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CHAPTER I
FRAMING THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

FRAMING THE QUESTIONS

Recent position statements of the International Reading Association (1988) and the National Council of Teachers of English (1988) called literature the foundation of the language arts program in the elementary school. These statements reflect a growing interest among teachers and school administrators in using literature as the primary material of the elementary school reading program. A result of this movement towards "literature-based reading" is that more children in more elementary school classrooms will be reading, interpreting, and responding to more pieces of literature.

Classroom teachers seem to be keenly interested in using literature more and basal textbooks less, yet they also seem to have questions concerning how they should go about it. If the proliferation of guides to operating literature-based reading classrooms is an indicator, then grassroots interest in using literature as the primary material of the reading program is growing (Hepler, 1988). These books also point to classroom teachers' concerns about what they should be doing with literature in their classrooms.
But is good literature-based teaching only a collection of practices? If a teacher reads aloud, holds book discussion groups, and gives children lots of time for silent reading, is that teacher a literature-based teacher? Are all read alouds the same? Is silent reading the same in every classroom? Is one discussion group like any other? Experienced and successful literature-based teachers say there is more to teaching this way than a kit of good ideas and practices. They say that good teaching of reading with literature involves a way of looking at learning in general and at the reading of literature in particular. Good teaching, in their view, is more than knowing what to do. Shulman (1987) noted that good teaching involves not only the "management of a classroom" but also the "management of ideas." Unfortunately, research has little to say about how good literature-based teaching works (Tunnell & Jacobs, 1989). The practices of good literature-based reading teachers are far ahead of theory (Goodman, 1989).

Thus in spite of the increasing popularity of using literature with elementary school children, little is known about how teachers and classrooms facilitate the forms and the substance of children's interpretations of literature. Classroom teachers are introducing literature into their classrooms with their students with little knowledge of how what they are doing with literature influences how the children respond. Research has little to say about these matters.

The reading of literature is often viewed as a solitary act. Whatever interpretations of literature the reader makes are seen as occurring within that reader's mind. The classroom teacher and the researcher face a dilemma in that they have no way of knowing what a reader is making of a
piece of literature when the reader is reading silently. For either the classroom teacher or the researcher to learn and understand what interpretations a child has made of a piece of literature, that child must in some form make an interpretation public. In other words, the child must make a public response to literature.

As children's interpretations of literature are made public, they make their responses within a social situation which has a "frame" (Bateson, 1972; Goffman, 1974). Goffman described frame as "the principles of organization which govern social events" (p. 10). It seems reasonable to assume that a child would offer different responses to a piece of literature in substance and in form while talking alone to a friend, while talking alone to a teacher, and while participating in a discussion group. Each situation could occur within a single classroom, yet different responses could occur because each situation has different principles of organization and different people interacting with the same child. Though the topic may be the same in each situation, what is said may differ because each kind of situation is different. To describe and understand properly the interpretations of literature a child makes, the frames within which the responses take place must be described and understood (Fish, 1980; Rosenblatt, 1985; Bloom & Green, in press).

A frame consists of physical aspects, cultural events, and participants (Jacobs, 1987). Physical aspects in a frame in which children are responding to literature might include what books are available, the layout of the classroom, and the type of furniture present. Classroom assignments, reading aloud, and quiet reading are examples of cultural events in a literature frame. Participants in a literature frame might be
the reader, the teacher, and other class members, who together mediate and negotiate meaning (Chambers, 1985). The participants form what has been called "interpretive communities (Fish, 1980) or "a community of readers" (Hepler & Hickman, 1982).

Much of what the participants bring to a frame can be characterized as "stance." Bruner (1986) described stance as that which gives others clues about how to use our minds. Stance is a manner in which people view the world and use their minds. Stance also includes how people expect others to view the world and use their minds. Stance, then, is a posture of the mind. In Halliday's (1975) language, stance would be part of "register," with register being "the range of meaning potential that is activated by the semiotic properties of the situation" (p. 126). In other words, stance assists in defining the limits of possible meanings.

Though teachers rarely state their stances explicitly, no one can teach without transmitting a sense of stance, a sense of how the material is to be viewed. When material is presented, a stance toward that material can be that this is the final and unchallenged word on the subject. Or a stance can be an invitation to consider other alternatives. Thus, stance can open or close the process of wondering. Duckworth (1972) suggested that children's curiosity slows down in school because children's ideas are undervalued or deemed as unacceptable. The range of stances in this situation is narrow and conformity is required. However, if this process of wondering is opened, then there can be negotiation of meaning between teachers and students, "culture making," - the co-creation of shared knowledge. Students, instead of being receivers of knowledge, become agents of knowledge. Bruner argued that "what is needed is a basis of
discussing not simply the content of what is before us, but the possible stances one might take toward it" (Bruner, 1986, p. 129).

Earlier work on response to literature has focused upon stance as a disposition of the reader to interpret literature in a certain manner (e.g., Harding, 1968; Britton, 1970; Favat, 1977; Applebee, 1978; Galda, 1982; Holland, 1985; Rosenblatt, 1985). Medieval scholars wrote of readers interpreting The Bible literally, morally, allegorically, or anagogically. Britton (1970) argued that readers and writers could adopt participant or spectator roles toward written text. Favat (1977), Applebee (1978), and Galda (1982) presented arguments for children's responses to literature being influenced by the Piagetian stage of cognitive development the children were in. Pillar (1983) understood children's responses to fables in terms of Kohlberg's stages of moral development. Schlager (1978) argued that children's interest in certain kinds of novels was due to the match in psychological stages (according to Eriksen's scheme) between the protagonists of the novels and the child reader. Holland (1985) offered a psychoanalytic perspective to response through his idea of identity themes. Rosenblatt (1982) wrote of efferent and aesthetic reading. Squire's (1964) idea of "happiness binding," in which children are seen as frequently interpreting their stories so as to make them end happily, often ignoring unhappy events such as the death of a major character, is but one more example of stance. What each of these theorists and researchers share in common is that each attempted to describe response in terms of the manner in which readers use their minds towards literature, stances which appear to be present before the reader reads the written text.
These studies, with the exception of Rosenblatt, tended to view reading as one reader reading one book in isolation. But as has been argued earlier, reading in school is not just one reader with one book acting alone. Reading occurs within a frame. It is an event (Bloome & Green, in press) with participants and physical aspects. Reader's stances are situated. None of the studies cited in the previous paragraph were conducted in a classroom. Little is known about how children respond to literature in terms of frame.

There also is a "community of readers" present in every classroom. This suggests that there may be demonstration, collaboration, and negotiation of stances among the members of the community. Dyson (1987, 1988, 1989) has shown how children collaborate through their talk about their writing to make their "possible," literary worlds. However, in terms of responding to literature, very little is known about how members of the community of readers show and negotiate their stances toward literature.

An important and often neglected member of this community is the teacher. Using Rosenblatt's (1978) idea of aesthetic reading, Koehler (1988) identified four aesthetic teaching stances teachers can assume. Koehler argued that teachers can assume different aesthetic stances which show children the various possibilities each new reading holds. Koehler took a small step toward understanding the "management of ideas" in a classroom. Much more needs to be known about how the teacher, together with the children, show and negotiate their stances toward literature.

Smith (1981, 1988, 1989) argued that learning is in part a consequence of the company one keeps. Children learn by the demonstrations made by members of groups to which children wish to belong. DeFord (1981) found
that young children's writing was highly influenced by the kind of reading materials offered in the classroom. These materials offered the children demonstrations of written language. Edelsky, Draper, and Smith (1983) argued that the success experienced by the classroom teacher they studied was due in part to the "literacy deal" offered to and accepted by the students. Applying these ideas to stance, a classroom becomes a place where a teacher and children show each other ways of using their minds. They negotiate stances toward the nature of learning and toward the nature of literature. They demonstrate the manner in which they read and exhibit their expectations of stances for each other. Stance, then, could be viewed as a way of taking from text (Howard, 1974; Heath, 1983). Through demonstration members of the classroom show each other how they take from text. By holding expectations of stances for each other and by negotiating these stances among each other, members of the community collaborate in the manner in which they take from text.

In understanding stance in a literature-based reading classroom, it would not be enough to understand only the specific stances demonstrated and negotiated by the teacher and the children toward literature. Such stances would be embedded in other stances about learning, about classrooms, and about children and teachers as people and as learners. These stances could be described as the tone of the classroom (Van Manen, 1986). Stances then are layered. To understand the specific stances toward literature in a classroom, the general stances toward learning held by members of the class need to be described.

The first studies in interpretation of literature and reader response were studies in which the researcher controlled, constructed or ignored
the context. It seems, however, that to understand children's responses to literature as they occur within a classroom, it is less important to present them with a new situation and more important to describe the existing frames in which children are responding to literature. With theorists such as Rosenblatt (1978) and Fish (1980) arguing that the context influenced interpretation, researchers began to study children's responses to literature in context. Studies such as Hickman (1979), Hepler (1982), and Kiefer (1983) looked at children's responses to literature as they occurred within the children's classrooms. These studies were important in that they showed what children were doing with books in the classrooms they studied. They showed researchers where researchers needed to look in order to study what children do with books. Though Hickman, Hepler, and Kiefer each noted that the setting seemed to be the key to the rich responses to literature they observed the children making, none of the studies was actually a study of the context. What is missing from the research on children's responses to literature are not studies in context but studies of the context. McClure's (1985) study of poetry in a fifth and sixth grade classroom and Cochran-Smith's (1985) study of a preschool are among the few studies which describe in rich detail the context in which the children were interpreting literature. There is a lack of research in this area, especially on second and third grade children and their classrooms.
THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The questions this study will address are:

Given a classroom of literature-based teacher, what is the social context in which children and their teacher respond to literature?

In what events (classroom activities and situations) do children and their teacher respond to literature?

How do children and their teacher respond to literature during these events?

What stances do the children and their teacher demonstrate toward literature?

What stances do the children and their teacher demonstrate toward learning and toward their classroom?

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to describe and understand the children's and their teacher's responses to literature as these responses occur in the context of their classroom and to understand these responses in terms of the events and stances present in their classroom. In Shulman's language, this study will look not only at the "management of the classroom" or the structure of the literature events but also will look at the "management of ideas" or the stances demonstrated and negotiated by the children and their teacher.

It is also a purpose of this study to make this description in reference to a classroom of a teacher who has been identified by her supervisors, her
peers, and the parents of her students as being a successful literature-based teacher. Since practice in literature-based teaching is outstripping theory, perhaps theory can be informed by studying a classroom of an experienced literature-based teacher who is recognized as being successful and good (Cazden, 1983).

This study will describe the responses to literature of children and their teacher in a literature-based classroom. There has been little research conducted on literature-based classrooms. Likewise, there have been few studies of the social context in which children and their teacher respond to literature. This study should offer insight into the operations of a literature-based classroom and its influence upon the children's and their teacher's responses to literature.
CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

Readers read and respond to literature in social situations. It was argued in the first chapter that part of the reader's construction of meaning of a text is the assuming of a stance toward that text. There is increasing interest in using literature in elementary school classrooms, however, there is very little research available on what teachers and students in successful literature-based classrooms do with and say about literature. Surely the social events constructed in the classroom by teachers and students and the stances they assume toward literature are important. This brief background is the frame for the following research questions:

Given a classroom of a literature-based teacher, what is the social context in which children and their teacher respond to literature?

In what events (classroom activities and situations) do children and their teacher respond to literature?

How do children and their teacher respond to literature during these events?

What stances do the children and their teacher demonstrate toward literature?
What stances do the children and their teacher demonstrate toward learning and toward their classroom?

This chapter will explore the theory and research which are background to the themes implied in these questions. Themes of stance, event, frame, reader response, social aspects of reading, and literature in the classroom will be discussed. The discussion will be in four parts. The first part will explore theoretical writings in cognitive psychology, sociolinguistics, and literary criticism as they pertain to stance and reading as performance. The second part will examine research in reader response with an emphasis upon social aspects of children's responses to literature and upon readers' stances. The third section will deal with research on event, frame, and reading as a social process. The final section will look at the research literature on the use of literature in elementary classrooms.

READING AS PERFORMANCE

Thinking as Creating Possibilities of Meaning

In order to make sense of their experiences, human beings construct meaning (Gruber & Voneche, 1977; Donaldson, 1978; Vygotsky, 1978, 1986; Bruner, 1986). Human beings are builders of "models of the world" (Donaldson, 1978), "theories of the world" (Smith, 1985), or "possible worlds" (Goodman, 1978, 1984; Bruner, 1986). Human beings construct these possible worlds through two primary and irreducible modes of cognition; logic and story (Bruner, 1986). It has been argued, then, that
logic (Gruber & Voneche, 1977) and stories (Hardy, 1977; Gregory, 1977; Bateson, 1979; Sutton-Smith, 1981; Rosen, n.d., 1986, Wells, 1986) are fundamental and primary modes by which a person organizes and makes sense of experience. As stories are formed of language and as language is a cultural product, the story mode of thinking is highly susceptible to cultural and linguistic influences (Bruner, 1987). These cultural and linguistic influences eventually achieve the power to structure perceptual experience and memory. Thus "possible worlds" of reality are constructed by humans from among the possibilities of worlds provided by the tools of culture and language (Bruner, 1987).

There are two important ideas for this discussion in this metaphor of cognition as creating possible worlds of reality. One is that this metaphor is a paradigm (Kuhn, 1970). It provides a frame for thinking about how human beings think. It is a way of looking at learning in general and reading in particular. Smith (1985) argued that language learning is not just information shunting but creating meaning. Reading, then, is not a reader receiving information but is rather a reader creating and exploring worlds. This metaphor of thinking as world construction is one which shapes this review of the research literature and the description and analysis of the study which follows.

The second idea is that of possibility. Donaldson (1978) argued that young human beings actively try to make sense of their world by asking questions, by wanting to know. "These questionings and these strivings imply some primitive sense of possibility which reaches beyond a realization of how things are to a realization of how they might be" (Donaldson, 1978, p. 87). Donaldson went on to state that humans' sense of
what is actual is heightened by considering what is possible. To borrow Bruner's phrase, learning is an active construction of a possible world by considering what is possible in that world.

Learning to read for Donaldson is a matter of children being in a situation which will encourage them to consider possibilities of meaning and interpretation of the text. To make meaning one considers the possible meanings of the text and selects one (or more) which seems most plausible. Donaldson argued that "the thoughtful consideration of possibilities... can take place only when there is a situation with enough structure in it to reduce the possibilities to some manageable set" (p. 100). Donaldson meant by this that we learn by considering possibilities. If there are too many possibilities to consider, there is a possibility overload and learning is difficult.

Some of these possible worlds humans construct are worlds of reality, while others are imaginary, literary "worlds of actors, objects, and actions that exist through words alone" (Dyson, 1987, p. 396; see also Bruner, 1986). Children are builders of literary possible worlds, not only through their writing and telling of stories, but also through the composing acts of reading and listening to stories (Tierney & Pearson, 1983; Baker & Greene, 1977; Barton, 1986).

The importance of possibility will reappear throughout the review in terms of how literature is approached by readers and how it is dealt with in the classroom.
Stance as the Way Humans Use Their Minds

As was stated in Chapter One, Bruner (1986) described stance as that which gives others clues about how to use their minds. Stance expresses the attitudes of speakers and writers toward the topic expressed and the attitude toward the audience of the utterance or piece of writing (Feldman, 1974; Feldman & Wertsch, 1976; Bruner, 1984). Stance expresses the manner in which speakers and writers view the world and how speakers and writers use their minds toward it. Stance also includes how speakers and writers expect others to view the world and use their minds. Stance can be thought of as a posture of the mind. Stance can be considered part of register (Halliday, 1975). Halliday stated that register is "the range of meaning potential that is activated by the semiotic properties of the situation" (p. 126). Stance assists in defining the limits of possible meanings.

Feldman and Wertsch (1976) stated that stance (they call it "stance indicating") "is heavily dependent upon the speaker-listener context for interpretation. Only in an appropriate context does a listener understand the full meaning of the linguistic device used to indicate stance. An example might be a teacher saying to a student "Will you please sit down?" The decontextualized text implies that the listener is being asked a question to which, theoretically, the listener could respond "yes" or "no." However, in the context of a classroom, this statement is not actually a question but a demand. The student is actually not being offered any choice of responses.

Gumperz (1982) argued a similar point for his term "conversational inference," which he defines as "the situated or context-bound process of
interpretation, by means of which participants in an exchange assess others' intentions, and on which they base their responses" (p. 153). Gumperz stated that it is through verbal and non-verbal responses, that speakers and listeners indicate to each other how they are interpreting the other's response.

Stances are implicit rather that explicit. Feldman and Wertsch (1976) studied the differences in teachers' uses of stance indicators between talk with their students and talk with other adults. They chose as their unit of analysis modal verbs such as "may," "should," and "could" as indicators of stance. Modals imply less certainty than the absence of modals. (Compare "the cat sat on the mat" with "the cat might sit on the mat.") They found that teachers used far fewer of these stance indicators with their students than they did with other adults. Furthermore, the teachers were unaware that any differences existed. Feldman and Wertsch speculated that teachers may be expressing different views of information. To their students the teachers expressed the view of knowledge as objective facts. To their peers they expressed a view of knowledge which was less certain.

While Feldman and Wertsch refused to pass judgment upon whether this kind of stance of teachers toward information as objective fact is beneficial or detrimental, Bruner (1986) argued that such a stance is detrimental. Bruner stated that no one can teach without transmitting a sense of how the material is to be viewed. If the stance toward the material is that the material is the unchallenged word on the subject, the process of wondering is closed down. In Donaldson's terms there is little opportunity to consider possibility. However, if the stance taken is an invitation to consider other alternatives or possibilities, then, Bruner argued, the process of wondering
is opened. If the process of wondering is opened, then there can be negotiation of meaning, what Bruner called "culture making," the co-creation of shared knowledge. Instead of being receivers of knowledge, students are constructors of knowledge, constructors of possible worlds. Bruner wrote that "what is needed is a basis of discussing not simply the content of what is before us, but the possible stances one might take toward it" (Bruner, 1986, p. 129). The purpose of instruction is the creation, rather than the transmission, of knowledge (Hanssen, 1986).

To summarize, stance is part of how humans consider that which is possible. It involves an attitude or a point of view toward the content of an utterance or a piece of writing and toward the audience of the utterance or piece of writing. Stance also includes expectations of speakers and writers toward the stances the audience will use. By providing a perspective through which content is to be viewed, stance can limit the number of possible meanings to a manageable number. However, if the stance is too narrow, the entire process of wondering can be closed.

Stances Toward Literature - Views from Literary Theory

If stance is a posture of the mind toward some content, then stances which are directed toward literature are dispositions of the reader to interpret the literature in a certain manner. In this section different literary theorists' conceptualizations of how readers read literature will be discussed.

Langer (1953) argued that though literature is made up of language, which is discursive, literature is also art, which, Langer suggested, must be
viewed as a whole. Literature for Langer is not mere words nor even arrangements of words. Rather, literature is created and built up through the use of literary elements. These literary elements provide the form around which the story is created. Stories are not merely linguistic creations, but works of literary art. As LeGuin (1979) put it, "The artist deals with what cannot be said in words. The artist whose medium is fiction does this in words. The novelist says in words what cannot be said in words" (pp. 158-159). This means that novelists use words to make symbols and metaphors. The literary work should be properly seen as being composed of these elements rather than mere words. It is these symbols and metaphors which implicitly rather than explicitly tell the story. Stories then are more than just words. They are forms consisting of words which can be endowed with the power to say more than just the words alone.

Langer seemed to suggest that there is a wholeness to literature which may not exist in other forms of written discourse. Britton (1970, 1982, 1984, 1989), building upon this distinction which Langer makes, described two "roles" one may assume toward written language. Britton argued that language may be used to do something or to make something. When language is used to do something, the focus is upon the verbal transaction and this Britton called the participant role. An example of participant writing would be a piece of informational text, where the purpose of the piece and the purpose for reading it is to gain information. Reading in the participant role implies that the reader will take some sort of action as a result of the reading or at least intends to have the reading result in some sort of action. (If the reader does not find the information sought, then
that participant reading could result, at least directly, in little or no action.) When language is used to make something, the focus is upon the verbal object, the world created by the writing, and this Britton called the spectator role. An example of the spectator role would be writing or reading a novel.

Britton (1970, 1982, 1984) argued that the relationship of the reader to the text in the participant role is piecemeal, that is, the reader is trying to accomplish something through the reading and that something could be accomplished at any point during the reading. Participant reading, according to Britton, carries with it a social demand for action. Spectator reading, on the other hand, is freed from any social demands for action and is a more detached reading. To come to any meaning of the written discourse in the spectator role, the reader must have a sense of the whole verbal object. The spectator reserves immediate judgment. Unlike the characters about whom the spectator is reading, the spectator's perspective is broader, it is not bound by the moment.

Britton was suggesting that one can take two different stances toward written language. A participant stance is a stance of doing and action. A reader who reads with this stance expects to participate in the affairs of the reader's world. A spectator stance is a stance of making. Here the reader resides in the world created by the text. Rather than participating in the affairs of this world, the spectator observes the affairs of the virtual world offered by the text.

Harding (1937, 1962) offered a conceptualization of stance virtually identical to that of Britton's. Like Britton, Harding discussed response as
"doing things" (what Britton called the participant role) and as detached evaluator, which is the role the spectator typically assumes.

Part of the confusion over Britton's and Harding's terminology lies in that Britton was attempting to use the same language to describe the relationship of the writer and the reader to the written text. There is an implication in this argument that readers should adopt a stance appropriate to the piece of writing. This seems to assume that readers need to adopt stances similar to the ones authors adopt while writing. It seems possible that a piece of writing which was ostensibly participant in the mind of the writer, such as the essays of Thomas Paine, might be read at a later date for the beauty and craftsmanship of the language. It seems that Britton did not recognize that readers may have other legitimate purposes for reading which may differ from the author's purposes in writing the piece.

Like many of the theorists who described the reading of literature, Langer, Britton, and Harding appeared to attach a higher value to a particular type of reading, in this case spectator reading. Britton, in particular, seemed to suggest that there is more satisfaction for the reader when the reader adopts a spectator stance. Furthermore, Britton implied that proper spectator role reading can only be achieved when the reader maintains a detached involvement with the text. In Britton's scheme there appears to be not only proper times when readers ought to assume spectator roles, but also proper ways readers ought to assume these roles.

Rosenblatt (1989) stated that "essential to any reading is the reader's adoption, conscious or unconscious, of a stance" (p. 158). Stance, said Rosenblatt, refers to the reader's purpose in reading. She argued that there are two stances which readers may adopt, an efferent stance and an
aesthetic stance (Rosenblatt, 1978, 1980, 1982, 1985a, 1985b, 1989). An efferent stance refers to the kind of reading in which the reader's attention is focused upon what is to be carried away or retained after the reading. Reading a recipe and reading a poem for the main idea could both be examples of predominantly efferent reading. In aesthetic reading the reader's attention is upon what the reader is experiencing during the reading. "The aesthetic reader experiences and savors the qualities of the structured ideas, situations, scenes, personalities, and emotions that are called forth and participates in the tensions, conflicts, and resolutions as they unfold" (Rosenblatt, 1989, p. 159). By adopting an aesthetic stance, the reader has a "lived-through" experience with a text (Rosenblatt, 1978). The reader's attention is fixed upon these experiences which the reader is evoking during the reading. The reader's primary purpose, then, is fulfilled during the event in contrast to efferent reading where the fulfillment of purpose generally occurs after the reading.

Rosenblatt noted that no one adopts either stance in a pure form. Nor is there any hard and fast line which separates efferent reading from aesthetic reading. She stated that the two stances, rather than being a dichotomy, reside along a continuum. Most readings, she believes, rest somewhere near the middle. Readers' stances also do not remain stable across an entire text, but may change, or rather, vary in degree throughout a reading, one moment the aesthetic may dominate, the next the efferent may prevail.

The distinction between aesthetic and efferent reading comes from what the reader does, the stance the reader assumes and not from the text. Rosenblatt noted that any text can be read predominantly from either
stance, though some texts may be more rewarding to readings from one
stance or the other.

While Britton, Harding, and Rosenblatt are the only theorists to use
terminology such as stance and role to describe reader's interpretive
relationships to written text, other theorists have explored this
relationship. Medieval scholars maintained that The Bible could be read in
four different ways. Literal readings hold the written text as history, an
account of events which actually occurred. Moral readings search the text
for advice on proper living or on the nature of good and evil. Allegorical
readings hold that the written text actually represents something not stated
explicitly, a symbol for something else. Anagogical readings of the text
attempt to unlock the deep mystical meaning of the text and of the nature
of truth. Frye (1957) used these four kinds of readings in his attempt to
form a science of literature.

Richards (1929) maintained that the task of the reader is to do "close
reading" of the text in order to determine its true meaning. This view holds
that a text could be studied objectively. While Richards acknowledged that
readers hold different interpretations of a particular text, these differences
are the result of improper attention to the written text, differences which
proper reading should correct. Richards' position was that there is one
true meaning of a text and it is the reader's job to figure out that meaning.
This meaning, according to Richards, resides not in the author's intent but
in the actual words printed upon the page. What happens when such a
stance is adopted in a classroom is that one particular reading takes on an
authoritarian relationship to other meanings. Generally, it is the
instructor's reading which assumes the role of "best reading" and the task
of the students is to figure out what the instructor's reading is (Rogers, 1988).

Hirsch (1976) took a position similar to Richards' in that Hirsch also believed there is one meaning of text. Hirsch differed from Richards in that Hirsch argued that the one meaning resides in the author's intent. Given this conceptualization of meaning, a possible stance a reader could assume would be questing after the author's intent, especially given that anything less than knowledge of author intent is not the true meaning of the text.

For Barthes (1975) reading is play, a pleasurable "romp" through a text "writing" meaning with disregard to outside interference. Barthes viewed any outside pressure upon the reader to determine meaning as terroristic upon the reader's pleasure of the text (Eagleton, 1983).

Society of the Friends of the Text: its members would have nothing in common (for there is not necessary agreement on the texts of pleasure) but their enemies: fools of all kinds, who decree foreclosure of the text and of its pleasure, either by cultural conformism or by intransigent rationalism (suspecting a "mystique" of literature) or by political moralism or by criticism of the signifier or by stupid pragmatism or by snide vacuity or by destruction of the discourse, loss of verbal desire. (Barthes, 1975, p. 14-15)

The idea that reading ought to be pleasurable is one which many critics of children's literature have argued. Darton (1982) began his tome on children's books in England with "(b)y 'children's books' I mean printed works produced ostensibly to give children spontaneous pleasure, and not primarily to teach them, nor solely to make them good, nor to keep them profitably quiet" (p. 1). Darton argued throughout his book against adults imposing a moral agenda upon children's books and children's readings of
books. Huck (Huck, Hepler, & Hickman, 1987) argued that the primary purpose in sharing literature with children is that children might discover delight in books and that nothing teachers and other adults do should stand in the way of this purpose. These arguments made by Barthes, Darton, and Huck for reading as pleasure share much in common with Rosenblatt's idea of the aesthetic stance. Implicit in the idea of reading for pleasure is the spontaneity of the reading and the lack of outside pressure to produce something after the reading, two features of the aesthetic stance.

Eagleton (1983) took exception to Barthes' extolling of the pleasures of reading without outside pressure. He referred to Barthes' stance as self-indulgent and hedonistic, especially in light of a world "where others lack not only books but food" (p. 83). Eagleton argued that literature really doesn't exist as an identifiable object. What does exist is rhetoric. The reading of literature then becomes political, or at least wrapped in political intention.

Tiemey and Pearson (1983) argued that "the alignment a reader or writer adopts can have an overriding influence" on the reading (p. 572). They described alignment as consisting of the stances readers assume and the roles within which readers immerse themselves. They described stance as the relationship of the reader to the writer. Stances of the reader toward the writer might be intimate, neutral, passive, sympathetic, or critical. Their description of role seems a bit like Britton's. Role, according to Tierney and Pearson, is the manner in which the reader immerses himself within the text, either as on onlooker or as a participant. Tierney and Pearson's use of stance is more specialized than the definition of stance.
which has been argued in this chapter. What Tierney and Pearson called "alignment" is much closer to this report's conceptualization of stance.

Tierney and Pearson argued that alignment is the "foothold from which meaning can be more readily negotiated" (p. 573). New readings come from readers trying out new alignments. They suggested that students ought to be rereading texts with different alignments. They implied that the role of the teacher of literature is to provide situations where readers can try out different alignments.

This body of work suggests that any reading of a text involves the reader adopting a stance toward the text. Looking over the range of writings on stance or on readers' purposes in reading suggests that there are many possible purposes or stances readers might take on in reading a text.

Tompkins (1980) noted that theorists' conceptualizations of the reader's purpose in reading come with moral wrappings. Barthes, Darton, and Huck, each in their own way were adamant about the "goodness" of reading for pleasure. Eagleton felt that such "hedonism" is morally wrong, that literature and readings of it should perhaps be empowering to the powerless. Hirsch and Richards made little pretense that some readings are better than others. Rosenblatt, while more tolerant of different kinds of readings, lamented that certain literature, which would be more rewarding if read aesthetically, too often in schools is read efferently. While there may be no way of escaping moralism, its presence in each conceptualization of stance suggests that in any classroom certain kinds of stances, and thus certain kinds of readings, will be more highly prized by those in authority over other readings and stances.
Theoretical Models of Reading - Reading as Performance

Stance has been discussed as the reader's purpose in reading, a disposition to interpret the literary text in a certain manner. Assuming stances enables readers to gain a foothold on meaning. It raises the possibilities of some meanings while lowering the possibilities of others. The reader, however, does not adopt a stance toward literature in isolation. Reading does not occur in a vacuum (Meck, 1987). This section will discuss several models of reading literature which come from literary theory. Particular emphasis will be upon the explanation of the social nature of reading literature.

Rosenblatt's (1978, 1982, 1985a, 1985b,) theory of reading suggests that the act of reading is a transaction between the text and the reader. According to Rosenblatt, the literary work does not exist until a reader takes up a text and reads it.

A two-way, or better, a circular, process can be postulated, in which the reader responds to the verbal stimuli offered by the text, but at the same time he must draw selectively on the resources of his own fund of experience and sensibility to provide and organize the substance of his response. Out of this new experience, the literary work is formed. (Rosenblatt, 1978, p. 43)

The literary work is evoked by the transaction of the reader's background knowledge, beliefs, and emotions. The key word is transaction. By this Rosenblatt meant that the reader and the text influence each other. In other words, neither the text nor the reader remain fixed during the reading. The reader's stances may shift which influences the evocation of
the literary work. This shift may be due to something the reader reads, thus the "circular" process which Rosenblatt described.

This evoked work is the "lived-through" process of building up the work. Rosenblatt stated that readers "perform" texts, partially under the guidance of the written text, partially under the guidance of the reader, and partially under the guidance of the context in which the reading occurs. Reading is an event which occurs under particular circumstances (Rosenblatt, 1989). As such, the stance a reader adopts toward a text may change as the circumstances change, even though the same written text is being read in each circumstance.


Iser (1978) wrote that readers compose or perform texts by bringing to bear a repertoire and strategies. Texts are underdetermined, according to Iser, and it is the reader's job to "fill in the gaps." The text serves as the monitor for "gap-filling as Iser saw the repertoire and strategies employed by the reader as being products of the reader's interaction with the language of the text.

While Iser seemed to believe that the reader's strategies for "performing" a text are a result of interacting with the language of the text, Culler (1975, 1980) took a different view. After first arguing that the
form and meaning of a literary text are not in the text itself, Culler (1980) wrote:

To account for the form and meaning of literary works is to make explicit the special conventions and procedures of interpretation that enable readers to move from the linguistic meaning of sentences to the literary meaning of works. To explain facts about the form and meaning works have for readers is to construct hypotheses about the conditions of meaning, and hypotheses about the conditions of meaning are claims about the conventions and interpretive operations applied in reading. In brief, I am arguing that if the study of literature is a discipline, it must become a poetics: a study of the conditions of meaning and thus a study of reading. (p. 50)

Culler was clearly making a distinction between what he calls the "linguistic meaning of sentences" and the "literary meaning of works." Literary meaning for Culler is tied to the "conditions of meaning" which he described as the "conventions and interpretive operations applied in reading." Culler argued there is meaning in the reading because the reader has read in a certain manner, applying a theory of discourse to the written text (Culler, 1975). Readers bring to a text an understanding of what literary discourse is. This understanding tells readers what to look for, and the meaning made is a product of this looking.

Culler differed from Iser in that Culler ascribed the form of the work and its subsequent meaning to the reader, while Iser seemed to argue that the form is in the work itself. For Culler the reader's repertoire and strategies are what the reader has learned from previous experiences with literature and with other people. Reading is readers applying the conventions they know to written texts and not vice versa.

Todorov (1980) in a point similar to Bruner's (1986) argued that the act of reading literature is the act of constructing an imaginary universe. He
stated that this act of construction was different from comprehension. Literary texts, according to Todorov, consist of signified facts and symbolized facts. Signified facts are understood, all the reader needs is knowledge of the language in which the text is written. Symbolized facts are interpreted, and interpretations vary from one reader to another. An example might be from Sendak’s (1963) *Where the Wild Things Are*. Readers would agree that the written text says “that very night in Max’s room a forest grew...” These are signified facts. However, to suggest that Max is dreaming or pretending that the forest is growing in his room is interpretation and relies upon symbolized facts. These facts go beyond the information given in the sentence and rely upon other information in the story and in the illustrations. What Todorov seemed to be suggesting is that signified facts are comprehended, but the symbolized facts, which are interpreted, are those which the reader uses to construct the imaginary world.

This distinction between comprehension and interpretation should be considered fluid. For example, a three-year-old child when read “The Gingerbread Man” (Rockwell, 1975) insisted that the Gingerbread Man and the fox were friends, that the fox wanted to help the Gingerbread Man across the river, and that the fox did not eat the Gingerbread Man. The text at this point reads:

> So the little gingerbread man jumped on the fox’s nose, and the fox threw back his head and snapped his sharp teeth. “Oh dear,” said the gingerbread man, “I am a quarter gone!”
> The next minute he said, “Now I am half gone!”
> And the next minute he said, “Oh, my goodness gracious! I am three quarters gone!”
> And then the gingerbread man never said anything more at all. (Rockwell, 1975, p. 44)
This is an example of "happiness binding" (Squire, 1964). The child has constructed a happy ending to the story by not taking into account the unhappy event of the Gingerbread Man being eaten by the fox. This child's interpretation is also an example of what Hunt (1985) would call a "necessary misreading," a misreading from the adult perspective but necessary in that it comes from the child's point of view. What most readers would call a signified fact (the gingerbread man is eaten) is for this reader a symbolized fact. Her interpretation or construction of the story is different from the conventional one, though necessary and appropriate from this child's point of view.

In terms of reading, signified facts might be considered those facts which traditionally fall under the rubrics of decoding and, in some cases, comprehension. This aspect of reading might fit well with the more mechanical theories of reading, either bottom-up theories, interactional, or top-down theories (Samuels & Kamil, 1984). Symbolized facts might be considered as those which fall under critical reading and fit well with transactional (Rosenblatt, 1978) or composing models of reading. Meaning occurs when symbolized facts are interpreted.

Readers "create meaning through interpreting, imposing form as it were" (Sawyer, 1987). This brings us back to Culler. The constructing of literary, possible worlds through reading or listening to stories occurs through the imposing of form upon text. Culler, Iser, and Rosenblatt, each in their own way, described the reader's act of reading a piece of literature as a performance.
While Bauman's (1977, 1986) investigations were on oral narratives, he noted that the conceptualizations of reading offered by literary theorists were similar to the manner in which he conceptualized oral narrative. Given this similarity, a brief discussion of Bauman's idea of performance will help in understanding what may be involved in understanding reading as performance. Bauman (1977) stated that performance establishes an interpretive frame, a set of guidelines which shape meaning. This suggests that how and in what context a text is performed matters as much as what the text is, if indeed the two can be separated. Surely the stance of the performer will matter greatly in the performance.

Performance is also culturally situated. Bauman (1986) wrote:

Oral performance, like all human activity, is situated, its form, meaning, and functions rooted in culturally defined scenes or events -- bounded segments of the flow of behavior and experience that constitute meaningful contexts for action, interpretation, and evaluation. (p. 3)

Performance is keyed to an event. Taken together, the reader's performance of a text is highly dependent upon the stances a reader takes. However, the taking on of stances does not occur in isolation, it occurs within an event, or more likely is itself an event. This suggests that to understand reader's stances, researchers need to look at the "culturally defined events" in which readers adopt stances or make their stances public.

Fish (1980) argued that the reading of literature is not an act of construing what is already present but is an act of constructing. Readers do not decode stories, they make them. Meaning is brought to the text by the reader. While potentially the number of possible meanings of a written
text is limitless, in actuality the number of possible meanings is limited. This limitation on meaning is established by the reader's interpretive community, the social group and situation in which readers find themselves. Any given interpretive community has a finite number of interpretive strategies, thus any meanings made by a reader are those which the conventions of the reader's interpretive community make possible. In a sense what Fish was stating is that the range of stances readers might assume is determined by the people and the situation in which readers reside. According to Fish what happens in classrooms influenced by "New Criticism," guessing what is in the head of the instructor, happens more or less in any literature classroom. Students' public display of their reading conforms to the stances offered by the authority of the interpretive community. According to Fish, outside pressure, which Barthes views as terroristic, is unavoidable.

Howard (1974) in his introduction to Barthes S/Z wrote that a reader's instinctive enjoyment of reading is "acculturated." He wrote:

We require an education in literature as in the sentiments in order to discover that what we assumed -- with the complicity of our teachers -- was nature is in fact culture, that what was given is no more than a way of taking. (p. ix)

Howard is arguing that the way in which readers make meaning from a written text is a learned way of taking from text. This perspective of reading as a cultural product has been supported by the research on reading and narrative of Cochran-Smith (1985), Cook-Gumperz and Green (1984), Heath (1983), and Scollon and Scollon (1982).
What these models of reading suggest is that an interpretation of literature is not something to be found in the written text, nor can it be located solely in the reader. Interpretation is a social activity; it is a context-specific act (Suleiman, 1980). It is the result of what Rosenblatt described as the transaction of a reader and a text in a situation, what Fish called interpretive communities, what Culler called reading conventions, what Bauman termed performance rooted in event, or what Howard called a way of taking. Disregarding the fine differences between these theorists, each conceptualization holds that, in Meek's (1987) phrase, "reading doesn't happen in a vacuum" (p. 6).

To summarize this section, readers take on stances toward literature. Though some theorists such as Britton and Rosenblatt viewed stance as bipolar and global, there are many different conceptualizations of readers' purposes in reading written text. There are then many possible stances a reader can assume. These stances can be varied and can be fluid across a reading. The readers' stances are a foothold upon which meaning is built. As Rosenblatt said, in order to read a reader must take on a stance toward the text to be read. Stance is part of the repertoire a reader calls upon to perform a text. Readers, however, do not perform texts in isolation. Their performances are rooted in a culturally defined event. This implies that to understand readers' stances, the events in which readers make their stances public need to be described.
RESEARCH INTO READER RESPONSE

The previous section discussed various theoretical writings on stance and the reading of literature. The attempt was made to define stance and discuss it in terms of stances readers take toward written text. It was argued that readers perform texts and that assuming stances are part of readers' repertoires. Furthermore, readers perform texts in situations or events. Thus, when readers take on stances toward a written text, they do so within a cultural event.

This next section will look at research into readers' responses to literature. The focus will be upon studies which looked at readers' responses to literature as being influenced by readers' stances and studies of the social aspects of readers' responses to literature.

Stance as Pre-disposition of the Reader

Britton (1968) suggested that children in different Piagetian stages of cognitive development will make different kinds of responses to literature. Specifically, he stated that until children have passed through the stage of concrete operations, they will not be aware of the nature of the processes which have led them to satisfaction. Britton seemed to imply that while children who are not yet in the stage of formal operations will have vibrant experiences with books and should not be rushed into higher level responses, the responses of these readers are "immature." Britton also seemed to imply that a child's stage of cognitive development serves as a
limit upon that child's ability to respond to literature. Young children by nature of their biology are incapable of making "mature" responses.

Britton's student, Arthur Applebee set out to investigate age-related differences in children's responses to literature. Applebee (1978, 1985) asked a group of six-year-old, nine-year-old, thirteen-year-old, and seventeen-year-old children to talk about their favorite story. His data suggested that each group talked about their story in a manner different from the other three groups. The six-year-olds tended to talk about their story in the form of a retelling. Applebee interpreted this to mean that the younger children were making a one-to-one correspondence between the representation and the original experience. Applebee stated that these responses were "enactive," the children seemed to retell the stories in order to relive them. He suggested that this attitude may be why young children request to be read the same story repeatedly. Responses from the six-year-olds which were not retellings, Applebee interpreted as reflecting the Piagetian characteristics of centration and ego-centrism.

The nine-year-olds tended to offer a different kind of response from the six-year-olds. These children would summarize their stories, showing the ability to organize and classify. Applebee argued that the differences in the kinds of response offered by the two groups of children was due to the Piagetian stage of cognitive development the children were in. Retelling as re-experiencing, centration, and ego-centricism Applebee classed as characteristic responses of the pre-operational child. Responses which were summaries, demonstrating the ability to classify, Applebee called responses typical of the concrete operational child.
The responses of thirteen-year-old students showed them moving beyond the information given in the text and toward analyzing characters and reflecting upon the readers' own likes and dislikes of the text. The seventeen-year-olds' talk showed an ability to generalize about the work, to consider themes and points of view, and to express the effect the work had upon their own views. Applebee interpreted these data as supporting two other stages of response which he believes corresponds to Piaget's stage of formal operations.

Applebee seemed to suggest that cognitive development plays an important role in how children respond to literature, not in the sense of what the children will do, but rather, what the children will not be able to do. Having the ability to do something, such as being able to talk about theme, does not insure that the person will actually do it, while not having the ability to talk about theme implies that the person could not do so. In light of developments in cognitive psychology since the publication of his study, some of Applebee's claims must be hedged. Donaldson (1978) showed that it is dangerous to assume that any stage of cognitive development narrowly limits a child's ability to do certain kinds of thinking. Social psychologists argue that the social situation is also important, to observe the child at the child's cognitive best the child must be acting in a social situation which makes "human sense" (Donaldson, 1978) to the child. Applebee (1985) noted that his model does not account for the social situation in which children respond. A Vygotskian perspective (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986) might investigate what the children could do with stories given a supportive environment.
Galda (1982), like Applebee, investigated children's taking on of the spectator role. She looked at the oral responses of three fifth grade girls to Constance Greene's *Beat the Turtle Drum* and to Katherine Paterson's *Bridge to Terabithia*. Two of the girls made responses which Galda calls "reality bound." By this she meant that the girls compared the stories to real life, dismissing parts as not possible in real life. Because these two girls did not evaluate the story according to the terms of the story world, Galda interpreted her data as showing that these two girls were not assuming a spectator role. These two girls also tended to classify and break the texts down into parts in their talk about the book. Galda suggested that classification and "reality boundedness" are characteristics of the concrete operational child and that these characteristics limited these two girls' ability to assume a spectator stance, to form "mature literary judgments", and to make "mature literary responses". The third reader could, according to Galda, assume a spectator stance because she evaluated the story world according to the rules of the story world itself and because in her responses she considered the texts as wholes.

While Applebee (1978, 1985) found evidence that the spectator role begins to develop in children around the age of two, Galda seemed to imply that a reader cannot assume a"true" spectator role until that reader analyzes and evaluates texts as wholes, abilities Galda seemed to argue cannot emerge in children until they pass out of the stage of concrete operations. It is perplexing that Galda can claim developmental differences in her informants when her informants are roughly the same age and were observed over a two week period of time. Neither the size of the group studied nor the length of time the group was studied allows Galda to dismiss
a host of other reasons for the differences in the girls' responses. These reasons could include reader interest in the written text, reader personality, the sense the reader was making of the research situation, how the reader perceived what Galda wanted them to do, and the reader's relationship with the other two readers.

Galda also seemed to be passing a value judgment upon the responses of her readers by repeatedly using the word "mature" to describe the responses of the third reader. By arguing that the other two readers were incapable of assuming a spectator role because of their stage of cognitive development, she seemed to be arguing that these readers were lesser or incomplete readers who gave lesser and incomplete readings. Her implied notions of validity in interpretation seem no less rigid than those of Richards or Hirsch.

Cullinan, Harwood and Galda (1983) studied the responses of fourth, sixth, and eighth grade children to Katherine Paterson's Bridge to Terabithia and Ursula Le Guin's Wizard of Earthsea. They interpreted their data as confirming the idea that "there are clear developmental levels in children's comprehension of literature" (p. 37). They argued that readers' expectations of the stories seemed to be a primary determinant of the way readers comprehend and evaluate stories. This suggested that children's stances formed before the reading of the text influences what readers do with written text. It also suggested that these expectations change over time. The repertoires of the fourth grade children were not the same as the repertoires of the sixth or eighth grade children. Cullinan, et al., did not argue that these differences were due to the stage of cognitive development
of the children, but did state that experience with literature may play a role in these differences.

Pillar (1983) investigated second, fourth, and sixth grade children's responses to fables. She concluded that the nature of the children's responses formed a positive correlation between the age of the children and stages of moral development as set out by Piaget and Kohlberg. Like Galda and Applebee, Pillar's study suggests that the stances child readers take toward written text are predetermined, in this case by the moral development of the child.

Two considerations should be made of Pillar's study. First, it is possible that children were in a research situation which made little "human sense" to them. Do the children in other situations make the same kinds of moral judgments? The other consideration is that like Galda, Pillar seemed to suggest that the younger children's readings were immature. She suggested that since younger children could make mature moral responses to fables, perhaps fables should not be shared with young children. Like Galda, Pillar seemed to be setting up a standard of validity in interpretation which, if children did not measure up, they were wrong. It seems banal to argue that children's responses to literature are more immature than adults. Rather, if children are enjoying fables, why do they enjoy them? What stances do they take toward fables? Because her younger informants did not assume the same stances as the mature adult toward fables, Pillar suggested considering not offering fables to children as literary fare.

Favat (1977) investigated why children's interest in fairy tales seems to peak at around ages six to eight and nearly disappear by age eleven. He concluded that the world view typically described in the folk tales of the
Grimms, Perrault, and Andersen is very similar to the world view of the preoperational child as described by Piaget. Arguing from Piaget, Favat stated that the child at around ages six to eight is having this world view challenged. The fairy tale offers the child a world view in a stable form consistent with that of the young child at a period of time when the child's world view is being questioned.

Favat suggested that children fulfill a general psychological need, meeting equilibrium, through reading and listening to fairy tales. Interestingly, Favat did not study any children. He based his conclusions upon previous interest studies, a Proppian (Propp, 1968) analysis of the tales of the Grimms, Perrault, and Andersen, and his interpretation of Piagetian psychology. Favat's explanation does not account for adult interest in these tales. These tales originally were told to adults. Could there also be social reasons for waning interest? Are folk tales typically published in formats associated with younger readers? Are they kept in areas of the library where the older, independent reader is not likely to go? Are they no longer part of the required school reading fare? Is there a "babyish" stigma attached to these tales?

Beach and Wendler (1987) found developmental differences in the responses to a short story given by eighth graders, eleventh graders, college freshmen, and college seniors. They argued that the differences in responses are likely influenced by cognitive, personality and social determinants.

Applebee, Galda, Pillar, Favat, and Beach and Wendler, to varying degrees, argued that the way children read or perform texts is, at least in part, predetermined by the stage of the children's cognitive development.
Stance, in their view, is a predisposition to interpret literature in a certain manner, with the predisposition determined by stages of cognitive development. The next group of studies to be discussed suggest that the way children read texts is predetermined by the personality of the reader.

Schlager (1977) compared the personal developmental characteristics of children ages seven to twelve as described by Piaget and Erikson with the personality characteristics of the main characters in Newbery award-winning novels. She selected for study the five novels which were most frequently and the five which were least frequently circulated in the public library. She argued that Karana, the main character in Scott O'Dell's Island of the Blue Dolphins, the book most frequently circulated, showed several personality characteristics typical of middle childhood. Among the characteristics Karana showed were "reality orientation" which is the desire to handle reality situations independently, "cognitive conceit" the feeling of children that they can handle any situation without adult help, and "industry versus inferiority," the Erikson stage which Karana seemed to be working on. In contrast, the main character of the least circulated book, Dobry, showed none of the developmental personality characteristics associated with middle childhood. Schlager concluded that the actions and attitudes of the main characters of a book must invite the reader to identify with them. To turn this conclusion around, the performative abilities of the reader need to be rewarded by a text which matches what the reader brings to bear upon it.

Holland (1975, 1985) argued from a perspective of psychoanalysis that if one analyzes the responses of several readers to one text, one will find few patterns of similarity. However, if one analyzes the responses of one
individual to several texts, definite patterns of similarity will emerge. This pattern Holland called the reader's "identity theme." Identity themes are like colored glasses through which a person views the world or in this case, through which readers read and interpret texts. In reading readers achieve new variations on their identity theme. Holland suggested that the most dominant factors in determining reader's responses are the reader's personality and the reader's individual needs.

Other research on readers' personalities and response is that by Petrosky (1976), Mauro (1983), and Hynds (1985). Petrovsky built his argument upon Holland's work while Mauro, and Hynds based theirs upon Kelly (1955). Each argued that readers' responses to a work were related to the readers' personal constructs.

The work of Schlager, Holland, Petrosky, Mauro, and Hynds suggests that readers have interpretive styles which are based upon their personality. Like the group arguing cognitive developmental influences upon readers' stances, this group also implied that readers' stances, or at least the limits of what stances a reader might assume, are predetermined, in this case by readers' personalities.

**Looking at Readers' Responses as a Social Activity**

Though some of the reader response studies discussed such as Cullinan, et al., and Beach and Wendler have commented upon social considerations of readers' responses to literature, none of the above studies looked at readers' responses as a social activity. The studies which follow address this issue.
There are three different ideas of the "social" in these studies. One type of study views the "social" as experience. Accounting for readers' prior experiences with literature is for these studies an explanation of the social considerations of reader response. A second idea of the social is that reading books and, especially, children reading books, is an activity done in the presence of and often with others. Studies which take on this perspective of the social look at readers' responses in the readers' natural settings. The third conceptualization of the social in reader response theory is that readers respond to literature according to their perceived meaning of the social situation in which they are making the response. Studies which take this perspective seek to understand readers' responses in terms of the social situations in which the readers respond.

Beach (1983) argued that response can be shaped by the reader's knowledge of social and literary conventions. Growth in the responses of an individual reader could be attributed to growth in learning social knowledge. Differences in responses between readers or groups of readers may reveal differences in knowledge about social and literary conventions. This suggests that readers' experiences play an important role in shaping readers' responses. Svensson (1985) compared readers' responses to poems with the readers' past experiences reading literature. He found that read aloud experiences at home, how often one reads, and the depth with which one reads were positive predictors of levels of response. Lehr (1988) compared young children's statements of theme with their score on the Revised Huck Literature Inventory (Lehr, 1987). She found a high correlation between children's ability to generate thematic statements and their exposure to literature.
These studies sought causes for response. They attempted to tease out the different variables of response and measure their effects. This seemed to be based upon a need among some reader response researchers to determine the roots of the convergence and divergence of readers' responses (Purves, 1985). Yet readers' responses are so complex, one wonders if causes can be demonstrated, if the variables of response can really be isolated. Divergence and convergence in response have been acknowledged by every theorist from I. A. Richards to Roland Barthes. What is interesting are the attitudes expressed by the theorists toward divergence. They range from Richards' distaste to Barthes' celebrations. Rosenblatt (1989) stated that no one can predict a reader's response, because no one can predict what stance a reader will assume. Convergence and divergence seem to be factors of stances. Stances, it has been argued, are context bound.

Any research on reader response has as its goal implications for how literature is used in classrooms. If convergence and divergence are givens among any group of readers, then it seems more relevant to look at how readers express their stances and how these expressions play out in certain situations. Readers have a range of stances in their repertoire they can bring to bear upon a text. Which ones they make public seems to be a product of who they are with, what is expected of them, and in what situation they are in.

There have been a series of studies looking at response as something one does with others. While each of these studies began as an attempt to describe children's responses in a natural setting, each researcher discovered that the setting, the people, and the situations surrounding the
reader were extremely important to understanding what children were doing with books.

Hickman (1979, 1981, 1983) used an ethnographic approach to study the spontaneous and solicited responses of 90 elementary age children over a four month period. She found the following increasing in frequency as one moved from kindergarten to fifth grade:

--reliance on verbal modes of expression
--confidence in verbal expression
--repertoire of response strategies and terminology
--appearance of abstracted or generalized language in summaries, classifications, theme statements
--evidence of distancing self from story in expressing distinction between real and make believe and in projecting own behavior as a character. (Hickman, 1983, p. 12)

Hickman also noticed that children's responses can take various forms. Younger children tended to use their bodies in responding to stories. They moved, wiggled, leaned forward when listening and clapped. They were also more likely to include pieces of stories in their play. Hickman also observed children of all ages responding to literature through drawings, paintings, and other art work as well as the traditionally studied forms of writing and talk.

Hickman's research is important in that she broadened the definition of what counts as a response to literature and where researchers need to go to study responses. She also extended thinking about children's responses to literature by noting the importance of the setting in the responses to literature of the children she observed.

Throughout the sifting of evidence for this study, it was observed that most of the observable response events were
tied to the settings in which they occurred. Various expressions of response were either permitted by or facilitated by or generated by the climate of the school and the classroom. (Hickman, 1981, p. 352)

According to Hickman, the teacher had considerable power to determine and influence expressions of response. The teacher could make changes in the child's environment by changing the books available, encouraging students to make certain kinds of responses toward literature, and by modeling different kinds of response acts. Hickman suggested that if children's responses are as tied to setting and context as she thinks, more research into classroom environments in which children respond to books is needed.

Hepler and Hickman (1982) argued that "what children do with books, what they say about them, and what they seem to think of them are all influenced in part by other people" (p. 279). They described the child reader as belonging to a "community of readers," in which books are recommended, possible meanings are explored, and reading behavior modeled. This community develops a history of shared response which becomes the shared knowledge or part of the culture of the classroom.

Hepler's (1982) in a year-long study described the classroom context of fifth and sixth grade children's responses to literature. She argued that the social context is a powerful influence on the development of a community of readers. She noted that children respond to literature during events such as read alouds, silent reading, book sharing, book discussion groups, extensions, and journals and describes each type of event. Hepler also described the teacher's role in shaping students' responses.
She described children's responses to theme as ranging from morals, to warnings, to information about the world. These kinds of responses seem to be indicators of stances the children have taken toward text. Hepler noted that children often had difficulty expressing their interpretations in words. When this occurred other children and the teacher would attempt to assist the student in describing what the student was thinking. Placing this finding in the context of her whole study, it suggests that as responses are played out in public, meaning is negotiated among the members of the "community of readers."

Keifer (1983) looked at the responses of first and second grade children to picture books as these response occurred in the context of the children's classroom. Like Hickman and Hepler, Keifer noted that the setting seemed to be the key to the richness and depth of the children's responses. In particular, the teacher seemed to play an important role in eliciting and shaping the responses of the children. McClure (1985) found that fifth and sixth grade children in a very supportive classroom exhibited responses to poetry which according to Applebee's scheme would have been placed at the later stages of formal operations, behavior normally shown by high school students.

There has been very little research which looks at children's responses to literature as readers acting upon the meaning of a social situation. Cochran Smith's (1985) study of a preschool described the differences in children's book activity "on the rug" and "off the rug." Activity "on the rug" meant an adult leading the whole group, for example reading a story. "Off the rug" activity could mean smaller groups of children which may or may not include an adult. The children made different responses to books
"on the rug" to "off the rug" in part because the events in which the children were acting required different responses. Cochran-Smith also showed what young children knew about books and how they came to know it. She described how these children learned "ways of taking" from text.

There are other studies which, while not conducted from the perspective of placing responses within a social event, do suggest that readers are responding to the norms and expectations of a social situation. Marshall (1987) looked at the effect writing had upon eleventh grade students' responses to literature. He found that readers' responses changed as the task changed. He suggested that students were sensitive to the expectations of their teachers in the kinds of written responses to literature they produced. He also suggested that the form in which readers make their responses is as important as the written text and the repertoire the reader brings to bear upon it. Rogers (1988) compared the responses of ninth graders in two different "interpretive communities," one which was led by the classroom teacher and the other which was led by Rogers. Rogers found that the students were sensitive to the interpretive expectations of the leader of the discussion group. These expectations ranged from the classroom teacher's expectation that students reiterate the teacher's interpretations to Rogers' expectation that the students share in the interpretive authority of the group. The students in Rogers' study were explicit in stating that they tried to provide their teacher the responses they thought their teacher was looking for.
Research on Aesthetic Stances toward Literature

Applebee and Galda looked at spectator stance as defined by Britton. There have been a few studies which have attempted to describe the "lived-through" experience of the text Rosenblatt characterizes as an aesthetic stance.

Based upon his research with child readers, Benton (1979, 1983) described the reader's aesthetic experience of text according to the reader's placement along three intersecting "psychic planes." One plane is the reader's conscious or unconscious awareness of response, one plane is the degree of involvement or detachment the reader is feeling toward the text, and the final plane is the degree of anticipation or retrospection of the reader. What is happening in the mind of the reader is the intersection of these three planes. Benton argued that the point of intersection shifts throughout the reading so that the reader shifts through various degrees of consciousness, involvement, and anticipation.

Sadoski, Goetz, and Kangiser (1988) asked college students to rate the paragraphs of three short stories according to degree of mental imagery, evoked emotions, and importance to the overall story. They found considerable convergence among the readers on each of the areas, though imagery showed the most divergence in response.

Jacobsen (1982) used Winnicott's (1971) model of the potential space of cultural experiences to describe college student readers' descriptions of the literary space they were creating as they read. Edmiston (in process) asked fourth and fifth grade children to describe their experiences reading a short narrative passage by creating and moving paper cut-out.
representations of salient characters and objects of the text and of themselves as readers. Both Jacobsen and Edmiston argued that the reader must be willing to engage with a text in order to enjoy it. Jacobsen and Edmiston attempted to get readers to talk, draw, and act their way through a description of this engagement process.

There are obvious methodological problems in attempting to learn what a reader's aesthetic experiences of a text are. To use Rosenblatt's terminology, in order to study a reader's aesthetic responses, research typically ask readers to perform efferent tasks.

There are also stance problems in any research which probes for any type of reader's response. Any probe, question, or task carries with it a stance toward literature. This stance also includes expectations of response by the researcher on the part of the informant. This problem can be seen from an example from Lehr's (1988) study of young children's understanding of theme. In order to get children to generate statements of theme, Lehr asked children questions such as "what were the authors trying to teach you when they wrote these stories?" This presents the child with a moral stance toward literature. Children are likely to respond in this situation with either a moral response or, if this type of stance is foreign to them, no response at all.

Research on readers' responses to literature suggests that readers' stances may be predisposed due to cognitive development or personality development. Readers' responses may be attributed to experience with literature and knowledge of social and literary conventions. Research on these aspects of response has ignored the social context in which the reader is responding. Hickman, Hepler, Keifer and McClure argued that the
rich responses they observed children making toward literature was keyed to the rich literary environment of their classrooms.

It was argued in the first section that reading necessitates the assuming of a stance toward the written text. This stance of the reader becomes the foothold upon which the reader makes interpretations of the text. Stance is part of the reader's repertoire from which the reader performs the text. This performance is a cultural event. Given the findings of Hickman, Hepler, Keifer, and McClure that the setting seemed important to the responses of the children toward literature, it also seems that the setting will be important to the way in which children take on stances toward literature. What seems to be needed are descriptions of the events in which children demonstrate their stances. Hickman, Hepler, Keifer, and McClure each noted the importance of the teacher to the manner in which children responded to literature. It seems that to understand the stances of children in a classroom, the stances of the teacher will need to be described as well.

READING AS A SOCIAL PROCESS

There has been little research on the social aspects of children's responses to literature, especially from the perspective of describing stance and response in terms of the child acting within a social event. There is, however, a growing body of work on reading from this point of view. In this section the research on certain social aspects of reading will be discussed. Drawing upon work in sociolinguistics, ethnography, and social cognition, ideas such as frame, event, and reading as a social process will be reviewed.
The Need for Others

Individuals do not learn in isolation, they learn in the company of and through interactions with others. Vygotsky (1978, 1986) argued that learning precedes development. He stated that children learn to perform tasks with the assistance of a more competent person. Vygotsky described this gap between what a person can do unassisted and what one can do with the assistance of others as the Zone of Proximal Development. Learning, Vygotsky suggested, is a social activity, it is the developing of culturally organized, psychological functions. Bruner (1983; Ninio & Bruner, 1977) suggested that "the more competent other" erects scaffolds which help the child learn and master new tasks. The adult, in Bruner's case, monitors the level of competence in the child and adjusts the scaffold accordingly.

Bruner (1986) noted that he has moved from a model of the child learning in isolation to an understanding that "most learning in most settings is a communal activity, a sharing of the culture" (p. 127). He suggested that when children learn they must make knowledge their own in a community of others who share their knowledge and sense of belonging to that culture. According to Bruner, learning is the negotiating and sharing of culture and that schooling ought to be the joint creating of culture.

Smith (1981, 1988, 1989) argued that learning is in part a consequence of the company one keeps. He suggested that people learn by the demonstrations made by members of groups or clubs to which the persons wish to belong. These persons act as they perceive members of these club
should act. While it is arguable that the ZPD, scaffolding, and clubs are not exactly conceptualizations of the same idea, what is common to each of ideas is that learning occurs with others. Smith's ideas suggest that in the classroom, members of "the community of readers" will demonstrate their stances toward literature and will learn possible stances through these demonstrations and through their own trying out of these demonstrations in activities.

Taken together these ideas from Vygotsky, Bruner, and Smith suggest that social action is not a result of cognitive development but rather cognitive development is a result of social action. If learning is social action then it is important to understand the social aspects of the situations in which learning takes place. Sociolinguists and ethnographers have termed these situations as "frames" or "events."

**Frames and Events**

Bateson (1972) is credited with introducing the term "frame." He suggested that frame is a psychological concept which individuals use to signal the intention of a message and to interpret the messages of others. Goffman (1974) described frame as "principles of organization which govern social events" (p. 10). Frames, Goffman argued, are culturally determined. Hymes (1974) discussed frame as one of the means of speaking. According to Hymes, listeners interpret utterances in accordance to the perceived activity the listener is being engaged in.

Some theorists, especially in the field of artificial intelligence, conceptualize frame as being static and held in an individual's mind
(Minsky, 1974). Frake (1977) argued against a notion of frames existing in a static form in an individual's mind. Instead he suggested, as did Goffman and Hymes, that frames are what people do when they speak with each other. Frame, then, is a culturally determined activity which people use to signal and interpret meaning. Speakers and writers signal intended meaning by structuring their messages into an event (Bauman, 1977, 1986). Listeners and readers interpret meaning by structuring the messages into events. Examples of frames from this perspective could be different kinds of genre such as joking or chatting in oral language and editorials, science fiction, or cartoons in written language.

Tannen (1979) described frame as structures of expectation based upon past experience. These structures of expectation filter and shape perception. The recognition of a frame calls up a host of expectations and norms of behavior for the individual and for the other participants in the frame.

Erickson (1986) argued that human beings act according to the possible meaning they perceive in the actions of others, not in the sense of imitation, but in the sense of perceiving what kind of event is occurring and acting accordingly. Acting, then, is a matter of recognizing the situation and its frames. Work in social cognition (Shanz, 1983; Nelson, 1985) has demonstrated that children at a young age achieve a knowledge of social events and can articulate what is likely to occur within these events.

To summarize what has been said so far, frames are structures individuals construct in their interactions with each other. Frames are used to signal and interpret meaning. Frames hold for individuals
expectations of action and meaning. An event, or what Gumperz (1977) called an activity, is an identifiable interactional happening that has meaning for the participants (Frake, 1977). For researchers events are the unit of study.

Gumperz (1986) described what the ideas of frame and event mean for understanding how classrooms operate.

Each of these learning contexts involves different modes of interaction and learning, and different standards for the evaluation of behavior and for the interpretation of what goes on. As part of the learning process, children must become familiar with what these structures are; they must understand how transitions between structures are signaled, and what behavioral strategies are effective in gaining the teacher's attention or in securing the cooperation of peers. In other words, familiarity with the subtleties of classroom social organization is a precondition for gaining access to learning opportunities. (p. 60)

Gumperz suggested that teachers create learning structures in their classrooms. These structures create frames within which children attend to and interpret what the teacher is saying. The task of the researcher is to describe these learning structures and their frames and events and to tease out the possible meanings these structures have for the people who participate in them.

What this body of research suggests is that human beings act according to the perceived meaning of the perceived event in which they are situated. Tannen argued that when a frame has been identified, one forms expectations of action and meaning. Work in social cognition has shown that even young children have knowledge of social events and, apparently, structure their memories according to events.
Reading as an Event

Bauman (1977, 1986) argued that like oral narrative, reading is a performative event. This event is constructed by the reader, the author, and other members of what Fish (1980) termed "the interpretive community" and what Hepler and Hickman (1982) called "the community of readers." Like the work on response to literature described previously, there are different notions as to what social reading involves. One view of the social aspects of reading is to look at the social transaction between the reader and the author. Another view of the social nature of reading is that reading is something often done in the company of others. A third idea of the social aspects of reading is that readers act according the perceived meaning of the social frames and events in which they are doing their reading. Certainly, these three views are complementary and not oppositional ideas. In fact, the third view would imply the other two perspectives.

Cazden (1985) viewed the social aspects of reading as something which is done with others. She stated "(U)sually we talk with others and read alone. Not so with children, especially children just learning to read in the primary grades. Learning to read, like mature reading later on, is certainly a cognitive process; but it is also a very social activity, deeply embedded in interactions with teachers and peers" (p. 595). Cazden seemed to imply in this passage that because children generally learn to read in groups, their reading is more social than adult reading. Studies by Mehan (1979), McDermott (1985), and Tierney and Rogers (1986) are examples of research which looked at the social structure of classroom reading lessons.
This group of studies showed that the reading and writing tasks and
cognitive strategies used by the children were influenced by the social
structure of the classroom events.

Bloome (1983, 1985) also argued that reading is a social activity, but from
a slightly different perspective from Cazden. He stated that there are three
dimensions of reading as a social process:

First, all reading events involve a social context. Social
interaction surrounds and influences interaction with a
written text. Second, reading is a cultural activity. That is,
reading has social uses which are an extension of people's
day-to-day cultural doings. And third, reading is a socio-
cognitive process. Through learning to read and through
reading itself, children learn culturally appropriate
information, activities, values, and ways of thinking and
problem solving. (Bloome, 1985, p. 134)

Bloome argued for a "constructivist" perspective of reading. According
to this view, the social context of reading is what people do in interaction
with each other. Social contexts are formed by the status readers award to
each other, and by what actions the various members of the reading
community can do and when, where, and with whom they can do these
reading acts with. Reading, then is not just a reader transacting with a
text, but is also located within the interaction of individuals with each
other (Bloome, 1983, 1985). As was argued in the previous section on frame
and stance, these interactions are the reading events of the classroom and
are the focus of study of the reading of literature from this perspective.

The social construction of reading, according to Bloome, involves many
different kinds of social relationships; relationships between teachers and
students, between students and students, between parents and children, and
between authors and readers (Bloome, 1985). These participants in the
construction of reading events construct the ways they will think about
the text, ways they will orient themselves toward each other and toward the
text, and hence, will construct meaning (Bloome, 1983). When children
read in school, they are reading within a variety of social relationships and
social events. "They are learning culturally-bound ways of thinking....
That is, children learn culturally appropriate ways of interacting with and
interpreting written material" (p. 138). Bloome suggested that reading is a
social event which may take many different forms and involve many
different purposes (Bloome, 1983). This implies that the stances readers
assume toward a text are stances bound within the social relationships and
events of the classroom. From this perspective the stances a reader
assumes toward a piece of literature would be a social construction of the
participants of the community of readers and their expectations of the
reading frame in which they were reading.

Bloome described reading as a product of the social context, as readers
acting appropriately according to the social situation in which they
perceive themselves to be. Bloome termed this kind of action "procedural
display." Children in classrooms will try to act according to the way they
perceive the teacher wants them to act (cf. Rogers, 1988). This perspective
obviously has its roots in the kind of social cognition argued by
sociolinguistics and ethnographers as described in the section on frame
and event (cf. Erickson, 1986). This kind of language carries an
implication that readers strive for consensus in meaning. As many reader
response theorists and researchers have noted, divergence in response is a
given in any reading situation. Acting accordingly, then, cannot mean
that individuals always can or do choose consensus. Work by Heath (1983),
Scollon and Scollon (1981, 1984), Michaels (1986), and Collins (1986) has shown that individuals from different cultural groups do not share the same expectations for a social frame. Even when all the participants do share the same expectations for a social frame, consensus will not necessarily occur. What frames do is place boundaries on the possible meanings readers will make. Frames do not limit meaning to only one possibility. (However, an authority figure in a frame may accept only one possible meaning as legitimate.)

Bloome and Green (in press) argued that reading is specific to a situation. For them reading is not a stable, context-free set of cognitive-linguistic processes applied to all texts but rather, reading is a social event. They viewed these cognitive-linguistic processes as by-products of the reader's participation in activities and situations involving text, not as properties of individuals per se. As Fish (1980) argued, Bloome and Green also argued that the reader's strategies are determined by the conventions of the reader's cultural and social situation. In terms of readers' stances Bloome and Green seemed to be suggesting that the stances readers show in public are conventions of the social and cultural situation.

Heath (1982), Michaels (1986), Collins and Michaels (1986), and Scollon and Scollon (1981, 1984) looked at different ways of taking from text, from the perspectives of ethnography of communication and interactive sociolinguistics. Collectively they found there were different cultural ideas of how one is supposed to act in a "literacy event," whether it is in questioning patterns (Heath, 1982) or participating in narrative structures (Scollon & Scollon, 1981; Michaels, 1986; Collins and Michaels, 1986).
Research in this area of ethnography of communication or interactive sociolinguistics tends to focus upon instances of culture clash, failure, or when one party, usually the party with the least power, does not understand the "meaning of the situation" as the party with the most power does. While this focus is important in understanding failure, there is a lack of research from the perspective of ethnography and sociolinguistics which describes instances of success (Cazden, 1983).

When children read in classrooms, their readings are part of a larger social milieu. There are the expectations which others hold for the reader. There are the cultural norms and obligations accompanying the reading event. And there are the other readings of the other members of the classroom. Tierney (1987) stated:

In most reading and writing situations there exists a host of social factors which overlap with a sense of audience or authorship as one reads or writes which have not been explored. For example, there are teachers and classmates whose own interpretations and views may be influencing an individual reader's or writer's experiences. (p. 9)

This recalls Hepler's idea of the community of readers, that in a classroom any single reader's reading takes its place among the other readers' readings with each influencing the other. Surely in the matter of the reader's stance, this also must be worked out among the other stances being demonstrated publicly and among the expectations being held by others for stance.

Goodenough (1971) defined culture as shared ways of acting, feeling, believing, and thinking. If reading is a cultural activity then the reading of literature is also a cultural activity. Investigating classrooms and the
shared ways the community of readers act, feel, believe, and think toward and with literature are the points of focus of this study.

**Reading Children’s Literature as a Social Event**

Meek (1987) noted that reading does not happen in a vacuum, though many researchers treat reading as though it does. Implied in the written text, Meek stated, are social instructions on how to read it. She argued that readers learn much of what they know about reading through the private lessons taught them by the authors of the books they read (1982, 1987). She went on to write that readers find that they can share their readings with other people. She suggested that "the most important single lesson that children learn from texts is the nature and variety of written discourse, the different ways that language lets a writer tell, and the many and different ways a reader reads" (Meek, 1987, p. 21).

Meek (1980) suggested that children usually bring a different set of expectations to text than do adults. This implies a rather tricky task of at once honoring children as competent readers, but at the same time showing children other "literary competencies" they may bring to bear on a specific text. In a sense Meek was arguing for a Bruner-like scaffold, in which the adult reader acknowledges the meaning-making of the child reader, while at the same time showing the child other possibilities, which, it would seem, carry some social expectation.

Chambers (1985) also argued that the issue of reading literature in the classroom is how the adult helps children read a particular text. Talk, for Chambers, is essential to this process, that reading necessarily involves
talking about what one has read. This Chambers called "booktalk" and it is through booktalk that readers make explicit their own meanings and can consider the meanings made by others. Chambers noted that readers bring to their booktalk a critical stance, their favored view of literature. These stances can range from there is only one correct reading of a text, usually held by the person with the most authority in the group and other readings will not be tolerated during the talk, to a stance that there are multiple of possible readings of a text with the expectation that the group will explore some of these possibilities.

Chambers and Meek each appeared to have been influenced by Culler (1975, 1982) and his idea of literary competence and that the reader cannot exhaust the possibilities of meaning in a text. Children, Chambers and Meek argued, are at the same time competent readers and readers in need of more competencies. In Iser's (1978) terms, they would say that children need adults to help them expand the reading repertoires which they can bring to bear upon a text. Chambers and Meek argued against consensus, that there is one competent way to read a text. Rather, through interaction with different authors and with other members of the community of readers, readers learn new possibilities of constructing meaning. This implies that a reader is never a complete reader, but is always in a state of becoming, of constructing new possibilities of readings.

LITERATURE IN THE CLASSROOM

It has been implied throughout this chapter that the events in which children take on stances toward literature have been events which occur
in elementary school classrooms. In this section research, or rather writings, on different ways of viewing classrooms, stance in the classroom, research on literature-based reading, and literature programs in elementary school classrooms will be discussed. Much of the professional literature to be discussed in this section is not research. This is because there is a paucity of research on the way literature is used in elementary classrooms.

Though literature-based reading appears to be gaining in popularity with classroom teachers and with university scholars, there have been very few studies of classrooms which use literature as the primary material for its reading program. Some of these studies have already been cited in the section on research on response to literature. Though Hickman (1979), Hepler (1982), Kiefer (1983), and McClure (1985) primarily looked at what children were doing with literature, they also each offered descriptions of what the classrooms they studied were like in terms of the literature environment.

Classroom Paradigms

Shulman (1986) argued that any piece of research grows out of a particular perspective. The findings of researchers are products of the kinds of questions researchers ask, the way they frame their problems, and manners in which they investigate. These perspectives Shulman calls paradigms (cf. Kuhn, 1970) and distinguishes two paradigms currently influencing classroom research. Product-process research is one paradigm; the second paradigm goes by a number of names, interpretive
(Erickson, 1986), sociolinguistic (Cazden, 1986), or ecological (Shulman, 1986). These two paradigms hold different perceptions of classrooms. From the process-product perspective the emphases is upon student outcomes and teaching as the transmission of knowledge from the teacher or textbook to the student.

Erickson (1986) stated that there are three problems with research from a process - product perspective. One is that this perspective has an understanding of interaction as being one-way and causal. Erickson argued that interaction is two-way and influential. Erickson's second objection to process - product research is that its use of predetermined categories presents a limited picture of the classroom offering limited details of the processes and activities which are claimed to be causing the desired outcomes. The third problem is that the product which is used to determine the effectiveness of the process, which is usually an achievement test, is too narrowly defined.

In place of the process - product view of the classroom, Erickson argued for an "interpretive" point of view. From this perspective "teacher effectiveness is a matter of the nature of the social organization of classroom life... whose construction is largely, but not exclusively, the responsibility of the teacher as instructional leader" (p. 133). From this point of view the emphasis is upon the classroom as a learning culture and how that culture is constructed among the teacher and students. In the interpretive paradigm, then, the classroom is a place where culture is created.

Green (1983) articulated this point in her discussion of teaching as a linguistic process.
This work demonstrates that tasks and activities within and across educational settings do not structure learning; rather teachers and students acting on these tasks and on each others' messages and behaviors construct or create these tasks. Curriculum, then, within this perspective is an evolving process that occurs within general frameworks that may or may not be static (e.g. lesson plans are guides; lessons evolve or are created through interactions). In addition, classrooms were defined as environments in which teachers and students develop shared meanings for activities, and teaching-learning processes are often developmental in nature. (p. 226)

While it may be possible to investigate questions of stance and event from the perspective of process-product research, the manner in which these two terms have been defined in this chapter makes the "interpretive" paradigm the more resonant.

Stance in the Classroom

Shulman (1987) argued that there are very few descriptive and analytic studies of the teacher's management of the classroom. From the sociolinguistic and ethnographic perspective laid out earlier, this would mean that there has not been much research describing the various events of a classroom. Shulman went on to assert that such descriptions of how teachers teach should not only include how they manage their classroom, but also how they manage the ideas through classroom discourse. This suggests that to understand how a classroom works, not only do events need to be described, but also the stances teachers and students take toward what they are learning.
Earlier in this review, stance was looked at in terms of how readers view literature. But surely these stances are embedded in other stances, especially stances assumed by teachers and students toward how learning and learners are to be viewed. Van Maanen (1986) noted that teachers embody possible ways of being to their students. The aspects of a possible way of being must include the stances toward learning and learners teachers present and value. Van Maanen suggested that for teachers to know a subject well, they must not only know the fundamental questions it raises, but also must hold the knowledge in such a way as to show that it is loved and respected. Bruner (1986) described an incident from his elementary school days which illustrates this point.

I recall a teacher, her name was Miss Orcutt, who made the statement in class, "It is a very puzzling thing not that water turns to ice at 32 degrees Fahrenheit, but that it should change from a liquid into a solid." She then went on to give us an intuitive account of Brownian movement and of molecules, expressing a sense of wonder.... In effect, she was inviting me to extend my world of wonder to encompass hers. She was not just informing me. She was, rather, negotiating the world of wonder and possibility.... She was a human event, not a transmission device. It was not that my other teachers did not mark their stances. It was rather that their stances were so off-puttingly and barrenly informative. (p. 126)

Bruner made an interesting coupling of two terms which have been much discussed in this review, stance and event. He implied that this teacher, by the nature of her stance, invited him to participate in her wonder of the phenomenon. Her stance communicated not only how the material was to be viewed but also how the students might also view the material. Implicit in this stance was a view of learning and of learners as co-creators of knowledge, as integral parts of creating a classroom culture.
The Literacy Deal as Stance

Whole language is a popular label for certain kinds of literacy activities in elementary classrooms. Some scholars have argued that whole language is not a kit of ideas but rather is a way of looking at children and how they learn language (Altwerger, Edelsky, and Flores, 1987). They stated that the key perspective upon which whole language rests is that language, written and oral, is learned through its real use in meaningful contexts. This perspective could easily be described as a stance toward learning and toward learners. It seems to imply that learning should happen in "real" events and that learners, no matter what the age, are competent.

Edelsky, Draper, and Smith (1983) looked at how a successful "whole language" teacher got her students, many of whom had experienced failure in school, to operate successfully in line with her perspective. They suggested that the children, based on the teacher's reputation, expected from the first day of school that school would be different and that the difference would be positive. The children were willing to "buy into" the literacy, subject matter, and relationship deal the teacher offered them. This study suggested that the children were sensitive to the stances of the teacher, even when they were different from their past experiences with school and they acted accordingly.

DeFord and Rasinski (1986) stated that in setting up learning environments, teachers demonstrate their assumptions about what children know and what they expect children to do. Children's conception
of what literacy is, what it means to read and write, fit the conception of literacy their teachers present in the learning environment (Rasinski & DeFord, 1988).

A literature program in an elementary classroom will present a way of looking at literature, a stance or stances toward what literature is and how it can be read. The children in these two studies discussed above appeared to be sensitive to the stances their teachers took toward literacy. They appeared to act in ways which were acceptable in the teacher-created classroom environment. If children are doing this with the notions of literacy presented in their classrooms, then it seems likely that the stances taken by teachers toward literature would be important in the kinds of reading of literature done by children in their classrooms.

**Purposes of Literature in the Elementary Classroom**

Huck, Hepler, and Hickman (1987) stated that there are four purposes of a literature program in the elementary school. The first and major purpose is that children should discover delight in reading books and sharing them with others. The second purpose is interpreting literature. By this they meant that children should have many and varied kinds of opportunities to express their personal responses to literature. The third purpose of the literature program is developing literary awareness in children. They cautioned that this purpose should be secondary to children's discovering delight in books through wide reading. They suggested that children should begin to develop an understanding of different genres, the elements of literature, and knowing individual authors and illustrators only as
children need this knowledge to deepen their understanding of the meaning of the story. Huck, et al., did not prescribe a body of knowledge about literature children should know, but argued that what any child will need to know about literature will vary according to the needs of that child to understand and appreciate a piece of literature. The final purpose of the literature program is developing appreciation. They made reference to Britton's statement that "a student should read more books with satisfaction... [and] he should read books with more satisfaction" (Britton, 1982, p. 35). The emphasis is upon both wide and in-depth reading.

These purposes of a literature program assume many possible stances. Reading for pleasure is one of many possible purposes a reader might assume (and a worthy one). But certainly readers might read for other reasons. The notion of children reading with satisfaction and with more satisfaction begs the questions "what counts as satisfaction in reading and who gets to decide what 'more satisfaction' is?" The point is not that these notions are improper. The issue is how is this worked out in the events and stances of the classroom. It would seem that depending upon the structure of the events in the classroom and the stances the teacher and the student assume and expect of each other, these ideas can be either liberating or limiting to children reading literature.

There are a few scholars who argue that literature is its own subject, as is science, math, and history, and therefore should be studied in its own right. Cook (1976) argued for the inclusion of myth, legend, and folktale in the elementary school curriculum and Sloan (1975) presented a system of literature study based upon the literary theories of Frye (1957, 1964).
There is a growing interest in the purpose literature serves in children achieving literacy. Sawyer (1987) noted that there are two distinct, yet related strands within this perspective. One is that literature is the appropriate material through which children ought to learn to read. This strand is best represented by proponents of whole language (cf. Newman, 1985; Goodman, 1986). Essentially, (and this is a gloss) whole language's perspective on using literature as the material for learning to read is that "real literature" provides the young reader with language which is more natural than the language in basal readers. This more natural language provides the young reader with a full range of cues to figure out what the words on the page are and what they mean.

The other strand is that the issue of becoming literate is a matter of learning to read literature, specifically, the particular piece of literature the child intends to read. This position was argued by Meeck (1982, 1987) and Chambers (1985). Learning to read from this perspective is achieving what Culler (1975) called literary competence. Children learn how particular texts work and what literary strategies they may use to make meaning of it. They learn the culturally constructed possible ways of performing texts.

Research on Literature-Based Classrooms

The little research which has been done on literature-based reading classrooms seems to fall into three groups. One group includes the response studies by Hickman, Hepler, Kiefer, and McClure which were discussed in the section on research in reader response. Though each
researcher focused upon what the children were doing with literature rather than upon the classroom and the view of literature the teacher was presenting, each study hinted much about how these teachers go about their business.

Hepler (1982) offered a rich description of how the teacher of the classroom she studied developed the environment in which the students responded to literature. Hepler showed the expectations the teacher held for her students, and the roles the teacher assumed in helping students meet her goals. In particular, Hepler described how the teacher developed a critical framework through her questions, which helped the children develop ways of talking about the books they read. McClure (1985) described the stances toward poetry of the teachers she studied and how these stances enabled and encouraged the responses and writings of their students.

The second group seems to have as a goal showing that literature-based reading is better than basal instruction or phonics instruction (cf. Tunnell & Jacobs, 1989). This perspective seems similar to process-product research. It tends to view literature-based reading as a collection of practices rather than a perspective toward what the nature of literature and readers of literature are (cf. Aeix, 1988). Little is understood about how teachers in these classroom organize literature events and demonstrate stances toward literature. Consequently, literature-based reading is presented as a kit of ideas and methods, which if applied, will produce "stunning levels of success" (Tunnell & Jacobs, 1989, p. 470).

The third body of work is studies done by teachers and not on teachers. This is a growing body of work (cf recent issues of Language Arts, The...
Reading Teacher, Corcoran & Evans, 1987; Nelms, 1988; and Jensen, 1989). Typically, classroom teachers explain their perspectives on some aspect of teaching by providing lots of examples of what children do in their classrooms. Research from this perspective can, if the teacher/researcher provides it, offer insight into the view of reading the teacher is presenting to the children and how the children respond to this view. An example of this would be Avery (1989), who explained how she wanted her first graders to understand that there are many possible ways to read a text and how she went about showing them explicitly how this is done.

It has been argued in this section that understanding the stances and events surrounding literature-based reading in a classroom are critical to understanding the nature of how children are reading literature in school.

Stances and Roles of Adults

It has been argued that adults are important in creating events and in demonstrating stances toward literature to children. Roser and Martinez (1985) looked at the roles adults took on in their reading of literature with preschoolers. They found that the children tended to respond in a manner similar to the adult in the situation they were in, whether this was at home or at school. If the adult talked about the illustrations, the children tended to talk about illustrations. Roser and Martinez also noted differences in the authority roles the adults assumed toward the child and toward the text. These roles ranged from the adult taking on a role of co-responder with the child, where the adult shared control of the reading event with the child, to
a role of director, where the adult maintained control of the entire reading event.

Koeller (1988) offered four teacher stances, which she argued were appropriate aesthetic stances designed to inspire "pupil/literature conversations." A teacher assuming the mentor stance suggests and models possible ways to read and talk about literature. In the peer-fellowship stance the teacher takes on a role as just another reader, another voice among the various voices in the classroom. When teachers identify the interests of an individual student and help that student to extend and enrich that student's literary experiences, they are taking on a director-editor-manager-coach stance. The fourth stance is that of the proud-parent. In this stance teachers applaud the wonderful ideas students have toward the literature they read.

These studies suggest, as have so many other studies described in this chapter, that the reading of literature is a social act. While the statement that "teachers create readers" (Corcoran, 1986) may be too strong, it does seem that "teachers can create readings" through their stances toward literature, their stances toward children as readers of literature, and the kinds of events they and the children construct in which to make and share readings.

Guides to Using Literature in Elementary Classrooms

There is a growing body of advice on how to use literature in an elementary classroom. This advice seems to come in two basic forms, one specific to the elementary reading program and one non-specific.
Cullinan (1989) offered advice on using literature which is non-specific to the reading program. She described literature centers, silent reading, ways in which teachers can present literature to children such as storytelling and reading aloud, and ways in which children can respond to the stories they read and hear. These responses include writing, drama, and discussion. Cullinan noted that the enthusiasm of the teacher is the most critical element to the literature program in the elementary classroom. Interestingly, Cullinan described enthusiasm in terms of assignments a teacher made for her class of third graders. "Enthusiasm" would seem to imply stance, a perspective on what purposes readers might have in reading, rather than specific activities a teacher might try. Surely, even the most well-designed literature activity could become a drudge if the accompanying stances of the teacher are off-putting.

Huck (1977) stated that literature is the content of reading, therefore the reading of literature is specific to the reading program. She suggested that the literature program consists of five components: silent reading, read aloud, discussion groups, literature extensions, and the use of literature across the curriculum.

There are two aspects of Huck's program which can be problematic in practice, extensions and the use of literature, particularly fiction and poetry, across the curriculum. The use of literature across the curriculum can mean that the curriculum is integrated around a theme of study. Cook (1976) issued a warning about "the integrated day." She stated that tying the classroom use of literature to the theme the class is studying will likely limit the children's responses to the story. She also cautioned that if the goal of teaching is to have the child produce a collection of writing,
artwork, and other projects based upon the child's reading of literature within a unit of study, then this body of work can become the child's purpose in reading, an efferent task as opposed to what Rosenblatt (1978) would call aesthetic reading. Again, issues of stance come into play. Each aspect can be enriching to students' understanding of a literary text. It can provide students with a possible way of looking at literature. However, if used improperly or if over-used they can give students a narrow stance of what literature is in the classroom.

It was mentioned earlier that there is a growing trend toward using literature as the material through which children learn to read. There has been a host of guides written for teachers describing how to teach reading with children's literature (cf. Holdaway, 1979, 1980; Butler & Turbill, 1984; Doake, 1987; Johnson & Louis, 1987; Routman, 1988) Certainly, these guides offer many appropriate suggestions for teaching children how to read through using literature. Unfortunately, too often guides from this perspective over-emphasize the sign aspect of reading, figuring out what the words are on the page, over the symbolic, interpreting what the words on the page mean (Todorov, 1980).

Bennett (1985) stated that fundamental to her approach in teaching reading with picture books are her expectations of her students and the expectations her students hold for her. These included her expectations that her students will learn to love to read books and that they will read for meaning. She stated that her students expect from her that they will be able to read the books she offers them to read. Bennett argued against color-coding or leveling books as they present the idea that a child can only read books at a certain level. Leveling, she suggested, places limits on
children's reading. The expectations Bennett described could be termed stances. The color-coding of books, which she discouraged, could be considered part of the reading frame in a classroom.

These examples show that how literature programs are put together, what kinds of events count as reading, and what expectations teachers and students hold for each other are critical to the readings of literature which occur in a classroom. Too often guides for using literature in classrooms come off as packaged kits of ideas and activities with little or no discussion of the stances which seem to be what makes any activity alive with possibilities or drudgery.

Discussion Groups

The questions which teachers ask students about literature are replete with issues of stance. There have been several different conceptualizations of what a discussion group should look like and what are appropriate questions to ask children about the literature they have read. Any style of questioning assumes many different kinds of stances. The point to be made in discussing the types of discussion groups and questioning patterns of the following scholars is not to infer that any stance is improper. What is the point is that each scholar offers a different, and sometimes only a slightly different, idea of what literature is. Assuming a stance toward what literature is and what kind of reading is expected from children is inherent in any question. It is unavoidable. However, it has been argued that children need to be presented with many different possibilities of stance.
Most guides to holding book discussions advocate asking questions which focus upon the readings the children make (Vandergrift, 1980; Great Books Foundation, 1984; Saul, 1989). These are questions designed to consider the author's craft and the possible meanings of the text. Advocates of these kinds of questions argue that questions should take readers deeper into the book rather than outside the book. Vandergrift's (1980) questions ask readers to consider ideas the story makes them think about, the feelings they experienced during their readings, and the characters, patterns in the discourse, and other structural features. Chambers (1985) offered a questioning pattern which first elicits the readers' responses, then asks the readers to consider structural features such as patterns or details which may offer other possibilities of meaning. The Great Books Foundation (1984) advocated asking questions which are interpretive, which have no right or wrong answer, yet readers must consider by what they read in the text. Points of ambiguity in the text, character motives, or author intent can all be possible sources for questions. Saul (1989) called questions which require one or two word responses or ask the reader to recall experiences the reader may have had non-literary questions. Literary questions are those which go beyond the text, yet require the reader to come back to the text to answer it. They are questions which have at least two good answers and they should help readers better understand a story. Finally, according to Saul, literary questions view the piece of literature as a human construction and explores issues of craft. Saul and the Great Books Foundation advocated teachers forming questions out of their own readings of literature, from points where they have questions about author or character intent. There is
implied in each of these questioning schemes a respect for what the child reader has to offer, that there are no right and wrong answers, only considerations of possible readings.

Hepler (1988) advised teachers that good discussion questions examine why the characters in a book act the way they do. This helps children clarify and build their code of values. She also advocated, in moderation, questions which encourage readers to identify with the characters in the book and to connect their readings with their own personal experiences. Again, these questions will produce a certain kind of reading. The first kind of question implies assuming a moral stance toward text, that the piece of literature can give guidance in understanding the reasons for a character's behavior. The second type of question is closely related to the first, but it also assumes that readers will find commonality in their lives with the lives of the characters they read about. Two kinds of questions assume that readers will find in literature statements about how human lives can be lived.

Hepler (1988) also noted that many commercially available discussion guides for works of children's literature present questions and activities which are basal reader-like. These, she said, often do not serve the work or the reader well.

Any of the stances demonstrated by the types of questions suggested by the scholars just discussed can expand children's attempts to make meaning. No single stance presented here is, in and of itself, illegitimate. What may be too limiting is the over-dominance of a single stance over all others in a classroom. What can occur with any of the questioning
schemes presented is that they become the official way of reading in the classroom.

Children need to talk about their readings of literature with others (Chambers, 1985). Strickland, et al (1989) showed that discussion groups can be an event where children and not the teacher do most of the talking. This is an ethos which each author of a questioning scheme advocates. Eeds and Rowe (1989) noted that in literature discussion groups children and teachers build meaning together. That has been the dominant theme of this review of the literature. In classrooms children and teachers construct possible meanings of literary text.

Classrooms are places where teachers and students make culture. Part of culture making is the stances students and teachers assume towards learning, the material to be learned and toward each other. It is in this milieu that literature is read and shared in classrooms. In establishing literature programs, teachers and students create social events into which they read and respond to literature. In their actions within these events they demonstrate to each other their stances toward literature and their expectations of stances for each other. Using literature in classrooms then is not a kit of portable ideas but a way of looking at learning, readers, and literature. It is suggested that the key to successful literature-based reading programs or the successful use of literature in the elementary classroom is less a matter of the activity than it is a matter of the stances taken by the teacher and the students toward literature, learning, and each other.
SUMMARY

Reading is a performative event. In order to read a piece of literature, readers bring to bear upon the text a part of their reading repertoire. One aspect of this repertoire is stance, a disposition to interpret a piece of literature in a certain manner. Stances are demonstrations of a reader's theory of literature and the reader's expectations of how the reader will interpret the text. In order to read a text, a reader must assume some kind of stance or stances toward the text. Stance may also include expectations of others to interpret text in a like fashion. Stance then becomes a foothold upon which readers make meaning and is a social construction. The assuming of stances limits the possible meanings readers may make of a text on the one hand, and on the other hand makes possible any meaning of the text.

Readers perform texts according to the meaning of the social situation in which they are reading. Social situations are not only events which have cultural norms. They also carry expectations of stance. Event and stance are bound into each other. Classrooms as a culture have their own events in which children and teachers read and respond to literature. As children and teachers make public their readings and responses to a piece of literature they also demonstrate to each other their stances toward text. Classrooms can be places where teachers and children show each other various possibilities of making meaning. Classrooms can also be places where the possibilities of meaning are very limited.

There has been little research looking at children's responses to literature from an ethnographic and sociolinguistic perspective. There
has been little investigation of the social events of the classroom in which children make their responses to literature. Likewise, there has been virtually no research investigating the assuming of stances in the classroom, how teachers and children demonstrate ways of taking from text to each other and how teachers and children demonstrate their expectations of each other in assuming stances toward literature.
CHAPTER III

METHOD OF STUDY

"Ethnography is more than just a set of 'field' methods, data collection techniques (tools), analysis procedures or narrative description. It is a theoretically driven, systematic approach to the study of everyday life of a social group which includes a planning phase, discovery phase, and a presentation of findings phase" (Zaharlick & Green, in press).

There are three major facets concerning the manner of this study which will be discussed in this chapter. First, ethnography is a theory-driven approach to research. Ethnography implies a view of what culture is as well as an epistemological perspective. Therefore, the cultural theory and epistemological assumptions which drive this investigation will be presented. Second, the work which was done in the field and in preparation for field work will be discussed. This work includes the manner in which the study was planned and conducted, the ways in which the data were collected and the ways in which data were analyzed. Third, the presentation of this ethnography is a written report. I will discuss the nature of writing this report and the purposes I am trying to accomplish in this kind of presentation.
ETHNOGRAPHY AS A THEORY-DRIVEN APPROACH TO RESEARCH

This ethnography is a study of a teacher's and her second and third grade students' stances and responses to literature. In Chapter Two it was argued that reading is a performative event. Readers perform texts using their reading repertoires according to the meanings of the social situations in which they are reading. It was argued in Chapter One that the only way researchers have of learning what readers are doing with literature is to study the public responses readers make to written text. These public responses always occur within a social situation.

The view of reading literature of this report is essentially a synthesis of a sociolinguistic perspective with Rosenblatt's (1978, 1985b) transactional theory. This view is that the reading of literature is "a unique coming-together of a particular personality and a particular text at a particular time and place under particular circumstances" (Rosenblatt, 1985b, p. 104). Rosenblatt noted that ethnographic approaches are especially appropriate for research grounded in her theories.

This study looks at the readings and responses of second and third grade children and their teacher as they occur within the culture of their classroom. Ethnography is an approach to inquiry which is driven by a theory of culture (Zaharlick & Green, in press). Zaharick and Green (in press) defined culture as "the norms for patterned ways of perceiving, believing, acting, and evaluating of a social group." Culture is the shared meanings members of social groups have for the events, artifacts, and actions of daily life. Given this definition of culture as "shared meaning" it
is possible to consider a classroom as a place where culture is created and where reading can be studied in its cultural context.

Geertz (1983) argued that explanation in the social sciences should be regarded as "a matter of connecting action to its sense rather than behavior to its determinants" (p. 34). Erickson (1986) asserted that "the object of interpretive social research is action, not behavior." (p. 127) Erickson went on to state that "people take action on the grounds of their interpretations of the actions of others." (p. 127) An act is the adjustment of a behavior according to the perceived meaning of a situation. Erickson distinguished between standing, which is a behavior, and standing in line, which is an act. Since this proposed study is not only ethnographic in method but also in epistemology, reading literature might be seen as a behavior, but reading literature in school during quiet reading time is an act.

Taylor (1988) argued that knowledge and mental processes held in the heads of children are beyond the scope of researchers to know. She maintained that it is more appropriate to study the situations and acts in which children must use their in-the-head knowledge. This means that in order to understand readers' stances toward literature and readers' responses to literature, one must observe readers reading in the course of their everyday classroom lives. It is readers' public responses to literature which will be viewed as evidence of stance and response. Put broadly, to understand what readers are doing one must get to know them (Geertz, 1973), and get to know them in their own surroundings.

One of the goals of this study is to present readers' stances and responses to literature from the readers' points of view. Geertz (1973) calls this "thick
description," the describing of social acts and events according to the meaning of those events as held by the participants in the event.

In Chapters One and Two, I argued a perspective of reading and responding to literature which could be called sociolinguistic. Gumperz (1986) explained what a sociolinguistic view of classrooms means for researchers.

The interactional sociolinguistic approach focuses upon the interplay of linguistic, contextual, and social presuppositions which interact to create the conditions for classroom learning. Analysis focuses on key instructional activities that ethnographic observations have shown may be crucial to the educational process. These activities are realized through definable speech events which stand out against the background of everyday conversation; they have characteristics which can be understood and can be described by ethnographers and recognized by participants. Moreover, knowledge of the events and what is accomplished by them is common to groups of people; they are not occasional occurrences but have a place in the daily conduct of affairs of groups. (p. 65)

Gumperz suggested is that by taking a sociolinguistic perspective to classroom learning, researchers will look at the common occurrences of the classroom, the events in which students and teachers act. Ethnographers attempt to describe these events according to the meanings held by the students and teachers who take part in them. An ethnographic perspective on readers' stances and responses to literature will seek to describe the events in which readers show their stances and make their responses public.

Lutz (1981) stated that ethnographic studies take place in context, that is, participants are studied in their own environment and that study is focused upon cycles of events which occur regularly. Mishler (1979) noted that the context within which an act occurs is the resource by which
researchers can begin to understand the act. Jacob (1987) stated that context is viewed as having three components: "physical aspects of the environment, culturally defined events, and other participants" (p. 18).

There is much discussion in the literature as to what constitutes a "whole" culture (cf. Lutz, 1981; Ogbu, 1981; Erickson, 1984). Green and Wallat (1981) note that what a study considers to be the whole context does not need to be the whole culture. What is important is that the unit of analysis be considered holistically (Erickson, 1984). In this study the focus is upon those events which occur in a classroom which might be considered as events in which the children and their teacher make their stances and responses to literature public. The purpose is not only to describe individual events but also to consider how individual events relate to a broader whole; in this case to two broader wholes: how the individual event relates to the use of literature in this classroom and how the individual event relates to the classroom as a whole.

This study might best be described as a topic-oriented ethnography (Hymes, 1982). By topic-oriented Hymes meant that one aspect of a culture is the focus rather than the whole culture. In this study the stances and responses to literature of a class of second and third grade children and their teacher will be the focus, rather than the broad patterns of life in this school and in the community from which these children come. This study shares a similar scope with Corsaro (1984) and McClure (1985) in that each study is focused upon a piece of the total classroom culture. In Corsaro's study the focus was upon peer interaction in the classroom, in McClure's study the focus was upon children's responses to poetry. Each study attempted to present the participant's point of view.
This study may be questioned by some researchers as to whether it may be properly considered an ethnography (Lutz, 1981; Ogbu, 1981 Heath, 1982a). It may properly be labelled an ethnography because this study is ethnographic in terms of its epistemology, because it is driven by a theory of culture, and because it uses ethnographic methods of research. This study shares the epistemological arguments of Taylor (1988) and Geertz (1973, 1983) that in-the-head knowledge is beyond the scope of researchers, that the purpose of this type of research is to describe the stances and responses to literature according to the meanings of these acts as held by the children and their teacher. This study argues a theory of culture as shared meaning. It also uses methods of research considered ethnographic, such as participant observation, informal interviewing, and audio tape recording. Studying the research question in context and studying whole events holistically are also characteristics of ethnographies which are shared by this study.

THE FIELD WORK

In this section I will describe how I chose the site to conduct this study, how I gained access to the site, my role as a researcher in the classroom, how data were collected, and how the data were analyzed.

The Site

The goal of this study is to describe children's and their teacher's stances and responses to literature in the context of a classroom of a
literature-based reading teacher. Given this goal, it was imperative to find a teacher who was a recognized literature-based classroom teacher. Hickman (1979) demonstrated that children's responses to literature can occur over a wide range of acts and that which acts occur in a classroom is largely dependent upon the context created by the classroom teacher. What Hickman's work suggests is that a classroom which provides for a variety of literature experiences should offer a rich and readily available set of data for this study.

During the 1987-1988 school year, I supervised student teachers placed at Highland Park Elementary School, part of the South-Western City School system in Grove City, Ohio. Highland Park had a reputation among members of the Language, Literature, and Reading faculty at The Ohio State University of being an excellent literature-based reading elementary school. Each year scores of visitors, from classroom teachers and administrators in Ohio to scholars in reading, visit Highland Park. Many of the teachers at this school have been trained in literature-based reading. Undergraduate students who were being trained in literature-based reading were often placed at Highland Park for part of their student teaching. I knew from my own observations and from the opinions of many others that Highland Park could be considered a school which was using literature in its classrooms in rich and interesting ways.

During my year as a student teacher supervisor at Highland Park, I came to know the principal, the administrative assistant for staff development, and many of the teachers well. During the winter, the administrative assistant suggested to me that I consider Highland Park as the site for my dissertation research.
In the fall of 1987 I had supervised a student teacher in Christy Pearl's second and third grade classroom. I had admired this classroom very much. I was particularly impressed with Christy's ability to make her teaching and her thinking explicit to her student teacher. I asked another teacher at Highland Park, a former supervisor of student teachers at Highland Park, a university professor who was familiar with the school, and the administrative assistant their opinions of Christy's classroom as a possible site for my study. Each person was enthusiastic about the possibility. Based on my past experiences in this classroom and with the encouragement of others, I asked Christy if she would be interested in allowing me to research how she and her students use literature in her classroom. She replied that she would.

That spring we agreed that a two week pilot study would be appropriate, not only for my purposes of testing data collection techniques but also so that Christy and I could run a trial of what it would be like having a researcher in her classroom for extended periods of time. In April, 1988, I spent two weeks in Christy's classroom, keeping fieldnotes, audio taping, and conducting interviews. We both were pleased with the pilot study and agreed to begin the formal study on the first day of school the following August.

Gaining Access

Gaining access to the field has two aspects; gaining physical access to the site and gaining personal access to the actions and thoughts of the people the researcher is studying. The section above on "The Site"
describes the beginnings of how I gained physical access to Highland Park and to Christy Pearl's classroom. In early August I gave Christy a final draft of my proposal for her review. I also gave a copy of my proposal to an assistant superintendent of the South-Western City Schools. About ten days before the start of the school year I had a meeting with the principal and the administrative assistant of Highland Park. I reviewed my proposal with them, gave them copies, and received their approval to conduct the study. The following day I met with Christy to go over any questions she might have about the study and to ask again for permission to do the study in her classroom. She enthusiastically approved. Four weeks into the school year I sent home with the children permission slips to audio tape record and to use data collected about their children in written reports of the study. I received permission for every child in the classroom.

This gave me permission to be physically present in the classroom and to collect data. However, the quality of data collected is influenced by the second type of gaining access, establishing relationships with the people I was studying so that they would allow me to observe them personally and would share with me their thoughts about what they were doing. These relationships were tied to the roles I played in the classroom.

The Role of the Researcher -- My Presence in the Classroom

Field work studies the status quo (Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988). My goal in this study was to describe the stances and responses to literature of the teacher and the children according to the social structures of the classroom. I wished to study what was already viewed by many as a
successful classroom. I did not want to show them my ideas for "good classroom uses of literature," rather I wished to learn their already established ways of using literature. As such, I wished to be more of an observer than a participant. Spradley (1980) noted that the greater the degree of participation of the researcher in the field site, the more difficult it is for the researcher to become aware of the tacit meanings of the culture. It was my intent to hold my degree of participation to a moderate level (Spradley, 1980) and the form of my participation to reactive (Corsaro, 1984). I intended to observe with as little participation in the classroom as possible. I did not intend to bring new ideas.

On the surface gaining personal access and developing an appropriate role seemed easy. I was welcomed into the building by the administration. Christy was enthusiastic about my being in her classroom. I had spent two weeks in her class the previous spring, so half of her class already knew me. Visitors were common to Highland Park, I thought that it would also be easy to establish an appropriate role with the children which would allow me access to the kinds of data they could provide.

What emerged during the study was not that I established a role in the classroom, but that many roles for me were jointly constructed by the children, Christy, and myself. These constructions were built upon the expectations others had for me, expectations I had for myself, and things I would and would not do in the classroom.
My Role as a Researcher

I was interested in studying the status quo of this classroom. Since I was interested in studying the stances the children and Christy assumed toward literature, I was self-conscious about injecting my own stances into the classroom. Since any human interaction comes wrapped in stance, it was impossible not to show some stances. Nonetheless, I was reluctant to initiate opinions, interpretations or thoughts about literature or about anything concerning the classroom to Christy or to the children. I tried to keep my participation to a moderate level (Spradley, 1980). I tried to keep the form of my interactions with children and with Christy to being reactive (Corsaro, 1984) of what they were doing or saying. I perceived my role as researcher as being primarily an observer. I wanted access with a minimum of intrusion (Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988) upon the way Christy and the children went about the day-to-day business of their classroom.

My Roles as Another Adult in the Classroom -- Relationships with the Children

I doubt that I had one single role which defines the relationships I had with the twenty-eight children in Christy's class. It is more likely that I had twenty-eight different roles, as my relationship with each child was a bit different. During the first week of observation, before I had learned everyone's name, a group of four or five children gathered around me. They asked me if was a teacher or a student. I replied that I was a teacher, but my students were at Ohio State studying to become teachers. I went on
to say, that I was also a student. I was studying their classroom, that I
wanted to understand how they read books. They replied that I must be
both a student and a teacher. But this did not seem to be a very satisfactory
answer to them. While I may have been a teacher, I was not acting like
their teacher, and while I may be a student, I was not doing the same work
they were doing. Mickey put it succinctly, "Mr. Hade, he don't do no work
around here."

While it would be impossible to describe all the nuances of my
relationship with each child, there were certain patterns in my
relationships with them. There were differences among children in how
they would talk to me. Most of the children would talk to me no matter who
initiated the conversation. There were four children who would talk to me
only if I initiated the conversation. These children included those who
tended to be quiet throughout the school day and those who tended to avoid
me. They frequently cast suspicious looks in my direction, especially when
I was writing in my notebook. These children rarely, if ever, approached
me. There were two children who would talk to me only if they initiated
the conversation. These two children were enigmas to me throughout the
study. They could approach me and talk at length about their writing, what
they were reading, or what they did over the weekend. Yet when I would
walk over to where they would be working, they often turned their work
over, face down, so I could not see it. Often they were smiling when they
did this, perhaps for them this was a kind of social game they were playing.
If they didn't turn their work over, they would respond to my questions of
what they were doing with short, curt answers. Likewise, during the final
interview, they gave short, unelaborated answers to my questions, the only
children to respond that way to the interview. They accused me of always watching them and always writing down what they were doing. In spite of these seemingly uncooperative acts, one of the two children invited me to her house for a delicious lunch. They were very cooperative with me when the conversation had been initiated by them. If I initiated the talk, which was usually a question to help me understand what they were doing, their answers were often abrupt.

My roles with the children were defined in part by what I would and wouldn't do with them. I decided early, and checked this with Christy, that I would not discipline children or interfere in their behavior unless they were doing something which could potentially harm someone. I was not a disciplinarian. I was for some children a spelling expert. Generally, if the child had made one good attempt at spelling a word, I would help them with the correct spelling or acknowledge a correct spelling.

Where to sit during class meetings was a problem for me. During meetings, Christy sat in a low chair and the children sat on the floor. I had to choose between sitting on a chair or the floor, which was very uncomfortable for me. This seemed to me to be a choice of presenting myself as "more like a teacher" or "more like a student." I seemed very conspicuous seated on chair taking notes on children sitting beneath me, not to mention the political statement that seemed to make. I chose to sit on the floor.

I was also a listener. I listened to children read their own writing and share projects they were working on. Often they were required to share their writing and other work with three other people. Many children asked me to be one of the three. Christy played a role in me becoming a
listener. She often asked children, when they shared with her, if they had shared with Mr. Hade. I was a listener for children's oral reading.

Occasionally, this was a problem. During quiet reading, when I would be observing children, frequently another child would ask to read to me. I would listen, especially at the beginning of the field work, but soon I had to tell children that I couldn't listen, or could only listen to just a little bit, because I needed to observe. It was a clash of expectations, my expectations for me as a researcher and the child's expectations of me as a listener.

For some of the children I was someone who would listen to them talk about things which happened to them outside of school. I was for them a friend who listened or someone who could be teased. During my third week in the classroom, Mickey teased me for several days about getting me out of the classroom. He threatened to break my arm (I believe so I couldn't write). He complained to friends in front of me, that I was writing down everything he said and did. "I want you out of here tomorrow," he said. When he looked at me, he gave me a baseball umpire's "out" sign. All of which he did with a smile on his face or later telling me he was teasing.

My initial goal of keeping the form of my participation with the children to being reactive was only partially met. There were times I needed to initiate conversation in order to understand better their perspectives on what they were doing. If a child was struggling with a project, I would occasionally offer a suggestion to the child. These initiated conversations were in response to something the child was already doing. With the exception of the final interview, I never asked children to do anything. I only asked them to explain what they were already doing in the classroom.
My Role in Relationship to Christy

Christy and I met about a week before school started. She asked me if I would be commenting to her about her teaching. I inferred from her question that she was hoping that I would periodically give her feedback about her teaching as a supervisor might. This was not an expectation I had, and I was reluctant to make this part of my role. I explained to Christy that I didn't want to change the way she taught, that I wanted to learn about how she was already teaching. I said that I would be sharing with her my observations and I would appreciate her comments on the veracity of them. I also said that while I would try very hard not to give unsolicited advice, I would, if I could, respond to her questions. I do not have written in my field notes any incidents where Christy asked if I thought a lesson was good or if I thought what she was doing was appropriate, nor can I recall any incidents. This was not part of my role in relationship to Christy.

We did talk about many things related to her classroom, not all of which was relevant to my study. We talked about student behavior, how well or how poorly work time had gone, and work which was exceptional for a particular student. Generally, this talk was initiated by Christy. If I initiated this kind of talk, I did so with a question such as, "How did you feel work time went today?" or "Did you see what Brad was doing with his project?" I did not wish to give Christy advice on the affairs of her classroom or pass judgment on them, but rather I tried to understand what her thinking was concerning what was happening. Giving feedback
proved to be unavoidable. Christy said that just through my "natural reactions" I unintentionally gave her "interesting feedback."

I did on two occasions recommend books to her. One day Tara, a second grader, brought in a cucumber, which had been grown inside a bottle. The cucumber was much larger than the bottle's neck. The other children were fascinated with this and wondered how the cucumber got inside the bottle. This reminded me of Like Jake and Me by Mavis Jukes. I went to the school library, checked out the book, and showed it to Christy. The next day Christy read the book aloud to the class.

On another occasion I showed Christy Two Bad Ants by Chris Van Allsburg. Christy had several of his other books in her room and several of the children were spending a great deal of time reading them. Two Bad Ants had just been released and Christy had not yet seen it. After reading it herself before school, she read it aloud to the class that morning.

One of Christy's reasons for allowing me to do research in her classroom, perhaps her most important reason, was that through the research she hoped to learn much about her own classroom. It was important to her to know what I was seeing and what sense I was making of what was occurring in her room. From Christy's perspective this was an important aspect of my role in her classroom. At first this made me feel uneasy. I thought this meant I was to give constant feedback about the quality of her teaching. I thought this would be potentially damaging to our relationship and to the study. My fears were unfounded. Actually, Christy's need overlapped nicely with my need for triangulation (Zaharlick & Green, in press) and member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). While
Christy was learning of my perspectives on what was happening in her classroom, I was gaining her perspectives on my interpretations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>April, 1988</strong></th>
<th><strong>October, 1988 - November, 1988</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>formulate broad research questions</td>
<td>observation of Christy and focus children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obtain Christy's approval to do pilot study</td>
<td>data analysis continues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conduct two-week pilot study</td>
<td>Christy review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analyze data and share with Christy</td>
<td>gaining personal access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May, 1988 - July, 1988</strong></td>
<td><strong>December, 1988</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revise research questions</td>
<td>formal interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write proposal</td>
<td>data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaining physical access</td>
<td>Christy review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August, 1988</strong></td>
<td>gaining personal access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaining physical access</td>
<td>co-construction of role of researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>begin data collection in classroom</td>
<td>research questions focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy review</td>
<td><strong>January, 1989 - March, 1989</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaining personal access</td>
<td>data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-construction of role of researcher</td>
<td>peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September, 1988</strong></td>
<td>Christy review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observation of Christy and entire class</td>
<td><strong>April, 1989 - June, 1989</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data analysis begins</td>
<td>data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy review</td>
<td>writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaining personal access</td>
<td>Christy review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-construction of role of researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research questions begin to focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Cycle

Spradley (1980) described the research cycle as being composed of: 1) asking ethnographic questions 2) collecting ethnographic data 3) making an ethnographic record 4) analyzing ethnographic data 5) which raises new questions and takes the cycle back to step 1. All of these steps occur while in the field and as the cycles recur, observations narrow in scope. The research cycle for this study, presented in a temporal form, is shown in Table 1.

Data Collection

Data collection began with observation and informal interviews with the classroom teacher prior to the first day of school. I began observing the children on the first day of school. I chose to begin on that day because I wanted to observe how the children and Christy constructed events such as read aloud time and quiet reading from the beginning of school. The first six weeks in the classroom were spent in observation of the entire class. I visited the classroom four days a week. The primary focus of these initial observations was to gain a sense of the large features of the social context within which Christy and the children were responding to literature. Another purpose of the observations during these first weeks was to select children for in-depth observation. The next eight weeks were spent in close observation of the focus children and of Christy. During this phase I
visited the classroom three days each week. During the final two weeks of observation, formal interviews were conducted.

**Data Collection -- Making the Ethnographic Record**

One of the distinguishing characteristics of ethnographic research is that data are collected from multiple sources (Green & Wallat, 1981; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983, Denzin, 1989; Zarharick & Green, in press). In this study data were collected in the following ways:

1. Field notes / Participant observation
2. Audio tape recordings
3. Informal interviews with Christy
4. Informal interviews with the students
5. Photocopying student reading logs
6. Formal interview with Christy
7. Formal interviews with the students

Field notes were taken over the course of observation. I took field notes using a modified Corsaro (1984) system. Instead of four types of notes, I took three kinds: theoretical notes, methodological notes, and field (or observational) notes. Field notes were my written recordings of what Christy and the children were doing in the classroom. Methodological notes made reference to what I was doing or might do in the classroom, usually in terms of data collection. Examples of methodological notes are "Tape record Patrick reading aloud to the other boys" and "Kristen has been interested in what I am writing in my book." Theory notes were any writing where I attempted to make theoretical sense of the data or to pose a question about what may be happening. For example "It is interesting how Christy helps the class see in a book what she sees." Theoretical notes could
be considered part of the initial phase of data analysis. In the evening after observation, field notes were transcribed into a microcomputer, elaborated and expanded. In all over four hundred pages of handwritten notes and over four hundred pages of transcribed notes were made.

Some children were curious about my field notebooks. They asked, even into the last weeks of the study, what I was writing in my notebooks. I would reply that I wrote down what they said and did. Some children would then say something and watch me to see if I would write down what they said. On a few occasions, children would point out to me things to write in my notebook. "Write down that Alvin is working on his mural, Mr. Hade," they might say. A couple of children commented on my handwriting, which, I admit, is messy. They suggested that I slow down and try to write more neatly.

Three times during the data collection phase, Christy took my transcribed notes home with her. She made comments to me about them, particularly on aspects of children's responses which I seemed not to be capturing in my notes. She especially prodded me into capturing children's speech while they were reading quietly.

An audio tape recorder was used for recording activities such as interviews, discussions, read alouds, book discussions, informal talk during quiet reading, and conferences. I began tape recording on the first day of school. During the pilot study, I had noticed that the children initially showed much interest in the tape recorder. Because I would be using the tape recorder frequently, I wanted to get this initial wave of interest over early so that the presence of the machine would seem natural. Some children during the first weeks would point at the tape recorder and nudge
their friends as if to say, "watch out, we're being recorded." This behavior subsided quickly after the first three weeks.

The tape recorder was small enough that Christy could carry it in her pocket with a microphone clipped to her lapel. I was able to obtain recordings of her talking and reading with children during quiet reading time.

Each student kept a reading log. In these logs students would record the books he or she read and would often make comments about the books. I borrowed these logs to photocopy.

Informal interviews were held frequently with the classroom teacher. Often, during the evening when I was entering my field notes into the computer, I would have questions about something observed that day. I recorded these questions onto the first page of the next day's notes and would ask these questions early the following day. Generally, these were questions for Christy, but occasionally the questions would be for a student.

The purpose of these interviews was to obtain the teacher's and the student's points of view concerning the literary environment of their classroom. I was especially interested in Christy's point of view concerning the responses to literature of her students, and as a check upon my perceptions of what was occurring in the classroom.

Informal interviews with the students were held primarily to help me understand what meanings the students were making from text or from the situation they were in. These interviews were more like conversations between the researcher and the students which occurred during normal classroom activities. Typical questions for me to ask informally of students were: "Patrick, what are you working on?" or "Patrick, I just saw you
reading to Brad, can you tell me about that?” The quality of informal interviews was very much a product of the type of role which had been established by the individual student and myself, and the student to whom I was asking a question.

During the last two weeks of data collection, I conducted a formal interview with each child and with Christy. The questions were not written out formally but each person was asked to talk about the different events in their classroom in which they might be reading or responding to a book. Specifically, the children and Christy were asked to describe what they did during:

1. morning quiet reading
2. afternoon quiet reading
3. read aloud time
4. discussion after read aloud
5. book discussion groups
6. book logs
7. writing time
8. sharing time
9. doing artwork about a book

They were also asked questions specific to things I had observed about them. Interviews with the children lasted from ten to fifteen minutes.

Christy’s interview was conducted over two days in periods of about 45 minutes each.

**Sampling**

Sampling was conducted with three aspects: children, time, and events. The first six weeks of the study were spent in general observation of the whole class. Because it was impossible to observe closely all twenty-eight children, I decided to select a smaller number of children for focused
observation. In this group I wanted an equal number of boys and girls, a range of reading abilities, and a range of "social styles." Social style refers to whether the child typically reads alone or with other children during quiet reading. After the six weeks, I selected four second graders and six third graders for focused observation. I shared my criteria for selection with Christy and the names of the children I had selected for her approval. In retrospect, though ten children did provide an interesting range of readers, it was still too large a number to manage well.

Events were also sampled. After extended observation it became clear that not every part of the day needed to be observed. It was a must for me to observe quiet reading and read aloud times. The time spent on math was much less important for me to observe. Closely related to event sampling was time sampling. While I did not observe every day of any given week, I did observe each day of the week. I also was unable to observe more than two entire days, but through the course of observation I was able to observe during each part of the day.

The primary data gathered were records of the children's and the teacher's stances and responses to literature and descriptions of the literary environment of the classroom. From the pilot study and the first weeks of observation I observed several large features of the classroom which seemed to provide the context in which the children and Christy were taking stances toward and responding to literature. These features became the focus of my observation.

1. norms, expectations, rights, and obligations
   - what is required, expected, etc.
2. physical layout of the room
   - including what books are available
3. reading in the meeting area at beginning of day
4. quiet reading
   - student and teacher
5. read aloud
6. book discussion groups
7. work time
8. sharing time
9. reading logs
10. teacher book talks
11. teacher questions

Hickman (1981) developed categories of types of responses. These were:

1. listening behaviors
2. contact with books
3. acting on the impulse to share
4. oral responses
5. actions and drama
6. making things
7. writing

The possible range of children's responses to literature is quite broad and can occur over a variety of aspects of the environment. These aspects of the literary environment and categories of types of literary responses provided a focus for observation, what kinds of actions I looked for. It also provided a possible framework for analyzing data, that is, was there anything in the structure of an event which seemed to encourage or enable certain kinds of responses to be made.

Data Analysis

As is typical of an ethnography, data analysis began with the first piece of data collected (Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988). In doing ethnographic research there is a transactive relationship between data collection and data analysis. As Spradley (1980) pointed out in his description of the
research cycle, data analysis and data collection inform each other. Decisions I made about what to write in my notebook, what I would tape record, what questions I would ask, what pieces of student work I would photocopy were all informed by my analysis of data I had previously collected. Admittedly, much of this early analysis of data was tacit. However, there was little doubt that from the first field note I took, I was beginning to build a theory about what was happening in Christy's classroom.

At various points during my time in the field, I would make a list of everything I thought I knew about a certain aspect of Christy's classroom, say, quiet reading time. I would then take this list to Christy for her comments on its veracity. After doing this several times, I began to use these interpretations to inform my further observations. Analysis of observations informed my choice of children for focused observation, the events I chose to observe, the times of day I chose to observe, and the questions I chose to ask during the formal interviews. When I finished observing the classroom, I had, then, constructed a general framework of the events in Christy's classroom.

The method of data analysis was constant comparative (Glaser & Straus, 1967; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I took pieces of data in turn and coded them, primarily in terms of event and in terms of stance. New pieces of data were analyzed according to their "likeness" or "unlikeness" to previous pieces of analyzed data. Spradley's (1980) list of semantic relationships serves as an example of the kinds of relationships I was looking for as I sifted through the data.
Relationship | Form
---|---
1. strict inclusion | X is a kind of Y
2. spatial | X is a part of Y
3. cause-effect | X is a result of Y
4. rationale | X is a reason for doing Y
5. location-for-action | X is a place for doing Y
6. function | X is used for doing Y
7. means-end | X is a way to do Y
8. sequence | X is a step or stage in Y
9. attribution | X is a characteristic of Y

(Spradley, 1980, p. 93)

I hung a large piece of mural paper on a wall. As I looked at field notes, transcripts, or photocopied student work, I would pencil in the margin codes or categories. I also wrote each category on a "post-it" and stuck the piece of paper on the mural paper. As new categories emerged, new post-its would be made and put on the mural. If categories shared some semantic relationship, I wrote those categories on the same color of post-it paper. As the data analysis continued, the wall filled with post-its of many colors with many post-its of each color. I moved post-its around, merged some categories with others, and split categories if a single category was becoming too broad. I made two passes through the entire set of data collected and in some cases made three and four passes through certain pieces of data which seemed to be key.

During the analysis, every two to three weeks I would copy the categories on the mural into a notebook and share them with someone else.
Usually, this was Christy. I would explain to her what I meant by the category and give her examples from my notes. Then I asked her if this was a fair interpretation of that particular aspect of her classroom. Usually, it was, but if it was not, then I would take down Christy's comments and rethink the category. While the names of the categories are my own, what they represent has been checked with Christy for their accuracy and veracity.

Peer Review

I had breakfast weekly with a colleague who was also working on her dissertation. At this time we would discuss a variety of matters concerning our research. Among these matters were our analyses of data. Periodically, I would share my data analysis with this colleague. I would explain the categories, give examples, and ask her opinion of the soundness of the analysis. Questions or clarifications she had concerning my analysis were noted and used to rethink that aspect of the analysis.

Christy Review

Christy has been an important part of every aspect of the fieldwork. She read my expanded fieldnotes, the transcripts of the audio tape recordings, the transcripts of the interviews, a paper I presented at a national conference, and chapters of this dissertation. She made suggestions for observations. She checked the categories for data analysis. She offered an addendum to the transcript of her interview, clarifying
points in the interview. At each step in the research I checked the
veracity of my observations, analysis, and writing with her.

"Culture is expressed (or constituted) only by the actions and words of
its members and must be interpreted by, not given to, a fieldworker" (Van
Maanen, 1988, p. 3). The categories used in the analysis are mine. They are
my way of making sense of the data. I have checked these categories with
Christy. She had a few suggestions for changes, which I have noted in the
discussion in the following chapters. These categories should not be
viewed as generic of any classroom. But, because they have been checked
by Christy, they can be considered as generic of this classroom.

Building Trustworthiness

The goal of any piece of research is for it to be a warranted claim to
know. For a piece of research using ethnographic methods a warranted
claim to know is established by demonstrating trustworthiness (Lincoln
and Guba, 1985). Trustworthiness in this study is demonstrated the
following ways.

Observation and data collection were prolonged and persistent. I spent
a period of approximately sixteen weeks in observation and data collection
with over fifty visits.

Data were triangulated. Triangulation seems to have two different
meanings to ethnographers. According to Denzin (1989), triangulation
means that multiple methods of data collection are used. Denzin stated
there are several different kinds of triangulation. Data triangulation can
mean that data are collected from multiple sources, be they people, places,
or times. Triangulation can also mean that different investigators may be used or that different theories might be used to drive the study. In this study data collection was triangulated by collecting data on different people with a variety of methods over an extended period of time.

Triangulation, according to Zaharlick and Green (in press) means the researcher checking his interpretations, impressions, and analyses with the classroom teacher and with the children to confirm that what the researcher perceives is the meaning held by those he is studying. This has also been described as member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This was a daily occurrence for me. I have already described how Christy was a vital part of reviewing my notes, my analysis, even my data collection methods.

Another purpose of ethnographic research is to embed what is observed within its larger cultural context (Green and Wallat, 1981). Though the focus of this study is upon the stances and responses to literature of children and Christy, these actions will be described in relationship to the use of literature as a whole in the classroom and to the classroom as a whole.

Geertz (1973) argued that ethnographic research does not seek to generalize across cases but within cases. Erickson (1986) stated that interpretive research seeks out "concrete universals." It is by studying intensely the particular actions of children and their teacher in a particular setting, doing what Geertz (1973) called "close reading" of a culture, that generic patterns of reader’s stances toward and responses to literature will emerge.
WRITING THE ETHNOGRAPHY

An ethnography is a written representation of a culture (Van Maanen, 1988). The questions an ethnographer poses lie at the margins between two cultures, the culture of the people studied and the culture of the ethnographer and his audience. By necessity, ethnographies decode one culture while they recode it for another (Barthes, 1972; Van Maanen, 1988). This ethnography is my interpretation of the reading culture in Christy's classroom. It is a description, framed by my theoretical perspective and my questions, checked against the perceptions of those people it describes. It is not the description (Mead, 1972). Since the readers' interpretations may not be the same as mine, it is my purpose in writing this ethnography to supply readers with enough data and information that they may, if they wish, come to their own conclusions.

An ethnography is a selective account that has a goal and a point of view (Zaharlick & Green, in press). I have tried throughout this chapter to describe the goals and points of view which frame this study. What follows is a view of what reading literature is like in a particular second and third grade classroom. The findings of this study (as with any other) are context-bound, bound not only to the context of this classroom, but also to the context of the writer of this ethnography.

Because of the variety of social and cultural factors involved in reader's responses to literature, it is possible that what is happening is unique to the children in this one setting. It has been argued here that stances and responses are tied to the event within which they occur. If generic stances and responses are to be understood at all, then specific stances and
responses must first be analyzed. The purpose of ethnographic research such as this study is to generalize within the acts described, not across acts (Geertz, 1973).

**SUMMARY**

This study is an ethnography of a second and third grade classroom and the stances toward and responses to literature of the children and their teacher. This classroom was chosen as the site for the study because the teacher was acknowledged to be a successful literature-based classroom teacher.

Fieldwork consisted of a transactive cycle of gaining access, co-constructing researcher roles, collecting data, and data analysis. Data was collected through field note, audio tape recordings, interviews, and photocopying written work. A constant-comparative method was used to analyze the data. The classroom teacher was involved in each phase of the fieldwork to provide triangulation of the data collection, data analysis, and presentation of the data.
CHAPTER IV

THE SCHOOL AND THE CLASSROOM

HIGHLAND PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Highland Park Elementary School is one of the fifteen elementary schools in the South-Western City School district which is located in Franklin County, Ohio. In terms of student population Southwestern is the seventh largest school district in Ohio. Highland Park is located on the southwestern edge of Grove City, Ohio.

Approximately 450 children in grades kindergarten through fifth grade attend Highland Park. Seven of the children are African-American children, three of the children are Asian-American, and the rest of the students are white. Economically, most of the children come from middle class or lower middle class homes. Approximately 11% of the children qualify for free or reduced hot lunch. About one third of the children walk to school from the neighborhood. The homes around the school appear to be mostly three bedroom ranch or split foyer houses.

Among those who ride the bus, are children from two federally subsidized apartment complexes. Though no statistics are kept, many of the teachers at Highland Park believe that there are many children attending Highland Park whose parents were born in Appalachia. They base this belief upon the places the children say they go to visit relatives (e.g. West Virginia, Kentucky) and upon the children's language patterns. While it is
difficult to guess a percentage, it seems safe to say that the percentage of children with Appalachian backgrounds is under 20% and probably under 10%.

Highland Park Philosophy

Though there are differences in style and structure between classrooms and teachers at Highland Park, there is a core of philosophical themes and practices which are part of each of the classrooms.

At Highland Park the curriculum is integrated. A theme is selected for study, for example, pollution. The teacher will gather many different kinds of materials together for this unit. She will pull thirty to fifty books on pollution. She will try to get a range of genres, nonfiction, poetry, fiction, picture books. The teacher will read aloud books on pollution. The children will be encouraged to read the books gathered during quiet reading. They may do some writing about pollution, either informational or fictional writing. They may make murals, dioramas, or other forms of art. They may go on a hike and look for signs of pollution. They may pick up litter from the school playground. Students may take a poll on opinions and graph their results. While not every activity during the day will relate to the theme of study, the theme of study does dominate much of what the children do during the day. Teachers seek out activities which relate to aspects of the theme of study and which require the children to read, write, create, and perform mathematical operations.

Generally, children have choices in the work they do. It is rare that each student would be working on exactly the same thing. If there is
writing to do, the students will have a choice in what to write. During reading time, the students may choose what they wish to read. If there is a science project assigned, usually the students will have some choices as to what project they do. During work time, students may have five or six possibilities of work from which to choose. The staff at Highland Park believes that permitting children choices within defined limits helps children assume, learn and practice responsibility and self-discipline.

With the exception of one half-day kindergarten classroom, each room is a "family group," it has students from two different grade levels. During the fall of 1988 there were these classrooms:

1 kindergarten
4 kindergarten/first grade
1 first grade/second grade
4 second grade/third grade
1 third grade/fourth grade
4 fourth grade/fifth grade

The staff and administrators give several reasons for grouping children in this manner. They feel that it is an advantage for a teacher to have a child for two years, that the teacher comes to know the child well and can teach to the child's strengths and weaknesses much better. They also feel it is better for children. The older children help the younger children adjust. The staff also wants children of a variety of abilities in each classroom. The teachers encourage the children to help each other with projects and other work. With this kind of grouping, they feel much peer teaching and learning can occur.
While there are variations in individual classrooms, there is a similar basic structure to the school day in each of the classrooms at Highland Park. The day begins with a whole class planning meeting. At this meeting the teacher sets out expectations, assignments, and choices for work time. The planning meeting is followed by an extended period of work time. The length varies from grade level to grade level, but in general work times are rarely shorter than 30 minutes and often an hour or longer. During work time the children may make choices about what they work on. They may also move about the room and talk quietly with each other. On most days there will be work time during the morning and during the afternoon. Other common events are teacher read aloud time, time for quiet reading, writing time, and math. At the end of the day, there is another whole group meeting. At this time children might share work, either finished or in progress, and ask for comments or questions. It is also common for sharing to occur after work times.

CHRISTY'S CLASSROOM

Christy's classroom was located in the Big Area. The Big Area was a large room which contained 10 classrooms around the outer edges and a media center in the middle. Though the only walls in the Big Area were outer walls, teachers used portable bulletin boards, portable chalk boards, and shelves to make boundaries and visual barriers between classrooms.
Christy's Students

Christy began the school year with 28 students. Eleven were second graders, eight boys and 3 girls. Seventeen were third graders, eight boys and nine girls. Of these third graders thirteen were in Christy's room as second graders. During the period of observation, one second grade boy and one third grade girl moved away, and one second grade boy moved in.

One child in Christy's classroom was Asian-American. The rest of the children were white. Though no statistics were kept, based upon the places the children said they traveled to visit relatives, Christy guessed that three or four of the children may have Appalachian roots. The children came from a variety of economic backgrounds, from those who had parents who were professionals to children who had unemployed parents. Three children in her classroom qualified for free or reduced hot lunch. According to Christy, three of the children lived in federally subsidized housing, the rest in houses. Fifteen children rode the bus to school, ten walked to school, and four attended through special permission. Of these four, two children attended Highland Park because their after-school babysitter lived in the area, and the other two attended Highland Park because their parents believed in the philosophy of the school.

The children in Christy's room were an active and lively group of children. By all appearances the children were enthusiastic about school and appeared to enjoy being there. According to Christy, most of the children worked well independently and were self-motivated. A few, four or five of the children, needed much direction from her. Discipline problems were usually about classroom noise, children getting along with
each other, and following classroom rules and procedures. I witnessed no child sassing or challenging the teacher, I heard very little profanity, and never saw any physical fighting.

The Tone of Christy's Classroom--The Classroom as a Workshop

Christy viewed her classroom as a workshop (1). The room was arranged into areas, each area was a storehouse of materials to which the children might come to obtain what they needed to do their work. The meeting area was lined with bookshelves. There were around 600 books which are a part of Christy's permanent classroom collection. In addition, Christy would have around 30 to 50 books from the school and public library on a display shelf in the meeting area. These books usually were about some aspect of the present unit of study, though some books may have been selected because Christy liked them and wanted to share them with her students. Hanging from the ceiling above the picture book shelf were plastic rings which had ten plastic clothes pins attached. Clamped by the clothes pins were books written and illustrated by the children in the classroom. Bookmarks were kept in this area, as were the children's reading logs. There was also a listening center in the meeting area. A phonograph and a cassette tape recorder were connected to a listening post which had four head phones attached. On occasion, a film strip viewer might also be at the listening center.

The writing area contained a case with lots of small shelves. Each shelf contained a different kind of paper. There was lined paper, unlined paper, white paper, manilla paper, lined paper in yellow, red, green and blue
colors. There was computer printout paper of various sizes. There were also cans with pencils in them and on the floor a crate with lapboards. The children's writing folders and journals were kept on top of the shelves. Dictionaries were stored on the bottom shelf. There were also bookmaking materials: pieces of cardboard, folded pieces of blank paper which had been stapled along the fold, and wallpaper books for making covers.

In the art area were two tables which had been wrapped with a thick vinyl covering for easy clean-up. A shelf held boxes which contained scissors, glue, material, crayons, oil crayons, colored chalk, water colors, tissue paper, markers, paint brushes, "nerf" (the school word for junk), buckets, bowls, sponges, scrap paper, clay, charcoal, yarn, and colored pencils. A cupboard kept construction paper, drawing paper, and newspapers. On top of the cupboard were baskets for storing finished and unfinished work. In the math and science area were such things as geo boards, counters, flash cards, a variety of math games and manipulatives, balance scales, magnifying glasses, shells, rocks, rulers, math textbooks, graph paper, play money, play clocks, and abacus. There were also tables which display material which had been gathered for the unit of study. During the geology unit, there were on the tables several rock collections, which the students and Christy had brought in, a rock tumbler, a coal garden, and salt and sugar crystals the children were growing. Also in the math science area were the class pets, a turtle and a rabbit.
There were a variety of workplaces for the children. There were tables, desks, a couch, and the floor. This enabled children to work in groups or alone, to talk while they work or to work quietly. Children working on larger projects, such as murals, might move into the school lobby.

On the walls, tables, and bulletin boards were displayed children's work. In fact, the only things on the walls and bulletin boards were completed children's work. This work might include writing, pictures, murals, graphs, charts, models, and dioramas.

Christy set aside long periods of time for uninterrupted work. She expected that many of the projects and assignments children worked on might take several days to complete. Work time was a time of variety, choice, and exploration. Children were offered a variety of possible activities and choices. These might include writing a report, listening at the listening center, making a science observation, publishing a story in hardback book form, making a picture, doing a math worksheet, and constructing a model of a geology museum. Through the variety of work choices Christy offered the children, she provided opportunities to explore and to try out ideas, whether the ideas were for a written piece, a picture, or a science exploration. Through either her own suggestions or through the ideas the children might have on their own, Christy encouraged the children to try new ideas. "You might want to try that" was a phrase Christy often said to children. It could be, "You might want to write about that." Or "Kids might want to look at the crystals today." Or "You might want to use charcoal in your tornado picture." Or "You might want to put a little food coloring in your crystals you are growing." When Tara
insisted she knew how to make sandstone by putting sand in water, Christy responded with "Tara, you might want to try that."

Christy often set up work choices by first demonstrating to the class possible ways of approaching a project. When Christy read Tico and the Golden Wings to the class, she assigned them to make a picture about part of the story. She showed the children some shiny, gold paper she had and noted that it was like the paper Leo Lionni had used to make Tico's wings. She added that "kids might want to use this paper in their pictures."

Christy felt that for the classroom to operate as a workshop, children must have choices and their choices must count. Christy trusted that all children have the ability to learn and that children would learn in the environment of her classroom. She felt it was important for her to respect the children's choices, efforts, thoughts, and ideas. This did not mean children could work on anything. Christy made assignments and would limit children's work choices if the children had unfinished work, were having difficulties making "good" work choices, or were not using their time well.

Attention to Detail and Observing

Paying attention to detail and making close and careful observations were two of Christy's expectations of students which cut across learning in all curricular areas. One of Christy's goals for the school year was for the second graders to be able to put their observations on paper and for the third graders to make a "good, quality" observation. During the first week of school, Christy gave as a work choice observing the class turtle. During
work time children watched the turtle, picked it up, and drew pictures of it. Following work time, Christy asked the children what they noticed about the turtle. The children's responses were:

Samantha: "There were twelve spots on the bottom of the turtle."
Lisa: "When you pick it up, it like swims in the air."
Brad: "When his head goes inside, it gets all wrinkled up."
Ricky: "His skin looks like it is sticking to his shell."
Tara: "Our armpits are curved and so is the turtle's"
Annie: "She has four claws in the back and five claws in the front"

Christy explained that the turtle makes the swimming motions because it doesn't like to be held upside down. There was also discussion about why the turtle has one more claw on its front feet. Christy wrote the children's responses on a piece of chart paper and labeled it, "Facts about Our Turtle."

When the class was doing the geology unit, Christy placed several different kinds of crystals in a basket in the science area. She assigned the children to make a sketch of one of the crystals and to write a detailed observation. Christy would share with the class completed observations she felt showed good detail either in writing or in sketching.

Christy did a variety of things to help the children produce more detailed writing. She would write a sentence on a piece of chart paper, such as, "It is snowing," and would ask the children to tell words which described snow. The children offered "cold," "white," "fluffy," "frosty," and "windy." Then Christy asked the class how they could make her sentence a "better sentence." Various children made suggestions and the sentence, "It
is snowing," grows into "It is silently snowing outside with fluffy, white snowflakes twisting and turning into a big white blanket of snow on the ground." Christy said, "Wow, this is a lot better than 'It is snowing."

Christy would also ask the children to listen for descriptive words as she read from books. When the children were doing writing about weather, Christy read portions from several different books, each time asking the children to listen for words which described weather. After reading Christy and the children would list the words on chart paper.

Detail was expected in the work children produced. As mentioned previously, Christy expected and helped children write descriptively. When children shared their writing during sharing time, Christy would comment about details and description. Christy also would often show pictures students had made and comment about the detail the student had put in the picture.

Children were expected to notice things in Christy's classroom. They were expected to keep a curious and careful eye and ear toward science displays, pets, read alouds, and each other's work. They were also expected to show attention to detail in the work they produced.

Sharing, Demonstrating, Commenting, and Questioning

Meeting time was not only a time for Christy to spell out her expectations for work time. Meetings could also be times when Christy and the children shared work and other items, demonstrated activities, and made comments and asked questions about what was shared and demonstrated.
Sharing was an integral part of each school day. Christy shared daily a picture book with the children by reading it aloud. If a child had produced a piece of work which was a good example of what Christy was looking for, she would share that work with the group, making comments about what she liked about the work. Children also shared all kinds of work in all kinds of stages of progress. Children might share work in progress and receive comments and suggestions from Christy and other members of the class. Christy had the children share work in progress in order for them to focus upon producing quality work and to think about the processes of making whatever it was they were sharing.

During the geology unit, Carolyn's grandfather brought in a small rock polisher. Christy gathered the children into a meeting and showed them the machine. She showed them the parts of the polisher, how the polisher worked, some rocks which had been polished, and the steps to take in polishing rocks. When she finished her demonstration, she asked, "What questions do you have about this rock tumbler?" This may seem like a small matter, but no sharing ended without the sharer asking if there were any questions or comments. It did not matter if the sharer was Christy or a student. It did not matter if what was shared was a picture book, student work, or something a child brought from home to show. The children were always asked if they had any questions or comments.

Christy assumed that children would be interested in what they were studying and in each other's work. Children were expected to have questions and to want to know more about what they were looking at or listening to.
Exploring Possibilities

Taken as a whole these aspects of the tone of Christy's classroom suggest that Christy encouraged her students to explore the possibilities of whatever the students' attention was focused upon. Learning in this classroom was often exploring possibilities. This was perhaps best illustrated by the questions Christy asked. What does it mean to be a friend? What do you see in this crystal? Why don't you try using oil crayon in your picture? Can you add more detail in your description of the tornado?

A DAY IN CHRISTY'S ROOM

The day described is Monday, September 19. The commentary around this day is based upon a composite of many days.

Students who arrived at school before 8:10 went first to the gym. After 8:10, they went to their classroom, where they hung up their coats and put their lunch bags on the lunch cart. By 8:15 there were 12 children in the room. Seven were in the meeting area, either reading silently, reading with other children or browsing through the book shelves. The other five milled about the room, talking with each other and looking at the class pet turtle and rabbit. Christy came into the room and reminded the children they were supposed to be reading a book in the meeting area.

By 8:30 all 28 children had arrived and were sitting on the floor in the meeting area. Most of them were holding a book, two children, Jason and Kristen, stared into space. There was much talking among the children. Most of them were reading with and to each other. D.J., Carolyn, and
Samantha took turns reading aloud *The Biggest Nose* (2). Alan and Tim leaned against the picture book shelves, holding copies of *In a Dark, Dark Room*. Patrick read aloud to Jerid *Scary Stories To Tell in the Dark*. Jerid pointed to the pictures and made comments. Others were sharing as well and the noise level grew. Christy in a soft voice said "freeze please," and the children became silent. She reminded them that they each were to have a book and that they needed to read quietly while she took lunch count. Christy sat down on a small chair in front of the chalk board and began the lunch count.

In a soft voice Christy called out each student's name, beginning with the second graders. The student replied either, "packing" or "buying." Two children assisted Christy, one collected and counted lunch money, the other stamped the back of the hand of those children who were buying a lunch. Meanwhile, the children were either reading silently or quietly to each other. They looked at what others were reading and traded books when others were finished. Occasionally, when the quiet readers became loud, Christy reminded them that they needed to be quiet so that everyone could hear her call out names.

Around 8:45 lunch count was finished. The student counting money took the money and lunch count to the office. The rest of the children put their books away, either back on the shelves or in their cubbies. Mike continued to read his book, *The Littles Have a Wedding*. Christy reminded him that he needed to put his book away and return to the meeting area. When the children returned, they sat on the floor facing Christy.
On the chalk board was written:

Schedule

A.M. Friends picture and writing
Q.R.
P.M. Art
meeting/work time
1:45 3rd grade math

In the corner of the meeting area was an easel with a large piece of chart paper. On the paper was written, "Recipe for a Friend." Leaning against Christy's chair was a copy of Friends by Helme Heine.

Christy asked what the children did over the weekend. The class talked about trips taken, soccer and football games, and backyard adventures. Christy noted that these would make for good writing in their journals.

Christy then held up Friends. She read the title and the author's name. She noted that this book was originally written in German. She showed the title page to the children and then began to read. She held the book with the print facing her. After she finished reading a page, she turned the book toward the children so they could see the illustrations. Carolyn and Sally stood behind Christy and rubbed her shoulders as she read. After Christy finished reading, the class and she discussed the book. They talked about the pictures, about what the characters did in the book and what the book said about being friends.

From this discussion Christy took the chart paper with "Recipe for a Friend" written on it. She took a marker and asked the children what would be the ingredients for a good friend. The children raised their hands and Christy called on them. Nancy said "nice" and Tara suggested "happy." The discussion slackened and Christy asked them to think of things they had
done for friends. Brandon said a friend lets other friends play what they want to. During the discussion a woman took all the third grade boys for hearing tests. When the boys returned, the third grade girls left. Cindy said that friends cheer up each other when they are upset. The chart paper began to fill with words, phrases and sentences about friends. Christy then said that this morning the children's first job was going to be to do a picture about a time they did something for a friend they felt proud about. She passed out white drawing paper. She told the children they may make any size picture they wish, but it needed to be a good picture. Christy said that they needed to put some thought into it. When their pictures were finished, then they were to do some writing. Samantha asked if everyone had to do this and Christy replied they did, that she wanted everyone thinking about being nice and good to their friends.

Christy explained that they may use any kind of writing paper they have in the room. She escorted the children to the writing center, where the paper was kept and showed the various kinds of paper to the children. At 9:35 Christy was finished. The children who had ideas for their pictures took a piece of drawing paper and left for various places in the room to work. Christy took five children who were having trouble thinking about what to do back to the meeting area. She went over the chart with them asking them if they could think of a time when any of the things on the chart happened to them.

Children took their papers to tables and desks. They went to the art area to collect crayons, markers, chalk, oil crayons, and watercolors. They spread out over the classroom, at tables, desks, and the floor.
At 10:25 Christy said "freeze please" and told the class it was time to clean up before silent reading. Children were supposed to clean up their own things and then go to an assigned area and clean up that area. One child would roll the cart with the sack and box lunches on it to the cafeteria.

Every child working on the same thing, such as happened on this day, was rare for a work time. Generally, there was a list of choices written on the board. These choices would be combinations of assignments and activities which were almost always acceptable choices. For example, for the rest of the week, the *Friends* picture and writing would be listed as a choice for work time. If by Friday, there were some children not finished, and on this day there were, then Christy would make that work those children's only choice. This activity was related to the unit of study, friendship and feeling good about oneself. There always was some work choice related to the theme. There could also be choices on math. While students did not have the choice to do these assignments or not, they did have the choice of when they would do them. If a child's work was not finished after what Christy felt to be a reasonable amount of time, then she would require that child to make that work choice. Ongoing choices included writing in journals, reading, and listening to tapes at the listening center.

As children finished their cleaning up, they got books and sat down in the meeting area. Cindy sat against the chalkboard reading *Frosted Glass* by Denys Cazet. Carolyn and Lisa each had a copy of *Cloudy with a Chance of Meatballs*. They took turns by page reading aloud to each other. As all the children finished clean up and came to the meeting area, Christy came in with a stack of reading logs in her hands. These were for the third
graders. The second graders also kept a log. In theirs they wrote down author and title of the book. In these new logs the third graders would also write down comments about the book. Christy showed the third graders their form. She explained that they were to write about what they were reading and that she would read what they wrote and write back to them. She then called on children who were reading quietly. They could leave the meeting area and read wherever they wished.

There were three areas which were popular places to read, the couch, under tables, and in the meeting area. Children who chose to read alone also liked to go into the coat racks or read at one of the desks.

Alan and Ricky laid on their backs in the meeting. Alan had a copy of Owliwer and Ricky had Frederick's Fables. The boys covered their heads with their books and read aloud. This caused a muffled roar, which elicited giggles from the boys. Cindy finished reading Frosted Glass. She picked up her reading log and wrote down the title, author, and sentence about the book. Then she put the book back on the display shelf and selected Ira Sleeps Over. She returned to her spot by the chalk board and began to read.

Tara, a second grader, told Christy she wanted to do reading logs also. So, Christy stapled together a few pieces of paper in Tara's folder.

At 11:00 the children left for lunch and recess. They came back from lunch at 12:00. Because this day was Monday, they were met in the room by the art teacher. They had art until 12:45.

At 12:45 the children returned from art and sat in the meeting area. Christy talked to them about a bar graph she wanted them to make for math. This involved doing some polling of opinions, such as what is your favorite food, and then graphing the results. In addition to the graph the
children were given these work choices which were written on a piece of computer printout paper and taped to the chalkboard in the meeting area:

- **Friends** picture and writing (needs to be finished by Friday)
- writing or other unfinished work
- math choice -- math book, math games, other items on the math shelf
- observing the rocks set out in the science area
- writing in journals
- reading logs

Worktime always began in the meeting area. Christy spelled out her expectations. She went over their choices and often made priorities for them. For example she might say, "if your **Friends** picture is not finished you need to work on that first." After going over the choices, the children, one by one, told Christy what they were going to work on. If Christy said "O. K." then they could leave the meeting area. Children then obtained the materials they needed from the various parts of the room, art supplies, pencils, paper, and took them to desks, tables, the floor or the couch. Frequently, Christy made the couch off-limits for work time. Children were allowed to move about the room, chat, and change their choice while they worked. Christy might take away these privileges for children who abused them, did not get their work finished, or had not made appropriate progress. As the children worked, Christy moved about the room, helping students with their work, reminding some students they needed to be
working, and occasionally, having someone put their head down for bothering other students.

This day much of worktime was taken by the children asking each other about favorite foods and sports. Some of the children went out into the Big Area and asked children and teachers from other classrooms. As children finished these graphs, they worked on *Friends* pictures, original writing, and games from the math shelf.

At 1:25 the second graders were called to the meeting area by Christy. She quickly explained a math paper on single digit subtraction she wanted them to do. At 1:30 the children went outside for a fifteen minute recess.

At 1:50 the third graders were in the meeting area with Christy for a math lesson. The second graders were working on their subtraction papers. The second graders had gathered unifix cubes and other counters and used them to figure out the problems. At 2:05 the third graders left the meeting area. They had an assignment from their math textbook. Children were working at desks, tables, the couch, and the floor (with a lap board). Some children moved about, working at a table, then moving to a desk. Many chatted with those close to them.

At 2:20 Christy said "freeze please" and announced it was time to clean up. The children put away their math into their cubbies and went to their designated areas to clean up. Scraps of paper were picked up, books were straightened, art supplies were picked up off the floor and returned to their boxes, tables were washed, and the pets were fed. Christy moved about the room reminding some of the children they needed to be cleaning up their area or putting away the unifix cubes they got out. When the children were finished, they sat on the floor in the meeting area.
On this day, a book order arrived. The class had some new books. Christy showed the class the new books: *My Father's Dragon*, *Nate the Great*, and *Miss Rumphius*. There were also multiple copies of three titles: 2 copies of *Bunnicula*, 2 of *The Biggest Bear*, and 5 copies of *The Beast in Ms. Rooney's Room*. Christy noted that the class might, if they wished, have a book discussion group on *The Beast in Ms. Rooney's Room*. At 2:35 the first trip bus riders were dismissed, about ten children. The remaining children looked at the new books and talk. At 2:45 they were dismissed.

**SUMMARY**

Children at Highland Park and in Christy's room while not ethnically diverse, were not privileged children. The children came from lower, lower-middle, and middle class backgrounds.

The classrooms at Highland Park shared certain common practices and philosophies. The curriculum was integrated. Children were given choices in the work which they do. Classrooms contained "family groupings." Each school day included time for planning, extended periods for uninterrupted work, and sharing time.

Christy's classroom operated like a workshop. It was physically arranged into centers in which materials were stored. It was scheduled like a workshop, with longer periods of work time. Work time was a time of variety, choice, and exploration. The children were offered a variety choices in the work which they did. Christy encouraged her students to observe carefully, pay attention to detail, and to try out and explore new and different things. Sharing was an important part of Christy's
classroom. Children might share with each other while they worked. They also shared during sharing time, where they made comments and asked questions about each other's work.

A typical day in this classroom included time for quiet reading, Christy reading aloud to the students, long period of work time in which the children had work choices, writing time, a time for sharing, and math.

Notes

1. I first heard the metaphor of the classroom as a workshop from a talk given by Moira McKenlzie to a group of undergradute education students. McKenzie said that the workshop classroom is organized around centers, which are not places where students work on teacher assigned activities, but are places to obtain the materials the students need to do the projects and other work they have chosen to do. After concluding the observations of Christy's classroom, I said to her that her classroom reminded me of a workshop. Before I had a chance to explain what I meant by that, she replied that that was exactly what her classroom was. She talked about giving children work choices and that it was important for teachers to respect the choices children make. Later, Christy discovered that Lindfors (1987) used this metaphor as well. After Christy read Lindfors' description of classroom which operate as workshops (pp. 292-314), she said, "I thought that pretty much described my room." I agree.

2. All children's books cited in this report are listed alphabetically by title in Appendix D.
CHAPTER V
LITERATURE EVENTS:
READING AND RESPONDING TO LITERATURE IN THE CLASSROOM

When children and their teacher read and respond to a piece of literature they do so as part of a cultural event. There were a variety of events in Christy's classroom in which literature was read and responded to by the students and by Christy. In this chapter the various events in which the members of this classroom read and responded to literature will be described.

PHYSICAL ASPECTS OF THE LITERATURE ENVIRONMENT

In Chapter Four a physical description of the classroom was provided. At few more points particular to the physical description of the literature environment need to be made. Many of the events in which children and Christy read and responded to literature occurred or began in the meeting area. The meeting area was a space of about 8 feet by 10 ten feet. On one wall were the coat racks. One of the walls perpendicular to that wall was a chalkboard divider, which separated Christy's classroom from a fourth/fifth grade classroom. The other two sides were bounded by book shelves. One shelf was about 30 inches high and about 6 feet long. In it were kept picture books. The shelves had dividers about every 15 to 18 inches. The books, a mix of hardbacks and paperbacks, were grouped by
subject and placed into these dividers. Groupings and approximate numbers of books were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bears</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs, Cats, Pigs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephants, Mice, Rabbits</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feathered Friends</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretend Creatures</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall Tales</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folktales</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other book shelf was tall, about 60 inches high and 36 inches long. On the side facing the meeting area were kept:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poetry Books</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I Can Read&quot; Books</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storybox Books</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Copies of Books</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(numbers are approximate) 14 titles

One the side of the book shelf opposite the meeting area were kept:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Books</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Books</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(numbers are approximate)

Perpendicular to this book shelf was a display shelf in which books were placed so that their covers faced forward. Generally, there were 30 to 50 books in this case, all of which had been gathered by Christy from area public libraries. She selected these books based upon the unit of study in which the class was currently engaged. The year began with books about friendship, getting along with others, and feeling good about oneself. By
the end of September these books were replaced with books on geology. By the end of October the shelf held books about weather and autumn. These books would include fiction, poetry, and nonfiction titles. Christy also placed in this case books which she liked but did not have any connection to the theme of study. For example, while the books on weather were in the room, there were also several of Chris Van Allsburg's books, some of which had a connection to weather and others which did not.

Suspended from the ceiling above the picture book shelf were three plastic hangers. These hangers were hoops with clothes pin-like clamps hanging from them. Christy put the books the children wrote and illustrated on these clamps. She also put new paperback books on them. The children were free to select either kind of book as a quiet reading choice.

Though children did bring in books from home to read in school and did go to the media center in the school, most of the books the children read in the classroom came from the classroom's permanent and temporary collections.

The entire classroom was carpeted. On the other side of the picture book shelf was a large couch. Usually four children would sit on it for quiet reading though at times as many as six might squeeze into it.

**CULTURAL EVENTS AND LITERATURE**

In August before school began Christy stated that literature was going to be one of her goals for the year. In previous years quiet reading, reading aloud, work time, sharing time, and reading logs were aspects of
her classroom in which literature was used. In addition to these aspects Christy said that she was going to add book discussion groups. She hoped to start these groups around the fourth week of school. She wanted to learn early what kind of readers her students were so she planned to spend much time the first few weeks reading with each child individually.

Christy's classroom was a literature-based reading classroom. This meant that the events described in this report were not only the events in which literature was read and responded to, they were also the reading program. There were no basal textbooks and no formal reading groups. There were no worksheets or other seat work. There were plenty of opportunities to read books, to listen to books being read, and to make a variety of responses to what was read and heard.

Literature was not just the basis of Christy's reading program, it was integrated throughout the entire curriculum. Whatever unit of study the class was focused upon, there were many books in the room about that topic. Children often had projects to do which required the use of these books. Christy's read alouds were often selected on the basis of what the class was studying. Christy said that across the various structures and events of her classroom there was a statement that books were important and highly valued. Books figured prominently in the physical and social aspects of her classroom.

Table 2 shows the events in Christy's classroom in which the children and Christy read and responded to literature.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITERATURE EVENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Quiet Reading  
during lunch count  
after noon recess  

* Read Aloud  

* Book Discussion Groups  

* Reading Logs  

* Sharing Time  

* Work Time  

making things  
writing

Quiet reading occurred at two times during the day. The children read quietly first thing in the morning while Christy took attendance and did lunch count. The second quiet reading occurred after noon recess. During quiet reading the children were expected to be reading a book. They might read alone or they might read with others.

Following the morning quiet reading time, Christy read a book aloud to the entire class. Generally, this was a short book which could be finished in one reading. Christy might also read aloud a second time during the day. This reading was usually a chapter book. Each read aloud session was followed by a discussion.

Occasionally, Christy conducted book discussion groups during the afternoon quiet reading time. Christy or the children would decide on a
book for discussion and post a sign-up sheet with a discussion date on it. The children who signed the sheet then read the book and participated with Christy in a discussion of the book.

The children were required to keep a reading log. Each day they wrote the title of a book they read that day during quiet reading. Each week they wrote a few sentences about one of the books they read that week.

During work time the children might be doing writing or art work which was in response to a book they had read or heard. Children might be making a picture of a story or a mural. They might also be doing some writing, usually about the picture they were making.

At sharing time the group gathered in the meeting area. Children then shared their work. Often they were sharing their writing or art work. Often the work was in progress. The audience responded by giving comments and asking questions.

Certainly the presence or absence of any of these events could be considered important to the responses to literature the children and Christy made. If children had no opportunity, say, to discuss the books they read, they would not likely be making any responses typical of discussions. In a sense this is the question which the guidebooks to literature-based reading attempt to address, the question of what kinds of activities teachers who wish to become literature-based reading teachers ought to do. But are all read aloud sessions the same? Is quiet reading just children reading quietly? It would seem that the way these events are organized is vital. Responses to literature would be encouraged and enabled by the norms, rights, expectations, and obligations which Christy and the children hold for themselves and for each other.
The rest of this chapter will be a closer examination of the different events in which literature is used in Christy's classroom. Particular attention will be paid toward what the children and Christy did and the expectations they held for themselves for and each other.

**Quiet Reading**

Quiet reading occurred twice each day, once at the beginning of the day while Christy took lunch count and attendance, the other after noon recess. Christy believed it was important that the children be able to choose what they read at this time. She stated that she had confidence that children would choose what they needed. When less able readers chose material which was too difficult for them, Christy wondered what needs they were expressing and how she could address these needs by helping those children find more appropriate reading material.

Christy allowed the children to read with each other during quiet reading. She did so for several reasons. She believed it helped children become better oral readers. Citing the research on the benefits of reading aloud, she also felt it was good for the listeners to hear stories read aloud. Christy valued the cooperation children must exercise when they read together and the sharing that they did. She also noted that the children enjoyed being together and took pleasure in sharing the joys of books.

Christy would limit children's choices of books to read, whether they could read with other children, and where in the classroom they could read. She based her decisions to make such limits on the appropriateness of the choices the children made and upon balance. By balance, Christy
meant that she watched for children making the same choices day after day, either in reading material or in choosing to listen to someone read rather than reading on one's own. If this occurred she would require the child to make another choice, or in rare instances would require the child to make a specific choice.

Christy viewed her job during quiet reading as monitoring the reading choices the children made. She also believed it was important for her to keep up on the strategies children used in their reading, so she often had children read aloud to her during quiet reading. Christy stated that it was important for her to hold conferences with children and to check up on them to see if they were really understanding what they were reading.

The morning quiet reading could last from fifteen to thirty minutes. This varied because once the children came into the room they were supposed to sit in the meeting area and read. Children could first come into the room at 8:10. School began at 8:30. Generally, quiet reading ended around 8:45. Generally by 8:30 the 28 children were seated on the floor in the meeting area. The meeting area was a space of about 8 feet by 10 feet. It was bounded by a wall and coat racks on one side, a chalk board on another side, and book shelves on the other two sides with spaces at the corners. There was only one chair in this space and the teacher sat on that chair while she took lunch count, conducted meetings, or read aloud. During lunch count the children were supposed to be reading or looking at books and most did this. Many children read silently, alone. Others read quietly with each other or talked quietly with each other about the pictures in the book. A few children stared into space. Some helped Christy take lunch count and count money. Some watched others read.
Quiet reading in the afternoon had a few differences from quiet reading in the morning. The children came in from the playground at 12:00. The children chose a book to read either from their cubby or from the book shelves and then sat in the meeting area. Christy then excused children who were reading quietly to read anywhere in the room. While quiet reading in the morning might last from 15 to 30 minutes, depending upon when the child arrived at school and when the child settled in the meeting area, quiet reading in the afternoon ran from 30 to 45 minutes.

Three extended excerpts from the field notes illustrate what could happen during quiet reading. The first excerpt occurred during morning quiet reading. Patrick, a third grader had been reading Theo LeScig's \textit{Wacky Wednesday} (1) with Bobby and Jerrid, also third graders. They had been pointing to the wacky things in the pictures and counting them.

\textbf{Excerpt 1}

\begin{verbatim}
Nov. 14
8:30
Q.R. - A.M.
\end{verbatim}

Patrick finishes reading \textit{Wacky Wednesday} to Bobby and Jerrid. He hands the book to Lisa. Patrick stands up and walks to the picture book shelves. He flips through a few books and then selects \textit{One Monday Morning} by Uri Shulevitz. He returns to his spot in the meeting area, sits down, and begins to read aloud. He begins with the cover, and reads each page, including the title page and the dedication. He reads with a steady pace, reflecting the rhythms of this text and he reads with expression. Bobby and Jerrid listen. Jerrid is holding in his lap the book \textit{What is Pink?} by Christina Rossetti and illustrated by Jose Aruego. His attention seems divided between his book and Patrick's reading. He interrupts Patrick to ask him, "Patrick, look, what is orange?" Jerrid turns the book so Patrick can see the illustration. Patrick looks, smiles, and continues reading aloud. The teacher calls Bobby's name and he gets up to buy lunch. Patrick continues reading aloud. Jerrid has been sharing his book with others around him, now he sits down and listens to Patrick read. Bobby returns from purchasing lunch and asks, "hey, Patrick where'd you
put that Wacky Wednesday?" Patrick replies that he gave it to Lisa. Bobby leaves to find Lisa. Brad, a second grader, sits down next to Patrick. Patrick continues to read aloud. When Patrick reaches the last picture, he says "ah, see it was just his cards and a doll and a jester and everything." He asks Brad and Josh if they want him to read it again. Brad nods. Patrick turns through the first two pages and comments, "the pictures are getting bigger all the way, see?" Patrick reads aloud with rhythm and expression and without interruption the entire book. Brad, sitting next to him stares at the pages. When Patrick reaches the last picture again, he says, "really, they were just these cards and here's the dog and here's the baker." Patrick points to the illustration as he talks. Patrick and Josh get up, walk to their cubbies, put away their books and return to the meeting area. Patrick looks at me and sighs, "what book am I going to read now?" Mrs. Pearl says 'freeze please' (her signal that she wants the group's attention) and asks the children to put their books away and prepare for morning meeting.

There are several things in this excerpt which were characteristic of quiet reading. There were some basic norms for quiet reading in the morning. Children were each to have their own book, hence Jerrid is holding a copy of What Is Pink? even though he is listening to Patrick read aloud. Though children were to stay in the meeting area, they could move about. Children could also talk and read quietly with each other.

Reading groups would form, dissolve and reform throughout quiet reading time. In this episode Patrick began by reading with Bobby and Jerrid. He finished quiet reading time by reading to Brad and Jerrid. This also showed different ways reading groups form. Patrick, Bobby, and Jerrid began quiet reading by deciding to read together Wacky Wednesday. When they finished Patrick and Jerrid chose to read something else, while Bobby decided to stick with reading Wacky Wednesday, this time with Lisa. After Patrick began to read One Monday Morning to Jerrid, Brad observed
them reading and decided to join them. He didn't ask, he just sat down next to Patrick and listened.

The children could make a variety of choices concerning their quiet reading. They could choose what to read. They could choose to change their mind and read something else. They could choose to read alone or read with someone else. They could choose how they would read with each other. Patrick and Jerrid began by reading together. They ended with Patrick reading to Jerrid and Brad.

There was also a variety of sharing going on. Books were shared, either by reading together or by handing a book to someone else after a reader was finished with it. Patrick gave Wacky Wednesday to Lisa. Meanings were also shared. Patrick showed Jerrid and Brad how he read and interpreted One Monday Morning with his talk and actions around the opening and closing illustrations in the book.

It was common for Patrick to read aloud to other students during quiet reading, morning or afternoon. Sitting either in the meeting area or under one of the tables, Patrick would read to groups of two to six, usually all boys. Patrick was a very fluent reader. His listeners generally were not. Patrick commented that he enjoyed helping other students learn to read. He said that he tried to ask his listeners questions like Mrs. Pearl would ask. He tried to find out if they understood what he was reading to them.

Brandon and Brad were second grade boys who were not fluent readers. They each stated in separate interviews that they liked to have Patrick read to them because Patrick helped them understand words. Brad also
commented that Patrick was his friend and that his favorite reading choice was to have Patrick read to him.

Patrick would often alert his listeners to important features of a story before he read. When reading "The Ghost in the Mirror" from Schwartz's More Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark, Patrick told Jerrid, Alvin, and Brad "Listen to 'The Ghost in the Mirror' real closely. You have to listen to it all. The end part is really what you have to listen to about turning on the lights and there's no ghost."

In Excerpt 1 Patrick's listeners said very little. Typically, Patrick's listeners would make comments about the story or ask Patrick questions about matters they did not understand. Patrick was reading Hot Air Henry by Mary Calhoun, to Brad and Alan. This was a story of a cat who managed to fly and land safely a hot air balloon. At almost every page the listeners made comments about what was happening. Brad wondered if Henry ever got his paws snagged. Patrick answered by telling Brad to keep listening to the story. When an illustration showing a panorama of the landscape Henry had flown over appeared, Alan asked where Henry had started. Patrick pointed out the place in the illustration. Brad asked how Henry kept from falling out of the balloon. Alan replied that Henry's claws kept him in the basket.

There were a few basic differences in the operation of afternoon quiet reading from morning quiet reading. Afternoon quiet reading began in the meeting area. If children were reading quietly, Christy excused them to read anywhere in the room. Usually, each child must also have a book, though on occasion Christy would excuse children who were sharing a copy of a book. Most children elected to do their reading log during the
afternoon quiet reading, though a few chose to write in their logs in the morning to "get it finished."

The second excerpt shows these differences in the norms. It also provides an example of a different kind of sharing style from Patrick's style of reading to his entourage of less able readers.

Excerpt 2
Nov. 8
12:05
Q.R.

Patrick, Carolyn, and Samantha look for a book with three copies at the chapter book shelf. They find two copies of DeDe Takes Charge by Johanna Hurwitz and sit down in the meeting area by the picture book shelves. As soon as they sit down, Mrs. Pearl tells them they may leave the meeting area if they wish. They go to the desks by the "hall" and sit on top of them.

Carolyn says, "It's my turn to read." She reads with expression. Bobby, who is sitting alone at the desks asks them, "to cool it." Samantha reads aloud. The three decide not to sit at the desks and move to the floor on the other side of the divider. Samantha resumes reading.

Carolyn says to Samantha, "I didn't think you knew that word." Samantha continues reading. Patrick corrects a word Samantha has read. Carolyn asks, "Where are you." Patrick shows Carolyn. Samantha continues to read, Patrick corrects her reading, noting a word she omitted. Samantha reads the word, "goose." Carolyn says "honk, honk, honk." Patrick corrects Samantha's reading. Samantha reads the word, "chicken." Carolyn says, "powk, powk, powk." Samantha finishes the page and Patrick begins to read. Carolyn says, "you read and watch my mouth, ok, where are you?" Carolyn lip synchs to Patrick's reading. Carolyn interrupts Patrick's reading, "wait, DeDe and Aldo." Patrick says, "yeah, this is before." Carolyn replies, "no! Cause he meets DeDe in Aldo Applesauce." Samantha says, "this is after Aldo Ice Cream." Carolyn reads.

The three shuffle their reading logs and identify their own by saying "that's mine." Carolyn reads the word "bonkers" and Samantha replies "crazy" and laughs. Carolyn finishes her page and Samantha begins to read. Patrick corrects Samantha twice. Samantha giggles and reads on. Carolyn prompts Samantha and Samantha raps Carolyn on the
head with the book. Samantha pauses and says, "why is everybody looking at me?" Patrick and Carolyn reply in near unison, "cause you're reading to us." Samantha finishes the page. There is discussion about whose turn it is to read. They decide it is Patrick's turn. Carolyn says, "you, me, you," and points to Patrick, herself, and Samantha.

Patrick begins to read the page. Samantha points to a quilt hanging from the ceiling and asks Carolyn, "Did you make that quilt last year?" Carolyn says, "yeah, last year." Patrick finishes the page and Carolyn begins to read. Patrick prompts Carolyn. Carolyn finishes the page and Samantha begins to read. Patrick interrupts, "wait, I'll read this page and this page" he says, pointing to pages 11 and 12, the last two in the chapter. Samantha resumes reading. She chuckles over a miscue, reading drying for dying. Carolyn says, "just read."

Samantha reads, finishes the page, then says her nose hurts. Carolyn tells her to put on her glasses, which she does. Carolyn turns to Patrick and says, "read." Patrick says, "me?" Carolyn replies, "yeah." Patrick reads the next two pages which finishes the chapter.

Samantha reads, "A.D. and B.D." which is the title of the chapter. Carolyn begins to read. Samantha looks at her reading log while Carolyn reads. Carolyn finishes reading the page and hands the book to Samantha. Samantha asks, "which page, this one?" pointing to page 14. Carolyn says, "yeah." Samantha reads. When she reads the word, "bathrobe" she giggles. Patrick says, "she still has her bathrobe on?" Samantha says, "what?" Carolyn says, "just read." Samantha begins to read but stalls and there is a pause. Carolyn picks up the reading and for a few words the two girls read in unison. Carolyn stops reading and says to Samantha, "just read." Patrick corrects Samantha. Samantha finishes her page. Carolyn turns to Patrick and says, "it's your turn." Patrick begins to read. Carolyn holds the other copy and Samantha looks on. Patrick and Carolyn have a discussion about how to pronounce, "trudge." Patrick finishes his page and Carolyn begins to read. She pauses and Patrick prompts her by reading the next three words. Carolyn finishes the page. Samantha reads. She stops to ask, "what's her sister's name?" Carolyn says, "Elaine." Samantha resumes reading, Carolyn corrects her pronunciation. Samantha finishes the page and there is a pause. Carolyn turns to Patrick and says, "read." Patrick says, "oh, it's my turn." Carolyn replies, "yes, it's your turn. Just read." Mrs. Pearl says, "freeze please" to the class and asks that everyone come to the meeting area.
Though this episode also occurred during quiet reading, it was a
different quiet reading from the first one described. Quiet reading in the
afternoon, like quiet reading in the morning, began in the meeting area.
Christy excused children from the meeting area. Once excused children
could read anywhere in the room. Typically, Christy excused children who
were reading quietly and who had a book of their own in their hands,
though she would excuse groups who were sharing a book, provided they
were reading quietly. In Excerpt 2 Carolyn, Patrick, and Samantha began
by choosing to read together. They then looked for a book which had more
than one copy. Once they found a title they could agree upon they settled
in the meeting area and began to read. Christy excused them and they
moved out into the room.

Their style of sharing was much different from the sharing of Patrick,
Jerrid, and Brad in Excerpt 1. In Excerpt 1 Patrick took on a mentor-like
role, reading to the other two boys and explaining to them how he read and
interpreted the story. In Episode 2 the children seemed to have different
expectations of each other. Their talk was focused upon negotiating whose
turn it was to read, correcting and prompting each other’s reading, and
"just reading" the words. This was a style typical of Carolyn during quiet
reading and in this excerpt she made it clear that she wanted to "just read"
by breaking off talk which strayed from this.

Carolyn typically read with other children during quiet reading. Some
children rarely read with others. Kristen, a second grader who was in
Chapter One stated that she didn’t like to read with other kids. She said that
she already knew what the words were on the page and she didn’t need
someone else telling her. Interestingly, Samantha also said that she
preferred to read by herself. She said it was bothersome to ask someone to repeat what they read if she didn't understand it, but that reading by herself, she could reread parts she didn't understand without disturbing any partner. Lisa said she preferred to read by herself because she didn't like the arguments over whose turn it was to read. Tara stated that she would rather read alone because when she read alone she "got to read all the pages."

Other children enjoyed reading with their friends during quiet reading. George said it was "funner" because you got to talk with your friends while you read. Bobby said "it's easier reading with another person because you don't have to read as much." Keith stated that children liked to read with each other because it helped them get the words right. Ricky, like Patrick, liked to read with other children "because when I read with other kids I like helping them with words and stuff they don't know."

A child's experience with a book frequently lasted through several quiet reading periods, both morning and afternoon. These experiences could involve a changing group of children. The following excerpts from field notes describe Alan's experiences with Alvin Schwartz's In a Dark Room.

Excerpt 3
Sept. 8
12:10
Q. R.

Annie, sitting in the meeting area, reads In a Dark Room aloud to Alan and Cindy. Michael tells Alan he needs to be reading his own book if Alan wants to leave the meeting area. Alan tells Michael he doesn't care. Pointing at Annie, he says he likes this book. Annie moves to the teacher's empty chair and sits down. Alan follows her and sits near her
feet. Annie says, "I'll show you the longest teeth," a reference to the story, "The Teeth." Alan stands up to look at the pictures.

Annie pushes Alan back so that Alan faces her as Annie sits in the chair. Annie reads aloud, holding the book toward her. Alan can see only the cover. She reads in a staccato rhythm and in a monotone voice. When she finishes a page, she turns the book so that Alan can see the picture. This pattern is similar to the one Mrs. Pearl uses when she reads aloud to the class.

Annie reads the story "The Night It Rained" (2). She stops reading in the middle of the story and says to Alan, "He been dead." Alan says, "What happens?" Annie says, "I'm not telling, you'll see. He's dead. He been dead. He's a spirit." Annie finishes the story and asks Alan, "What do you want me to read next?" Alan asks to see the book. Annie, instead, reads the table of contents.

Alan wants Annie to read "The Night It Rained" again. Instead, Annie reads "The Teeth." Alan stands up and moves behind Annie. He reads silently over her shoulder while Annie reads aloud. He corrects Annie at points and sometimes the two of them together attack unfamiliar words. Annie reads "The Green Ribbon" (3). Ricky sits down in front of Annie and listens. Annie covers up the last illustration of the story as she reads. When she finishes the story, she uncovers the picture, which shows a woman's head which has fallen off. Ricky asks, "I wonder why it fell off?" Annie replies, "Don't you know part one?"

Annie stands up, places the book on the chair and leaves. Ricky eagerly takes it. Alan sits down on the chair. Ricky begins to read aloud to Alan. Mrs. Pearl comes into the area and asks Alan about the book he is reading. Alan is not holding any book. Mrs. Pearl has been concerned that Alan has been spending all of his quiet reading time listening to others read aloud and has not done any reading on his own. Alan tells Mrs. Pearl Ricky is reading to him. Mrs. Pearl says, "yes, but what about the book you're reading?" She asks Alan to pick out a book for himself to read. She asks him if he needs any help finding a book a read. Alan, with a disgusted and disappointed look, says no and goes to the picture book shelf. He grabs what appears to be the first book he sees, Popcorn by Frank Asch. He goes back to the chair and sits down. Mrs. Pearl sits on the floor beside Alan. Alan reads aloud. Mrs. Pearl stops him to help him with words he is having trouble with. She explains some of the words and the two of them talk about what the words mean. After reading about six pages, Alan says he remembers this book. Mrs. Pearl stands up, a group nearby has become noisy. She tells Alan to
keep reading and leaves to handle the noisy group. Alan reads for a few seconds then looks down at Ricky. He asks Ricky, "what is that?" pointing to a picture in Ricky's book, *In a Dark, Dark Room*. Ricky gives a reply I cannot hear. Alan looks at his book a few more seconds. He turns his book toward Ricky, showing a picture of a room filled with popcorn. He says, "Ricky, wouldn't you like it if you had this much popcorn -- I'd jump off the steps into it."

Mrs. Pearl calls for the books to be put away. Alan slides toward the shelf to put the book away. He shows his book to Bobby and Brandon. He says, "Wouldn't you like this much popcorn?"

Sept. 9 8:20
Q.R. - A.M.

Ricky is sitting in Mrs. Pearl's chair in the meeting area. He is reading aloud *In a Dark, Dark Room* to Alan and Brandon, who are kneeling on either side of Ricky and looking over his shoulder at the book. They appear to be following along as Ricky reads.

Sept. 9 12:10
Q. R.

Ricky and Alan sit in the coat racks. Ricky reads *In a Dark, Dark Room* and Alan listens and looks at the pictures. Occasionally they talk about the book.

Ricky finishes reading the whole book. He goes back to the beginning and reads it again. The two boys get up and ask Mrs. Pearl if they may leave the meeting area. She replies that Ricky may but that Alan must get his own book. Ricky heads for the couch. Alan goes to the picture book shelves and picks *Titch* and sits down by the shelves. He reads silently.

Ricky returns to the meeting area and tosses *In a Dark, Dark Room* to Alan. Alan puts *Titch* back on the shelf and quickly opens *In a Dark, Dark Room*. He begins to read, this time aloud in a very quiet voice. He is reading "The Green Ribbon." As he reads he covers up the final picture, the one that shows the woman's head has fallen off. When he finishes the last sentence he uncovers the picture. He shows Timmy and Karl the picture.
Sept. 12
8:15
Q.R. - A.M.

Alan sits in the meeting area reading *In a Dark, Dark Room*. He is reading "The Green Ribbon." He points at the words with his finger as he reads.

10:20
Q. R.

Alan sits in the meeting reading silently *In a Dark, Dark Room*. Mrs. Pearl calls him to come to a table. She wishes him to read from *Little Bear's Visit* and to take a running record. Alan puts his book down on top of the picture book shelf. Timmy picks it up, sits down next to Mickey and the two boys talk about the pictures.

Sept. 13
8:45
end of meeting

Alan asks Mrs. Pearl if he may check out *In a Dark, Dark Room*.

10:20
work time

Alan and Brandon are talking to Mrs. Pearl in the meeting area. They tell her they want to do a mural on race cars. She says doing a mural is fine but it needs to be about a book they have read or something the room is studying. The boys talk about doing a project with *In a Dark, Dark Room*. They discuss "The Green Ribbon." They say there is a story which comes before it, one which tells how the girl had her head cut off. They decide that making up that story would be too complicated. They discuss "The Teeth," but reject that one also. They decide to copy the poem "The Ghost of John" and make a picture, mural sized. They talk with Mrs. Pearl about the materials they will need, black butcher paper, and chalk. They read the poem aloud to Mrs. Pearl, then leave to get their materials.

12:10
Q. R.

Brandon reads *In a Dark, Dark Room*. Alan looks on.
Brandon draws in the skeleton's legs while Alan colors in the skeleton's head. *In a Dark, Dark Room* is opened to the page of the poem.

Sept. 14
9:30
work time

Brad sits by the table where Alan and Brandon are working on their mural. Brad is reading from *In a Dark, Dark Room*. The boys have finished the skeleton and now are copying the poem. After finishing copying the poem, Alan draws in clouds and mist with gray chalk while Brandon puts in little skeletons with yellow chalk.

Sept. 19
8:20
Q.R. - A.M.

Alan and Brad sit in the meeting area each holding a copy of *In a Dark, Dark Room*.

Alan had repeated experiences with *In a Dark, Dark Room* over the course of these twelve days. He listened to the book being read several times. He looked at the pictures. He read the book on his own. He showed pictures to other children. He made a mural based upon a poem in the book. Alan had heard and had read the stories in this book many times.

Children's experiences with a book could stretch beyond quiet reading. Alan had several experiences with *In a Dark, Dark Room* across different events. Though most of his experiences occurred during quiet reading, he also used work time to make a mural with Brandon on the poem "The Ghost of John." Though I was not present to record it, Alan and Brandon, when they finished their mural, shared it with the whole group during sharing time.
In summary Alan had several different kinds of opportunities to read and respond to this book. He listened to it read aloud. He read it to himself and with Brandon. He talked about it with other children. He did art work based upon one part of the book and he shared his work with the other children and received their comments and questions.

In the first two excerpts the children made several different kinds of choices. They chose whether to read alone or with others. They chose with whom they would read. They chose where they would read. They chose what book they would read.

In Excerpt 3 the children still could make these choices, but there were examples of how these choices could be limited. A child could choose to read anywhere in the room provided Christy gave the child permission. Permission in Episode 3 was based upon reading quietly and upon having a book of one's own. Alan had been listening to others read for several days and Christy wished him to do some reading on his own. Therefore she put some limits on his choices of where he could read. When Ricky left with the book, Alan was forced to choose something else to read.

The book, *In a Dark, Dark Room* was shared by a number of children over this period of twelve days. Though Alan always seemed to be where this book was being read, Annie, Cindy, Ricky, Timmy, Karl, Mickey, Brad, and Brandon also had experiences with this book. One wonders if this much sharing of one book would occur were the children not allowed to move about and talk quietly during quiet reading.

The children were also sharing how they read the stories in *In a Dark, Dark Room* and what the stories meant to them. Alan covered up the last illustration in the story "The Green Ribbon" just as Annie had done when
she first read the story to him. Alan and Brandon insisted to Christy that there was a story which occurred before "The Green Ribbon." This recalls Annie's earlier statement to Ricky. Ricky had asked Annie why the woman's head had fallen off. Annie replied, "Don't you know part one?" Alan had overheard this conversation. It appeared that Alan shared Annie's thought that there was a story which told how the woman had her head cut off.

**What the Children Did During Quiet Reading**

As the preceding section demonstrated, quiet reading was a time of rich activity. Christy expected that all the children would read during this time. But what counted as reading in this classroom appeared to be varied as children did a variety of things during this time which were acceptable to Christy and often encouraged by her. Table 3 lists what children did during quiet reading.

Children read and looked at pictures in their books. They might look at or read the same book over and over or they might read many different books. They might do their reading alone. They might read with other children. They might read to other children. Children might also listen to others read or look on.
TABLE 3
WHAT CHILDREN DID DURING QUIET READING

* Read Books / Looked at Illustrations
  - alone
  - with others
  - to others
* Listened / Looked On
* Talked with Others
* Formed Groups to Read Together
* Moved about the Room
  - to find or change places to read
  - to read with others
  - to browse for a book
  - to talk to Mrs. Pearl
* Pretended to Read Aloud to an Imaginary Audience
* Wrote in Their Reading Logs
* Other (usually inappropriate behavior)

Children moved about the room during quiet reading. Generally, children moved to find or change places to read. In the morning the children remained in the meeting area, but they could change places within the meeting area. In the afternoon children read in several different places in the room. They read on the floor of the meeting area. They sat in Christy's chair in the meeting area. Four to six children might sit on the couch to read. Children sat in the coat racks, which provided a bit of seclusion. Some children would read at the tables, but it was more
likely that they would read under the tables. Children would sit on the
floor, leaning against the various dividers which separated their classroom
from the classrooms on either side. Children might read at a desk or they
might read sitting on top of the desks.

Children formed reading groups during quiet reading. The children
formed groups three different ways. In Excerpt 2 Patrick, Carolyn, and
Samantha had mutually agreed to form a group and then found a book to
share. Sometimes a child would select two or more copies of a book and
then would look for people with whom to read that book. The third way
groups were formed was by serendipity. Children would see someone
reading a book they were interested in and would sit down near them.
Sometimes they would look over the reader’s shoulder, assuming a kind of
onlooker role. Other times they would sit next to the person. An example of
this was in Excerpt 1 when Brad saw that Patrick was reading One Monday
Morning, decided to listen in, and sat down beside Patrick. It was likely
Brad did this not only because he wanted to hear that book, but also because
he rarely passed up an opportunity to listen to Patrick read. Children
almost always had choice and control over forming and dissolving their
reading groups. Only if a child had been listening to another child read for
an extended period of time would Christy limit that choice and require the
child to read something on his own.

Children moved about for other reasons besides to find a place to read.
They might move to seek out a partner or group to read with. Children
might move to browse the book shelves in their classroom or to go to the
library. They also might move to talk to Christy.
Three children were observed at different times reading aloud quietly to an imaginary audience. Their style was quite similar to Christy's style of reading aloud. They would sit on a chair and read a page with the book facing toward them. After reading a page they would hold the book up, turn it so it faced away from them, and would slowly pass the book in a semicircle. Then they would read the next page and repeat the pattern until the book was finished.

Children also wrote in their reading logs during quiet reading. This was a requirement. Most children wrote in their reading logs during the afternoon quiet reading. A few children would write in the morning so they would have more time to read with friends in the afternoon. Reading logs will be explained in greater detail in the next section following the discussion of quiet reading.

The children could talk during quiet reading. Their talk appeared to be for many different purposes and about many things. Table 4 shows the different kinds of children's talk during quiet reading.

One type of children's talk was their oral reading of the words in their books. Along with reading the words, the children also prompted and corrected each other's reading. In Excerpt 2 much of the talk between Patrick, Carolyn, and Samantha was their correcting of each other's reading.

During quiet reading there was much negotiating talk. Children discussed with each other which book they were going to read together. They talked about where in the room they were going to sit. They might negotiate with each other over who got to sit on the couch. They talked to each other about trading or sharing books. It seemed that many children
knew what the others were reading and if they saw someone reading a book they were interested in, they would ask to read that one next.

---

**TABLE 4**

**CHILDREN'S TALK DURING QUIET READING**

* They read the words on the page.
* They prompted and corrected each other's oral reading.
* They traded and shared books.
* They recommended books to each other.
* They reread or retold sections of a book.
* They talked about the book.
  - about the pictures
  - shared meanings and explained them
  - asked questions of the story
  - asked questions of others about the story
* They talked about other matters (usually non-book).

---

Much of the book talk of the children could be described as "acting on the impulse to share" (Hickman, 1981). This talk was more "response-like" in that it expressed the feelings or thoughts of a child about a certain book. Children would often reread or retell parts of a book to other children. They also recommended books to each other. They would point out "good books" or "funny books." Third graders would note to second graders books Christy had read aloud the year before.

Children also talked about their books with each other. They talked about the pictures. Alan, for example, showed Ricky the picture of the
room filled with popcorn from Popcorn and said he'd like to be able to jump into it. Children shared meanings and explained parts of the story with each other. Annie did this with Ricky and Alan when she talked about the story which came before "The Green Ribbon." Patrick explained to Brad and Jerrid about the pictures in One Monday Morning. He suggested to them that the story was only in the mind of one of characters. Children asked questions of the text. In the example described earlier of Patrick reading Hot Air Henry to Alan and Brad, Alan and Brad each asked questions about what was happening in the book. Children also asked questions of others about the story. Patrick was aware that he was reading aloud to less able readers. He viewed himself as a teacher and asked them questions which he believed would be questions Christy would ask. Patrick said that he asked his listeners questions to know what they understood of the story.

It seemed important that if children were not allowed to talk during quiet reading, then the "acting on the impulse to share" talk might not have occurred during quiet reading. Were the children to do only silent reading, then they would not be sharing with each other the meanings they made out of text, the ways in which they read text, and the questions they had of the text and of each other.

Children also talked about non-book matters. In excerpt 2 Samantha asked Carolyn about a quilt which was hanging in the classroom. This incidental talk was quite common when children would read together. Nancy, a second grader, expressed why children did this by saying, "I usually read and talk because sometimes you've got to get your mind off the reading so you just talk to your friends for a minute and then go back to
reading." Such incidental talk was acceptable so long as it was brief. If children's talk strayed off the book they were reading for too long a time, Christy would remind them that they needed to be reading.

One incident seemed to test the boundaries of what was acceptable talk during quiet reading. A group of children had been reading a play from the Storybox Books series called The Dragon. They had decided that they would like to put on the play. They then had a lengthy discussion, at times a bit heated, over who was going to be which part and what costumes they could make. After this discussion had been going on for about ten minutes, Christy requested they stop discussing and read the play. She noted that discussing how to do the play was more appropriate for work time, but that during quiet reading they needed to either read or talk about what they were reading. They could talk about the play if they wished, but their talk about how to put on the play was to be left for work time. Christy later told me that this was a hard decision for her to make, but that she felt that quiet reading time needed to be a time to read and that work time was a more appropriate time for the children to work on putting on the play.

Much of what the children did during quiet reading seemed to be facilitated by a few decisions Christy made concerning how quiet reading would operate in her classroom. She decided that the children may move about the room and that they may read together and talk quietly about the book. Were the children not allowed to talk, every observed act of the children, with the exception of a single child reading silently, would have been contrary to the norms of quiet reading. As it was, there were many other kinds of responses to literature, besides silent reading, the children could make which were accepted, if not encouraged by Christy.
What the Teacher Did During Quiet Reading

Christy was actively involved in the children's reading during quiet reading time. Christy saw her role during quiet reading as monitoring the reading choices children made, assessing the strategies children used to read text, and holding conferences with children to learn if they were understanding what they were reading. In Table 5 are listed what Christy was observed doing during quiet reading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHAT CHRISTY DID DURING QUIET READING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* She reminded children of rules and expectations
* She monitored and managed children's behavior.
* She moved about the room.
* She talked with children, usually with individuals.
* She took running records.
* She listened to children read.
* She helped children with their reading strategies.
* She talked to children about the book they were reading.
* She encouraged readers.
* She limited choices.
* She helped children select books.
* She led discussion groups.
Christy reminded children of the rules and expectations of quiet reading. In the morning she would say to the class something like, "I'm going to start taking lunch count now. I need all of you reading quietly with your own book." In the afternoon as the children came in from recess she would remind the children that quiet reading was beginning and that they needed to get ready for it. Throughout quiet reading time Christy monitored the children's behavior. She had a signal, "sh - sh - sh," which she used during the morning quiet reading to indicate that the reading was becoming too loud. In the afternoon the children were scattered around the room, so she dealt with noise problems individually. Christy would move about the room, stopping to read with students, talking with them about their books, monitoring the selections they made and reminding children who were not reading that they needed to be reading.

Christy read with children during quiet reading. At the beginning of the year she took a running record (Clay, 1985) of each student. She told them that she was interested in learning what they did when they came to a word they didn't know. Taking running records lasted through the first three weeks of school. After that Christy would make her way around the room and have children read to her. During this time her attention was on the strategies the children were using in their reading and she would help them by suggesting certain strategies such as using meaning, the pictures, or sounding out the letters.

Besides helping children with their reading strategies, Christy also talked to the children about the books they were reading. Many of her questions were requests for some sort of retelling or for a prediction about what may happen. These questions seemed to be a way for her to assess
whether the children were understanding what they were reading. In the following excerpt from transcriptions George had been talking to Christy about a story from *Owl at Home* by Arnold Lobel.

Christy: Can you tell me a little bit about what's going on so far?

George: The wind is like shaking the trees on the front door.

Christy: Hmm. Think so? What makes you think that?

George: Cause nothing else would be knocking there.

Christy: How come?

George: Because there's nobody else there.

Christy: You don't think so? You think it's just the wind moving something to knock there? What does Owl think?

George: The winter wants in.

Christy: The winter wants in.

George: Yeah.

Christy: He thinks winter is knocking at his door.

George: Uhhuh.

Christy: What do you think about that?

George: It's weird.

Christy: Why is it weird?

George: Because winter, when it goes near a fire it just

Christy: Hmm. So you wouldn't think winter would want to get in there. Hmm. Have you ever read this story before?

George: No.

Christy: What do you think is going to happen?
George: Aah - he lets them in.

Christy: You think he lets who in?

George: The winter and then it will melt probably.

Christy: Oh, you think Owl will let winter in and then winter will melt when it comes in. Hmm. O.K. Let me know what happens at the end of that, o.k.?

Christy checked out George's understanding of the story by asking him to "tell a little bit about what's going on." After talking with him about what has happened, she asked him what he thought was going to happen. It is also interesting that Christy accepted each of George's answers. George was never told his answers were wrong or that his interpretations were incorrect. Christy did seem to push for rigor in George's responses. Christy responded to George's comments with further questions such as, "What makes you think that," "Why is it weird," and "What do you think about that?" Each question expected George to deepen his response to a certain aspect of the story. Christy also seemed to expect George to use evidence from his reading to support his statements.

George made his responses to literature in reference to the expectations of Christy. Christy expected George to provide her with certain kinds of responses when she asked a question. This is not to say that specific answers were expected, only that certain kinds of answers seemed implied in the kind of question asked. Christy asked George to tell a little bit about the story and George did. Christy asked what George thought about the story and George said "it's weird." It is interesting to take this pattern back to Patrick and his entourage. Patrick expected his listeners to pay attention to what he saw in the story. He also expected that his listeners might have questions of
their own. Carolyn seemed to have a different set of expectations when she read with someone. She expected talk to be limited to reading the words on the page and to be correcting and prompting each other's reading.

During quiet reading Christy would be encouraging of the children's reading. When the less able readers would read aloud to her, she would say things like "impressive" and "you're some kind of reader." She would also comment positively if these readers finished reading a book on their own during quiet reading. "Wow, you read two stories today?"

Christy would limit the choices the children could make. When several of the second graders were having difficulty selecting books they were able to read, she made up a list of Storybox Books and I Can Read books, made copies, and stapled the list inside those children's reading logs. The children were to choose one book from the list, and read it. Then they could cross it off the list and read one book of their own choosing.

When Alvin, a third grader continued to select books which were much below his reading ability, Christy told him:

I want you to be a really good third grade reader and I want you to pick books that are at the third grade level instead of the first grade level. It's O.K. to read some easy books but if you don't read books that are a bit harder, then you're not going to get better at reading. O.K? So listen, you did such a good job on In the Dinosaur's Paw. You read it every day and you enjoyed and you wrote about it and you did a really good job on it and I'd like you to have that experience again.... I'd like you to work on a chapter book that will help you get to be a better reader. Now you know there's some choices you can make about what book to read and maybe we can pick a few out an you can choose the one that you think's the most interesting.
Christy carefully monitored the selections the children made during quiet reading. She was especially attuned to children like Alvin who always read material which was not challenging to them. Christy looked for "balance" in the children's reading.

She was also mindful of those who were having some difficulty in reading and the selections they would make. She would make comments such as "Brad, that book looks awfully hard." When she said that, Brad replied that his mother read it to him. Christy then asked him to tell her about it and Brad faltered. Christy said, "You know, we have a ton of books that you would be able to read in this room. I'll show them to you, o.k?" She then took Brad to a shelf and showed him several books he would be able to read on his own.

Along with the monitoring of what the children were reading, Christy was also active in helping children select books to read. In the following section of transcript, Christy was talking to Timmy and Kristen in front of the shelf which held the "I Can Read" books.

Christy: You know Kristen you ought to look through these. These are great ones, like here's Amanda Pig and her big brother Oliver. Have you read any of these in this bunch? Kristen, turn around here and look at these books. Any of these would make really good ones. This one is a good one. It's called The Fish That Got Away. It's really neat. See the fish. There's a little one and a big one and a giant one and a medium sized one. And look here's -- have you read this one? The Hippopotamus Ate the Teacher?

Timmy: I like that. That's bad.

Christy: And then this is called The Fire Cat. This is about a cat named Pickles who works at the fire department. Amelia Bedelia. You can read any of these. Have you read any of the Fox books?
Kristen: No.

Christy: Here's *Tales of Amanda Pig*. See these are all different Amanda Pig books. Do any of these look good?

Kristen: I'll read the fish one.

Christy: O.K. *The Little Fish that Got Away* and Kristen when you don't have a book to pick you can look in this section here cause there's some great ones and you already have *This*. *In a Dark, Dark Room*, that's a good one.

This went on for several more minutes. Christy recommended books to three other second graders from this shelf, pulling books off and telling a little bit about each book. Early in the school year many of the second graders were carrying chapter books which they had seen the third graders reading. Christy was concerned that the second graders wanted to be viewed as being like the third graders even though they were not able to read such books. She gathered the second graders in front of the same shelf just described and began pulling off Frog and Toad books, Little Bear books, and Amanda Pig books. She turned to the table of contents and showed the second graders that these books had chapters in them and thus were also chapter books. If they wanted to read a chapter book, Christy suggested to them that they choose one of these books. This seemed to be an attempt to find appropriate reading material while still satisfying the second graders' needs to feel they were reading books like the third graders.

Though Christy was especially mindful of what the less able readers were reading, she also monitored and helped the more able readers select
books. This excerpt from a transcript is an example of her helping an able third grade reader.

Christy: What are you reading?

Child: Bread and Butter Journey.

Christy: Oooh. There's one that comes before this called Bread and Butter Indian. It's like this is the one after Bread and Butter Indian, I think. Let me see. Have you ever heard of Bread and Butter Indian?

Child: No.

Christy: Is this very good?

Child: Yeah.

Christy: Hmm. Yeah, I think Bread and Butter Indian is first. Have you read -- let me go see if I can find it.

When book discussion groups were held, these occurred during quiet reading. Christy's role was to ask questions and keep the discussion going. Book discussion groups will be described in greater detail later in the chapter.

For a "quiet" time of the day, quiet reading was a busy time with a variety of readings and responses to literature. Children read alone, with, and to each other. Christy monitored the choices the children made, listened to children read, and talked to children about their books. When interacting with another person there were a variety of expectations for readings and responses. Patrick and Carolyn showed two different styles of reading and responding. Christy also held various kinds of expectations as well.
Reading Logs

Each child kept a reading log. The log was a piece of 11' by 17' blue construction paper folded to make a cover. Inside Christy stapled a piece of paper in which the children recorded daily the title of the book they read that day. Once each week the children wrote about one of the books they read. Generally, Christy would write a response to what the children wrote.

Christy had the children do reading logs because it gave her a record of what the children had been reading. Christy said that the writing made the children think and reflect a bit about the story they had read. According to Christy, the children liked to do them. She liked them to write about what the story was about or about a character. Christy wished that the reading logs would become more like written conversations between the children and herself. However, the children rarely responded to the comments she wrote in the reading logs and when they did respond often it was with one to three words.

Twelve children mentioned during interviews that the reason they did reading logs was so that Christy would know what they were reading. Lisa said that they wrote in reading logs to learn more about reading. Billy stated that doing reading logs encouraged them to read more. Missy said that having to write in reading logs made sure that the children read. When asked what they wrote in their reading logs, children responded that they wrote the title of the book they had been reading and then they wrote what the book was about. Brandon said he wrote about stuff he thought was neat. D.J. said children wrote about what the problem in the story was and how it got solved. Carolyn and Lisa also mentioned that they wrote about
the problem in the story. Mickey, Jason, and Sally responded that they wrote about the characters. Reading logs changed throughout the term of observation. Shortly before the interviews were conducted Christy changed the old reading log form, which asked the children to write about the book, to a new form which asked the children to write about one of the characters in the story. The responses the children gave to the interview question were likely colored by this change in form.

Second graders and third graders had different reading log forms. For most of the fall the second graders had a form which looked like Figure 2

---

Name: ..................................................  Date: ..................................................

Book Titles

Mon. ..........................................................
Tues. ..........................................................
Wed. ..........................................................
Thurs. ..........................................................
Fri. ..........................................................

Tell about 1 book you read this week.

[six blank lines followed]

FIGURE 2
SECOND GRADER'S READING LOG
During December the second graders were given a piece of paper lined with the base line, mid-line, and top line of handwriting paper. Figure 3 shows what this form was like.

---

**title:**

**author:**

**illustrator:**

Tell about one of the characters in this book:

[three blank lines followed]

**FIGURE 3**

SECOND GRADER'S DECEMBER READING LOG

---

The basic third grade reading log form was a duplicated piece of lined paper. Down the left hand side of the page were written the dates, one date per line. On the remainder of the line the children were to write the title of the book they read on that day. For example: Oct. 28 F More Tales of Oliver Pig

Behind this page were stapled several blank pages of lined paper. Once a week the third graders were to write on these pages about one of the books they read. In December the third grader also received different reading logs. Figure 4 shows what these forms resembled.
Christy introduced reading logs on the Monday of the third week of school. She first gathered the third graders in the meeting area. She told them that they were going to begin reading logs and that these would help them and her know what they were reading. Christy showed them the form and where they were to write the
titles of the books they were reading. She also explained that each week they needed to write about what they were reading and that she would read it and write back to them. She told them that it would be like a conversation.

Christy then gathered the second graders and explained their form as well. She showed them where to write their name and the title. She noted that at the end of each quiet reading they should write the title of the book they read that day. Christy explained that they were to write their own thoughts on the bottom part and that they should try to fill up all six of the lines.

In the reading logs the second graders had for most of the fall they were asked to "tell about 1 book you read this week." Mike responded to this question by stating that the book was about the main character of the story.

**Mike**

**Superfudge**

Superfudge is about a little boy is in kindergarten and he will not do wat his teher tell him. His name is fudge.

The typical response to the question of telling about the book was to provide a brief retelling or summary of the book.

**George**

**The Three Little Pigs**

One Pig Fard some stasx and The Threr pig Fard some stre and The Threr Fard some Brasx and They ol mard some hoses.

[One pig found some sticks and the third pig found some straw and the third found some bricks and they all made some houses.]
Kristen

Tales of Oliver Pig

oliver and his mom maed a cake and it has raisins and it was good.

Some students wrote about their reaction to the book and commented on the characters.

Timmy

Miss Nelson Is Missing

It is funny. I thite [think] Miss Viola Swamp was ugle. hoo is miss viola Swamp. wer is miss Nelson can the kits [kids] find her

Tara wrote responses which connected the book she read with an experience from her own life.

Tara

A Chair for My Mother

A Chair For my mother is making me think a lot about the Fire on my street. Because of the Fire in The Book. But the one on my street was way, way smaller.

Two students recopied parts of the story into their reading log. Billy copied the entire text of Rosie’s Walk into his reading log and Ricky did the same with Bears in the Night.

The third graders had blank pieces of paper stapled into their reading logs. They were to write about what they were reading. Christy intended to write responses to their writing and hold a written conversation about their reading. Initially, none of the children wrote responses to Christy’s comments, so Christy had a meeting and pointed out that she was writing in their logs. She told them that they needed to read what she wrote and that they needed to write back to her if she had written a question to them.
After that more, but not all, of the children wrote responses to Christy's questions.

Like the second graders, many of the third graders wrote retellings or summaries of the book. Allison wrote a bit of summary and a retelling of part of *Little House in the Big Woods* and Mickey wrote a summary of *The Biggest Bear*.

**Allison**

*Little House in the Big Woods*

Laura and mary live in the woods and know one lives around them. They have to go thru the big woods one time pa and ma said laura and mary your old enough to go to town they were so icited [excited] that they could not get to sleep.

**Mickey**

*The Biggest Bear*

Johnny live In A Farm whif his DaD. One Day Johnny went to the wood. he sall a Bear But It was a Baby Bear so he dident sote the Bear. he took It home. But his MoM denten wunt the Bear so he took the Bear Back To the Forst. The Bear came Back egen. the End.

[Johnny live in a farm with his dad. One day Johnny went to the wood. He saw a bear. But it was a baby bear so he didn't shoot the bear. He took it home. But his mom didn't want the bear so he took the bear back to the forest. The bear came back again. The end.]

Patrick wrote about what he liked in his book, *The War with Grandpa*. He gave a short retelling of a favorite part. He shared his boredom with the latter part of the book, yet still insisted he liked the book overall. He also wrote replies to Christy's comments.
Patrick

The War With Grandpa

Oct. 2

I liked it when he wrote a note to his grampa in the middle of the night. He set his grampa alarm cloack and it rang his grampa got veary angrey and they got real made at each other.

Christy's response:

Yes they are mad. I wonder if the boy is the maddest.

Patrick's reply:

Yes he is. His grampa got that madest and slaped him as hard as he could in the check.

Oct. 7

the Book is getting pretty boaring at this time but I'm on chapter 30 so I think I'll finish the Book I really like it. I it is strange when peter wants to start a war I'd never start a war with my Grampa

Christy's response:

Why do you think Peter is so mad at him? Does his Grandpa understand?

Patrick's reply:

Peter is mad because his Grampa hid his school books, his shoes his alarm clock

There were many entries in which the children identified what they liked about their stories. Cindy's entry also provided an example of a child not responding to Christy's comments in writing. Some children would read her comments and then would talk to her about them and it is possible Cindy did this.

Alvin

Popcorn

I like Popcorn becos the hole house was filld with popcorn and evrone had to eat it all UP.
Cindy  

Rotten Ralph’s Trick or Treat

I like this book because Rotten Ralph is Rotten then nice
because he embarrassed Sarah.

Christy's response:

How does he embarrass her?

Cindy's reply:

[no reply written]

Carolyn commented that she liked some of the structural features of the
book: the reports in the corners of the pages and the conversation
between the reader, the author and the illustrator at the end of The Magic
School Bus Inside the Earth.

Carolyn  

The Magic School Bus Inside the Earth

my favorite part is Mrs. Frizzle's clothes and shoes. She is
prtty wred when it comes to clothes. I like the report up in
the conre. I don't thing [think]I would want to be in her class.
I also like the back when the reader the Aother and the Artist.

Christy's response:

[to Carolyn's statement she wouldn't want to be in Mrs.
Frizzle's class] Why not?

Carolyn's reply:

She is wild.

In December both second and third graders received new reading logs.
The second graders were asked to pick one of the books they read during
the week and "tell about one of the characters in this book." That week
Christy was reading aloud from Ramona and Her Father. There had been
several class discussions about Ramona, what she was like and what her feelings were. Many of the second graders chose to write about Ramona. Tara was the only child to write a physical description of Ramona. Mostly, children wrote about Ramona's traits, her feelings, and they retold bits of the story. Christy had also pointed out during the discussions of Ramona that stories have problems in them and the class talked about what the problems were in Ramona and Her Father. Some of the children also wrote about problems.

Tara Ramona and Her Father

sad - beezus making fun
happy - Dad try to quit smoking
let down - pumpkin get ruined
    Dad lost job
family isn't happy
    Ramona has short, straight, black hair. She always has feelings. The problem is you don't know which feeling it is. She likes her sister sometimes but other times she doesn't.

Mike Ramona and Her Father

Picky - Picky ate the pumpkin and Ramona was very sad and very mad with picky - picky. and Ramona's father lost his job and Ramona was scared about that too.

Timmy Ramona and Her Father

Ramona's nice. funny and grase [crazy] she gets mad she gets sad. I theg [think] she's funny. I theg she was funny wene she put the geroun [crown] on.

The third graders' reading log was very similar to the second graders'. Theirs had written on it: "Choose one book you read this week Tell about one of the characters in detail." Christy expected that the third graders would write more and would write with more detail than the second
graders. This seemed in line with much of the science observation work Christy had the children doing. She expected the third graders to provide a "good quality" observation providing much detail, while she was looking for the second graders just to be able to express their thoughts on paper. This expectation of paying attention to the detail and being able to write it carried over into this reading log assignment.

Like the second graders most of the third graders wrote about Ramona. They also wrote about her traits and feelings. They also commented on her character, much as Timmy had done when he described Ramona as being funny. The third graders also wrote brief retellings of bits of the story.

Carolyn  Ramona and Her Father

Ramona she is kind of por and kind of rich. Her father lost his job and her mom only works half time. They don't even have a pumkin there cat Brock it.

Samantha  Ramona and Her Father

Ramona is a worried little girl. She is worried about her father because he lost his job. And she wants to get him to stop smoking. When Ramona is sad she always finds a way to get happy again.

Lisa  Ramona and Her Father

Ramona is a girl that has all kinds of feelings. Like happy, sad. Her promled [problem] is she want her father to stop smoking and makes snigs [signs] But her father ignores.

Patrick  Ramona and Her Father

Ramona is very funny she has very many fealeans [feelings] she got very mad when picky picky wouldn't eat her pus puddy.
A few children wrote about books other than *Ramona and Her Father*. Allison wrote about *Fantastic Mr. Fox* and Cindy wrote about *Rosie's Walk*. They made comments about the major character, and provided pieces of retellings.

**Allison**

*Fantastic Mr. Fox*

Mr. Fox is fantastic because he saved the fox family. He dug a hole to the chicken house and the cider cellar and the Goose house.

**Cindy**

*Rosie's Walk*

I think Rosie is smart because she got away from the Fox and the Fox is really sneeze.

Though many of children said they enjoyed writing in their reading logs, it seemed that putting their thoughts on paper was difficult. As she did during quiet reading, Christy accepted the responses the children gave, but also pushed them to become more rigorous by writing questions in their reading log. That many children did not respond to her questions was disappointing to Christy but she continued to push her students to consider her comments and write replies to them.

The children seemed to perceive Christy's expectations for reading logs differently. Some copied sections from their book into the log, though that ended quickly. Some wrote retellings. Some told about their response to the book by writing "it was funny" or "I liked the part about...." Children commented on the characters in the book when they were expected to do so. They wrote about character traits and character feelings, reflecting an earlier discussion they had had about *Ramona and Her Father*. Their
written responses seemed to be, in part, products of the social environment of their classroom, their perceived expectations of the event and their prior experiences with similar tasks. Of course there were individual differences. Some children were more competent writers than others. Some perceived the task differently from others. But each written response was a logical response to the task.

Read Aloud and Subsequent Discussion

Christy read aloud to her students daily, sometimes twice a day. Most read alouds occurred in the morning, right after she finished lunch count and attendance and just before work time. The book she read at this time was always a book she could finish in one reading, and it was always a picture book. If Christy read a second time during the day, it would be in the afternoon. During that time she would read a chapter book which would require several readings to finish. After each read aloud Christy would lead a group discussion about what the children had just listened to. Christy considered the morning read aloud one of the pivots of the day, because "a lot of our work kind of springs from that read aloud." After listening to a particular book, choices were presented to the children about what they could do with the ideas they received from the book. Table 6 shows some of the books Christy read to the class and the work the children did subsequent to the reading.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frosted Glass</td>
<td>wrote and made pictures about themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Alexander and the Terrible, Horrible</td>
<td>wrote about their own bad days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>No Good, Very Bad Day</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tico and the Golden Wings</em></td>
<td>picture of something Leo Lionni didn't draw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rosie and Michael</em></td>
<td>wrote about a friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Friends</em></td>
<td>wrote and made a picture about a time they were a good friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sylvester and the Magic Pebble</em></td>
<td>made pictures and puppets wrote about the story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sam, Bangs, and Moonshine</em></td>
<td>wrote about what moonshine is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Mysteries of Harris Burdick</em></td>
<td>some children wrote stories about one or more of the pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ramona and Her Father</em></td>
<td>made &quot;no smoking&quot; posters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were other ties to work. Often Christy used the books she read aloud as models for the children's own writing and art work. When the children were writing about weather, Christy read aloud non-fiction books about the weather and asked the children to listen for "good weather words." Likewise, she would also talk about artists' uses of color or media
and how children could use these same techniques in their own pictures. Some of the work children did which was tied to a read aloud book was required, such as the work listed in Table 6. More often Christy made "invitations to extend" from the books children listened to being read. These invitations to extend could be like those just described, an offer to consider using the techniques of professional authors and illustrator in their own work. Christy would also ask the children what work they might want to do on the ideas they had from a book. Tying a read aloud to work could, then, be a requirement or an option.

This tie to work time, Christy said, was a difference between the two read aloud times. The shorter work she read in the morning generally had a tie to some work the children might do. The afternoon chapter book was read to enjoy an author's work.

Christy selected particular books for many reasons. Books she read in the morning were selected because they fit with the unit the class was studying, the season of the year, or with some experience the group had. For example, Christy read Friends by Heine during the unit on friendship, she read poetry about snow the day after the first snowfall, and the day after the class made a graph of their birthday's, she read Paul's Christmas Birthday by Carrick. Christy also selected books to get the children interested in certain authors. She did this with Chris Van Allsburg and with Beverly Cleary.

She also selected certain books in order to explore the book's form; story elements such as plot, characters, theme, sequence, and imagery or the author's use of descriptive language. These selections almost always were tied in some manner to the children's writing. These reading/writing
connections were intended by Christy. She said, "somehow when I'm reading them books I'm always thinking about their writing, like how is this going to tie over into their writing.... How can this affect their writing? What can we learn about this for their writing?"

Christy would also select books to read aloud for enjoyment, and on occasion a child might recommend a book to Christy to read, though often a child-recommended book had a tie to a class experience or to what the class was studying. The day after a hot air balloon visited the school, Patrick recommended to Christy that she read Hot Air Henry, which Christy did.

Christy said her orientation is to look for books which go with what is happening in the classroom. She also felt that sometimes her tying the book to her purpose in the classroom could "make the book flat." She said, "you want to read books for the sake of the book and I think sometimes my purpose does get bigger than the book and I don't like that to happen too much but sometimes I think it's appropriate that you're going to do a friendship thing and you want to read a book about friends and somehow you're going to tie that into what you want to talk about and sometimes it works beautifully, the tie in is amazing."

Christy also felt a similar tension between considering the book for its own sake and her great interest in reading/writing connections. "I'm almost always making that connection. Maybe I ought not to make that connection and just think of it more in terms of the book. But I'm always making connections."

Christy said she usually liked to begin discussing the book she reads aloud with talk about what interests the children. The first question she commonly asked after reading aloud was "Questions or comments?" Christy
said she also likes to talk about "literal things" such as what happens in the story and then move on to interpretive questions such as asking the children what they thought about certain parts of the story, why they thought a character did certain things, and what the children think might happen next. If she decided to make a reading/writing connection, Christy might ask question about the elements of a story. She also said she liked to ask questions which helped children make connections with other books, the subject they were studying, and past experiences.

When the children were asked how Christy selected the books she read aloud, they gave many different answers. Seven children said that Christy selected books based upon what they were studying. Some of the wordings of their answers were curious, indicating that if Christy read a book about something, then they must be studying that thing. This was most evident in Tara's response that they were reading *Ramona and Her Father* because they were studying about smoking. Christy had chosen to read this book for enjoyment and to introduce Beverly Cleary to the children.

Children gave other reasons for why Christy read the books she did. Three children mentioned that Christy selected books based on the season of the year. Brandon said Christy picked funny books. George said she picked books they had never heard of and then the children could read those books. Jerrid gave a similar response that Christy read to "try to get us to read harder books." Allison noted that Christy picked shorter books on the holiday or on what they were studying but that Christy didn't pick chapter books that way.

Children mentioned that they talked about what happened in the stories and about the characters and the characters' feelings. Samantha and three
others noted that they talked about favorite parts of the book. Missy said that children could express their own opinions and Mike said that they talked about what they thought about the book. Karl, Tara, and Nancy said that they often did writing or made pictures and murals about the books. Billy said that the read alouds helped him with his writing. Patrick commented that he enjoyed the expression Christy used in her reading.

Read alouds served many purposes in Christy's classroom and the children and she held a variety of expectations about what would happen during a read aloud time. As a result responses to read aloud books could be quite varied. Two different read aloud sessions serve as illustrations to the different purposes and expectations associated with quiet reading. They also serve as illustration to the similarities which cut across most of the read alouds.

*Friends* by Helme Heine was read on Monday, September 19, following lunch count. *Friends* is a story about a rooster, a pig, and a mouse, who are close friends. They ride bicycles, and play hide and seek and other games. They swear a pact to always stick together. When night comes, they try in vain to sleep at each other's places and so learn that even good friends sometimes have to be apart.

The class was doing a unit on friendship and on feeling good about oneself. Sitting on her low chair with the students sitting on the floor. Christy showed the children the cover of the book. She told the class that this story was originally written in German and so it was translated. Christy turned to the title page and showed this to the class. As she showed a page, she held the book out away from her body and in a slow sweeping motion moved the book in front of the children's faces. When Christy read,
she turned the book toward herself and put it in her lap. When she finished a page, she repeated the sweeping motion to show the children the illustrations. As Christy began to read, Sally and Carolyn stood up, moved behind Christy's chair, and began to rub her shoulders.

Alvin laughed that the characters in the book were a chicken, a mouse, and a pig. The children listened quietly as Christy read the first few pages. When the children saw the illustration of the animals riding a bicycle, Michael said, "I didn't know they had a bicycle." Christy read on. As Mike saw the illustration showing Charlie Rooster hiding in the pond, he exclaimed, "The chicken's in the water!" Christy read on. Mike moved forward. There were children already sitting where he wanted to sit so Christy pointed to a spot near her feet that he could sit.

Christy read the sentence, "They conquered the village." Then she paused and asked Brandon what it meant "they conquered the village." Brandon replied, "destroyed." Christy asked Mike and he responded, "They scared all the people away." Christy read on. The children laughed when she read "they tried to catch a fish but their stomachs rumbled so loudly that they frightened away all the fish." Christy read to the end of the book. The children listened quietly until the conclusion.

When Christy finished the book she began the discussion with a connection to the times the children shared their writing to the whole group. When Christy referred to "an author," she was making reference to student-authors.

Christy: Questions or comments about the story? [pause] You notice how when an author shares their story and they ask for questions or comments and you raise your hand sometimes. You ask questions about the
book and sometimes you just give comments. If Helme Heine were here, what questions or comments would you give her? What would you say about her book? Cindy.

Cindy: [in reference to the bicycle] How can they pedal if the mouse is on one end and the pig is on the other?

Christy: It didn't make sense? How could they pedal like that? O.K. What else would you have for Ms. Heine.

Tara: How come the persons didn't ever fight?

Christy: The friends didn't ever fight? Why would you ask her that?

Tara: Cause friends are supposed to fight, especially my sister.

Christy: So friends can be friends but sometimes they fight, too, yeah. Would you ask Ms. Heine anything else? What comments would you give her? Like if she read this book to you, would you raise your hand and say -- like things that you guys say to each other sometimes. Karl.

Karl: I like that picture.

Christy: You like this picture. How do you think Helme Heine did these pictures?

Karl: Probably just did painting and glued them on. That looks like water color.

Christy: Yeah. I think it is water color. If you look very closely, it looks like it is water color.

Christy then asked, "Who were the characters in this book?" The children provided the names quickly. Christy asked, "What were some of the things the three friends did together in this book. Samantha said they played pirates. Timmy responded that they ate cherries and got stomach aches.

Christy's next question was, "What did this book say about friends?" After asking that question, she moved off her chair and stood by an easel
which held a large piece of chart paper. On the chart paper was written at the top, "Recipe for a Friend" and underneath that is written "Ingredients." Patrick said that friends should always stick together. Christy said that they were going to write a recipe for a friend and asked them what some of the ingredients would be. The children gave no response so Christy asked them to think about the kind of friend that they were to people or the kinds of friends that they had.

Nancy said a friend needs to be nice. Tara said a friend needs to be happy. After each response Christy wrote on the chart paper. When the discussion lagged, she asked the children to close their eyes and think about some of the ways they had shown a friend that they were their friend. Carolyn responded that when a friend was sick you could get them something. The discussion picked up and more ideas were offered. Christy ran out of room on the chart paper and ended this part of the discussion. The children and she read the sentences written on the paper:

A nice person
A happy person
Someone who is tired when you are.
Someone who is not sick.
Someone who plays with you a lot.
When they're sick, you get them something.
You get them a band aid if they need it.
Let them play whatever they want if they're new.
Cheer up an upset friend.
Invite them to your birthday party.
Invite them to any party.
Don't tease them.

Christy asked the children to raise their hand as she read the list if they had done what was on the list. She read each sentence and most of the children raised their hands for each one. She then told the children that
their first job would be to do a picture of a time when they felt proud about something they did for a friend. She passed out the white drawing paper. She said she wanted them to do a good picture and to put some thought into it. Christy also stated she wanted them to write about their picture when they had finished it and that they could write on the drawing paper.

There are several things which need to be pointed out about this read aloud. Children often rubbed Christy's shoulders while she read. This was something of a school tradition. Apparently many children would stand up and move behind the teacher in order to see the illustrations. The teachers decided to control this problem by making it a rule that if a child stood up, they must rub shoulders. This limited the number of children standing to two, and not everyone would be willing to rub shoulders for a chance at a better view of the illustrations. There were occasions where Christy asked that children not rub her shoulders.

Christy stopped in the middle of her reading to ask the children what "conquered" meant. Christy often stopped in the middle of her reading to talk about words she thought the children might not know. Christy would also stop reading and ask questions if she thought what was happening in the story was ambiguous to the children. In these instances she seemed to serve as a mediator between the text and the children, helping them understand parts they might not understand on their own.

Children often made commentary on the story during the reading by spontaneously blurting out or by making quiet comments to someone next to them. Alvin's comments about the characters were made quietly to those around him, while Michael's and Mike's exclamations seemed spontaneous and not necessarily directed at anyone in particular.
Christy's first question about what would the children like to say to Helme Heine was indicative of two common aspects of read aloud discussion. By making reference to the way children shared their writing in the class, Christy was making a reading/writing connection, in this case that children could question the professional text just as they would question each other's text. She framed this question with another common aspect, beginning the discussion with whatever caught the children's interest during the reading. The responses were varied. Cindy commented about the incredulity of the animals riding a bicycle, and Tara stated that it didn't seem possible that friends never fought. Karl, on the other hand, stated that he liked the water color illustrations.

After this talk, the discussion switched to the characters and to what happened in the story. This was also typical of many read aloud discussion. First, the children would talk about what had captured their interest, then Christy would steer the discussion toward talking about the literal aspects of the story.

Christy's purpose in reading the book began to be revealed with her next question. She asked the children what this book said about friends. As she asked this she moved toward the chart. The children had other books about friendship read to them, so it is likely they were aware that this book was chosen because it was about friendship. Christy intended for them to make a picture about a time they were proud of the way they treated a friend and to do a bit of writing to go along with it. She prepared the children for this by having them give her a list of things friends are and do. Having done this, she set them off to do their drawing and writing.
This was again a typical pattern. If Christy intended to use a read aloud book as a starting point for a piece of work the children were to do, she would shift the discussion away from the book and onto the task at hand. In the case of *Friends*, the discussion shifted from "what had happened in the story" to "what did the book say about friends" to "what would make a good friend." In a sense the work the children were being asked to do was not a response to the book but a response from the book.

*Sam, Bangs, and Moonshine* was read under different circumstances than *Friends* was. *Sam, Bangs, and Moonshine* was read on Monday, October 24. It was the first day of a new unit on weather. Christy had read aloud a number of nonfiction books during the geology unit which had just been completed and wished to concentrate her read alouds on stories for a while. She had just finished lunch count and had pointed out the new books she had brought in from the public library. Though this read aloud also ended a writing and drawing task for the children to do, there were differences in the nature of the discussion and in the assignment from the *Friends* read aloud.

*Sam, Bangs and Moonshine* by Evaline Ness is the story of Sam, who has a habit of stretching the truth. Moonshine is what her father calls her lies. She tells a gullible younger boy, Thomas, that she has a kangaroo and that her mother is a mermaid. When she tells Thomas that her kangaroo is out at Blue Rock, Thomas leaves to find it. A storm blows in strandng Thomas and Sam’s cat, Bangs, on the rock. The boy is rescued and Bangs survives the storm. Sam learns a lesson about bad moonshine and good moonshine.
Christy sat on the low chair in the meeting area with the children seated on the floor in front of her. She showed them the cover of the book and told them the title. She said, "Sam is a little girl. Her name is short for Samantha. Bangs is her cat and after we read the story, we'll find out what moonshine is." Christy noted that this book won the Caldecott medal. She opened the book to the title page and read it. Then she began the story. She read with her usual pattern of holding the book towards her then when she finished a page, showing the children the illustration. No one rubbed her shoulder this day.

Christy read much of the book before she stopped to ask a question. She read until Sam's father had left to rescue Thomas from the storm and Sam was waiting at her house.

Christy: What is Sam waiting for at this point in the book?
Brandon: For Bangs and Thomas to be o.k.
Christy: And where are Bangs and Thomas?
Brandon: Blue Rock
Christy: What is the danger that has to do with Blue Rock right now? Can you say a little more about that?
Brandon: The water -- the tide.

Christy resumed reading and read without interruption to the end. She asked for questions and comments. Nancy replied that she saw a movie of the book. Christy asked the children for the names of the characters in the story, which they provided. She asked them if moonshine was a character. Patrick said in a way. Others disagreed. Christy asked what moonshine is. Children responded, "pretending" and "lying." The discussion moved to
rtelling the story and considering the individual characters as they came into the story.

Christy:  If we had to describe Sam and what Sam's like, what would be some things that we would say about Sam?

Tara:  A liar.

Christy:  Can you say more?

Tara:  She always lied and one day she learned not to.

After discussing Sam, the children and Christy talked about Bangs, the cat, and how Sam believed Bangs could talk. Then they talked about Thomas.

Christy:  Who is this Thomas?

Timmy:  He wasn't smart to believe her.

Christy:  You don't think he was smart to believe her? O.K.

They talked about where Thomas lived and how he came into the story. Next Christy asked what the problem was in the story. They talked about Thomas going to Blue Rock, being stranded by the storm and getting sick.

Christy:  What happens to Sam while Thomas and Bangs are off to the Blue Rock?

Patrick:  She thinks its like her fault.

Christy:  Do you think it is her fault?

Patrick:  Some.

Christy:  A little bit.
Mike: It is mostly Thomas's fault because he believed everything she said.

Christy: You think it's Thomas' fault because he believed her.

Mike: Sam is at fault because she is saying that.

They finished the discussion of the story. Christy then asked if they could tell her something they thought was "good moonshine." There was no response. Christy asked them to raise their hand if they knew what moonshine was. She asked those who raised their hands if they could "help the other kids understand it."

Lisa said moonshine was lying. Tara said that good moonshine was when you used your imagination. Brandon said that bad moonshine was when you're not telling the right story or you're not telling anything.

Christy asked the children to make up some moonshine. Timmy responded, "My house was smashed by dinosaurs." Ricky said, "My dad found a million dollars." Nancy offered, "My rabbit could go in my room every night and watch TV." Other children said equally preposterous things.

The discussion then took another turn.

Christy: What did Sam learn about moonshine in this book?

Timmy: That she shouldn't do it.

Christy: Did she learn that you should never do moonshine?

Timmy: She learned that.

Christy: Did she? Did Sam learn in this book that you should never do moonshine? Patrick.

Patrick: She learned that she could have good moonshine.
Christy: She learned she could do good moonshine and not bad moonshine.

Christy then asked, "What did you notice about the pictures in this book?" Bobby replied that they were all the same colors. Christy asked what colors he noticed and Bobby responded, "Brown, white, gray, black." Timmy noted that the pictures looked like the drawings in Tikki Tikki Tembo. Christy asked why Evaline Ness chose to make the pictures this way. One child responded that she wanted it to look dark and scary.

Christy then announced that she "would like you to write something about this book, Sam, Bangs and Moonshine." She suggested that they could write about a character or they could write about Moonshine, what it is and how it is different from Real. She also said they could do a picture with their writing if they wished.

Christy's purpose in reading this book aloud was different from her purpose in reading Friends. She wanted specifically to read a story and the discussion which followed stayed focused on the story. Even the writing assignment was one which was focused on the story. The responses the children made were responses to the story.

As she did in the Friends read aloud, Christy stopped in the middle of the story to ask questions of the children about what was happening. This was a key point in the story and Christy was making certain the children understood what was happening in the story at this point.

The discussion was much more in depth in terms of talking about the story. The pattern is similar to that of Friends in that the discussion began with the children sharing what interested them. It was interesting that they had very little to offer. Christy felt that many times the children
stopped thinking about the story after she finished reading it and perhaps that is what happened here. After this initial question, discussion moved toward a blended discussion of plot and characters. The group moved through the plot and discussed characters as they appeared in the story. There was some disagreement over whether Thomas was at fault or Sam was at fault. The discussion moved on with a consideration of what moonshine was and whether there was good moonshine and how it differed from bad moonshine. The discussion ended with some talk about the illustrations and how they helped create the mood for the story.

Throughout the discussion Christy showed an acceptance of the children's responses. She did question Timmy on whether Sam learned never to do moonshine, but she also didn't tell him he was wrong. Besides acceptance, Christy pushed for rigor in the children's answers. When children gave brief answers she asked them to say more, to clarify what they meant.

Not every book which Christy read was used as a springboard to writing or artwork. Generally, only one or two of the read alouds each week would be used as a tie to a specific assignment, such as these two read alouds were. Children usually took several days to complete an assignment such as the two in these examples. Often these assignments would be work choices for the remainder of the week.

Book Discussion Groups

Four times during the quarter Christy posted a sheet for children to sign-up to participate in a book discussion group. The title of the book was
written at the top and spaces were provided for six children to sign-up. The
date the discussion would be held was also listed. Sign-up was voluntary.
Christy selected three of the books which were discussed, *The Biggest Bear*,
*Freckle Juice*, and *Jumanji*. At a class meeting the children suggested that
*The Wreck of the Zephyr* would make a good book to discuss.

After the children had signed-up, they read the book. They then
gathered at a table on the appointed date during quiet reading with Christy
to talk about the book. Christy lead the discussion by asking questions.
With the small group each child had several opportunities to talk about the
book.

Book discussions were relatively new to Christy. She had in previous
years organized small reading groups. In general these groups were
formed by Christy of children who were roughly of the same reading
ability. When they met, they often read the book aloud together as well as
discussed it. She had read the previous year *Ramona Quimby, Age 8* with
several of last year's second grade children in that manner. The discussion
groups this year met only to discuss the story, there was little reading aloud
during this time. The children chose to participate and so the reading
abilities of the children in the group were often diverse.

In contrast to the discussions she had after read alouds, Christy viewed
these discussions as being more literary. The focus of the discussion was
more upon the book itself and less upon connecting the book to other
experiences or classroom activities. Christy said the purpose of book
discussion groups was for the children to understand a book in way that
they hadn't thought of before. She was not looking so much for particular
answers from the children as she was looking for more of an exchange of
ideas. She thought the children listened to each other more than they did during read aloud discussions and that they were not reading for just her questions. Since the children listened to each other more, Christy hoped that they would "feed off of each other's ideas." Christy said she felt more satisfied at the end of one of these discussions as opposed to read aloud discussions.

Christy tried to select books with "meat to them" for discussion. Generally this was limited to books in her classroom for which she had several copies. She felt that The Biggest Bear and Jumanji were good selections and offered much to talk about but that Freckle Juice was limited and not as satisfying a selection.

Timmy and Tara said that the class did book discussion groups because they helped kids think about the book better. D.J. said that discussing books "gets you to know more about reading." Other children said that Christy did book discussion groups so that she knew what they understood of the story. Several children said that during book discussion groups they talked about what happened in the story and about the characters. D.J. commented that groups talked about the problems in the story and how they were solved. Billy said that everyone got to talk during book discussion groups and that they talked about the parts of the book they liked. Karl said that Christy liked them "to try to picture the book... in your head." Karl's comment was interesting because Christy on occasion during read aloud asked children to close their eyes and to try to picture what she was reading in their minds. She also would comment favorably on children's writing which she could picture in her mind. There is no record in any of the transcripts of book discussion groups that Christy ever asked the children to try to
picture the story in their heads. It is possible that Karl was connecting this expectation from other events to this one.

Not all children participated in book discussions and not all children enjoyed them. Kristen was one child who did not participate and showed little interest in doing so. Mike did participate in *The Biggest Bear* and *Freckle Juice* discussions but said in his interview that he would rather read a book than talk about one.

The first discussion group was on *The Biggest Bear*. Sally, Tara, Mickey, Karl, Mike, and Patrick were the discussants along with Christy. Christy began the session by laying out a little outline of the discussion. She said that she thought they would first talk about where the story takes place and then they would talk about what "Johnny's problem was in this book and some different things that we remember from this book about how he solved the problem."

Christy then set out some of the expectations for the children. She said "We're going to really try hard to listen to what each other says and then talk back to what other people say." Mickey then began to talk about the farm in which the story took place. Karl seemed a bit confused by this and this exchange with Christy resulted.

Karl: Miss Pearl, are all the people that are reading *Freckle Juice* going to read the whole book or just a chapter?

Christy: The whole book.

Karl: We're going to talk about it, we're not going to read it?

Christy: Right, we're not going to read it. We're just going to talk about it.
Mickey: Then it shows him with the calf. There's a calf picture.

Karl: I thought we were going to read all together.

Christy: No, we're going to talk about it. This is a discussion for kids who have already read it. Has everybody here already read The Biggest Bear?

[four children say yes and Tara says she has only read half.]

Karl: I thought we were going to read it, because if we were just going to talk about it, I didn't want to do it.

Christy: Oh. This was just to have a discussion about it.

Mickey: Then the bear began to tear up the house and the three farmers...

Karl: Cause I already know what it's all about.

Christy: O.K. Well, that's what we're here to do, talk about it. You can stay if you know what it's about.

Karl elected to stay and finish the discussion. He joined in the discussion at several points. Karl's understanding of the expectations and norms of book discussion groups was different from Christy's. Karl thought that they would be reading the book with each other. It is interesting that he would rather read aloud with a group than talk about the book because he "already know(s) what it's all about."

After this exchange with Karl, the group discussed parts of the plot. They talked about what the bear ate.

Patrick: He ate the mash for the chickens and after the neighbors had left, Johnny's father explained to Johnny that the bear would have to go back to the woods.
Mickey: Yeah, then he kept on taking him back to the woods and the next day it came back. He even took it across the lake and it came back.

Christy: And the bear came back?

Mickey: Yep.... They took him as far as they could and after that he came back again and they decided to put him in the zoo.

Patrick: No, he was taking him out to shoot him and then he stole maple sugar.

Christy: What in the book makes you think that they were taking him out to shoot him?

Patrick: Because it says in the book.

Mike: No.

Patrick: Yeah, it does.

Mike: It just says never decided (unintelligible) and Johnny said he would do it.

Christy: What does that mean?

Mike: It means that he would do it cause he has his gun.

Mickey, Patrick, and Mike had a disagreement about Johnny's intentions. Mickey seemed not to have noticed that Johnny intended to shoot his bear. Patrick said it said so in the book, but Mike said that it didn't say that, it just showed a picture of Johnny with his gun. Christy's role in this discussion was to accept the answers the boys gave and then to give them gentle pushes for further rigor by asking them what in book made them think what they did.

Christy then took the discussion on a different turn. She asked the group what Johnny's biggest problem was. Many children replied the bear. Christy asked them "what makes you say that?" Tara mentioned all the food the bear took and that Johnny was being blamed for it. Karl noted
that the bear kept coming back when they took it into the woods and Mike said that the bear made a mess of the kitchen.

Christy then asked why Johnny wanted a bear in the first place. The children provided a bit of retelling of the beginning of the story about Johnny's hunting and the expectations of his family. Christy then asked "What do you think about Johnny wanting to hunt bears in the first place?"

There followed a long discussion of whether it was good that Johnny hunted bears or not. Tara, Mickey and Mike noted that his family wanted Johnny to hunt so it was good. Christy asked how Johnny felt about not having a bearskin on his barn.

Mike: He didn't like being the only one.

Christy: So Johnny decided he should go hunting for a bear. What do you think of that, Karl?

Karl: Yes and no. I mean good and not good.

Patrick: I agree with him.

Christy: Give us your good and your not good.

Karl: Not good because he shouldn't have hunted in the first place and good if he did, he didn't kill the bear.

Patrick: I think it was good because it runs through the family and I think it was kind of bad because it was killing nature. I would have did it.

Mickey: That's what I think. Miss Pearl, I think it was good.

Patrick: I think it was good like it runs through the family, a sport, and I think it was bad because it was killing nature.

Christy: What do you think, Sally?

Sally: I agree with him.

Christy: What part do you agree about?
Sally: All parts. It did run through the family and it was bad to kill nature.

This discussion over the appropriateness of hunting continued and lead into a general discussion over whether hunting was good or bad. Throughout the excerpt just given, Christy made sure that all the members of the group had a chance to express their thoughts. Christy also called on the children, such as Sally who were reluctant to talk.

Christy then asked "what happened at the end of the story?" Mike explained that Johnny was going to shoot the bear but it went into a trap instead. Sally said that Johnny was trying to be nice to the bear and not harm him. Mickey said that he liked the part "when they put the bear in the cage and they didn't shoot it." Tara agreed with Mickey and said she liked the boy getting paid and that maybe the circus would let the bear go free. Christy ignored Tara's substitution of the circus for the zoo and asked if they thought the boy got paid. The children could not find where it said that. Mickey said he didn't think the zoo would let a wild animal go.

Christy then asked if they would recommend this book to other kids. Sally said it would be nice to give other people the chance to read it. Mickey said he would recommend it because "there's not a whole page of sentences."

Christy asked them if they thought their "discussion today helped you guys think about parts of the book that maybe you might not normally have thought about so much?" Tara responded, "Normally I wouldn't have thought about why he did things and stuff but now since we read it, I'll think a lot about that. From now on I'm going to think about the books
when I read." Christy then excused the group and asked that they write in their reading logs about the book.

The discussion of The Biggest Bear was focused upon the story throughout the session. The group talked about the setting. They retold portions of the plot. They discussed Johnny's problem. They argued about Johnny's hunting and they talked about their satisfaction with the ending.

There was some confusion at the beginning of the discussion as to what they would be doing. Karl thought that the group was going to read aloud to each other and seemed surprised when the group began discussing the book instead. Unlike Carolyn's expectations of "just read" for her groups during quiet reading, this group was expected to talk about the book. Karl and Tara each indicated they had not read the book, but they also participated in the discussion. They either had read it, perhaps some time ago, or they were quickly picking up the story from the discussion and by looking at the copies of the books at the table.

It seems trite to say that the children were mindful of the kinds of questions they were being asked and responded accordingly. However, they did talk about the book within the boundaries set by the expectations of the questions they heard. Their responses seemed framed by the norms of discussion groups and the expectations of the questions they were asked.

The children did pay attention to each other and responded to what they said. They agreed and disagreed at various points. Tara's statement that she thought about the book in ways she hadn't before indicated that she considered the kinds of questions Christy was asking and the comments the other children were making as possibilities for other books she might read.
Christy's role was somewhat different from her role as leader of discussions of read alouds. Making connections was less important to book discussion groups. Discussion stayed focused upon the story. It was more important that the children had opportunities to express their thoughts about the book. She kept the discussion moving, changing the subject when a topic was exhausted. She made sure each child had several opportunities to talk. Christy accepted and honored every answer a child gave. She never told a child an answer was wrong. She did ask children to make their answers more rigorous by requesting further explanation or support from the book. Christy also showed the children what she considered to be important to this story. She announced at the beginning that they would talk about Johnny's problem and how he solved it. Much of the discussion was on this aspect of the story.

Christy hoped that children would begin to form their own discussion groups. Frequently, she would point out to the class books they had multiple copies of and state that children could form a discussion group on one of these books. No one formed a formal discussion group while I observed this classroom, but children did read together and talk about books in the manners described in the section on quiet reading.

Listening Center

The listening center never became an important part of the classroom during the period of observation. There were on occasion tapes of stories with copies of the books present. Some children, mostly boys who were less able readers, would spend part of work time listening to stories and
following along in the book. It was a popular choice for them. At times they could be seen lip synching to "Chicken Soup with Rice," a rather comic sight as with the headphones on no one could hear to what the boys were lip synching. It was Christy's hope that after winter break she would be able to find more tapes and multiple copies of books so that more students could listen to stories.

Work Time

The relationship the literature the children and Christy read had with the children's work during work time goes well beyond the scope of this study. Being a literature-based classroom, the vast majority of activities and projects the children worked on were in some form connected to something they had read or Christy had read to them. Christy prized using literature as models for the children's writing and it was obvious from looking at their writing that several of the students borrowed heavily from their reading in making their own stories. Some children borrowed the techniques of the commercial illustrators to illustrate their own stories or just to make a picture. For instance, Carolyn made a scratchboard of a hot air balloon and noted that it was a technique that Leonard Everett Fisher used.

The focus of this study is children's responses to literature and the purposes for which children and their teacher read literature. For this study's purposes only writing, art work, and other related work which was about a book will be considered. Work which was inspired by literature, while very interesting, must be left for another study. Certainly,
children's writing would reveal much about what children know about stories. Children's writing, art, and other projects which were inspired, say, by a book Christy read aloud, would tell much about the influence children's literature can have on student's work. But, this study's scope does not include these issues. The line between the two may be fine, but there seems to be a difference between children's responses to a book and children's responses which come from a book.

Among their choices during work time the children could be writing about a story they had read or making something. Though any number of art projects were possibilities for making something about a book, during the time I observed this classroom, pictures, murals, and puppets are what I saw children make. Children did make dioramas for geology projects, but for literature, I observed the children only making pictures, murals, and puppets. The pictures ranged from small, 4 inches by 6 inches to large murals around 3 feet by 6 feet. The puppets were stick puppets of about 4 to 8 inches in height.

Most of the writing the children did about books was written in their reading logs. There were other examples of writing about books. Some children rewrote favorite books. Patrick, for a time, made his version of The Mysteries of Harris Burdick. He carefully looked at each illustration and then drew in pencil his rendition of that illustration. His plan was to do some writing with these illustrations, but that was aborted when he misplaced his drawings and couldn't find them. Carolyn had found a play version of Aldo Applesauce. She spent several work times editing and recopying the play. Kristen on two occasions made her own versions of favorite books. After spending several weeks reading Little Bear stories,
she wrote and illustrated her own Little Bear book. She also made a version of Jack Prelutsky's *It's Halloween*.

The children did do writing about *Sylvester and the Magic Pebble*. After Christy had read the story she asked them to make a picture and then write about their picture. Their writing here resembled their writing in the reading logs. Much of it was retellings and comments on characters' feelings. Below are some examples of what children wrote.

**Lisa**

*Sylvester and the Magic Pebble*

One day Sylvester was walking on Blueberry Hill and saw a red pebble. It began to rain. He shivered. He said softly to himself I wish the rain would stop and suddenly the rain stopped out of nowhere. And a big lion came out of the bushes and ran after Sylvester and he wished he was a rock. He was. After his mother and father knew he was gone, they looked everywhere for him. One day his mom and dad went on a picnic. They went on Blueberry Hill. In fact they sat right on Sylvester. Then his dad saw the pebble. He picked it up. Sylvester would have liked that. He sat the pebble on him but he did not know it was on him. He said I wish I was a donkey. He was. They hugged and kissed. The end.

Lisa was the only child to write a fairly complete retelling of the story. Her picture was of Sylvester holding the magic red pebble. Many children's writings were addressed specifically to their picture. Sally, Michael, Samantha, and D.J. each wrote about their picture. Sally and Samantha provided retellings of parts of the story which helped explain what their pictures were showing. Michael and D.J. wrote about what was in their pictures.
Sally  
*Sylvester and the Magic Pebble*

Sylvester is a rock and this is how he turned into a rock. He had a red pebble and he saw a lion and wished that he was a rock and that's what he turned into and he stayed that way winter and summer.

Michael  
*Sylvester and the Magic Pebble*

It is fall. The leaves are falling on Sylvester. The clouds are fluffy. The grass is green. The trees are tall and the rock is small.

Samantha  
*Sylvester and the Magic Pebble*

This is a picture of when Sylvester was a rock. It is fall and the leaves are falling on the rock. The pebble is laying on the ground next to the rock. Sylvester wants to pick it up and wished he was safe at home but he cannot pick it up so the only way that the can become a donkey again is if someone will pick up the pebble and wish that the rock would turn into a donkey and this is not very likely.

D.J.  
*Sylvester and the Magic Pebble*

Sylvester is a rock and his parents have a picnic on him and his dad places the magic pebble onto Sylvester again and they all lived happily ever after.

Children also wrote about the emotions the characters were feeling. Billy wrote of the despair Sylvester and his parents were feeling.

Billy  
*Sylvester and the Magic Pebble*

The leaves are falling on Sylvester. He is a rock. He is sad. He misses his mom and dad. His mom and dad are worried. Sylvester is worried too.

Christy commented that when the children made pictures about books they had read, they mostly copied a picture from the book. If they had done
any writing with the picture, it would most likely be a retelling of part or all of the story such as the *Sylvester and Magic Pebble* writing. Christy wished that the children would illustrate scenes which were not pictured in their books. When she asked the children to consider making a picture of *Tico and the Golden Wings*, Christy asked the children to think of things which happened in the story for which Leo Lionni had not made a picture. The children listed a few, but most of the pictures they made were still their versions of pictures from the book.

Children seemed aware of Christy's expectations. Brandon said during his interview that they were supposed to do pictures of parts of the stories for which there weren't any pictures. Samantha commented that though they copied their pictures from books they had "to make some of it your own idea." Billy noted that he looked for a picture in the book he wanted to draw and then he drew it.

The children used a variety of media in their pictures. Crayons, oil crayons, markers, colored pencils, and chalk were the most popular. Children also used water colors and collage. Often children used mixed media in their pictures. Several children cut out bits of shiny red paper as their magic pebble and pasted them onto their drawing of Sylvester.

It seemed that perhaps the illustrations were what made certain parts of a story memorable. When the children made pictures for *Sylvester and the Magic Pebble*, almost everyone made a picture of Sylvester when he was a rock. Allison and Carolyn did a version of the autumn picture, with different colored leaves falling all about Sylvester the rock. Patrick and Jerrid did a picture of winter with the wolf on top of the rock howling and the snow blowing all about. Bobby, Keith, and Brandon did a picture of the
multitude of dogs searching for Sylvester, with the rock tucked
inconspicuously in a corner. Lisa did one of the few pictures which did not
show Sylvester as a rock with her picture of Sylvester holding the shiny
red pebble.

The writing the children did about Sylvester suggested that Sylvester's
isolation from his parents could be what was important to so many of the
children. Billy said that Sylvester and his parents were worried. Samantha
wrote that Sylvester wished he was home. D.J. wrote about Sylvester's
reunion with his parents.

Not all children wrote and made pictures about *Sylvester and the Magic
Pebble*. Timmy, Ricky, and George as a group made stick puppets of the
characters. When the boys finished they presented a puppet show. Ricky
reptold the story by looking at the pictures in the book while Timmy and
George handled the puppets.

On occasion children made pictures which were not versions of already
existing illustrations. Sally made a picture of picture of Tico from *Tico and
the Golden Wings* by Leo Lionni. She showed Tico flying by the window of
her classroom. In the classroom Sally had drawn Christy reading *Tico and
the Golden Wings* to the class.

**Sharing Time**

Christy had several purposes in providing time for children to share
their own writing. By hearing other people read their stories, she hoped
that children would get ideas for their own writing. By sharing their
writing with other members of the class, children were provided with an
audience for their work. She encouraged the listeners to ask questions of
the author and to seek things they didn't understand in the text. She hoped
this questioning would help the children understand that they were
writing for an audience and not just for themselves. It was Christy's
intention that through the sharing of their writing the children would see
each other as authors.

Sharing time, especially when children shared their own writing, bore
a strong resemblance to Christy's read alouds. Sharing time, like read
 aloud, occurred in the meeting area. The student-author sat in the same
chair Christy sat in to read aloud. The rest of the children and Christy sat
on the floor, looking at the person sharing. This person would read from
what was usually a book which was illustrated. He would hold the book
facing himself. When finished reading a page, the student would turn the
book so that it faced the audience and he would slowly pass the book in
front of everyone, much as Christy shared picture books. Often times other
children would stand up and rub the shoulders of the person sharing.
When the person was finished sharing, the first question asked would be
"questions or comments." This was frequently the first question Christy
asked after reading a story. After comments or questions were made the
sharer picked someone else to share. This pattern repeated until there was
no more time for sharing.

In the strict sense of the term what the children and Christy did during
sharing time could not be considered "response to literature." However, it
was clear from the manner in which Christy shared books with her
students, that she expected their writing and art work to be influenced by
the books the children read and by the books she read to the children. This
reading/writing connection was an important aspect of the way literature was used in this classroom. It seems more than just coincidence that the forum in which the student-authors had to share their work was so similar to the forum Christy used to share work by commercial authors.

The first question asked after sharing was "any questions or comments." A typical response was "I loved all the detail you put into the pictures." Similarly, children might respond that the student-author had used a lot of good descriptive words. Children often responded with a mere, "I loved all the detail." Christy would then ask the child to give an example. Putting detail in writing and illustrating was something Christy worked hard for her students to achieve. Often she would point out good words or detailed illustrations in the books she read aloud. More often she would make similar comments about the students' work. For example when Ricky shared the book he was writing about dinosaurs, Christy responded "I could tell you did your drawing carefully, because there is so much detail." When Samantha shared her story of a visit to a farm in Pennsylvania, Christy replied, "I really liked the part where you said that you built a fort and that you had to board it up to keep the cows from getting in. I could kind of picture that."

Many of the stories shared were work in progress. A typical response to these stories was asking the author what was going to happen. Children might also ask how a certain illustration was made if a child had used materials in an unusual way. Sometimes children would point out inconsistencies between the text and the illustrations. When Allison shared a story she had written about a witch with a magic broom, Brandon
asked her why the pictures of her characters had smiles on their faces when bad things were happening to them.

Though many of the responses Christy and the children gave to the stories shared by students were about the making of the story, there were responses to the story itself. Some responses were emotional. Allison wrote a Halloween story which made several children shudder when they listened to it. When Karl read his story about the "Big Green Booger" students expressed disgust. If a student had written herself into her story, students might question her as a character, asking her why she did certain things. When Brandon read a story he was working on about a fight he had with an alligator, Mike asked him how he started the fight with the alligator and how he got away so quickly. One child asked him if it was true, suggesting that perhaps some of the children wondered if Brandon was writing about a real experience. Brandon replied, "No! I wouldn't get in a fight with an alligator."

**DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSE PATTERNS AMONG EVENTS**

Though the children had a great deal of freedom and choice in expressing their responses to literature, there did appear to be certain kinds of responses which were more prominent than other responses in certain events. The expectations of readers changed from event to event or in the case of quiet reading they could change depending on with whom the person was reading.

During quiet reading children could make a range of oral responses to literature, provided their talk was about the book. Doing art or writing or
practicing a play (though they could read their parts) was not acceptable
during quiet reading. Children exercised a variety of choices in how they
chose to respond to their reading. Silent readers, such as Mike, rarely made
any response. Patrick would show the boys who were listening to him read
how he interpreted certain stories and what he paid attention to in the text.
Carolyn expected a straight reading of the words on the page. Christy's
expectations also varied from listening to children read to asking them to
tell about the book.

Writing in reading logs required the children to write "about the story"
or to "tell about a character." Children often wrote summaries of plots or
short retellings of episodes. They wrote about characters and their
feelings. A few children wrote about their own feelings towards the story
by stating "it was funny" or "it was scary."

Responses to read aloud discussions varied according to the purposes
Christy had in reading the book. Christy made her purposes known
through her questions and the children responded according to what they
were asked. If Christy asked them to consider words or other aspects of the
craft of book writing and illustrating, then the children responded in that
fashion. If Christy's questions concerned literary features, that became
the focus of the children's responses. Often read aloud discussions lead to a
tie to the theme of study and a project the children might do.

Responses during book discussion groups followed Christy's line of
questioning. Unlike many of the read aloud discussions, responses were
focused upon the book itself. Plot, characters, problems and their
resolutions, illustrations, and themes were all discussed. Some children,
like Patrick, seemed to thrive on discussion. Some children, like Sally,
chose to join the groups but talked very little. In Sally's case, when she did talk, she often repeated or voiced agreement with points which other children had already made. There were also children such as Brad and Kristen who avoided discussions.

What seemed to be characteristic of this classroom was that there were typical kinds of responses to literature associated with each event. Because there were so many different events, the opportunities for demonstrating a range of responses to literature was present. Each event seemed to have expectations for certain kinds of responses, but these could vary. Also within these events were allowances for individual differences and preferences. Children had a variety of opportunities to express their responses.

**DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSE PATTERNS AMONG CHILDREN**

Much has been made of the children responding to literature according to the expectations of the literature event as held by themselves and by Christy. It needs to be pointed out that there were great individual differences among children's responses to literature. Children tended to resonate more to the expectations of some events and less so toward others.

Mike seemed to prefer his experiences with books to be solitary. He never read with other children during quiet reading. He appeared to be so absorbed in his reading that he was oblivious to things happening around him. I observed him during a work time reading a book three feet away from a noisy group of children who were doing observations of the class's pet turtle. For fifteen minutes, Mike's eyes did not leave his book. Mike
participated in two book discussions, *The Biggest Bear* and *Freckle Juice* and he made several contributions to the discussions. In spite of this he told me that he didn't like to talk about books. He said he would rather read them.

Mike rarely talked during discussions after read alouds unless he was called upon. If a book Christy was reading would interest him, he would inch his body toward the front of the group. If he became excited about the story, he would raise up on his knees, maybe point, and often say something spontaneously. Mike said he disliked making pictures about the books he read. He said he preferred to write and he did write more in his reading log than most of the second graders did. He wrote two and three sentences summaries, usually naming the main character and something the character did. There was little doubt that Mike was having rich experiences with his books. He would on occasion approach Christy during quiet reading and talk briefly about some part of his book which captured his interest. He was one of the few second graders who read mostly chapter books.

Patrick seemed to have rich experiences with literature across all events. During quiet reading he read to others, he read with others, and he read alone. He seemed balanced in making time to do each type of reading. As noted in Excerpt 1 in the quiet reading section, Patrick was sensitive to metaphoric meaning and would share his interpretations with others. He loved his role as teacher and mentor to the less able readers in the class.

Patrick put equal vigor into his art work. His mural of Sylvester as a rock during winter with the wolf on top was stunning. His writing was thoughtful. He wrote about what he liked in the books he read and he
wrote about books he enjoyed reading aloud to others. He was sensitive to the oral interpretation of literature, either when he was reading aloud or when Christy was reading aloud. He enjoyed contributing to discussions, either of read alouds or in discussion groups.

Carolyn rarely shared her interpretations of her readings during quiet reading unless it was a spontaneous show of emotion such as a laugh. Most often, though she would read with other children. Carolyn was an accomplished reader but for her to share what she thought about her books she had to be in a discussion. Carolyn did participate in book discussions and would volunteer during read aloud discussions.

Carolyn wrote pages in her reading log. Most of her writing was an extended summary of the book. She did comment on the repetitive language of Bringing the Rain to Kapiti Plain and on the structural features of The Magic School Bus Inside the Earth. But she never really reflected on what she thought or felt about the story. Carolyn did detailed pictures about the books she read. She enjoyed using a variety of media in her art. Her pictures were her versions of existing illustrations in the book. Carolyn is a good example of a child who needed the richness of opportunities provided in this classroom to respond to literature. Unlike Patrick, who shared his interpretations with others and was reflective in his writing, Carolyn seemed to need the structure of discussion to give those kinds of responses.

Brad rarely took risks. He commented during his interview that in first grade he had shared some of his writing and the other kids laughed at him. He also said he never used paints in his art because he had made a mess of
paints in first grade and again the kids had laughed at him. Seeking safety seemed to be what was critical to Brad in his reading.

Based on qualitative observation, Brad was probably one of the poorer readers if not the poorest reader in the classroom. He rarely chose to read books by himself. He never read to other children. He did not participate in book discussion groups. He wrote very little and often Christy had to be firm in getting him to write in his reading log. He never shared his writing with others. Each of these activities would seem to require Brad to show his abilities as a reader and writer. Since his abilities were low, he seemed to avoid them when he could.

But Brad did enjoy being read to, especially if Patrick was doing the reading. When Patrick read, Brad would often make comments about the story and about the illustrations. He would ask Patrick to read the same stories over and over again. Brad would also make comments about other children's work, often about the beauty of someone's pictures.

Though there were many times when Brad could not avoid those tasks which he did not like, the norms of quiet reading allowed Brad to exercise a reading activity he was comfortable with, and through Patrick he was able to enjoy and respond to literature.

Kristen was also one of the less able readers in the classroom. Unlike Brad she did not like reading with other people because she said she already knew the words and didn't need anyone to tell her what they were. She did not participate in book discussion groups and showed little interest in doing so. She also rarely volunteered to talk during read aloud discussion. She seemed to enjoy writing in her book log, though she rarely wrote more than one or two sentences of retellings.
Kristen seemed to have intense experiences with a few books. For several weeks she read little except books in the Little Bear series. She then wrote her own Little Bear book. She did her art work carefully, choosing each color with some deliberation. She said it was important to get the right colors for each page because her pictures were telling the story. When she finished it, she read her own Little Bear book during quiet reading.

These children were all different in their preferred modes of responding to literature and yet they were all accommodated by the structures of the classroom. Each student had ways of reading and responding to literature which were comfortable to them. Each student was provided with opportunities to respond which fell within their comfort zone. Likewise, they were also stretched and encouraged to try new things. Mike did a discussion group. Kim and Brad participated in read aloud discussions. Brad read by himself.

These individual differences suggest that one of the strengths of this classroom was the diversity of opportunities the children had to respond to literature. The children had many different outlets available, and to a degree their preferred mode of responding could find an acceptable outlet. This suggests that the successful literature-based reading classroom provides children with a variety of opportunities to respond to literature, allowing children to operate in comfortable modes while providing for and coaxing children into new and different experiences.
SUMMARY

There were many different kinds of opportunities for children to respond to literature in this classroom. Each event seemed to carry with it a different set of expectations of response. These expectations should not be considered as necessarily being hindrances to response. Rather they seem to be appropriate limits to the possibilities of response. Many times the children gave no response to such wide open questions as "any questions or comments." It seemed that perhaps the children had too many possibilities and needed a tighter frame in which to come to responses. Responses didn't just happen in this classroom. They seemed to happen within the range of norms and expectations the children and Christy held for themselves and for each other.

Within these expectations, children had many, many choices in reading and responding to literature. They could generally choose what to read, where to read it, with whom they wished to read, what they wished to write about the book, and what to draw or paint. Many of the questions Christy asked were open-ended, so the children often had choices in what to say about their books. Because children could make many choices and because of the range of opportunities to respond to literature, individual differences seemed to be accommodated.

With the choices came limits if children chose inappropriately or made the same choice over an extended period of time. Christy looked for balance in her children's reading. She sought out those children who made the same choices and coaxed and sometimes required them to make another choice.
Virtually, every aspect of each of the events could involve sharing. During quiet reading, children could share their reading with each other. During work time children could talk with each other and show each other their work in progress. There was an "official" sharing time most days. Then children could show their work to the entire group and receive their comments. Reading logs were read by Christy and she wrote comments in them. Some children wrote her back. Read alouds were always discussed in large group, and smaller book discussion groups were held.

With the sharing came demonstrating. Because Christy and the children so often made their responses in the company of others, they showed each other how they read and how they responded. Christy, through her questions, showed children during discussions different ways of looking at text and responding to it. Sharing carried with it the tacit statement that "this is the way I do this."

Christy seemed to always push for more rigor. She accepted children’s responses, but she also asked them to dig deeper. She asked them to provide support for their responses from the book. She asked them to explain more. She asked them to provide more detail in their writing and in their art.

Children were conscious of the expectations of each event and tried to act accordingly. The expectations of the children were not always the same as that of Christy. Christy supplied much support for the children through her questions and demonstrations.
Notes

1. All children's books cited in this report are listed alphabetically by title in Appendix D.

2. "The Night It Rained" is a story of a man driving a car at night who picks up a hitchhiker. The hitchhiker appears cold, so the driver lends him his sweater. After dropping the hitchhiker off at his home, the driver realizes the hitchhiker still has his sweater. He returns to the hitchhiker's home, only to learn that his passenger has been dead for a year. Driving away, he passes a cemetery, where he finds his sweater draped across the tombstone of the hitchhiker.

3. "The Green Ribbon" is a story of a man who falls in love and marries a woman who always wears a green ribbon around her neck. She never removes the ribbon and refuses to tell her husband why she always wears it. The years go by and the now elderly woman lying on her death bed tells her husband he may remove the ribbon. He does so and the woman's head falls off.
CHAPTER VI

ASPECTS OF STANCES TOWARD LITERATURE

In Chapter 5 the various events in which the children and Christy read and responded to literature were discussed. Part of the cultural events of reading and responding to literature in this classroom were the stances the children and Christy assume toward literature.

Bruner (1986) described stance as the point of view or attitude someone takes toward the topic expressed. Stance expresses the manner in which a person views something and how that person will use his mind toward it. Stance also includes how that person expects others to use their minds toward the topic. In terms of literature a stance is a disposition to interpret or to use literature in a certain manner.

Stance is not a mental process or collection of processes such as Bloome's taxonomy or Piaget's stages of cognitive development. Stance is the perspective the reader assumes toward a piece of literature. Stances cut across any mental process.

In Christy's classroom the children and she assumed stances toward literature which were rich and complex. Table 7 lists some of the characteristics of the stances the children and Christy took toward literature. Some qualification needs to be made concerning this list. Though the list is lengthy, it is not an exhaustive list. Because stance is complex, continued analysis would reveal more characteristics. The list is
virtually limitless. The list also should not be viewed as a taxonomy of
generic stances. The purpose of this list is to describe the richness in the
perspectives toward literature of the children and Christy as they were
made public in the fall of 1988. The characteristics are not distinct from
each other but overlap. A stance was rarely taken in a pure or a simple
form, but rather was a mixture of several of the aspects shown on the list.
Many of the characteristics bear close relationship with each other. Given
this, the categories listed in Table 7 will be presented as "aspects of stance"
rather than as stances in and of themselves.

| TABLE 7 |
| ASPECTS OF STANCE IN CHRISTY’S CLASSROOM |

* Aesthetic
* Considering the Secondary World of the Text
* Moral
* Genre
* Craft
* Connection to the Classroom Theme of Study
* Connection to Personal Experience
* Connection to Other Published Work
* Information
* Reading the Words on the Page
Aesthetic Aspects of Stance -- Expressions of Lived-Through Experiences

Aesthetic aspects of stance were generally expressions of the lived-through experience of reading the text (Rosenblatt, 1978). Most often these were expressions of the reader's feelings which were evoked while reading or listening to a piece of literature. These feelings were often those of pleasure, delight, beauty, fear, and disgust.

In Christy's classroom this aspect of stance was often shown non-verbally. Facial expressions such as smiles, raised eyebrows, or "twinkles in the eye" were frequent ways Christy and the children showed their feelings about a book.

Some expressions of the aesthetic began with the phrases "I liked the part where..." or "I liked it when...." These were followed with a retelling of some part of the story the child was especially interested in. Patrick showed the "I liked it when..." aesthetic in his writing in his reading log.

Patrick

The War with Grampa

I liked it when he wrote a note to his grampa in the middle of the night he set his grampa Alarm clock and it rang his grampa got very angry and they got real mad at each other.

Children often talked or wrote about the specific feelings they had about a book. Timmy wrote this is his reading log.
Timmy

Miss Nelson Is Missing

It is funny. I thite miss viola swamp was ugly.

[It is funny. I thought Miss Viola Swamp was ugly.]

Many of the children read and reread books such as In a Dark, Dark Room, Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark, and More Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark. They often expressed their delight in being scared by these stories. In his interview Mike said that he liked reading scary stories. He said his mother thought they would give him nightmares, but he claimed they didn't. Mike also wrote about feeling scary in his reading log.

Mike

Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark

Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark has 22 scary stories to read in the dark. Some times they are scary and some times they are not scary to me.

Children also expressed feelings of disgust. Cindy was reading silently from The Beast in Ms. Rooney's Room. Apparently Cindy had been reading about a lunch one of the book's characters was having. Cindy suddenly said aloud, "ooh, his mother put it on rye bread. It's sickening, tuna fish, peanut butter and marshmallows on rye bread." Patrick, who was sitting next to her agreed. Karl, who was sitting under some desks nearby, appeared and said, "It is sickening."

Mickey told me during a quiet reading that he was reading The Beaver Pond by Tresselt. He said it was one of his favorite books. He commented that he liked the story but that he really liked the pictures, especially the way the artist used the color green. Making a public response to the beauty
of the illustrations was not very common, but it did occur. Mickey was one child who seemed sensitive to the beauty of picture book illustration. Missy was another. When Christy asked for comments or questions after reading aloud *Hooray for Me*, Missy commented that she loved the watercolor illustrations.

On occasion during quiet reading, Christy would ask the children to close their eyes and to try to picture the words in their minds. She did this during her reading of *Frederick*. Christy asked the children if any part of the story made them see pictures in their heads. No one responded. Then she asked the children to close their eyes, listen, and then tell her what they "saw" and felt while she read Frederick's poem. The children giggled and shuddered and talked about seeing colors in their heads and feeling warmer. It is interesting that when Christy first asked the question, there was no response. But after she presented an aesthetic purpose to their listening, the children were able to respond according to the stance offered by Christy.

When Christy read *Tornadot* by Adoff, she noted that it was poetry and that the children might want to close their eyes to help them picture the words. Sometimes the children would do this without prompting. During Christy's reading of *Like Jake and Me*, Ricky said he was going to close his eyes in order to "see the story better." In his interview Karl noted that Christy liked them to picture the story in their minds. This suggests that Karl understood that Christy held expectations for the children that they would try to picture the story in their minds. This seems to hint that stances were part of the social expectations of the classroom, that children
were aware of these expectations, and that they tried to respond to books meaningfully, according to these expectations.

The aesthetic was also seen through oral expression while reading aloud. Patrick commented that he enjoyed the way Christy read aloud and the different expressions she used while reading. He noted that when he read to others he tried to read aloud as Christy would, conveying the feelings or mood of the story.

Ricky also enjoyed using different voices in reading aloud. During a quiet reading time, Ricky read and reread the same passage from a book using a different voice each time, much to the delight of George, Ricky's listener.

Many children enjoyed expressing their feelings about a piece of literature through oral expression. Christy wrote on chart paper the following poem.

**Guessing Game by Dorothy Aldis**

"Guess if I have a stone in my pocket."
"What I guess is Yes."
"You think I have a stone in my pocket?"
"I said that I guessed Yes."
"Well, ha, ha, ha, then guess again."
"You haven't any stone there then?"
"No, no, no, that isn't so."
"You're saying neither Yes or No? Well have you a stone or haven't you? I guess I've guessed it. You have two."

The children read this aloud several times, taking turns with the dialogue. They read with much expression, particularly the "ha, ha, ha," which they read with a great deal of sassiness in their voices.
Considering the Secondary World of the Text

Often readers looked at the book in terms of the secondary world created by their reading of the text. From this perspective readers might focus upon the characters of the story and the characters' feelings, actions, and motives. Or the attention of the reader might be on aspects of the plot. Readers might retell parts of the story, predict what may happen, or discuss the problems in the book. Readers might consider the book according to possible themes. Readers also might look at various structural features of the book in order to understand the secondary world of the text better. In addition, readers might look at the story metaphorically, symbolically, and inferentially. They might consider that the story means or is about something which is not stated explicitly in the text, but rather is hinted at.

Considering the secondary world is a complex aspect of stance, covering a range of perspectives a reader may assume towards a text. Table 8 provides a listing of the characteristics of considering the secondary world as they were observed in Christy's classroom.

Looking at the characters in a story was a common perspective taken by readers in Christy's classroom. Christy often asked questions which asked the children to consider the traits of characters. After reading the first chapter of *Ramona and Her Father*, Christy asked, "What can you tell us about Ramona? What's she like as a character, as a person? What are some things you know about Ramona?" Missy stated that Ramona liked to do things early like making her Christmas list and that Ramona was shocked about her dad losing her job.
TABLE 8
CHARACTERISTICS OF CONSIDERING THE SECONDARY WORLD

* Talking about the characters' feelings, actions, and motives
* Talking about the plot
  retellings
  predicting what will happen
  talking about the problem in the story
* Talking about the theme
* Paying attention to the structure of the book
  author / illustrator intent
  looking for patterns and things which repeat
* Looking at the story metaphorically, symbolically, or inferentially

In the reading logs the children received for early December, they were asked to write about one of the characters in a book they read that week. Many of the children wrote about Ramona and what she was like. Cindy wrote about how smart Rosie was in Rosie's Walk and Allison wrote about why Mr. Fox in Fantastic Mr. Fox was fantastic.

Christy also asked questions about the characters' motives. During the discussion of The Biggest Bear, Christy asked why Johnny wanted to hunt a bear. Children replied that Johnny wanted a bear skin and that hunting bears probably "ran in the family." Patrick wrote in his reading log about The War with Grandpa. Christy wrote in his log, "Why do you think Peter is
so mad at him (Grandpa)?" Patrick wrote back, "Peter is mad because his Grandpa hid his school books, his shoes, and his alarm clock."

There was also much talk about characters' feelings. During her discussion of *Sylvester and the Magic Pebble*, Christy asked how Sylvester's parents felt about Sylvester being missing. Several children replied that they felt sad. When Christy read Arnold Adoff's *Tornado*, she frequently interrupted her reading to ask the children what the people in the book were feeling. In *The Biggest Bear* discussion, Christy asked Mike how Johnny felt about being in the only family that did not have a bear skin on their barn. Mike replied that Johnny did not like it. Children wrote in their reading logs about characters' feelings. From the book, *The Beast in Ms. Rooney's Room*, Jason wrote about the character Richard's feelings.

Jason

*The Beast in Ms. Rooney's Room*


Much of the children's writing in the December reading logs was focused upon the feelings of characters. It should be noted that the children were required to write about characters in those logs.

It was common for Christy to lead the children through a retelling of a story during read aloud discussion and book discussion groups. She might ask a general question such as "Let's talk about what happened in the story." Or Christy could be more specific, "What things did Sylvester do in the story." This perspective seemed to focus upon the action in the story and over the course of a discussion the children and Christy could make a fairly complete retelling of the story.
Retellings were common among the children in their talk during quiet reading and in their reading logs. One of the common kinds of book talk during quiet reading was for children to retell or reread sections of a book. These seemed often to be cases of "acting on the impulse to share" (Hickman, 1981). Applebee (1978) noted similar responses in his study and suggested that children did this to re-experience the book. This seems a possible explanation of what the children were doing in this study. Their retellings also hint at an aesthetic perspective, because the children seem to be reliving the enjoyment of a particular section of text. However, retellings also suggest that the children are considering the secondary world of the text.

Providing retellings was very common in the reading logs. Karl retold The Purple Coat in his reading log.

Karl                The Purple Coat

    every Fall The geirl in this story go's to her grampas and he makes a blue coat for her But this fall she wants a purple. her grampaw likes Blue bader than purple. grampaw thinks and thinks Faynle he has a ansure we will mack it revrsbil.

    [Every fall the girl in this story goes to her grampa's and he makes a blue coat for her. But this fall she wants a purple (coat). Her grampa likes blue better than purple. Grampa thinks and thinks. Finally, he has an answer. We will make it reversible.]

Besides telling about what happened, Christy might ask the children to predict what will happen in a story. She did this with Ramona and Her Father, a book she was reading aloud over the course of several days. She
also would do this during her conferencing with children during quiet reading.

Christy often had the children consider the problems the characters had in a story. Nearly every discussion of *Ramona and Her Father* had some talk about Ramona's problems. In *The Biggest Bear* discussion, Christy asked "What was Johnny's biggest problem?" Tara combined character feelings with a consideration of the problem in the book when she wrote in her reading log, "Ramona has short, straight, black hair. She always has feelings. The problem is you don't know which feeling it is. She likes her sister sometimes but other times she doesn't."

Another characteristic of considering the secondary world was looking at the theme of a story. This seemed to be a difficult perspective for many of the children and seemed to be influenced by how the question was framed. Sometimes Christy would ask the children "what was this book about?" Generally, the children would say it was about the characters in the story and then name some of the things the characters did. If Christy was more explicit in her question, the answers would be different. After finishing reading *Friends*, she asked, "What does this book say about friends?" Patrick responded that it said that friends should stick together. Though Patrick pulled his answer almost word for word from the text, it seemed, from Christy's perspective, a more thematic statement than "the book was about three friends."

Some children wrote in their reading logs from a thematic perspective.
D.J. John Brown, Rose and the Midnight Cat

John brown and the midnight Cat is about jealousy. John brown is Jealous because Rose wants the midnight Cat that comes to there window and she gets sick and John Brown gets her the midnight Cat.

D.J. was looking at this story thematically. She noted that the book is about "jealousy." She also provided a bit of retelling. It was unusual for the children to give a thematic response to the phrase "it was about." Generally, "it was about" phrases were completed with the names of characters or actions in the story.

Missy gave a more typical "it was about" response by providing a character and a bit of retelling.

Missy Hey, Al

It was a book about a man who had no colors in his life till a big bird came in his window.

Missy's writing seems to indicate that Missy was paying close attention to the illustrations and what they were suggesting for the story world. There is a suggestion of looking at the book thematically, that the man had no color in his life until the bird came into his window.

Christy and the children would look at a book from the perspective of its structure in order to gain a better understanding of the book. One aspect of a structure perspective was to think about the intent of the author or illustrator. When Christy read Hooray for Me, she asked, "Why would someone write a book like this?" She lead the children into talking about whether the authors felt "good about themselves" or not. Christy used
author intent to build a bridge to another perspective, connecting the book to the class theme of study. Feeling good about one's self was the focus of study when Christy read that book. In another example Christy asked the children why Arnold Adoff put an exclamation point after the title of his book, Tornado! Tara responded, "because they were shouting 'tornado!'"

Christy also asked about the intentions of illustrators. Christy asked why Uri Shulevitz chose dull colors to illustrate Rain Rain Rivers. The children replied that when it rains it is not bright outside. Carolyn noticed that in Two Bad Ants, sometimes "you're looking up at it and some of them you're looking down at it." Christy asked why Chris Van Allsburg chose different perspectives in his illustrations of Two Bad Ants. Carolyn replied to the question, "cause it wouldn't be like just looking at it one way all the time."

If a story was told in the first person, Christy often asked who was telling the story. The replies varied. In Ira Sleeps Over, everyone said that Ira was telling the story. In The Wreck of the Zephyr, many of the children were convinced that the "I" referred to Chris Van Allsburg. The narrator is named in Ira Sleeps Over in the text of the story, but no reference is made to a name in The Wreck of the Zephyr.

Sometimes the focus of readers' attentions would be on patterns and repetitions in books. After she read Alexander and the Terrible, Horrible, No Good, Very Bad Day, Christy asked the children what was repeated in the story. Lisa also noted a pattern in Each Peach Pear Plum and wrote about it in her reading log.
Lisa Each Peach Pear Plum

Each peach pear plum is a I spy book. And its like I spy the 3 bears. It was a good book. I liked when robbin hood was shouting arrows at the old witch and baby bunting was cute. I could not bulive robbin hoods den.

Lisa was commenting on one of the patterns of the book, the repetition of "I spy" and her looking for a character hidden in one of the pictures. She also provided a bit of retelling and by stating her feelings about the book, Lisa was also sharing an aesthetic perspective.

Readers in Christy's classroom also looked at books metaphorically, symbolically, or inferentially. This perspective focused upon meanings of the story which were not stated explicitly. Patrick provided an example of this when he pointed out to Brad and Jerrid that he thought the action in One Monday Morning (see Chapter 5 for full discussion) was all in the mind of the main character. Patrick pointed to the toys pictured in the last illustration which had been animated characters earlier in the book. He noted that the size of the illustrations changed throughout the book.

During the book discussion group of The Wreck of the Zephyr, there was much discussion concerning whether the old man telling the story in the book was also the boy who had made the voyage in the story. During the discussion, the children and Christy reread the entire book looking for clues which might provide proof. Most children felt that the two characters were the same person, because the boy had suffered a broken leg and the old man walked with a limp. Patrick maintained that the limp of the old man could be just a coincidence.
As Christy was sharing *Tornado!*, she read the phrase, "If you hold yourself together tight and listen, afraid can be full of life." She asked the class what it meant that "afraid can be full of life." There was no response, so Christy shared what the phrase meant to her, "To me it means that if you are really afraid, then there's no doubt that you're really alive."

**Moral Aspects of Stance**

Looking at literature from a moral perspective meant commenting on the appropriateness of human actions and motives. There seemed to be three different aspects to this perspective. One aspect looked at the actions and motives of the characters. This type of perspective placed the reader in the world of the text. A second aspect was readers commenting on what they would do if they were in the story. In this perspective readers seemed to place one foot in the secondary world and their other foot in their real worlds. The third aspect looked for lessons in the story. In this perspective readers were using the book as a guide for their own behavior. Here the readers were located with both feet in their real worlds.

Looking at literature from a moral perspective generally meant taking on the first aspect of this perspective, commenting on the appropriateness of the actions, choices, and motives of characters in the story. These comments may be about whether a character was right or wrong, good or bad, the best or the worst.

An example of looking at a story from this perspective was a part of the class's discussion of *Frederick*. After Christy had read *Frederick*, she asked the children what they knew about him. Patrick replied that Frederick was
lazy. Christy asked if anyone agreed with Patrick. About nine children raised their hands. Mike said that Frederick was lazy because he just sat around. Alvin agreed.

Christy then asked if anyone disagreed. Michael said that Frederick was thinking hard. Jason said that Frederick had the best job, that Frederick collected his stuff for himself and the other mice were foolish to ask for it. Karl thought that Frederick wanted to share with the other mice. D.J. said "If you think about it, Frederick worked harder than the other mice, his work was harder than theirs."

This episode shows the children commenting upon Frederick's actions and making judgments about whether they were good or even better than the actions of the other mice. Jason even comments on the other mice by saying that they were foolish to ask for Frederick's supplies. While the children do disagree with each other, they are expressing the same aspect of stance, passing moral judgement upon a book character.

Many book discussions contained this aspect of the moral perspective. During the book discussion group of The Biggest Bear the children discussed whether it was good for Johnny to be hunting bears or not. When Christy was reading aloud Ira Sleeps Over, the children argued over whether Ira should take his teddy bear to his sleep over.

The moral perspective could also be a commentary on the children's own lives, generally in the form of a lesson. For example, Christy might ask the children if the book taught them any lesson. This questions also contains elements of "connection to personal experience."

Another aspect of the moral perspective toward literature was an expression by a reader of what they would do if they were in this story.
Jerrid and Brad commented about the scary creatures in *More Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark* that they would "chop off the heads" of certain villains. When Alan read *Popcorn*, he commented that he would jump into the mounds of popcorn. During Christy's reading of *Ira Sleeps Over*, Timmy said that he would knock Ira's sister in the face when she kept talking Ira out of taking his teddy bear to the sleep over. Carolyn wrote in her reading log that she would not want to be in Ms. Frizzle's class of *The Magic School Bus Inside the Earth*. Carolyn felt that Ms. Frizzle was too wild.

**Genre - What Is It That Is Being Read?**

Genre aspects of stance seemed to address the question, "what is it that is being read?" In certain instances this seemed to have bearing upon the manner in which the book was read or interpreted. Readers' expectations of how they will respond to a book seemed to be shaped by the type of book they thought they were reading or were listening to being read.

There was some discussion of conventional genres. After reading *Sylvester and the Magic Pebble*, Christy asked the children what kind of story this was. Responses were "a folk tale," "a magic story," and "a tall tale." Many of the children seemed to agree with the response "tall tale," largely because they knew the story could never happen.

There was also quite a bit of discussion about the difference between true and made-up, between fiction and nonfiction. One morning Christy shared parts of three books on volcanoes, *Volcano* by Lauber, *Volcanoes* by Lambert, and *The New True Book of Volcanoes* by Fradin. She introduced them by stating that these books were informational books and then asked,
"What do I mean by 'informational' book?" Tara responded that it meant the books were nonfiction and about true things.

The next day Christy read The Magic School Bus Inside the Earth. This is a book of blurred genre. It presents a great deal of information about geology through a fanciful trip through the earth. Christy asked the children if the book was an informational book or a story book. D.J. said it was a story book but that it did tell about rocks. Mike said that it told information in a kind of story. Missy said it was both and that the author did that so that readers could understand it more. Tara agreed with Missy. Christy then asked them if they were the librarian, where would they put it. D.J. said she'd put it in the "everybody" (easy) books so that the younger children could find it. Samantha said she'd put it in the information books because the book had lots of information about rocks. Carolyn agreed with Samantha, but noted that the book was also a story.

Christy read the following day, How to Dig a Hole to the Other Side of the World. This book is similar in structure and content to The Magic School Bus Inside the Earth. Again the class talked about whether the book was a story or an informational book. These examples show the focus of the children's and Christy's attention on the genre aspect of the book. They are looking for evidence to support their views on what kind of book it was.

Looking at the conventional aspects of genre of a book typically occurred during Christy's read aloud discussions. There was one instance in a reading log where a child seemed to be looking at the book in terms of what its genre might be.
Carolyn  Brining the Rain to Kapiti Plain

In Bring the rain to Kapiti Plan it repeats all of the words and it keeps getting longer. And it was sort of a pome.

There are hints of other aspects of stance in her writing, particularly that of craft. But Carolyn's last sentence indicates that she was thinking about what kind of book Brining the Rain to Kapiti Plain is.

Genre stances also share a connection to craft. Christy stated that one of her goals was for children to understand what made a story a story, and what made informational books informational books, so that the children's writing would become better.

Some aspects of this perspective seemed to be announcements of what was to come. They often used an aesthetic response as a label for the story. Children would say, "this is a scary story," or Christy may say before she read a poem that "this is a funny one." These seemed to inform the listener or reader of a way they might be expected to respond to the story or poem.

Tara showed Nancy a copy of A Taste of Blackberries and told her it was "an exciting book." Missy told me that "The Green Ribbon" from In a Dark, Dark Room was a funny story because the a woman's head fell off. Missy's example shows the fine difference between taking an aesthetic perspective and looking at the book as an example of a genre. Though Missy is stating the feelings she has about the story, she is also stating what kind of story it is, in this case a funny story. Given the horrific nature of this story, another child could state that this was a scary story. Though the words of the story are the same, the two children categorize the story in two
different ways and implicitly expect that other readers might have the same response as they did.

Christy also showed these aspects of stance. She told the class that *Crichtor* was a silly book. If Christy was reading poetry, she often announced the "kind" of poem it was before she read it, especially if the poem was a "funny one."

**Making Connections - Looking at the Craft of the Work**

There were a number of aspects which looked at making connections between the piece of literature and something outside the work. One of these aspects was looking at the piece of literature as a model for one's own writing and illustrating. There were some similarities in this aspect to looking for patterns in the story, which could be considered as considering the secondary world. One might look at how the work was made in order to understand the secondary world of that work better. If that is the case then that person is considering the secondary world. But if the person is looking at the work in order to understand how the work was made for the purposes of making something similar, then that person is looking at the craft of the work. This latter perspective is the one this section describes.

Christy often asked the children to listen for words while she read to them. Christy planned to have the children do writing about the weather. A week before she started her weather unit, she read aloud poems from *Blackberry Ink* by Merriam. After she read the poem "Autumn Leaves," she asked the children if they heard any words that reminded them of leaves or described leaves. When the children gave very little response,
she asked them to "listen for a word that you heard that describes the leaves." She then reread the poem. The children then named "red," "brown," "yellow," "crackling," "crunch," and several other words. The children's listening the second time had a different stance from their first reading. The first reading was more open in possible stances the children could assume. In the second reading Christy expected the children to take on a craft perspective and listen for words which described leaves.

A week later Christy had just begun reading Rain Rain Rivers by Shulevitz when she stopped and asked the children to listen for "good rain words (like) gushing and rushing," words Christy had just read. When she finished, Patrick announced that he had heard 22 words. Patrick and other children then named several of the words.

On another occasion Christy read excerpts of several nonfiction weather books and asked the children to listen for words which described a particular kind of weather. From that task the children went to their own writing about weather and made lists of words about the kind of weather they were writing about.

During the geology unit, the children wrote reports on rocks, minerals, and various geological formations such as volcanoes. Two days after Christy had read The Magic School Bus Inside the Earth, she gathered the group and showed them the book again. This time she only pointed out the reports the children in the book had written, which appeared in the upper corners of the pages. She told her students that these reports were good examples of the kinds of writing she was looking for.
Children also used books as authorities for their spelling. If they needed the spelling of a word and could remember that word appearing in a certain book, some children would consult that book.

This use of the book as a model for the children's work also extended into illustrating. During the weather unit, Christy read *Snow Is Falling* by Branley. She said to the class, "I want you to pay careful attention to the pictures in this book because after I've finished reading it, your first job this morning is going to be make a picture of some kind of weather." When Christy read *Rain Rain Rivers*, besides talking about "good rain words," she also asked the children how Uri Shulevitz made it look like it was raining in his illustrations. Samantha noted that he had used very dull colors. Keith noticed that he had put lines in his pictures to make it look like it was raining. Allison said there were puddles on many of the pages. Patrick commented that there were reflections in the puddles. Missy said the illustrations were dark and Karl said that Uri Shulevitz used dull colors because when it rains it is not very bright outside.

When children made pictures about the stories they read, such as the *Sylvester and the Magic Pebble* pictures or the *Tico and the Golden Wings* pictures, they usually had the book open to the picture they were making. The use of the illustration as a model for their own work was obvious. When Mickey made his picture of Frederick during the winter, he had a copy of that book in front of him throughout the several days he worked on that picture.

Kristen made her own version of a Little Bear book. Though her pictures were original, she said she had studied the pictures in *Little Bear's Visit* and *Little Bear's Friend* very carefully.
Sometimes children would use the book to get an example of a certain object, much the way they sometimes used books to find the spellings of certain words. If they were having trouble making a rainbow in their picture, they might seek a book which had a picture of a rainbow in it to use as a model.

Bobby summed up this perspective nicely during his interview. When asked why they did quiet reading, he responded "so you can learn words and colors." When asked to explain what he meant by that, he said, "not colors but like making new pictures." He explained that books gave him ideas for writing and for making pictures. In Christy's room books often served as invitations to try the writing and illustrating techniques of commercial authors and illustrators.

**Connecting Literature to the Classroom Theme of Study**

As was described in Chapter 5, many of the books chosen by Christy for reading aloud and many of the books she chose for the class's temporary collection of books were based upon the theme of study the class was engaged in. This aspect could be seen as a subset of considering the secondary world, looking at the theme of the book. In this case though, theme comes not so much from the reading, but is present before the book is read. There was a theme of study which Christy and the children were aware of. Much of the work the children did in the classroom was connected to this theme. Many of the read alouds were chosen by Christy because they fit in with the theme of study.
The children were aware of this connection. During interviews the children were asked why Christy selected the books she did to read aloud. The most common answer was that she selected books based upon what the class was studying. For some children this connection was expected for the class read alouds.

Christy began the year with the themes of feeling good about oneself and friendship. The day Christy read *Hooray for Me*, she wore a button which said, "I'm feeling good about me." She showed the button to the children and then told them that it went along with the book she was about to read. In the discussion which followed, Christy asked if the children thought the authors of the book felt good about themselves. Many children raised their hands.

What makes this noteworthy is that the discussion began with the usual "questions or comments?" The children talked about the illustrations and the "tongue twister" language of the text, each response showing aesthetic aspects of stance. Christy accepted these and continued the discussion in this manner for several turns. It is interesting that when Christy reintroduced a different aspect of stance, a connection to the theme of study, the children then took on that stance.

Christy's reading of *Rosie and Michael* was similar to *Hooray for Me*. She began with a brief discussion about friends. Then she told the class she was going to read a book about best friends. The discussion which followed began with the children sharing their favorite parts of the book (again, an aesthetic perspective). The children shared parts of the book they found funny. Then Christy moved to a discussion of things the children did for
their best friends, putting the focus within the frame of the class's theme of study.

There was one display book shelf in which Christy kept books she had checked out from public libraries. Nearly all of these books had some connection to the theme of study. The children seemed to know this. When the books changed, they often commented about what they would be studying next. Christy would also announce this. When the weather unit began, she brought in books in two phases. The first phase included the poetry and story books. She told the children during morning meeting that she had brought in new books and that most of the them were story books about weather. It seems likely that this was providing a frame for the types of stances the children might take up concerning these books.

**Connecting Literature to Personal Experience**

Often Christy asked the children if they had ever had experiences or feelings similar to those described in a book she had shared. Typical questions which fell within this perspective were: Have you ever done that? Have you ever felt that way? This perspective could be both inside the secondary world and outside it. Readers might use their personal experiences to understand the characters in the story. More typically though, the story was used to understand or recall the reader's personal experiences.

Christy read *Frosted Glass* on the first day of school. This story is about a boy who has trouble doing some things but excels in others. Christy asked
the children if the story reminded "you of you in anyway." Jason replied that he had lost his lunch box before just as Gregory had in the story.

Christy read *Ira Sleeps Over* aloud later in the year. In this story Ira has been invited to a sleep over with a friend. He struggles to decide whether to take his teddy bear with him, fearing that his friend will laugh at him. Christy asked the children if they ever worry about people laughing at them. D.J. said that people sometimes laugh at her because she is small. Patrick said that some kids made fun of his pet rabbit because it was small but then the rabbit grew and they didn’t make fun anymore. Christy then asked if they slept with any stuffed animals. Many children named stuffed animals and live pets which slept with them.

During the weather unit, Christy read aloud *Storm in the Night.* This story is about a grandfather and a young boy who wait through a thunderstorm which has knocked out the electricity. After reading, Christy asked "Can you think of a time when you were afraid or you have a storm story to tell?" Tara told about a time her sister and she had to go to the basement because of a bad storm. Keith talked about a hail storm he had witnessed. Patrick shared about a blizzard of hail he had seen. Brandon told of falling off his scooter from the noise of a thunder clap. Several other children told stories about storms they had seen.

Typically, connections to personal experience were made during discussions of books Christy had read aloud. On occasion children would state these connections publicly on their own. Tara did this in her reading log.
Tara             A Chair for My Mother

A chair for my mother is making me think a lot about The Fire on my street. Because of the Fire in The Book. But the one on my street was way, way smaller.

Sometimes books were shared because they had a connection to an experience the class had. The day after the class made a graph of their birthdays, Christy read Paul's Christmas Birthday. In the discussion which followed, several children talked of their own birthday parties.

One day Lisa brought in a large cucumber in a bottle. The cucumber was much larger than the neck of the bottle. Lisa told how her mom had put the bottle over the cucumber when it was small on the vine and how the cucumber grew inside the bottle. At my suggestion Christy read Like Jake and Me. In this story one of the characters does a similar trick with pears. Later Cindy wrote about this connection in her reading log.

Cindy             Like Jake and Me

I learned they had pears in a bottle just like Lisa had a pickle in one.

[I learned they had pears in a bottle just like Lisa had a pickle in one.]

Connecting Literature to Other Published Work

On occasion readers looked for connections between the work they were reading and other literature. Attention was rarely focused for any length of time on a work from this perspective. It seemed to be more of an acknowledgement that the work was related to other published books.
When Christy read aloud *Hooray for Me*, she noted that Vera Williams had done the illustrations and asked the children if they knew of any other books Vera Williams had illustrated. Missy said *Three Days on a River in a Red Canoe*. Patrick said the story about the Blue Diner and the new chair. Christy supplied the title, *A Chair for My Mother*. Timmy said *Music, Music for Everyone, Cherries and Cherry Pits* was mentioned by Christy.

After reading aloud *Two Bad Ants*, Christy asked the children "Is there anything in this book that reminded you of a Chris Van Allsburg book?"

Most of his books had been in the classroom and many of the children had read or looked at all of them. Brandon said that the book was sort of like a mystery. Bobby noted that you seemed to be looking down on the pictures. Patrick said the story was an adventure. Each of these responses seemed to be directed at other Van Allsburg books as well as *Two Bad Ants*. Van Allsburg's work is frequently mysterious and adventurous. Bobby's comment is interesting in that he made a connection to Van Allsburg's tendency to use different perspectives in his illustrations.

When Christy and the children were discussing *Storm in the Night*, Christy noted that it had a story inside of a story, referring to the story the grandfather told his grandson. Christy asked the children if they knew any other books that had a story within a story. Karl responded *The Wreck of the Zephyr* and Tara suggested *A Chair for My Mother*.

In Chapter 5 an episode of quiet reading involving Carolyn, Samantha, and Patrick was described. They were reading together *De De Takes Charge*. They discussed where that book fit in sequence with *Aldo Applesause* and *Aldo Ice Cream*, books about the same characters.
Looking at Literature for Information

Readers sometimes read books for information. In Christy’s classroom this stance was generally limited to informational books. The first day of the geology unit, Christy introduced the unit and explained that the class would be looking at rocks, minerals, volcanoes, and crystals. She told them that she had checked out a book called *Rock Collecting* by Gans. Christy then said to the children, "Let’s see what we can learn from this book.” After reading the book, which was interrupted several times to talk about the content of the book, Christy asked the children "What did you hear that you didn’t know before?” This frame seemed to ask the children to listen for information about rocks. The children did adopt this stance as they offered several facts about rocks as answers to Christy's question.

This aspect of stance shared some things in common with looking at the craft of the book. Children would not only look at a book as a model for how they could write and draw but also as a source for what they would write and draw about. As mentioned in the discussion about looking at the craft of the work. Children used books about rocks to find information for their reports.

Children did not take on this perspective only in reference to class assignments. Children would talk about dinosaur books with each other. They would discuss what certain dinosaurs ate and their size relative to each other. Mickey decided to make his own book on weather forecasting. He found three books in the classroom including *Weather Forecasting* by Gibbons. He consulted his books often as he wrote and illustrated his own book.
Reading the Words on the Page

From the point of view of "reading the words on the page," the reader's focus was upon orally reading the words. Little or no response was expected by the reader or the person being read to. Carolyn showed this point of view when she admonished Patrick and Samantha to "just read" every time they began to talk about other matters. This was a common stance among some children, most notably Carolyn, during quiet reading.

In a sense the running records which Christy took also carried similar expectations. The children were to read aloud to Christy, who had told them that she was looking for what they did when they came to a word they didn't know. Though Christy was looking at the running record as an assessment tool and a gauge on the strategies the children used during reading, the stance being offered and adopted seems to be that of reading the words on the page as best as one can.

STANCE IN CONTEXT - A DISCUSSION OF TICO AND THE GOLDEN WINGS

Christy's reading of Tico and the Golden Wings and the discussion which followed included several of the aspects of stance just discussed. This example shows the broader context in which Christy and the children demonstrated the stances they assumed toward books. While this read aloud and discussion was rich in the variety of stances Christy and the children assumed, Christy was dissatisfied with this read aloud. Her dissatisfaction was based upon what she considered to be only mild interest by the
children in the book and in the pictures they made following the discussion. Even with this caveat taken into consideration, the following discussion shows the richness in stances assumed and the connected nature of the aspects of the stances.

The story of *Tico and the Golden Wings* by Leo Lionni is about a bird who was born with no wings. Having been granted a wish by the wishing bird, Tico wishes for and receives a pair of golden wings. His friends, seeing Tico's new wings, accuse him of thinking he is better than they are and fly away from him. One day Tico comes across a poor man who cannot buy medicines for his sick child. Tico plucks one of his gold feathers which the man uses to buy the medicines. In place of the plucked gold feather, Tico discovers a real, shiny black feather has grown. Tico goes about the countryside, giving gold feathers to those less fortunate than he is. Soon he has given away all his golden feathers and now has a pair of black wings made of real feathers. Tico flies back to his friends, who welcome him because Tico is now like them. But Tico thinks to himself that because of his experiences he is not like his friends.

Christy began by noting to the children that she had read a Leo Lionni book the day before and that she was going to read another one, *Tico and the Golden Wings*. The session began with a hint of a connection to other work, in this case to *Frederick*, the book Christy had read the day before.

Christy then said, "While I'm reading this book you might want to think about pictures that you could do about this story and you might want to think about how Leo Lionni made some of his pictures because he does really good art work." Christy was making a connection to work the children might do. She asked them to consider how Leo Lionni made his
pictures so that they also might do likewise. This was looking at the craft aspect of the book and using the book as a model for one's own work.

Christy read to the part of the story where Tico's friends leave him. She asked the group why Tico's friends had left. Karl replied that they thought Tico was trying to be better. Christy asked why the friends were angry. Mike said that it was because Tico had golden wings and they didn't.

This exchange was an example of Christy and the children considering the secondary world of the text. They talked about the events and characters in the story as if they were real. In this case they were focused upon the characters. They discussed the characters' actions, the friends leaving. They talked about the characters' feelings, being angry. They also discussed the characters' motives for their actions and feelings, in this case the friends wishing they had golden wings and thinking that Tico believed he was better than they were.

Christy read to the end of the story and then asked if the children had any questions or comments. Michael said that Tico may have looked the same, but he wasn't. Christy asked if anyone had anything else they wanted to say about the book or anything they noticed. There was no response. She followed by asking who the main character was.

Jason responded "the golden bird." Christy asked what they knew about Tico, what was he like. Alvin said that sometimes he worked. Christy paused, then repeated her question, "what kind of bird is Tico?" Nancy replied that he might be a crow because he had real black wings.

This part of the discussion also showed the children and Christy considering the secondary world as a real world. The focus was upon the character Tico and what his character was like. Though it would be
impossible to prove, Alvin's response could be a reference to Frederick, which was read the day before. By pausing and then repeating the question, it was possible that Christy also interpreted Alvin's remark in this way. Christy repeated the question, trying to get responses on what Tico was like. She asked what kind of bird he was. Nancy interpreted this differently and responded that he might be a crow. Even though Christy and the children had different conceptions of what the questions meant, they all were assuming similar stances. Their attentions were on the character of Tico. They were considering the secondary world as a real world.

Christy went on by asking what things did Tico want in the story. Michael responded that Tico wanted golden wings. Christy asked what Tico did with his wings. Tara replied that he gave them to the people. Different children named the different people Tico gave his feathers to.

The perspective in the discussion was that of considering the secondary world. Christy and the group were doing a bit of retelling of the story by recalling what Tico wished for and what he did with his wings.

Christy then asked, "What do you think about Tico giving away his golden wings? Do you think that was a good thing to do or not a good thing to do?" Carolyn responded it was a good thing to do because he was helpful to other people. Timmy said Tico was a nice bird. Christy asked him why he thought Tico was nice. Timmy replied because he was helpful. Karl also said that he thought Tico was helping the other people.

Christy asked, "What do you think about the way that Tico's friends treated him when he had the golden wings?" Lisa said, "mean." Other children agreed.
Though in one sense the stance still has elements of considering the secondary world, Christy and the children have also taken on a moral perspective. Christy asked what they thought about Tico giving away his wings and the way Tico's friends treated him. By this question the children were expected to pass judgement on the actions of the characters. They thought Tico was a nice bird and that his friends treated him "mean."

Christy then asked, "If you were one of Tico's friends, would you have treated Tico mean?" In near unison several children said no. Christy asked, "Why not?" A child responded, "just because he's different" and pauses. Christy said, "Just because he's different doesn't mean you have to treat him mean."

Christy asked the children what they would do if they were in the story. This was a type of moral perspective. This particular type seemed to have one foot in the secondary world and one foot in the real world. The children put themselves in the story as themselves, not as one of the characters. There was also a hint of a connection to the class theme of study, which was friendship and getting along with others. The day before Christy had shared Peter Spier's People and there had been much discussion about how people were different. The children had given a response which was in keeping with the class theme of study and Christy repeated it and elaborated it for the entire group.

Christy's next question was, "Do you ever have people that treat you mean just because you're different." Jason told about some children in his neighborhood who had picked on him.
This exchange showed Christy and Jason connecting this book to personal experience. Christy asked the children to consider if they had had experiences similar to Tico's. Jason recalled such a time.

Christy then asked, "Do you think that this book has a lesson in it or something that we can learn from this book?" Karl responded, "Just because somebody else has something that nobody else has then it doesn't mean they should be mean."

This was a moral perspective again. This time the perspective was not so much upon the characters of the book or what the readers would do if they were in the book, but was focused upon what lessons the book might have for the way readers lived their real lives.

The discussion moved to parts of the story Leo Lionni did not illustrate. Christy showed the children some shiny, gold paper. She suggested that the children might want to use this paper to make parts of Tico's wings. Christy then asked, "How do you think Leo Lionni did these pictures or how do you think you could do pictures like this? What do you think he used?" Lisa said that he used all different colors. Allison replied that she thought "he glued things on." Christy asked Allison what materials she thought Leo Lionni used. Allison responded, "paper."

Christy picked up a copy of Frederick and then said, "Look at these pictures from Frederick. It looks like he cut out gray paper and just glued it on to make Frederick. This looks like it might be paper glued on, too. So if you wanted to make a picture about Frederick, remember when we read Frederick yesterday, if you wanted to make a picture from Frederick, you might want to think about gluing paper on to make that." The discussion ended shortly after this.
Christy began her reading with a craft perspective. She told the children to pay attention to the pictures because they might want to make pictures about the story. She ended the discussion by raising again this perspective. The children at her urging looked at the way Leo Lionni made his illustrations, not so much for the purposes of understanding the story, but as a model for their own illustrating and picture making.

There were several different perspective taken towards *Tico and the Golden Wings* throughout the reading and discussion. Attention to the craft, connection to personal experience, looking at the story morally, considering the secondary world, connection to other books, and connection to the theme of study were all aspects of the stances Christy and the children assumed toward *Tico and the Golden Wings*.

Many of these stance overlapped with each other, at least from Christy's perspective. The class theme was on friendship. Looking at the story from a moral perspective also tied with Christy's purposes in the friendship unit as well as asking children to consider their own personal experiences of being treated poorly by others. Though there was a fair bit of looking at this story in terms of connecting it to other books, themes, and work the children might do, there was also talk which operated inside the secondary world. The children's first comments and the first part of Christy's discussion also were focused upon the secondary world. Looking at the story morally seemed to be a bridge in the discussion out of the secondary world and into making the theme and connections to the children's work which were Christy's purposes in sharing the story. The children seemed to provide answers within the stances presented by Christy, even when their understanding of the question was not the same as hers.
An interesting issue to consider was what happened when two or more people brought different stances to talk about a book. Unfortunately, there was not much data collected which allows for much of a discussion about this. There were two cases which gave hints at how these differences may have been resolved.

The first case was that of Carolyn, Patrick, and Samantha reading aloud together De De Takes Charge as described in Chapter 5. At different points during the reading Patrick and Samantha begin to talk about the book, usually from a perspective of considering the story world. Carolyn made it clear repeatedly that she just wanted to read the words by admonishing Patrick and Samantha to "just read." It appeared that the force of Carolyn's personality prevailed as Patrick and Samantha never engaged in any prolonged discussions and generally just read the words.

The second case was a discussion of Frederick following Christy's reading of it to the group. After discussing whether Frederick was lazy or not, Christy asked, "Who can tell me in words what the book meant to you? What was the book about?" Given the discussion just before this question, it appeared that Christy was asking the children to consider possible themes of the book. Their replies indicated that the children had a different perspective. Alvin said it was about Frederick. Bobby said it was about Frederick gathering colors. Ricky said it was about a family of mice. Samantha said it was about collecting things for winter. Christy acknowledged each of the responses and then moved on to another
question. Christy and the children were each considering the secondary world, but while Christy seemed to want to talk about theme, the children were providing pieces of retellings and summaries. The matter was resolved with Christy dropping the issue.

Christy made a similar attempt at discussing theme in the *Tico and the Golden Wings* discussion. In that discussion the issue of theme was dealt with morally and in the context of a discussion from a moral perspective. The children were able to provide a theme in the form of a lesson in this instance. The frame appeared to be more clearly and tightly defined than in the Frederick discussion.

Though the data were sketchy on matters of dissonance, what was there hinted that dissonance between stances may be resolved through force of personality, dropping the issue, or by providing a tighter frame. That there was not much data on dissonance suggests that either that data was not collected, which seems unlikely, or that there was not much dissonance between readers in assuming stances in Christy’s classroom.

**THE SITUATED NATURE OF STANCES**

Certain stances seemed to be more prominent than other stances in certain events. Taking quiet reading, read aloud and discussion, book discussion groups, and reading logs as the most important literature events, certain patterns of adopting stances could be seen. It should be emphasized that there were exceptions to these patterns and that stances varied widely with individuals and their purposes in reading.
Quiet Reading. Considering the secondary world seemed to be the aspect of stance most commonly observed. Looking at books from a moral perspective, in terms of genre, from an aesthetic perspective, and "just read the words" were also common.

Read Aloud and Subsequent Discussion. All stances could be observed during read aloud times. However, the four connection stances seemed to be more salient than others, partly because they often coincided with Christy's purposes in reading a certain book aloud. Christy had said repeatedly that she viewed her role as helping children make connections in their reading. One connection Christy prized was the connection of professionally produced books to the children's own writing and illustrating, a connection generally demonstrated through a craft perspective. Considering the story world was also very common as was taking on a moral perspective. Frequently, the children answered the "questions or comments" request from an aesthetic perspective.

Reading Logs. Virtually all of the writing was either considering the story world or from an aesthetic perspective. Often it was a mixture of both.

Book Discussion Groups. Much of the discussion came from a perspective of considering the story world with a mixture of a moral perspective. On occasion children would offer aesthetic responses.

SUMMARY

Christy and the children demonstrated many aspects of stance toward the literature they read. These aspects included:
* Aesthetic - expressing the lived-through experience of reading the book.
* Considering the secondary world of the text - looking at the book in terms of the characters, their actions, and possible meanings of the book.
* Moral - commenting on the appropriateness of human actions and motives. This could be in terms of the characters in the book, what readers said they would do if they were in the book, and what lessons the book might have for readers' own lives.
* Genre - considering what if was that was being read.
* Looking at the craft of the work - looking at a book as a model for the children's own writing and illustrating.
* Connecting literature to the classroom theme of study - considering a book in terms of what the class had been studying.
* Connecting literature to personal experience - recalling personal experiences similar to those of the book's characters.
* Connecting literature to other published work - looking at a book in terms of other books.
* Looking at literature for information - seeking information in a book.

* Reading the words on the page - focusing on orally reading the words with little expectation for any other kind of response.

As was pointed out in Chapter 5, literature was used across a wide variety of events with a wide variety of expectations of readers. Literature also appeared to serve many purposes and many different points of view were taken towards it in Christy's classroom. Not only was there richness in
opportunity to respond to literature in this classroom, but the perspectives a reader may take were also rich in possibilities.

Often stances carried expectations of others to adopt similar stances. For the most part the children in Christy's classroom took on or tried to take on the stances Christy offered. In general Christy made her stances known through her questions and through the different reading tasks she asked the children to do. Though the children may not have always understood her questions, it was very rare that they did not understand her stance. Likewise, there seemed to be little misunderstanding between children in adopting stances. Stances, at least as they were made public, appeared to be worked out socially, in the face to face interactions of children and their teacher. The community of readers appeared to share, negotiate, and help each other assume a variety of stances toward literature. It seems to be to the credit of these children and to Christy that there was richness, substance, and variety to the stances they assumed.

That stances carried an expectation of others to adopt similar stances should not be viewed necessarily with disfavor. Stance appeared to be an unavoidable aspect of reading and responding to literature. Likewise, expectations of stance could help children form responses. By presenting children with a variety of perspectives, Christy demonstrated to children other possibilities for looking at literature. Expectations of stance could also provide a footing for children to form responses. It often seemed difficult for them to respond to the open-ended "questions or comments." Unless the children were captivated and had a strong reaction to the story, frequently this question met with few or no responses. Also the vague, "what was this story about," seemed to be a difficult question for them. The
children seemed more able to respond to stances which were more explicitly stated. Perhaps this was the difference between children acting alone and children acting with others, especially when one of the others included a teacher. There seemed to be something similar to what Vygotsky calls the Zone of Proximal Development in the manner that stances were assumed.

Christy's attitude toward the stances expressed by her students seemed important to maintaining the richness present in the classroom. With very few exceptions she accepted children's responses to literature. Even though she had other purposes for reading books aloud, she began most discussions by probing for the children's first responses to literature, even if their responses had little to do with her ultimate purpose in sharing the book. By listening thoughtfully to what children said, she conveyed a message that what they were saying was important. She also pushed for rigor, asking the children to clarify and think further about their ideas.
CHAPTER VII
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to describe and understand the children's and their teacher's responses to literature as these responses occurred in the context of their classroom. This study sought to understand these responses in terms of the cultural events in which the children and their teacher responded to literature and in terms of the stances they assumed towards the literature they read.

Increasingly, studies on children's responses to literature have been conducted in classroom contexts. These studies have focused upon the responses children have given to literature during the course of their school day. However, there have been very few studies which focused upon the contexts of the responses and the perspectives or stances readers assume toward literature in classrooms.

Another purpose of this study was to make this description in terms of a literature-based reading classroom. Though increasingly popular, there has been little research conducted on literature-based reading classrooms. Though many professional books now exist which describe how a teacher may conduct a literature-based reading classroom, many literature-based
reading teachers feel that the guidebooks do not quite capture the essence of successful literature-based reading classrooms.

**METHOD OF STUDY**

This study is an ethnography of Christy Pearl's second and third grade classroom at Highland Park Elementary School in Grove City, Ohio. Christy has been identified as a successful literature-based reading classroom teacher by her peers, her supervisors, and the parents of her students.

Field work consisted of a transactive cycle of gaining access, co-constructing researcher roles with participants, collecting data, and data analysis. Data was collected over the course of sixteen weeks through field notes, audio tape recordings, interviews, and photocopying written work. Data was analyzed with a constant-comparative method. The classroom teacher was involved throughout each phase of the field work to provide triangulation. Christy made suggestions for data collection. She read field notes and transcriptions and she commented on categories of data analysis. She also read draft chapters of this report and made comments.

**FINDINGS**

**Literature Events**

The literature environment of Christy's classroom was rich. There were many different kinds of events in which Christy and the children read and responded to literature. These events included: quiet reading, reading logs,
read aloud, book discussion groups, sharing time, and work time. Each event was a different kind of opportunity for the children to read and respond to literature. The expectations for children differed from event to event.

* Quiet reading occurred at two different times during the day. Though there were some differences between the two times, essentially quiet reading was a time children could choose what read, with whom to read and where to read. Quiet reading was actually an active and busy time of the day. Christy and children engaged in a variety of readings and book talk.

* Children were required to keep reading logs. Daily, they recorded the title of the book they read during quiet reading. Once a week they wrote a few sentences about one of the books they read during the week.

* Christy read aloud to the class daily. In the morning she usually selected a book which could be read in one session and which was generally connected in some manner to the class's theme of study. After each read aloud, Christy led a discussion of the book.

* There were also voluntary book discussion groups. Five to six children signed-up to participate in a discussion of a book with Christy. Children read the book and then during quiet reading would gather at a table with Christy and talk about what happened in the book, who the characters were, and what problems they had. According to Christy, these discussions were "more literary" than read aloud discussions.
During sharing time the children shared art work and original writing with the whole group. This was considered a literature event, because the structure of sharing time bore a close similarity to Christy's read aloud sessions. Children shared their books in the same manner Christy shared read alouds and many of the same questions were asked.

At work time children might be engaged in making something in response to a book they had read or Christy had read to them. Children wrote about stories. They also made pictures, murals, and puppets.

These events presented children with different kinds of opportunities to read and respond to literature. Children read, either alone or with others, books of their own choosing. Children heard books read aloud to them. Children had opportunities to talk with others about books, either through book discussions, discussions which followed read alouds, or talking quietly with each other during quiet reading. Children wrote about the books they read. They also made pictures, murals, and puppets.

Each event carried certain expectations of the children. Christy had well-defined purposes for each event and generally was explicit in communicating these purposes to the children. Children seemed to be aware of these expectations and acted accordingly. For example, book discussion groups were for talking about the book not for reading aloud the book together as Karl had originally thought. Billy and Ricky at first copied from their book into their reading log. After the first week, neither did that again. Talk during quiet reading could be about books but could not be for the purposes of organizing a play.
There were individual differences among children's responses to literature. Children tended to resonate to the expectations of some events and less so towards others. The variety of opportunities and expectations seemed to accommodate the individual styles of the children. Every student had ways of reading and responding to literature which were comfortable to them and every student had opportunities to read and respond which fell within their comfort zone. This suggests that Christy provided children with a variety of opportunities to respond to literature, allowing children to operate within their zone of comfort while coaxing them into new and different experiences.

Within the expectations of each event the children had choices. It was Christy's belief that in classrooms children must have choices and their choices, if appropriate within the expectations, should be accepted and honored. Children could choose what to read, where to read it, whether to read alone or with others, and with which others they might read. Though they had to write in reading logs, they could choose what to write. Though they might be required to make a picture about a book, they could choose which picture and which book. Many of the questions Christy asked were open-ended, so the children had choices in what to say about books.

There were limits surrounding these choices. Christy monitored the children's choices according to appropriateness and balance. Children who made inappropriate choices were requested to make different choices. Children who made the same choice repeatedly might be asked to make a different choice or might have a certain kind of choice taken away for a while.
Placing limits around choices seemed to be helpful to many of the children. By limiting the number of possible choices, some children seemed to be able to make better or more appropriate choices in the classroom.

Every event included the opportunity for children to share with others their readings and responses to literature. Children could read and talk with each other during quiet reading. Christy read their reading logs and wrote responses to what they read. Read aloud and discussion were conducted with the entire group. Smaller book discussion groups enabled children to hear and comment on other children's thoughts about a book. During sharing time, children showed their work and received the comments from the other children and Christy. Children could work together and talk with each other during work time.

With sharing came demonstrating. As Christy and the children shared with each other their thoughts and work, they showed each other how they went about reading and responding to literature. Through her read alouds and questions, Christy showed children how she read and what she paid attention to in books. Some children made similar demonstrations during quiet reading. Through discussions, children shared how they read and interpreted a book. It seemed that children were mindful of what each other was doing and how they were doing it.

Surrounding all the events of the classroom was Christy's tone of accepting children's choices and responses, giving these choices and responses honor, and pushing children for further rigor in their thinking and in their work.
Aspects of Stance

Christy and the children assumed stances or perspectives toward literature. Just as there was a variety of literature events in her classroom, the stances Christy and the children assumed were also varied and complex.

* Aesthetic aspects of stances were expressions of the reader's feelings about the work of literature. These aspects expressed such feelings as delight, disgust, enjoyment, pleasure, and fear.

* Often readers took a perspective of considering the secondary world of the text. From this perspective readers talked about characters, plot, themes, the structure of the work, and metaphoric, symbolic, and inferential meaning.

* Readers also looked at literature morally. Readers commented upon the appropriateness of characters' actions and motives. Readers made statements about what they would do if they were in the story. Readers also commented on lessons stories might have for their own lives.

* Readers also looked at literature in terms of genre. This perspective seemed to answer the question, "what is it I am reading?" These genres could be conventional such as a tall tale, a story, or an informational book. They could also be labels of aesthetic responses such as a funny book or a scary book. These genres seemed to be statements by readers that this was the way they responded to these books and others might respond the same way.

* There were a group of perspectives towards literature which sought to connect the book with other things. One of the most
frequent of the "connection" perspectives, was looking at the craft of the book as a model for the children's own writing and illustrating. This was a connection highly prized by Christy and she made it often during read aloud discussions.

* Readers also connected books to their personal experiences. Something which happened in a book would remind them of similar happenings to themselves.

* Readers connected books to the class theme of study. Christy often selected her read alouds and some of the books in the temporary class collection according to what the class was studying. This seemed to offer a frame for looking at a book before the book was read.

* Readers also connected books to other books. These might be other books the author or illustrator had done or other books which shared similar features to the book being discussed.

* Readers looked to books for information.

* Readers took a perspective of "just read the words on the page."

Response is in part a product of the stances assumed by readers. These stances seemed often to be implied or expected with the event. When a reader made a stance public, it often carried with it the expectation that others would also assume this stance. This was most apparent when Christy asked the children questions during discussion, but it could also be seen in the interactions between children. This public negotiating of stance seemed to indicate that there was always an "official" stance. Children seemed aware of the stances being offered. Though they often
misunderstood questions, they rarely misunderstood the stance being offered.

Stances were situated within the expectations of events. These expectations could vary, not only among events, but also among individuals. This seemed to be a result of the different purposes individuals might have in reading. When two or more read together, then stances had to be negotiated. In spite of the magnitude of sharing in this classroom, there was very little dissonance between readers in assuming stances.

Christy's view of children as learners and readers seemed important to the success of her classroom. She set up a classroom as a workshop. She offered the children a variety of choices for working in the classroom. She respected their choices, gave them honor, yet also pushed the children to be more rigorous in their work and in their thinking. She expected her students to be interested in what was happening, to have questions, and to want to do writing and other projects about what was happening in the classroom.

Through her actions, her words, and the norms and expectations of her classroom, Christy encouraged and enabled children to make responses in a variety of ways. There were many different opportunities for children to read and to respond to literature. Likewise, there were many different perspectives assumed towards literature. The literature environment was rich in opportunities and in ideas.

The findings of this study suggest that readers' stances toward literature are much more complex than has been previously described. Simple bipolar descriptions of stances, such as spectator/participant (Britton, 1970, 1982, 1984, 1989) and aesthetic/efferent (Roseablatt, 1978, 1980, 1982, 1985a,
1985b, 1989) were insufficient to describe the perspectives and purposes Christy and the children assumed toward the texts they read. Aspects of stance overlapped with each other and several aspects could be held by a reader at the same time.

Not only were the stances assumed by Christy and the children complex, they were also situated in the expectations of an event. Previous descriptions of stance, particularly those of Britton (1970, 1982, 1984, 1989) and Galda (1982), take little consideration of the social context in the stances assumed by readers. The norms of the events as understood by Christy and the children seemed to expect that readers would assume certain kinds of stances toward literature. These stances toward literature were also layered in other kinds of stances, such as stances toward children as learners and as readers.

The children in this study appeared to be very sensitive to the stances offered by their teacher and generally took on the stance being offered by her. This raises several value-laden issues. Are some stances more appropriate than others? Do some stances not serve literature well? Do some stances serve children better than others? Can appropriate stances be generalized or are they specific to readers and the situations in which they are reading?

Bruner (1986) argued that stance should open the process of wondering rather than close it. Donaldson (1978) argued that children need a limited number of possibilities for their consideration or they will be overwhelmed. Each of these ideas appeared to have been acted out in this classroom. While Christy was accepting of the children's responses to literature, her expectations of stance also placed limits on the possible
stances children might assume toward a piece of literature. Christy seemed to encourage the children to consider a variety of possible stances toward literature. At the same time she also placed some limits on the possible stances the readers in her classroom assumed.

**Summary Finding**

Children responded to literature according to their perceived meaning of the frame. This frame included the opportunity to respond, the stance assumed toward the piece of literature, and the norms and expectations of the event. Put another way, Christy offered to her students a view of what literature is, how literature is to be read, and how she expected children to read it and respond to it. Children read and responded to literature in classrooms within these frames.

**IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR A LITERATURE-BASED READING PROGRAM**

Literature-based reading in Christy's classroom was not a kit of ideas bound between the covers of a guide book nor was it a collection of activities a teacher could pick up at a workshop. It was also not a bibliography of approved children's books. It was a "total package" of method and theory. The richness of the children's experiences with literature in Christy's classroom seemed to come from the way Christy viewed her classroom as a whole, her perspectives on literature, and how she viewed her students as learners. Her success seemed to be less a
product of actual method than it was a product of her points of view toward teaching, learning, children, and literature. Her perspective involved a way of organizing the classroom, creating literature events, her expectations for her students, and a theory of literature and children reading literature. Christy's methods seemed to spring logically from these theories which she held.

This suggests that one important component of literature-based reading is the construction of a total literature environment which includes opportunities for the children to read and to respond to books, opportunities for the children to make choices, a supportive teacher and classmates with whom to share literature experiences, the norms and expectations of the literature events, and the possible stances toward literature the teacher and the children demonstrate to each other.

Children need a variety of opportunities to read and to respond to literature. Christy's classroom provided enough variety in opportunities that each child had some manner in which to read and enjoy literature which fell within the child's comfort zone. In addition Christy humanely coaxed her students into new experiences.

The children in Christy's classroom generally had choices throughout the literature environment. They could choose what to read and whether to read it alone or with others. They could choose a variety of responses to literature. Their choices were accepted by Christy and honored as rigorous. Christy also pushed the children into deeper understandings and rigor in their thinking and in their work.

The people in Christy's classroom were supportive of other readers. Throughout the day in Christy's classroom she and the children shared
with each other the ways they read and responded to literature. By accepting, honoring, and pushing for rigor, Christy helped children through new and different experiences with reading and responding to literature. By giving the children the opportunities to share with each other, either during structured sharing time or during quiet reading, the children could show each other how they read. This vibrant "community of readers" did not just happen. It was encouraged and enabled by the attitudes and actions of the teacher and the children in the classroom.

The children in Christy's classroom read and responded to literature according to the norms and expectations they and Christy held for each other. It is to their credit that the norms and expectations for reading and responding to literature enabled and encouraged children to have rich experiences with literature. Teachers planning to have literature-based reading classrooms need to consider these aspects of the social environment.

Christy and the children assumed a variety of stances toward literature. Across the different literature events and over time, Christy demonstrated various stances to the children and expected them to assume similar stances. Stance revealed the theories the reader had about literature. The children, being relatively inexperienced with literature, needed to see and to try out a variety of stances toward literature. Certainly classrooms in which children have rich experiences with literature are classrooms in which the teacher and the children are assuming a variety of stances.

This study has a cautionary implication for experienced literature-based reading teachers. Many literature-based reading teachers integrate their curriculum. In an integrated curriculum books and activities are selected
by teachers according to the classroom theme of study. Similarly, many literature-based reading teachers use literature as models for their children's own writing and illustrating. These were some of the "connection stances" discussed in Chapter 6. Christy had concerns that sometimes her purpose overwhelmed the books she was using. She considered her book discussion groups as "more literary" than the discussions she held after read alouds. Books read aloud were often selected for their connection to the theme of study or to the children's writing. Christy also seemed to be more satisfied with the book discussion groups compared to the read aloud discussions. Her concerns seemed to be about the "literariness" of literature being lost in the other curricular purposes of the literature-based reading classroom. Christy seemed to wonder if sometimes children's experiences of delight in books were being overridden by other curricular purposes. Integration, if done carelessly, can potentially damage children's enjoyment of literature.

Literature-based reading teachers who integrate their curriculum or who use literature as models for children's writing need to be aware of other stances they can offer to children and be watchful that these stances do not overpower other aspects of the literature environment. If discovering delight in books is to remain the primary purpose of any literature-based reading teacher, then literature-based reading teachers need to remember to be "literary" in their classrooms as Christy did. Though literature can be used successfully for other purposes, those stances should not stand in the way of children enjoying reading.
IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

The findings of this study suggest that teachers need to be trained not only the in methods of teaching reading, but also with an understanding of how to build a vibrant reading classroom. In children's literature courses prospective teachers need not only a survey of children's books but also need to learn about the different ways readers read and respond to literature.

Reading and children's literature courses need to address the ideas of literature events and of giving children a variety of opportunities to read and respond to literature. Teachers need to think about giving children choices and why giving choices is important. They need to understand the importance of sharing in the classroom, not only between children but also how teachers share the ways they read and respond to literature with children. Courses for teachers need to discuss how classroom events have norms and expectations. Teachers need to consider how the norms and expectations of events contribute to children's understandings of what literature is. Finally, they need to consider the idea of stance, that readers take on perspectives toward literature and respond from these perspectives.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH INTO THE "HIDDEN CURRICULUM"

Often ethnographers train their attention on the hidden curriculum of the classroom, yet ignore the relationships between the hidden curriculum and the manifested curriculum of what is to be learned. Looking at the
stances of learners and teachers may offer enlightenment on the hidden curriculum in two ways. First, stance makes at least a portion of the hidden curriculum explicit. Stance shows the underlying assumptions and perspectives learners and teachers take on towards that which is to be learned. Second, stance provides a bridge between the hidden curriculum and the manifested curriculum. It can show the relationships between the attitudes and perspectives of learners and teachers toward what is to be learned and what teachers and learners actually do in classrooms.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH ON READER RESPONSE**

This study showed that in any reading situation in the classroom there were social norms and expectations concerning what readers were to do. It also showed that readers were aware of these norms and expectations and responded accordingly. Also the children were sensitive to the stances being offered by the teacher and generally took on that stance. Any stance was one of a wide variety of perspectives readers could take toward a piece of literature.

There is much research on reader response which probes for responses or creates an experimental context in which readers respond to literature. Researchers need to be mindful that these situations are cultural events, complete with expectations, norms, and stances. Researchers need to recognize that the norms, expectations, and stances presented in their research frame are but a few of the vast possibilities in stances and expectations.
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Stance is, admittedly, a somewhat fuzzy term. Though it seems to be potentially a powerful idea for understanding readers' responses to literature and perhaps even for understanding teaching as a whole, there has been little philosophical and theoretical work on this idea. Stance is also more complex than has been previously described in research. Britton’s (1970, 1982, 1984, 1989) and Rosenblatt’s (1978, 1980, 1982, 1985a, 1985b, 1989) descriptions of stance are based more upon theoretical perspectives rather than upon actual research on readers reading literature. Descriptions of stance which are research based, such as Galda’s (1982) study, are based upon data collected over a very short period of time with little consideration of the social context in which the readers were reading. Further research on the nature of stance from an ethnographic perspective seems warranted.

This study was conducted in one classroom. The advantage of studying a single classroom over studying two or more classrooms was that I could spend more time on the one classroom and come to know it well. It is also logistically more difficult to study two or more classrooms at the same time. The amount of time needed to observe would double at the least. It would likely require an entire school year to properly study two classrooms. The disadvantage of studying a single classroom is that the basis of comparison is limited to events and people in the one setting. A much richer description of literature events and stances could be had if the readings and responses of teachers and students from more than one classroom would be observed.
The research reported here needs to be replicated across a variety of classrooms in order to understand better the social contexts of reading and responding to literature. There are a wide variety of other kinds of classrooms which could be studied according to the events of the classroom and the stances assumed by the teacher and children. Similar studies of other literature-based teachers would add to our understanding of the successful use of literature with elementary school children and perhaps aid in efforts to make this kind of teaching more portable. Other kinds of teachers could also be studied. Beginning teachers would make an interesting study in how a professional grows in understanding of classrooms and in how literature is read and responded to. Teachers who are not literature-based reading teachers should also be studied as points of comparison. The aspects of Christy's classroom which were discussed in this report are in some degree independent of the actual books. Theoretically, many of the stances and events could occur in classrooms which use basal readers.

What comprises successful literature-based reading teaching is still an open question. Many teachers who call themselves literature-based reading teachers may have events and stances which differ greatly from those in Christy's room. Some of these teachers may be successful, others may not be. Further research could identify those aspects of those classrooms which appear to be positive and also identify those aspects which appear not to be serving children or literature.

Other literature-based classrooms with different kinds of students should be studied. Children of different ages and cultural backgrounds should be studied. The children in Christy's classroom were fairly
homogeneous. It is possible that the absence of dissonance was due to the cultural similarity of the children. Classes which are multicultural might have more cases of dissonance. If so, then this needs to be understood if literature is to be used successfully with children of different cultural backgrounds. Similarly, the absence of dissonance could be due to the age of the children. Perhaps older children would not accept as readily the stances being offered as it is more likely that they would have a stronger sense of autonomy than younger children. Children younger than Christy's students might not accept the stances being offered because they do not understand them or the frame in which they are responding.

Kindergarten children could make an interesting study. Christy's children had several years of schooling. They knew something about the different literature events in the classroom. Discussion groups were the one new event and that proved to be confusing to a few children. Observing kindergarten children as they learn about events and the expectations of the events and for stances could yield knowledge about how children learn to read literature in school.

Children in classrooms where little literature is read would be interesting to study. Christy's students had had many experiences with literature across many different events before they became students in her classroom. Would children who had had little experiences with literature show similar patterns?

In Christy's classroom there appeared to be few cases of dissonance between readers in assuming stances. Closer attention needs to be paid to how stances are offered, expected of others, and how others negotiate and assume the stances being offered.
This study produced some data on individual differences in reading styles and preferences for certain kinds of reading events. Further study, much more in-depth on individual children, their preferences for certain events, and reasons for these preferences is warranted. Also, patterns in assuming stances could be looked at more deeply. Investigations of this sort could provide a kind of reader profile not presently available.

With the growing use of literature in elementary school classrooms, there is also a growing concern among children's literature scholars for the use of literature in classrooms. Are there inappropriate stances teachers could offer towards literature? Are there literature events in which the expectations and norms do literature and its readers disservice? These are value-laden concerns, but important to the future successful use of literature in elementary classrooms. They deserve the attention of researchers.
APPENDIX A

SAMPLE OF FIELD NOTES
12:00 -- QUIET READING

Kids begin to come in from recess. Rose the volunteer is working in the room and several of the kids come over to greet her. 2's begin to assemble in meeting area.

12:07 CP comes in and says freeze please. She says she needs all second and third graders to show her what they are supposed to do when they come in from recess.

CP gathers the two's in front of the tall book case in the meeting area. She pulls books off the shelves and talks about them with the 2's. She shows them chapter books which would be good choices. [She brilliantly calls Frog & Toad a chapter book!!!] Most of these books showed up later during Q-R.

Five 3's all girls are on the couch, Samantha, D.J., Carolyn, Lisa, and Allison. Sally is reading OWL MOON to me. She seems to like to read to me and it is beginning to become a problem as it is difficult for me to observe what anyone else is doing. Sally reads straight through never stopping except to turn pages.

Carolyn is explaining to Lisa how to make a hardback book. (class-made)

Jason & Tommy are looking at PEOPLE by Spier under the Math/Sci table.

Kristen is seated at science table reading GOAT’S TRAIL by Wildsmith.

Tara returns A TASTE OF BLACKBERRIES saying to Nancy this is an exciting book. She finds a choose-your-own adventure YOUR VERY OWN ROBOT.

Jason and Timmy comment on a page being boring and quickly turn it to another. Timmy sits next to Jason who is holding the book. Timmy looks over Jason's left shoulder.

Kristen calls Nancy, who doesn't respond, then she turns to me and shows me the cut-out of the door in her book. She runs her finger inside the cut-out as she shows me.

Nancy returns with FRECKLE JUICE.

Jason sits next to me at the sci table reading DANNY AND THE DINOSAUR aloud. He says 'dinosaurs' loudly when it appears in all caps. Timmy comes over and reaches for the book asking if he can read it. Jason continues reading leaning out of Timmy's reach. Jason says 'look, he was so tall he had to hold up the ropes' paraphrasing the book.
APPENDIX B

EXCERPT OF A TRANSCRIPT OF A READ ALOUD DISCUSSION
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Christy: Comments? Michael.

Michael: He may have looked the same but ( ).

Christy: At the end you mean? His wings looked the same as . . .

Michael: As the others.

Christy: But they weren't quite the same? O.K. Other things that you noticed in this book or that you wanted to say? Who was the main character in this book? Jason.

Jason: The golden bird.

Christy: What do you know about this bird Tico? What do you know about him? What's he like? Alvin.

Alvin: Sometimes he works -

Christy: We're talking about the - what's Tico like? What kind of a bird is he? Want to tell me some things that might describe Tico? Nancy.

Nancy: He could be a crow. He has black in there and he has real black wings.

Christy: Uhhuh. What was he like? Do you remember some things that he wanted in this story? Jason -

Jason: Golden wings.

Christy: Why did he want golden wings?

Jason: So he could fly. ( )

Christy: I can't hear you. You think that he thought he was better than everybody else? Why do you think that?

Nancy: Cause he kept saying that he'd rather ( ).


Michael: He wanted golden wings because he didn't have anyone to ( ).

Christy: What did Tico do with his golden wings? D.J. -

D.J.: He gave them to people.

Christy: What do you think about that? Karl.
Karl: Are you talking about the golden wings?

Christy: Uhhuh. Can you speak up so ( ) can hear you?

Kari: He bought a ( ).

Christy: Uhhuh. What else did he do with his golden wings? Nancy?

Nancy: He gave one to a ( ).

Christy: Uhhuh. Remember who else he gave them to? He gave one to the fisherman. He gave one to a puppeteer. Samantha -

Samantha: ( )


Ben: The basket maker.

Christy: The basket maker's son, yeah. What do you think about Tico giving away his golden wings? Do you think that was a good thing to do or not a good thing to do? Carolyn. Why do you think that was a good thing?

Carolyn: I don't know. Because he was helpful to other people.

Christy: Tommy.

Tommy: Because he was a nice bird.

Christy: He was a nice bird. What in this story makes you think that?

Child: Because he was helpful.

Christy: Karl -

Karl: I think he was helping other people and he wanted the ( ) to be like ( ).

Christy: What do you think about the way that Tico's friends treated him when he had the golden wings? Lisa.

Lisa: Mean.

Christy: They treated him mean. Mike -

(unable to hear response).

Christy: If you were one of Tico's friends, would you have treated Tico mean?
Children: No.

Christy: Why not?

Child: Just because he's different.

Christy: Just because he's different doesn't mean you have to treat him mean. Do you ever have people that treat you mean just because you're different? Jason -

Jason: Kids they used to do ( ) but not no more.

Christy: Why not?

Jason: Because all the kids who do that ( ) left alone. Their father owns a company, All State Painting Machine and all the trucks he had. They put paper and ( ).

Christy: What does that have to do with this story? How did this story remind you of that?

Jason: Because Tico they was being mean to him.

Christy: Being mean to him.

Jason: ( )

Christy: Do you think that this book has a lesson in it or something that we can learn from this book? Does this book like teach a lesson? Or help us learn anything? Do you think Karl? What do you think?

Karl: Just because somebody else has something that nobody else has then it doesn't mean -

Christy: Sounds like a ( _). Can you think of a picture about this story that you would want to make? Lisa.

Lisa: A big picture of golden wings.

Christy: A big picture of golden wings, o.k. Can you think of any other pictures from this story that you would want to make? Nancy.

Nancy: Want to make like a golden bird like golden wings. Maybe make it like ( )

Christy: Giving the golden wings to who?

Nancy: To the bird.

Christy: To the bird. O.K. Were there pictures in this book that Leo Leoni didn't make because there were parts of the story - I mean you can't make a picture for every part of the story.
Were there parts of this story that he didn't really make a picture of?

Child: Uhhuh.

Christy: Can you think of one? What were some parts of this story that there wasn't a picture for? Tom.

Tom: When there was (   ).

Christy: There wasn't really a picture for that. Annie.

Annie: When (  )

Christy: They didn't show his (   ) or anything did they. Karl.

Karl: Didn't even show (   ) makers (    ).

Christy: They didn't show him with the tears coming down. The part that I thought of was when he flew. They didn't have a picture of these words - (Michael, you need to go put your head down). Alan, sit down. Timmy. See if you can make a picture in your head of these words. "I flew higher than the tallest tree. The flower patches below looked like stamps scattered over the countryside and the river like a silver necklace lying in the meadow. I was happy and I flew well into the day." Could you see a picture when you heard those words? Leo Leoni didn't make a picture of that but that would be something that you might want to think about making a picture of too. I also have some gold kind of shiny paper. If you wanted to make a picture from this book you could use that for some of Tico's wings. Let me show you what that looks like. While I'm getting that paper, think about a picture that you might want to do from this book too - from Frederick.

Child: Those pictures (   ).

Christy: This is gold shiny paper. If you want to make a picture from Tico, if you want to picture a part of his wings or feathers you could use this to do that.

Child: Here it kind of shines.

Christy: Kind of shines. Uhhuh. How do you think Leo Leoni did these pictures or how do you think you could do pictures like this? What do you think he used?

Child: All different colors.

Allison: Think he glued things on.

Christy: You think he glues things on. What would it be out of? Like glued on what?

Allison: Paper.

Christy: On paper. Look at these pictures from Frederick. It looks like he cut out gray paper and just glued it on to make Frederick. This looks like it might be paper glued on too. So if you wanted to make a picture about Frederick yesterday, remember when we read Frederick yesterday, if you wanted to make a picture from Frederick you might want to think about gluing paper on to make that.

Child: There's two books of it.

Christy: This morning I want you to think about a project that you want to start. It could be a picture about a book that you've read or a book that I've read out loud. It could be a picture from Tico or from Frederick or maybe from another book that you've read. It can just be like your own picture about the story. Not really a picture out of the book. Also yesterday we talked about how people are different. I think the first trippers might have already gone when we talked about this but Carolyn was saying that we made a web of ideas around the central idea that people are different. Carolyn said that you could take one of these things like you could take feelings and you could make your own web with feelings in the middle and around that word you could do pictures like all the different feelings that you feel. Can you think of some other little webs that you could do on a piece of paper that would be like pictures that you could make around one of these ideas in the middle? Patrick?

Patrick: Do we have this kind of project?

Christy: A lot of kids I think are anxious to work in the art center and if you feel like you're anxious to work in the art center you would want to think of something that you could do. Some kids have started books and you might want to work on a book using some of the things in the art center or some kids might want to do some little webs about this. So what I need you to do is really to think about what kind of a project you might want to work on today and if you have an idea for that that can be your work choice today. Let's see. Are there any ideas that you have that you think you want to share out loud to maybe get some other kids ideas? Nancy?

Nancy: (unable to hear)
Christy: O.K. You could do a book about people and feelings and how people are different. O.K. Who thinks they might want to try to ( ) Tico and the Golden Wings? Does anybody want to try a Tico picture this morning? Do you want to try a picture like that? How do you think you might do that? Have you read the story?

Child: Uh huh.

Christy: Are you both going to work on that together? Would you like to go get started?

Child: It looks like it's glued.

Christy: I think it does.

(interruption)


Kristen: Me and ( ) are going to ( ).

Christy: O.K. What are you going to do it about? You are going to do it about owls? O.K. Nancy?

Nancy: ( ) about library.

Christy: O.K. Jason.

Jason: ( ).

Christy: You want to do what?

Jason: Book about planets.

Christy: A book about planets. Have you seen this ( )? Would you like to look at that first?

Jason: Yes. I had ( ). I had to take that back.

Christy: (unable to hear).

much noise in classroom - end of tape)
APPENDIX C

TRANSCRIPT OF THE INTERVIEW WITH BRANDON
Dan:    O.K., Brandon. What I want to talk with you about - I'm talking with kids about what you do in Mrs. Pearl's classroom and what it's like to do certain things. As you know I've been watching you guys and I'm interested in what you think and what you can tell me about what you do. I'm interested in reading so I'm going to tell you about some things that I've noticed kids doing and I'd like you to just tell me about them. I've noticed that in the morning when you come in, you do quiet reading right away.

Brandon: It's not really like a quiet reading. It's sort of like a quiet reading but it's a real short one. It's about 10 minutes and the teacher takes lunch count and you've got to be really quiet and she doesn't dismiss you or anything. You have to be - you can read with other partners but not for very long. You have to have your own book and she likes it usually when she comes in for all of us to be sitting down and it's usually kind of fun to read quietly because you can just sit there and read while she's gone but ( ). She's sort of reading too because she's reading a list.

Dan:    Oh yeah?

Brandon: And it's kind of fun for her and us.

Dan:    It's fun for you to do that?

Brandon: Yeah.

Dan:    Do you like to read by yourself then or with other kids?

Brandon: I like to read with other kids and myself both.

Dan:    How are they different?

Brandon: It's kind of different when you're reading by yourself than when you're reading together because you might not know a word and it's kind of not very fun - or it's fun but it's not very fun - yeah, not very fun until you get back up and ask Mrs. Pearl. She wants you to be reading and so I like being with the third graders because if I don't know a word they know it. Like Patrick because he's good at reading. I like reading with him and it's fun.

Dan:    Now you do quiet reading at another time during the day.

Brandon: Yeah. After lunch recess.

Dan:    Is that the same or is that different?
Brandon: It's kind of different because quiet reading in the morning is kind of real short and the quiet reading after lunch recess is about a half an hour long so it's pretty long so you can read a couple of books at a time and me and Keith like to read chapter books so we don't have to keep on switching, get back up to switch books and stuff. We've been trying to read really hard to see how many books we can read in the whole year. We want to try to read most of the books the whole year.

Dan: Are you keeping count?

Brandon: No, but we want to see how many -

Dan: How many you can get in. Mrs. Pearl reads aloud to you. How would you describe that to somebody when she reads aloud to you?

Brandon: It's kind of like a quiet reading to her and she enjoys it when the whole class is quiet when she's reading to you so she doesn't have to keep on stopping to tell you would you please be quiet. She usually likes to read a real funny book or something because she likes it in class. Starts laughing or something and she likes to start laughing. She likes funny books.

Dan: She likes funny books?

Brandon: Yes.

Dan: Are most of the books she reads funny books?

Brandon: Yes, she reads real funny ones and when she reads she tries to read kind of quiet so the whole class will be quiet too so they can hear it and like the Ramona books if we have a lot of those or from the library, we will all lay down and read and then we don't have to really listen because we will have our own books but they're kids that don't have a book and they can't share with anyone and they should listen to Mrs. Pearl. That's sort of like another quiet reading but it's not really a quiet reading because we're all reading the same book and that's kind of weird sort of.

Dan: When Mrs. Pearl is finished reading aloud you sometimes talk.

Brandon: We talk about how we liked the book. We talk about why the book was made and stuff. Some of the characters in the book - like with last week we talked about Ramona trying to stop her father from smoking and I thought that was kind of neat and I had a lot of comments for that and all the rest of the kids had comments too and she likes it when you have lots of comments about it because then she thinks you are really listening to the book and she likes that too because then she knows that
you're a real good listener and she knows that she won't have to ask you because you raise your hand so much that it doesn't seem like you talk that much because you've heard a lot of the book and it's kind of fun, too, listening to Mrs. Pearl read because some kids like Nancy can't read very fast. They read really slow and some books have different kinds of words and stuff and that's kind of different for them when Mrs. Pearl reads and when they read by themselves. So that's a kind of object to them sort of. And the kids that listening are the kids that can't read very well then they should really be good listeners because then they can learn different words. You know how people rub Mrs. Pearl sort of? Well most of the time they watch the words if they're not very good at reading or anything. Then they watch the words and they know better words.

Dan: Is that why they rub her shoulders? So they can see the words?

Brandon: Not that much but it's most of the time that's why they do it.

Dan: Do they have other reasons do you think?

Brandon: Yeah, cause they like looking up to the class and stuff.

Dan: I see. Tell me about doing book logs.

Brandon: Book logs?

Dan: Reading logs. You're right. I've got the wrong word written down here. Reading logs.

Brandon: Reading logs are a little thing that tells Mrs. Pearl when she looks in them what you've been reading through the day so she doesn't have to keep on coming around and checking on you to see what books you're reading and the little writing part where you have to write about the thing - when she makes you pick one of the books - she makes you pick one of the books that you've read and you've read a lot and stuff and you thought it was pretty neat and you should write it down. That's kind of like a rule in our class that you have to write down the book that you -

Dan: That's a rule? You're supposed to do that? O.K. Do you like to do those?

Brandon: Uhhuh. It's fun. You get to write down and you get to move your hands a lot.

Dan: You like to write, huh. What kinds of things do you like to write in your book log?
Brandon: I like to write about how the book was. Why I liked the book and I like to write about - if it was funny or something. I like to write down what was funny and that's sort of a rule too.

Dan: That's sort of a rule too?

Brandon: Yeah, sort of. And that's fun, too - thinking about what kind of thing is funny and stuff. You don't remember - thinking of what was funny and what wasn't and you can start really concentrating. That's kind of fun.

Dan: O.K. A couple more things here. I took you out of writing time and I'm kind of curious. What is writing time like?

Brandon: Writing time is a time where you shouldn't be coloring in things. Well you can little things and you shouldn't be really that much drawing or something. You should be writing down something. You should be writing your Christmas story like Mrs. Pearl was saying and you should be writing about your book or something. Most of the people in the class when they're doing books they like to do the writing first and then when they write they kind of think and when they're thinking about writing they can also think of the picture because if you do the picture first and you are thinking of writing - it might kind of connect with your picture. That's what I like doing. I like connecting.

Dan: So you like to write first and then do the pictures?

Brandon: Then I know exactly what I can write instead of thinking for a long time.

Dan: What kinds of things do you write?

Brandon: I write - two times I practiced my spelling words writing them down and I write - like me and Bobby were writing poems because we were making books.

Dan: You were making a book of poems.

Brandon: I like to write poems.

Dan: Are there any kinds of things you're not supposed to be writing, do you think?

Brandon: You're not supposed to be writing scary things that much. They'd be making me think that much about scary things and then you wouldn't get anything done with writing.

Dan: Some days you share writing.
Brandon: If it is something that we've been working on and we think it makes a lot of sense and it will make a lot of sense to the class and we take it over to share but if we don't like anything and we don't have anything to share, we just like to listen a lot. Make comments about it.

Dan: What kind of comments do you make?

Brandon: Nice comments like I like that book because it has colorful pictures. You shouldn't be doing that book is kind of dumb because your pictures aren't colorful. Then that illustrator wouldn't feel very well.

Dan: Do you think that sometimes?

Brandon: Yeah.

Dan: But you don't say it.

Brandon: Yeah.

Dan: Anything else about sharing time?

Brandon: People really think it's nice to share with other people so they give them ideas what to write down if they don't have anything to write. They think they're writing then - like copy down or something. The same words - turn it in - make it kind of different and stuff. That's why everybody sort of likes sharing.

Dan: You kind of talked a little bit about making pictures and doing art work earlier for your writing and sometimes you do pictures for books that you have read or Mrs. Pearl has read to you. Can you tell me about doing that?

Brandon: You should be doing what a book - if a book that you're reading - if Mrs. Pearl wants you to do a book that you're reading, a picture of it, then what you heard is sort of like you should make a picture of it instead of making a picture of something that you haven't even heard of - like her father smokes and stuff. Ramona's father smokes and stuff. Well then you should be doing a picture like her father smokes because there wasn't any picture about what her father is looking like so you could listen to the words.

Dan: Make a picture of something that's not a picture in the book.

Brandon: Yeah. That you heard the words of. Turn the words into a picture and its fun doing pictures. Everybody likes doing pictures, to color them in it's enjoyable. Everybody likes using the crayons and stuff and the chalk and we usually do
pictures all the time most of the time because we have lots of writings and stuff.

Dan: Pictures of your writing.

Brandon: Yeah and sometimes we don't have the writing that you do or you don't think of the pictures so you can just do a picture with the writing ( ) is talking about and you should be really putting details into your picture if you like doing pictures. You should be putting a lot of details and stuff and I like that because I sort of want of want to be an artist when I grow up so I really try to put some detail into it and like when I do pictures of a house or something - if anybody does pictures of a house they work on one little thing like the door - like if some people really work on the door a lot, put a lot of detail and stuff and some people like to make a big square and a dot in the middle but I don't really like doing that. I would draw a square and I would kind of do an outline of it and stuff and for the doorknob I'd make a big circle, pretty much a circle and then I'd make another circle for apartments behind, where the doorknob connects to and then the part where you put your hand on and pictures can be kind of fun when you're really working hard and stuff. As you work sort of like you're thinking of what the picture should be and stuff and that's fun.

Dan: Is there anything you want to say about reading or writing in your classroom that I haven't asked?

Brandon: Well, writing in the classroom, Mrs. Pearl sort of likes when you write in the classroom she really likes it when you get most of your words right and stuff and she wants you to do your best in writing and she wants you to really work hard on the word, like sound it out. Like if you have the word Mississippi River, m - i - s - sound it out real goood.and then spell it. If you already know how to spell those words - like for example Paul - he's really good at spelling and stuff and Keith is good and I'm sort of good. I'm not very good but I'm pretty good at reading and stuff. and doing all sorts of stuff but really in reading I like reading - I like reading chapter books because it has got characters that I've already heard of like Richard Beast - he's in a lot of books and Emily - she's in a lot of books. And ( ) in a lot of books. They are the same but they're different.

Dan: Uhhuh. I don't remember Brandon. Have you been in one of Mrs. Pearl's book discussion groups?

Brandon: No.

Dan: What do you think those are about?
Brandon: Why you like it and stuff. Mrs. Pearl wants you to really think up something that you really liked in the book. She really wants you to think really hard about it and it's kind of difficult doing one of those things because you've got to really tell about the book that you read and stuff. One of the books was The Little Boy and the Bear - the Biggest Bear. And I read that and when I went up to sign up there was already six people there so I couldn't do that so I read it a couple of times. It's a kind of nice book too.

Dan: You would have liked to discuss that one. O.K.

Brandon: Cause it has stuff in it.

Dan: Do you think you'll do a book discussion?

Brandon: Yeah. I've already read the book.
APPENDIX D

LIST OF CHILDREN'S BOOKS RELATED TO RESPONSE


The Beast in Ms. Rooney's Room by Patricia Reilly Giff, illustrated by Blanche Sims. Dell, 1984.


The Beaver Pond by Alvin Tresselt, illustrated by Roger Duvoisin. Lothrop, 1970.


Bringing the Rain to Kapiti Plain by Verna Aardema, illustrated by Beatriz Vidal. Dial, 1981.


Frederick by Leo Lionni. Pantheon, 1967.


The Hippopotamus Ate the Teacher by Mike Thaler. Avon, 1981.


In a Dark, Dark Room by Alvin Schwarz, illustrated Dirk Zimmer. Harper & Row, 1984.

In the Dinosaur’s Paw by Patricia Reilly Giff, illustrated by Blanche Sims. Dell, 1985.


The Littles Have a Wedding by John Peterson. Scholastic, 1972.


Nate the Great by Marjorie Weinman Sharmat, illustrated by Marc Simont. Coward, 1972.


Ramona and Her Father by Beverly Cleary, illustrated by Alan Tiegreen. Morrow, 1977.

Ramona Quimby, Age 8 by Beverly Cleary, illustrated by Alan Tiegreen. Morrow, 1981.


Snow is Falling by Franklyn M. Branley, illustrated by Holly Keller. Crowell, 1986.
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