say. The sharing of expressive writing needs to take place in social relationships where the interlocutors are willing to take risks, share, and explore ideas. The role of the teacher in responding to students' expressive writing is as a sympathetic reader (Britton, 1970).

Britton (1977) lists the possible satisfactions for the writer from writing in the spectator role as: (1) students offer their experiences as a basis for forming a relationship with the reader they have in mind, a relationship of mutual interests and trust; (2) students expose their system of values, feelings, and beliefs about the world through what they chooses to write about; (3) writers present themselves in the light in which they would like to be seen through the values that are presented in their writings; (4) and, there is satisfaction in the bringing into existence a pleasing verbal object.

The lists of satisfactions possible in expressive writing point to the use of written language as a way for student to use their own experiences as topics and resources for their writing. The use of their experiences would not only help the students explore and give shape to their lives, but would also help them learn how written language can be used to reflect on and share their experiences with others. In spite of the benefits of expressive
writing, Britton (1977) reports that expressive writing is rarely found in schools.

Personal narratives play an important role in a Japanese model of expressive writing. Kitagawa and Kitagawa (1987) report on expressive writing in Japanese elementary schools in which personal narratives are used as a means through which children can make connections between the experiences from their daily lives and writing. Teachers in this model are encouraged to respond in a way that shows that they are familiar with the child. The child’s writer-based writing, which requires the reader to be willing to read into the text and appreciate the mind of the child, is seen by the teacher as an indication of real self-expression.

The first graders’ writing observed by the Kitagawas served primarily to anchor the personal experiences of the students by means of written language. The writer’s desire to share an experience is important to the teacher and young children in this Japanese model of writing. Consequently, children begin by sharing their experiences through writing rather than writing to inform or persuade. Students begin writing in the expressive mode because teachers believe that the writer’s voice and self will remain evident in written texts even when the reader’s needs become more prominent. The students gradually move away from expressive to other types of writing as they progress through the elementary school curriculum.
The Social Construction of Written Communication

Rubin (1988) has discussed the role that written communication plays in constructing social contexts by helping define relationships between participants. He discussed four ways that people construct social contexts through written communication:

(1) writers construct mental representations of the social contexts in which their writing is embedded; (2) writing as a social process or system can create or constitute social contexts; (3) writers...create texts collectively with other participants in discourse communities: (4) and writers assign consensual values to writing and thus construct a dimension of social meaning. (1988, p. 2)

Rubin (1988) says that effective communication adapts to social context. He used the concept of communicative competence from the ethnography of communication to discuss how writers adapted to social contexts by selecting from a repertoire of ways of speaking according the specific rules for culturally appropriate uses of language. Participants need to be aware of the social constraints of communication in a given situation. Communicative competence has usually been used in reference to face-to-face communication, but Rubin makes the link to written communication but discussing how writers have to face these issues as they define for themselves their communicative purposes in relation to the rhetorical effect of the text that they are writing.

Written language helps construct a social context by determining what counts as a worthwhile topic, the functions played by texts, and the writers' and audiences' beliefs and values about a topic (Rubin, 1988). The writer and reader participate in the definition of the situation proposed by
the written discourse. The reader temporarily adopts the definition of the situation presented by the text. Texts bring social contexts into existence and writers and readers who elect to participate in roles become part of a discourse community. Writing constructs contexts for self-expression and many times "for suffering evaluation" (Rubin, 1988, p. 14).

In a study of students' ownership of writing, Hudson (1988) found that some written products that were assigned by the teacher were perceived by students as their own, and writing that was presented to them as unstructured free writing was seen by students as assigned writing. Hudson proposed that ownership may be closer to the adult's use of composer than initiator. One category of writing that she identified in her study was called curriculum sponsored writing. She defined this type of writing as initiated by the teacher but heavily infused with original composition by the writer. The teacher's role in this type of writing was not to evaluate, but to encourage writing. Among the types of writing in this category were stories, reports, and poems. Students created most of the text themselves and the repeated routine of classroom writing encouraged a sense of control. Hudson concluded that when children continued to act upon their own representations of an assignment, they tended to claim ownership and control of official writing.

Personal Narratives

The personal narrative has been a topic of interest among folklorists. Bauman (1986) defined personal narratives as:
a particular class of reported events and a particular point of view. The event recounted is one in which the person telling the story was the one originally involved, and the point of view from which the event is recounted is that of the narrator by virtue of his participation in that event. (p. 33)

Bauman says that people tell personal narratives to construct and negotiate a social identity. Narratives are not only a reflection of culture but are "constitutive of social life in the act of storytelling" (Bauman, 1986, p. 13).

Stahl (1989) also discussed the role of personal narratives in the expression and construction of identity. She defined personal narratives by saying, "the personal narrative is a prose narrative relating a personal experience; it is usually told in the first person" (p. 12). Stahl used three unique features to define the genre of personal narrative. These three features were, dramatic narrative structure, the assertion that the narrative is true, and the same identity of the teller and the story's main character. The story makes use of a dramatic structure in which there is some kind of conflict and resolution. The dramatic structure is balanced by the need to make the story convincing. The truth of the incident is certified by the teller's first-hand participation in the event.

Stahl (1989) stated that the teller chooses a situation in the telling that becomes a way to talk about a cultural value. The situation and action chosen for the story express a covertly held value. Thus, the storyteller chooses the specific situation to be a significant showcase for the teller's actions. The overall function of the personal narrative then becomes to allow for the discovery of the teller's identity (especially in terms of values and character traits) and to maintain the stability of that identity for both the teller and listener.
The Social Worlds of Oral and Written Discourse

The following section on the social worlds of oral and written discourse complements the section on language socialization. The authors of the studies discussed in the language socialization section were anthropologists and sociologists, whereas the authors of the works discussed in the following section are philosophers, literary theorists, and linguists. The relevance of the works in the following section to the present study is their discussions of the creative power of language to open up worlds through written and oral texts and how texts are used to negotiate a sense of self. Those worlds are the imaginative realms of literature that engage readers of fiction as well as the everyday realms of conversational stories.

The relationships between subjectivity and language have been a central concern of Benveniste (1971). He says that speakers constitute themselves as subjects through the use of language. Subjectivity is used by Benveniste as the capacity of speakers to posit themselves as subjects in discourse. Subjectivity is determined by the linguistic status of person. He builds his argument around the personal pronouns "I" and "you." Self is experienced by contrast to the other. The pronoun "I" is used when speaking to someone who becomes a "you." This condition of dialogue is constitutive of persons because reciprocally "I" becomes "you" during conversations in which speakers participate in turn-taking and switching roles as speaker/listener. Language is possible because speakers set themselves as subjects by referring to them selves as "I" in their discourse. Benveniste (1971) says, "I' posits another person" (p.225).
Besides person, another aspect related to the instance of discourse is that of time. Past, present, and future are always in relation to the present, to the instance of discourse, "the time at which one is speaking" (Benveniste, 1971, p.226). The time of speaking defines how the "past, present, and future" are to be interpreted and who the "I" in the discourse refers to.

Benveniste (1971) summarizes his views by saying,

Language is accordingly the possibility of subjectivity because it always contains the linguistic forms appropriate to the expression of subjectivity, and discourse provokes the emergence of subjectivity because it consists of discrete instances. In some way language puts forth "empty" forms which each speaker, in the exercise of discourse, appropriates to himself and which he relates to his "person" at the same time defining himself as I and a partner as you. (p. 227)

Bakhtin (1986) also discussed the relationship of language to subjectivity. He used the term text for actual instances of discourse and broadly defined text as any coherent complex of signs. Subjectivity is constituted and expressed for oneself and for others through texts. Bakhtin says that subjectivity is not a given thing but that it is constituted in the realization of texts, "The event of the life of the text...always develops on the boundary between two consciousness, two subjects" (p. 106). The event, the happening in concrete social situations in which discourse is oriented towards the responsive understanding of the listener, is the situation in which the text takes its shape. The speaker anticipates challenges to his claims, points of confusion or doubts and attempts to address those
possible points of conflict in his text. The text is oriented towards the response of the other.

The role of the text to create and open up worlds is discussed by Ricoeur (1981). He defines the term "world" as, "the ensemble of references opened up by the texts" (p. 321). Ricoeur uses the phrase, "the world of Greece" as an example to talk about the term worlds by saying that to speak about the world of Greece is not to designate the situations for those who lived in Greece, but to designate the symbolic dimensions of our orientation and perspective towards the classical thought and culture of Greece. Ricoeur (1976) says that texts point towards a possible world and that as the text shows the world, it also creates it:

the sense of the text is not behind it but in front of it. It is not something hidden but something disclosed. What has to be understood is not the initial situation of discourse, but what points towards a possible world. The text speaks of a possible world and of a possible way of orienting oneself to it. The dimensions of this world are properly opened up by and disclosed by the text. It (discourse) goes beyond the mere function of pointing out and showing what already exists and in this sense transcends the function of the ostensive reference linked to spoken language. Here showing is at the same time creating a new way of being. (p. 88)

According to Ricoeur a text projects a world, and reading is a way of appropriating the world of the text and following the direction of thought that the text suggests. Ricoeur (1981) defines appropriation by saying, "'Appropriation' is my translation of the German term Aneignung. Aneignung means 'to make one's own what was initially 'alien'" (p. 134).

The use of the term "multiple social worlds," in this study was originally influenced by Dyson (1989), but has been elaborated for the
purposes of this study through Shutz (Natanson 1989; Shultz, 1970). Dyson (1989) used the notion of multiple worlds in order to explain the role that children's interactions with drawing, talk, and writing played in their growing experiences and understanding of literacy. As has already been discussed, Dyson saw children's interactions with these various symbolic media as attempts to negotiate the meaning potential of each one in their efforts to construct a text in their journals.

Shutz (1970) talked about multiple social worlds through the use of the term "enclaves." Shutz discussed how enclaves of meaning and provinces of different activities overlap. Enclaves are defined as, "regions belonging to one province of meaning enclosed by another" (Shutz, 1970, p. 256). The result of this overlapping is the embedding of social worlds within one another. Meaning in everyday life may be infiltrated by elements of meaning from other spheres of activity not present in the ongoing activity. The overlapping of enclaves is constitutive of multiple social worlds.

Conversational stories are enclaves in conversations. Young (1987) says that, "stories can be identified as a different order of event from the conversation of which they are enclaves" (p. 24). The story is seen as a different type of discourse from the conversation. The storytelling directs attention to the realm that the events of the story are about. In this way a conversation can be embedded within the social worlds of the ongoing talk and the world of the narrated events. The social worlds that are embedded are represented by different types of discourse or events. The conversation in which the storytelling takes place is characterized by the features of conversation such as turn-taking. The storytelling is characterized by an
extended turn at talk and the actual story by the ordering of events along a
dimension of time (past, present, or future).

Dialogue and Dialogue Journals

The role of dialogue in children's oral language learning has
received the attention of such researchers as Bruner (1978) and Wertsch
(1980). Bruner (1978) states that knowledge of language develops in
dialogue. The early interactions between infant and mother develop
conventions for turn-taking and the baby's vocalizations are seen to be the
roots of dialogue. As children learn about dialogue, they learn how to map
the speaker/listener pair onto the ongoing exchange and how to signal and
interpret the action between the two partners. Bruner uses the example of
dialogue during book reading to discuss his main points. In those dialogues
the child begins to recognize the point at which a response is required and
what the appropriate points of entry into the dialogue are. The child also
learns to use pauses to turn the floor over to the mother.

Wertsch (1980) has looked at the movement of dialogue from the
social context to the speaker's inner speech. Children learn the nature of
dialogue in social interaction with other speakers, internalize dialogue, and
provide their own responses to their own prompts. Dialogue is an
interactional process that provides young children with an initial point of
entry into many of a community's concepts and discourse strategies.
Dialogue provides an entry point by making a way for individuals to
participate in the give and take between speaker and listener.
In dialogue journals, students and their teacher carry on a written conversation in which students write about a topic of interest to them or ask the teacher questions about school or personal matters. The teacher then comments on what the students have written usually while the students are not present and hands back the journals to the students. The students then decide whether they will continue to respond to the teacher's comment or initiate a new topic. Staton (1988) has described dialogue journal writing as "functional, interactive, mostly about self-generated topics, and deeply embedded in the ongoing life of the classroom" (p.198). Dialogue journal writing is functional because writing is used to get things done (complain, inform, express personal viewpoints), and it is interactive because two participants alternate turns at writing. The journals are embedded in the life of the classroom because the topics are selected by the students. Dialogue journals are beneficial for the writing development of students because they allow self-expression and contribute to the development of a personal voice in writing (Staton, 1988).

The major study on dialogue journals was conducted with sixth-grade students and their teacher. Staton, Shuy, Peyton, and Reed (1988) investigated the role that dialogue journal writing played in: making a bridge from oral to written language, building personal relationships, using the event as a way of getting things done (such as complaining), and constructing knowledge (i.e. elaboration and development of topics through writing). Dialogue journals can serve as a bridge from spoken conversation to writing because of the dyadic interaction across turns at writing and
because writing is used in purposeful ways to complain, describe, reflect on experiences, and express personal feelings.

Shuy (1987) has advocated the use of dialogue journals in classrooms because they provide a means through which teachers and students can participate in dialogues that are different in nature than the dialogues that take place during classroom lessons. In dialogue journals, participants ask questions or give their responses to topics that are of interest to them. Unlike the questions teachers usually asked during lessons, the teacher's questions in the dialogue journals were real questions that requested information not already known by the teacher. The students' writing reflected more personal facts or opinions than their talk during lessons. Their writing in the journals also showed that the students were involved in process thinking instead of the recall of factual information usually demonstrated during lessons. Dialogue journals helped establish dialogue between the teacher and student that was "built on mutual trust that enables both to speak their minds, explain their feelings and offer arguments" (Shuy, 1987, p. 898). Because of their similarities to the tone and turn-taking of spoken dialogue, journals introduced writing as a social, interactive, and functional activity.

Dialogue journals have also been used with young children (Braig, 1986; Staton & Shuy, 1988). Staton and Shuy (1988) described how a teacher used them with young second-language speakers. The children drew a picture and wrote in their journals. The students then took their journal to the teacher or the classroom aide and read what they had written. The adults discussed the picture and writing with the students and then
wrote back a response on the students' journal. The adults read their response to the student as they wrote on the journal. Braig (1986) reported a study in which he and second-grade students wrote back and forth to each other. Braig, like Staton et al. (1988), concluded that dialogue journals provided an opportunity for student to use oral conversational strategies in written dialogues in a supportive context for the use of written language. The students used journals for a variety of functions including, recreating experiences, requesting information from the teacher, and getting assistance in generating new topics for writing.

Dialogue journals have also been used with ESL (English as a second language) students. Research findings report that ESL students benefited from their writing experiences with dialogue journals since they were able to write about topics of interests to them and to discuss personal and school concerns with the teacher (Hudelson, 1989, Staton and Shuy, 1988). The students wrote only in English because they were exchanging journals with their teacher and not with other students who knew their native language.

There are few studies of the use of dialogue journals among bilingual populations in which the students had the opportunity to write in both their native language and English. Flores and García (1984) reported the use of dialogue journals in a bilingual first-grade. The students drew a picture and wrote in their journals and then read their writing to their teacher. The teacher wrote back on the students' journals and read to the student what she had written. The teacher's responses provided a reason for students to write in their journals and the student–teacher interaction helped students
see writing as communication. The dialogue journals provided opportunities for both student and teacher to demonstrate each others' use of written language. In a study of dialogue journals in a bilingual sixth-grade class, Reyes (1989) reported that the teacher validated the students language and culture through her responses in their journals in which wrote about topics from the bilingual children's cultural backgrounds and showed interests in their family lives. Like in other studies on dialogue journals the teacher responded to the message of the journal entries and not the form. There are no studies on the use of dialogue journals where the students wrote to one another. This study contributes to previous research on dialogue journals since the children in this study were bilingual and wrote in their journals to each other in Spanish, as well as English.

Summary

The relationships between language and social life have been the focus of the ethnography of communication and interactional sociolinguistics. These two branches of sociolinguistics represent current interests in relationships between language and culture that have been a central concern of linguistic anthropology. Language socialization research has contributed to understanding the relationships of language learning and socialization among children from various cultures. A specific area of interests has been the study of routines in children's socialization process. Routines have received attention because they represent a patterned way of language use that is prevalent among adult-child and child-child
interactions. In routines, children learn about the relations of language and social life in predictable sequences of verbal interaction.

Several topics related to conversations have been reviewed in this chapter. Those different topics were, speech play, conversational stories, side sequences, and conversational closings. These various topics represent areas of interests in conversational analysis as well as child language and language education research. Conversational analysis has focused on how speakers accomplish talk in face–to–face settings and has described different facets of the way that conversations are managed as social occasions. Child language research and language educators have been interested in children’s play with language, as well as the stories children tell during conversations. Through speech play children explore the meaning potential of language through inversion of meaning and nonsense as well as the patterns of language form through repetition and rhyme.

Recent research in children’s early literacy and studies of writing have focused on the social aspects of written language. The writer’s purposes and use of written language to mediate social relationships and constitute social contexts has received the attention of researchers who have studied written language as communication across a range of ages. Britton’s term, "expressive writing ," describes writing that is close to the self and through which writers interpret their personal experiences through written texts.

Speakers and writers use a variety levels of language from personal pronouns to texts to construct social worlds in which they interpret their
experiences through stories that present images of themselves or create imaginary worlds. Language presents a range of possibilities for the construction of social worlds and the presentation of self in social occasions. Social worlds can be embedded within one another during daily activities. An example of multiple social worlds was conversational storytelling in which the narrated events were embedded within the ongoing conversation.

Dialogue journal writing has been describes as functional, interactive, and based on self-generated topics. Dialogue journals are a beneficial form of writing because they contribute to the writer's self-expression and development of personal voice in writing. Dialogue journals are a supportive context for writing because students can use familiar oral language strategies in their writing.

Participants' interactions with oral and written language need to studied in naturally occurring situations in order to understand the meaning that literacy events hold for those who participate in them. The ethnography of communication and interactional sociolinguistics provides concepts and tools to investigate the cultural aspects of language in social life. The research methodology used in this study to investigate bilingual children's uses of oral and written language during the dialogue journal literacy is discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

The present study was concerned with bilingual children’s use of oral and written language during a specific classroom literacy event. The children’s interactions during the event were observed over an extended period of time and multiple sources of data were collected. The analysis of the event as a unit and the use of case study children allowed for the analysis of the features of the literacy event as well as how the students interpreted the event.

The purpose of the present study was to describe a dialogue journal literacy event within a classroom setting and to analyze how oral and written discourse within the literacy event was used by bilingual children to construct the social worlds in which their interactions took place. The social worlds constructed by the children helped define both the literacy event (the context of their interaction) and the social functions that literacy served. The research questions addressed in this study were:

1. What is a dialogue journal literacy event? What are the dialogue journal literacy event’s main characteristics?
2. What are the various ways of speaking/writing that are patterned and recurring during this event?
3. How did the bilingual students use oral and written language to negotiate and construct social worlds in interaction with each other?
In order to address this topic, research frameworks from the ethnography of communication as well as interactional sociolinguistics were employed. The ethnography of communication has specialized in analyzing the relationships between language and social life (Gumperz & Hymes, 1972) and interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 1986) in analyzing the dynamic relationships that constitute social life through linguistically-mediated interaction (See chapter 2 for a discussion of the ethnography of communication and interactional sociolinguistics).

The Teacher as Participant–Observer

A research question posed in this study is, what is a dialogue journal literacy event? This question makes the definition of the event central to the research problem. The event itself will be understood through the research process and not before hand.

The description of any social occasion can be pursued from the perspective of an observer or from the perspective of the participants. These two perspectives can be incorporated in order to bring a cumulative description that unites the contributions made by the observer’s and participants’ perspectives.

The terms etic and emic have been used by ethnographers to discuss the observer–participant distinction in terms of “insider–outsider” (Pike, 1954). The term etic is used to mean the view from within the culture and etic from outside the culture. The terms etic and emic were developed from “phonetic” and “phonemic.” Phonetics are the distinctions in the phonological system of a language as they are classified by linguists and
phonemics are the distinctions as they are classified by the speakers of the language. Distinctions made by linguists may not be made by speakers of a language. The distinctions between the range of sounds that can be identified by linguists and those that serve as meaningful contrasts for speakers of a given language serve as an analogy in the study of social interaction. The researcher of social interaction that is interested in the participants' perspectives has to analyze interaction in terms of the meaningful distinctions of interactions made by the participants. The criterion for making these distinctions is the participants' interpretation of events.

One way researchers have attempted to understand the participants' meaning perspectives has been through long-term field research. The anthropological canon states that one year in the field is the minimum requirement for long-term field research because the researcher would have been able to see the flow of life through a yearly cycle of seasons. This assumes that the participants as well as the anthropologist count a year as four seasons and that the seasons happen to match our calendar in which they are spread out through a year of 365 days. In other words, even attempts to understand the meaning perspectives of the participants are not immune to problems that are the result of trying to bridge etic-emic distinctions.

Another aspect of a researcher's attempt to understand the participants' perspective is active participation in the every day activities of the social group under study. The attempt to bring together the observer's perspective with the participants' has been called participant-observation.
Participant–observation occurs on a continuum from passive participation at one end (being present at the scene but not interacting) to active participation (participating in the activity along with other people) to complete participation at the other end of the continuum (studying a situation in which the researcher is already an ordinary participant) (Spradley, 1980).

The School

The school in which the data were collected was in a large city in the Southwestern part of the United States. The school had an enrollment of approximately 400 students, approximately 65% of whom were Mexican–American, 20% Anglo, 13% Black, and 2% Laotian. Most of the homes in neighborhood in which the school was located had been built during World War Two. After the war the population of the neighborhood gradually shifted from a majority of Anglo to Black. Gradually Mexican–Americans began moving into the neighborhood until they became the majority of residents. The neighborhood is in a city that is about an hour's drive from the Mexican border. Thus, Mexican–American families often travel either to border communities or deeper into Mexico to visit relatives and friends. Visits by family and friends from Mexico are also common. During the recent arrivals of Southeast Asian refugees, community refugee services helped Loatians settle in the neighborhood. Most of the residents of the neighborhood had working–class jobs such as factory workers, mechanics, and truck drivers.

The school had a bilingual (Spanish–English) program in which children received instruction in their primary language. The Hispanic and Laotian
students also received English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction. The bilingual teachers faced great curricular demands due to their having to plan and orchestrate bilingual and ESL programs in their classrooms. The kindergarten teachers were the only teachers that had instructional aides. The bilingual program was a maintenance model in which the use of native language instruction was a part of children's instruction from kindergarten to sixth grade. In kindergarten and first-grade, Spanish was the language of instruction the majority of time. Gradually through the remainder of the elementary school grades more instruction took place in English while still maintaining instruction in Spanish. The school district, in which this school was located, had an official policy of a bilingual maintenance program from kindergarten to high school.

The Classroom

The first-grade classroom in which the data were collected had 28 students; 14 received their primary instruction in Spanish and 14 in English. The second grade had 26 students; 12 received their primary instruction in Spanish and 14 received their primary instruction in English. The author was the first-grade classroom teacher and then moved to second-grade the following year in order to continue to investigate the same bilingual students' reading and writing.

The classroom was under study for approximately 1 1/2 academic years, the last 3 months of first grade and the entire second grade year. This involved a change of rooms between first and second grade. Both rooms had the same physical layout (see Figure 2 below). The classrooms had windows from the
ceiling to halfway up the wall on one side. The windows looked out to an enclosed patio that was used for classroom vegetable gardens. A set of storage shelves (F) ran along the side of the room facing the patio. A wide counter top created by these shelves was used to display student's school projects such as ant farms, cages for guinea pigs and pigeons, and clay or paper maché sculptures. The teacher's desk (D) was in a corner by a closet (E) where materials were kept. There were blackboards in the front of the room as well as on one of the sides. A rug (C) at the front of the room was a space where the class could sit down for whole-group discussions. The classroom had five large tables (A) set up around the two sides and back of the room. The
students' desks (B) were in the center of the room and were set up in groups of four. The students' desk had flat, hinged, tops. Students kept their materials inside their desks. Groups of desks were arranged so that they faced each other made a table-top.

The reading/language arts curriculum in the classroom consisted of written language activities in which reading and writing were used for interpersonal, creative, and informational purposes. Students had opportunities to share their writing through performances of their plays and stories and through presentations of their content area projects to both their classmates and to the larger school community. The students were free to read and write both in their first and second language. During reading instruction the students were grouped by language the majority of time even though there were many times that they were mixed and the bilingual students read in their second language. A variety of reading materials were used including children's literature books and children's individual and groups stories.

An important feature of the everyday life of the classroom in this study was literacy and the different purposes and situations in which it was used. The teacher plays a critical role in determining what counts as literacy in a given classroom because the teacher determines the types of instructional activities in which students have an opportunity to use and learn reading and writing. The culture of the particular classroom that was the site for this study was influenced by the fact that the teacher was enrolled in a Master's degree program in language and literacy during the time of data collection. Through his course work the teacher became aware of developments in
early literacy research and sociolinguistics. His course work influenced his understanding of language and literacy learning. The way he set up his classroom reflected what he learned in his course work as well as his discussions with other teachers who had similar interests.

Research findings from early literacy research indicated that children's explorations with writing helped their growing understandings of how written language works (Ferreiro & Teberosky, 1982) and that children learned the forms and functions of literacy by using literacy for a variety of purposes (Teale & Sulzby, 1986). Based on his course work on early literacy research and discussions in his graduate classes, the teacher decided to give the children in his classroom opportunities to write extended narratives and to engage in other kinds of writing opportunities such as group stories and science learning logs. Through course work in sociolinguistics the teacher also became aware of language use in bilingual communities (Genishi, 1981; Gumperz, 1982; Zentella, 1981). Reading sociolinguistic research led the teacher to develop a descriptive instead of prescriptive view of language use. For example, a prescriptive view of a common feature of bilingual language use, code-switching, states that bilingual speakers should not mix both languages and that to do so indicates a nonproficient command of both languages. On the other hand, a descriptive view recognizes the sociolinguistic findings that code-switching serves a variety of social functions in bilingual communities. A descriptive view looks at code-switching as sociolinguistic competence rather than a linguistic deficit (Genishi, 1981).
The teacher in this study set up his classroom in such a way that the students had many opportunities to write and talk as they did their school work. They were not discouraged from talking to one another either about topics related to their work or other topics as long as they finished their assignments. Most of the time the students worked together in small groups at tables and only very rarely did they work individually at their desks. The teacher usually worked at the table that required his attention and at which new information was introduced to the students. The students at the other tables were expected to function independently of the teacher and to help one another while they worked together. The students were given opportunities to write extended texts in first- and second-grade when they were learning to write. They were encouraged to help one another with spelling as well as to use the primary dictionaries that were available in the classroom.

The Literacy Event

The teacher’s requirements for the dialogue journals were that a personal narrative be written and that the students participate in a written dialogue. The directions given to the class were to write a story about something that the students had done (such as a playing with friends or visiting relatives) and to read it to a friend. The friend was to write a response to the narrative on the journal. The students were then to repeat the process on the writing partner’s journal. The requirements of the event were explained to the entire class at the beginning of both first and second grade.
Dialogue journals were used by the teacher to give the students an opportunity to write personal narratives and to be able to interact with students of varying linguistic backgrounds and academic abilities. Research had indicated that bilingual children selected a code to speak based on the linguistic abilities of their interlocutors (Genishi, 1981; Zentella, 1981). The teacher wanted the bilingual students to have opportunities to write in either Spanish or English for communicative purposes. Bilingual children would have a reason to write in English when they participated in dialogue journals with a monolingual child and a choice between both codes when writing with another bilingual student. The teacher was interested in having the students write personal experience narratives because he wanted them to be able to connect reading and writing to their own daily lives and to be able to use literacy to reflect on their personal experiences (Kitagawa & Kitagawa, 1987). In this way their personal experiences would provide a common base from which to talk and write during the dialogue section of the event.

There were several reasons for using the dialogue journals in a face-to-face context. One was so that the students could read what they had written to each other. The students were in first- and second-grade and wrote with invented spellings. Their writing was sometimes difficult for another child to read. Another reason was that it would have been very time-consuming for the teacher to respond to 26 children's journals on a daily basis. The teacher decided to have the students respond to each others' journals and in that way the teacher only had to respond to one student's journal every day. As a result of having the students respond to
each others' journals, they had an opportunity to interact with children that had different linguistic and academic abilities. They would not have had that variety if the teacher were the only one responding to their journals.

Data Collection

The data collection period covered the academic months between 3/18/85 and 5/5/86 (see Figure 3).

First Grade


1st grade school year begins. Teacher and students start using dialogue journals.

Data collection begins during the last half of March, 1985. Teacher stops writing in his dialogue journal and begins observation and audio recording.

1st grade school year ends. Data collection ends during first week of June.

Second Grade

September-1985  June-1986

2nd grade school year begins. Data collection begins.

2nd grade school year ends. Data collection ends during last week of May.

Figure 3. Data Collection Timeline

These dates represented the last 3 months of first grade and the entire 9 months of second grade. The data collected included audio tapes, the teacher's observational notes, and the student's journals. The audio
recorder was placed on the table in front of the students being observed. The teacher sat next to the students at the table. In his notes the teacher recorded what word the students were writing and how they were spelling the word. The teacher recorded this information in order to be able to read the students' journals at a later date.

The data were collected by the teacher as the students were writing in their journals. The students talked to the teacher, and he occasionally asked them questions about what they were writing. Four bilingual students that were in the classroom during first and second grade will be the focus of this study. The data collected from these four students included 38 sessions (see Table 1). Each session included the audio recording, the students' journal writing, and the teacher's notes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Robert</th>
<th>Gilbert</th>
<th>Yolanda</th>
<th>Kata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SET 1</td>
<td>3/25/85*</td>
<td>4/29/85*</td>
<td>4/12/85*</td>
<td>4/22/85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/21/85</td>
<td>5/29/85</td>
<td>6/5/85*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/14/85</td>
<td>10/22/85</td>
<td>9/10/85</td>
<td>9/30/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/85*</td>
<td>12/16/85*</td>
<td>12/9/85*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET 3</td>
<td>2/25/86*</td>
<td>3/3/86</td>
<td>1/5/86</td>
<td>3/6/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/19/86*</td>
<td>4/9/86*</td>
<td>3/17/86*</td>
<td>4/16/86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/15/86*</td>
<td>4/10/86</td>
<td>5/16/86*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/5/86*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Transcribed

The data were divided into three sets in order to be able to refer to the early, middle, and later parts of the collection period.
1. The samples from the beginning of the collection period ranged in dates from 3/18/85 to 6/5/85. These samples are called set 1 of the data.
2. The samples from the middle of the data collection ranged from 9/14/85 to 12/16/85 and are called set 2.
3. The samples from the end of the collection period ranged in date from 1/5/86 to 5/16/86. They are called set 3.

The Case Study Students

Several criteria for the selection of the case study students were established: 1) the student was bilingual, 2) the student was in the classroom for the entire first- and second- grade school year, 3) the student had not been absent for extended periods of time, 4) the individual sessions of data collection were complete, and the entire event was recorded. Two male students and six female students met all the above criteria.

In order to reduce the number of female students, another criterion was established, based on the language in which the students wrote the personal narrative. An important feature of this study was the students' use of Spanish and English during the event. The narrative writing was selected as the basis to select from among the six female students because the narrative writing was the part of the event in which an extended text was written. The purpose of this criterion was to select students who used English and Spanish in different ways during the narrative writing. Two female students were selected. One wrote her narrative the majority of time
in English, and the other female student wrote many narratives in which she switched between both languages in her narrative writing.

The four students selected as case studies are briefly described here. Gilbert was a quiet student in whole group settings but was very talkative when he was in a small group with his friends. Gilbert was bilingual; he spoke Spanish most of the time with his friends and English when he interacted with the monolingual children in the classroom. Gilbert had one older and one younger brother, and his parents were born and raised in Mexico.

Robert was a very energetic student who spoke English as often as he spoke Spanish. Robert's father was an Anglo who was fluent in Spanish. His mother was born and raised in Mexico. The older of two boys, Robert was always an active participant in whole or small group activities in the classroom.

Kata was also very involved in both whole group and small group settings. She also spoke English as well as Spanish with her friends. Both of her parents had been born and raised in Mexico. Kata had an older brother and a younger sister.

Yolanda, Robert's cousin, was also very outgoing and participated in all aspects of classroom life by taking part in discussions. Yolanda spoke Spanish and English with her friends and her mother. Yolanda's parents were born and raised in Mexico. Yolanda was an only child and was occasionally ridiculed by one of her friends as a result of being an only child.
Data Analysis

The audio-recordings of 24 sessions of dialogue journals were transcribed (see Table 1 above), six sessions from each of the four case study children. The sessions averaged 30 minutes. These recordings totaled approximately 11 hours of tape. Two of the earliest sessions from set 1, two sessions the last part of set 2, and two of the last sessions from set 3 of the data collection period were transcribed for each case study child. The sessions that were transcribed were selected in order to have sessions transcribed from three points in time ranging from the earliest to the latest sessions with two sessions from the middle period.

The transcripts from the sessions that were transcribed were analyzed in order to identify patterns of interaction. The tapes that were not transcribed were listened to in order to compare the patterns in the ways of speaking and writing from the tapes that were transcribed. The patterns were then compared with sessions that were not transcribed in order to search for more instances of the identified patterns as well as for different patterns.

The analysis for the research questions: What is a dialogue journal literacy event?; and, What are the main characteristics of the dialogue journal literacy event?, was carried out by identifying the different parts of the event. Those different parts were called phases. The phases were identified by locating shifts in the relationships between components of the SPEAKING mnemonic (Hymes, 1972) and shifts in the different uses of oral and written language.
The phases of the event were identified through the use of several of the components from Hymes' SPEAKING mnemonic. The following components of the SPEAKING mnemonic were used: participants, instrumentalities (channel and message form), and norms (for interaction and interpretation). The key characteristics of the event were highlighted by these particular components. The use of both oral and written language during this event were highlighted in the channel component. The message form highlighted what the students were talking and writing about and the form in which the topic was expressed (narrative or dialogue). The specific aspect of the norms for interaction that helped differentiate one phase from another was whether dialogue was necessary for the phase to be carried out and whether the closing of the phase had to be negotiated between the participants.

Two unique tutoring sessions between a student who was a recent arrival to the classroom and a student who had been in the classroom since the beginning of the year provided information used to triangulate the findings of the identification of the phases of the event and the norms for interaction and interpretation. The student who was familiar with the event explained the procedure for the use of the dialogue journals to the new student. The explanation by the experienced student provided information that was used to compare with the findings arrived at through the analysis of the transcripts.

The analysis for the research question: What are the various ways of speaking/writing that are patterned and recurring during this event?, was carried out by identifying the different ways in which oral and written language were used and the different participant structures that operated for the different ways of using oral and written language.
The personal narratives were analyzed by looking at the following features: topic, characters, setting, the language they were written in, time orientation of the narrative (past or future), and the way they began and ended.

The written interaction that took place during the written dialogue was coded using a category system that was inductively developed through analysis of the transcripts (see Figure 4 below). The sequence of the questions and statements during the dialogue phases were then recorded in order to analyze the pattern of question–answer and statement–response exchanges (question–answer, statement–response, question–answer–response or initiation–question–answer). The transcripts were also coded to identify whether the oral or written channel was used to close the dialogue phases.

The extended interaction that took place in the oral channel was classified either as side sequences or as conversational narratives. The parts of the side sequences (the ongoing sequence, the side sequence, the request to resume and the return to the ongoing sequence) were identified on the transcripts. Comments were also written on the transcripts that recorded how the side sequences broke away from and returned to the written dialogue. Also noted was whether the side sequences were related to the topic of the written dialogue or whether they initiated a new topic. Conversational narratives were also analyzed to see if they were related to the topic of the written dialogue or if they were used to initiate new topics. The manner in which conversational narratives were initiated and terminated was also analyzed. Brief exchanges that took place in the oral
channel that were related to management of the event were not classified as side sequences. Examples of talk related to the management of the event included children's talk about where to write on the journal or whether to write with pen or pencil.

1. Requesting information:
A. Actors–Actions
B. Setting
C. Time
D. Objects–Toys

2. Giving requested information
A. Actors–Actions
B. Setting
C. Time
D. Objects–Toys

Examples

1A & 2A = Requesting and giving information on actors–action
"Is your brother going"
"Sí" (Yes)
(12/5/85–Gilbert)

1B & 2B = Requesting and giving information on setting
"¿Cuál parque van a ir?" (What park are you going to)
"Yo no sé qué parque" (I don't know what park?)
(5/15/86–Robert)

1C & 2C Requesting and giving information on time
"Cuándo van a ir?" (When are you going?)
"Ahora" (Today)
(5/17/85–Robert)

1D & 2D Requesting and giving information on objects
"What kind of car"
"Any kind"
(4/9/86–Gilbert)

3. Requesting reasons:
A. Actors–Actions

4. Giving reasons:
A. Actors–Actions

Example

3A & 4A Requesting and giving reasons:
"¿Por qué no le dijistes?" (Why didn't you tell him?)
"Porque no me acordaba" (Because I didn't remember)
4/12/86 Yolanda

5AB. Requesting and giving opinion

Example

5A & 7B Requesting and giving opinion
"Do you think it’s fun?"
"Yes we are gonna have a lot of fun"
(Yolanda 5/15/86)

6AB. Responses (not requests)

Example

6A & B Initiation–Response
"Yo pienso que voy a ir a la casa del Gilbert para jugar a los carrillos (I think that I am going to Gilbert house to play cars) We are going to have fun yes Gilbert and me"
G: "Yo quiero a ir a tu casa también"
(I also want to go to your house)
(Gilbert 3/3/86)

Figure 4. Category System for Written Dialogue
The participant structures for the different ways of speaking/writing were identified and described. Participant structures were defined as, "the patterns in the allocation of interactional rights and obligations among all the members who are enacting a social occasion together" (Florio, Schultz, & Erickson 1982, p. 94).

The analysis for the research question: How did students use oral and written language to negotiate and construct social worlds in interaction with each other?, was concerned with focusing on the participants' perspective of the event. Probing questions used to guide the analysis were: What was this literacy event for the students?; How did they interpret the event?; How did the students communicate the activity they were engaged in achieving?; What social functions did it serve them; and, How did the students use the ways of speaking writing to collectively construct and participate in the social worlds of peer culture? The analysis of the students' appropriations of the literacy event began by looking at how participants' interpreted the ongoing interaction. Participants' interpretations were inferred by looking at how the different phases of the event were used to negotiate social worlds. The definition of appropriation used in this study was based on Ricoeur's (1981) use of the term. He defined appropriation by saying that appropriation means to make one's own what was initially alien and to make it contemporary to the present situation. For the purposes of this study the term appropriation was defined as how students made the literacy event their own by making it serve their own purposes and the functions for which they used the literacy event. The appropriation types were classified according to the time orientation of the narrative and the
social purposes of the dialogue. The probe questions were developed based on the term appropriation and on previous research in language socialization (Cook-Gumperz, Corsaro, & Streeck, 1986) and were intended to help the researcher develop a set of questions that would help him identify and classify the students' purposes.

The negotiation of social worlds during the event began by analyzing the world of the text projected from the students' personal narratives. The following questions were posed to identify the world of the text: How did time unfold in the narrative; What received attention in the narrative (actors, actions, setting)?; What were the relationships between the characters in the story?; and, How did the authors present themselves through the situations and actions that they chose to write about in their personal narratives? The probe questions were developed based on previous research on narratives (Bauman, 1986; Britton, 1970; Ricoeur, 1981; Rosen, 1988; Stahl, 1989).

The varying contributions that the personal narrative and dialogue phases made to the negotiation of social worlds were also analyzed. The following probe questions were used: How did the students use the phases of the event to construct social worlds?; How did the world of the text become the topic of dialogue?; Did the introduction of the world of the text into the dialogue affect peer relations? and, How did the partner participate and become part of the social world introduced through the world of the personal narrative?
Summary

The data which included audio recordings of the students' talk, the students' journals, and the teacher's observation notes, were collected during the last three months of first-grade and the nine months of second-grade. The teacher of the bilingual first- and second-grade classrooms was the researcher. Four bilingual students were selected as case studies, two male and two female students, from the bilingual students that had been in the classroom the entire first- and second-grade school year.

The purpose for the analysis of the research question: What is a dialogue journal literacy event?, was to begin the description of the dialogue journals as a literacy event. The analysis for this research question identified the parts of the event using components of Hymes' SPEAKING. This research question along with the second research question, "What are the various ways of speaking/writing that are patterned and recurring during this event?," identified the parts of the event and the different ways of speaking and writing that took place during the different parts.

The purpose for the analysis of the research question, "What are the various ways of speaking/writing that are patterned and recurring during this event?," was to identify the different types of recurring forms of speaking and writing that the students used during this event and to describe how the use of the different ways of speaking/writing helped define the characteristics of the event.

The analysis related to the research question, "How did students use oral and written language to negotiate and construct social worlds in interaction with each other?," provided an opportunity to discuss how oral
and written discourse were used to create and negotiate social worlds. The construction of social worlds was related to how students appropriated the event. In order to explore the construction of social worlds, features identified in the previous two sections of analysis were used. Those features included the sequence of the movement through phases of the event and the interactional routines of the dialogic phases. The concept of appropriation was introduced in this section to discuss how students purposes were played out during the event.

The first two research questions analyzed the event from an observer's perspective. The analysis was an "etic" description of the event. The last research question, "How did students use oral and written language to negotiate and construct social worlds in interaction with each other?," was concerned with the analysis of the event as it related to the students' social purposes. This analysis was more "emic" in that it defined the event in terms of the students' interpretations of the event.

The research findings are presented in chapter four and five. Chapter four introduces the main characteristics of the event which are then elaborated in relation to the individual case studies in chapter five. Chapter five also discusses the students' appropriations of the event.
CHAPTER IV
DIALOGUE JOURNALS AS A LITERACY EVENT

This study investigated the oral and written language interactions of students within a specific literacy event, dialogue journals. This chapter describes the event as a unit through the use of the conceptual tools of the communicative and literacy event (Hymes, 1972; Heath, 1982a). The event's different phases and their sequence during the event are identified. Students' patterns of interaction are discussed through the description of the ways of speaking and writing and their accompanying participant structures. This chapter introduces the phases of the event and the ways of speaking and writing. The characteristics of the event are discussed in relation to the case study student in the following chapter.

The analysis in this section helps answer the following research questions:

1. What is a dialogue journal literacy event? What are the dialogue journal literacy event's main characteristics?
2. What are the various ways of speaking/writing that are patterned and recurring during this event?

Dialogue Journals in the Classroom Setting

Dialogue journals were a daily instructional activity in the classroom in which all the students in the classroom participated. The event began by the teacher announcing to the entire class that it was time for dialogue...
journals. Since the journal writing was part of the daily routine, the students made a smooth transition into dialogue journal time. The beginning of the event was marked by the students getting spiral notebooks that they used as journals from their desk and selecting a place in the classroom where they would be writing. The students worked in self-selected small groups as they sat at either the tables around the perimeter of the classroom or at the table tops made by the students' desks. These groups varied in size from approximately two to six students. During this time the teacher was either writing in his own journal with a group of students or was observing students as they wrote.

After the students finished writing their personal narrative, they located a writing partner. If the students at their table were not finished writing their narrative, they went to another part of the room and looked for someone who was finished. As they walked around the room, they looked for a student who was not already paired up and writing with someone else. Sometimes the students waited a few minutes until someone finished writing their narrative. Most students finished sharing their journals before the hour allocated for the event. When they were finished they read, drew and colored pictures, or played with any of the materials in the classroom. The average amount of time students spent with their dialogue journals was approximately 30 minutes. The students were encouraged to write with different writing partners. They were discouraged from writing with the same person every day or only with their closest friends since one of the purposes for using dialogue journals was so that students had an opportunity to interact with a variety of written language users.
After about 30 minutes the majority of pairs of writers had finished with the event. They put away their journals and chose something to do for the remainder of the time. The teacher marked the end of the dialogue journal event by bringing the whole class together at the front of the classroom and setting up a transition time to shift to recess, lunch break, or the next instructional activity. Occasionally one or two pairs were still writing at the time of transition. They were allowed to keep writing until they were finished. The students rejoined the class when they were finished writing.

During the first few weeks of first- and second-grade, after the students had finished their journals, the teacher selected a pair of students who had written an extended dialogue in the journals and had the pair of students read their journals to the entire class. The students passed the journal back and forth to each other as they each took turns reading what they had written. The teacher led a discussion after the students had read their journal. During the discussion the teacher highlighted the communicative aspects of the dialogue. These communicative aspects included the questions and answers or responses that were used to respond or request further information. The extended dialogue was used to demonstrate to the class the conversational type of interaction in the students' journals. That interaction was one in which students were developing their interaction much like a conversation in which information was requested by one partner and provided by another.

An Example of a Dialogue Journal Literacy Event

Dialogue journals were a literacy event in which two students wrote back and forth to each other. This written exchange was initiated by a written
response to a personal narrative. There was wide variation in the individual
events, such as duration (total time of the event) and type of interaction
carried out in the oral and written channels. The following transcript of an
entire event took place on 5/6/85 between Silvia and Alicia is a short session
that lasted 14 minutes and is used to introduce the main features of the event.
The average session for the four case study students during this period of the
data collection was 26 minutes.

Example 4.1. 5/6/85 (S: Silvia, T: Teacher, A: Alicia, Talk is in
plain text, writing is underlined– the student read what was
being written so it could be picked up on the tape recorder, oral
reading is in italics, ..... indicate data omitted, and translations
are in parenthesis.)

(Silvia is writing a personal narrative)
S: Mi papá me compró unos cigaritos y no
( My father bought me some cigarettes and they're)
T: ¿Qué dice, "y no" (What does it say? and they're)
S: Y no están dereveras y mi hermanito quería hacer el baño y
lo hizo en el piso ya (And they're not real and my little brother
wanted to go to the bathroom and he did it on the floor)
yá acabé (I'm done)

.....

(Silvia reads her narrative to her writing partner, Alicia)
S: Mi papá me compró unos cigaritos y no están dereveras y mi
hermanito quería ser el baño y lo hizo en el piso (My father
bought me some cigarettes and they're not real and my little
brother wanted to go to the bathroom and he did it on the
floor)

(Alicia begins the written dialogue)
A: Te gustó los dulces? (Did you like the candies)
S: No sé no lo probé (I don't know I didn't taste them)
you could write something else of my baby brother
A: Why did he drop it
why did he drop it?
S: Because mi papá no encontraba su bañito (Because my father
couldn't find the training toilet)
because mi papa no encontraba su bañito
A: Eh?
S: Because mi papa no encontró su bañito
   because he gets a bañito
   he gets a bañito
   he gets a bañito chiquito like that and then he gets on it but
   no más hizo poquito y no ahm (and he only did a little and)
   se baja los calzones ((laughs)) (he pulls down his
   underwear)
   and then
   cuando cuando está en el bañito hace hace y luego no nos
   avisa y luego se levanta sin los calzones para arriba
   ((laughs)) (When he's on the training toilet he goes and then
   he doesn't tell us and he gets up without his underwear)
   andale pues (hurry up well)
(Written dialogue ends)

(Alicia reads her narrative to Silvia)
yesterday
yesterday Mónica spent the night at my house and she slept
with some of my clothes and then she came with me to school

(Silvia begins the written dialogue)
S: It was fun ha
   it was fun ha
A: I don't know
   I don't know
S: I don't know
why did she wear your clothes?
why did she wear your clothes?
A: Because she spent the night
   because she spent the night
S: Oh
A: OK
S: OK Too
A: OK too
S: ((laughs))
S: Ok too
(Written dialogue ends)
A: could we hear ourselves Mr. Galindo

The event began when Silvia wrote a personal narrative about her
father buying her some play cigarettes and about her baby brother going to
the bathroom on the floor. After Silvia finished writing, she read the narrative
to Alicia who would be her writing partner. Alicia listened and then wrote a question on Silvia's journal in which she asked her whether she liked the cigarettes. Silvia answered by writing on her journal and saying that she had not tasted them yet. She then suggested that Alicia write about her brother. Alicia followed Silvia's suggestion and Silvia answered her question. Alicia did not understand her answer and Silvia then clarify her answer through a conversational narrative that described a humorous scene in which her brother was attempting to use the training toilet.

The students finished writing in Silvia's journal and moved on to Amber's journal. Alicia read her personal narrative about a friend spending the night at her house. The two then engaged in a pair of question–answer exchanges in which Silvia asked why Maria was wearing her clothes. After Alicia answered that question, the two engaged in closing the event. Silvia first proposed the closing by writing "Oh." Alicia then responded by writing "OK." Silvia then also wrote "OK" and added "too." Alicia then responded in the oral channel. Both of them were in agreement to close the written event. The end of the event was signaled by Amber's request to listen to the audio recording, "could we hear ourselves, Mr. Galindo?" The interaction changed from reading and writing to a request to listen to the tape recording as the event came to a close.

This example illustrates several features of the event and the student's interactions. First, each student wrote a personal narrative in her own journal and participated in the oral and written dialogue. The oral and written channels were foregrounded in different parts of the event during different times. The written channel was foregrounded in the narrative writing and the
oral channel was foregrounded during the reading of the narrative. The written dialogue was put "on hold" as Silvia told the story of her brother using his training toilet.

Second, the participants' roles shifted during the event from reader to writer and from initiator to respondent as the students took turns initiating or responding to the dialogue through the written or oral channels. Students' roles shifted as they repeated the process in the partner's journal.

Third, another characteristic of the event was the students' code-switching in both channels. Both students were bilingual, and they used both Spanish and English during the event.

Fourth, the written dialogues were characterized by question-answer exchanges. As in oral interaction, each participant's contribution was necessary for the event to go on. These exchanges along with the formulaic closings show the routinized nature of the interaction in this event.

The event followed a predictable sequence. Different parts of the event always took place in the same order due to the instructional requirements of the event. The personal narrative was written first, followed by the oral reading of the narrative to the writing partner, and then followed by the written and oral dialogue. Once the dialogue was finished the students repeated the process with the writing partner's journal. The phases of the event and the different ways of speaking/writing are introduced in the next section.

The Phases of the Event.

The phases of the event and their sequence during the event were as follows: personal narrative (the writing of the personal narrative), reading
narrative1 (the oral reading of the narrative), dialogue1 (the oral and written
dialogue that was initiated in response to the oral reading of the narrative),
reading narrative2 (the oral reading of the writing partner's narrative), and
dialogue2 (the second oral and written dialogue). Reading narrative2 and
dialogue2 took place with the writing partner's journal. The phases are
discussed in detail in the sections that follow (see Table 2 below for the
phases of the event).

Within the dialogue journal literacy event some of the ways of
speaking/writing were specific to a certain phase whereas others occurred
during several phases of the event. Among the ways of speaking were:
conversational narratives, side sequences (conversations that put the written
dialogue "on hold"), oral reading, and closing exchanges. The conversational
narratives and side sequences occurred in the dialogue and narrative
phases. The closing exchanges occurred only in the dialogue phases and the
oral reading was the only way of speaking that occurred in the reading
narrative phase (see Tables 2 and 3 below).

There were three main ways of writing: personal narrative, the written
dialogue exchanges, and closing exchanges. The personal narrative writing
was usually the only extended writing that took place during the event. The
dialogue exchanges were usually short exchanges and the closing sections
made use of one- or two-word markers such as, "OK" or "all right." The
personal narrative writing occurred only during one
Table 2. Phases of the Event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Instrumentalities</th>
<th>Written Dialogue Required</th>
<th>Closings Mutually Negotiated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal narrative</td>
<td>Every student writes a personal narrative</td>
<td>Oral and written Written: narrative about personal experience Oral: conversation, question/answer about spelling or conversational story about personal experience</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading narrative1</td>
<td>Two students</td>
<td>Oral Oral: Oral reading of the personal narrative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue2</td>
<td>Two students</td>
<td>Oral and written Written: dialogue about personal narrative or new topic Oral: oral dialogue or conversational story about personal narrative or other personal experiences</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading narrative2</td>
<td>Two students</td>
<td>Oral Oral: oral reading of the personal narrative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue2</td>
<td>Two students</td>
<td>Oral and written Written: dialogue about personal narrative or new topic Oral: oral dialogue or conversational story about personal narrative or other personal experiences</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Ways of Speaking and Writing in Phases of the Event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of the Event</th>
<th>Ways of Speaking</th>
<th>Ways of Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal narrative</td>
<td>Conversational narratives</td>
<td>Personal narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side sequences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading narrative1 and 2</td>
<td>Oral reading</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue1 and 2</td>
<td>Conversational narratives</td>
<td>Question–answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side sequences</td>
<td>Question–answer–response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closing exchanges</td>
<td>Initiation–question–answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral reading</td>
<td>Initiation–response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closing exchanges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

phase of the event and distinguished the narrative writing phase from the other phases. The written dialogue and closing exchanges only occurred during the dialogue phases.
Table 4 (see below) summarizes the rights and obligations of the participants during the different ways of speaking/writing that varied according to the type of interaction between the students. The writing and reading of the

Table 4. Participant Structures of Ways of Speaking and Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of Speaking</th>
<th>Participant Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversational narrative</td>
<td>A speaker initiates a report of a past event. The story is told within an extended turn at talk. The other participants listen to the story or contribute to the story by asking questions or back channeling. The story can be initiated either while a student is having a turn at writing or is waiting for the partner to finish writing. The topic of the conversational narrative can be either on or off the topic of the written dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side sequence</td>
<td>A side sequence was a conversation in which any number of participants could join. Turn taking was managed as in naturally occurring conversations. The topic of the side sequence could be either on or off the topic of the written dialogue. The side sequence was terminated by a return to the written dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral reading</td>
<td>The student who wrote the personal narrative or written response read to the partner what was written. The partner listened. Occasionally the partner read along with the author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of Writing</th>
<th>Participant Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written dialogue</td>
<td>The written dialogue was initiated as a response to the personal narrative but the topic could shift to other topics. The written dialogue was carried out by two participants who alternated turns through question-answer, initiation, response, question-answer response, or initiation-question-answer exchanges. Control of the conversational floor was signalled through possession of the journal. Only one student wrote at a time. The written dialogue was always initiated by the student who listened to the personal narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal narrative writing</td>
<td>Each student wrote an extended text that reported an event or events. There is no turn taking in the written channel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing exchanges of the written dialogue</td>
<td>The closing exchange was initiated by a student through a proposal to close which was usually signalled through the use of a closing marker in either the oral or written channel. Once a proposal to close was signalled the partner could either agree or disagree to close. The partner signalled his agreement to close through the use of a closing marker. Turn-taking was managed as in the written dialogue. The purpose of the closing section was to bring the dialogue to an end.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
personal narrative had the least amount of interaction since the narrative was both written and read by one person. The other ways of writing/speaking: side sequences, conversational narratives, written dialogues, and closing exchanges were interactive. The most interactive were the written dialogues and side sequences. The written dialogues were developed through different types of question-answer or initiation-response exchanges. The side sequences were usually more interactive than the conversational narratives. During the side sequences several participants often participated and contributed to its development. The conversational narratives sometimes included contributions from the listeners in the form of back channeling (short utterances such as "aha" or "Oh no" to indicate that the listener is following the speaker) or questions, but many times the other students and teacher only listened to the story.

The example of the dialogue journal literacy event discussed at the beginning of this example introduced the characteristics of the event. In the following sections those characteristics are discussed in detail.

The Personal Narrative Phase

The first phase of the event, during which the students wrote their narrative, was called the personal narrative phase. The beginning of the phase occurred after the students had arranged themselves into self-selected groups and began writing. The only materials the students had were their spiral bound journals and a pencil or pen. Sometimes they used primary grade dictionaries in English or Spanish to check the spelling of words they needed. The students each wrote their own narrative and occasionally asked
each other for help with spelling or for other information that they needed, such as the date. During this phase the students usually had not selected their writing partner. Consequently no special dyadic interactional rights and obligation existed between pairs of students at this point. This phase ended when students finished writing the narrative.

The genre of the personal narrative was specified by the instructional requirements of the event. The teacher instructed the students to write a story about something that happened to them or something that they had done. The story was not be a fictional tale. The following is an example of personal narrative:

Example 4.2 Robert 3/25/85
Yesterday I went to my friend's house and I had fun and we played kickball and we played freeze tag and I went to the park and we played ball tag and we played with a tennis ball and we kept playing until seven o'clock.

During this phase the students composed a narrative about experiences in which they had been direct participants. The students interpreted their experiences through the narrative writing as they selected from among their various experiences in order to write about an event or events and report those according to a temporal ordering in their narrative. Some narratives reported past events and others reported anticipated events. The students represented themselves to each other through the events that they wrote about. Through their narratives the students provided each other with an interpretation of their world. During this phase the students used written language in a narrative genre to give shape and form to their experiences.
In the sessions that were analyzed, a minimal amount of interaction took place between the students during the writing of the narrative. In the 24 sessions transcribed there was interaction between the case study student and other students only one-third of the time. Most of the time the interaction was limited to requests for help with spelling. One possible explanation for the limited amount of interaction during the narrative writing phase was the presence of the teacher and the audio tape recorder. Perhaps the teacher's and audio tape recorder's presence discouraged the students sitting near the case study child from engaging the student in talk. One example of extended talk between the case study student and other students during the writing of the narrative was identified and will be discussed in the presentation of Robert's case study in the next chapter (see Example 5.12). During the narrative writing there occasionally was talk between the teacher and student that usually centered around requests for help with spelling.

A type of interaction that occasionally occurred during the narrative writing were conversational narratives. The conversational narrative was signalled when the writing stopped as someone began a story. After the story was finished, the students resumed their writing. For example, Mario used the following story to open a conversational floor with the teacher while the teacher observed Robert writing his personal narrative. The teacher's question and feedback contributed to Mario's recounting of the event.

Example 4.3  Conversational narrative told by Mario to the teacher, 5/16/86. (M: Mario, T: Teacher)

M: look what I barely got (referring to a cut) when Robert went and tripped me like that
T: You were playing and running around ha?
M: When I was trying to get the ball
   Robert just rammed me
   because he was was chasing me and I fell like that
T: You fell together

Another type of interaction that occurred infrequently during the narrative writing phase were side sequences. Because of their infrequent occurrence during this phase they will be discussed in the description of the dialogue phases.

The characteristics of the personal narratives will be discussed in relation to the form of the narrative in terms of the features of topic, characters, setting, temporal opening marker, and closing marker.

**Topics of the Personal Narratives**

Half of the personal narratives were about family events (51%). The events included going to the zoo or shopping with the family. Slightly less than half (44%) of the stories were about playing with friends (see Table 5). In these stories the students wrote about playing with their friends after school. A small percentage (5%) of the narratives were about classroom activities like a health demonstration done by a resource teacher.

**Table 5. Personal Narratives Topics and Time Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family Events</th>
<th>Playing Friends</th>
<th>School Events</th>
<th>Past Time</th>
<th>Future Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The N for the total future and past time do not match the N for the topics of the narratives because some narratives shifted from future to past time orientation and were counted more than once.
The topics of the narratives did not change much over the data collection period. The genre was fixed by the assignment. When asked to write a story about something from their life, the students consistently wrote about playing or about their families throughout the data collection period. There were no instances of fictional stories from the four case study students even though occasionally other students wrote a fictional story.

The narratives varied in length through the time of data collection. They got longer at the end of the collection period but the last narratives were not necessarily the longest ones. The narratives from set 1 averaged 30 words, the narratives from set 2 averaged 83 words, and the narratives from set 3 averaged 92 words.

**Characters in the Personal Narrative**

The term characters is used not in the literary sense but only to refer to the people mentioned in the students' narratives. There were few characters in the narratives and they included the students' friends classmates, family members, and neighborhood friends. The few stories about school activities had the teacher or resource teachers as characters.

As might be expected the majority of the narratives reported events that had already taken place (60%, 26 of 43, see Table 5 above). This was a reflection of the assignment to write about something that the students had already done. What was not expected by the researcher was that a large percentage (40%, 17 of 43) were written about anticipated events that were to take place in the near future since the instructions were to write about something that had already happened.
Personal Narrative Opening and Closings

Many personal narratives began with a word or a phrase that indicated the time of the event that was reported in the narrative. The words or phrases that indicated the time frame of the event will be called a temporal marker. Among the temporal markers used were: "yesterday," today," "the day before yesterday," "this" morning," and "last night." Temporal markers were used slightly more than half of the time (58%). The use of temporal markers became more consistent towards the end of the collection period.

A personal narrative closing was defined as the use of a marker such as "the end" to indicate that the narrative was finished. These markers could be either in the written or oral channel. Markers in the oral channel were usually directed at the teacher who was observing and were used to tell the teacher that the narrative writing was over. For example Kata told the teacher "ya" (all done) when she finished her narrative consistently through the entire data collection period. Written markers were used 28% of the time with the written marker, fin (the end) used most of the time. The Spanish word fin was used to close narratives that were written in Spanish as well as English. Oral markers were used 23% of the time was always ya (all done). The use of opening and closing markers varied with the individual students. Some students never used them, and other students used them regularly.

There were two changes over time in the personal narratives. The first change was the use of the temporal opening marker. This marker was not used in the early sessions and began to be used during the second set of data (9/85–12/85). By the third set the temporal opening marker was used consistently by most of the students. The other change was the use of the
closing marker "fin" (the end). Like the temporal opener, the use of the closing marker became more consistent over the time of data collection. The use of the temporal opening and the closing marker of the narrative that developed over time was not part of the teacher's directions for the event. The development of these two characteristics over time by the students helped define the personal narrative as a unique narrative form found within the event. The other narrative form, conversational narratives, usually did not open with a temporal maker and never closed with a closing marker.

**Reading Narrative1**

The phase reading narrative1 followed the personal narrative phase. This phase began by the students locating a partner with whom to "share" their journal (share was the term used by the students to indicate their participation in the event with a partner). The phase began by the students reading their narrative to their writing partner. The partner's only obligation was to listen and begin to think about a response to the narrative that would initiate the written dialogue phase. There was little interaction between the reader and the student listening to the reading of the narrative during this phase of the event. The interaction that did occur was related to the reading of the narrative. Sometimes the author had difficulty reading back his/her writing. In those cases the partner tried to help the author read the narrative. A few times the partner tried to read the narrative along with the author. The authors rarely had difficulty reading back their narratives because they had been written only a few minutes before the reading. The phase ended when the student finished reading the narrative. This phase was the shortest in the
event. Many times it took the author less than a minute to read the narrative. The distinguishing feature of this phase was that it was the only phase in which there was no writing. The phase dialogue1 began as soon as reading narrative1 was finished. The characteristics of the two dialogue phases were similar and are discussed in the next section.

**Characteristics of the Dialogue Phases**

Interaction between the students was essential for the accomplishment of the dialogue phases. The characteristics of the dialogue phases are described by discussing the different ways of speaking and writing that occurred during the dialogue phases.

**The Written Dialogue**

The purpose of this section is to introduce the different types of exchange structures that took place in the written channel. The early sessions were characterized by the predominant use of question–answer exchanges in the written channel. Through the time of the data collection the students made wider use of question–answer–response exchanges, initiation–response, and initiation–question–response exchanges. The following dialogue phase from 9/4/85 includes examples of initiation response and a question–answer exchanges:

**Example 4.4** Written Dialogue from Kata 9/4/85

(Kata's narrative was about her and her younger sister wearing a pair of glasses and her mother laughing at her sister. K: Kata, J: Josie)

J: Did it look funny on you? Question
K: I don't know because I don't have four
eyes to see my glasses
J: Why don't you have four eyes?
K: Because all the persons have two eyes
J: Do you like to have four eyes?
K: No because only the animals have four eyes
J: Would you like to have two eyes better?
K: Of course my glasses

The initiation–response was used in conjunction with question–answer exchanges. The initiation–response exchange was rarely the only type of exchange structure used in a dialogue phase. The following example includes a question–answer–response exchange.

Example 4.5 Written Dialogue from Kata 9/30/85
(The narrative was about a funny incident involving Liz’s brother. K: Kata, L: Liz)

K: Did you guys laugh?
L: Yes because it was so funny I couldn't stop
laughing
K: Me too when I laugh that makes me that happened
to me
L: Did you laugh like me?
K: Yes I did I couldn't stop laughing it make me go to
the bathroom?
L: To me it doesn't make me go to the bathroom
K: To me sometimes and sometimes it doesn't
L: When my sister starts to laugh too she always got to
go to the bathroom
K: OK

Another type of exchange was the initiate–question–answer exchange. An example of such an exchange comes from one of Yolanda's sessions. The different types of exchanges will be discussed in greater detail in the case studies in the next chapter.
Example 4.6 Written Dialogue Yolanda 5/7/85

(Alicia's narrative was about not being punished and being able to play with her friends. Y: Yolanda, A: Alicia)

Y: That sounds like fun
A: Do you think it is fun?
Y: Yes we are going to have a lot of fun

The Oral Dialogues

The two main types of interaction that took place in the oral dialogue were side sequences and conversational narratives. Side sequences were conversational exchanges between the students and students and teacher, and conversational narratives recounted past events. Conversational narratives also occurred during side sequences.

Side Sequences

A side sequence was a temporary break in the on-going written dialogue (see Table 7 below). The break introduced by the side sequence temporally put the written dialogue "on hold." A side sequence indicates horizontal movement during a conversation and is like a mini-conversation that is embedded within a larger one. The horizontal movement of a side sequence in this study was opposed to the vertical movement of the written dialogue. Side sequences branched out and later rejoined the written dialogue. A side sequence consisted of the following parts: the ongoing sequence, the side sequence, the request to return to the ongoing sequence, and the return to the on-going sequence. The ongoing sequence was defined as the written dialogue that was a response to the narrative.
The definition of the written dialogue as the on-going sequence was supported by the fact that the side sequences were terminated by rejoining the written dialogue. When the students completed the side sequence, they picked up the written dialogue where they had left off. A part of some side sequences was a request to return to the written dialogue. This part was not mentioned by Jefferson (1972) in her study of side sequences but was developed and incorporated into the present analysis of side sequences as a result of the data analysis. The request to return to on-going sequence was a request to terminate the side sequence and resume the written dialogue.

Table 7. Definition of a Side Sequence and Criteria for Identification of the Parts of the Side Sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Side Sequence</th>
<th>Defined</th>
<th>Criteria for Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-going sequence</td>
<td>What is provided for by the structure of the on-going activity? A written dialogue in response to the narrative is the minimal required structure for the accomplishing of dialogue journals</td>
<td>Return to on-going sequence returns to the written dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Request to return to on-going sequence were requests to continue written dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side sequence</td>
<td>A mini-conversation that breaks from the on-going sequence and is terminated and rejoins the on-going conversation.</td>
<td>Contains a recognizable first and last part. Temporarily halts the on-going sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to return to on-going sequence</td>
<td>A request (or command) to terminate side sequence and return to the on-going sequence</td>
<td>Marked by a command or request (&quot;andale (come on), write, stop wasting time&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to on-going sequence</td>
<td>The conversation shifts from the side sequence to the on-going sequence</td>
<td>Shift in channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side sequence terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On-going sequence continues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The shift from the ongoing sequence to a side sequence was marked either by a break that was signaled lexically ("Mr. Galindo"),
through a shift in channel (moving from the written to the oral), or through both. Side sequences were terminated by returning to the on-going written dialogue and switching from the oral to written channel.

An example of a side sequence that was not related to the topic of the ongoing interaction comes from Yolanda's session from 3/17/86:

Example 4.7 Yolanda 3/17/86
(Yolanda was reading her response, "Because I didn't take a shower in this morning," she addressed the teacher and initiated a side sequence. Y: Yolanda, J: Josie, T: Teacher, R: Robert, plain text= talk, italics= oral reading)

Y: *Because I didn't took a shower in the morning*

Mr. Galindo yo tambien tengo un Corvette de las Barbies (I also have a Barbie's Corvette)

J: aha yo tambien tengo una [pink one] (I also have a pink one)

Y: its a [pink one]

T: de que tamaño es? (What size is it?)

R: así (Like this)

Y: es un Corvette que dice la luego la desta in front of the thing onde casi tiene la casi como un papel casi que dice Corvette en frente y también en la orilla en la puerta también dice Corvette (It's a Corvette that says in front of the thing it has a paper that says Corvette in the front and on the edge on the door it also says Corvette)

J: y también atrás la license verdad? (And also on the back on the license, right?)

Y: ya se eso te estaba diciendo pero no me acordaba como decir (that's what I was trying to say but I didn't remember how to say it) *because I didn't took a shower in this morning last night*
In this example Yolanda broke from reading her response and initiated a conversation about her doll's car. Josie, Robert, and the teacher contributed to the side sequence. Yolanda terminated the side sequence by reading her response in the written dialogue.

Side sequences could also be related to the topic of the written dialogue. In the following example of a side sequence, Yolanda commented on her wet hair that was mentioned in her narrative (..... indicates data were omitted).

Example 4.8 Yolanda 3/17/86 (Yolanda finishes reading her personal narrative and Robert initiates a side sequence. R: Robert, Y: Yolanda)

Y: and I had to take a shower
in this morning fin
R: Con tanto frio (In such cold weather)

Y: Mr. Galindo watch
touch my hair right here
esta un poquito (its a little) wet
R: a si (oh yeah, in mocking tone)
.....

Y: go ahead and write
just I was going to tell you
why did you have to take a shower in this morning
that was my question you could put it if you want to
R: why did you take a shower

Robert initiated this side sequence by commenting on Yolanda's personal narrative then Yolanda pointed out to the teacher that her hair was still wet. This side sequence contained a request to resume. Yolanda told
Robert, "Go ahead and write." The side sequence was terminated by the shift back to the written channel when Robert's began writing his written response.

**Conversational Narratives**

Conversational narratives were brief reports of past personal experiences told either as part of ongoing conversation during the personal narrative, dialogue phases, or used to initiate a conversation. Most of the conversational narratives were told during the sessions from the last part of the data collection. They sometimes had temporal openings that indicated the time of the event, but they did not have closing markers like the personal narratives. Like side sequences they were terminated by a return to the written dialogue, or by the initiation of another story or side sequence. Conversational narratives were told during the personal narrative and during dialogue phases. They were not told during the closing sections of the dialogue phases or the reading of the personal narrative.

Many conversational narratives were addressed to the teacher and were introduced by a shift of addressee. The shift was marked lexically through the use of the teacher's name. The students called the teacher "Mr. Galindo" and then proceeded to tell the story once the teacher's attention had been obtained. The story was used to open a conversational floor between the student and teacher. An example of a conversational narrative that was used to open a conversational floor with the teacher was told by Yolanda.
Example 4.9 5/7/86, Conversational narrative told by Yolanda to the teacher

Y: Mr. Galindo
mi pichona ya puso
puso tres y en esta mañana mi papi me dijo que otra
pichona puso otro huevo
ya son cuatro huevos
el Robert tiene seis
(My pigeon already laid three and in this morning my father
told me that another pigeon laid another egg. Now there's
four. Robert has six)

Sometimes students used the oral channel to clarify the interaction
taking place in the written channel. In the example of the dialogue journal at
the beginning of this chapter Silvia told Alicia a conversational narrative about
her brother in order to explain her written response. In other sessions, the
question–answer routine was taken into the oral channel in order to clarify or
add details about the written question–answer exchanges (see Example
4.10). The check mark (√) indicates the line where Yolanda told Mónica that
she already told her the information she was requesting in the narrative.

Example 4.10 4/12/85 (Y: Yolanda, M: Mónica)

Yo iba a ir a Long John Silvers pero mi
papá fue ir ensayar y no no fuimos (I was going to
go to Long John Silver's but my father had to go
practice and we didn't go)
M: porque no fueron
(why didn't you go?)
√ Y: ya te dije María
(I already told you)
M: pues si porque no fueron
(well, why didn't you go?)
Y: porque mi papá fue a ensayar
(because my father went to practice)
M: qué es eso
(what's that?)
Y: qué iba ir a tocar hacer música
(that he was going to go play music)
M: no más él
(only him?)
Y: no
M: no fue
(he didn't go?)
Y: we stayed home
M: qué tonta ero yo
(I'm so dumb)

The students shifted from written to oral channel in order to clarify a misunderstanding. Mónica didn't understand the word ensayar (to practice) and consequently requested information in her written response that already had been given in the narrative. The exchange then shifted back to the written channel.

Closing Exchanges in the Dialogue Phases

An interactional routine that was unique to the dialogue phases was the negotiation of closings. Through their experiences with each other during this event the students developed the use of a small set of markers that were used to end the dialogue phases. The students knew to interpret the marker which made up the entire utterance as a proposal to close (Shegloff & Sacks, 1973). The student could then agree to close and respond accordingly by writing a closing marker, or in a few cases disagree or ignore the suggestion and continue writing. In most cases the closing was agreed upon within a few turns. These closing routines were not part of the teacher's directions or requirements for the event. The set of exchanges in which the students used the closing markers will be called a closing exchange. The discussion of closing exchanges will be presented in three sections, one for each set of data in order to show the shifts over time.
In set 1 of the data, eight examples of closings were found. That sample consisted of ten sessions from 3/25/85 to 6/5/85 during the early part of the collection period. Six of the eight closings were accomplished in the oral channel.

Most of the oral closings were of the same type, that of an announcement in which one student would announce that they were finished. The announcement would be made using a phrase like "ya terminamos" (we're done). An exchange between the participants followed in which the closing was agreed upon. The following is an example of such a closing. The check mark (✓) shows the location of the oral markers.

Example 4.11 4/26/85 (D: Daniel, R: Ramona, T: Teacher)

R: Three
D: I'll say four
R: Did you put Silvia Mr. Galindo?
D: I'll say four
✓ R: We're done
T: You're done? Dile al Robert (Tell Robert)
R: Eh?
D: Eh?
T: Dile al Robert (Tell Robert)
✓ R: We're done Robert
✓ D: Ok We're all Done (yelling into the recorder)

There were two written closings in set 1 of the data. Both were from the latter part of the period (5/6/85, 5/7/85). The closing markers were words or phrases that were used as written "goodbyes," that is, "OK," "all right," and "Oh." Both times the written closing was followed by an oral closing. The response with the closing marker by the partner indicated that they were in
agreement to close. The following example from 5/7/85 illustrates this type of closing.

Example 4.12  Yolanda 5/7/85 (Y: Yolanda, A: Alicia)
Y: I love that
   I love that
A: you forgot to make a "t"
Y: I love that
√ A: All right
√ Y: Oh
A: ya Mr. Galindo (All done)
T: ya terminaron (Did you finish?)

An example of the fact that closings didn't take place automatically but required the mutual agreement and negotiation of both participants came from Yolanda's session from 5/7/85. Alicia proposed a closing by writing "OK." Yolanda did not respond with another closing but continued to write about what they were going to play. At Amber's next turn she proposed to close again by writing, "all right." Yolanda still did not take up the closing and wrote more about what they were going to play. At Amber’s next turn she attempted to close again but this time she used the oral channel and was successful. The examples from set 2 of the data (9/85 to 12/85) showed a dramatic shift from oral to written closings. Out of nine examples, eight included written closings.

Ten sessions from set 3 were analyzed. This set included sessions from 2/86 to 5/86. An additional source of information on closings comes from this set of data in a short conversation between Robert and Yolanda in which the teacher asked them when they knew it was time to close. In the session from 3/17/86, Robert had said during phase dialogue1 that he did not know what else to write. Yolanda told him that if he did not have something else to
write, he could write fin (the end). The teacher then asked them "¿Cómo sabes cuando es tiempo de poner fin?" (When do you know that it's time to put "the end"). Yolanda answered by saying, "When you're finished. Cuando te enfadas de escribir, hay veces cuando no quieres escribir." (When you get tired–bored of writing, there's times when you don't want to write). After Yolanda had finished answering my question Robert wrote "fin" and Yolanda responded with "fin." At other times students commented on their closings by saying that they were tired. In these cases the students had been writing for a long time and were ready to end the written dialogue.

Set 3 continued the pattern first seen in set 2 of a shift to the use of more written closings. All the sessions in this set of data included written closings. The closing markers included, "OK, ya, fin, all right, bye," and "the end."

The small set of markers along with the move to more written closings showed that the students developed conventions for interaction during the event which became routinized. Closings were accomplished through few turns with a small set of markers due to the conventional and routinized nature of the closings. This was accomplished in the early set through the use of oral markers such as "ya." By the end of the collection period written markers were used consistently, with or without the use of an oral marker.

Two Tutoring Sessions

The preceding discussion of the characteristics of the dialogue journal literacy event have presented the event from the perspective of the
researcher's analysis. The following two tutoring sessions provide information on how students perceived the characteristics of the event and make possible a comparison between their perceptions and the researcher's analysis.

The two tutoring sessions were unique in that a student who was familiar with the event verbalized the process to a student new to the classroom. These sessions provided insight into what that student perceived as the rules for carrying out this event. The two sessions took place on 3/18/85 and 3/20/85 between Silvia and Ramona. The teacher was also present during both sessions.

Ramona was a new first-grade student who had recently moved into the neighborhood. Her cousin, Silvia, had been in the classroom all year. The teacher decided to ask Silvia to show Ramona what to do with the dialogue journals in order to find out how she would explain the process to Ramona.

Silvia and Ramona sat next to each other with their journals at a table during dialogue journal time. Silvia explained the personal narrative writing to Ramona by saying she could write what she wanted, and then Silvia gave her the following example, "mira pon aquí lo que quieras (look write here what you want), like the teacher want to go with my mom to play with my dad OK. You could write whatever you want to right here OK?" Silvia then started to write her narrative about washing the car with her family. The example she used was about an activity (playing) that she did with her family. She did not tell her that it had to be an actual occasion in which she was a direct participant and she didn't tell her that it couldn't be a fictional story. Her directions did indicate that the writer had to choose the topic for the narrative.
As Silvia was writing her narrative she told the teacher that Ramona was copying. Ramona had looked over to Silvia's journal and copied what was written on it. After Silvia had finished writing her narrative she read it to the teacher.

Example 4.13 3/18/85 (S: Silvia, R: Ramona, [ ]= overlapping talk)
S: mi mamá le gusta a comprar mucho cosas buenas pero a la Debbie no le gusta comprar muchas cosas la Debbie le gusta comprar chucholucos le da a mi perro a mi perro y a mi no me gustan los [chucholucos]

(My mother likes to buy alot of good things but Debbie doesn't like to buy alot of things. Debbie likes to buy candy and she gives some to my dog and I don't like chucholucos—a kind of candy)
R: [chucholucos]
S: a mi mamá tampoco (my mom doesn't either)

Silvia told Ramona about writing something different and not to copy. She then talked to Ramona about listening to the sounds of the words in order to be able to write the word. She demonstrated by saying the word "chucholucos" (a type of candy) slowly and by breaking the word into the syllables "chu cho lu cos" as she said the word. Silvia told Ramona, "tienes que rayar los sonidos de tu boca que salen" (You have to write the sounds that come out of your mouth). She asked Ramona if she understood and Ramona said she did. Silvia then demonstrated how to write using other words, no, stop, and mamá.

Silvia then read her narrative to Ramona and the teacher explained to Ramona that she needed to a write back a response. Ramona responded to the narrative by writing, "mi mamá le gusta comer carne guisada" (My mother
likes to eat fried meat). Silvia wrote back, "a mi mamá le gusta también" (My mother also likes it). After they had finished writing that exchange the teacher reviewed the process of exchanging responses with Ramona. He then asked her if she had copied her narrative from Silvia, and she said that she did. The teacher then told her to write something different the next day and that she could write about anything and she didn't have to write what Silvia wrote.

This tutoring session brought out a kind of knowledge necessary for the carrying out of the event that had not been previously discussed. Silvia explained to Ramona about spelling words. She told her to say the words slowly, and she demonstrated by breaking the words up into syllables as she pronounced them. She also mentioned to Ramona that she had to listen to the sounds from her mouth. She told her that she couldn't just put down random letters for the words and demonstrated by telling Ramona that she could not put "s, t, o, h, o n, n, o" for the word "stop" but instead "s,t,o,p."

During the event, the other students asked each other for help spelling words and they provided the information by telling the student the names of the letters, by saying the words slowly, and sometimes breaking them into syllables. The students did not talk about that process as in this tutoring session between Silvia and Ramona.

On the next day (3/20/85), these two cousins wrote again with each other in their dialogue journals. Ramona wrote the following personal narrative about her family, "Do you want pizza mom and dad and Concha and María and me want pizza." After Ramona had finished reading her narrative, Silvia made an unusual remark to the teacher asking him what he wanted her to do. She then said that the story that Ramona had written was not like the
stories she was used to. She compared Ramona's story with a story she might have written. She gave as an example a story about going shopping with her mother and father, "I'm writing like yo fui para la tienda con mi papá o mamá" (I went to the store with my father or mother). She then told me she didn't know what to write in response to Ramona's story. After the teacher prodded her several times to explain why she didn't know what to write she used another example of what she would do with another narrative. She said if a narrative was "Do you have a cat?, or something like that" that she would put "yes" but that she didn't know what to do in this case.

It seemed that Silvia's uncertainty was related to the unusual narrative that Ramona had written. Ramona was just learning about the generic features of the personal narrative. The examples that Silvia gave of the type of narratives that she was accustomed to contained some of those generic features: they were based on personal experiences and involved either the student or family members as the characters. The narrative that Ramona wrote, "Do you want pizza Mom and Dad and Concha and María and me want pizza," did not have the same temporal or experiential orientations of Silvia's examples. She said another classmate might write a narrative such as, "Mi perro o algo, yo y mi perro fuimos para" (my dog or something, me and my dog went to), again providing a contrast with what Ramona had written.

The teacher had Ramona read the narrative again. During the second reading, Silvia responded to the narrative buy answering "no" to the question of whether she liked pizza. During the following exchanges the teacher had Ramona and Silvia orally rehearse the question–answer routines in order for Ramona to get acquainted with those exchanges. After they had finished
orally rehearsing the exchanges the teacher told them to go ahead and write their comments and responses.

After the girls had written several question-answer routines, the teacher asked them when they would know when it was time to stop writing. Silvia answered by saying that she would say "stop." The teacher then asked when she would say "stop." She said when she wanted to and when Ramona wanted to. The teacher then asked her when she would want to. Silvia said that she didn't know that maybe until night time. The teacher asked her again and she said when they finished. The event actually finished when Ramona suggested that they stop, and Silvia then wrote "stop" in the journal.

A few points about the closing of the event can be made through this session. Silvia discussed negotiation and the use of a closing marker to end the session. Agreement between both was necessary in order to close. The closing marker Silvia mentioned was not the usual "OK" or "all right," instead it was the word "stop." The closing marker was the entire written utterance for that turn in the exchange.

These two unique sessions made it possible to see how an experienced student explained the event to a novice. The experienced student, Silvia, discussed the key features of the event: the personal narrative, written dialogue, and closing of the dialogue. The audio recording of the events and systematic data collection did not begin until March of the first grade year (3/85). Consequently there were no records of the first interactions between students from the first months of the first grade year. By March, the students were all experienced with the dialogue
journals. Thus, these tutoring sessions are the only record of a beginner's experience with the event.

The Dialogue Journal Literacy Event as a Routine of the Classroom

The dialogue journal event served as a frame in which students' interactions defined the situation according to the principles of organization that were specific to the event (Goffman, 1974). A salient principle of organization were the phases of the event. Students interpreted each other's interactions within specific phases of the event and in relation to previous and following phases. The interactions varied across the different phases through different patterns of rights and obligations that made varying uses of channels and message forms (narrative, dialogue, oral reading).

Students' interactions during the event followed a predictable sequence. The sequence began with the narrative writing and was followed by the phases, reading narrative1 and dialogue1. The sequence of the two phases, reading narrative2 and dialogue2, was then repeated with the writing partner's journal. The students' interactions followed this routinized pattern due to the instructional requirements established by the teacher for this classroom activity. This sequence of movement through phases was a main characteristic of the event. Patterned ways of interaction which take place through predictable sequences have been called routines (Corsaro, 1985; Peters & Boggs, 1986).
Corsaro (1988b) stated that routines share the following characteristics: the activity is communal, involving two or more participants; the activity follows a predictable sequence of actions; and the activity flexible and can be adapted to different social situations. Along with the predictability of sequences of interaction there was also predictability of the recurrence of "specific configurations of time, place, participants, and goals" (Peters and Boggs, 1986, p. 84). The dialogue journal event was a predictable occurrence in this classroom's daily activities. During the event the students made use of the same materials, (the journals, pencils, and dictionaries), and their interactions took place in small groups. A goal of the students within this configuration of time, place, and participants was to meet both their social purposes and the instructional requirements of the event (the social purposes of the students will be discussed in the next chapter).

The routinized manner of movement across the phases of the event can also be called a sequencing strategy (Gumperz, 1982). Sequencing strategies are characteristic of routines and are used by speakers to contextualize ongoing activity and to make predictions about possible directions the activity might take. The signalling of sequencing strategies and the movement through phases took place through the use of openings and closings that helped signal the start and finish of the phase. The boundaries which were signalled through the opening and closing of the phases helped signal what phase the students were in.

Figure 5 (see below) shows the different phases of the event and the movement from one phase to another. In some of the phases specific
openings and closings were developed by the students over time. Two openings and closings developed by the students themselves included the temporal opening and the closing marker of the personal narrative and the closing markers of the written dialogue. The markers resulted from conventionalized interactions that the students developed apart from the teacher's directions.

Figure 5. The Movement through the Phases of the Event and Opening and Closings
The movement from the writing of the narrative to the next phase was signalled through the shift in activity from writing to reading along with the accompanying shift from the oral to written channel. The reading phase was opened through the initiation of reading and ended when the student finished reading the narrative.

The dialogue phases were opened by the initiating move that was either a question or statement and were closed through the use closing markers. After the closing of the first dialogue phase, the sequence of movement between the reading of the narrative and the writing of a dialogue was repeated with the writing partner's journal.

An interesting piece of evidence that helps illustrate how the movement through the phases served as a sequencing strategy comes from the students' narratives. Several narratives included questions which were directed to their writing partners.

Example 4.14

María 4/22/85
Onde va ser el party de la Silvia? en su casa o el parque o en la casa de la Rosita o en la casa mia si o no? (Where is the Silvia's party going to be, in her house or in the park or in Ramona's house or in my house, yes or no)

Eddie 9/20/85
Tomorrow I have a football game with the Rams it is fun playing football can you watch my game tomorrow?

Yolanda 12/16/85
Tu has tomada fotos si o no? (Have you taken photos yes or no?)

Silvia 12/16/85
Oh Yolanda can I be the baby's tía?
Gilbert do you take cars when you take a bath?

The embedded questions in the narratives indicated that at the time of the personal narrative writing the students were anticipating the next phases of the event. They anticipated that they would read their narrative with the embedded question to a partner during the reading narrative phase and that the partner would respond to the question. Because the phases served as sequencing strategies, the students were able to predict that the upcoming interaction would be dialogic. They knew that the interaction would incorporate question–answer exchanges and that the question in their narrative would receive an answer or some other kind of response.

Openings and closings served to mark the boundaries of the different phases and set up expectations of co–occurrence between the openings and closings and ways of speaking and writing. For example, the end of the dialogue phases were signalled through closing exchanges. The signalling of a closing section of a dialogue phase by the use of a closing marker such as "OK" not only signaled that the closing of the dialogue phase was being proposed, but it also signaled the structure of the upcoming turns at writing. In closing sections, the closing marker was the entire utterance. The writing partner used his previous experiences with the event to predict that the marker would be the entire utterance and that the turn would pass to him after the student had finished writing the closing marker. The partner then agreed or disagreed to the closing. If the
partner agreed, his response was a closing marker such as "OK," "Bye," or "all right." The phase was ended after the agreement to close.

The example of closings help show how they served as contextualization cues. They set up a predictable sequence of actions that could be used to interpret the meaning of messages within the closing section. They placed the students' responses within an interpretive frame. The students used sequencing strategies along with the openings and closings to interpret the ongoing activity and to know what the appropriate ways of speaking and writing were for the particular phase they were in.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the dialogue journal literacy event by looking at the phases of the event and the different ways of speaking and writing that took place during the event. The findings presented in this chapter identified the dialogue journal event as a whole unit that was composed of five phases, personal narrative, reading narrative1, dialogue1, reading narrative2, and dialogue2. These phases occurred in a predictable sequence during the event. The different phases and their order within the event were a main characteristic of the event.

Other characteristics of the event were the different ways of speaking and writing that took place within these particular phases. The ways of speaking that were identified were conversational narratives, side sequences, oral reading, and closing exchanges. The ways of writing were the personal narrative, the various types of exchanges in the written dialogues, and the closing exchanges. All these ways involved different interactional rights and
obligations between the students. The resulting participants structures were related to the channel that was used, the type of turn-taking, and the form of the message.

The event was classified as a routine due to the predictability of the sequence of movement between the phases. The movement between the phases of the event was partially signalled through different kinds of openings and closings that served as boundary markers for the different phases. The movement through the event served as a sequencing strategy that students used to predict subsequent phases and the type of interaction that commonly took place in those phases. As a routine the event served as a frame in which students' interactions signaled the phase they were currently in as well as their movement between phases.

The findings presented in this chapter have introduced the main characteristics of the event and the main types of speaking and writing that took place. The perspective of two students were presented in the tutoring sessions in order to gain children's perspectives on the description of the event. In the next chapter the characteristics of the event are related to the four case study students and the student's appropriations of the event are also presented.
CHAPTER V
CHILDREN'S APPROPRIATIONS OF THE EVENT:
FOUR CASE STUDIES

This chapter elaborates on the findings presented in the previous chapter through the presentation of four case studies. The research question: What is a dialogue journal literacy event?, was addressed in the previous chapter by identifying and describing the different phases of the event and the characteristics of the personal narratives and oral and written dialogues. The case studies presented in this chapter address this research question by looking at how the students defined the event through their own social purposes and how they made use of oral and written language to construct the social worlds in which their interactions took place.

The findings for the research question: What are the various ways of speaking/writing that are patterned and recurring during this event?, were introduced in the previous chapter. The cases studies extend those findings in more detail in relation to the particular characteristics of the case study students. This chapter will also addressed the research question, "How did students use oral and written language to negotiate and construct social worlds in interaction with each other?"
Introduction to the Case Studies

The presentation of each case study begins by discussing characteristics of the personal narratives, dialogue phases, and types of appropriations for the case study student. A detailed discussion of a session that illustrates the main characteristics of each case study student is then used to relate the characteristics of the student to actual instances of their use in a particular session. The selected sessions were chosen because they were "telling" examples (Mitchell, 1984). Telling examples illustrate the configuration of elements made important by the underlying theory on which the analysis is based. In the case of the dialogue journal, the central concerns of the analysis were the types of appropriation illustrated, the ways that oral and written language were used, and the negotiation and construction of social worlds through social interaction. A telling example highlighted the relations among those concerns. It is the relationships among the features of the event and not just the features themselves that the examples were chosen to illustrate.

For example, the session chosen to illustrate Kata's sessions included elements from speech play that were characteristic of her sessions throughout the data collection. But there was also a breach of norms related to turn-taking during this written dialogue. While such a breach of norms for turn-taking occurred infrequently, this particular occasion in Kata's session served to highlight a dimension of interaction that otherwise might have been taken for granted and remained invisible. The negative case was not typical, but the norm that was highlighted through that breach was a norm that operated during the event. The breaking of the rule for turn-taking helped
illustrate one way that interaction was managed during the written dialogue. Telling cases serve to make previously obscure theoretical relationships apparent (Mitchell, 1984). In this way, Kata's session served to illustrate the more common features of her sessions as well as to make previously invisible relationships among norms for interaction visible.

The first case study that is discussed is Robert. Robert's sessions during the last set of data collection were characterized by extended oral interaction that took place during the event. Robert and his partners engaged in extended side sequences and conversational stories during their interactions. Their extended talk helped develop the topic of their writing as well as introduce new topics. The session used to illustrate his case study shows how the event was appropriated as a time to discuss the children's world of playing baseball through the use of side sequences and conversational stories as well as through the written dialogue.

Yolanda's case study is presented next. Her sessions from the last part of the collection period also contained many instances of conversational stories and side sequences. Yolanda's sessions were also characterized by the many sessions in which she and her partner appropriated the event as a time to negotiate peer relationships. The sessions that are used to illustrate Yolanda's case study shows how Yolanda and her partners collaboratively appropriated the event as a time to negotiate peer relationships.

Kata's case study is presented next. Kata made use of several elements from speech play during her sessions throughout the data collection period. The session that illustrates her case study shows how
Kata and her partner appropriated the event as a time to call names, engage in speech play, and discuss past and anticipated events through the written channel. The event was defined by Kata and her partner as a time for play.

Gilbert is the last case study student to be discussed. The interaction between Gilbert and his partners took place primarily through the written channel. There were no conversational stories or extended side sequences in his sessions. The session that is used to illustrate his case study shows how Gilbert and his partners appropriated the event as a time to discuss past and anticipated events in the children's world of play through the written dialogue. A general discussion of the four case studies is then presented after Gilbert's case study.
Robert

Characteristics of the Personal Narratives

The world of Robert's narratives was the world of play (see Table 8). The majority of the narratives were written in the past tense (78%) and reported the play events and friends with whom Robert played (63%). Robert's friends were other boys with which he played organized games like freeze tag or kickball as well as simple games, like playing with toy cars, that required only one friend. Like the other case study students, Robert's narratives were developed through writing about one play activity or moving from one play activity to another. Besides his friends, Robert also mentioned his family in relation to play activities or toys they had bought him. Through his narratives Robert presented himself along with his friends in the children's world of play.

Table 8. Personal Narrative Topics and Time Orientation in Robert's Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Family Events</th>
<th>Playing Friends</th>
<th>School Events</th>
<th>Past Time</th>
<th>Future Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N   %</td>
<td>N   %</td>
<td>N   %</td>
<td>N   %</td>
<td>F   %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>1 12</td>
<td>5 63</td>
<td>2 25</td>
<td>7 78</td>
<td>2 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The N for the total future and past time do not match the N for the topics of the narratives because some narratives shifted from future to past time orientation and were counted more than once.

Besides play, Robert also wrote about events that took place in the classroom. The two stories about classroom events were different from the other personal narratives because they were the only narratives written about events in the classroom by the case study students.
Example 5.1  Robert's Personal Narrative About a Classroom Event 9/20/85

Ahora voy a escribir mi nombre en un pedacito de papel y luego voy a tener tiempo libre y luego compartirlo con alguien y luego voy a mirar a mi semillita no sé si ya porque han crecido a la mejor ya han crecido tengo días que yo pedía tierra y no sé cuando el mister Galindo a ver cuando me deja echar agua a la mejor para las letras como el abecedario.

(Today I'm going to write my name on a small piece of paper then I'm going to have free time then I'll share it with someone. Then I'll look at my little seed. I don't know if its grown maybe its grown. Its been days that I don't ask for dirt. I don't know when Mr. Galindo will let me water the garden maybe in alphabetical order)

Robert used a temporal marker to begin his narrative 66% of the time. Among the markers he used were: "yesterday," "ayer," "ahora," and "Friday." Robert's use of the temporal marker was more consistent at the beginning of the data collection. Robert ended his narratives with a written closing marker only once out of six times (17%). During the two earliest stories Robert said "ya I'm done" to indicate to the teacher who was observing him that he had finished writing the narrative. The length of the Robert's narratives increased throughout the data collection period. The narratives from set 1 averaged 24 words, the narratives from set 2 averaged 106 words, and the narratives from set 3 averaged 105 words. Robert wrote his narratives 50% (4 of 8) of the time in English, (2 of 8) in Spanish and 25% (2 of 8) of his narratives switched between English and Spanish (see Table 9).
Table 9. Language in Which Robert's Personal Narratives Were Written

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Code-Switch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics of the Oral and Written Dialogues

The sessions from the last part of the data collection were characterized by extended talk that took place through side sequences and conversational narratives and contrasted with the earlier sessions which had few instances of conversational stories or side sequences. The sessions from the beginning of the data collection averaged 14 minutes; the sessions from the middle averaged 26 minutes; and the later sessions averaged 37 minutes (see Table 10). The sessions from set 1 and set 2 were shorter because they had less talk and the written dialogues were shorter.

Table 10. Duration of Phases in Robert's Sessions (in minutes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Personal narrative 1</th>
<th>Dialogue1</th>
<th>Reading narrative2</th>
<th>Dialogue2</th>
<th>Total minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/25/85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The types of exchanges used during the written dialogue in Robert's sessions followed the pattern of moving from the predominant use of
question–answer exchanges to other types of exchanges. Table 11 shows that the percentage of use of the question–answer decreased from set 1 (85%) to set 3 (12%). There were fewer exchanges in the written dialogues during the sessions from set three because much of the interaction took place in the oral channel through the conversational narratives and side sequences.

Table 11. Types of Exchanges in Robert’s Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th># of sessions</th>
<th>Q–A pairs</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Q–A</th>
<th>%Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**
- Q–A= Question and Answer exchange
- Other= Initiation and Response exchange
- Initiation and Question and Response exchange
- Question and Initiation and Response exchange

Table 12. Type of Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1A= Request information about actor or actions  
1B= Request information about setting  
1C= Request information about time  
1D= Request information about object (toy or pet)  
3A= Request for reason for an action  
5A= Request opinion

The majority of questions in Robert’s sessions requested additional information about the actors and actions in the narrative (28%) or the reasons for an action reported in the narrative (28%, see Table 12 above).
Questions were also used to request more information about the toys mentioned in the narrative (20%), the time (10%), and the setting (7%) of the events reported in the narrative. The questions also requested opinions of the reported events (7%).

The written dialogues in Robert's early sessions made use of question–answer routines. At the beginning of the data collection the routines were a simple two–part question–answer exchange. Later in the collection period the routines also included three part question–answer–response exchanges. The first written dialogue from the session on 3/25/8 consisted of two turns, a pair of question–answer exchanges.

Example 5.2 Dialogue1

Ralph: Where did you play kickball? Question
Robert: At Dwayne’s house Answer

After these two turns Ralph signaled the end of the dialogue phase and the shift to the next phase by saying, "I go" meaning that it was his turn to read his journal. The second dialogue phase that was a response to Ralph's narrative, "Yesterday me and brother was getting wet and Liz wet us with the water hose and we bought ice cream." The written dialogue was initiated by Robert and it consisted of eight pairs of question–answer exchanges. During this phase the oral channel was used to clarify the written channel.

Example 5.3 Dialogue2 from 3/26/85 (Plain text = talk, underline = writing, italics = oral reading)

Robert: What day of the month? Question
Ralph: yesterday Answer
Robert: *I mean what kind of water hose do you guys get wet?*
Ralph: *With a regular water hose*

Robert: *What color was it? was it?*
Ralph: *green*

(Ralph and Robert used the oral channel to clarify the written dialogue)

Ralph: *Green*
Robert: *Green?*
Ralph: *Green*
Robert: *Green?*
Ralph: *Green*
Robert: *I thought you said gray*
Ralph: *It's green We cut because it had a big hole right there*
Robert: *Where?*
Ralph: *Right there you know how it goes and it has a hole*
Robert: *You mean it has like holes sticking in it like that?*
Ralph: *It had a hole like that big*

Robert: *What kind of ice cream did you guys ate?*
Ralph: *Bullet*

Robert: *What color was the bullet?*
Ralph: *Red and yellow*

Robert: *And what color was the water of the water hose?*
Ralph: *White*

Robert: *And did you have fun?*
Ralph: *Yeah*

The question–answer exchange was used during set 1 and set 2 of the data collection. Occasionally there was a three–part exchange usually in the form of question–answer–response. On 5/21/85 there was an example of this type of exchange
Example 5.4
(Robert had written a narrative about having a remote control truck. Yolanda initiated the written dialogue by asking him what a remote control was)

Y: *Qué es un move control?*  
(What is a move control?)  
R: *Qué se mueven los reviates*  
(That the trucks move)  
Y: *Yo no sabía lo que iba decir*  
(I didn’t know what it would be)

Question
Answer
Response

Occasionally questions embedded in the personal narratives initiated the written dialogue. On 9/20/85 Robert was sharing with Eddie who had written a narrative about playing football. The narrative ended in a question:

Example 5.5 Personal Narrative written by Eddie 9/20/86

Tomorrow I have a football game with the Rams it is fun playing football can you watch my game tomorrow?

"Can you watch my game tomorrow?"  
Question in narrative

R: *I don't know*  
Answer
E: *Too bad*  
Response
R: *Maybe I'll see you at the park*  
initiation
E: *I'm going to play at Westin High School*  
Response

This written dialogue about watching the football game did not proceed through an exchange of question and answer pairs. Instead the dialogue was developed through question-answer-response and initiation-response exchanges.

During set 3 there was a shift away from the predominant use of the question-answer routine. Instead, the exchange types used were initiation-question-response or initiation-response exchanges. An example of an initiation-question-response exchange from 2/25/86 was:
Example 5.6
(Yolanda had written in her personal narrative that her mother was
getting her a surprise and that she did not know what it was)

R: I bet I know what it is she told me what it is.
    but I am not going to tell you
Y: Why?
R: Because it's a surprise

The dialogue phases were closed through the use of closing
exchanges. Among the closing makers used in Robert's sessions were:
"OK, fin (the end), and bye." Robert's sessions followed the pattern identified
for the other case study students. In the early sessions the closings were
carried out in the oral channel (see Table 13 below). Through the time of the
data collection the closings shifted from the oral to the written channel. The
closing sections from the second dialogue phases showed a more
consistent use of closing markers than the first dialogue phase. There were
no occasions in Robert's session in which the proposal to close was
contested.

Table 13. Closing Markers Used in Robert's Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dialogue1</th>
<th>Dialogue2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/25/85</td>
<td>the end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/85</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;OK we're done&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/85</td>
<td></td>
<td>bye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/85</td>
<td>&quot;OK&quot;</td>
<td>ah fin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/86</td>
<td>fin</td>
<td>OK fin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/86</td>
<td></td>
<td>bye OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(closing markers in quotations were in the oral channel)

The earliest session collected for Robert (3/25/85) contained two
conversational narratives. Robert addressed both conversational narratives
to the teacher. One conversational narrative was told while Robert was writing the personal narrative and the other was told during the phase dialgoue2. His writing partner, Ralph, did not participate in the storytelling. Robert’s personal narrative from 3/25/85 was:

Example 5.7
Yesterday I went to my friend's house and I had fun and we played kickball and we played freeze tag and I went to the park and we played ball tag and we played with a tennis ball and we kept on playing until seven o'clock and me and Danny we start to play kickball and Danny started to get mad because Dennis was cheating.

As Robert wrote his narrative, the teacher saw Robert write the letters "D, a, n." The teacher asked him if he wanted to write the word "Dwayne" (one of Robert's friends in the classroom). Robert replied that he was writing "Danny." He then told the teacher about his friend Danny:

Example 5.8
T: Did you want to spell Dwayne's name?
R: nuha Danny
T: Oh Danny well that's "Dan" very good
R: Porque hay un amiguito mio que allá vive junto en mi casa y se llama Danny (Because there's a friend of mine who lives over there close to my house and his name is Danny)
T: I see is that who you were playing with?
R: hmhm we were playing at Dwayne's house and then we kept on playing and kept on and then we started cheating and then he started Danny started to get mad because there was already three outs and he said its one away and Danny started to to to get mad because Dwayne was cheating
R: ya I'm done Ya termine (I'm finished)
T: OK

Robert told the teacher that his friend Danny lived near his house and he then told the conversational narrative in reply to the teacher's question. Robert told the teacher another story during the phase dialogue2. In
dialogue2, Robert was writing his response to Ralph narrative which was, "Yesterday me and brother was getting wet and Liz wet us with the water hose and we bought ice cream." Robert wrote the following question,

Example 5.9
R: I mean what kind of water hose did you guys get wet? did you guys get wet with those water hose with those water hose except it's got alot of hair sticking up like that? Y tira agua Mr. Galindo because antes (before) me and Dwayne used to play with it y luego la metiamos en el water hose y prendiamos el agua y empezaba haciendo como un helicoptero así (We used to put it in the water hose and we turned on the water and it started doing like a helicopter)

Robert elaborated and explained his question through the use of a conversational narrative. His partner, Ralph, did not speak Spanish. During this session all the written dialogue and the brief talk between Robert and Ralph took place in English. Robert used the conversational narrative to open a conversational floor between himself and the teacher. Robert signaled this by addressing the teacher through the use of his name and the shift of code from English to Spanish.

Besides using the oral channel to elaborate or clarify the written dialogue, the oral channel was also used to discuss spelling or punctuation marks. The following examples come from Robert's 2/26/86 session. In that session Robert shared with his cousin, Yolanda.

Example 5.10 Robert 2/26/85

(Robert noticed that Yolanda had misspelled the word "play." In this discussion Robert points out that Yolanda had not written the word play correctly. Throughout the conversation Robert tried to make Yolanda look bad, as if she didn't know how to spell "play".)
R: This aint how you spell play this is "p" "l" "a" "y"
T: You have all the letters you have the "p" the "l" "a" and the
"y" now if you have all the letters why do you think they're in
the wrong way the wrong order?
R: Because she said "plough"
Y: "Play" I said
T: You said "play"
R: Pero (but)
Y: Pero (but) I just tried to hurry quickly because I was thirsty
T: Mira hay estan todas las letras hay estan todas las letras
(Look there's all the letters Look there's all the letters)

.....

if you know all the letters why do you think they came out in
a different order
Y: Because I write it very quickly
T: You just wrote it a hurry OK
R: No she should have write it "p" "l" "a" "y"

Later in the same session a similar discussion takes place, this time
related to question marks.

Example 5.11 Robert 2/26/85

Y: Why?
   How do you put the question mark Mr. Galindo?
T: A question mark?
R: Una así y así
   (One like this and like that)
Y: Es cierto?
   (Is that true?)
T: Mmhh
R: Así mira así
   (Like this look)
Y: I'm not dumb
Y: Gosh ( ) make them already
R: Así
   (Like this)
Y: OK don't write on my paper
R: Así
   (Like this)
Yolanda asked the teacher about question marks. Robert showed Yolanda how to make a question mark by writing one on her journal. Robert's comments during this discussion seem to indicate that he was saying that Yolanda should already know about question marks. Yolanda tried to defend herself by saying that she wasn't dumb and by telling Robert not to write on her paper. In summary, the oral channel was used to tell stories, request help on spelling or to comment on the partner's writing.

Types of Appropriation

The way that Robert and his partner's made the event their own, how they made it serve their social purposes, was related to the time orientation of the narrative (past or future time) and the routines of the oral and written dialogue. The type of appropriation most frequently found in Robert's sessions was the discussion of past events (71%, see table 14).

Table 14. Appropriation Types in Robert's Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types:
- AE: Discuss anticipated experiences
- PE: Discuss past experiences
- CN: Call names

The next most common type was discussing anticipated experiences (24%). Name-calling (5%) occurred only during the sessions in which Robert's writing partner was Yolanda. Robert's appropriation of the event will be discussed in more detail through the presentation of a specific session.
called, the baseball session. The following section presents an example of a session in order to relate the characteristics of Robert's sessions to the actual interactions that took place during a session called, the baseball session.

The Baseball Session

A session that came from the last part of the data collection period will be used to provide an example of Robert's sessions. On 5/19/86 Robert shared his journal with his cousin Yolanda. This session took place during the last full month of the second-grade school year and lasted 40 minutes. His sessions from this part of the data collection averaged 37 minutes. During this time of year, the children's municipal baseball season was in full swing, and several of the children played on different teams. Thus, both Robert's and Yolanda's narratives were about baseball and the written dialogues initially discussed baseball and then shifted to other topics. Example 5.12 shows the personal narratives and the written dialogue. The conversational narratives (CN) and side sequences (SS) have been omitted in the example to make the written dialogue easier to read. They will be discussed later in this section.

Example 5.12 Robert, 5/19/86 (R: Robert, Y: Yolanda. Talk is in plain text, writing is underlined— the student read what was being written so it could be picked up on the tape recorder, oral reading is in italics, , ... indicate data omitted, ( ) audio recording not clear, and translations are in parenthesis.)

Robert's personal narrative
Friday we won the Phillies and we got free sodas for $6 and my dad buy us some nachos if we win the games we won the Phillies four times (SS#1) The Phillies won us one time
Dialogue 1

Y: Good but I aint playing baseball (CN#1) any more
R: Why go Yolanda
Y: (CN#2) Because my mom doesn't want me to play baseball (CN#3), OK niña (little girl)
R: Qué burra (What a dumb bell)
Y: Tonto torpe me saca de quesio (Dumb clumsy, You make me mad)
R: OK Mañuela (SS#3) (street urchin)
Y: Bye bye bye bye
R: No no no no

Reading Narrative 2

El otro día cuando yo fui a la practica de béisbol mi tía was throwing the pelota y me cayó la pelota (SS#4)

Dialogue 2

R: OK Yolanda (SS#5) You should have put the glove on your head
Y: But you pushed me
R: OK Yolanda I will write
Y: I am tired bye Robert
R: OK

Robert's narrative was about his baseball team's recent victory and about the snacks that his father bought the team after their victory. In his narrative, Robert did not mention the name of his baseball team but he did mention the name of the team that they beat, the Phillies. Robert's narratives used the movement from one action to another to develop the plot. Description or attention to details, like the name of his team, were not the types of features developed in the narratives. Instead the focus was on writing about the events reported in the narrative.

The topic of Robert's narrative, playing baseball, was also of great interest to two other students, Yolanda and Eddie, who were writing their
narratives at the same table with Robert. The students' interest in baseball led to lively discussions among them during the writing of Robert's personal narrative as well during the first dialogue phase.

As Robert was writing his narrative, Eddie overheard him composing his narrative. Eddie was a member of the Phillies team, and he disagreed with Robert when Robert wrote that his team had beaten the Phillies four times. Eddie initiated a discussion with Robert about how many times they had beaten his team (SS#1). Towards the end of this side sequence, Yolanda attempted to have the two boys terminate their talk and return to the task of writing their personal narratives. The teacher then asked Robert if he was finished writing his narrative.

Example 5.13. Side Sequence #1
(Robert was writing his narrative. Yolanda and Eddie were seated at the table where he was writing. Robert had just finished writing, "We beat the Phillies four times." Eric overheard Robert and disagreed with him.)

R: We won the Phillies four times
E: We played you guys four times only Robert
R: But we won four times
E: We won you guys once

(Robert continued writing his narrative)

R: The Phillies won us one time
Y: We won them three times huh
R: Four they won us once
Y: We played them four times huh?
R: We won them all those times but
Y: And then we won
E: We played you five times then
R: Four oh yeah five
Y: Five
E: We won you guys (.)
Y: Five times
R: So you guys won us
five take away one equals four
We won you guys four times and you guys just won us one
.....

Y: Don't waste time
E: Cause you guys were an hour late
Y: Robert don't waste your time on baseball just on talking and
talking share
T: OK ya terminaste OK léeselo (did you finish, read it to him)

All three students were members of the teams being discussed and
they all were very interested in keeping track of how many games they had
won or lost. Yolanda and Robert were members of the same team, and
Eddie was a member of the Phillies. Yolanda helped terminate the side
sequence by telling the boys not to waste time and to get back the journal
activity. After the three students had finished talking Yolanda kept the side
sequence going by initiating a conversation with the teacher about a
statement Robert's father had made. Yolanda told the teacher that Robert's
father had said that playing baseball was the most important thing. In
contrast to Robert's father, Yolanda volunteered that God was the most
important thing. Robert joined the conversation and supported his father's
position in the following continuation of the group's discussion.

Example 5.14 Side sequence #1 continued.

T: OK ya terminaste OK léeselo (did you finish, read it to him)
Y: Mr. Galindo también el papá de el papá del Robert dice que que el
juego es más importante que todo (Robert's father says that the
game is the most important thing)
T: Sí es lo que dice (Is that what he says?)
Y: Mentiras el juego no es más importante más que todo (That's lies,
the game isn't the most important thing)
R: Pues sí es (Well it is)
Y: Mentiras (Lies)
R: Cause Cause
Y: Diosito es más importante que todas las cosas y la escuela porque aprendes a escribir y todo (God is more important than everything and school because you learn to write and everything)
R: Pues allá en los juegos también (Well over there in the games too)
Y: juegos no es tan bien (In the games its not as good)
R: en los juegos también aprendes como (In the games you also learn how)
Y: jugar y hacer (to play and do)
R: jugar (play)
Y: Ya sé pero en que es más mejor aprender de Dios o de escuela o de beisbol (I know but what is more important, to learn about God or school or baseball?)
R: To win
Y: To win?
R: To win all the games
E: You know what's more important than the Wildcats
R: I know they're (.)
E: Cause they're undefeated
R: They're cheating
E: No they aren't
Y: These people are winning us and they're cheating
R: And we won the Yankees once so they won us once Toros won us two times.

The side sequence initially was a discussion in which the three students talked about the losses and wins of baseball teams. It was initiated by Eddie as he heard Robert write his narrative. In the discussion that followed the students attempted to come to an understanding about exactly how many games had been won and lost. During the second part of the side sequence, Yolanda initiated a conversation with the teacher. Yolanda compared the merits of playing baseball to other activities like going to school. Yolanda and Robert were in disagreement about the comparison that Yolanda made. Robert supported his father's position as it had been presented by Yolanda. For Yolanda God, school, and writing were important. For Robert, winning all the games was what counted. Later in the conversation Yolanda joined the discussion of baseball again as she stated
that the reason they were beaten was because the other team was cheating.

In this example of discussions during the literacy event the students' talk was related to the topic of the writing as well as to their opinions of what was most important. In this session both the writing of the narrative and the students' talk were based on their personal experiences as well as on their reflections on those experiences. Yolanda's talk about the importance of winning was an example of students reflecting on their experiences.

After this discussion on the merits of baseball, the students briefly talked again about baseball teams winning and about some teams cheating. Robert then read his narrative to Yolanda. After Robert had finished reading his narrative Eddie continued to talk about how many games they had won. Yolanda then initiated the written dialogue by writing, "Good but I aint playing baseball." Yolanda initiated the first written dialogue by responding briefly to Robert's narrative ("Good") and then she contributed to the development of the dialogue by informing Robert that she wasn't going to to play baseball. Yolanda's written response made the topic of the narrative the topic of the written dialogue. Both Robert and Eddie were interested in her response, and the following conversational narratives (CN#1) took place.

Example 5.15 Conversational Narrative #1

Y: Good but I aint playing baseball

(Yolanda stopped writing her response after she finished the word "baseball." Robert and Eddie asked her about her response and in reply to their questions she told a
conversational narrative. In the story Yolanda recounted how she got hit in the eye with a baseball)

R: You aint playing anymore? huh
Y: Baseball
E: You're not playing baseball Are you, baseball?
R: Why?
Y: Just my mom doesn't want me
    Mr. Galindo mira yo le había dicho a mami que no no me metiera en beisbol y ella me metió
    yo le decía
    yo le decía no mami porque yo mejor no
    ya dijiste Yolanda ya hice el cheque dijo
    No mejor no quiero estar en el béisbol mejor me gusta tennis y luego no en béisbol ya escogiste y yo sabía que ya me iba pasar (.)

(Mr. Galindo, look I had told my mother not to put me in baseball and she put me. And I told why not better, and she said I already made the check. No I don't want to be in baseball I like tennis better. But no you already chose baseball and I knew that something was going to happen to me)
E: Mr. Galindo I got hit in the eye with the ball and then I had a black eye
R: so did I
E: Just like Yolanda and then my mom she'll let me play
Y: Because you still wanted it
E: My cousin my dad he's coach my cousin he always gets a pencil and goes boom and breaks them
Y: A ver Good but I aint playing beisbol anymore
    Good but I aint playing any baseball anymore

Both Robert and Eddie were interested in finding out why Yolanda had decided not to play baseball. Yolanda answered their questions through the conversational narrative she told them. Yolanda's story helped initiate a series of stories. After she told her story, Eddie recounted an event in which he was hit by a baseball. Robert also said that he had been hit by a baseball. An interesting point about the conversational narratives is the inclusion of the teacher as an addressee of the stories. Robert and Eddie
asked Yolanda why she wasn't going to play baseball. Yolanda began her response in English then addressed the teacher ("Mr. Galindo") and shifted into Spanish as she told her story about why she was not going to play. As soon as she was finished, Eddie addressed the teacher and told his story about getting hit in the eye. The students included the teacher, even though he did not participate in the story telling, by specifically mentioning him as the addressee. They directed the story to the teacher, but the other students were also the audience for the stories.

After the series of brief stories Yolanda returned to her writing. She signaled this shift back to the writing through the use of the phrase "A ver" (let's see) which can be loosely translated in this case as, "Now where was I." Yolanda wrote the word "anymore" and read her response to Robert. The conversational narratives told by Yolanda and Eddie show how the oral interaction during the dialogue phases of the event moved away from the ongoing written interaction and then returned to the writing. The conversational narrative influenced the writing as Yolanda added the word "anymore" for emphasis after the the conversational narrative. In this example Yolanda moved from her written response to tell the story of why she was not going to play baseball anymore. She then signalled her return to the written dialogue through the phrase "a ver" (let's see).

Robert then asked Yolanda why she wasn't going to play baseball again, and Yolanda told him to write his question. Robert then took his turn to write and asked Yolanda why she wasn't going to play anymore.

Example 5.16 (in response to Yolanda's "good but I and going to play baseball any ball" Robert wrote, "why?" He then
added the written command, "go Yolanda" telling Yolanda to take her turn at writing.)

R: Why go Yolanda
Y: Because my mom doesn't want play baseball.

Yolanda's written response did not elaborate her answer the way that her conversational narrative did. Perhaps she felt that she had already given that information, and in her written response she summarized her answer.

After Yolanda had written her reason for deciding not to play baseball, Robert initiated a conversation with the teacher in which he said that Yolanda couldn't learn anything. Robert was referring to her baseball playing skills because Yolanda then commented that she could learn how to play other games. During this conversation Yolanda told a conversational narrative, and Robert also attempted to tell a conversational narrative but was unsuccessful. All he was able to say was, "a mí el pitcher" (to me the pitcher) before he was cut off by Yolanda.

Example 5.17
R: Mr. Galindo, la Yolanda no aprende nada (Yolanda doesn't learn anything)
Y: I don't care OK I could learn other games its better than dumb baseball you can just hurt yourself
E: I play soccer
Y: El Robert tam–
   Ya van dos veces que me lastimo (I've hurt myself twice) cuando estoy así con mi bat (when I'm like this with my bat) el pitcher me dió aquí porque no podía ver la pelota y me pegó aquí (And the pitcher hit me here because I couldn't see the ball and he hit me here) y luego me cayó (.) (and then the ball fell on me)
T: Te pegó en el brazo (It hit you on the arm?)
Y: mejor no
    ya se enfado mi mamá que me de golpe y golpe (It's better
not to, my mother got tired of me getting banged up)
R: A mi el pitcher (To me the pitcher)
Y: pon el guante aquí en el ojo (Put the glove here on your
    eye)
en la cara (on the face)
pero también porque los míos tienen así little things like
pero todavía puede darme porque nimodo que me la
ponga aquí
(But also mine has little things—talking about her glove—but
the ball can still hit me because I can't put it here)
D: Está así una raya y dos así (The glove—its like this one line
    like this and two like this—talking about the glove's
    webbing)
Y: Como una ventana aquí mira dame el guante (Like a
    window, give me the glove.)
    I'll do it
D: Así está (Its like this—the students were talking and
drawing a picture of the webbing on a baseball glove)
Y: Big liar big liar Robert it's like this

........

Y: Well let me finish writing

After these conversational narratives Robert and Yolanda briefly
talked about baseball gloves. Yolanda then attempted to terminate the side
sequence by requesting the ongoing written dialogue be resumed, "Well let
me finish writing." She finished her written response by adding the phrase,
directed to Robert, "OK niña" (all right little girl) to "Because my mom
doesn't want play baseball." She might have added the insult in response to
Robert saying that she didn't learn anything. Robert then asked where
Yolanda had written "niña." Yolanda reread her response and added that
she liked to call Robert niña in order to make him get upset. The topic of the
written dialogue then shifted to name-calling and insults as Robert wrote
"qué burra" (what an idiot). Yolanda then called Robert "qué torpe" (clumsy)
and said that he made her mad ("me saca de quesio"). Robert in turn called Yolanda "Mañuela" (a young street urchin). Yolanda then proposed to close by writing "bye bye bye." Robert did not respond with another closing marker but with "no no no," repeating the pattern of Yolanda's closing. Yolanda then mentioned that she was tired of writing in Robert's journal. The teacher told her to read her journal so that they could write in it.

There were no more conversational narratives told while the students traded insults. The only extended talk took place as the result of the teacher's initiation. The teacher asked the students what the word "Mañuela" meant. The teacher was unfamiliar with that term. The students described the children they called "Mañuela" as dirty and unkempt.

Example 5.18
T: Por qué le dices Mañolita? (Why do you call her Mañolita)
   Qué quiere decir? (What does that mean?)
R: Los chamacos cochinos de allá en Magdalena (The dirty kids over there in Magdalena— a city in Mexico)
T: Los chamocos cochinos de Magdalena se llaman Mañuelas Es cierto Yolanda (The dirty kids in Magdalena are called Mañuelas. Is that true Yolanda?)
R: Tienen los mocos para afuera verdad? (Their noses are running right?)
Y: mhh Todos cochinos alla en Cucurpe tambien (yeah all filthy over in Cucurpe— city in Mexico— also)
R: Y ni se lavan (and they don't wash up)
Y: No se bañan (The don't bathe)
R: Veras tienen el pelo chinito así (You should see they have their hair all curly)
T: Y porque tienen el pelo chinito así lo tienen así es ( And why do they have their hair curly?)
Y: Todos despeinados la mamá ni los cuida los dejan allá andan corriendo en medio de la calle a veces con calconcitos. Todos pellones de aquí con los cabellos parados los mocos (..) (Their hair isn't combed. Their mothers don't take care of them. They run around the streets sometimes in their underwear. All bald with the hair standing up and their noses all dirty)
R: Y los ojos llorando así (And their eyes are full of tears like this)
R: Ok Mañuela

Through this one word, Mañuela, the students had indexed a social world with which they were familiar and had been able to describe it in detail to the teacher.

The second dialogue phase was similar to the first in that there was much extended talk. Yolanda read her narrative about baseball. Her narrative ended with the closing marker fin (the end). Robert initiated the written dialogue by writing "OK."

Example 5.19 Yolanda's Personal Narrative, 5/16/86

El otro día cuando yo fui a la practica de béisbol mi tía was throwing the pelota y me cayó la pelota fin

R: Me cayó la pelota fin (The ball hit me, said in a mocking tone)
Y: Me cayó (It hit me)
    ni modo que me caí (Well it couldn't hit–Makes reference to use of past tense in previous utterance)
R: Ni modo que te (Well it couldn't)
té pegó en el ojo pero porque no hiciste (It hit you on the eye because you didn't)
Y: Y se me cerró el ojo (My eye closed up)
    Que te you don't even know
R: Yeah I don't even know
Y: OK well write
T: Se te cerró el ojo? Cómo estabat? Así (Your eye closed up? How was it, like that)
Y: Todavía me duele poquito (It still hurts me a little bit)
R: OK
Y: That doesn't tells me anything
R: I said You said fin I said OK.
Y: But that’s because I finished well writing
    OK doesn't tell me anything
    That means wasting time
    Instead of OK
    You should have been thinking while I was writing it to you
Be thinking while I read it again a ver si piensas algo
(Let's see if you can think of something)
*El otro día cuando yo fui a la práctica*

Robert began the second dialogue by writing "OK" in response to Yolanda's "fin." Robert used his knowledge of how the written dialogues were closed. He knew that he was initiating and not closing the dialogue, but he decided to initiate the dialogue by proposing to close it in response to Yolanda's "fin." Yolanda did not agree to close, and she protested by telling Robert that his response did not contribute to the development of the written dialogue, that is his written response "OK" did not tell her anything or provide new information. Robert told Yolanda that he had written "OK" in response to the "fin" at the end of Yolanda's personal narrative. Yolanda then told Robert that "fin" indicated the end of the narrative, not the end of the written dialogue. The word fin was used both as a closing marker for the personal narrative as well as a closing marker for the dialogue phase. Yolanda then told Robert that he was wasting time and to listen to the narrative one more time and to think of a response.

Yolanda read the narrative a total of three times to Robert before he expanded his written response, prompting him by saying, "Since you wanted to write a whole bunch on your journal let's write a whole bunch in my journal." While Yolanda waited for Robert to write his response, she talked to the teacher about the earrings she was wearing. Robert eventually wrote, asking why Yolanda had not put the glove over her head to protect herself. Yolanda wrote back because he had pushed her. Yolanda then proposed to close the dialogue and the session ended.
During the baseball session there were several side sequences. On four separate occasions Yolanda made attempts to help terminate the side sequences or conversational narratives and return to the written dialogue. These attempts were called "requests to resume" the ongoing written dialogue. Examples of request to resume from this session were: "don't waste your time on baseball just on talking and talking, share;" "Well let me finish writing;" "OK pues (well) write aretas (earrings) they're not so important writing is more important;" and, "OK write Robert." It is interesting to note that all the request to resume were carried out by Yolanda even though she initiated some of the side sequences or conversational narratives.

Discussion

The majority of Robert's narratives presented the children's world of play which became the topic of both the oral and written dialogues. The first topic in the baseball session was playing in organized baseball teams and then shifted to name-calling as a result of the students' interactions. In this case the shift in topic indicted a shift in the appropriation type from discussing past experiences to name-calling. The shift in appropriation indicated a shift in the student's social purpose.

The conversational narratives and side sequences in the baseball session took place during a portion of the personal narrative and the first part of the written dialogue. When the topic shifted, the interaction took place through the exchange of written insults and not through side sequences and conversational narratives. The only side sequences were
those initiated by the teacher in regards to the use of an unknown term and the talk about the closing. The first part of the written dialogue contained the topic of baseball which could be elaborated by the students experiences. The calling of names might not have been as easily elaborated through stories even though one might expect that the insults could also have been traded through the oral channel.

Children's participation in baseball teams introduced them to the organized elements of play that include such details as scheduled practices and league rankings. In response to the topic of baseball, the students discussed their evaluations of the relative importance of winning games. In this session, as students were talking about winning and losing games, Yolanda initiated a discussion about the relative importance of winning. She challenged the notion that winning was the most important thing. Robert and Eddie joined the conversation and stated their belief that winning was the important thing. Through their discussions the students presented their viewpoints and attempted to support their positions.

It is interesting to note the different ways that Robert and Yolanda supported their position. Robert supported his position by contrasting the learning of school with learning that is valued by peer groups, such as being skillful at playing a game. Yolanda drew her support from values based on belief in God and the value of being literate. Robert and Yolanda represented values from two differing peer worlds. Their discussion presented their evaluations of their experiences related to the overall importance of winning and loosing, and those evaluations became a topic of the dialogue (Britton, 1970).
Through their interaction the students addressed the concerns of peer culture related to playing games and winning and losing and the relative importance of playing in sports. Through the side sequences and conversational narratives the students presented and defended their position regarding the importance of playing and thus develop their communicative strategies as they participated in the interaction. Through the narrative, written dialogue, side sequences, and conversational narratives the students were able to draw upon a range of discourse strategies and collectively build the social world that was the dialogue journal literacy event during the baseball session.

The baseball session illustrated the differing ways that participant structures shifted during different phases of the event and how students could perceive those shifts differently. During the writing of the personal narrative the interaction was three-way between Robert, Yolanda, and Eddie. Eddie participated in the discussions during the narrative writing and the beginning part of the dialogue phase. Eddie's participation began to be resisted by Yolanda when Robert began reading his narrative. The reading of the narrative signalled the end of the personal narrative phase and the beginning of the phase reading narrative 1. Yolanda interpreted the phase reading narrative 1 as the beginning of dyadic interaction. Robert and Yolanda became partners in the event during the phase reading narrative 1.

Robert did not interpret a shift from multi-party interaction to dyadic interaction and consequently did not attempt to limit Eddie's participation. Yolanda, not Robert, defined the situation as a time for dyadic interaction. For Yolanda, Eddie's participation was interrupting her from participating in
the event with Robert. Yolanda used the term "sharing" both times that she resisted Eddie's participation. The use of the term "share" provided evidence of Yolanda's definition of the situation. She saw herself in a role relationship of writing partner with Robert that excluded Eddie. Robert defined the situation and appropriated the event as a time for three-way interaction. On the other hand, Yolanda definition of the event shifted from three-party to two-party interaction when the phase changed from personal narrative writing to reading narrative.

The session from 5/19/86 showed how the social world of children's interaction was constructed through the use of both oral and written discourse. It also showed how interaction among three students contributed to the ongoing activity and how at other times the three way interaction was resisted by one of the students. The conversational narratives and side sequences that characterized the baseball session provided a way for the three students to participate together in the development of the interaction and consequently influenced how the students defined the event and the social purposes it served. The event was defined as a social occasion for the sharing of experiences related to baseball through the oral and written channel. During the name calling the absence of conversational narratives and side sequences also reflected how the students were defining the situation. The event was defined as a time to call names through the written channel. The social organization of the event was realigned through the name calling from team-mates discussing the wins and losses of their baseball team, to cousins engaged in verbal fighting.
Summary of Robert's Case Study

The world of Robert's narrative became the topic of the written dialogue through the question and answer routines of the earlier sessions. In the session from later in the collection period there was a greater variety in the written routines. They were not limited to question–answer pairs. Through the routines of the event, Robert along with his partner were able to participate in the construction of the social worlds in which their interaction took place. Along with the routines of the written dialogue, Robert's sessions included conversational narratives and side sequences. The conversational narratives and side sequences which took place in the oral channel were used to elaborate or clarify the social world initially presented through the personal narratives. The extended talk was characteristic of the sessions from the later period of the data collection.

In the baseball session the topic of baseball as well as the fact that all the students were members of baseball teams provided the students with a common background of social knowledge related to baseball that contributed to the interactive nature of the event. The highly interactive nature of the session caused Yolanda to resist Eddie's participation because she saw it as a hindrance to the construction of social worlds between herself and Robert. Yolanda's resistance of Eddie's' participation has some similarities to Corsaro's (1985) "protection of interactive space" where young children involved in play define a situation in such a way as to limit the participation of other children.
Yolanda

Characteristics of the Personal Narratives

The topics of Yolanda's narratives were related to either family events (55%) or playing with friends (45%) and most reported past events (see Table 15). The stories that dealt with family took place around relatives' visits or activities, such as shopping, done with family. The stories about playing with friends included playing at home, at school, and at baseball games.

Table 15. Personal Narratives Topics and Time Orientation in Yolanda's Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Events</th>
<th>Playing Friends</th>
<th>Past Time</th>
<th>Future Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The narratives from the middle and last part of the collection period consistently used temporal openers and closing markers. The narratives were introduced by the temporal markers including, "the day before yesterday, yesterday, and today." These indicated that the experiences took place in the recent past or were anticipated to occur in the near future time. Like the other case study students, Yolanda wrote about experiences that took place, or were anticipated to take place, only a few days from the time of the time of writing. All of Yolanda's personal narrative's for set 2 and set 3 ended with "fin" even if the narrative had been written in English.
Yolanda wrote three narratives in English, one in Spanish and two switched between both languages (see Table 16). The length of Yolanda's narratives from set 1 averaged 38 words, the narratives from to set 2 averaged 87 words and the narratives from set 3 averaged 83 words.

Table 16. Language in Which Yolanda's Personal Narratives Were Written

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Code-Switch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>7 64</td>
<td>1 9</td>
<td>3 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example of code-switching in the narrative writing comes from 11/4/85. The narrative was about going to take Yolanda's grandmother to the doctor and about Yolanda getting spanked. She switched from English to Spanish at the point in the narrative in which she wrote about getting spanked (translation of the portions of narrative that was code-switched is in parentheses within the narrative).

Example 5.20 Code-Switching in Yolanda's Personal Narrative from 11/4/85

Today my mom is going to take my grandma to the doctor and I think after school I am going to be with them over there if my mom comes and picks me up and I think my mom is going to come early and pick my grandma up and going to go take her to the doctor y yo no me voy a ponerme contenta y no voy a ponerme bien bien contenta porque mi mamá me va pegar y no quiero que me pegué porque si me porto mal (and I'm not going to get happy and I'm not going to get real real happy because my mother is going to spank me and I don't want her to spank me because I do misbehave) I am going to get a big big whooping and I'm going to start crying y luego mi mamá se le baja el coraje y a mí se para el de llorar fin (and then my mother calms down and my crying stops the end)
Characteristics of the Oral and Written Dialogues

The sessions from set 3 of the data collection were characterized by extended talk that took place through side sequences and conversational narratives. The sessions from the beginning of the data collection averaged 15 minutes, the sessions from the middle of the data collection averaged 39 minutes, and the sessions from the last part of the data collection averaged 41 minutes (see Table 17).

Table 17. Duration of Phases from Yolanda’s Sessions (in minutes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Personal narrative</th>
<th>Dialogue1</th>
<th>Reading narrative2</th>
<th>Dialogue2</th>
<th>Total minutes</th>
<th>Ave. minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/12/85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>set 1: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>set 2: 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4/85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>set 3: 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/86</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5/86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yolanda's sessions followed the pattern identified for two of the other case study students in which there was a shift from the use of question–answer pairs in the beginning of the data collection to the use of other kinds of exchanges during the middle and late collection periods (see Table 18 below). The percentage of question–answer pairs was 65% during set 1, and gradually changed to 50% during set 3. The percentage of other types of exchanges besides the question–and–answer changed from 35% during the first set of data collection to 50% during the last set. During the last set of data collection the question and answer and other types of exchanges were both 50%.
The questions in Yolanda's sessions requested information on actors or actions the majority of time (57%). The questions also requested information on objects (toys or animals) (23%) and the reason for character's actions (20%, see Table 19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th># of Sessions</th>
<th>Q-A pairs</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Q-A</th>
<th>% Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

Q-A= Question and Answer exchange
Other= Initiation and Response exchange
  Initiation and Question and Response exchange
  Question and Initiation and Response exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1A= Request information about actor or actions
  1B= Request information about setting
  1C= Request information about time
  1D= Request information about object (toy or pet)
  3A= Request for reason for an action
  5A= Request opinion

Yolanda's sessions differed from some of the other case studies in that her early sessions already contained a variety of exchange patterns besides the question-answer routine. The following example of from 5/29/85 contained a question-answer-response exchange:
Example 5.21
Y: What kind was it?  Question
S: Strawberry  Answer
Y: Those are my favorite kind  Response

The question–answer exchanges and variations of that type were common during Yolanda's and the other case study students. Occasionally a dialogue phase would be carried out without the use of question–answer exchanges. The following dialogue phase from the middle part of the data (9/10/85) collection is an example of a dialogue phase that took place without the use of questions:

Example 5.22
(The narrative that this dialogue was in response to was about Yolanda spending the night at Mónica's house. Y: Yolanda M: Mónica)

Y: I don't remember if Juanito put on the stereo or the radio  Initiation
M: No todavía estabas duermida  Response
(No you were still asleep)
Y: Yo no soy floja como tu Mónica cuando no hay escuela te levantas muy tarde (I'm not lazy like you are. When there's no school you wake up late)  Comment
M: Los sábados tenemos doctrina  Initiation
(We have catechism on Saturdays)
Y: Ya lo sé (I already know)  Response

A session from 3/17/86 contained several instances of conversational narratives and side sequences (a few examples have been indicated by using CN for conversational narratives and SS for side sequences). The written dialogue shifted from the question–answer sequences to initiation–response sequences when the Yolanda and Robert started calling each other names:
Example 5. 23 3/17/86 (Yolanda mentioned in her narrative that she had taken a shower in the morning. Y: Yolanda, R: Robert)

R: Why did you take a shower
Y: Because I didn't took a shower in the morning
R: Yo pienso que (SS#1, CN#1) la Yolanda estaba susia (I think that Yolanda was dirty)
Y: Como un cochi (Like a pig?)
R: Si (SS#2) señorita (Yes mam)
Y: Noño (SS#3) me simpatises Noño (Noño—TV character, don't make me mad)
R: Noña
Y: que Noña
R: Shut up (SS#4)
Y: Fin

As Robert was writing his response "Yo pienso que la Yolanda estaba sucia," the teacher noticed that Yolanda had said something to Robert. The teacher asked Yolanda what she had said. Yolanda's responses initiated the following side sequence (SS#1) during which Robert told a conversational narrative. Yolanda made a request to resume as Robert started telling his story.

Example 5.24 Side Sequence #1

Y: yo nomás estaba diciendo (I was only saying) because I was a dirty last night se me escuría toda la tierra (All the dirt on me was running down)
D: a nosotros anoche estaba jugando [allá en la tierra] en el soquete (last night I was playing in the mud)

Y: [ándale pues escribe] (Come on well, write)
D: Estábamos jugando en un hoyo estábamos
hallando eggs huevitos de pájaro así chiquitos
allá en la casa verás como hay huevitos
chiquitos allí tirados abajo de los hoyos de las
pierdas verás como hay allí
(We were playing in a hole and we were finding
bird's eggs, little ones like this. At my house you
should see how many little eggs there are
thrown underneath the holes of the rocks. You
should see how many there are over there.)
T: Tráelos a la escuela a ver (Bring them to school
to see them)
D: OK
a ver si mañana mi papi me deja traer un
huevo de palomita de esa
(I'll see if my father lets me bring a pigeon egg)
T: no traes la paloma no traigas los huevos
necesitamos porque se van a morir
(No, bring the pigeon, don't bring the eggs
because they'll die)
D: los huevos? (The eggs?)
Y: y luego las palomas no los van a querer verdad
Mr. Galindo los va a dejar y se van a morir
I need to have gloves on verdad?
(Then the pigeons won't want them right Mr.
Galindo? They'll leave them and they'll die.)
R: la Yolanda estaba sucia
(Yolanda was dirty)

The side sequence was terminated by a shift to the written channel
as Robert finished writing his response. The conversational narrative and
the following discussion were not related to the topic of the written dialogue.
Through the conversational narrative and the discussion the students
shared their out of school life with the teacher.

After a few turns the written dialogue shifted to name—calling. The
name—calling was precipitated by an argument between Robert and
Yolanda over the spelling of the word "si" in Robert's response, "si señorita."
As Robert wrote si señorita Yolanda started an argument by telling Robert that he had misspelled "si."

Example 5.25

Y: Mr. Galindo ya no voy hacer share con él va a mi casa o yo voy a su casa todo el tiempo nos peleamos (I'm not going to share with him. He comes to my house or I go to his house and we fight all the time) R: shut up you hear that's what I said shut up Y: Mr. Galindo I'm not going to share with him if he writes those words inside my journal T: bueno (all right) Y: I'm not going to be sharing with you ya sabes Robert qué le puedo decir a tú mamá y no te va a dejar a jugar (You know that I can tell your mother and they won't let you play) R: si me dejan (They let me) Y: bueno ya (all right) I'm going to erase now write something else I don't like that word write something else write good things para qué te sirve ir a la catechism? (What good does it do you to go to catechism?)

This section of the side sequence ends on a moral note as Yolanda makes reference to the religious education of catechism. After this side sequence, Robert and Yolanda called each other "Noño" (a character from Spanish television), and Robert wrote "shut up" in the written dialogue. The dialogue phase was closed through the use of the closing marker, "fin." This name-calling example is similar to one from Robert's case study. Both dialogue phases in which there was name-calling were initiated through a
series of questions and answers about the personal narrative. Later in the dialogue there was a shift in social purposes from discussing past events to the present time of the event through name-calling which was carried out through initiation–response exchanges.

Yolanda's early sessions made use of oral closing markers. The sessions from set 2 and set 3 made use of written closing markers. Among the markers used were: "Oh, OK," and "fin" (see Table 20).

Table 20. Closing Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dialogue 1</th>
<th>Dialogue 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/12/85</td>
<td>&quot;are you going to write some more?&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ya pues&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/85</td>
<td>&quot;Now let me read it to you&quot;</td>
<td>All right Oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4/85</td>
<td>Oh</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/85</td>
<td>fin Ok</td>
<td>fin fin Silva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/86</td>
<td>fin fin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/15/86</td>
<td>&quot;can we write in mine?&quot; fin</td>
<td>&quot;OK&quot; fin &quot;ya&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Closing markers in quotation marks were in the oral channel. The other markers were in the written channel.)

**Types of Appropriation**

Yolanda appropriated the event by using it as a time to negotiate peer relationships in unique ways. Yolanda's sessions dealt with the negotiation of peer friendships 23% of the time (see Table 21 below). This type of appropriation was found more frequently in Yolanda's sessions than in any of the other case study students. Besides this type of appropriation, Yolanda also used the event to discuss past experiences (59%) and anticipated experiences (14%). Yolanda also used the event to call names (5%). The three sessions will be discussed to illustrated the use of the
dialogue journal literacy event by Yolanda and her partners as a time to negotiate peer friendship.

Table 21. Types of Appropriation in Yolanda's Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types:
AE: Discuss anticipated experiences
PE: Discuss past experiences
DP: Discuss present experiences
NP: Negotiate peer relationships
CN: Call names

The Play Sessions

Three sessions from the early (5/7/85), middle (12/16/85), and last part (5/5/86) of the data collection period will be used to discuss the main characteristics of Yolanda's session. In these sessions the students used the literacy event as a time to negotiate peer friendships. These examples were chosen because they illustrate how the different phases of the event were coordinated in the constructions of social worlds. The example from 5/5/86 will also be used to illustrate the occurrence of conversational stories and side sequences in Yolanda's sessions.

The discussion of the negotiation of peer activities will be presented in two sections. The first section will discuss the sessions from 5/7/85 and
5/5/86 which involved the planning of after-school play. The second section discusses the session from 12/16/85 in which the negotiation of peer activity took place during the writing of the event.

**Personal Narrative**

The world of Yolanda’s narrative from the 5/5/86 sessions was a world of play and friendships in which classmates participated in familiar events that were part of their peer culture. Yolanda’s narrative (see Example 5.26) from the play session projected a world in which playing with her school friends was anticipated and planned.

**Example 5.26 Yolanda’s Personal Narratives 5/5/86**

Today Suzy is going to my house and Suzy is going to ask her mom and I am too and if my my mom says no and Suzy’s mom says no too then probably another day she will be able to come and if she comes we are going to play with our Barbies we are going to play Barbies and then get my car of my Barbies and if Suzy wants day and night Barbies then if I want day and night Barbies too then I will let her fin

In both sessions Yolanda wrote about anticipated play with Barbies with her friends. Yolanda planned by writing about the dolls they would play with at her house. The student with whom Yolanda shared her journal were characters in the personal narrative. She appeared in the opening lines of the personal narrative (see Example 5.27).

**Example 5.27 Yolanda 5/5/85**

"Today Suzy is going to my house"
Yolanda's writing partner was an integral part of the world of the text. Within the world of the text the activity of play unfolded during the relatively brief time of a friend's visit to her house. Time in Yolanda's narratives unfolded through after-school play.

Alongside the anticipation of playing with her friends there was also an uncertainty in Yolanda's narratives that came from the students' need to get their parents' permission. The students needed their parents' permission in order to be able to carry out their plans. This uncertainty introduced a sense of conflict because the students were not sure that they would be able to proceed with their plans. Yolanda addressed this uncertainty in one of her narratives by using "if, then" statements. The "if" part of the statement showed the uncertainty and the "then" part anticipated what they would do if the uncertainty was resolved.

Example 5. 28–Statements of Uncertainty from Yolanda's Personal Narrative

and if my mom says no... then probably another day and if she comes...we are going to play with our Barbies

Dialogue1

The anticipation and planning of the after-school play that was introduced in the personal narrative became the topic of the written dialogue.

Example 5.29 The written dialogue from phase Dialogue1 from 5/5/86

S: But I don't know if I could go to your house today
Y: I know Suzy but if you could come then we'll play Barbies.
S: What Barbies do (CN#1) you have?
(SS#1)
Y: Day and Night Barbie and Peaches and Cream Loving
You Barbie Western Barbies (CN#2) Exercise Barbie My
First Barbie and that's it (CLOSING PROPOSED1) and
Crystal Barbie (CLOSING PROPOSED2) Fin

The uncertainty presented in the personal narrative that was the
result of not being sure that the students would have their parents
permission was evident in Suzy's initiating move from 5/5/86. Suzy's
response that initiated the phase dialogue was, "But I don't know if I could
go to your house today." The opening move was a response to the
narrative. It did not request additional information or reasons for an action
like other opening moves. Her response showed her uncertainty of being
able to go to Yolanda's house to play. Yolanda then responded with
another "if, then" statement, "I know Suzy but if you could come then then
we'll play Barbies." At this point Suzy switched the topic of the dialogue from
discussing the after-school play activity to Yolanda's Barbies. While Suzy
wrote her question, Yolanda told the teacher the following conversational
narrative (CN#1).

Example 5. 30
Mr. Galindo mi pichona ya puso
tres y en esta mañana mi papi me dijo que otra pichona
puso otro huevos ya son cuatro huevos
el Robert tiene sies

(My pigeon already laid three and this morning my father
told me that another pigeon laid another egg. Now there's
four. Robert has six.)

Yolanda's story about pigeons was not related to any previous
mention of pigeons during this session and the topic of pigeons was not
brought up later in the session. Yolanda signalled a shift of addressee from Suzy to her teacher through the use of his name and by switching from English to Spanish. Suzy understood but did not speak Spanish. The teacher did not comment on the conversational narrative. After Yolanda told her story about the pigeon, Suzy read her responses. Yolanda then initiated a side sequence about something she noticed on an ant farm that was sitting on a counter top close to the table where they were writing (SS#1).

Yolanda resumed her writing after they had briefly talked about the ant farm during the side sequence. As Yolanda was listing all the different kinds of Barbies she owned she wrote "Western Barbie." At that point she shifted away from the written channel and told the following conversational story (CN2).

Example 5. 31
Y: Mr. Galindo cuando yo agarre la western Barbie la Suzy fuimos a la casa de la Suzy yo le di una tambien
(When I got the Western Barbie, we went to Suzy's house and I gave Suzy one also)
T: es cierto? si (Is that true, yes)

After Yolanda had listed six different kinds of Barbies Suzy asked Yolanda if they could stop writing on Yolanda's journal and start writing on her journal (CLOSING PROPOSED1). Yolanda did not respond to Suzy's request to close. Yolanda then wrote one more doll and Suzy asked again if they could write in her journal.

Example 5. 32
Y: One two three four five and crystal Barbie
and crystal Barbie ya Mr. Galindo
S: Can we write in mine
Y: at last
(.) fin Suzy
ay niña (oh, little one)
T: Porque dijistes "ay niña?" a la Suzy (Why did you say, "oh, little one" to Suzy?)
Y: Ay porque es muy terca
no me deja terminar de rayar (Because she's very stubborn and she doesn’t let me finish writing)
S: Its my turn?

In this dialogue phase, Suzy did not wait for her turn to write and propose to close through the use of a closing marker. Instead she proposed to close through the oral channel by asking Yolanda if they could write in her journal. Yolanda signalled her agreement to close by writing "fin" after had had written "Crystal Barbie." Suzy did not write back another closing marker the way that students usually closed the dialogue phase. Instead she asked if it was her turn and then read her narrative to Yolanda.

In this phase there was an initiation–response and question–answer exchange. The response dealt with uncertainty and the question–answer exchange requested additional information about the Barbies that the students would be playing with. The written dialogue provided a way for the participants to interact and coordinate their appropriation of the event through the use of the different types of exchanges through which they pursued the topic of after-school play that was introduced through Yolanda’s narrative.

Reading Narrative?

Another level of coordination of social worlds during this session becomes evident upon Suzy’s reading of her personal narrative. Suzy’s
narrative was also about playing dolls with Yolanda after-school, but it also contained the additional information that Yolanda might go to Suzy's house and play with her there.

Example 5. 33 Suzy's personal narrative 5/5/86

Today I might go to Yolanda's house to play Barbies and then my mom is going to come for me and she might take Yolanda home with us so she can play with me.

Suzy's personal narrative, like Yolanda's, also anticipated the after-school play time. Yolanda was mentioned as a character in the story. Both Yolanda's and Suzy's personal narratives have similar opening lines.

Example 5. 34 Opening Lines from the Personal Narratives

Yolanda
"Today Suzy is going to my house"

Suzy
"Today I might go to Yolanda's house to play Barbies"

The uncertainty expressed in Yolanda's personal narrative through "if/then" statement is expressed in Suzy's personal narrative through "might" in the phrase, "Today I might go" from the first line in the narrative.

It is unclear at what point the girls decided to write about their plans. They were sitting close to each other, and Suzy could have overheard Yolanda orally reading her narrative as she was writing it, or the girls could have discussed their plans earlier in the day.
Dialogue 2

The second dialogue phase was initiated by Yolanda’s response to Suzy’s personal narrative. Like dialogue 1, this phase began with responses and then shifted to question-answer exchanges. In the responses the students wrote about what they will do if their parents don’t give them permission. The phase ends after two question-answer exchanges. The first two responses in the written dialogue showed the uncertainty of their plans through the use of "if, then" statements.

Example 5.35 Written dialogue from Dialogue 2 phase—5/5/86

Y: And if my (CN#3) mom says no well I will go another day (SS#2)
S: And if my mom says no that you can’t come to my house then I will have to play by myself
Y: I will stay crying and I will hit my mom (CN#5)
S: You will hit your mom just because you can’t go to my house
Y: Porque (CLOSING PROPOSED) yo soy corajuda (SS#3) (Because I’m hot-tempered)
S: Why are you mean with your mom
Y: I don’t know (SS#4) fin

As Yolanda was writing her response, "And if my mom," she paused and said, "Que torpe soy" (I’m so dense). The teacher asked her why she said that. Yolanda answered the teacher’s question in the following way (CN#3):

Example 5.36

Y: Porque mi papi dijo que iba venir del trabajo y que me bañará y me cambiara porque ibamos a ir a 31 Flavors (Because my father said that he was coming from work and for me to
Yolanda told this story as she wrote about the possibility of playing with Suzy after school. She remembered that she had already made plans to go with her father to buy ice cream in the afternoon. Yolanda was writing her response in English, but she shifted from the written channel to the oral channel and told the story in Spanish.

Yolanda finished telling the story and returned to finish writing her written response to Suzy’s narrative, “And if my mom says no then I will go another day.” Yolanda’s first response contained an “if/then” statement. The uncertainty of children’s worlds presented in the narrative as well as the topic of the narrative became the object of the written dialogue. Yolanda initiated a side sequence about getting stung by an ant as soon as she finished writing her response(SS#). After the conversational narrative and side sequence Suzy wondered if Yolanda was done writing. She asked Yolanda:

Example 5.37
Y: and if my mom says no then I will go another day
ay Mr. Galindo me dan las creep a mi porque tengo un
piquotote de acá atrás de hormiguitas
era una hormiguita con little wings
(Oh, Mr. Galindo I get the creeps because I have a big ant
bite on my back)
S: those are flying ants
Y: and there was on top of my head
    tal vez era el diablo (maybe it was the devil)
    mi mami lo pinchó así (My mother pinched it like this)
T: sí esa (.)
Y: sí
S: are you done writing or not
Y: you go well
    OK if my mom says no but I will go to another day
    what's your nickname
S: Suzy
Y: Suzy
    I want a short nickname
    because I hate writing a lot
    I like writing alot
S: OK let's see what we can write

All the conversational stories told by Yolanda during this session
were told in Spanish and most of the side sequences were in Spanish. This
side sequence about the ant sting is interesting because Suzy makes a
contribution by saying that they were flying ants, thus providing evidence
that she understood some Spanish. Yolanda did say "little wings" in English
but it is doubtful that "little wings" would have been sufficient information on
which Suzy could base her contribution, "those are flying ants." Later in the
written dialogue Yolanda wrote her response in Spanish, and Suzy told her
that she did not understand what she had written.

Before Yolanda passed the turn to Suzy she read her response to
her. Suzy then comments on her turn at writing by saying, "OK let's see
what we can write." In this exchange Yolanda caught herself saying that she
did not like to write a lot. She then reversed herself and said she liked
writing a lot. This short comment gives a glimpse of Yolanda's presentation of herself in this classroom setting as one who liked to write.

Suzy wrote, "If my mom says no that you can't come to my house, then I will have to play by myself," in response to Yolanda's opening statement. Suzy's response also used the "if, then" construction. Yolanda responded by saying that she would start crying and hit her mom. She then described how she spanked her mother and told an extended conversational narrative about a child who was disrespectful to her mother (CN#5):

Example 5.38
Y: Le pego unas nalgadas, Mr. Galindo, a mi mami una nalgada y se mueve así porque le duele y luego una muchachita de allá de Cucurpe Mr. Galindo de allá de Cucurpe se llama Carmen se portó mal porque su mamá tenía tres hijas esa señora y luego esa señora se iba ir y no quiso llevar niñas que tenía la quiso dejar con mi nina en Cucurpe y se enojo la niña y luego sabes que? lo que dijo cuando ya se iba su mamá? ojala que se matan en medio camino dijo la muchachita llorado y luego la mamá de ella le pego una chachetada aquí y luego le salió sangre por las narizes

(I spank my mother, Mr. Galindo, and she moves like this because it hurts her and then a little girl from over there in Cucurpe, Mr. Galindo, her name is Carmen she misbehaved because her mother had three daughters, that lady, and then that lady was going to leave and she didn't want to take her daughters with her she wanted to leave them with my godmother and the little girl got mad and then do you know what happened? What she said when her mother was going to leave? I hope you get killed on the highway the little girl said crying and then the mother slapped her and then blood came out of her nose.)
T: ay (Oh no!)
Y: llorando con toda la sangre de aquí y no quiso qué su mamá (.)
(Crying with all the blood over here and she didn't want that her mom)

As Yolanda was answering Suzy's question, the teacher noticed Suzy whisper something to Yolanda. The teacher then asked Yolanda what Suzy had said (CLOSING PROPOSED):

Example 5.39
T: What did Suzy say?
Y: that we're done after you finish after you write
S: I'm tired of writing
Y: no no
S: yeah yeah
Y: Pues yo no
Porque yo soy corajuda (Because I'm hot tempered)

In her next response Yolanda switched from writing in English to Spanish. She called herself "corajuda" (hot tempered) and then demonstrated to the teacher how such a person could be identified (SS#3).

Example 5.40
Y: Mira Mr. Galindo si me corto un pelo veras y si se me hace curly es que soy corajuda
(Look Mr. Galindo, If I cut a hair and if it gets curly that means I'm hot tempered)
T: Quién te dijo eso Yolanda (Who told you that Yolanda)
Y: Mi nina (My godmother)
cuando alguien se porta mal alguien le jala un cabello y es corajuda (And when someone misbehaves someone pulls out a hair and the person is hot tempered)
T: Si se le hace chinito es corajuda (If it gets curley they're hot tempered)
Y: Muy corajuda soy (I'm very hot tempered)
S: I don't know what you said Yolanda
Y: Because I am mean with my mom porque yo soy corajuda
y si lo agarro me lo jalo así todavía (.) (And if I get it I pull it like this)

Suzy then wrote and asked Yolanda why she was mean with her mom. Yolanda answered that she did not know. Yolanda then commented again on the ant farm. This time she described the fighting ants as if they were fighting. Yolanda then wrote a closing marker to close the session (SS#4):

Example 5.41
Y: I'm not dare to touch one of those things
   Mr. Galindo se andan peliando (They're fighting—looking
   at ant farm)
   yo creo que una es la queen y luego la queen es mean (I
   think one is a queen and the queen is mean)
   you see right there
   anda ancaramando (they're crawling)
   es que una fuerte el otro esta guilito como (.) (Its that one
   is strong and the other is skinny like)
   el otro está fuerte fuerte (the other one is strong, strong)
   OK fin ya
   ya me cansé (I got tired)
S: I did too
Y: por fin (At last)
   I'm dead that's what I feel like

Yolanda began the side sequence in English. She addressed the teacher and shifted to Spanish and told her fictionalized account of what was taking place in the ant farm in Spanish. The dialogue phase was closed through the use of both oral and written closing markers.

The appropriation of the event as a time to plan peer activities took place through the use of both the personal narrative and dialogue phases. The students sat at the same table when they wrote their personal narratives and they were both about the same topic. Suzy's personal
narrative added the additional detail that Yolanda might get to go to her house.

The planning of peer activities found in this session was similar to the other play session between Yolanda and Alicia from 5/7/85. In that session both students were also sitting at the same table, and both, their personal narratives were about playing. Yolanda's narrative was similar to the one from 5/5/86 in that the writing partner was mentioned in the narrative and that she made plans to have Alicia come to play Barbies at her house. The sense of uncertainty is also present in both narratives through the phrase, "I think." Alicia's narrative did not include Yolanda as a character, but it was about playing with her friends.

Example 5.42
5/7/85 Yolanda's Narrative

I think Alicia is going to go to my house to play Barbies at my house and we are going to eat and my mom ain't going to get mad at me and my dad.

Alicia's Narrative
I think I'm not punished and I think I can't play I have to ask my mom if I can play she'll say OK and I can play with all my friends

The dialogues were used to pursue the topic introduced in the personal narrative. A difference between the interaction from this session and the other play session from 5/5/86 was that there were no extended side sequences or conversational stories in the session from 5/7/85. In the following written dialogue from dialogue1 Alicia attempted to close the dialogue through the use of the closing markers "OK" and "all right."
Yolanda did not respond with other closing markers instead she kept on writing. Finally Alicia closed the dialogue by shifting to the oral channel and saying, "Now let me read it to you."

Example 5.43
A: What else are we going to play
Y: a game
A: what kind of game?
Y: a guessing game
A: OK
Y: we are going to play doctor
and I am going to put a tape and we are going to see television
A: all right
Y: and maybe we are going to play with the dogs
and don't be scared because when I am there I'll hit the dog and when he barks at you run away and we are going to throw them the ball
A: Now let me read it to you.

Both of the play sessions had similar characteristics. The narratives and the written dialogues were related to the negotiation of after-school play. These two sessions were very similar despite the fact that they were separated by a period of one year, the first session in May of 1985 and the second session in May of 1986.

In both sessions the written dialogues were not used to open new topics. The topic stayed related to the anticipated event of playing together after-school, or their reactions if their parents did not give them permission. Both students initiated the dialogue through the use of responses. In these responses the students expressed their feelings about the possibilities of playing together. After the responses, the question–answer exchanges
were used to request additional information about the dolls they would play with or about other games they might play.

The Kinship Session

The third session in which Yolanda and her writing partner used the event to negotiate peer friendships comes from the middle of the data collection period, 12/11/85. The negotiation of peer relationships was different from the play sessions because Yolanda's narrative was not about planning peer activities that were to take place in the future. In her narrative Yolanda reported a past event in which she went with her parents to buy a Cabbage Patch doll. Also, Yolanda's narrative did not include her writing partner, Silvia, as a character.

The Personal Narrative

In her narrative, Yolanda wrote about going to a store to buy a doll. At the store they met her aunt and uncle who became part of the story. The story ends with the signing of the Cabbage Patch doll's adoption papers and the taking of photographs.

Example 5.44—Yolanda's narrative 12/16/85
The day before yesterday my mom and my dad went to Levy's then we saw my tío y mi tía y mi my mom y mi papá me agarraron una Cabbage Patch Kid y se llama Polly Nessa y tuve que firmar una cosa no se como se llama y también tuve que firmar un pasaporte para la Polly tuve que firmar mucho y mucho y mi papá me tiró una patada y se la devolvi luego me dejó firmar y también tuvo que firmar mi tío Nono y mi tía Dora tuvo que firmar luego le dije a mi mamá que si podía tomar una foto y me dijo que si y tome dos fotos tu haz tomado una foto si o no fin.
(My mother and father bought me a Cabbage Patch Kid and her name is Polly Nessa and I had to sign a thing and I don’t know what it’s called and I also had to sign a passport for Polly and I had to sign a lot and a lot and my father kicked and I kicked him back and then he let me sign and my uncle Nono had to sign and my aunt Dora had to sign and then I asked my mom if I could take a photo and she said yes and I took two photos. Have you taken a photo yes or no the end.)

The world opened up by Yolanda’s narrative was a world of relatives. All the characters in the story, Yolanda, her parents, and aunt and uncle were related. Through adoption the doll became part of the network of relations. Experiences from other family ceremonies, including taking photographs, were used to frame the doll’s adoption as a “family ceremony.”

Yolanda in this story selected a “ceremonial” occasion in which she presented herself. The occasion was different from the ones in the play sessions because it involved adult relatives as opposed to the peers of the play sessions. The occasions were similar in that they involved dolls and a network of relationships. The relationships were based on different connections. In the case of the play sessions the relationships were based on peer friendships, and in the kinship session the relationships were based on kinship ties.

The personal narrative in the session with kinship roles did not include the writing partner, in this case Silvia, as a character in the story. The writing partner was incorporated at the end of the narrative in the line, “Tú has tomado una foto, si o no.” This last line incorporated the writing partner not as a character in the personal narrative but as a respondent to the narrative. The writing partner was asked about her experience with one of the actions of the story, taking photographs.
The following discussion of the dialogue phases will show how the writing partner participated in the appropriation of the worlds presented through the personal narrative.

**Dialogue 1**

Yolanda's personal narrative about the doll's adoption ended with a question, "tu has tomado una foto si o no." Silvia initiated the dialogue by responding to Yolanda's question.

Example 5.45—Written Dialogue 1 12/16/85

S: Sí he tomado un foto de el Georgie (Yes, I've taken Georgie's picture)

Y: Yo he tomado muchas fotos ayer yo y mi mamá estábamos de llegar en mi casa y luego mi mamá tuvo una idea dijo que me iba tomar una foto y dijo que me iba a tomar una foto y me tomó mas que una foto y luego yo le tomé una foto con mi Cabbage Patch kids y la agarró como una baby girl and she was rocking her she looked cute with the Cabbage Patch Kids (I've taken a lot of photos. Yesterday me and my mother were about to get home and them my mother had an idea she said she was going to photograph me and she took more than one photo and then I took her picture with the Cabbage Patch kids and she held it like a baby and she was rocking her she looked cute with the Cabbage Patch Kids)

S: How cute did your mom look with the Cabbage Patch Kids

Y: Very cute

S: No sé qué más escribir voy a poner fin (I don't know what else to write I'm going to put, the end)

Y: Pues si no sabes qué escribir prende el foco (Well if you don't know what to write turn on the light bulb)

S: Dije fin (I said the end)

Y: OK Silvia

The initiating move, that began the written dialogue, was an answer to the question in the narrative. After the question Yolanda wrote a statement. Her response was an extended turn in which she recounted an
event. Yolanda's response was a personal narrative that began with a temporal marker "ayer." This was unusual and the only narrative in the written channel during the dialogue phases in all the case study students' sessions. Yolanda's conversational story adds details to her personal narrative. In her response she describes how on the way home from the store her mother had an idea to take photographs of Yolanda. Yolanda then took photographs of her mother holding the doll.

Yolanda's written story was the type that was usually told as a conversational story in the oral channel, similar to her stories told by Yolanda during the play session from 5/5/86. The discussion between Yolanda and Silvia afterwards shows a possible reason why there were not more narratives in the written channel:

Example 5.46
S: Gosh read it to me
Y: All
S: You have to you did it
Y: I read it right now
S: No but everything
    well you read it to me
Y: You already know that
    no te puede leer todo desde aquí hasta acá (I can't read everything from here to there)
S: No de aquí a acá (No from here to there)
Y: A no
    para que rayé tanto (Oh no, why did I write so much)
S: ándale (come on)
Y: Bueno ya no puedo
    ya ni me acuerdo (Well I can't, I can't remember)
S: Bueno (all right)
Y: Por qué escribí tanto (Why did I write so much)
    y luego mira ya te voy a decir (No look I'm going to tell you)
    she and y ella le estaba rocking her like that like a baby a la cabbage patch (And she was rocking her like a baby the cabbage patch)
Silvia wanted Yolanda to reread the entire narrative and Yolanda told her that she had read it as she wrote it. Writing a narrative took longer for the children than telling it. Telling a story was more efficient than writing it during the dialogue phases.

An interesting exchange took place at the time of the closing. Silvia wrote that she did not know what else to write and that she was going to write fin which was a proposal to close. Before Silvia wrote her response she had said that she was tired. Yolanda wrote back and told her that if she did not know what to write, she should think. Silvia responded by telling her that she did say something by writing "fin." Yolanda agreed and wrote OK which served both as an agreement and acceptance of the proposal to close. Up to this point in the interaction, Silvia's role in the session consisted of discussing the Cabbage Patch Kids with Yolanda. That role shifted during the reading of her personal narrative during the phase reading narrative2.

**Reading Narrative2**

During this phase Silvia read her narrative to Yolanda. The story reading does not appear coherent because Silvia had difficulty reading her personal narrative.

**Example 5.47— Silvia's Personal Narrative**

Yolanda has a baby girl and I am going to tell
I'm going to her if I can be the tía she has went to
Oh and Yolanda can I be the
Oh and Yolanda can I be the tía of the baby
and she and you would have another baby it would be a boy
and you can rest
and I can take care of the children.
Silvia's personal narrative included Yolanda as a character and had the question, "can I be the doll's tía?" embedded it. Silvia appropriated the world of Yolanda's personal narrative by seeking to be related to the doll and by extension, to Yolanda.

**Dialogue 2**

The second dialogue phase was initiated by Yolanda responding to Silvia's request to be the doll's aunt.

Example 5.48 Written Dialogue 2 from 12/16/85

Y: Of course you could
S: Now I am a tía now the baby can call me tía but who is going to change the diapers
Y: Me Silvia la ropa que yo tenía los shorts se los puse son amarillos quieres a ver los (The clothes that I have, the shorts, I put them on. They're yellow do you want to see them?)
S: No porque a la mejor se hizo pipi (No because maybe she peed in them)
Y: No se hizo y también quién va ser el tío (She didn't and also who is going to be the uncle)
S: Pues no me digas a mi (Well don't ask me)
Y: Fin Silvia (CLOSING CONTESTED)

The remainder of the dialogue pursued the implications of Silvia's new kinship role by discussing a relative's possible responsibilities, such as changing diapers. Yolanda also pursued the implications of Silvia's kinship role by wondering who would be the uncle.

There was no extended talk during this phase except during the closing. This session contains one of the few examples of a contested closing.
Example 5.49
Y: Fin Silvia
S: Así hace tu baby (This is what your baby does— imitates baby's cry)
Y: Tu haces (You do that)
S: (making noises)
    come on Yolanda write
Y: I'm finished
S: No you're not you didn't answer my question
Y: Fin
S: Eso no me dice nada (that doesn't tell me anything)
Y: Fin Silvia
S: Eso no me dice nada (that doesn't tell me anything)
Y: Si te dice es que yo ya me cansé de rayar y rayar como tu me dijistes ahorita ves (Yes it does, its that I got tired of writing and writing like you told me before see)
S: Vente ya vamonos (come on lets go)
Y: Ay si (oh yeah)
S: (laughs) Como te importa (What does it matter to you)
Y: Come torta tu gordota tu naciste en Caborca (Eat a sandwich you fatso you were born in Caborca— chant from peer culture)
    (making cat noises)
S: Turn it off
Y: I'll turn it off
    watch just put it like that

Yolanda proposed to close through using the closing marker "fin."
Silvia, however, did not agree to close. Instead she told Yolanda to write. Yolanda then told Silvia that she was finished and Silvia contradicted her by telling her that she had not answered her question. Silvia's last turn at writing was, "Pues no me digas a mi" (Well don't ask me). It was not a question. Yolanda then read her response. Again she said "fin." Silvia told her that that did not tell her anything. Yolanda told her that it did provide the information that she was tired of writing and she reminded Silvia that she had proposed to close the first dialogue phase after she had said that she
was tired. Silvia then agreed with Yolanda. That was the last line of the event. The interaction shifted then to playing with the recorder by making cat noises and saying a chant from peer culture. This example provides evidence that the proposal to close was considered a valid type of response, even though the proposal to close could be contested by the partner.

This session is an example of a play routine from the children's peer culture that was carried over into the written channel (for an example of another peer routine that was carried over into the written channel, name-calling, see Robert and Kata's case study). The play routine that served as a strategy for interaction during the phases reading narrative2 and dialogue2 was sociodramatic role play. Usually sociodramatic role play takes place through the oral channel as children assume and assign roles through the use of props and as they act out the situation according to their respective roles. For example a child might say to his friend, "I'm the police and you're the robber." The child might then get a toy gun or use a stick to represent a gun and act out a chase scene in which the policeman chases the robber.

Discussion

In her narratives, Yolanda presented herself as a friend playing gender specific games with friends who were also her classmates. Friendship between peers was not specifically mentioned in the narrative. The words "friend," or "making friends" are not found in the personal narratives. Rather what was portrayed was what friends did together; they played at each others' homes. Yolanda's house was not mentioned more
than once in each narrative. What was mentioned were the dolls and the
doll's car that they would be playing with.

In the narrative world of Yolanda and Suzy's narratives from the play
sessions, there was a meeting together of school friends in which play
events that had not yet taken place were anticipated. The students'
friendship was what brought them together in the narrative word. Yolanda's
narrative world also felt her parents' influence. This influence introduced a
sense of uncertainty that also colored the dialogue phases of the event.
Playing with dolls was a familiar part of the students' everyday life
mentioned in Yolanda's narratives, and it was an activity that the students
anticipated doing once school was over and they were back in their homes.

The coordination of the students appropriations through verbal
interaction during different phases of the event was highlighted in the
kinship session. During the personal narrative Silvia requested permission
to be an aunt. Then through the written response Yolanda granted Silvia
permission. In the next turn of the written dialogue Silvia was able to
participate in the appropriated social world of Yolanda's narrative by saying,
"Now I am a tía, now the baby can call me tía but who is going to change the
diapers?" She was able to occupy a role in the social world of Yolanda's
narrative by being able to call herself a tía or as Benveniste (1971) said, by
proclaiming herself "I am a tía" (aunt) in the instance of discourse and by
being able to receive the term of address "tía" from the baby when she said,
"now the baby can call me tía." The session between Yolanda and Silvia in
which they talked about kinship relations to the doll and by extension to
each other took place by Silvia appropriating the event as a time to be in
kinship role relations by requesting permission to become an aunt to the
doll that had recently been adopted by Yolanda. In that session question–
answer exchanges were not used to request information but to negotiate
social roles and their consequences. There were no side sequences and no
conversational stories in this session.

Yolanda's personal narrative in the kinship session introduced the
world of relatives (every character in her narrative was related) and the
written dialogue followed the implications of the students appropriated
social roles. The appropriation of the world of the narrative and the
negotiation of social roles took place during the time of the event. Their
written interaction was not related to the discussion of past or anticipated
events, but to the unfolding events of their interaction. The play the students
engaged in through the written dialogue was not so much through action as
it was through wondering what the possibilities were for their newly adopted
roles. In the kinship session, the worlds of play took place through the use of
written language. The use of a set of known interactive strategies from peer
play routines in the oral channel were used in this literacy event in order to
coordinate appropriations of the event and negotiate social worlds of play.
Both students appropriated the event as a time for peer play, and indeed
would not have been able to play without each other's cooperation. They
defined and constructed the event as a time for play similar in nature to
sociodramatic play.

The specific way that the different phases of the event were used to
accomplish this goal in the Kinship and Play sessions were different. In two
sessions both personal narratives and dialogue phases were part of the
negotiation of peer activities. In the kinship session, Yolanda's personal
textile narrative influenced her writing partner and the negotiation of peer
friendships took place only during the reading of the second narrative and
the second written dialogue.

Summary of Yolanda's Case Study

Yolanda and her partners made use of side sequences,
conversational stories and the written dialogue during her sessions in order
to construct the social worlds of their interaction. Of special interest were the
sessions in which Yolanda and her partners appropriated the dialogue
journal literacy event as a time to negotiate peer friendships. These
sessions were of interest to this study because they demonstrated the
appropriation of the literacy event to accomplish a feature of peer culture,
the negotiation of friendships. The negotiations of peer friendships has
been an important concern in studies of peer culture (Corsaro, 1985, 1988,
Rizzo, 1989). In those sessions the students made use of both the narrative
and dialogue phases to coordinate their appropriations and the construction
of social worlds in which their interactions took place. The students made
use of various genre forms (narrative and dialogue) in their construction of
the social world along with the use of play routines from sociodramatic role
play. The narratives were used to present the world of friendship in which
the two students were presented playing together and the dialogues were
used to discuss their reactions to their plans and to interactively construct
the world of anticipated peer activities.
Kata

Characteristics of Kata's Personal Narratives

The topic of most of Kata's narratives was the everyday world of her family. Of the narratives that Kata wrote, 90% were about family and 10% were about friends (see Table 22). Most of Kata's narratives were situated in her home and involved her immediate family members or relatives as the characters. In her narratives, Kata presented herself engaged in everyday routine household activities such as helping take care of her cousins, bathing, or shopping.

Table 22. Personal Narratives Topics and Time Orientation in Kata's Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Events</th>
<th>Playing Friends</th>
<th>Past Time</th>
<th>Future Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 80</td>
<td>2 20</td>
<td>8 80</td>
<td>2 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the narratives of the other case studies, time unfolded through the movement of actions. In the personal narrative from 4/16/86 the action was bathing and going shopping. In the personal narrative from 4/2/85 the action was traveling to visit her cousins and taking care of young girls.

Example 5.50 Personal narrative from 4/16/86

Today this morning I had to take a bath because last night I didn't take a bath and this morning when my mom told me to go with her to the store to buy milk and my sister was crying because she thought that my mom was not going to take her with us to the store "ya"
Personal narrative from 4/22/85

We went to Nogales y cuidamos a todas las niñas chiquitas y yo y mi cousins cuidamos a las niñas y mi hermano y mi cousins no nos ayudaron porque estaban jugando "ya"

(We went to Nogales and we took care of the little girls and me and my cousin took care of the little girls and my brother and my cousins didn't help us because they were playing)

The narrative from 4/22/85 began in English and shifted to Spanish when she began to write about taking care of her cousins. The remainder of the narrative was written in Spanish. Kata's partner on 4/22/85 was bilingual, and Kata read her narrative the way it was written, the first part in English and the second part in Spanish. Kata wrote another narrative on 3/6/86 that switched between English and Spanish. This time Kata was not sure her partner would be able to understand the Spanish portion of the narrative.

Example 5.51 Kata's Personal Narrative 3/6/86
Today after school we are going to the park and my brother is going to fly the kite and my mom is going to do exercises and me and Jenny ar going to play in the bars cause my mom is going to do exercises and then me and Jenny are going to slide in the slide y por mientras que mi mamá hace ejercisios nosotros vamos estar jugando en los juegos y mi hermana va a volar el papalote

(and while my mother exercises we are going to be playing on the games and my brother is going to fly the kite)

When Kata read the narrative to her partner she stopped when she got to the part that switched to Spanish. She asked the teacher if her partner understood Spanish. The teacher told Kata to ask her partner. Instead Kata started to translate the Spanish section a few phrases at a time. Other bilingual children also translated the narratives they had written in Spanish
when they read them to a partner that did not understand Spanish. The majority of Kata's narratives were written in English (80%) (see Table 23).

Table 23. Language in Which Kata's Personal Narratives Were Written

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th></th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th></th>
<th>Code-Switch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>% 80</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>% 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the personal narratives from the other case studies, Kata used reported speech in order to help indicate the action in her narratives. (Emphasis has been added to highlight the verbs of reported speech, "said").

Example 5.52
Personal narrative with reported speech 12/9/85

Today Liz said she was going to go to my house but when we were outside she said that her mom was not going to be there she said her tío was going to be there and Mónica said she was going to go to my house too and Mónica said to Liz to tell her tío to let her go to my house and she said maybe yes or maybe no

Like the other students, Kata's later narratives made use of temporal openers. The temporal markers used in her narratives included: "this morning," "today," and "yesterday." Unlike the other students Kata did not make use of a written closing marker. Instead, she indicated to the teacher who was observing that she finished writing her narrative by saying "ya" (I'm done).
Characteristics of the Oral and Written Dialogues

The oral and written dialogues from Kata’s sessions were characterized by the talk that took place between the turns at writing. There were a few occasions of conversational narratives and side sequences in her sessions but not the extended oral exchanges such as in Robert’s and Yolanda’s sessions.

Table 24. Duration of Kata’ Sessions (in minutes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Personal narrative</th>
<th>Dialogue1</th>
<th>Reading narrative2</th>
<th>Dialogue2</th>
<th>Total minutes</th>
<th>Ave. duration for each set of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/12/85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5/85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Set 1: 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9/85</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Set 2: 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/16/86</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6/86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Set 3: 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kata’s sessions from set 1 averaged 46 minutes (see Table 24), the sessions from set 2 averaged 32 minutes and the sessions from set 3 averaged 28 minutes. Kata’s sessions averaged approximately 30 minutes through most of the data collection period.

The questions in the written dialogue from Kata’s sessions requested additional information about the actions or characters in the story (47%, see Table 25 below), reasons why a certain action took place (28%), the objects mentioned (12%), requests about opinions (9%), and the setting of the story (5%).
Table 25. Types of Questions in Kata's Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1A= Request information about actor or actions  
      1B= Request information about setting  
      1C= Request information about time  
      1D= Request information about object (toy or pet)  
      3A= Request for reason for an action  
      5A= Request opinion

The majority of questions in Kata's sessions requested more information about the actions or reasons for the actors that were mentioned in the narrative. Kata's narratives, like the other case study students' narratives, focused on the action of the characters. In the case study student's narratives there was little mention of the setting or description of objects and yet the students questions very rarely requested information about the setting of the narrative.

The sequence of question-answer exchanges and other kinds of exchanges in Kata's session did not follow the pattern identified for the other case study students. In the other case studies there was a shift from the predominant use of the question-answer exchanges during the early session to the use of other kinds of other kinds of exchanges during the middle and later part of the collection period (see Table 26).

In set 1 the percentage of question–answer responses and other types of exchanges was approximately equal, 47% for question–answer and 53% for other kinds of exchanges. In set 2 there was an increase of
question–answer exchanges to 70% and decrease of other types of exchanges to 30%. In set 3 the percentage of question–answer pairs was 60% to 40% for other types of exchanges. In set 2 and 3 the question–answer exchanges predominated.

Table 26. Types of Exchanges in Kata’s Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th># of Sessions</th>
<th>Q–A pairs</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Q–A</th>
<th>%Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY
Q–A= Question and Answer
Other= Initiation and Response
       Initiation and Question and Response
       Question and Initiation and Response

In an example from the early collection period (4/22/85), Kata’s writing partner made use of the question–answer exchanges to request additional information from Kata about the action, setting and identity of characters that were mentioned in the narrative.

Example 5.53 (Kata’s narrative reported her visit to her cousins house where she helped take care of some young girls. Kata’s writing partner was Maria.)

Written Dialogue
M: Que estaban jugando como se llama el game? (What were you playing what’s the name called?)
K: Yo no se porque estaba cuidando a las niñas por eso no se que juego estaban jugando (I don't know because I was taking care of the girls that's why I don't know what game they were playing)
M: Que niñas estabas estabas cuidando? (What girls were you taking care of?)
K: A mis cousins
   (My cousins)
M: Adonde casa estabas cuidando?
   (What house were you taking care in)
K: En la de mi nana
   (In my grandmother's house)

Kata and María shared again in a session from the middle part of the
data collection. In a session from 12/9/85 the written dialogue was carried
out entirely through a series of initiation–response exchanges. The narrative
was about two of Kata’s friends, Mónica and Liz, who were going to visit Kata
at her house.

At the beginning of this written dialogue María was not sure what to
write about after Kata had read her narrative to her. The following side
sequence took place in which the oral channel was used to plan the written
response. The participants in this side sequence were the Teacher, Kata and
María. María initiated the side sequence and it was terminated by the
movement from the oral to written channel as María began to write her
response.

Example 5.54 After Kata had finished reading her narrative to
María, she waited for María to write her response. She then
told María to write.

K: ánále qué vas escribir María
   (Come on what are you going to write María)
M: Yo no sé No sé que rayar (I don’t know I don’t know what to write)
T: No sabes qué rayar (You don’t know what to write)
K: Escribe (Write)
M: Qué escribo? (What do I write)
T: Pues la María sabe que escribir (Well María knows what to write)
M: No sabo que escribir (I don’t know what to write)
K: I know what you could write
T: Qué? (What?)
K: If she could go to my house
M: Es lo que andaba pensando pero (That's what I was thinking but)
Maybe I will go

During this side sequence the movement from the reading of the
personal narrative to the first written dialogue was put on hold. María initiated
the written dialogue by stating that she might go to Kata's house.

Example 5.55 Written Dialogue 12/9/85
M: Maybe I will go to your house
K: OK but give me your phone number and I will give you my phone number if I don't call you
call me
M: OK I will call you if they let me
K: All right María give me five

María's response made a link between the world of Kata's narrative to
the written dialogue by proposing the possibility of joining the planned peer
activity. The topic of the written narrative then became the possibility of María
joining the peer activity as they made plans for María to call Kata. Kata then
proposed to close the dialogue by writing the closing marker "all right" along
with a familiar phrase used in routines from greetings and departures, "give
me five."

Unlike the session from 4/22/85 (see Example 5.53) the social
purpose of this dialogue phase was not to discuss past experiences but to
negotiate peer friendships. María was not interested in requesting additional
information about the characters or actions mentioned in the narrative, but
rather in negotiating peer friendships by proposing to join the planned peer
activity. Consequently, in this case, the dialogue did not develop through
question–answer exchanges.
Kata's and the other case study students used the oral channel to predict what their partner was going to write. In example 5.67, María predicted "phone number" as Kata wrote it and she predicted "number" before Kata wrote it:

Example 5.56 (K: Kata, M: María, [ ] = overlapping talk)
M: Maybe I will go to your house to your house
K: OK but give
M: permission
K: me your your [phone number]
M: [phone number]
T: You thought she was going to say phone number?
K: I will give you my phone
M: number
K: number if I don't call you you call me me

The second dialogue phase of this session made use of speech play through manipulation of the meaning between words. Kata played with the word pop that María mentioned in her narrative in relation to her puppy's stomach.

Example 5.57

María's Personal Narrative
Today my little dog is learning to walk but this morning in this morning my little dog didn't let me didn't let me eat because he was very very crying for her mother

K: Do you take care of your puppy María yes or no does your puppy eats lots of food You know María you gave me a good idea is your puppy fat?
M: Yes but I can't give him that much food because he will get fatter and when I give him so much milk it almost going to pop his stomach but it is for my dad the little dog is for my dad but the little dog died and the girl lived
K: I know why you don't give him some a lot of food because he will pop and break in Cheerios and you will cry and one more thing that in your TV they say pops.
In the first dialogue phase from a session from set 3 (4/16/86), Kata's initiating move responded to Nicky's narrative about holding her baby brother and going shopping with her mother. The word "because" was used by Nicky in the first dialogue phase and then again in the second dialogue phase. In the first dialogue phase Nicky used the word "because" as her entire response during one of her turns at writing.

Example 5.58
N: Why did your sister start to cry
K: Because she thought that my mom was not going to take her
N: Why did she think that?
K: I don't know why
N: I don't know either
K: Well you didn't go
N: I know that
K: Well why did you ask
N: Because
K: OK Nicky

In the second dialogue phase Nicky uses the word "because" again as her entire response during one turn. During the turns following Nicky's use of "because," Kata and Nicky used elements of repetition that were similar to ritualized speech play (Garvey, 1977):

Example 5.59 4/16/86 Personal Narrative

Today when I go home I am going to hold my baby brother and after that we're going to the store and after that we're going to K-Mart

Dialogue2

K: What is she going to buy?
N: New clothes for my baby brother
K: Is she going to buy clothes for you?
Kata used the structure of the question-answer responses for ritualized speech play through the controlled reception of the question-answer exchanges. She manipulated the structure slightly after each of Nicky’s responses and used Nicky’s words against her in her written responses. Using a person’s words in reply to them showed that Kata was engaged in speech play with features of argumentation (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1989). Another example of the manipulation of the structure of the exchanges for ritualized speech play is the following dialogue phase from 9/4/85:

Example 5.60 Kata 9/4/85
(Kata’s narrative was about her and her younger sister wearing a pair of glasses and her mother laughing at her sister. K: Kata, J: Josie)

J: Did it look funny on you? Question
K: I don’t know because I don’t have four Answer
   eyes to see my glasses
J: Why don’t you have four eyes? Question
K: Because all the persons have two eyes Answer
J: Do you like to have four eyes? Question
K: No because only the animals have four eyes Answer
J: Would you like to have two eyes better? Question
K: Of course my glasses Answer
Kata's sessions showed the shift in the use of closing markers from the oral to written channel. Her most consistent use of written closing markers took place during set 2, of the data collection. The other students made more consistent use of the closing makers during set 2 and set 3. Kata used formulaic expressions in some of her closing. On 9/4/86 she closed with a variation of the common closing marker, "OK" by writing "Okey Dokey" and in 12/9/85 she proposed a closing by writing, "all right María give me five."

Table 27. Closing Markers from Kata's Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Phase Dialogue1</th>
<th>Phase Dialogue2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SET 1</td>
<td>4/22/85*</td>
<td>&quot;OK ya acabamos&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/3/85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/5/85*</td>
<td>&quot;Ya te voy a leer el mió&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;OK&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET 2</td>
<td>9/4/85</td>
<td></td>
<td>Okey Dokey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/30/85</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/6/85*</td>
<td>&quot;ya quieres&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/9/85*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET 3</td>
<td>3/6/86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/16/86*</td>
<td>OK Nicky</td>
<td>all right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/16/86*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Closing markers in quotation marks were in the oral channel. The other markers were in the written channel.)

The oral interaction during the dialogue phases was characterized by the short exchanges that were intermingled with the writing. The oral channel was also used to manage the event. Short phrases such as, "Are you going to write some more," "ya terminé Mr. Galindo," or "Mr. Galindo, now we're
going to write in my journal" were used to help manage the movement of
turn-taking or from one phase to the next.

Kata interacted with the teacher by talking to him about her spelling.
She was a good reader and writer, and the teacher praised her spelling
when she pointed out specific words to him. In the session from 4/16/86 she
called his attention to the word "why." After Kata had written "I don't know
why" she asked the teacher, "Qué dice allí? (what does it say there?). She
wanted the teacher to noticed how she spelled the word "why." The teacher
asked Kata how she knew how to spell "why." Kata told the teacher that she
noticed how he had written "why" in his notes when Nicky had written, "Why
did your sister start to cry?" Kata was the only case study student that asked
the teacher to comment on her spelling. The other case study students
occasionally asked the teacher how to spell a word but they never asked him
to comment on their spelling.

Spelling was a topic that also came up during Kata's sessions with
peers. The following side sequence was initiated by Liz after she had written
her response:

Example 5.61 5/16/86
R: Why did you put the Sox under the slide?
   That's how you spell socks, ha, "s" "o" "x"
T: How do you girls spell socks?
K: S, o, k, s
R: [No ]
T: [How do you know?]
R: Because, sabes por qué? (do you know why) Because
   there's a team se llama la (they're called the) Red Soxxs.
   The name the socks
T: The Red Socks, and you saw the name? And how did they
   spell it?
R: "S" "o" "x"
K: No, "s" "o" "k" "s"
T: Maybe that's the way the baseball team I think might spell it like that but if you go to a store like Penney's and in the catalogue you look for socks, it's going to be "s, o, c, k, s."
R: Bags of socks
K: En las cortinas de mi hermano en las cortinas de mi hermano dice socks (On my brother's curtains is says sockss)
T: En las que (On the what?)
K: Y luego, cortinas de mi hermano, luego dice (and then, on my brother's curtains, then it says)
T: En las cortinas de tu hermano dice socks, en las cortinas (On your brother's curtains it says socks, on the curtains)
K: Luego dice dice Phillies (Then it says Phillies)
T: The Phillies, How does how do they spell socks on the on the cortinas (curtains)
R: The curtains
K: Como tu lo escribiste (Like you wrote it)
T: "S" "o" "c" "k" "s," o "s" "o" "x"
K: No así como tú lo escribiste (No like you wrote it)
T: I think sometimes baseball teams spell it like that like s o x
K: S o x ? ah
Because I was going to put them on so I just put them under the slide.

In this side sequence the teacher and students talked about the different ways that the word "socks" might be spelled. The children's conceptions of the spelling of the word "socks" was influenced from their experiences with environmental print (the curtains in their homes).

Types of Appropriations
The most common appropriation type in Kata's sessions was the discussion of past experiences (57%) (see Table 28 below). The next most common types of appropriation found in Kata's sessions were discussing anticipated experiences (22%), negotiating peer friendships, (17%), and name–calling (4%).
Table 28. Types of Appropriations in Kata's Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types:
AE: Discuss anticipated experiences
PE: Discuss past experiences
NP: Negotiate peer relationships
CN: Call names

Kata also appropriated the event as time to display her knowledge of spelling to her teacher. Throughout the time of the data collection she initiated conversations with the teacher regarding her spelling. In her sessions Kata pointed out to the teacher different words that she knew how to spell and invited the teacher's comments. Kata's appropriations of the event were also characterized by speech play.

The following section discusses in detail a session that was selected to illustrate the key characteristics of Kata's sessions in relation to the ongoing interaction with her partner and to illustrate Kata's appropriations of the event.

**The Lollipop Session**

Kata's case study will be discussed through a 66 minute session from the last week of the first-grade year (6/5/85) during which her writing partner was Silvia. This session illustrates the characteristic uses of oral and written language in Kata's sessions and highlights norms of turn-taking during the
written dialogue as well as the students' appropriation of the event through the use of routines from peer culture.

During the lollipop session the students talked frequently to each other but not in the form of extended side sequences or conversational narratives as in Robert's and Yolanda's case. Instead, the talk was in the form of short exchanges that took place in frequent alternation with the written dialogue. In this session Kata told the teacher two short conversational narratives. Of special interest in the lollipop session is the long series of exchanges in which the students called each other names. Unlike the previous examples of name-calling described in Robert's and Yolanda's case study, this example made use of a chant from peer culture and the name-calling was signalled as "play." The second dialogue in this session illustrated the more common discussions about the personal narratives that took place between Kata and her writing partners.

**Personal Narrative**

The personal narrative from the lollipop session reported an event that had taken place in Kata's home that morning. Kata and her brother had gotten lollipops, and her little sister cried because she also wanted one.

**Example 5.62 Kata's Personal Narrative 6/5/86**

This morning my brother got a lollipop and my baby sister start yelling to my mom and my mom said what she want and my brother said she wants a lollipop and my mom didn't wanted to give her a lollipop but she gave her a lollipop
Dialogue 1

Silvia initiated the written dialogue by asking Kata about the color of the lollipop. Silvia and Kata talked about each others' responses as they were writing.

Example 5.63 (K: Kata, S: Silvia, T: Teacher, plain text= talk, underline= writing, italics= oral reading)

S: What color was the lollipop?
    What color was the lollipop?
K: What color? or what kind?
S: What color?
K: Brown it taste like like it taste like
S: Like the ground?
K: No like
S: {laughing}
K: Vaca (cow)
T: Qué? (What)
S: Oogh
T: Qué? (What)
K: Vaca (cow)
T: Cómo que vaca? (What do you mean, cow?)
S: Es que taste like a vaca (Its that it taste like a cow)
K: Milk
T: Oh OK
K: vaca's milk (cow's milk)
S: It taste like brown vaca's milk uh yuk
K: The color's brown of the vaca's
S: yuk

In this series of exchanges the oral channel was used to clarify the written dialogue, to wonder about Kata's written response, to reply to Silvia's guess, and to react to the written response. During the first dialogue phase, short utterances in the oral channel were exchanged throughout the writing of the responses. The oral and written interaction continued in this manner through the following exchanges of the written dialogue in which the
students continued their dialogue about lollipops (the oral exchanges have been omitted from example 5.53).

Example 5.64 Written dialogue

K: Don't you like it the lollipop yes or no?
S: Yes but I don't like that flavor
K: Then what kind of flavor you like Silvia?
S: Strawberry and shortcake
K: Well I love every kind of lollipop

After Kata had finished writing her last response in which she wrote that she loved every kind of lollipop, Silvia hid her pencil. Kata discovered that Silvia had hidden her pencil and asked for it. Silvia started laughing and gave her back her pencil. This incident was the first to signal the playful mood that was to characterize the remainder of this phase. During Silvia's next turn to write, she signalled a shift in topic through the use of the word "oeyes" (hey, or by the way). Until this point the entire written dialogue had been in English. Silvia switched to Spanish and wrote about her friend Ramona (CN#1= the first conversational narrative told by Kata).

Example 5.65

S: Oyes la Ramona (CN#1) y yo somos las catch up girls y nunca nos vamos a pelear porque la punchy sale en la tele y por eso nunca nos vamos a pelear

(Hey, Ramona and I are the catch up girls and we're never going to fight because Punchy comes out on the TV and that's why we're never going to fight)

As Silvia was writing her response, Kata told the teacher the following brief conversational narrative. In her story Kata reported an event that took
place in the cafeteria. Kata told the teacher that one of her classmates, Josie, had bumped her head on a table in the cafeteria.

Example 5.66 Conversational Narrative #1

K: Sabes que en la cafetería cuando la (. ) con la Josie se estaba pegando la cabeza (Do you know that in the cafeteria Josie was hitting her head)
T: En dónde se estaba pegando la cabeza? (Where was she hitting her head)
K: En la mesa y todos los platos botaron (On the table and all the plates bounced)

Kata told this story while she was waiting her turn to write. This story was similar to the story told by Yolanda about her pigeons in that both stories were about topics that had not previously been introduced and did not become part of the following oral or written dialogue (see Example 5.30 in Yolanda's case study). While they waited for their partner to finish writing, the students told stories to the teacher or they predicted what their partner would write. After Silvia finished writing her response, she read it to Kata. As Silvia read her response she sang a few words. During Kata’s next turn she started calling Silvia’s friend names.

Example 5.67

K: tu y la Ramona son muy locas. (You and Ramona are very crazy)
S: Mírala (Look at her)
K: y burras y la Debbie también y el hermano de la Ramona también y todas la de las clases son locas y crazys somos (And dumb bells and Debbie also and also Ramona’s brother and everybody in the classroom is crazy.)
S: Ya parastes ya (Did you finish now)
mira anda diciendo cosas malas la Kata (Look Kata’s saying bad things)
K: viscas mucho (Very cross-eyed)
S: Ooh no digas eso (Ooh no don't say that)
te va salir el diablo (The devil is going to appear to you)
K: I love you too too too to too (singing the word "too")

Kata started calling Silvia's friend's names and then she called the entire class and herself "crazys." Silvia expressed her reaction to Kata's writing as Kata wrote her extended response. She told the teacher, "mira anda haciendo cosa malas la Kata" (Look, Kata's saying bad things). Kata ended her written response by attempting to compensate for her comments by saying, "I love you" and she sang the word "too" as she wrote it. The last part of Kata's response, "I love you" and her singing signalled that her name calling was "play." The written dialogue of the following exchanges is shown in Example 5.68, but only selected portions of the oral dialogue are included:

Example 5.68

S: Oyes Kata no andes diciendo eso (Hey Kata don't by saying that)
K: Y si me da la gana lo puedo decir Fijate en el libro (And if I feel like it I can say it. Notice the book)

(Silvia tries to grab the journal from Kata)
T: Que estás haciendo? Por qué le estás arrebatando el libro? (What are you doing? Why are you grabbing the journal from her?)
S: Pues mira ya hizo mucho (Well look she already wrote a lot)
T: Pues todavía no terminó no le arrebates el cuaderno deja que termine. (Well she still hasn't finished. Don't grab the journal from her. Let her finish)
S: Andale (Come on)

K: Burra (laughing) (Dumb bell)
S: uhuh (.) tu Kata (No you Kata)
K: Cabezon pelonete (Bald head— begins chant from peer culture)
S: Mira Mr. Galindo dile que se calme (Look Mr. Galindo, tell her to settle down)
K: Cabeza de cuehuete vendiendo (laughing) tamales a cinco por siete (finishes chant from peer culture—rocket head selling tamales five for seven)

S: No me la vas a pagar eh me la vas a pagar a la otra no voy a ser share contigo (You're going to pay for this huh you'll pay for this. Next time I won't share with you) pelon pelonete vendiendo tamales a cinco por siete (says the chant as Kata writes it)

S: Te va salir el diablo fea pelona peloneta pelona peloneta rodillas apestosas con la cara de somorete. (The devil is going to appear, ugly, bald head, stinky knees, with a face of a somorete—nonsense word)

(Kata gets the journal from Silvia)
K: A ti (To you)

S: No he acabado (I haven't finished)
T: No acabastes? (You didn't finish)
S: No
T: Y la Kata ya esta escribiendo Oyes que es un somorete? (And Kata is writing already. Hey what's a somorete?)

.....

T: Bueno quién va escribir tú o la Kata (All right, who's going to write you or Kata?)
S: [yo] (me)
K: [yo] (me)
T: Kata le habías quitado el cuaderno todavía no había terminado (Kata you had taken the journal away and she hadn't finished writing)

S: También sovacos ((laughs)) apestosos ((laughs)) (also stinky arm pits)

T: Ya se estan poniendo muy exageradas (Now you're getting carried away)
S: Pues si la desta primero hizo started so I put apestosa (Well she started first so I put stinky.)

S: mula (laughs) (mule)
K: A ti también te va salir en la cabeza cuernos de chiva hobo Silvia feita bonita (You also on your head your going to have goat's horns, Silvia, ugly, pretty)
S: *Ya te voy a leer mi libro* (I'm going to read you my journal)
K: *OK te amo* (CN#2) (I love you)

As Kata initiated the name calling and insults, Silvia countered her claims, threatened her, and asked the teacher to tell Kata to settle down. Kata kept writing through all of Silvia's protests until Silvia finally tried to grab the journal from Kata.

Kata called Silvia names through the use of single item terms, burra (dumb–bell) and cabezona (idiot). She then used a chant from peer culture that was commonly used in the neighborhood to taunt kids, "Pelón pelonete cabeza de cuehete vendiendo tamales a cinco por siete" (bald head, rocket head, selling tamales five for seven). Silvia also recited the chant after Kata had written it. This chant was recited by groups of children in the neighborhood and sometimes addressed to a particular child that was singled out for ridicule.

During Silvia's turn she began by using the phrase "*te va salir el diablo*" (the devil is going to appear to you). That phrase was usually used by adults in the neighborhood when someone wanted to control a child's behavior. Usually is was used to warn a young child after he/she had done something wrong. Silvia warned Kata that the devil was going to appear to her for calling her names. In her written response Silvia also used parts of the chant. Silvia then called Kata "fe" (ugly) and rodillas apéstosas ("stinky knees").

The teacher intervened when Kata took the journal away from Silvia and decided that Silvia would get the journal because she had not finished writing. Silvia insulted Kata by speaking about the "unspeakable" (talking in
public about topics that are not culturally appropriate to mention in public) when she wrote "sovacos apestosos" (stinky arm pits). The teacher commented for the first time on the name-calling when Silvia wrote about the inappropriate topic by saying, "Ya se estan poniendo muy exageradas" (Now you're getting carried away). Silvia defended her use of "apestoso" by telling the teacher, "pues si la desta primero hizo started so I put apestosa " (Well she started first so I put stinky).

Silvia proposed to close by writing, "te voy a leer el mío" (I'm going to read you mine) after Kata had compensated for her insults by calling Silvia "bonita" (pretty). Kata agreed to close and wrote "OK" and "te amo" (I love you). After Kata had written "te amo" she told the teacher the following conversational narrative about "te amo."

Example 5.69 Conversational Narrative #2

K: En la tarde cuando salgo de la escuela dan un película una novela que se llama Te Amo (In the afternoon when I get out of school they show a movie, a soap opera, and its called I Love You)
T: La novela se llama Te Amo y tu lees la palabras en la televisión? eh y así sabes escribir Te Amo léeselo a ella para qué sepa (The soap opera is called I Love You and you read the words on the television? Huh and that's how you know how to write I Love You. Read them to her so she'll know)
K: eh? (what?)
T: léeselo a ella para qué sepa (Read them to her so she'll know)
K: Te amo (I love you)

After Kata told the teacher about the Spanish soap, he asked her if that was where she had seen the words, "te amo." The teacher then told Kata to read "te amo" again to Silvia as a conciliatory act.
In summary, the first dialogue phase of the lollipop session was initiated by Silvia’s question about the color of the lollipop. After a few turns in which they discussed their favorite lollipop flavors, Silvia changed the topic of the dialogue. She signaled the shift with the word “oyes” (by the way) and by switching from writing in English to Spanish. Silvia wrote about her friend Ramona and during her next turn, Kata began to call names instead of asking a question or responding to what Silvia’s had written about her friend. The two students then called each other names in the written dialogue. Kata closed the dialogue during her turn at writing and made up for her remarks by writing "OK te amo." The name-calling exchanges were signalled as play through the students laughter.

Reading Narrative?

After the closing of the first dialogue phase Silvia then began to read her narrative which reported that they were taking her dog to the veterinarian that afternoon. The second dialogue phase was a discussion of Silvia’s dog.

Example 5.70 Silvia's Personal Narrative

La Debbie tiene un perrito que mi papi le dió y yo tengo una perrita y va tener perritos o perritas y ahora vamos a ir al doctor y dijo mi mami que va tener muchas mujeres la perra

(Debbie has a dog and my father gave it to her and I have a dog and its going to have puppies and today we’re going to the doctor and my mother said that she’s going to have a lot of female puppies)
Dialogue 2

The dialogue phase that followed the reading of Silvia’s narrative was short. Unlike the first dialogue phase there were few exchanges in the oral channel as the writing took place.

Example 5.71

K: *Para que van a ir al doctor Silvia* (Why are going to the doctor, Silvia)
S: *Para operar a la perrita* (To get the dog operated)
K: *Para qué?* (What for?)
S: *Para que salgan los babies así chiquitos* (So the babies will come out like that, real little)
K: *Por qué* (Why?)
S: *No sé* (I don’t know)
K: *Sí sabes* (Yes, you know)
S: *No sí no* (No, yes, no)
K: *OK no sabes pero sí sabes* (Ok you don’t know but you do know)
S: *Sí sabó* (I know)
K: *OK*

The dialogue phase began with two pairs of question–answer exchanges in the written channel and one question–answer exchange in the oral channel that were used to request information about the narrative. The written dialogue shifted from question–answer to initiation–response exchanges as the interaction shifted from a discussion of anticipated events to speech play through the repetition of "no sé, sí sé" (I know, I don’t know). The repetition of the phrases "no sé, sí sé" along with the nonsense of the exchanges and the reversal of positions from not knowing to knowing marked the exchanges as speech play.

The name–calling ended during the closing of the first dialogue phase. The second dialogue phase did not contain any reference to the
name-calling of the previous written dialogue. During the second dialogue phase the students engaged in play through speech play as opposed to name-calling.

Discussion

The lollipop session was a telling example because it made visible the implicit rules for turn-taking during the event. The breach of norms during this session, taking the journal away from the student who was writing, made visible the implicit norm for turn-taking. During conversations, competition for the conversational floor can take place through overlapping talk. One speaker does not always have to wait for the other speaker to finish. The norm for turn-taking during the written dialogue phases was that a student waited until the partner had finished writing. Having possession of the journal was equated with holding the written conversational floor. In the case of the name-calling, the students were anxious to respond to their partner's insults. Consequently, the norm for turn-taking was breached as the students grabbed the journal from each other. The teacher had to mediate the dispute and decide whose turn it was.

The teacher did not intervene during the name-calling because the students were laughing and the name-calling was signalled as play. But when Silvia started talking about topics that might be called gross, the teacher gave his opinion that the students were getting carried away. By defining the event as play the students were able to use language that otherwise would not have been considered appropriate for a classroom. One way insults work is through the use of inappropriate topics. Topics that are
called gross by adults frequently are part of speech play (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1976). The lollipop example was not only revealing in relation to norms for turn-taking, it was also revealing of how students appropriated the event through the use of routines from peer culture. The specific routines were related to speech play.

There were several characteristics of speech play that were evident in this session. Among them were the focus on rhyme, creative uses of language, the use of nonsense words, the use of a chant from peer culture, the use of repetition, and the reversal of positions (for example Silvia’s switch from knowing to not knowing in dialogue2). Besides these characteristics of speech play, the name-calling was also signalled as play by the students’ laughter.

The creative aspects of speech play were demonstrated by Silvia. Silvia insulted Kata not only through the use of familiar terms used to call names, such as "mula" (mule), she also invented her own terms such as, "rodillas apestosas" (stinky knees). The chant used by Kata provided material for Silvia’s speech play. She adapted the chant by writing "cara de somorete" (somorete face) which rhymed with the words in the chant "cuehete" (firecracker) and "pelonete" (bald head). In adapting the chant Silvia invented the nonsense word "somorete."

The use of nonsense words was another feature of speech play. Silvia used the word "somorete" and Kata "hobo." The teacher asked the children what these words meant and they provided definitions for those words. Silvia provided a definition only after the teacher asked her several times what the word "somorete" meant. Silvia defined "somorete" as a mouse eaten, smelly
shoe and Kata defined "hobo" as being bald. The teacher had never heard those words before. During speech play the means or process of play is highlighted over the message. Children are more concerned with their involvement in play than with the specific meaning of the words they are using. They have a higher tolerance for unresolved ambiguities in speech play than adults (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1979). The word that Silvia created, "somorete" manipulated the element of rhyme but the teacher's focus was on meaning. The teacher asked the students what the nonsense words meant but students did not ask each other about them. For them, nonsense was a part of speech play. They were not concerned with meaning but with speech play that was carried out through turn-taking, repetition, and reversal of position.

In this example the students defined the event as a time to play and also as a time to discuss past and anticipated events. The students discussed past events when they wrote about the lollipops and they discussed anticipated events when they wrote about Silvia's dog's visit to the veterinarian. The event was signalled as play through singing and laughter. The trading of insults was not serious. Consequently the students were able to call each other names and use words that they normally would not have used in a classroom context. Defining the situation as play gave the students the opportunity to break the norms of the classroom culture. At one point the teacher told them they were getting too carried away even for a situation that was defined as play.

This example highlights two central issues to this study. The construction of social worlds through interaction with oral and written
discourse and routines from peer culture that children used to appropriate the event. The definition of the event, what social purposes the students made the event served, was negotiated partially through the use of the verbal routines from peer culture. These routines were ways of speaking usually found in the oral channel that were carried over into the written channel. It is interesting to note that in this session and the other name-calling sessions, the name-calling and trading of insults took place only in the written channel. This session also complemented the other name-calling sessions between Yolanda and Robert that were not signalled as play.

**Summary of Kata's Case Study**

Along with the general appropriation types that were used to classify Kata's sessions (see Table 28), her appropriation of the event was also related to other features of the use of oral and written language during the event. A characteristic of Kata's appropriation of the event was related to elements of speech play. The social worlds constructed in Kata's sessions did not take place through extended side sequences and conversational stories like in Robert's and Yolanda's sessions. Rather, in her sessions Kata used the written channel to develop the topic of the dialogue. Occasionally Kata told conversational stories to the teacher but the telling of conversational stories rarely included her writing partner. The talk between Kata and her partners were exchanges that took place around turns at writing like in the lollipop session. Through their interaction Kata and her partners discussed past and anticipated experiences.
Defining the event as play was evident in the lollipop session where the laughing, singing, and speech play signaled the session as a time for play. The students appropriated the event through the use of familiar speech play routines from peer culture that were carried out through the written channel. Through their participation in the event and their use of routines the students collectively reproduced the features of peer culture related to peer situations in which speech play and name-calling take place.

In the session with Kata and Josie (see Example 5.60), both students used the couplet effect of the question–answer exchanges in the written channel in order to have a playful discussion about Kata's glasses. Through the students' witty use of the exchange structure of the question–answer pairs they built humorous and nonsensical images of Kata with four eyes. The students developed the dialogue by staying in the couplet pattern. Kata and Josie appropriated the typical question–answer exchange that was most often used to request additional information from the author about her narrative and used it to engage in speech play.

The use of the question–answer pair to develop features of speech play was also evident in the session with Nicky (see Example 5.57). At other times elements of speech play were not developed through the structure of the exchanges but rather by playing with certain words that had been used in the responses. An example of the manipulation of the semantic dimension of words was Kata's play with the words "pop" and "Cheerios" in relation to María's use of the word "pop" when she was writing about her dog's stomach (see Example 5.57). The use of speech play as a means to define the event took place during the dialogue phases of Kata's sessions. Kata's personal
narratives did not reflect the use of elements from speech play. The dialogue phase was the most interactive part of the event during which the students jointly negotiated the definition of the situation. Kata, by herself and in conjunction with her partners, used the dialogue phases to define the event as a time to be involved in speech play.
Gilbert

Characteristics of the Personal Narratives

The topics of Gilbert's narratives were evenly divided (see Table 29 below) between family events (50%) and playing with friends (50%). Gilbert's stories about family events were usually about going places with his family. Among the different places mentioned in Gilbert's narratives were the park, zoo, and stores. The characters in his stories about family events were his immediate family members, especially his mother and brothers.

Table 29. Topics and Time Orientation of Gilbert's Personal Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family Events</th>
<th>Playing/ Friends</th>
<th>Past Time</th>
<th>Future Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The N for the total future and past time do not match the N for the topics of the narratives because some narratives shifted from future to past time orientation and were counted more than once.

The following personal narrative is an example of a story about a family event. In the narrative Gilbert wrote about buying ice cream from the ice cream-truck that drove around the neighborhood.

Example 5.72 Gilbert's Personal Narrative from 9/19/85
Yo fui para afuera y yo vi la paleta y mi hermanito quería un cono y se lo compré y era de chocolate y luego mi mamá compró una paleta de cherry y me compré un avión del paletero
(I went outside and I saw the ice cream truck and my little brother wanted a cone and I bought it for him and it was chocolate and then my mom bought a cherry popsicle and I bought myself an airplane from the ice cream man)
The everyday play activities that were the focus of Gilbert's narratives in which he played with friends took place during times that he was out of school. During this time Gilbert was free to visit his friends and played with such toys as: Voltron, balloons, monkey bars, bicycles, and guns. In the world of Gilbert's narratives these different play activities were connected, and the flow of time was shown by use of the phrase "y luego" (and then). This connection also became a way to describe a toy, "y luego le voy enseñar mi Voltron y luego hace luces en la cabeza luego tiene un big sword" (and then I'm going to show him my Voltron and then it makes lights in the head then it has a big sword). The locations in which Gilbert and his friends played were only briefly mentioned through the use of a single word, casa (house) or parque (park), or had to be inferred from the story. Playing took place in a small set of locations within his neighborhood. These locations were his or his friend's house, the street, or the park.

The majority (75%) of Gilbert's narratives were written with an orientation towards the future time (see Table 29 above). The events had not yet taken place but they were after-school play events with which he was very familiar. A few narratives shifted from a future to a past time orientation. The following example began with Gilbert writing about going to play at Daniel's house, then shifted to a past time orientation as Gilbert said that his father had changed his mind about giving him permission to go to Daniel's house.

Example 5.73
Yo a la mejor voy a ir a la casa de el Daniel y me voy a llevar a mi bombas de Mickey Mouse y luego no me dejaron y luego mi pa sí me dejó a ir
(I might go to Daniel's house and I'm going to take my Mickey Mouse balloons and then they didn't let me and then my father did let me go)

Gilbert was the only case study student who wrote all his stories in Spanish. Gilbert did use some English words in his personal narratives, but he did not switch from Spanish and English at the phrase or sentence level like the other case study students.

Table 30. Language in Which Gilbert's Personal Narratives Were Written

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Code-Switch*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Beyond the word level

In the following example Gilbert includes two words in English in an narrative that otherwise was written entirely in Spanish.

Example 5.74
Yo y el Daniel vamos a jugar a la pelota y luego vamos a jugar a los monkey bars luego vamos a jugar transformers

(I and Daniel are going to play ball and then we're going to play the monkey bars then we're going to play transformers)

Gilbert's personal narratives demonstrated a shift from set 1 to set 2 in the use of temporal opening and closing markers. Gilbert's narratives were introduced with the temporal marker "yo ahora" consistently beginning in set 2 of the data collection until the end. The use of the closing marker, fin (the end), also took place during the same time period.
The length of the narratives increased throughout the data collection period. Gilbert's narratives from set 1 averaged 29 words, the narratives from set 2 averaged 58 words, and the narratives from set 3 averaged 138 words.

Through his narratives, Gilbert's presented himself in situations and actions of the child's world of play or going places with his family and relatives. Gilbert's world of the text, like all the other case study students, involved activities with friends and relatives.

**Characteristics of the Dialogue Phases**

A characteristic of Gilbert's sessions was the minimal use of the oral channel. In his sessions there were no extended conversations. The absence of conversational narratives and side sequences and the short length of his written dialogues contributed to the short duration of Gilbert's sessions (see Table 31 below). Gilbert's sessions were the shortest of all the case study students.

**Table 31. Duration of Phases in Gilbert's Sessions (in minutes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Personal narrative1</th>
<th>Dialogue1</th>
<th>Reading narrative2</th>
<th>Phase dialogue2</th>
<th>Total minutes</th>
<th>Average length of the sessions for each set of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/29/85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17/85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>set 1: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>set 2: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/9/86</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/15/86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>set 3: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sessions from the first set of data averaged 12 minutes, the sessions from set 2 averaged 10 minutes and the sessions from set 3 averaged 16 minutes. The sessions became slightly longer during the time of data collection.

The interaction in Gilbert’s sessions took place through questions and responses in the written channel. The majority of questions in the written dialogue from Gilbert’s sessions were concerned with the characters and actions presented in the narratives (47%) (see Table 32).

Table 32. Types of Questions in Gilbert’s Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1A = Request information about actor or actions  
1B = Request information about setting  
1C = Request information about time  
1D = Request information about object (toy or pet)  
3A = Request for reason for an action

The questions were also related to toys or other objects (such as pets) that the characters in Gilbert’s narratives played with (22%). The questions also requested the reasons for why certain actions took place (13%) and the setting of the actions reported in the narrative (13%). The questions rarely were concerned with the time the events took place (5%).

Gilbert’s sessions from set 1 made exclusive use of the question-answer exchange (100%). In the sessions from set 2, the question-answer exchange was used 75% of the time and there was a shift to a use of other types of exchanges 25% (see Table 33). In set 3 other types of exchanges...
were used 50% of the time and question-answer exchanges were used only 50% of the time. The shift from the predominant use of question-answer to other types of exchanges was also identified in the sessions from the other case study students.

Table 33. Types of Exchanges in Gilbert's Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th># of Sessions</th>
<th>Q-A Pairs</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Q-A</th>
<th>% Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY
Q-A = Question and Answer
Other = Initiation and Response
Initiation and Question and Response
Question and Initiation and Response

In the two sessions from set 1, the entire interaction during the event consisted of question-answer exchanges. The following example from 4/29/85 of a dialogue phase illustrates the exclusive use of the question-answer exchange. Gilbert's writing partner, María, had written a narrative about calling her friends on the phone. Gilbert initiated the dialogue by writing a question to ask María about the anticipated events.

Example 5.75
G: ¿Vas a ir a la casa de ellos?
(And are you going to their house?)
M: No voy a ir a su casa
(I'm not going to her house)
G: ¿Qué vas a hacer en tu casa?
(And what are you going to do at your house?)
M: Voy a cuidar al niño de mi tía
(I'm going to take care of my aunt's boy)
G: Y vas a jugar con el niño?  
(And are you going to play with the boy?)  
M: Sí voy a jugar con el niño  
(Yes I'm going to play with the boy)  
ya terminamos  
(We're done)  

The sessions from set 2 showed a shift away from the exclusive use of the question-answer exchange that was common in set 1. In set 2 there were instances of question-answer-response exchanges. The following example comes from 12/11/85.

Example 5.76  
R: Is your brother going?  
G: Sí (Yes)  
R: OK I just wanted to know  
G: OK  

In the following example from 9/19/85, an initiation-response exchange followed a question-answer pair. Gilbert and Robert were writing about the days when the ice cream salesman drove around the neighborhood:

Example 5.77  
R: Por qué no me dices cuándo pasa?  
(Why don't you tell me when he comes by)  
G: Todos los días  
(Every day)  
R: Los sábados no pasan  
(Not on Saturdays)  
G: Yo no sé si pasa los domingos  
(I don't know if he comes by on Sundays)  
R: No pasa ya sé que no pasa los domingos  
(I know he doesn't come by on Sundays)  
G: Yo ya sé  
(I know now)
Although the question-answer and the question-answer-response exchanges were the main type of exchanges in Gilbert's sessions, one session did not make use of any question exchanges. That session came from 3/3/86 in set 3 of the data collection. Gilbert's narrative was about going to the park with his mother and then coming home and riding his bicycle to Freddy's house. Unlike other sessions, this phase was initiated through a statement.

Example 5.78
R: Yo pienso que voy a ir a la casa del Gilbert para jugar a los carritos (I think that I am going to Gilbert's house to play cars) We are going to have fun yes Gilbert and me
G: Yo quiero a ir a tu casa también (I also want to go to your house)
R: Está bueno Gilbert si puedes a ir mi casa para jugar los carritos (OK Gilbert you can come to my house to play cars)
G: OK voy a ir a tu casa (OK I'm going to go to your house)
R: Porque en mi casa hay chocones trae tu bicicleta Gilbert OK (Because in my house I have crash-up cars bring your bicycle Gilbert)
G: OK la voy a traer OK Robert (OK I'm going to bring it)
R: Fin Gilbert (the end)
G: OK Robert

The topic of this written dialogue was not related to Gilbert's narrative, instead the dialogue was about making plans to play at Robert's house. During the next dialogue phase the students did not discuss the negotiation of peer friendships again. The written dialogue was a question-answer exchange in which Gilbert asked Robert about the pigeons that he had written about in his narrative.
This session between Gilbert and Robert in which initiation-response exchanges were used to negotiate peer friendships was very similar to a session discussed in Kata's case study (see Example 5.55). In the session between Kata and María initiation-response exchanges were also used to negotiate peer relationships.

The use of other types of exchanges along with question-answer pairs was characteristic of set 2 and set 3. A session from set 3 illustrated the use of question–answer exchanges along with initiation response exchange:

Example 5.79 Gilbert’s Personal Narrative from 4/9/86

Yo ahora voy a ir a la casa del Daniel y luego le voy a decir que puedo ver su conejo y luego voy a dijer onde vive el señor luego vamos a jugar con su rabbit le voy a decir al Daniel como se llama su perrito luego le voy a decir que puede a ir a ver las chicks y luego le voy enseñar mi Votron y luego hace luces en la cabeza luego tiene un big sword luego cuando el Richard fué a mi casa mi hermanito le dijo quien es ese chamaquito y le dije mi amigo luego jugamos guns luego el Richard era el robber luego el Carlitos era la policia luego el Richard se fue para su casa y se estaba haciendo noche y luego me fui a comer y luego me fui a dormir fin

(I today am going to go to Daniel's house and then I'm going to tell him if I can see his rabbit and then I'm going to tell him where the man lives and then we're going to play with his rabbit and I'm going to tell Daniel what's his dog's name and then I'm going to tell him if I can see his chicks and then I'm going to show him my Voltron and then it makes lights in the head and then it has a big sword and then when Richard went to my house my little brother said who is that boy and I said my friend and then we played guns and Richard was the robber and Marcos was the policeman and then Richard went home and it was getting dark and then I went to eat and then I went to sleep the end)
Dialogue 1 (Written dialogue)
R: Gilbert you and Daniel are going to have fun
G: Yes because we're playing with the rabbit and we're going to put him in the grass
R: What about the puppy?
G: I aint going to take him out because he will bite the rabbit
R: So you guys are going to have fun with Daniel's rabbit
G: Yes
R: OK

Initiation
Response
Question
Answer
Initiation
Response
Closing

Gilbert had written a narrative in which he anticipated playing at a friend's house after school. Gilbert read his narrative to Richard and Richard wrote the following response on Gilbert's journal, "Gilbert you and Daniel are going to have fun." Richard had savored the narrative world of Gilbert's story and his response indicated his own boyhood approval of Gilbert's anticipated playing (Britton, 1970). Richard's response did not request additional information or the reason for an action in the personal narrative like other initiating moves. Instead, Richard's response commented positively on Gilbert's planned activity by saying that Gilbert and Daniel would have fun when they got together after school and played. This type of response did not predict another response in the same way that a question usually predicted an answer. Gilbert wrote back, "Yes because we're playing with the rabbit and we're going to put him in the grass." Richard next wrote a question about playing with a puppy and Gilbert wrote back an answer. During Richard's next turn he moved out of the question-answer routine and shifted back to responses by writing, "So you guys are going to have fun with Daniel's rabbit"? Gilbert wrote back "yes" and then Richard
proposed to close by writing the closing marker, "OK". The closing was not contested and the phase was closed.

During the phase Dialogue2 (see Example 5.80) a similar interactional routine took place that was not limited to question-answer routines:

Example 5.80 Gilbert 4/9/86

R: *David do you take cars do you take cars when you take a bath I do it I kind of I do I throw them then I play with them*

Do you take cars when you take a bath

G: *What kind of cars?*
R: *Any kind*
G: *I don't take cars when I go I go to bath*

R: *What?*
G: *I don't take cars when I go to bath*
R: *Why not?*
G: *Because I don't want the cars wet*
R: *I like them wet but you don't*
G: *OK*
R: *By*

In most of his personal narratives Gilbert had written about anticipated events. Richard, through his responses, was able to comment on the anticipated events. The information volunteered by Gilbert expanded the world of the text introduced through the reading of the personal narrative. Richard participated in the world of Gilbert's narrative by wondering about the puppy and by contributing his comments and opinions. The students' interactions took place within a social world that was introduced by the personal narrative. The narrative world became the topic
of the dialogue between the two students during the dialogue phases of the event. Through the routines of question-answer and initiation-response the students constructed a social world in which anticipated events were discussed and in which the writing partner participated in the world of the text by wondering, commenting, and expressing his opinions. In such a way the writing partner participated in the world of the author's text and both students interacted in a social world that was the result of their appropriation of the event.

The closing sections in Gilbert's sessions followed the pattern identified for the other case study students. The closing of the dialogue phases in the early collection was accomplished through the exchange of closing markers in the oral channel (see Table 34). The markers used included "ya" (already). Over the time of the data collection there was a shift to the use of closing markers in the written channel. By set 3, the closing were accomplished in the written channel through the use of closing markers, "bye, OK," and "the end." There were no instances of a proposal to close being contested in Gilbert's sessions.

Table 34. Closing Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dialogue1</th>
<th>Dialogue2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/29/85</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;ya, terminamos&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(We finished)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17/85</td>
<td>&quot;ya&quot; &quot;ya&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/85</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/85</td>
<td>OK OK</td>
<td>OK, BYE, OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/9/86</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>OK bye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/15/86</td>
<td>ok ya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Closing markers in quotation marks were in the oral channel. The other markers were in the written channel.)
Gilbert's movement through the different phases of the event with the minimal use of the oral channel was occasionally facilitated through the teacher's help. The teacher helped manage the movement though the phases by asking the students if they were finished and ready to move on to the next phase. In the examples from 12/11/85 and 5/17/85 the teacher helped manage the transition between the phases dialogue1 and reading narrative1 through his comments.

Example 5.81 12/11/86
T: Did you finish writing yours already
R: mmhh
T: OK read it to Gilbert

5/17/85
G: ya
R: ya ya
T: ya terminaron aquí (Did yo finish here)
R: sí (yes)
T: Ya terminaron Robert? (Did you finish Robert?)
G: sí (yes)
T: Ya terminaste de escribir tú? (Did you finish writing?)
R: no (Robert finishes writing his narrative)

Types of Appropriations

The two most common types of appropriation found in Gilbert's sessions were the discussion of anticipated and past events (see Table 35). Half of Gilbert's narratives were about anticipated events that would take place after school. The future time orientation in Gilbert's narratives influenced the dialogue phases towards discussion of the activities that Gilbert anticipated doing in the near future. This type of appropriation was similar to discussing past experiences only that the experiences the
students were discussing had not yet taken place. The only other appropriation type was negotiating peer activities (4%).

Table 35. Types of Appropriations in Gilbert’s Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types:
AE: Discuss anticipated experiences
PE: Discuss past experiences
NP: Negotiate peer relationships

The Waiting Session

The following example from the middle of the data collection period (12/11/85) is used to illustrate the main characteristics of Gilbert’s sessions through a specific session. This example illustrates the minimal amount of interaction in the oral channel, the future time orientation of Gilbert’s narratives, and the short duration of the sessions. In this session Gilbert shared his journal with Richard who was one of Gilbert’s friends with whom Gilbert often worked together on classroom projects and played with during recess. This session lasted 9 minutes. The average duration of Gilbert’s session from this set of data were 10 minutes.

Example 5. 82 Gilbert 12/11/85 (G: Gilbert, R: Richard, T: Teacher, (talk= plain text, writing= underline, oral reading= italics)

Personal Narrative

Yo ahora mi papá va a ir a la casa de mi tío y luego vamos a ir a las montañas y yo no quiero a ir a las montañas y me voy a quedar con mi tía y luego vamos a jugar a las bicicletas y le voy a decir si podemos a jugar las cicletas y nos vamos a ir adentro y cuando venga mi mamá me va llevar a la casa y los vamos a ir a dormir fin
(I today my father is going to my uncle's house and then we're going to the mountains and I don't want to go to the mountains and I'm going to stay with my aunt and then we're going to play on the bicycles and then we're going to go inside and when my mother comes she is going to take me home and we are going to go to sleep the end)

Dialogue 1

R: Is your brother going?
   Is your brother going?
G: Si
R: OK I just wanted to know
G: OK
T: Did you finish writing yours already
R: mmhh
T: OK read it to Gilbert

Reading narrative 2

R: If my dad comes for Christmas my dad will rent a VCR my grandpa has a surprise for me

Dialogue 2

G: You don't know what he's gonna bring you?
R: I think I'm thinking of a bear a polar bear
G: What kind of bear?
R: A stuffed up one
T: A what?
R: A stuffed up one A stuffed up one
G: OK
R: Bye
G: OK
T: OK you guys finished
R: yeah

In his narrative, Gilbert wrote about staying at his aunt's house after-school while his father went to the mountains. Gilbert's narrative began with an opposition between his father's plans and what he wanted to do. Gilbert did not want to go to the mountains. From that point of opposition, Gilbert
developed the remainder of his narrative in which he wrote about staying at his aunt's house until his mother came for him. Being taken care of by a relative is a common experience in children's worlds. Even though the narrative was written in a future time orientation, Gilbert was able to write his narrative based on his previous experiences with staying at his aunt's house. In the last part of his narrative Gilbert described anticipated events during his stay at his aunt's house. The following events were mentioned in Gilbert's narrative: asking permission to play, playing with the bicycles, going inside the house, going home with his mother, and going to sleep.

The narrative began with the temporal marker "yo ahora" which served to signal the time orientation of the narrative and to frame the events that would be mentioned in the remainder of the narrative. It ended with the closing marker "fin" (the end). Gilbert read his narrative in Spanish to Richard who understood, but did not speak Spanish. Richard began the written dialogue by writing in English and asked if Gilbert's brother was going to go to the mountains. Gilbert answered "yes" in Spanish and then Richard proposed to close by using the closing marker "OK". Gilbert agreed to close and wrote, "OK." The exchange of closing markers between Gilbert and Richard signalled the end of the phase dialogue.

Richard then read his narrative about his father's anticipated visit and the surprise that his grandfather had for him. The narrative was written in English and Gilbert initiated the dialogue by writing in English and asking Richard if he knew what his grandfather's surprise was. Richard then told Gilbert what he thought the surprise was. Gilbert then asked a follow-up question. The dialogue closed by Gilbert proposing to close through the use
of the marker "OK". A closing section followed in which Richard agreed to close and Gilbert responded with another "OK".

**Discussion**

During the dialogue phases from the waiting session, the narrative world in which Gilbert and Richard anticipated future events became an object of the written dialogue through question–answer routines as the students discussed the anticipated events reported in the narrative. For example Gilbert asked Richard, "you don't know what he's going to bring you?" Through this question, Gilbert was able to participate in wondering along with Richard about the surprise that Richard's grandfather was bringing him.

This session illustrated the type of discussion carried out through interactional routines that discussed a narrative reporting anticipated rather than past events. In this particular session, Gilbert and Richard discussed experiences that would take place in the future.

The majority of Gilbert's narratives had a future time orientation. Goffman (1974) called such stories that reported future events, preplays. Preplays were a counter part to stories that reported past events which he called replays. In stories, the narrator reports past events, but also interprets experience from the personal perspective of an actual, or in the case of preplays, potential participant. A narrator is located in a temporal and dramatic relationship to the reported event and the story develops from that point (Goffman, 1974). In the case of Gilbert's narrative from the waiting session, the point of dramatic departure is the opposition between his
father's plans and his own. The remainder of his narrative develops his plans during his anticipated stay at his aunt's house.

Richard's narrative, like Gilbert's, was a preplay about his father's possible visit and the surprise his grandfather had for him. The dramatic and temporal relationship of the point of departure that Gilbert responded to in his written question to Richard was the element of surprise. Stories are commonly told as something to enjoy and savor (Britton, 1970). Gilbert's response to Richard's narrative reflected an interest in the element of surprise reported in Richard's narrative. Gilbert asked Richard if he knew what the surprise was going to be. Through this question and the following exchanges Gilbert was able to participate in the drama of surprise presented through Richard's preplay and both students were able to interact in the world opened up by Richard's narrative.

Summary of Gilbert's Case Study

The construction of social worlds was accomplished entirely through the written channel through the use of question-answer and other types of exchanges. Gilbert's partner's were usually boys who had similar interests in the children's world of play. In their narratives they presented themselves to one another as they were involved in different play activities.

Gilbert and his partners collectively reflected on the play world of their peer culture through their narratives and interactions. Through the use of initiation-response exchanges, Gilbert and his partners contributed to the construction of their interpersonal world by being able to comment and react to the world of play presented through the narratives. Initiation-response
exchanges were also used to negotiate peer friendships as Gilbert and Robert planned after school play activities. Even though Gilbert wrote all his narratives in Spanish, the fact that he shared his narratives with English speakers gave him the opportunity to write and use English in meaningful situations in order to communicate his response to his partner's narrative.
Discussion of the Case Studies

The discussion of the case studies first presents a comparison of the types of exchanges from the written dialogues for the four case study students. The case studies are then compared according to the ways that oral and written language were used to structure different types of group interaction between the students and between the students and teacher. The following sections then discuss the event through the following topics: the types of appropriations and their effect on peer relationships, the contribution of the different phases to the construction of social worlds, the appropriation of the event through routines from peer culture, literacy and the personal experiences of minority students, the dialogue journal literacy event as focused and nonfocused interaction, and the multiple social worlds of the event.

The Exchanges Used in the Written Dialogues

The percentage of the types of exchanges that were used during the written dialogues shifted over the time of data collection from the predominant use of the question-answer pair to other types of exchanges. This pattern was reflected in all the case study students' sessions except Kata. Table 36 shows the totals for the exchange structures for all four case study students. The percentage of question-answer exchanges changed from 70% in the early part of data collection to 47% in the last part.
Table 36. Total Exchange Structures for the Four Case Study Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Q-A pairs</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>% Q-A</th>
<th>%Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-A = Question – Answer
Other = Initiation – Response, Initiation – Question – Answer, Question – Answer – Response

The question-answer exchange routines helped define the event as a time for the exchange of information. The majority of questions that the students asked each other were requests for information regarding the characters or actions reported in the narrative or requests for the reason why a certain action took place. The use of written dialogue to request additional information about characters, actions, or reasons for an action was one way to respond to the personal narrative. The initiation-responses and other types of three part exchanges (for example, initiation-question-answer), on the other hand, did not always begin with requests for information. Instead they were initiated by reactions (responses) to information provided in the personal narrative or in the writing dialogue. The use of exchanges that began with a statement instead of a question were a different way to define the interaction during the dialogue phases. Instead of requesting information, the students were volunteering their reactions to the narrative or written dialogue.

The predominant use of the question–answer pairs made many of the sessions from the early part of the data collection highly structured and predictable. The use of structured and predictable exchanges has also been identified as a primary characteristic of classroom discourse during
teacher-directed lessons (Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Highly structured exchanges are often used for the exchange of information and are not as characteristic of situations where the general function of the discourse is to establish conversation between the speakers rather than to transmit information (Stubbs, 1983).

In the dialogue journals the question-answer exchanges were used to request additional information from the author of the narrative. The students' use of other types of exchanges over time would seem to indicate a change in how the students defined the situation. The change reflects a shift away from only using the written dialogue for the exchange of information toward conversation that served a variety of social functions (such as making plans for peer activities and volunteering reactions to the events anticipated in the narrative). The use of responses rather than questions has been identified as a common type of interaction in another study of dialogue journals (Peyton & Seymour, 1989).

**The Uses of Oral and Written Language to Structure Different Types of Group Interaction**

The interaction through the oral channel between the students and the teacher and the interaction through both the oral and written channel between the students took place through three different types of group interaction.

In the first type there was little interaction between the teacher and students (see Figure 6, S = Students, T = Teacher). The students' interactions were carried out primarily through the written channel. The oral
channel was used for short exchanges in which the students requested that their partner reread their written response or to manage the movement through the phases. The oral channel was not used for side sequences or conversational narratives. Gilbert's sessions represented this type of interaction.
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**Figure 6. Type 1 Group Interaction**

In the second type of interaction there was oral interaction between the teacher and the case study students (See Figure 7). Examples of this type of interaction were Yolanda's session from 5/5/86 (see Example 5.22), Robert's session from 3/25/85 (see Example 5.7), and Kata's session from 4/16/86 (see Example 5.58). In these sessions the case study students initiated conversational narratives with the teacher in Spanish and used the conversational narratives to open a conversational floor between themselves and the teacher. This function of the conversational narrative was especially noticeable in both Yolanda's and Robert's session because the conversational narratives took place in Spanish while the written and oral dialogue between the two students took place only in English. The use of Spanish served to signal the opening of a new conversational floor between the student telling the narrative and the teacher. The students' use of code-switching served to indicate a shift in addressee (Genishi, 1981;
Zentella, 1981), as well as a social relationship between the students and teacher in which they defined their interaction with him related to the use of Spanish as a member of their cultural group and as a caretaker (McClure, 1981).

All the case study students except Gilbert engaged the teacher in conversation through conversational narratives or side sequences. Kata engaged the teacher in a unique way. She invited him to comment on her spelling through the use of the phrase "Qué dice allí" (What does it say there?) throughout the data collection. Kata wanted the teacher to notice that she knew how to spell the words that she was pointing out to him.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 7. Type 2 Group Interaction**

The third type of interaction included talk between the teacher and both students (see Figure 8). Both students initiated side sequences or told conversational narratives to each other and to the teacher. The two students were also involved in the written dialogue. In this type of interaction, the teacher-initiated side sequences, but he did not tell any conversational narratives. Robert's session from 5/19/86 (Example 5.12), Yolanda's session from 3/17/86 (Example 5.23), and Kata's session from 6/5/85
(Example 5.62) are examples of this type of interaction. Conversational narratives and side sequences were used to develop the topic of the written dialogue as well as initiate new topics.

![Diagram showing interaction between students and teacher]

Both students initiate conversational narratives and side sequences with the teacher and each other as they participate in the written dialogue. Teacher occasionally initiates side sequences but not conversational narratives.

Figure 8. Type 3 Group Interaction

The varied uses of the oral channel helped differentiate the case study students since all of them participated in the written dialogues, which were a part of the instructional requirements of the event. The use of the different channels was related to how the students defined the event in order to include the teacher as part of the interaction. The students that told conversational stories and engaged in side sequences with each other and the teacher, defined the event as a time to talk and share their experiences with one another. This was especially evident when the conversational narratives were not on the topic of the written dialogue because they were used to introduced new topics into the interaction between the student and teacher. The new topics could incorporate the teacher as well as the students because the teacher did not participate in the written dialogue.
Types of Appropriations

Four general appropriations types were identified. They were discussing past experiences, discussing anticipated experiences, negotiating peer relationships and calling names (see Table 37). These types of appropriations were global categories of different purposes for which the students used the event. The most common type among all the case study students was discussing past experiences (58%). The appropriation type discussing anticipated experiences was the next most common type (27%). The type negotiating peer relationships occurred 12% of the time. The appropriation type name calling (3%) only occurred a small percentage of time.

Table 37. Total Types of Appropriations for the Four Case Study Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types:
PE: Discuss past experiences
AE: Discuss anticipated experiences
NP: Negotiate peer relationships
CN: Calling names

The appropriation type, discussing past experiences, was the largest category for all the case study students. Anticipating experiences was the next largest category among Kata (22%), Robert (24%), and Gilbert (48%). The next largest category for Yolanda was negotiating peer relationships (23%). Negotiating peer relationships was also found in Kata's (17%) and
Gilberts (4%) sessions but it accounted for a smaller percentage of their sessions. This type of appropriation was not found in Robert's sessions but he was Gilbert's partner in the session from Gilbert's case study that involved the negotiation of peer relationships.

The different appropriation types affected peer relationships between the students in different ways. In the name-calling appropriation the students were placed in conflicting roles as they called each other names through the written channel. Between Silvia and Kata, the name-calling was signaled as being playful. The name-calling between Robert and Yolanda was not signaled as playful and their peer relationship as cousins and classmates during the dialogue journal event was characterized by rivalry and oppositions. This was demonstrated in the oppositions related to types of knowledge and values expressed during their sessions. One would contradict the other's spelling in order to show that they knew more about writing, or the opposition would be based on moral values (winning games vs. God as being most important). These oppositions eventually led to the name-calling that took place during their sessions.

In the negotiation of peer relationships, the students were involved in working out friendship roles. The interaction directly affected the students because they were planning activities in which they would be participating. The students in Yolanda's peer friendship sessions were characters in the narratives they had written and the topic of the written dialogue were the plans they were making. In the appropriation types, discussing past or anticipated experiences, the students involved were not necessarily characters in the personal narratives or direct participants in the events.
They were able to participate in the world of their partners' narrative by wondering and questioning their partner about events that had either already taken place or were still to take place.

**The Different Contributions of the Phases of the Events in the Construction of Social Worlds**

The personal narratives played a different role in the different appropriation types. In the appropriation types, discussing past and anticipated experiences, the narrative presented the topic that was developed in the written dialogue. The narrative played a slightly different role in some of the sessions when children negotiated peer relationships. In those sessions the narrative presented a way for the students to use their imaginations to place themselves in the setting of play and to foresee the possible flow of events. In the appropriation type, calling-names, the personal narrative did not play a role.

Through their stories the students interpreted, gave shape to and evaluated their experiences. They then shared their interpretations and evaluations and were able to compare them with the response of their writing partners (Britton, 1970). Rosen (1988) says that through narratives people attempt to understand their lives and communicate those understandings with others. Through narratives people construct and negotiate a social identity as they tell stories that communicate covertly held values (Bauman, 1986; Stahl, 1989), and they present themselves in narratives in ways that they wish to be seen (Britton, 1977).
Most of the stories the children wrote were about family and play events in which they presented themselves playing with friends or involved in activities with their families and relatives. The peer group and family are two main sources of influence in children's socialization. Interestingly, only Robert wrote a few narratives about another source of influence in children's socialization, the school. In their narratives about play, the students presented themselves in gender specific activities of their peer culture. Yolanda wrote frequently about playing with Barbies but also about playing baseball. Gilbert and Robert wrote often about playing games with other boys. Gilbert also wrote about going to the park with his family and other kinds of family events. Kata wrote about family events and in those stories presented herself in the role of sister or daughter. Through their narratives the four case study students presented images of themselves as friends playing and as sons, daughters, or cousins engaged in the social relationships and activities that comprised their lives.

The students were able to share their narratives as soon as they were finished writing them. Sharing their narratives and having their partner respond to them helped the students extend their understandings of their experiences by having someone asks questions about their narrative or react to them. In reading their stories to one another, the author and partner were able to be co-spectators of the reported or anticipated events and could enjoy and savor them (Britton, 1970). An example of this co-spectatorship was Richard's response to Gilbert's narrative of anticipated events, "Gilbert you and Daniel are going to have fun" (Example 5.81), and Gilbert's response to the mention of a surprise in Richard's narrative that
expressed Gilbert's curiosity, "You don't know what he's going to bring you?" (Example 5.73).

During the dialogue phases the negotiation of the social world became an interactive event. The personal narrative was written by one person, but the dialogic phases required a minimum of two people. The construction of social worlds was a collective accomplishment in which the student used communicative routines (such as question-answer) as well as routines from peer culture to collectively participate and produce the interpersonal contexts in which their interaction took place. The dialogue during the appropriation type, negotiating peer friendships was used by the students to pursue the possibilities of their plans and to collectively engage in a time where friendship was highlighted through their mutual anticipation and planning of play activities. The dialogue in the appropriation types, discussing past and anticipated experiences, was used to discuss those experiences by requesting from the author of the narrative additional information about the activities or objects mentioned in the narrative as well as reasons why certain actions took place. During the appropriation type name-calling, the written dialogue was the means through which the name-calling took place.

The different phases of the event contributed to the construction of social worlds in different ways. The personal narrative served to open up and introduce the social world of the narrative. Through the narrative, the students presented themselves to one another engaged in their daily life. The students selected from past or anticipated experiences an image of themselves involved in activities from children's worlds. The social world
then became an object for discussion, negotiation, and manipulation during the dialogue phases.

**The Appropriation of Dialogue Journals through Routines from Peer Culture**

In chapter four, Dialogue Journals as a Literacy Event, the dialogue journal event was described as a routine of the classroom. The event was a routine due to the predictable sequence of movement between the phases of the event and the predictable occurrence of certain ways of speaking and writing within the different phases. As a routine the event served as a frame that contextualized students' interactions.

The presentation of the case studies showed that one way the students appropriated the event was through the use of routines from peer culture. Among the routines were: name-calling and trading insults, speech play, sociodramatic role play, and the planning of peer activities. The different phases of the event played different roles in the students' use of routines. The routines took place within the dialogue phases and they served as a frame for their interaction. The personal narratives played a role in some of the sessions in which peer friendships were negotiated, but in other routines, such as name-calling, the personal narrative did not play a role.

In chapter four the contextualizing function of the movement through the phases of the event was seen to operate as a sequencing strategy. Besides the use of the movement through the phases, the students also contextualized their interaction through the peer routines they were involved
in. Peer routines provided a more specific kind of contextualization than a phase. The students defined the situation not only in terms of whether they were in a dialogue phase or not, but also in regards to the specific routine in which they were involved. Within specific routines, such as name-calling, the students used initiation-response exchanges in order to call names and trade insults. Question-answer exchanges were used in the sociodramatic role play to negotiate social roles. In the other sessions involving negotiation of peer friendship, question-answer exchanges were used to inquire about the different kinds of games or toys that the students were going to play. The event was a routine of the classroom within which routines from peer culture were enacted.

Corsaro (1988a) has stated that through their participation in communicative events children become part of and collectively reproduce interpersonal relations and cultural patterns of peer culture. Cook-Gumperz and Corsaro (1986) mention that social experience is shaped for and by children through acts of speech. Children use speech strategies, which in this study have been called ways of speaking and writing, to control and effect communication. Children's use of speech strategies to define and construct social worlds gives rise to social knowledge and communicative competence that helps form a social identity for a child (Cook-Gumperz and Corsaro, 1986). In this event students used reading and writing to pursue the interests and concerns of peer culture, such as developing friendships and engaging in speech play. Reading and writing took place through ways of speaking and writing that children used to collectively define the situation of the event.
The formation of a social identity is related to the development of interactional and communicative competencies (Speier, 1970) through which children identify themselves as members of social groups. In the dialogue journal event the students' social identity was related to their membership in social groups such as baseball teams, as well as their membership in a dyad involved in a classroom literacy event. Peters and Boggs (1986) state that children's experience with initiating and participating in routines play an important role in children's socialization because children learn not only about the content and kinds of utterances to be expected in sequences but also about participation structures that specify who can say what to whom. In the dialogue journal event the students used reading and writing as a means through which they could establish their participation and membership in the classroom community of readers and writers by initiating and participating in communicative and peer routines.

In the dialogue journal event the students assumed situation-specific roles, such as author and respondent, along with the accompanying interactional rights and obligations as they presented their identity as both the author of the narrative and participant in the narrative's reported events. In the baseball session the students were both members of baseball teams and of the triad (Eddie, Robert, and Yolanda) and dyad (Robert and Yolanda) that presented and supported their opinions through ways of speaking and writing during that session. The students' participation in the event helped them negotiate their identities as both readers and writers.
within a classroom literacy event and their out-of-school identities as members of families and peer groups.

Corsaro's (1988a) research on the routines of peer culture has looked at routines as a frame for action with a predictable sequence and as actual enacted routines. Corsaro discussed those two aspects of routines of peer culture by saying that routines have internal (cognitive) and external (behavioral) components. The internal component refers to a frame for organizing behavior and the external component the actual enactment of an interactive sequence within the general boundaries of a frame. The dialogue journal literacy event was classified as a routine of the classroom that served as a frame for the students' actions due to the predictable sequence of movement through the phases. The present study also discussed the actual forms and function of the event through the global categories of appropriation types. This dual perspective describes two important aspects of routines found also in Corsaro's (1988a) study: (1) the patterned and recurring structure of routines and; (2) the individual ways that children appropriated the routines according to the specific characteristics of each instance of the routine.

Another similarity between the present study and Corsaro's work on routines is related to the term appropriation. The term appropriation as used by Ricoeur (1981) means how something that originally was distant or alien was made contemporary to the occasion. Ricoeur used the term in regards to the relationship between texts and readers. The concept of appropriation was used in this study to discuss how children made the dialogue journal literacy event have sense for them by making it serve their own purposes.
Corsaro (1986) used the term "familiarization" in order to talk about how the routines of peer culture serve to transform the ambiguities of the adult world into the familiar and shared routines of peer culture. Corsaro states that routines make the unfamiliar (alien or distant in Ricoeur's terms) into the familiar routines of peer culture. In the dialogue journal literacy event the students also used routines from peer culture in their definition of the event in order to appropriate the event in a way that defined the literacy event according to their previous knowledge and experiences.

**Literacy and the Personal Experiences of Minority Students**

The use of children's personal experiences and interactional routines in literacy events have been shown to support minority students' participation in classroom instructional events (Au, 1980; Hudelson, 1984, 1989; Philips, 1972; Moll, 1987, 1988). A key issue identified in teaching minority students is the incorporation of their experiences in classroom discussions (Au, 1981; Moll, 1988). Effective teachers of minority children encourage them to use their own experiences to make sense of the classroom content. In effective classrooms minority children introduced topics from their home or community experiences and used anecdotes (called conversational narratives in this study) to make a point during classroom discussions (Moll, 1988).

In a study conducted in a bilingual setting, the cultural congruence in teacher–student interactions was called a personalized style (Cazden, Carrasco, Maldonado-Guzmán, & Erickson, 1980). Such a style shows a close and caring relationship between the teacher and student. The close
relationship is shown through the teacher's use of cultural forms of address (papi, mami—can be loosely translated as honey), the use of diminutives, "respeto" (showing respect for other children and adults through the use of politeness formulas such as "con permiso"—excuse me, and "mándame"—at your service), and personal knowledge of the families. In the present study the teacher did not make use of diminutives, politeness formulas, and cultural forms of address in his speech to the students. Instead a close relationship between the teacher and students was evident through students' conversational narratives and side sequences through which they involved the teacher in the interaction. The teacher valued the students' narratives of their lives and thereby valued the students themselves, by allowing them to break from the written dialogue to tell him their stories and by listening to them.

Research on minority students' literacy experiences at home and at school has found that one way to engage students in school activities is to make the communities' experience and knowledge relevant topics for writing (Hudelson, 1989, Moll, 1988). Dialogue journals provided a supportive context for the children's writing by drawing upon their experiences with friends, family, and relatives and by allowing the students to collaboratively make sense of instructional activities (Moll, 1988). In this event the social and academic worlds of children came together as they used written language to interpret their personal experiences and as they shared and responded to each others' writing through interactional patterns from their peer culture. Bringing together the social and academic worlds of students had been suggested as an effective way to engage second
language learners (Johnson & Roen, 1989). Johnson (1989) suggests that for children who are second language learners, writing is best approached as communicative interaction in a defined context in which second language learners have opportunities and reasons for writing in English and that assigned writing tasks should build on children's social purposes. In this event the students' personal experiences and literacy were brought together through the personal narratives and the interaction during the oral and written dialogues.

Besides the use of children's personal experiences as topics and the basis for writing, the incorporation of children's interactional routines in classroom events has proven beneficial to minority children (Au, 1980). In the dialogue journal event the children made use of familiar forms of oral interaction from communicative and peer routines. Literacy, as it was used in this event, was characterized by the use of oral forms of communication in the written channel. The students used their knowledge of conversations in their definitions of the event. An example of the use of a communicative routine were the closing sections of the dialogue phases that were very similar to closings from conversations and telephone calls (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Some of the routines from peer culture that were used during the event were modified in order to be able to carry them out through the written channel. The sociodramatic role play for example did not involve the actual playing with dolls, instead the written channel was used to request and confer social roles. The written channel was then used to pursue the possibilities of their roles in relation to the strategies of role play as the
students constructed the imaginative contexts of their play through written language interaction.

Another oral strategy from peer culture that was carried into the written channel was ritualized speech play (Garvey, 1977). The students used the dialogic interaction during the written dialogues to engage in ritualized speech play in which they played with turn-taking conventions of conversation through controlled repetition of question-answer exchanges. Other studies of dialogue journals have reported similar findings related to the use of oral language strategies in the written channel and have called dialogue journals a bridge from oral to written language (Staton, Shuy, Peyton, & Reed, 1988). The use of oral language routines in the written channel influenced how reading and writing were used during this event. Literacy was used to interpret and share personal experiences through the personal narratives and written dialogues as well as to transform the event into occasions for play and the negotiation of peer relationships.

The use of children’s personal experiences in literacy events has been mentioned as an important way to encourage minority children’s participation in instructional activities (Au, 1980, Moll, 1987, 1988). Writing that is based on personal experience has been called expressive writing by Britton (1970). In expressive writing the writer gives shape to an experience in order to share it. Britton says that the sharing of expressive writing is important because a large incentive for the writing lies in the sharing of the writing. Britton says that expressive writing needs to be shared with someone who will be a sympathetic listener and who will share the interests and interpretive contexts of the writer. In the dialogue journal literacy event
the students shared their writing with peers who were the kind of sympathetic listeners that Britton mentioned as being important. As peers the students had similar interests and they shared the context of the neighborhood in which most of the narratives took place as well as the social context of peer culture. The students responded to each other's narratives during the dialogue phases in a manner that helped establish a classroom climate in which they could risk sharing their experiences with one another.

Sharing the narratives helped the children anticipate the response of an audience to their writing. The children shared their narratives and received responses to them immediately after they had finished writing them. The writing partner, as a sympathetic listener, also played an active role by listening with the purpose of formulating a response to the narrative. The students' comments were not evaluative of the composition of the narrative, rather they responded to the content of the story. Through their experiences with the event the students began to anticipate the response of the audience. Evidence of the writer's anticipation of the response of the audience were the questions that were embedded in the narrative which were addressed to the writing partner (see Example 4.14).

Through their participation in the dialogue journals, the students were able to experience some of the satisfactions mentioned by Britton (1977) that can come from expressive writing. Among those satisfactions were: forming relationships of mutual interests and trust with peers on the basis of sharing personal experiences, sharing feelings and values related to their everyday life, presenting themselves in a manner in which they
would like to be seen, and being creators of verbal objects in the form of personal narratives.

Another feature of the event that made possible the integration of the students' personal experiences and patterns of interaction was the flexible nature of the event, which was evident through the variety of the students' appropriations of the event. The flexibility of events to various definitions of the situation has been discussed through the terms focused and nonfocused interaction (Scollon & Scollon, 1982).

The Dialogue Journal Literacy Event as Focused and Nonfocused Situations

The Scollons (1982) have used the terms focused and nonfocused to describe the flexibility or lack of flexibility in the definition of situations. The Scollons state that focused or nonfocused is not a structural feature of situations but rather that it is the outcome of interaction in particular situations. The dialogue journal event sessions had features of both focused and nonfocused situations.

As a focused situation the negotiation of the event was constrained by the instructional requirements established by the teacher. The type of narrative and the sequence of movement through the phases of the event was established and was not negotiable. The students had to write a personal narrative and they had to share both journals. The instructional requirements were that students had to participate in two written dialogues. These characteristics made dialogue journals, as they were used in this study, have features of focused situations.
As a nonfocused situation, the students were able to negotiate the definition of the situation with their partners. The types of appropriations gave one indication of the different ways that the students defined the situation. The students’ negotiations of the situation were most apparent during the dialogue phases of the event. During some of Yolanda’s negotiation of peer friendship sessions, there was evidence of negotiation of the situation within the personal narrative as Yolanda and her partner included each other as characters in their narratives.

A characteristic of a nonfocused situation is that participants "assume, and grant to each other, the right to make one's own sense of the interaction" (Scollon & Scollon, 1982, p. 195). In the dialogue journal event there were few side sequences concerning students who wanted to define the situation in different ways from one another. It seems that the students were willing to follow one another's lead. The students followed the definition proposed by the partner, and through their oral and written exchanges they collaboratively constructed the social world of their definition. In the sessions where the students negotiated peer friendships, for example, there was no resistance on the part of the students to keep their partner from mentioning that they were interested in joining the peer activity when the partner had not been specifically mentioned in the narrative as a character (see Example 5.55). The lack of resistance might be due in part to the fact that a peer activity had already been mentioned in the narratives.

Another aspect of some of the sessions that made them have features of nonfocused situations was the fact the students were able to
make use of peer routines to define the event. School literacy events have been characterized as being resistant to appropriation through the use routines or knowledge from outside the school culture (Bloome & Green, 1984; Scollon & Scollon, 1982; Gilmore, 1986). The students during the dialogue journal event were able to use routines to define the situation and appropriated the event through their use of their cultural knowledge from outside of school contexts. The dialogue journal event was more flexible than most school literacy events and consequently the students were able to make use of routines to appropriate the event in ways that they might not have been able to do in other literacy events in school settings.

**The Multiple Social Worlds of the Dialogue Journal Literacy Event**

Dyson's (1989) research on young children's literacy has investigated children's self-expression through drawing, talk, and writing, within their ongoing peer relationships. She noted that writing does not evolve only from writing but from children's interactions and constructions of symbolic and social worlds. Nystrand (1989) makes similar claims suggesting that features of writing are best understood in relation to writers' and readers' interests and purposes and that the forms of texts are not only related to the function they serve, but also the role they play in mediating social relationships.

The present study has also focused on children's interests and purposes during the dialogue journal literacy event and is similar to Dyson's (1989) study in that peer interaction played an important role in the children's writing. In her study one way that children were able to bring
together the world of their written text with their peer friendships was to include friends as characters in their stories. In the present study the students also included their friends as characters in their stories in the peer negotiation session but, unlike the students in Dyson’s study, the students were required to engage in peer interaction as a characteristic of the event itself. Consequently the students in the present study had means available to them for peer interaction that were not available to the students in Dyson’s study. The peer group in Dyson’s research were both audience and critics of each other’s stories, and their interaction influenced the development of their stories. In the present study the writing partner responded to the story and the influence on the interaction was most apparent in the various ways the event was appropriated.

Another point of comparison between the present study and Dyson’s research is the fact that the children in her study created imaginative worlds through fictional stories whereas the children in the dialogue journal event wrote personal narratives. However, the students in the present study did participate in the creation of imagined worlds through the use of sociodramatic and speech play in which they used their imaginations and communicative and peer routines to transform a classroom event into the children’s world of play.

As in Dyson’s (1989) study, there was tension between multiple words in the dialogue journal event. The students in her study faced the tension involved in orchestrating the different symbolic media of drawing, talk, and writing along with ongoing peer relationships that took place during the event as they constructed their stories. In this study the tension
involved orchestrating the interaction between the students and teacher, and the interaction taking place between the students through the written dialogue.

The social world constructed through written dialogue was embedded within the ongoing interaction between the students and teacher. The interaction between the students and teacher included conversational narratives through which the students recounted their experiences with pigeons, Spanish soap operas, their godmother's earrings, new clothes, their dolls' cars, and brought elements of their life from outside of school into the interaction that was taking place during the event. The conversational narratives were enclaves of meaning from their out-of-school lives that were embedded within the ongoing literacy event (Shutz, 1970; Young, 1987). The multiple social worlds helped the dialogue literacy event become a social encounter between students as they shared their views of past and anticipated events of the written dialogue with each other and the teacher through conversational narratives and side sequences (see Figure 9).
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Figure 9. Multiple Social Worlds
The use of conversational narratives and side sequences was one way the students dealt with the tension between the student–student interaction and the presence of the teacher who was not involved in the written interaction. The students dealt with that tension through conversational narratives and side sequences which served to develop the topic of the written dialogue as well as temporarily open up a conversational floor between the students and teacher. During the telling of the story and subsequent discussions, the students and teacher collaboratively constructed their interpersonal worlds (Cook-Gumperz, 1986). When the conversational narrative or side sequences were terminated the students returned to the construction of the social world that was taking place through the written dialogue. The social world constructed through the written dialogue operated alongside the worlds opened up by the conversational stories and side sequences. During the sessions in which there were conversational narratives and side sequences there was an embedding of multiple social worlds (Dyson, 1988; Shutz, 1970).

Another source of tension was defining the situation in order to make sense of the contrived nature of the written dialogues. The students transformed the contrived nature of the written dialogues and appropriated them by defining the situation as a time to play and participate in peer relationships. The dialogue phases of the event were contrived situations that the students appropriated and made sense of through the interests and concerns of peer culture such as peer friendship and play. Hudson (1988) examined how students claimed ownership of assigned writing tasks and said that ownership is better understood by looking at the role of the
students as composers during the writing task and the opportunities they have to engage in the event instead of looking at who initiated the writing assignment. Hudson stated that students can take ownership of assigned writing tasks if they create the text and have experiences with the assignment over time. Hudson concluded that when students continue to act upon their own representations of an assignment they tend to claim ownership of official writing. This appears to have happened with the dialogue journal event as the students worked on their representation of the event through the different types of appropriation over an extended period of time.

The students' ownership of the dialogue journal literacy event is difficult to gauge, but their engagement in the event might provide information related to ownership. Their engagement might be made evident by enjoyment of the event as displayed through play, laughter, storytelling or chatting (side sequences). Another possible indicator of students' engagement might be the different amount of time that they participated in the event. Gilbert's sessions were the shortest of all the case study students averaging 13 minutes (see Table 38 below). The other three students sessions averaged 27 minutes for Yolanda, 32 minutes for Kata, and 35 minutes for Robert. The students' possible level of engagement in the event was demonstrated by Kata and Silvia when as first-graders they participated in the lollipop session for 66 minutes.
Table 38. Average Duration of Sessions in Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Set 1 (3/85-6/85)</th>
<th>Set 2 (9/85-12/85)</th>
<th>Set 3 (32/86-5/85)</th>
<th>Average for all three sets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kata</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The case studies presented in this chapter extended the findings presented in chapter four by relating the characteristics of the event to the individual case study students. Chapter five introduced new findings by discussing how students made the event their own by appropriating the event through the use of communicative and peer routines. The students' appropriations were discussed in terms of the broad functions for which they used the event as well as to how they used oral and written language to establish three types of group interaction which established different configurations of interaction.

The findings for the research question, how did students use oral and written language to negotiate and construct social worlds in interaction with each other?, were presented in this chapter by looking at how the students presented themselves through the actions and situations that they selected to write about in their narratives. The resulting oral and written dialogues built upon the world presented through the narrative and constructed the interpretive contexts which both guided and were the result of the students' interactions. Through their participation in the event the students gained experience in using oral and written language to establish social relationships, interpret their experiences through narratives, and
appropriate a literacy event by negotiating the definition of the event with their partner.

Research among minority students has indicated that the incorporation of their experiences and interactional patterns in classroom events have supported their participation in classroom events. The dialogue journal was discussed as a supportive context for bilingual children's writing because they were able to use their experiences as topics for writing and share their writing with peers who were sympathetic listeners. Britton's term, "expressive writing," was used to discuss the benefits of students' personal narrative writing as well as the role of the students as audience for the narratives and as respondents. The findings of this study will be summarized in the following chapter. Implications and questions for further research will be discussed, as well as reflections on teacher-as-researcher in relation to this study.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study was concerned with a description of the dialogue journal literacy event. Its characteristics were described and interpreted from an observer's perspective, as well as the students'. The findings were reported in two chapters. Chapter four reported the findings related to describing the main characteristics of the event and chapter five reported how the students appropriated the event in order to make it serve their social purposes and at the same time fulfill the instructional requirements of the event.

The research problem was addressed through a two-part analysis. The first part, reported in chapter four, identified the event as a unit composed of five phases and the ways of speaking and writing that occurred within the specific phases. This analysis identified the structural properties of the event which were the phases of the event and the students' movement between them that served as a sequencing strategy used by the students to contextualize their interactions.

The second part of analyses reported in chapter five identified the role and function that the ways of speaking and writing played in the children's social purposes and how students used the phases of the event to achieve their social purposes and mediate peer relationships. The students defined the event by how they used the ways of speaking and writing to appropriate the event.
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The first section of this chapter reviews the main findings of this study for the three main research questions. The next section discusses the implications of the study and questions for further research. The last section discusses the topic of teacher as researcher as it relates to this study.

Summary of Findings

The summary of the findings will be presented for each of the three main research questions.

1. What is a dialogue literacy event? What are its main characteristics?

   The two chapters in which the findings were presented each contributed in a different way an answer to the first research question. The fourth chapter showed the way an observer could define and describe the event, and the fifth chapter described the event by looking at the variety purposes for which the students used the event. The different approaches of chapters four and five can be discussed in terms of "etic–emic" distinctions. The etic perspective of chapter four presented the outsider's view of an event. An outsider can analyze an event by identifying parts of the event and attempts to understand their relationships. The emic perspective highlighted in chapter five was concerned with an insider's perspective on the event and investigated the participants' interpretations (what in this study have been called appropriations) and the meaning that the event held for them. The etic-emic distinction is not a clear-cut one; it is a matter of emphasis.

   The purpose of the first research question was to make the definition of the dialogue journal literacy event itself central to the research problem.
In this way the "social context" of the dialogue journal writing and its
definition as part of the event could no longer be treated as a given. The
definition of the event was an outgrowth of students' uses of oral and written
language to construct social worlds within the context of the literacy event.

The findings in chapter four defined the dialogue literacy event as a
unit that was composed of five phases: personal narrative, reading
narrative1, dialogue1, reading narrative2, and dialogue2. These phases
occurred in a predictable sequence, and their order within the event was a
main characteristic of the event. The event was classified as a routine of the
classroom due to the predictability of the sequence of movement between
the phases. Movement between phases was partially signalled through
different kinds of openings and closings that served as boundary markers
for the different phases. Movement through the event served as a
sequencing strategy that students used to predict later phases and the type
of interaction that commonly took place within those phases.

Another characteristic of the event was the different ways of speaking
and writing that took place within the phases of the event. The inclusion and
exclusion of the ways of speaking and writing in the individual phases
helped identify the phases and differentiated them from one another. The
specific ways of speaking and writing will be summarized in the discussion
of the second research question. Another way that the students defined the
event was through the three types of group interaction that will be discussed
in the summary of the findings for the third research question.

The findings reported in chapter five focused on how the students
defined the dialogue journal literacy event. One way that students' definition
of the event was discussed was through the use of global types of appropriations. Four general types of appropriations were identified, discussing past and anticipated experiences, name-calling, and negotiating peer friendships.

The four case study students' sessions had different characteristics that differentiated them from each other. Kata's sessions were characterized by speech play and by incorporating the teacher in the interaction by asking him to notice and comment on her spelling. Robert's sessions from the later part of the collection period were characterized by conversational narratives and side sequences that involved both the teacher and other students. Yolanda's sessions were similar to Robert's in regards to conversational narratives and side sequences, but were different due to the sessions in which the event was used to negotiate peer friendships. Robert's and Yolanda's up-and-down relationship as cousins was characteristic of their sessions from the later part of the data collection period in which their sharing turned into name-calling. Gilbert's sessions were the shortest of all the students and did not include the conversational stories and side sequences that the other case study students used to engage each other and the teacher in talk. The types of exchanges in Gilbert's sessions did shift over time, as did the other students', and indicated a more conversational tone to his sessions from the latter part of the collection period.

In summary, the dialogue journal literacy event was an occasion in which talk and writing were used by the children during different phases of
the event to share or plan personal experiences with one another through their personal narratives as well as through their oral and written dialogues.

2. What are the various ways of speaking/writing that are patterned and recurring during this event?

The different ways of speaking that were identified were conversational narratives in which students reported personal experiences to each other and the teacher, side sequences which were conversations that developed the topic of the written dialogue or initiated a new topic, oral reading in which the students read their narratives to one another, and closing exchanges which brought the written dialogues to a close. The different types of writing were the personal narrative in which students wrote about past or anticipated events, the various types of exchanges in the written dialogues through which students developed the topic of the written dialogue, and the closing exchanges which made use of a small set of closing markers to end the written dialogues. The different ways of speaking and writing involved different interactional rights and obligations between the students.

3. How did the students use oral and written language to negotiate and construct social worlds in interaction with each other?

The uses of oral and written language during the different phases of the event contributed to the construction of social worlds differently according to the appropriation type. The personal narrative played an important role in the appropriation types, discussing past and anticipated experiences and some of the negotiation of peer friendship sessions. In the
name calling appropriations, and in some of the negotiation of peer friendship sessions the dialogue phase was used to achieve the social purposes specific to the appropriation type.

Another way that the students used oral and written language to construct social worlds was the use of oral and written language to establish three types of group interaction. In the first type of group interaction the students used the written dialogue to construct the interpersonal context of their interaction. In this instance, the students did not tell conversational stories to one another and they did not participate in side sequences, nor did they interact with the teacher. In the second type of group interaction the students opened a conversational floor with the teacher through the use of conversational stories or side sequences. This interaction between the students took place both through the oral and the written channel. In the third type of group interaction the teachers and students both initiated side sequences, and the students told conversational stories to both the teacher and their writing partner. The different uses of the oral and written channels were related to the construction of social worlds by arranging different configurations of social interaction.

Among the general findings of this study was the fact that shifts occurred over time. Some characteristics of the event which were originally in the oral channel were carried out in the written channel toward the end of the study. Two characteristics that exhibited this change were the closing exchanges and the closing marker of the personal narrative. Another general finding was that the students developed some of the characteristics of the event over time apart from the teacher's directions. These
characteristics were the closing exchanges of the written dialogue and the temporal opener and written closing marker of the personal narrative.

Another general finding was that the students appropriated the event in a variety of ways and were still able to meet the instructional requirements for the event. Two types of appropriation, negotiating peer relationships and name-calling, most likely would not have occurred if the students were sharing their journals with an adult. The teacher anticipated that the students would use the journals to discuss past experiences reported in the narrative but did not expect the varied social purposes that the children pursued.

Implications for the Classroom and Questions for Further Research

This study found that students' social purposes played a key role in how they defined the dialogue journal literacy event. The varying ways that the event was defined by the students suggests that teachers should keep in mind that students' definitions of literacy events may not be the same as their definition. A given event might be defined in different ways according to the students' social purposes. Teachers should examine how students actually use literacy events in their classrooms in order to identify the varying ways that the student's might be defining and using the event. The following questions for further research are related to this finding and implication. What role do students' social purposes play in defining other literacy events? How do students' social purposes work in combination with the instructional requirements of the literacy event in their definition of the event? This study looked at students' purposes during one literacy event.
The following questions for further research would investigate students' purposes across literacy events. How do students' purposes vary across literacy events? How do a literacy event's characteristics affect the students' appropriation of the event?

Another finding showed that the dialogue journals built on what children know about spoken conversation and that one resource children have as a result of their knowledge of spoken conversations are various routines from their peer culture. An implication from this finding is that teachers should keep in mind that if children use routines from peer culture, or other types of cultural knowledge during an instructional event, it is because they are making sense of the instructional event according to their previous experiences. Because children's ways of making sense of situations are not always the same as adults' ways, teachers may be blinded to the sense-making the children are involved in (Scollon & Scollon, 1982).

The following questions for further research are related to children's use of routines from peer culture. Do children use routines from peer culture in other literacy events and in different grade levels? How are the routines transformed from the oral channel in which they are normally used to the written channel of the literacy event? How does participation in literacy events affect children's presentation of self and their relationships with peers?

Another implication comes from the students' use of speech play as a means to appropriate the event. Sutton-Smith (1982) has talked about the importance of play as a means to integrate the culture of children into
school. He suggests that children's play can help release the imaginative life of children in ways that traditional school activities might not when it is collective in nature and reaffirms the cultural values of the children. In other words, teachers should be sensitive to the fact that play is a powerful tool in children's learning and that play routines from the students' culture are ways that children attempt to define the situations of school in ways that are culturally relevant to them. Children use play during literacy events as a familiar resource that helps them explore and learn how written language can be used for a variety of purposes (Dyson, 1990). Related questions for further research are: Do children define other literacy events as a time for play? What resources does play provide children with which they can appropriate literacy events? And, should teachers more consciously integrate play within certain literacy events in the primary grades since it is such an important sense—making strategy for children?

Another implication from this study is that children's own personal experiences can be the topic of their writing. Kitagawa & Kitagawa (1987) found that the use of children's experiences as their own writing topics helped them make connections between literacy and their own lives especially as they had opportunities to share their writing with a sympathetic reader. The dialogue journal activity in this study provided a forum in which students' out-of-school lives found a legitimate place within the classroom curriculum and thereby their personal experiences were valued in the classroom. The students' personal experiences were foregrounded during the dialogue journal literacy event and they were the basis for the narratives and the discussions with peers during the dialogue phases. During this
event, literacy was used to establish a social occasion in which students' personal experiences mediated their interactions with oral and written language. Questions for further research are: How can minority students' experiences be incorporated into other parts of the classroom curriculum? And, would the use of expressive writing along with other types of writing in the content areas support minority students' participation in instructional activities in the content areas?

Students wrote in both Spanish and English in the narratives as well as the written dialogues. An implication for the classroom is that bilingual children need opportunities to write in both English and Spanish for communicative reasons to real audiences that will respond to their writing. A question for further study related to the use of Spanish and English would address a limitation of this study. It was beyond the scope of this study to analyze in detail the students' code-switching. Questions for further research are: How did students' code switching in the oral channel compare with their code-switching in the written channel? How did the code-switching in the personal narrative compare with the code-switching in the written dialogues? And, did the code-switching in one channel affect switching in the other channel?

In this event oral language was used in conjunction with written language. Three of the four children in this study used talk to make sense of the event and to develop the topic of the dialogue and contribute to the ongoing interaction. Teachers should be aware that children make varying uses of oral and written language during literacy events and that children's talk plays an important role in their attempts to define the situation during
instructional events. A question for further study is related to a limitation of this study. It was beyond the scope of this study to examine in detail the personal narrative writing. Questions for further research are to examine changes over time in the composition and spelling of the personal narrative and to examine if and how the oral and written dialogues influenced the composition of the personal narratives.

The dialogue journal event in this study provided an opportunity for the students to engage in oral and written dialogues that served communicative purposes. Shuy (1987) addressed the importance of dialogue journals as a means to keep the power of dialogue in classrooms. Dialogue journals, in this study and others, have been shown to have positive effects on children's writing. Teachers should consider the benefits of dialogue journal writing and consider ways that dialogue journals might be adapted according to the specific characteristics of their own students and classroom situations.

Reflections on Teacher as Researcher

The researcher was also the teacher in the classroom in which the dialogue journal literacy event took place. The roles of researcher and teacher will be collapsed through the use of the pronoun "I" in the following discussion of teacher–researcher.

Teacher–researchers ask questions that reflect their areas of interest and are concerned with specific instructional activities that take place in their classrooms (Bissex, 1987). One purpose of their research is to construct knowledge about matters that are important to them and to get a
better understanding of instructional events in their particular classrooms (Strickland, 1988). They hope that a better understanding of classroom processes can lead to better teaching. The value of teacher–research is that teachers get involved in their professional development and play an active role in answering their own questions.

In this study, I investigated questions of interest related to bilingual students’ literacy within a specific literacy event in order to learn about the relationships between social interaction and the uses of oral and written language. The dialogue journal event was selected as the focus for this study because it was in the students’ journals that I first noticed the children writing in both Spanish and English. I wanted to investigate the interaction that was taking place during this event that might have contributed to the students’ writing in both languages.

As a teacher–researcher I set aside time from the daily instructional tasks of the classroom in which I was normally occupied to observe students as they participated in the event. This was an unusual time since I was generally directly participating in instructional activities and it gave me the pleasure and luxury of being able to closely observe what a few students were doing. At the onset of this study, in the spring of 1985, there were few studies in bilingual children’s literacy and there was a growing interest in that area of study. I set out to conduct this study with the purpose of developing my own understanding of bilingual children’s uses of oral and written language and to contribute to the young field of bilingual children’s literacy. As a classroom teacher, I wanted to make informed curricular decisions in my classroom that would help the children in my classroom
grow as readers and writers. What I learned from the study, as it progressed, was that students had a real reason to select from among codes (Spanish and English) when they were sharing their writing with both bilingual and monolingual students. A result of the research was that I provided more opportunities for mixed language and ability grouping in reading and other instructional activities. Previously I had grouped bilingual students for instructional activities the majority of time according to their language and had unknowingly set up a segregated classroom in which the bilingual students had few opportunities to interact with the monolingual English students. During the dialogue journal literacy event I saw students choose to share their journal with students of varying linguistic and academic abilities and recognized the value and benefits that the students would reap from those interactions.

Another benefit from the research was the opportunity to analyze the usefulness of the event itself and to closely observe children's interactions over time. Through those observations I was able to identify and begin to understand the relations between teacher, children, and experiences as they read, wrote, and interacted with peers (Goodman, 1988). Several times during the period of data collection, I wondered if I should continue using the event because I had questions about the contrived nature of the written dialogues. I continued to make use of the event throughout the second-grade school year because students' engagement during the event was demonstrated through the amount of time they participated in the event as well as their enjoyment, which was communicated through the stories they told, their laughter, and play. Another reason I decided to continue the
activity was that it gave students an opportunity to write personal narratives. Through contact with Mary Kitagawa and an earlier manuscript of her book, I realized the importance of the personal narrative as a way for minority students to make connections with literacy. I also realized that the dialogue journals were a literacy event in which students' experiences could play an integral role and could serve as a means through which students could respond to each others' narratives.

Another effect the research had on me as a teacher was that I became actively involved in pursuing answers to my research questions and in sharing and discussing preliminary findings of my research at conferences and teacher-support groups. My involvement in classroom research led to my decision to enroll in a graduate program in language and literacy and proved a useful base from which I related my research questions, interests, and preliminary findings to the readings and assignments of graduate coursework. My involvement in ongoing classroom research helped me take full advantage of my graduate studies because of its immediate relevance to my research.

Now that this study is completed, I can look back and consider what I might have done differently in my classroom. One difference would be that I would not have required that all students participate in dialogue journals all the time, but instead would offer it as one option from among other literacy events for the students to select from. Gilbert's short interactions in which his sessions only averaged 13 minutes in comparison to approximately 30 minutes for the other case study students might be evidence that he was not as interested in the event as the other students. My primary interest in the
event was the personal narratives and the interactive nature of the written
dialogues. Besides the dialogue journals, I would provide other
opportunities through which students could reflect on, share, and respond to
their personal experiences through the use of other media besides writing,
such as drawing, puppets, and clay. These media were already part of other
classroom events such as the English–as–a–second language/literature
response event in which children responded to literature through a variety
of media, but I had kept separate the students' personal experiences and
their use of different media.

Another curriculum area in my classroom in which I incorporated the
students' personal experiences was science. I helped the students'
organize science interest groups in which they studied self-selected topics
of interest such as pigeons, guinea pigs, chicks, or gardening. Looking
back, I would have provided the students opportunities to write personal
narratives and other types of expressive writing about the topics they were
studying in their groups along with the usual science writing in which they
reported the results of their research. The changes I would have made in my
classroom are related to incorporating the children's personal experiences
in other aspects of the curriculum and providing different media through
which they could reflect on and share their experiences.

Teachers play an important role in helping children grow as readers
and writers. As teacher–researchers, teachers take an active role in
learning about what takes place in their classrooms in order to make better
informed curricular decisions. The concern for the reading achievement of
children has focused on reading methods and on ways to measure
student's reading achievements. In this focus other important matters have not received the same attention. Among those are "the content of reading (and) its function or purpose" (Goodman, Goodman, & Flores, 1979, p. 41). Bilingual children's response to literacy is part of, and not separate from, their general response to schooling. Goodman, Goodman, and Flores (1979) state:

If school is relevant, if its curriculum and goals are consistent with the functional needs of the pupils, if it accepts their language and culture and builds on it, then children will respond to school and grow. But if the school is irrelevant and insensitive, the pupils will only make whatever minimal accommodations they can to its demands. (p. 41)

Through this study I have become more aware of the importance of bilingual children's worlds and peer culture in their sense-making during a classroom literacy event. I have also learned about the power of play and peer routines to transform an event according to the students' meaning perspective and social purposes as they make sense of and appropriate a literacy event, according to their own experiences and backgrounds. The participant's meaning perspective has been the elusive goal of ethnography, and this study has pursued the goal of explicating bilingual children's perspectives on the uses of language and literacy during the social life of a literacy event.

In conclusion, studies of literacy from an ethnographic perspective are concerned with understanding literacy events in terms of the meaning that they hold for people who participate in them. In this study, the meaning perspectives of the students were investigated through the analysis of the
various ways that students appropriated the dialogue journal literacy event, the analysis of different ways of speaking and writing, and the way that the student's appropriations mediated peer relationships. An important element in understanding the event was the analysis of the students' use of oral and written language in relation to their specific appropriations of the event.
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