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CHAPTER I
THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Background of the Study

Over the past decade, a growing amount of attention has been given to the quest for literacy in our country. Educators, researchers, and theorists have joined the ranks of the literacy movement, raising questions and providing new insights into various issues related to literacy. Recent research has broadened our knowledge base and has enabled educators to reconsider the following aspects of literacy: the nature of literacy and what it does; the ways in which literacy is perceived and defined across cultures; how people use literacy to accomplish routine tasks in their daily lives; various means for gaining access to literacy and becoming "literate" within the cultures of home, work, school and community; and the evaluation of literacy competencies within these cultures (Bloome & Green, 1982; Heath, 1983; Michaels, 1986; Scribner, 1988, Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988).

Discussions of literacy in this document will avoid focusing on reading and writing as mere acts in and of themselves or as a discrete set of skills to be mastered. Instead, references to literacy will encompass written language with all its functions and uses as well as insights one needs in order to create meaning within any given setting. In other words, people use language to get things done. All language use, whether
oral or written, is embedded in a social context that affects both its form and its function (Bloome & Green, 1982; Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz, 1982; Heath, 1983; Scollon & Scollon, 1981; Scribner & Cole, 1981).

Because literacy's forms and functions are integral parts of social life, literacy cannot be defined in terms that remove it from the persons, places and contexts in which it occurs. Literacy, in effect, requires insights and working knowledge of the social-historical aspects of a given situation, the functions and uses of literacy within that situation, and the interrelated language systems of speaking, listening, reading and writing (Hymes, 1971).

Researchers agree that as there can be no single definition of literacy (Fishman, 1988; Goelman, 1984); there is no such thing as a universal literacy. In fact, there is evidence that there can be a variety of literacies (Scribner, 1988; Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988) at work both within and across cultures. Literacy is an outcome of cultural transmission; people are socialized into literacy while participating in socially organized activities with written language. These activities take place as people routinely accomplish daily life.

These literacies, then, are embedded in the social meanings of the cultures in which they are constructed. In turn, the social meanings are embedded in cultural meanings, which are embedded in historical meanings. All of these embedded "meanings" are influenced by the views of the relationship between the language and everyday life within that culture. These views contribute to one's understandings of literacy as an individual and as a society, and affect not only one's individual uses of
literacy, but one's perceptions of the literacy competencies of others. Literacy is a "many-meaninged thing." (Scribner, 1988, p. 73)

In summary, literacies are learned, interpreted and utilized in social contexts, and these contexts vary both within and across cultures. We also know that being perceived by others as "literate" involves one's knowledge of the language systems of speaking, listening, reading and writing AND one's ability to use this knowledge in communicating with other persons to construct meaning. A literate person, therefore, exhibits the capacity to utilize language in its various forms, functions and uses to "mean".

Researchers have amassed a great deal of information about the multifaceted nature of literacy and literacy development in young children. The family setting has been the focus for much of this research. This growing body of literature documents that from birth, children are immersed in a multitude of language and life experiences that enable them to construct the foundations for learning to read and write. Of particular import to a study of inner city children's literacy explorations in a first grade classroom is the research that pertains to young children as emergent readers and writers prior to entering school, and how children can and do continue literacy learning in the school setting.

The Literacy Development of Young Children Prior to Entering School

In a literate society such as ours, children develop understandings of the forms, functions and uses of print very early in their young lives. They begin to recognize and read environmental print such as road signs, labels from household, toy and food products, and logos from stores and
restaurants which their families frequent, etc. (Altwerger & Goodman, 1981) long before entry into school. Family is the dominant social context in which literacy is first encountered by young children.

Ferreiro (1984) notes that young children are actively searching for information about literacy. Her studies of children three to five years of age in Mexico document that young children seek out literacy experiences prior to reading and writing in adult and conventional ways. They begin to make sense of the print in their environment at early ages. Ferreiro notes that these experiences are not extraneous to the young child's literacy development, but are an integral part of the process of becoming literate. She depicts the young child as "researcher." Experiences with literacy through interaction with texts and literate others provide the child with opportunities to develop hypotheses about literacy. These experiences (past and future) and hypotheses about written language in its various forms become the raw data for the child's own explorations of literacy.

Taylor (1982b) conducted extensive anthropological research in the homes of six white middle class families in suburban towns near New York City and has also completed a subsequent collaborative study (Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988) with four poor Black families in the inner city of a major metropolitan area in the Northeast. In both studies, which parallel findings documented by Heath (1983) and Teale, Anderson & Estrada (1982) in separate studies which involved other cultural groups, Taylor found that literacy was deeply embedded within the context of people's activities regardless of their cultural background, socioeconomic status or family configuration. These families used literacy to "solve practical
problems and to maintain social relations." (Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988. p. 200)

The children, then, as part of the dynamic culture of family were part of many of these social contexts in which people used literacy to get things done. They observed as family members wrote messages to one another, copied down recipes, read magazines, wrote poetry, created grocery lists, read legal documents, and used literacy for a wide variety of purposes which either enhanced their lives or made it possible to survive. Children had opportunities to explore literacy and to make literacy activities relevant to their own lives as they used literacy to perform specific social functions such as writing the rules of membership into a club, browsing through a sibling's magazine, writing labels to accompany their drawing, reading environmental print, and creating a birthday card for a friend or family member. Although literacy was a part of the whorp and weave of family life in all the families studied, there were some major differences between families both within and across cultures (Teale, Estrada & Anderson, 1981).

Heath's (1983) ethnographic study, in which she studied the oral and written language development of young children within three diverse communities in the Southeast, drew our attention toward the nature of specific literacy events (storytelling, family storybook reading, writing grocery lists, etc.) in which children participate within the family setting and how these literacy events change over time.

A literacy event is a socially constructed experience "in which a piece of writing is integral to the nature of participants' interactions and their interpretive processes" (Heath, 1988. p. 350). Each literacy
event has its own participant structure (who does what, when, where, with whom, for what purposes and in what ways), and demands particular interpretive competencies on the part of the participants. Each literacy event, then, is novel and is constructed in the interactions between the participants, the texts and the people around them. These interactions reflect the social and cognitive insights and know-how of each person who is participating in the literacy event and may change over time.

Heath noted that the types of interaction and the nature of the literacy event changed as children grew older and could participate in new ways. Literacy events provide children with opportunities to engage in, talk about, and explore the forms and functions of literacy in a multitude of ways. Some literacy events, such as family storybook reading, help to prepare children for routine literacy events which would be encountered in the school setting.

Children who have not had such experiences at home will appear to be at a disadvantage when they enter school. Although these children bring with them a rich background of literacy experiences and a wealth of knowledge about literacy's functions and forms, the nature of their experiences with literacy is different. They will have more to sift through as they learn how to negotiate the participant structures of specific classroom literacy events when they enter the school setting.

The Literacy Development of Young Children In the School Setting

As young children make the transition from home to school, the demands are great. They are expected to engage in a variety of activities while simultaneously exhibiting both social and communicative competence from the teacher's perspective (Collins, 1986). Throughout each day these
children are learning about what readers do, learning about how different texts work, learning about the functions and uses of print in a variety of settings, and learning how people write. The rules for "looking like a reader" and "looking like a writer" may be vastly different for children who come from homes with values other than those of mainstream middle class society.

Writing and reading at school also add a further dimension to the literate lives of children. Children move from the supportive environment of the home in which language is viewed as "action" into the school in which language is frequently viewed as "object". Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines (1988) observed differences in forms, functions and uses of literacy between the family cultures and school cultures of the first grade children in their study. Literacy at school is used to exhibit knowledge, and to gain access to learning both as an individual and as a group (Bloome, 1983).

Whether the literacy environment of school is similar to or different from the literacy environment of the home, children are still actively working to refine and elaborate upon their own personal "literacy orientations" (Scollon & Scollon, 1984) as they participate in and observe literacy "in action" as a part of their daily lives. The ways in which teachers plan for and facilitate an environment which builds upon and expands children's literacy orientations and the ways in which children respond to such facilitation are important issues to consider.

In a summary of studies of early readers, Teale (1986) outlines three general types of experiences which have been associated with facilitating the literacy development of young children. These experiences are: 1)
interacting with others in speaking, listening, reading, and writing situations; 2) independent explorations of print; and 3) adult modeling of language and literacy. Providing these types of experiences within the school setting frees children to explore the worlds of literacy individually, with peers and with literate others. The key element is interaction; interaction with texts and with literate others.

Dyson and Genishi acknowledge that the child's acquisition of language (both oral and written) is a process based on interaction. They suggest that reading, writing, speaking, and listening are processes that involve the child in an exploration of language within the social contexts of a classroom. Dyson spent two years in a primary classroom looking at children's spontaneous talk while writing stories. This study supports the findings of Britton (1971), Graves (1975) and Rosen (1974) which show that young children (ages four to seven years) use language as an accompaniment to, and directing force of their activities (Luria, 1961; Vygotsky, 1978). Dyson's findings shed some light on the jointly constructed nature of collaborative talk between peers, and the role of such talk in enabling children to reconsider their own perspectives. This well-documented study has also enabled researchers to see that young children write for a variety of purposes which are not necessarily equivalent to those purposes of adults.

Dyson & Genishi (1982) studied two children as they wrote in two settings: at tables with their peers, and at a table by themselves. They noted that, although both children exhibited personal preferences and stances as to the role of writing in their lives and which social setting
in which they preferred to write, the children's interactions had positive effects on their ability to write. They state:

The 'muttering' of young children to themselves and their 'chattering' with each other can be valuable and for some children critical factors in the process of learning to write. Children can sometimes serve as their own teachers: questioning, modeling, providing feedback and support for each other. Writing can be a lonely struggle without an alert friend who asks, 'Anyway, whatta ya trying' to write?' p. 131

A more substantive research base is needed to enable us to understand how children utilize language and other available resources to make sense of the world around them; more specifically, the multiple worlds of literacy. It is imperative that we try to learn not only how children explore literacy within specific contexts, but how the acts of literacy themselves become part of these contexts of discovery.

Dyson's work, limited to young children's writing within classrooms, is merely the tip of the iceberg. She has enabled us to see that children focus on tasks as whole experiences that include materials to be used, a series of actions to be followed, and a way of talking during and about the activity. Dyson (1984) echoes the voices of other researchers (Collins, 1986; Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Green, 1981; Gumperz, 1984; Michaels, 1986) as she calls for further research which is focused on literacy as a socially constructed phenomena from the child's perspective:

There is reason, then, to critically examine and evaluate the kinds of literacy activities available to children and how children with different literacy backgrounds and understandings interpret those activities. Such investigations will allow insight into why some children succeed in school, and others, for all their active thinking, fail to achieve academic success. p. 262
Statement of the Problem

School, as a culture, socializes children into a type of literacy which is frequently referred to as "schooled literacy" (Cook-Gumperz, 1982). This schooled literacy (referred to in this paper as school literacy) is integrally related to mainstream cultural values and its notions of what it means to be literate. The rules for gaining access to knowledge at school and the functions and uses of literacy at school are often vastly different from those of the home setting. In other words, for the majority of teachers and children within the school culture, literacy IS knowledge (Bloorae, 1986).

As the child refines and redefines his or her own notions about literacy (its forms, uses and functions) through socially constructed actions and events, the child's concepts about literacy become internalized. The child then tests his/her hypotheses in the context of social relationships. These hypotheses are "enacted" (Vygotsky, 1986) through real, everyday life situations which have purpose for the participants and lay the foundations for the child's understandings of the functions and uses of print, ways to access print, and specific attitudes or orientations toward reading and writing. An understanding of how children construct these enactments (literacy explorations) through purposeful activity, and how these literacy explorations lay the foundations for the child's literacy development is crucial if we are to facilitate "legitimate, conceptual, developmental literacy learning" (Teale & Sulzby, 1986, p. xx) within the culture of schooling. As Bissex (1980) writes:

When he was five and a half years old, Paul wrote and posted this sign over his workbench-desk: DO NAT DSTRB GNYS AT WRK.
The GNYS (genius) at work is our human capacity for language. DO NOT DISTRB is a caution to observe how it works, for the logic by which we teach is not always the logic by which children learn. (p. 199)

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms will be referred to throughout the study according to the following definitions.

**Literacy Event.** The term refers to any socially constructed experience "in which a piece of writing is integral to the nature of participants' interactions and their interpretive processes" (Heath, 1988. p. 350).

**Participant Structures.** Participant structures are socially constructed and negotiated rules which are enacted by participants within social situations. These rules include who does what, where, when, with whom, how and why. Participant structures are sometimes explicitly stated, but are most often implicitly acted upon by the participants as they compose and revise what takes place within any given social setting.

**Literacy Exploration.** A literacy exploration refers to the ways in which people act upon their hypotheses about literacy within any given literacy event. This term stems from Hymes' (1967) definition of speech act. Literacy explorations are the literacy acts which occur while interacting with texts and/or others within occasions (literacy events) in which print is central. In some instances, the literacy event itself is one continuous literacy exploration. In most cases, literacy events are comprised of several literacy explorations.

**Literacy Community.** Literacy community is the term used to describe the classroom under study and parallels Hymes' (1967) definition of a
speech community. A literacy community is a community that constructs and shares rules for the creation and interpretation of literacy acts, and rules for the interpretation of various written registers of language.

**Text.** Text refers to printed language in any form.

**Reenactment.** When children retell a book or story that they have heard while acting as if they are reading the text, it is referred to as a reenactment.

**Enactment.** This term refers to the behavior of children when they act as if they are reading a text with which they have no prior experience.

**Partner Reading.** Partner reading refers to children who are reading together in dyads. During partner reading children negotiate the participant structures of the activity so that both children read together or each child alternates reading portions of the text (a page, a paragraph, a story, a line, etc.).

**Parallel Reading.** When two children are in close proximity of one another and are reading the same text or title, but are not involving one another in their independent explorations, this activity is referred to as parallel reading. This type of reading generally begins as a partner reading and then moves into parallel reading as the children become more involved with the text.

**Echo Reading.** Echo reading refers to the act of one or more persons when reading just a bit behind the leader or group of leaders within a literacy event which involves oral reading.

**Mumble Reading.** This term refers to children's "mumbling" participation in oral reading experiences where they join with the key
reader (usually a leader) by sounding as if they are reading along with them. Typically, such indecipherable mumbling becomes more understandable as the reading experience continues. (Doake, 1985)

**Choral Reading.** When two or more children are orally reading a piece of text with the intent of reading in unison and sound as if they are reading in unison, the activity is referred to as choral reading.

**Journaling.** Within the setting of the classroom under study, the teacher and children referred to writing in one's journal as "journaling." Therefore, throughout the body of this document, the words "journaling" and "journalled" are used frequently as verbs.

**Topic-centered interaction.** This term refers to a communicative style (speaking or writing) in which the person begins with a specific topic and elaborates upon that topic throughout the duration of the discourse. The content remains centered upon the topic of origin (Michaels, 1986).

**Topic-associated interaction.** People topic-associate when they talk or write about a series of related topics which are implicitly linked (Michaels, 1986).

**Shared Reading.** Shared Reading refers to the activity of three or more persons as they orally read together chorally or as they take turns in reading specific portions of text.

**Shared Writing.** This term refers to the collaborative activity of two or more persons as they mutually construct text through writing. Shared Writing takes on a variety of configurations: one person writing while the rest of the participants dictate, several persons taking turns
in writing portions of the text, or a leader eliciting letters from other participants and organizing them to make conventional text.

**Shared Book Experiences.** Shared Book Experiences are experiences in which the teacher participates with children in the reading of a big book (large book with easily visible print) and then follows up with inviting children to point while the group reads the text again. Teacher often provide children with trade books of the same title and read the books together while the teacher models reading strategies on the big book and the children read the smaller versions.

**The Purpose of the Study**

This study was designed to investigate how children with different backgrounds constructed literacy explorations in a first grade classroom of an inner city school over the course of one academic year. This study is unique, in that it documents children's literacy explorations across literacy events such as reading the teacher's daily message, journaling, storytime, authoring books, free reading, free writing and other literacy events that occurred throughout the course of each day. Instead of choosing one literacy event to follow across time, the researcher studied all literacy events as they were constructed in the classroom setting, what occurred during children's literacy explorations within these literacy events, and how specific children made links toward understanding the forms, functions and uses of literacy both within and across events.

The major organizing questions explored in the study evolved from emergent literacy research (Goodman, 1984; Clay, 1975; Cochran-Smith, 1984; Dyson, 1982; Ferreiro, 1983; Harste, Woodward & Burke, 1983; Teale,
1986; Teale & Sulzby, 1984), family literacy research (Fishman, 1988; Taylor, 1983; Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988), community ethnographies (Heath, 1983; Philips, 1983), interactive sociolinguistics (Bloome, 1986; Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Green & Weade, 1983; Gumperz, 1986; Hymes, 1971; Michaels, 1986), the researcher's previous participation in classrooms, and observations of young children’s literacy behaviors in a variety of settings. The questions are as follows:

1. What is the nature of the literacy events in which the children in this study participate?

2. How do the focal children in this study construct literacy explorations within the classroom setting across time?

Scope and Limitations of the Study

Although this study provides detailed descriptions of the literacy events in which the children under study participated, documents the changes that occurred within these literacy events, and locates the participant structures which impacted the children's explorations of literacy within literacy events, it is limited in the following ways:

Because the researcher collected data during four points in time throughout the year, she did not observe every day over the course of one entire academic year. Therefore, children made links to prior literacy explorations of which the researcher was unaware.

Although the researcher triangulated data with children and the teacher as much as possible, there is a limitation due to the impact of one observer's recorded observations. All literacy events were viewed through the lens of one researcher. Although scholars in the field were...
consulted throughout the data analysis phase, the study is constrained by the selectivity of a single observer and that observer's biases.

The researcher did not regularly observe children during Math. From a semiotic perspective, math is considered to be a routine literacy event. Literacy artifacts were photocopied during the time period which was reserved for Math.

This study informs, but does not make any attempt to predict. It reports descriptively, and does not draw conclusions as to instruction which is most appropriate for young children. The study does, however, provide a window into the literacy explorations of five children from different backgrounds in a classroom over a specific range of time. Inferences may be drawn from reading the final report.

Summary

This investigation was designed to study how young children construct literacy explorations in an environment where they are given many opportunities to interact with texts, teacher and one another. Participants were children in a first grade classroom of an inner city school and their teacher. These participants represented a wide range of linguistic, cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds and reflected the diversity found in many inner city settings. Using an ethnographic perspective, the researcher participated in the life of the classroom as a participant observer during four thematic unit studies across the course of one academic year.

Theoretical perspectives which impacted this study and a summary of related research is presented in Chapter II. A detailed description of
the methods and procedures which guided the investigation can be found in Chapter III of this report. Chapter IV describes the classroom literacy events which were observed in the classroom setting, discusses how the participant structures of these literacy events changed over time, and documents the ways in which literacy served specific functions for the focal children as they participated in the ongoing life of the classroom culture. Literacy explorations are then located within the literacy events which have been described. The nature of children's literacy explorations and the elements which impacted the construction of literacy explorations are discussed in Chapter V. Chapter VI summarizes the findings of this study in light of already existing research, suggests implications for educators and researchers, and proposes new questions for further study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Colin Turnbull (1983), in his book entitled The Human Cycle, portrays children as constructors of multiple explorations of the world around them regardless of cultural or socioeconomic background. He writes:

In all cultures, at all times known to us, the children are a source of wonderment for they are the supreme example of the human potential for creation. They are themselves filled with wonder during their first years, as the strange world around them slowly reveals itself. Their wonderment is one of the major tools that will shape their destiny, for in looking at the world around them they have to discover not just what things are, what they can do to or with them, but what things mean. . .(p. 25)

The discussion in this chapter portrays children as constructors of worlds and explorers of life, literature and literacy. Studies which have prompted such a portrayal are reviewed. The nature of teaching and learning within the classroom culture is then reviewed. The role of teacher and children as both teachers and learners is then highlighted.

Explorations of Life, Literature and Literacy

All young children are faced with the task of constructing the world. From birth, they are engaged in a variety of investigations about life, literature and literacy. They generate hypotheses and act upon those hypotheses as they actively explore the world around them. Children,
then, continually add to their backpacks that are brimming with a store of familiar concepts, people and objects (Nelson, 1985). These concepts are organized around children’s experiences and become the lens through which they view the world. Both oral and written language develop through interactions with others and are filtered through those hypotheses upon which children are acting.

Lev Vygotsky (1986), a Russian psychologist, has contributed significantly to our understandings of how children, in interaction with those around them, come to terms with the world as they see it. Vygotsky is best known for his research on the role of play in children’s cognitive development and his writing about thought and language. In his research and writing, he considered the embedded social contexts in which all learning occurs. Yet he gave credence to the cognitive nature of humans as well.

Vygotsky proposed that learners first explore concepts on the social level, between people (interpsychological) and then move to an internalization of concepts within the head (intrapsychological). This process of generating hypotheses and confirming or disconfirming predictions is monitored by inner speech. A learner, from a Vygotskian perspective, is a detective who searches for clues and then tries to put them together in a logical order based on the learner’s past experiences (social history) and how the clues seem to fit together at that given point in time.

Vygotsky recognized that, although children bring their social histories (or backpacks) with them to the school setting, they need direction from a knowledgeable adult. He suggests that persons who work
with children provide opportunities for them to work within their zones of proximal development; the distance between what a child can do independently and what he/she can do with help from a more knowledgeable person. Vygotsky invited us to look at the terrain which must be traveled in this process of becoming an active participant in our cultures. Language and thought are the two streams that wind their way around, merging at some points and separating at others. The zone of proximal development is the plain one must travel through in order to get to higher ground.

Children, therefore, are making knowledge their own. They do this in a community of those who share a sense of belonging to a culture. The work of several researchers in the field of emergent literacy has lifted early childhood educators to new awareness of young children's expertise as explorers of life, literature and literacy.

Bissex (1980) studied the written language development of her son Paul and reports that he generated hypotheses about written language in ways that were similar to his hypotheses generation about spoken language. This led her to suggest that children, as constructors of worlds, are not simply reconstructing the world as adults know it. They are, instead, reflective explorers who use thought as a means of constructing the world and language as the medium through which these worlds can be manifested, refined, redefined and shared in the course of daily experiences. Bissex maintains that children encounter literacy through meaningful social contexts and view literacy as a way of making sense of the world without any instruction from adults.
Ferreiro and Teberosky (1982) spent two years studying the literacy understandings of children between four and six years of age in Mexico. They, like Goodman (1986), show that children know a great deal about literacy prior to entering school. Ferreiro and Teberosky created tasks from a Piagetian perspective which provided them with information about children's notions of: formal characteristics of text, written language as symbolic representation, spatial relationships of text, interpretation of silent and oral reading, constitutive elements of writing acts, and the use of writing utensils for various types of writing. They found that children not only had developed theories about literacy processes, but that they also posed questions for themselves to explore. Such explorations yielded further questions. Ferreiro (1984) writes:

Children pose deep questions to themselves. Their problems are not solved when they succeed in meaningfully identifying a letter or string of letters, because they try to understand not only the elements or the results but also, and above all, the very nature of the system (p. 172).

Although the work of Ferreiro and Teberosky was not Vygotskian in perspective, their findings are illustrative of the types of issues and concerns which Vygotsky addressed in the 1930's. In an attempt to understand the nature of the questions posed by young children as well as the ways in which they seek information on which to build hypotheses, Harste, Woodward and Burke (1982) searched for literacy patterns as they observed and interviewed twenty preschool and primary children over a five year period.

Their focus on "child as informant" enabled them to highlight the wealth of knowledge that young children put to use in daily literacy activities as children explore and extend their knowledge in new ways.
Their findings correspond with Hall's (1987) discussion of four types of explorations in which young children engage. These explorations are: 1) learning about what readers do; 2) learning about how text works; 3) learning when and why people write; 4) learning how people write.

Children are choosing to explore literacy because literacy is "social action." They do not consciously set about teaching themselves to read and to write. Instead, they explore the worlds of literacy as they explore other domains of life. They develop hypotheses, test their hypotheses and act upon these hypotheses until something occurs which causes them to reflect upon their current notions. The children in Harste, Woodward & Burke's study appeared to set off in directions which would be profitable to them.

We found this phenomenon particularly interesting in that it flies in the face of current pedagogy, which assumes that corrective feedback must come from an obliging adult; that errors, if not immediately corrected by an outsider, become reinforced habits of some consequence to the acquisition of literacy. Children in our study seemed well aware of their literacy decisions, changed their perceived errors and capably self-selected a set of things upon which they knew they needed work (p. 144)

At first glance, one might assume that the findings of Harste, et al. run counter to Vygotsky's learning by social transaction notions. Harste's work, based on the previous work of Vygotsky, has been devoted to enabling educators to reflect upon the ways in which one can skillfully guide a child within the zone of proximal development as well as facilitate opportunities for the child to test hypotheses at the intrapsychological and interpsychological levels. Children, as explorers, continually refine and redefine their expanding notions of literacy while conducting literacy investigations independently and with others.
At times, parents and literate others are involved in children's explorations. Ninio and Bruner (1978) conducted one of the first studies which highlighted the dance between a mother-child dyad as they interacted during interactive storybook reading over a ten-month period. Results from this study showed that the interactions enhanced the child's mastery of turn-taking and this knowledge of interaction contributed to the child's subsequent labeling behaviors that occurred. The mother supported the child by following the child's lead and responding in ways that simultaneously sanctioned the child's notions and expanded the child's use of language within the naturally occurring activity. The mother did not overtly teach the child to label, but drew the child's attention toward specific aspects of text and expanded the child's repertoire of language which could be used while interacting with mother and text.

A more recent study of mother-child dyads over a sixth month period (Altwerger, Diehl-Faxon & Dockstader-Anderson, 1981) portrays the mother as "broker" between print and the child. Altwerger, et al found that the mother constructed a text which only vaguely resembled the print, but was meaningful to the child. Over the six month course of the study, the "conversational text" gradually shifted to a text which more closely approximated the print. Heath (1983) and Wells (1981) noted similar shifts in the role of parents and children in their longitudinal studies of young children both at home and at school. The classroom literacy experiences of children in both studies did not appear to be as flexible and as responsive to the individual needs of the children. The construction of literacy activities depended mostly upon the agenda of the teacher; which was based on mainstream middle class values.
Such findings, embedded within Vygotsky's theory that individual reflection is rooted in social action, lead one to consider the ways in which children explore literacy within the classroom setting. Regardless of the type of classroom, personality of the teacher, materials used or methodologies employed, children will actively seek out experiences which teach them about literacy. In classroom settings, children have a wide range of persons with which to share knowledge and test developing hypotheses provided such social interaction is valued by the teacher. The following portions of this chapter will highlight the nature of teaching and learning within the classroom culture and will discuss the roles of teachers and children within that setting.

The Nature of Teaching and Learning Within the Classroom Culture

A classroom is a social system in which life is constructed over time by members (teacher and children) who interact with and build upon each others actions, intentions and messages (Gumperz, 1981). Within each classroom, participants work toward common patterns in regard to the ways in which they perceive, believe, evaluate and act. This social system, then, is a culture which is embedded within the broader setting of school. Children are not only involved in developing notions about the social rules and norms of the classroom culture, but they are acting upon their understandings of appropriate behavior while actively participating in the creation of culture from the onset of the academic year.

When children move from one class to another, they are involved in cross-cultural endeavors. Each classroom is structured by rules which mandate who can do what, where, with whom, when, for how long, with what,
for what purposes, and in what ways. These rules or participant structures (Philips, 1983) are often negotiated and renegotiated on a daily basis. They are most typically implicitly acted upon and either broaden or narrow the options available to children as they explore life, literature and literacy.

Throughout the year, children are developing a common social history which embodies all of thought and language and is influenced by what has gone before and what one expects in the future. As they interact with one another and with texts, they use a wide range of prior knowledge in constructing meaning within any given literacy event. Social history includes what actually occurs within interactions, persons interpretations of what occurs, roles and relationships of participants, history of relationships among participants, expectations and goals of participants, history of the event (other similar occurrences across time), intellectual knowledge, participants' views of self and contribution to the interaction, and perceptions of the ways in which meaning is being constructed (Green and Kantor-Martin, 1988). Because classrooms as cultures are dynamic in nature, children are continually adding to their social histories and thus, changing their hypotheses about life, language and literacy.

In some classrooms, there is little opportunity for children to act upon their hypotheses in a non-evaluative setting (DeFord, 1986). There is a subtle shift from "Did you get my meaning" to "Did I get it right?" Talk is often used in such classrooms to elicit children's attention, direct their attention to a specific task or problem and provide directions in ways of handling it (McDermott, 1976).
In other classrooms, people and texts in interaction actually become environments for one another. The structure is created by the activity instead of molding the activity into the rigid form of the structure. In such classrooms, talk provides the social energy needed for nurturing human relationship, becomes an analytic tool as children define and redefine worlds, and moves into a reciprocal relationship of support within literacy acts themselves (Dyson, 1990). It is through such talk that group members link themselves together and make literacy relevant to life in communities (Vygotsky, 1978). Through talk, children establish common expectations and values for written language and sometimes acquire a special vocabulary for talking about and analyzing texts (Heath, 1986). Thus a literacy community is formed in which the teacher and children explore literacy in ways that concentrate on the "living energy of meaning" (Rosen, 1978).

**Teachers: Teaching and Learning**

Erickson (1986) equates teaching with "instructional leadership." This implies that there is a leader and at least one person who is "following" the leader's direction. Good leaders are people who have that uncanny ability to involve others in making their decisions empower them to problem-solve in their own ways. Effective leaders provide persons with a wide range of options, supporting them as they work to discover which options are most applicable to their situation. Frequently such leaders blend in with the group which is being guided, taking on a partnership role instead of telling the group what to do. Good instructional leaders enable the people around them to ask "why" and
facilitate the exploration of possible explanations; flexibly moving between background and foreground of the exploration depending upon the needs of those around them.

Dewey (1938) reminds us that teachers must provide students with conditions which stimulate thinking. He states that the teacher's main responsibility is to provide opportunities for students to test their hypotheses as well as act upon them. Teachers, then, are engaged in a complex cultural enterprise. They along with students, are negotiating an intricate system of participant structures. This takes place simultaneously with moment-by-moment decisions and interpretations of what students need to know. Erickson (1986) describes this process which could be related to what happens in regard to both teacher and student. He writes:

Teaching is mediated by the sense the learner makes of the social context of the classroom situation—the way turns are distributed, the character of praise and blame, the implicit standards of performance, the cues employed to signal opportunities to participate, or changes of task and the like. Parallel to the learner's active interpretation of the social reality of the classroom, there exists a mental representation and construction of the cognitive content of what is being taught. New concepts are constantly compared to and assimilated within older ones; metacognitive strategies are deployed accurately or not, to direct and monitor intellectual skills and specific pieces of knowledge needed for understanding a new principle or perspective. p. 17

Sowers (1985) notes that the focus of children's talk about writing was influenced by the talk about writing that was modeled by the teacher. This highlights the importance of demonstrating strategies to and with children, but does not preclude other aspects of literacy learning. Bissex (1984) writes: 

"Literacy learning, like language learning, is not merely imitative but systematic and creative, in the sense that the child
constructs (or reconstructs) the rules for him/herself. (p. 89)" Frank Smith (1981) documents three aspects of literacy learning which are essential for children's literacy development. They are: demonstrations, engagement and sensitivity.

Demonstrations are experiences in which the teacher provides children with a window into literacy processes by engaging in such processes and talking about such engagement with children. Children then are provided with opportunities to engage in literacy explorations in which they can "play with" the processes which were demonstrated. Both teacher and child are called to employ sensitivity in reflecting upon their engagements and planning for subsequent explorations in the future. Dyson (1987) reminds educators that children need "building space" as they construct worlds and negotiate those world. Teachers also need "viewing space" so they can act upon their understandings of what they see children are doing.

Teachers, as instructional leaders, "follow the child" (Pinnell, 1987). They guide and direct student's attention toward those aspects of literacy which are most important at any given point in time. Teacher, as learners, continually seek the answer to the following question: What is it that the child is showing me she/he needs to know? This implies sharing control with students and encouraging them to actively construct worlds as they know them. Cynthia Onore (1990) highlights the importance of talk in classrooms and shows that it is often difficult to decide who is doing the teaching and who is doing the learning when everyone is involved in constructing worlds which have meaning for them.

Teachers are all the time teaching about talk. WE (teachers) can't avoid it, since talk is our medium of exchange. When teachers control the flow and the topic of talk, students learn that talk---at least talk in institutions such as schools---is
disembodied from the world of meaning. When teachers share control with students, students learn that talk is a means for constructing knowledge. The scary thing is that when students do learn about talk as a vehicle for choice and for negotiating what will be learned, then teachers discover that their classrooms are full of twenty or thirty other teachers. Then you have to rethink what it means to teach. That's the scary thing, and that's the exhilarating thing when you do a good job of teaching your students about talk. (p. 57)

The focus is not who is doing the teaching and who is doing the learning. It is, however, important to have a sense of each participant in the classroom culture as a maker of meaning in order to understand the meanings that are being constructed and the ways they are interpreted and acted upon within the classroom setting (Scollon & Scollon, 1982).

Children: Teaching and Learning

Until I began observing five year olds closely I had no idea that they took stock of their own learning. They spontaneously and systematically made lists of what they knew. They consciously ordered and arranged their learning—or should I say, some of them did. (Marie Clay, 1975, p. 337)

Children not only know what they know, but they seem to know what they don't know. They are engaged in a search for meaning and utilize structures and patterns that will help them to make sense of the world around them. Peers within the classroom setting provide opportunities for lively dialogue and engagement with text. Dyson (1989) suggests that teachers are viewed by children as "peripheral beings." Based on a three year study of children's writing in a multi-ethnic classroom, she proposes that the instruction which occurs within the peer culture while children are engaged in writing is as effective as direct instruction which is provided by teachers. Talk, in the classroom under study, was a major
tool for gaining control of the complexities involved in the process of writing.

Children not only can teach themselves a great deal about literacy, but they can teach others in the process. Research by Solsken (1985) showed that children develop personal orientations to specific literacy activities and also develop their own unique approaches to various tasks. Bissex (1984) studied the literacy development of two young boys and reports that they both were self-taught learners. She argues children are searching for order in the world around them. In considering the child as teacher, Bissex suggests that children mediate between what they already know and the information that is available within the environment to inform their hypothesis generation and that they carry on dialogues about what they are learning with both inner and outer voices. Such findings are corroborated in the philosophical discussions of both Vygotsky (1986) and Bakhtin (1981).

Dyson's (1987, 1989) research on children's writing in classroom settings documents children's abilities to teach themselves through explorations of literacy and their expertise in moving their peers to new levels of awareness while engaging in social interaction. This research extends the notions of Bissex that children ask questions, seek order and monitor their learning along the way. Bissex (1984) states:

The child as teacher is child mind interacting with the information and structures provided by its immediate environment, and guided and supported by the enduring structures of human mind and language which, like a great net, protect it from falling into the abyss of nonlearning. Children have demonstrated their power to abstract, hypothesize, construct, and revise. Given this view of children, surely one role of education is to affirm each child's inner teacher. (p. 101)
Summary

We are now beginning to view curriculum as continually being formed; expanding, growing and changing through the talk between teachers and students as they work toward joint meaning-making and goal setting. Curriculum, as developed within the explorations of children and teachers in classrooms, changes as all participants make explicit those meanings upon which they have been implicitly acting.

Jon Cook (1982) conducted interview with teachers and students of all ages and abilities in order to understand how people perceive that they learn best. They found that; learners learn best when they are themselves engaged, when they are supported through collaboration with peers and teachers to explore, and when they have opportunity to reflect on their learning.

The following chapters document the explorations of young children as they interacted with texts and with one another throughout the course of one academic year. These first graders were immersed in a language-rich environment in which the teacher was a co-learner, in which students collaborated with one another to build knowledge, and in which both students and teacher reflected upon and assessed what was learned.

Chapter III provides an overview of the methods employed throughout the study as well as a description of the participants and their roles. Detailed description of data analysis procedures are included as well. In Chapter IV, the ontogenesis of literacy events within the classroom culture of the classroom under study is described. The metamorphosis of those literacy events are then documented. Chapter IV provides insights
into the socially constructed nature of the literacy explorations which were constructed by the focal children within literacy events. In Chapter IX, the findings of the study are summarized and discussed in light of other research.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The research design of this study is ethnographic from the perspective that it views the classroom as a subculture within the culture of schooling and acknowledges that the culture of "school" is embedded within the larger, overlapping cultures of community, society and world. In order to understand how the participants in this study perceive, believe, act and evaluate as they actively construct culture throughout daily life (Goodenough, 1976), the researcher became a participant observer (Spradley, 1980) in the classroom. The researcher utilized this ethnographic perspective so as to study the socially constructed and socially constrained reasons for everything that occurred in any event at any given time (Erickson, 1986). For this reason, all children in the classroom and their teacher were participants in the study. Five children (representative of the group) were selected as focal children in order to provide tracer units for indepth observations.

The researcher identified key and/or recurrent literacy explorations; described these literacy explorations in functional relational terms from an emic perspective; placed these literacy explorations in relation to the wider social contexts (literacy events) in which they occurred; and explored links to other literacy explorations. Data were triangulated on
an on-going basis, through formal and informal interviews and discussions with both the teacher and the students, observation of children as they explored literacy, collection of daily written work of the focal children in the study, audiotaping of literacy events and subsequent transcription, a dialogue journal (Staton & Shuy, 1987) kept by the teacher and the researcher, and informal conversations with parents and family members. Szwed (1981), in his classic piece entitled "The Ethnography of Literacy," presents the following challenge:

There is in this sort of study a need to keep literacy within the logic of the everyday lives of people; to avoid cutting these skills off from the conditions which affect them in direct and indirect ways; to shun needless abstractions and reductionist models; in short, to stay as close as possible to real cases, individual examples, in order to gain the strength of evidence that comes with being able to examine specific cases in great depth and complexity. (p. 20)

The children, the texts, and the social contexts as they were constructed were at the center of every piece of collected data, analysis and description.

Setting and Population of the Study

The Community

Lincoln Elementary School is located one block west of Main Street in the inner city of a midwestern city with a population of approximately 73,000. It is a diverse economic community, but is known mostly for its factories. Situated near the center of town, the population surrounding the school community is also varied. Lincoln Elementary School skirts the residential section of this portion of town to the south, west and east while facing a bakery, a pizza and ribs grill, and a beauty shop to
the north. Children from the surrounding residential section (houses, apartments and three low-income housing projects) attend Lincoln School.

The School

Lincoln Elementary School is a public elementary school, kindergarten through grade six. This school is part of a school system that serves approximately 20,000 children. There are five classrooms per grade level for grades 1-3 and four classrooms per grade level for grades 4-6. In addition, there are three Chapter I teachers, one Learning Disabilities teacher and eight paraprofessional aides. The school district's gifted and talented program is also housed at Lincoln School. Children are bused or driven in by parents to attend these special classes. Children who participate in the gifted and talented program are homogeneously grouped into their own classrooms and are not part of the regular classrooms at the school. Lincoln School has two social workers, as well as "special" teachers for physical education, vocal music, band and orchestra. Within the school year, enrollment at Lincoln School ranged from 570 to 609 students.

The academic year began on August 24, 1988 for the children. School began each day at 8:45 a.m. and ended at 3:00 p.m. Pupil progress reports were issued each nine weeks during the school year. Parent-teacher conferences were held at the end of the first and third reporting periods. In addition, teachers were free to make contact with parents at any other time throughout the year. Home visits (accompanied by a social worker or other school personnel) were encouraged.

The teachers at Lincoln School were making several transitions during the time of this study. Both the principal and the assistant principal
were new to the school. Staff had remained fairly stable, with the addition of three new teachers and several student teachers. Preservice teachers from a nearby private liberal arts college were involved in field experiences at Lincoln School during January through March.

The school building was designed to be flexible enough to accommodate both open space and traditional teaching philosophies. Teachers reflected a wide variety of perspectives. Most teachers leaned toward the provided curriculum of basal readers and content area textbooks and sought to supplement these materials in a variety of ways. Some teachers were moving toward developing literature-based curricula either in the content areas or in Language Arts.

The Classroom

Mrs. L's first grade classroom was located on the first floor of the school. It was a large room that had been divided into two first grade classrooms by a folding partition. Mrs. L's classroom occupied one half of this room and Mrs. G's first grade classroom was in the other half. The partition could never be completely closed, as there was only one doorway for both classrooms. All children had to pass through a portion of Mrs. G's room in order to enter or leave the room at any given time. This was the first year for Mrs. L to be in this particular classroom. Both she and Mrs. G agreed to work together as much as possible throughout the year. There were between 16 and 20 students on the attendance roster of each classroom at any given time throughout the year.

A traditional blackboard covered a large portion of the south wall of this attractively arranged classroom. Mrs. L's teacher's desk was located perpendicular to the blackboard and parallel to the west wall.
Two four-drawer filing cabinets and a bookshelf that housed teaching resources were against the west wall and behind Mrs. L's desk. Five circular tables were arranged in the front portion of the room, with four tables at each desk. Puppets, games, puzzles and other materials filled the shelves which lined the western wall beneath the radiator. A large display shelf which was brimming with books extended halfway across the northern wall, with an Author Center (book display and information about the author of the month) attractively arranged at children's eye level on top of a movable storage unit. Carpet squares highlighted the floor directly in front of the book display shelves. A sink and cupboard area filled the northeastern corner of the room from which the partition extended.

Figure 1 provides a map of the physical layout of the classroom on the first day of school. Throughout the year, the furniture remained in approximately the same locations. A variety of books and book displays were placed on the top shelves of bookcases, the chalkboard tray or any flat surface. Mrs. L and the children frequently arranged text sets of books around a theme or particular author on top of the radiator shelf. A Message Board/Art Center bookcase, Class Publication display unit, two bookcarts, record player, listening center, children's cubbies, circular book rack, overhead projector, cart for balls and lunch boxes, two children's desks, chart stand, and easel changed locations throughout the year depending upon the needs at that time.

Four or five children were generally seated at the round tables, although they were free to use student desks or the carpeted floor whenever the need arose. There were four windows in the classroom (two
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on the north wall and two on the south wall) which provided an abundance of natural lighting as well as opportunities for Mrs. L to add plants and pleasant curtains for a more "homey" atmosphere.

The Participants

All persons in this classroom (teacher, parent volunteers, third grade helpers, preservice teachers, high school helper, researcher and students) were considered to be participants in the study. Five children, however, were considered to be focal children within the study. These focal children were in the foreground of the study, framed against the background of the class as a whole. The class composition and background children (children in the class other than the focal children), the teacher, and the focal children will be described in the paragraphs that follow.

Class Composition and Background Children: Due to a Chapter I program in this school, all children were given a standardized test at the end of kindergarten which determined their placement in first grade for the following year. Children whose scores on this test comprised the lowest 20 percent of all the children's scores were automatically tracked into two Chapter I first grade classrooms where they received supplemental instruction from the Chapter I teacher. The remaining children were then assigned to one of three regular first grade classes. Mrs. L was the teacher of one of these regular classes.

The background children in this study came from diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds. The demographics of Lincoln School, in general, fluctuated more during the duration of this study than in previous years. This was partially due to renovations that took place in
the low-income housing projects where a large number of the children lived. People were asked to leave their housing units for periods of up to three months and were then invited to return once the renovations were completed.

Room 100A began the year with 18 children. Within two weeks, two children had been moved into the Chapter I classes in order to satisfy an enrollment requirement and one child had been moved from another first grade class to equalize the number of students in each regular first grade classroom. Table 1 shows the changes in composition that took place in Mrs. L's classroom over the four periods of data collection. The ethnic groups represented are: Anglo, Afro-American, Thai, and Appalachian. Eleven of the original 18 children remained in Mrs. L's classroom for the entire year. One child moved to California to live with her father for several months and then returned to Mrs. L's classroom for the duration of the year.

Focal Children: This ethnographic study focused on the focal children's construction of literacy explorations in Mrs. L's classroom. Due to the transient nature of the population within this school, complete data was collected on five children with the intent of presenting data on three of the children in the final report. Four of the children remained in the classroom for the entire year and data for all four of these children were represented in this report. Data for the child who left prior to the end of the year was included because she participated in the study until March and her contribution to the study was highly valued.
Table 1
Class Composition By Data Collection Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anglo</th>
<th>Afro American</th>
<th>Appalachian (a)</th>
<th>Thai</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) None of the original children in this category remained at the end of the year. This represents 5 different children.

Note: Twenty-four children were enrolled in Mrs. L's class during the year. At the end of the year, 11 children remained from the original group.

Children were selected as focal children in collaboration with Mrs. L on the basis of the following criteria:

1. They, as a group, represented the range of literacy knowledge exhibited within the class at the beginning of the year.
2. They represented diverse family backgrounds.
3. Their parents/guardians consented to the child's participation in all phases of the study.

The focal children in this study were Bobby, Candie, Elijah, Kenny and Krystal. A brief description of each child follows. Scores on formal measures are included in Appendix A. A brief description of each child's literacy behaviors during each phase of data collection is found in Appendix B.
Elijah lived approximately five blocks from the school with his mother, stepfather and younger brother. Both Elijah's father and mother worked outside the home. His mother's part-time job was flexible enough so that she could be at home when Elijah walked home from school. His mother took him to the library regularly and she frequently accompanied the class on field trips throughout the year. Elijah was Anglo.

Bobby's family was from Thailand. He was a middle child. His older brother was nine years old and his younger brother was three. Bobby spoke Thai at home. His mother and father both spoke English, but exhibited lack of confidence when it came to reading official materials that were sent home. Bobby's nine-year-old brother read and interpreted most of the "school" materials that Bobby took home. When they moved next door to Elijah mid-year, Bobby indicated that his older brother had read the lease and told his parents where to sign. Bobby was bilingual. He spoke English fluently and was reluctant to speak Thai at school. Bobby's parents both worked. Bobby walked to a babysitter's house after school. His mother accompanied the children to the Young Authors' Conference in the spring.

Candie lived two blocks from the school with her mother, stepfather and younger brother. She enjoyed reading books at home with her parents. Candie's mother changed part-time jobs several times throughout the course of the year. Her mother or her aunt were usually at home when Candie returned from school. Candie's mother helped to bind the children's published books and accompanied the class on field trips when her busy schedule permitted. Candie's father was offered a promotion during Phase II of the study. After considering the extra hours it would require, he
declined stating that he wanted to have enough time to be home with his family in the evenings. Candie went to the speech therapist at the school twice weekly in the mornings. Candie was Anglo.

Krystal lived in an apartment with her father and her younger sister approximately fifteen blocks from the school. Her mother had left the family during the summer prior to Krystal's entry into first grade. Krystal's father juggled his busy work schedule with the girls' school and babysitter schedules. Krystal often came to school by taxi, as her father had to leave for work early in the morning and needed enough time to get her younger sister to the babysitter or the grandmother's house. He made arrangements for Krystal to stay in Mrs. L's room during these times. He usually picked Krystal up on his way home from work at 3:45 p.m. which meant that she stayed forty-five minutes later than the rest of the children. In addition to his regular job, Krystal's father was a referee for the school district. Krystal and her sister sometimes accompanied him to the evening games. Krystal often talked about reading books she took home to her father and her sister. Because she was often in the classroom before and after school, Mrs. L invited her to be the class librarian. She took great pride in arranging and organizing book display shelves and was frequently called upon to locate a particular book during the school day. Krystal and her sister were taken by their mother toward the end of the year and their whereabouts were unknown for several weeks. Krystal completed the academic year in another city. She participated in the study from August through mid-March. Krystal was Afro-American.

Kenny lived with his mother and younger brother within walking distance of the school. His parents had separated at the end of Kenny's
kindergarten year and were going through divorce proceedings at the beginning of the study. Kenny and his brother stayed with their mother during the week and often spent the weekends with their father. Both sets of grandparents were quite involved in Kenny's life. Kenny's mother worked full-time, so Kenny walked to his babysitter's house after school and stayed there until her workday was complete. Kenny spent a great deal of time playing Nintendo at the babysitter's house. His mother read with him at home when she had time. Kenny was Anglo.

The Teacher: The study occurred during Mrs. L's third year of teaching. Her previous teaching experience was in first grade in this school. During the year of this study, Mrs. L developed and implemented a literature-based curriculum based on her whole language philosophy of teaching and learning. Content was presented in the context of thematic units which integrated all content areas with the exception of math. Math was, however, integrated whenever appropriate. Mrs. L was chosen as a collaborator in this study because of her whole language perspective, her commitment to using children's trade books and writing to teach reading, and her interest in learning more about the literacy development of the children she teaches. Mrs. L was Anglo.

Access and Role of the Researcher

Gaining Access

After a colleague suggested that both the teacher and the school seemed ideal for the proposed study, initial contact was made with Mrs. L. During a brief telephone conversation in March of 1988, she indicated her interest in pursuing the possibility of such an endeavour. A follow-
up visit to her classroom for an entire school day assured the researcher that Mrs. L's classroom was the type of setting which was optimum for the proposed study and gave Mrs. L an opportunity to experience having a participant observer in her classroom for one day. After the visit, both researcher and teacher agreed to begin talking with gatekeepers within the school setting. The key gatekeepers were identified: the principal, the assistant principal and the Assistant Director of Curriculum for the school district. Appropriate permissions were granted, and confirmation obtained when key administrators were re-assigned through the summer months.

Renegotiating Access

After every initial contact, the researcher sent a follow-up letter to all participants, thanking them for their interest and time. The researcher and Mrs. L met together throughout the summer, discussing Mrs. L's plans for the coming year, working out theoretical implications of her curriculum, and refining joint understandings of the study itself. Frequent telephone conversations between the collaborators kept them both apprised of any new developments in the "gaining access" phase. Both researcher and teacher gathered books and resources which they thought might prove helpful in the coming year. Mrs. L centralized these resources and utilized them when she felt they were appropriate.

The researcher and the teacher designated one afternoon each week (after school) to discuss issues that arose throughout the course of the year. Both collaborators were open to informal discussions at any other times, but felt that a specific time set aside for such discussion would most likely facilitate a more focused dialogue. Mrs. L kept a journal,
in which she discussed her feelings about participating in the research study and her perceptions of the literacy development of students in her classroom. This proved to be a valuable tool in continuing to renegotiate the social contract between teacher and researcher. Future meetings were then tailored to meet the needs of Mrs. L as well as the researcher. Mrs. G requested that she become part of the debriefing on a regular basis. Over time, this interaction seemed to move into directions that were not necessarily beneficial to the study. The researcher, therefore, agreed to meet with Mrs. G informally to discuss issues and interests of concern to her at her convenience.

Consistently, the researcher was visible to the administrators, teachers, and other staff of Lincoln School throughout the study. The principal was updated on a monthly basis. The researcher ate lunch regularly with teachers in the teachers' lounge and also provided resources for teachers upon request. Although the researcher did not participate in faculty meetings and other teacher functions, she was viewed by teachers and students as a part of the ongoing life of the school.

Participant Observation

The researcher negotiated the role of participant observer throughout the course of this study. This provided a great deal of flexibility as decisions were made in the field concerning the taking of field notes, informal and formal conversations with children, the drawing of maps, audiotaping, photocopying, and triangulating data in a variety of ways.

On the first day of school, Mrs. L asked the researcher to introduce herself to the children and tell them what she would be doing in their
classroom during that year. The researcher described her participation in the life of the classroom by stating that she "wanted to learn about how children learn to read and write" and that Mrs. L had assured her that "the children in her first grade classroom would show her many things about reading and writing."

She was a participant, in that children treated her as a special member of the classroom community. She was neither child nor teacher. In fact, when a new student became part of the class community during the second week of school, several children told him: "Oh, that lady's Mrs. Nussbaum. She's just trying to learn how to read and write!" Children described her to relatives and other classroom visitors as "a lady who just likes to watch kids a lot." The researcher participated in special classroom events such as parties and some field trips.

The literacy development of the children in this classroom was influenced by their interactions with the researcher as they read with her, to her, and talked about specific aspects of literacy. Children's literacy development was also indirectly influenced because of the discussions that took place between Mrs. L and the researcher after school and between data collection phases. The researcher entered the study with a strong commitment to interfering as little as possible with the course of events in this classroom. Yet she also felt that the teacher should feel that she was gaining something from the experience.

At the beginning of the year, Mrs. L did all of the planning and the researcher offered suggestions and ideas only when invited into the process by Mrs. L. As the year progressed, such planning became more collaborative. Both teacher and researcher brainstormed ideas for various
units and combined resources for use with the children. Mrs. L made final decisions as to what would take place on any given day. The researcher's input, however, helped to broaden the available options. For example, Mrs. L had not previously taught a unit on plants and benefited from the researcher's suggestions based on plant units she had developed when teaching third grade.

Discussions about literacy processes and the literacy development of specific children also emerged in much the same way. Mrs. L and the researcher shared their insights about various children and talked about ways of working to meet specific needs. Typed field notes of the previous day were available to Mrs. L during Phase I and Phase II. Field notes provided Mrs. L with a detailed description of the ongoing processes of the classroom culture as well as provided insights into the literacy development of the five focal children. Although the teacher and researcher talked a great deal, Mrs. L ultimately made all final decisions as to what would take place on any given day.

The dialogue between researcher and teacher served to inform them both in their respective roles. Mrs. L's honesty and thoughtful questions challenged the researcher to spend more time in triangulation with the children. The relationship between teacher and researcher was collaborative in nature. Although each had very specific roles, they saw them as mutually enhancing and acted accordingly.

To compensate Mrs. L for her time during the weekly meetings after school, the researcher frequently went to the library in search of books for use with a particular child or unit of study. She also purchased many books for use in the classroom. The researcher's responsibility, then,
lay not only in observing and recording what was taking place in the here and the now, but documenting the possible ways in which her participation impacted what took place.

The researcher worked to establish her role with the children as well as with Mrs. L. At the beginning of the year, the children tried to move her into the role of teacher. They asked her to help spell words when they were writing and invited her to intervene when discipline problems arose. She tried to be consistent in responding with: "My job is to listen, watch and write. Mrs. L is the teacher." For the most part, the children saw her as a learner and worked to help her gain new information. It was not unusual for a child to bring a written product to the researcher and say: "Let me show ya' how I did it!". They would invite her to observe and record their readings of favorite books and on some occasions would stop reading, look at the researcher and say: "Did ya' get all that down?"

In a few instances, the researcher was placed in the awkward position of violating her role. This caused a great deal of confusion for the children. For example, when the class was going as a group to the area-wide Young Authors' Conference on a Saturday morning, the researcher planned to accompany them on the trip. She arrived at the conference, notebook and tape recorder in hand, ready to document the experiences of specific children.

Because one of the parent helpers was unable to come at the last minute, the researcher was forced into the role of group leader. This meant that she was in charge of five children for the entire day. Naturally, Mrs. L gave her the group that was having the most difficulty
with control, as she felt that the researcher knew the children and could handle them. Suddenly, the children had to adjust to a new Mrs. Nussbaum. The person who had overlooked all their misbehavior in the classroom and had taken virtually no responsibility for anything in the classroom setting was making "teacher-like" demands on them at the conference! It was an extremely frustrating experience for the children and researcher alike. In fact, it took approximately three days for the children to allow her to return to the role of researcher upon re-entering the classroom setting the following week.

Both researcher and teacher talked a great deal about the anticipated unobtrusiveness of the researcher's participant observation. For the most part, children interacted with one another concerning their processes and products and included the researcher quite naturally in many of their conversations. Gordon, on the second day of school, looked at the researcher and made the following comment with a grin: "We worked really hard in kindergarten, too, last year, but we didn't have nobody bothering us all the time!" When asked if he minded having someone watch what he was doing and asking him questions, he proffered an emphatic "NO!" and asked to see what the researcher had written about him.

The researcher took Gordon's cue and asked Mrs. L to observe as she interacted with the children during the next several days so that she could ascertain if her interactions with the children were inhibiting their literacy explorations and their ability to work. After watching the class and individual instances where children talked with the researcher and reflecting upon these interactions, Mrs. L shared that she felt that the children were naturally inviting the researcher to become part of
their literacy explorations and that they considered her to be a peer in many ways. Mrs. L provided such feedback throughout the course of the year.

The most obtrusive aspect of the researcher's presence in the classroom had to do with audiotaping the children as they worked at their tables and when they came together as a large group at Story Floor. At the beginning of the year, children were intrigued with the buttons on the tape recorder and the microphones. They spent a great deal of time watching the tapes wind when they were supposed to be doing other things. In order to make the tape recorders less obtrusive, they were placed in shoeboxes which were covered with a wood-grain pattern of Contac paper. The microphones (which were flat squares) were placed on top of the shoeboxes. Children could not see the movement of the tapes or any other part of the tape recorders and the researcher was the only person permitted to open the lid. This new arrangement, coupled with an explanation of the situation by Mrs. L, solved the problem immediately. Children began to see the boxes as a natural part of their environment and turned their attention to other things.

**Time Frame for the Study**

Observations were made on a daily basis at four points in time during the academic year. Because Mrs. L taught through integrated thematic units, periods of data collection were coordinated with the beginning of a specific unit of study and ended with the culmination of that unit. Data collection included collecting and triangulating data for analysis during the interim between data collection periods. The researcher was
a participant observer in the classroom for the entire day during the data
collection period. Reading of related research occurred during all phases
of the study. The four data collection phases of the study are outlined
below.

**Phase I: August 25-September 20, 1988**

The researcher began data collection on the first day of school in
order to understand the social structure of the classroom (rules, norms,
etc.), as well as to begin to understand the diversity of literacy events
occurring over the course of the year. This period of time, which will
be referred to as the Exploratory Phase, was crucial in developing rapport
with all participants as the researcher established a participant
observer's role. During this phase, the researcher administered the
Letter Knowledge Task (Appendix C), the Ohio Word Test (Appendix D), and
conducted the Literacy Knowledge Interview (Appendix E) with all children
in Mrs. L's classroom. She attended a parent meeting and asked parents
to sign consent forms indicating their knowledge of the research and
consent to their child's involvement. By September 10, the researcher,
in consultation with Mrs. L had selected the five students who would be
focal children in this study. The literacy explorations of these students
were explored in depth throughout the remainder of this exploratory phase
and other subsequent data collection phases.

During Phase I, the children were involved in a mini-unit on nursery
rhymes and a unit on bears which lasted for three weeks. Throughout the
study, the researcher observed the children as they participated in daily
activities with the exception of recess, lunch, music, physical education,
and sometimes math.
Phase II: November 3-November 23, 1988

The researcher returned to the classroom at the beginning of a unit on trees/plants and collected data on a daily basis throughout the study. While observing focal children, she initiated discussions with them while they were engaged in literacy explorations or soon after they had completed a particular literacy exploration.

Although the researcher focused specifically on five children, all children were participants of the study and were treated as such. They all had tape recorders at their tables and the researcher took great care to show interest in everyone's activities. At the end of this phase, the researcher called each child individually out into the hallway and asked them to read to her and engage in writing activities. She conducted interviews of the five focal children at this time and also took Running Records (Clay, 1986) of their reading.

The researcher found that informal discussions with the children within the context of their real-life literacy explorations within the classroom setting were much more revealing than the formal interviews she conducted in the hallway. For this reason, most of the data reflected in this document stems from observations and dialogue with children while they were engaged in "literacy in action" within the classroom setting.

Phase III: January 24-March 10, 1989

The children were beginning a study of nutrition and community safety when the researcher returned to the classroom. Their study involved detailed comparisons of various versions of Little Red Riding Hood and much small group work with other texts. Two preservice teachers from a nearby college were involved in Mrs. L's classroom during this time. The
researcher collected data on a daily basis in the classroom setting throughout the unit in its entirety.

Phase IV: May 8, 1989-June 5, 1989

Upon the researcher's return to the classroom, the children participated in a study of the water cycle. This unit culminated on June 1, however data collection continued as children completed projects and helped Mrs. L pack boxes to be moved to the classroom in which she would teach the following year. There was a great deal of time for reflection as children explored their favorite books, talked about the authors they had "met", favorite books they themselves had written, and what they had learned during the year. Krystal, one of the focal children was not enrolled at the school during this time. On June 3, the researcher conducted interviews about reading and writing processes with small groups of children. She again found that their abilities to discuss metacognitive processes were facilitated when they were asked to reflect upon their actions, strategies and thinking while engaged in meaningful literacy activities within the classroom setting.

In between all phases of data collection, the researcher transcribed audiotapes and analyzed data. Contact was maintained with Mrs. L through informal telephone conversations and the dialogue journal. An overview of data analysis procedures is provided later in this chapter.

Research Techniques and Tools

Literacy explorations which occurred during data collection phases were recorded in the following ways:
Field Notes

The questions underlying the basis of this study, as well as the more focused questions that emerged, guided the researcher's decision-making process in selecting what to write down and how to organize data so that it could be analyzed with integrity at a later date. Throughout the course of the study, the researcher took handwritten field notes which focused on specific questions, explorations, or participants against the background of the larger classroom. These descriptive field notes (Corsaro, 1981) were organized chronologically, with special attention to routine literacy events and what occurred within those literacy events.

The following information was recorded on a daily basis:

1. Detailed descriptions of all observed literacy events. This included the texts that were written and read by, with and to the class as a whole and most small group activities.

2. Location and times of all literacy events.

3. Detailed descriptions of observed literacy explorations which involved focal children: with whom, with what literacy artifacts, where, when, how and for what purposes they were constructed.

4. Coding numbers for audiotapes. This included any audiotapes that were made while researcher was taking field notes as well as audiotapes that were made while researcher was observing another literacy exploration.

The right hand portion of field note paper was designated as a column entitled "notes to myself." This provided a separate place for methodological, theoretical and/or personal reflections that corresponded to the descriptive notes on the left hand portion of the page. Notes in this section included questions about a particular child's explorations; suggestions for further follow-up, observations, data needed or discussions with a child; correlations with other research studies;
reminders of "things to do"; references to previously observed literacy explorations; references to related research studies; lists of things to look at closely; and helpful ideas for Mrs. L if she asked for input.

The researcher followed the maxim of "if in doubt, write it down" (Hammersley and Atkinson, p. 150). Whenever writing field notes during an "event" was not possible, the researcher made detailed notes at a later time. The exploratory phase of this study allowed adequate opportunity to refine categories and procedures so that the content of fieldnotes reflected a learner's stance in seeking to understand the issues at hand.

**Literacy Artifacts**

The researcher kept a portfolio for each focal child which included a list, description, photograph or photocopy of everything the child read or wrote during an observed unit. The following literacy artifacts were included in the portfolio or documented in field notes: dated lists of texts with which the focal children interacted individually or with others (books, papers, poems, charts, environmental print, notes, personal writing, etc.); any writing which the child created (with accompanying field notes whenever possible), lists of writing utensils (pens, pencils, crayons, markers, types of paper) that children used, and a list of books which each focal child took home each night. The researcher also kept a list of all the possible texts with which the children had opportunity to interact within the classroom. Documentation of how these literacy artifacts were utilized in the literacy explorations of focal children and the class as a whole were noted in the descriptive field notes.
Audiotapes

Verbal interactions related to a wide variety of literacy explorations were audiotaped for later analysis and triangulation with field notes. A tape recorder was placed inside a shoebox and positioned at the center of each round table in the classroom at the beginning of each day. Tape recorders were activated at each table whenever children were working at their tables. When children were involved in literacy explorations outside the confines of their respective tables and their explorations warranted being audiotaped, the researcher moved the tape recorders to locations which would provide audible audiotapes and further documented the children's actions with field notes. Tape recorders were also available for children to read stories into at specific times throughout the day. Small group and whole group experiences were also audiotaped and complimented with field notes. Transcriptions were made of "promising" (Heap, 1986) audiotapes which were asterisked in the field notes and any other audiotapes that were considered to be helpful in seeking more information about a particular literacy explorations. Audiotapes without accompanying field notes were considered to be incomplete data and were not transcribed for purposes of this study.

Journals

The teacher kept a journal continuously throughout the course of the year. In this journal, she reflected upon her perceptions of individual children's literacy development, the nature of instruction and evaluation, and discussed issues of relevance to her at that particular time. The researcher responded to the journal entries, much like a dialogue journal (Staton & Shuy, 1987) and returned the journal to the teacher within two
days. This dialogue journal provided the researcher with a glimpse as to the teachers perceptions and the purposes that she had for facilitating various literacy explorations. The teacher's journal entries were not an essential part of the data collection for this study, but served as a way to assess the teacher's needs and her perceptions of individual students throughout the study. In many ways, this dialogue journal was a form of renegotiating access with Mrs. L.

The researcher periodically sent notes home (in a spiral bound notebook) to each child's family, sharing a few positive things that were noted about his/her literacy development. Each family was encouraged to respond by adding some insights as to what they had noticed about their child's literacy development at home (Baskwill, 1988) to the notebook. This means of communication seemed inappropriate for one child who was a focal child in the study. His parents did not feel comfortable in reading English, so the researcher recorded her message on an audiotape and sent one of the tape recorders home with this student. The family responded via audiotape as well.

Informal conversations and formal interviews

Informal conversations with participants (children, parents, teacher) prior to, during, and after specific literacy explorations were noted immediately following the dialogue. Many of these interactions were audiotaped. All formal interviews were taped and transcribed.

Because the formal interviews and formal tasks tended to evoke behaviors that were unlike the literacy behaviors of the children as they explored literacy within the classroom setting, they are not included in the data presented within this document. Children tended to move into a
"performance mode" when they were taken into the hallway and asked to read, write or talk about literacy. This artificial setting was not conducive to understanding more about the children's literacy explorations for purposes of this study.

**Photographs**

Literacy artifacts (books, graphs, charts, murals, etc.) were photographed in the classroom and hallway. Mrs. L requested that still photographs would not be taken of the children while they were working. The researcher honored this request throughout the course of the study and only took pictures of displays and literacy artifacts around the room and in the hallway. Toward the end of Phase IV, Mrs. L began taking photographs of the children while they were reading books independently and to one another.

**Data Analysis and Interpretation**

Data analysis began with the initial contact of Mrs. L and became part of the formulation and focusing of questions which informed the researcher's investigation in the classroom. This process of continual reflection, coupled with refinement of analysis procedures formed the grounded theory upon which the researcher acted when observing and triangulating data in the field setting, reflecting upon what occurred, and subsequently writing thick description from field notes. "Theory building and data collection are dialectically linked." (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983 p. 174)

Although the data collection techniques used by the researcher were the same throughout the course of the study, the data analysis procedures
changed in response to the questions asked and the reflections which the
data demanded. The following model represents data analysis as it
occurred in Phase I and Phase II of the study (Figure 2).

Figure 2
Data Analysis Procedures

Data was analyzed both within the field setting and outside the field
setting by:

1. **Identifying patterns and developing working hypotheses.** The
researcher began searching for and identifying consistent patterns in
field notes. These patterns led to the development of working hypotheses
which were tested and refined through further selective field observations
and triangulating data with Mrs. L or with the children themselves.
2. **Initiating selective field observations.** As specific foci emerged within the study, the researcher began to select specific activities, children and contexts for observation. These observations served as a vehicle for making decisions about the appropriateness of data collection procedures and subsequent observations in the field setting.

3. **Rewriting field notes as thick descriptions.** This process of rewriting took place on the same day or the day following collection of that data. This allowed the researcher to add to the descriptions accurately and to consider directions for selective field observations on the following day. These descriptive notes were triangulated with Mrs. L., who provided input as to the authenticity of what the researcher had recorder and also served as an important tool for renegotiating entry into her classroom during the first two phases of data collection.

4. **Triangulation of data with Mrs. L.** Mrs. L's input proved to be quite valuable as she shared her perceptions of observed events. This provided new insights as to working hypotheses and also had an impact on the decision-making process in regard to additional field observations.

5. **Triangulation of data with the children.** Whenever possible, data was triangulated with the children *in situ*—while they were engaged in the processes under exploration or when they appeared to be at a breaking point. At other times, it was necessary to talk with children about their participation in events which had taken place on the previous day. Such triangulation added to the researcher's understandings and often precipitated the emergence of new hypotheses which needed further reflection and investigation.
The types of data analysis described were not cyclical in nature in any sense of the word. Instead, they tended to ricochet from one to another; serving to inform the researcher and often proposing new directions. Such microsociolinguistic analysis (Corsaro, 1981) was rarely void of surprise.

During the interim between Phase II and Phase III, the researcher developed composites for each focal child. This was accomplished by merging all the data (description from the field and photocopies of collected artifacts) for all the literacy events in which each child had been involved. The composites of each focal child were then compared and contrasted with the composites from the other focal children. Data for each child was reviewed in order to ascertain whether data collection techniques were providing the researcher with complete pictures of each child and information which was necessary for answering the questions that guided the study (triangulation of data). Summaries, written during and at the end of each phase, were analyzed using a constant comparative method (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). The researcher also began developing typologies based on patterns that appeared to be emerging in the data from Phases I and II. This was done by using taxonomic analysis (Spradley, 1980). This analysis provided the researcher with the information needed to reformulate and refine research questions as needed and to plan for data collection and analysis during Phase III.

In Phases III and IV, the analysis procedures remained the same with the exception of the rewriting of field notes. Mrs. L was no longer interested in reading the field notes on a daily basis. She was, however, quite amenable to talking about the research findings on an informal basis
whenever she had time. These discussions (frequently guided by handwritten notes which the researcher had prepared) took the form of indefinite triangulation (Corsaro, 1981) in which discussions focused on past occurrences. The researcher continued to feed the process of theory generation with new material. The time that had previously been devoted to rewriting of field notes was transformed into a time of intense reflection on the immediate task at hand: to describe the culture of Mrs. L's classroom and to identify the cultural patterns and regularities within the processes of continuity and change. The researcher employed taxonomic analysis on new data, careful to compare it to other segments of data that were similarly categorized.

The interplay between data collection and taxonomic analysis during Phases III and Phases IV led to the discovery of categories for the ways in which the children used literacy in Mrs. L's classroom. These categories, referred to as functions and uses of literacy, paralleled the ways in which the inner city families who participated in Taylor and Dorsey-Gaines' study (Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988) used reading and writing. Taylor and Dorsey-Gaines elaborated on the categories that Heath (1983) had initially established in her study of the language development of children in two working-class communities and one mainstream community. Taylor (1983) subsequently expanded those categories in her study of literacy within the daily lives of suburban families. Because of the similarities between these three studies and the present study in regard to the ways that participants used literacy, the same categories were utilized and expanded for purposes of this study. The functions and uses of literacy in the classroom under study are briefly described in Chapter
4. Any references to such functions and uses of literacy in the following chapters correspond to the definitions and categories which were found in this study.

Data were entered onto a data base using categories that corresponded to topics of interest and emerging taxonomies. A pilot of this stage of analysis procedures included entering data from Phase IV and reflecting upon the capacities and constraints of this method of collapsing data. The data base categories were then modified, the format of the data base altered to meet the needs of the expanded categories, and data for each data phase (this included reentering Phase IV) were then entered using the modified categories and format. Each literacy exploration was recorded separately by: date, literacy event, primary literacy use, child/children involved in the exploration, literacy artifacts utilized, and links made (text-to-life, text-to-text, life-to-text). The books that focal children took home during each data collection phase were recorded and correlated with pertinent information regarding their explorations of that text during that day or preceding days. Portions of fieldnotes and transcripts were entered as a separate field entitled "notes."

Data were then sorted by various categories in order to provide a focused portrait of the ways in which children used literacy within each literacy event during each data collection phase. Other sorting configurations provided a focused look at specific texts over time, contexts in which children constructed literacy explorations, relationships between "bookhome" choices and experiences with those books within various literacy events, and links that children made both within and across literacy events. Data were also configured to provide an
abbreviated composite for each child within each data collection phase. Each literacy exploration was numbered with a corresponding key. Notes for each key were kept separate and referred to frequently when descriptive data was needed. Indexed fieldnotes were also referred to at this time. An example of sorted data is provided in Appendix F. Keyed notes are shown in Appendix G.

As noted in the preceding paragraphs, data analysis began long prior to entry into the field setting. This analysis and interpretation of data was a complex and continual process. The researcher continually strove to maintain an open acceptance of the behaviors of all members in the group being studied. Data that were obtained pertaining to each literacy event was related to existing knowledge about other components of the whole of this literacy community. Data analysis was reworked, modified, edited and subsequently transformed into a linear argument for this context of presentation.

**Summary**

This study was designed to investigate the nature of children's literacy explorations in a first grade inner-city classroom where the children were immersed in a print-rich environment and were encouraged to engage in explorations of literacy on a daily basis. An ethnographic perspective guided the formation of the study and sculpted the subtle transformations that occurred along the way. Five children, representative of the class as a whole, were selected as focal children who remained in the foreground of the study throughout the year. The
teacher and other children in the class (background children) were also participants in the study.

Data were collected on a daily basis at four points in time during the year. These data collection phases corresponded with the beginning of four thematic units and ended with the culmination of these units. The researcher employed the following ethnographic techniques and tools in collecting and recording data: field notes, collection of literacy artifacts and documentation of the material culture, audiotapes, dialogue journals with the teacher and parents, informal conversations, formal interviews, and photographs.

Data analysis occurred simultaneously with negotiating access, initial entry into the classroom, renegotiating access, re-entry into the field, and subsequent analysis outside the field setting. The researcher employed constant comparative analysis and taxonomic analysis throughout the entire study. Typologies were continually refined and data was entered onto a data base and then foregrounded against the rich description of field notes.

Descriptive data of literacy events as they were initiated and negotiated at the beginning of the year is included in Chapter IV. In addition, the ways in which those literacy events were transformed by the participants in the study are compared and contrasted using a form of progressive disclosure. Chapter V presents an analysis of the ways in which children constructed literacy explorations and provides a discussion of possible phenomena that impacted these investigations. A summary of findings from this study is reported in Chapter VI along with implications and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER IV
CREATING STRUCTURES FOR EXPLORING LITERACY

Introduction

An understanding of the nature of the literacy events within which children explored literacy in this classroom is necessary at the macro level prior to identifying the ways in which the focal children explored literacy within these events at the micro level. This chapter begins with a series of realist tales (Van Maanen, 1988) as a means of providing an overview of routine literacy events in the classroom under study. These realist tales are third person accounts which attempt to describe minute details among the everyday lives of the people studied and have been triangulated with the native's point of view. The presentation then takes on the form of critical tale (Van Maanen, 1988) as the changes occurring within literacy events are identified, compared and contrasted. Such critical tales seek to shed light on larger social, political and symbolic issues.

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section describes data analysis and interpretation to provide the reader with a focused presentation of the evolution of data from field notes, artifacts and transcripts to the final form of presentation. The second section focuses on the ontogenesis of literacy events during Phase I. Because most of the routine literacy events originated at the onset of developing
a literacy community in this classroom, a detailed description of the ways in which the teacher and children worked together to establish and reestablish the participant structures of each literacy event will be included. Section three provides a description of the functions and uses of literacy which were observed in this literacy community. This discussion leads to the fourth section, "The Metamorphosis of Routine Literacy Events Across Time," and describes the changes which occurred over time with respect to three key aspects of life in Room 100A which emerged: 1) functions and uses of literacy; 2) the children's interactions with one another and with texts; and 3) Mrs. L's role as participant.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Although an overview of data analysis and interpretation was provided in Chapter III, a more detailed description of the microanalysis is presented in this section. Because the analysis evolved through a series of stages (which overlapped somewhat), such stages will be highlighted in the following paragraphs.

Stage 1. During Phase I, the researcher identified consistent patterns through analysis of field notes and selective audiotape transcriptions. Hypotheses based on these patterns were generated, tested in the field, triangulated with other raw data and refined accordingly. This set the stage for reactive field entry (Corsaro, 1981) in which the researcher utilizes data collected at one phase to inform subsequent collection and analysis of data in latter phases. Routine literacy events were identified and changing patterns documented. Within each data collection phase the researcher developed summary descriptions of each
literacy event. These summaries were compared and contrasted and appear in narrative form in this document.

Stage 2. After identifying five focal children who are foregrounded in this study, the researcher developed composites for each child. Patterns which were child-specific were identified and triangulated with both teacher and child in the field setting. The researcher continued to develop composites and note changes in children's literacy explorations throughout the course of the year.

Stage 3. Functions and uses of literacy, children's interactions with one another and texts, and Mrs. L's role as a participant emerged as critical areas for microanalysis. Functions and uses of literacy were tallied by child and by literacy event for all four data collection phases. Differences across children, across literacy events, and across data collection phases were noted. A discussion of the children's uses of literacy across literacy events over time is included in this chapter. The nature of children's interactions with one another and with texts was also followed across time. Field notes, coupled with transcriptions of audiotapes, provided raw data for use in taxonomic analysis. The data will be presented in broad categories for purposes of this document. Mrs. L's role as participant emerged as a category early in the study, much to the surprise of the researcher who had intended to focus solely on the children. Mrs. L's participation in all literacy events became a category which was summarized and highlighted during Phase II, III and IV.

Stage 4. Data were sorted so that the researcher could follow each focal child, literacy event, function and use of literacy and specific texts over the course of the year in its entirety. Typologies which were
identified in the field setting concerning the nature of children's literacy explorations were followed throughout the course of the year. Those elements of most importance to the present study were examined using keyed notes, transcripts, and going back to raw data for clarification and triangulation.

Data presentation will be narrative in form because of the descriptive nature of the study. Tables, figures, transcripts and excerpts from field notes are provided as tools for helping the reader focus on specific information or to clarify and extend the narrative.

The Ontogenesis of Literacy Events During Phase I

From the beginning of the year, Mrs. L took great care to provide children with a multitude of experiences in which they could explore literacy in a variety of ways. These experiences became routine literacy events as they reoccurred daily over time. Math, although considered to be a literacy event, was not observed for purposes of this study.

Throughout the course of the year, both teacher and children negotiated the ways in which literacy events could be constructed. As Mrs. L observed and interacted with the children, she made moment-by-moment decisions concerning children's needs as a group and as individuals and responded accordingly. Rules for who could do what, where, when, with whom, in what ways and for what purposes changed as Mrs. L allowed the children to show her what they needed to know and how it might best be learned. She sanctioned specific activities and behaviors within particular literacy events and expressed disapproval when she felt that the activity was taking away from children's growth as literacy
apprentices. She altered her own behavior when she felt that she was "doing too much" or "not enough" in supporting children's literacy explorations. The structure of specific literacy events changed continually as children and teacher alike participated in and negotiated the dynamic life of this on-going classroom culture. A description of this negotiation is presented for each literacy event as they were observed at the beginning of the year.

Arrival Time

Arrival Time provided Mrs. L with the opportunity to greet children as they entered the room, help them find their seats, and take attendance and lunch count on a daily basis. The children used this time to return books they had taken home on the previous day and to make decisions about the books they wanted to take home in the afternoon.

During the first few weeks of school, Mrs. L greeted the children when they arrived each day. On the first three days of school (Wednesday through Friday, half days), children arrived "in mass", as the teachers on duty had instructed them to line up by class so that they could enter the school building in lines. Upon entry into the classroom, Mrs. L helped the children find their seats at the five round tables by locating their names which were attractively displayed on namecards and taped to the back of their chairs. Once she had observed that children could recognize their own names, Mrs. L removed the namecards from their chairs and used their journals to designate seating arrangements for any given day. She changed the seating arrangement frequently so that children would learn to know one another and would benefit from working with a wide variety of their peers.
As children straggled in (they were not required to enter the building as a class after the third day), they established a comfortable routine. Mrs. L was frequently involved in last minute preparation or talking with another teacher or child when they entered. The children would put their lunch boxes on the lunch cart, return any balls to the ball box, return the books they had checked out to take home, check out a new book to take home, and find their seats by locating the journal with their name on it. Returning books involved taking the book's card from their envelope at the library chart, placing it in the pocket at the back of the book, and returning it to the shelf.

Children were quite excited about taking books home, and frequently "snatched up" a book to take home at the beginning of the day. They looked at books while returning the book that they had taken home the previous day, and often made their "bookhome" selections at that time. It was not unusual for a child to change his/her bookhome selection three or four times during the course of a day. Mrs. L always gave them time to choose books to take home at the end of the day, but children tended to reserve their books at the onset of the day during Phase I.

Many children wanted to be sure to "stake their claim" early in the morning so that the cherished treasure would be theirs to retrieve when it was time to go home. In fact, Kenny was so concerned that Bears Live Here (Eberle, 1966) remain in his possession that he brought it to school for five days, but kept it in his backpack. Kenny told Mrs. L: "I need Bears Live Here for three more days so me and my mom can finish it. My mom has been having trouble finding time to read it to me...but I've been going through and looking at the pictures myself. Is that okay?"
Mrs. L thanked Kenny for being responsible with the class' book, and assured him that he could keep it for as long as he needed it. She did not want him to bring it back each day because she planned to use that particular text in the Bear unit which was scheduled to start in a few days.

When children were seated at the appropriate tables, Mrs. L would call the roll and take the lunch count. New students were introduced and welcomed during this time and seated next to a special friend who was commissioned to explain the classroom "happenings" throughout the course of the day.

Mrs. L sometimes initiated discussions about the proper care of books taken home during this time. When Toya tearfully brought forth a rather soggy, torn and chewed Little Red Riding Hood (Galdone, 1974) and explained that her "little sister chewed on it this morning," Mrs. L asked the children for suggestions about where to keep books if they have little brothers or sisters. The conversation immediately turned to pets, and children talked about protecting their books from animals, younger siblings, and parents that misplace things. Once such "classroom business" had been taken care of, Mrs. L then guided children into the next routine literacy event: Journaling.

**Journaling**

As mentioned previously, each child had a journal that was placed at a location to signal his/her seat for the day. The journals were constructed of approximately 25 blank, unlined white pages stapled together with colored paper as the front and back covers. The front cover had a picture or a message on it that was connected in some way to the
unit of study. For September, the journal cover had a picture of a bear on it. Children were to write their names in the blank beside the word "Author."

When Mrs. L introduced journaling on the first day of school, she invited children to copy the date from the board onto the top of the page and then write a message. Many children asked if they could get their crayons to draw. Mrs. L told them that they could draw AFTER they wrote their messages and she circulated around the room, supporting and encouraging children as they worked. Many children opted to draw with their pencils despite the teacher's instructions.

Candie, however, was caught in a dilemma. She knew enough about "doing school" to know that she should do whatever the teacher asked her to do. But her knowledge of writing and writing conventions told her that she was NOT a writer. Candie quietly took Mrs. L aside and explained: "I can't write yet. We didn't do that in kindergarten." Mrs. L, responding to Candie's tear-stained face and the comments of other children as they struggled to follow her instructions, invited children to "pretend" they could write. This suggestion prompted the creation of the breakthrough journal entry which impacted the course of classroom events during journaling in the coming days.

Chancy, who had been working on an elaborate picture of a boy walking near some flowers with a huge sun hovering overhead, wrote "SD" at the top of his journal page. Mrs. L happened to be walking by at that moment. She let out a gleeful squeal and said (for all to hear): "I can read that! It says: 'Sunny day'!" The children stopped writing and celebrated
this "moment in the sun" with Chancy. He proudly showed his journal entry to all who wanted to see it during the next several days.

In reflection of this experience and experiences on following days, Mrs. L realized that the illustrations enabled her to read their texts and that, for Chancy (as well as many of the children), the picture was a critical part of the message. Several days later, Mrs. L invited children to keep their crayons at their tables so they could draw WHILE they were journaling. This provided them with the option of drawing before, during or after writing the message as well as not drawing at all.

During the following two weeks of school, Mrs. L provided children with a wide variety of experiences with writing journal entries. During journaling, she modeled how to write entries through shared writing of journal entries on the board. She taught children to "stretch out the words like a rubber band" (Clay, 1986) and to write what they could hear. They talked a great deal about WHO journals were for (themselves), WHAT they could write about (things that are happening at home or at school), and HOW to write (stretch out the words). Candie, who had initially expressed that she didn't know how to write, progressed from "Sunny Day" entries to writing entries which looked like Alpha Time cards (which she had experienced in kindergarten) to writing in cursive-like script (like Chrystal who was at her table for three days). On the tenth day of school, Candie began to talk with her peers about stretching out words as they supported one another in creating their entries. Examples of Candie's journal entries are provided in the figure below (Figure 3).

Most children tended to draw prior to writing during Phase I. For the most part, detailed illustrations played significant roles in the
children's journal entries. Children at the same table frequently wrote about the same topic. There was a great deal copying of environmental print such as color words from the colors chart or crayons and using other children's namecards as they included them in their entries. Some children wrote using words they already knew such as: "I like..." Writing during journaling time appeared to be laborious for many of the children, and quite comfortable for others.

Mrs. L was quite involved in supporting and affirming children as they created their entries during this phase. She read each child's message daily as she moved around the room, stretching out words with children, observing, and interacting with them as they worked. Mrs. L spent a great deal of time thinking about the placement of children at their tables. She wanted children to become independent from her support during journaling as well as during other literacy experiences in which
they were engaged at their tables. She also knew that several children still needed a great deal of support during such experiences. Mrs. L worked to be sure that the configuration of children at each table was balanced so that they could all learn from and support each another.

After the first two weeks of school, Mrs. L told children that they could begin working on their journals once they were at their seats. She no longer signalled a formal "beginning" to journaling time. Thus, journaling became a part of Arrival Time—as natural and fluid as returning books that were taken home the night before. In fact, children sometimes wrote in their journals before returning their books. It was not unusual to see a child back by the book display shelves, quickly savoring a last "read" before giving the book a pat and returning it to its appropriate place. Although Mrs. L supported children as they stretched out words, affirmed their efforts and responded to the content of their "messages" (both illustrations and writing), she considered that the interactions between children and "text" as they worked independently and together at their tables was the guiding force behind what they learned about the forms and functions of written language and one another's worlds during Journaling.

Mrs. L's Message on the Board

When it appeared that children were finished with their journals, Mrs. L would initiate a Shared Reading of the message which she had written on the board. This message was usually two to four lines long, often was accompanied by pictures which supported the text, and had something to do with the unit of study or what would be happening during the day. (See Figure 4)
Most of the time, the message was on the board when the children arrived. There were, however, a few instances when Mrs. L wrote the message while the children were journaling. It was not unusual for children to stop working on their journals to watch as the teacher wrote the message on the board. This provided them with opportunities to observe a fluent writer "in action."

During Phase I, the following routine was established. Mrs. L would lead the children in a whole class Shared Reading of the message. She would point to each word (1:1 pointing) as the class read, using a pointer so that her body would not obstruct their view. Children generally engaged in mumble reading (Doake, 1985) along with Mrs. L. There was much modeling by Mrs. L as she talked to children about reading from left to right, top to bottom, return sweep, making predictions about what might be next, using the pictures to help get the meaning, and sound-symbol relationships (especially initial and final consonant sounds) between their predications and what was written on the board.

Mrs. L was consciously directing children's attention toward specific aspects of print and making explicit specific strategies that good readers use when reading. She would then lead the children in one or two more Shared Reading experiences with the message on the board, often fading out when it appeared that children were able to read it chorally without her rather directive guidance.
Schedule on the Board

Immediately after guiding children through the reading of her daily message, Mrs. L moved them into a Shared Reading of the daily schedule. Children relied on the schedule to help them know what they would be doing during the day as well as (and most importantly from the children's perspectives) keeping track of recesses and lunch. They frequently marked off the activity by drawing a line through it when they had completed that particular event. The following portion of a transcript is indicative of what generally took place during a Shared Reading of the schedule during Phase I.

On the board:

1. Journal
2. Reading
3. Recess
4. Reading
5. Free Reading
6. Lunch
7. Recess
8. Nursery Rhymes
9. Math
10. Recess
11. Story Floor

Mrs. L: Let's look at the schedule for today. What do you think number one might be? (pause) It starts with a J.

Chin: Journal!

Mrs. L: What about number 2? It starts with an R. (pause) What do we usually do after we're done with our journals?

Chin: Reading

Mrs. L: That's right. Now, what's next? (points to number 3 on board) This one starts with an R, too. Rreeeeeee---

Elijah: Recess!

Mrs. L: Yeah. Let's look at all the times we have recess today. I wrote recess in green so you'd know when it was coming up. See where they are? (shows
children by pointing to each green recess) How many do you have today?

Chln: Three!

Mrs. L: Three recesses, cuz it's your first full day of school.

(Mrs. L continues going through each event item by item. Children know Recess whenever they come to it and they also recognize Lunch.)

Mrs. L used colored chalk and underlining to help children with difficult words at the beginning of Phase I. Near the end of Phase I, she stopped doing this. One day Brandon noticed that there were no "green" words on the schedule for the day. He marched up to Mrs. L during Journaling, assumed his typical "fight" stance and indignantly queried: "Ya mean we don't have no recesses today?" Mrs. L smiled and asked Brandon if he had REALLY read the board. He looked at her sheepishly and responded: "All I saw was there was no green words up there today." Mrs. L suggested that he take another look at the schedule. With Kevin's help, he located the precious word at three different places on the schedule. A noticeably relieved Brandon sighed and remarked: "It'd be a lot easier for everybody if ya'd just keep it in green." Mrs. L smiled and placed her arm around Brandon's right shoulder. "You don't need the green anymore, Brandon." And indeed, he didn't!

Children were free to ask questions about the schedule and Mrs. L's spelling of the words that were written on the board. Mrs. L paid a great deal of attention to beginning and ending sounds during their Shared Readings. Kenny wanted to know why "Writing" didn't start with an "R" like "Reading" did. They talked about silent letters as well as blends and chunks as new points of interest emerged.
Mrs. L was free to direct children's attention toward specific aspects of print as well. She had been noticing that children weren't leaving spaces in between words during their writing in other literacy events, and used the schedule to discuss this with them. On the schedule, she had written: "Reading Bear Facts" which referred to a chart they were making at Story Floor. They were in the process of documenting facts about bears that they were learning while reading Bears Live Here and exploring other "reality" books about bears from home and school. The following exploration occurred.

Mrs. L: When do you leave spaces when you're writing?

Kenneth: Anytime you want.

Kenny: In between words.

Mrs. L: Well, let's see...uh, Gordon. Think of a sentence for me.

Gordon: I'm trying to think.

Mrs. L: Okay. Everybody...help me write it. (Children offer letters for Mrs. L to write. She writes all the letters in one long string.)<On board: I'mt>

Chancy: You need a little room.

Mrs. L: (Erases the t and uses two fingers to make a space. Continues writing letters the children tell her.)<On board: I'm tren to> Okay...I'm trying--

Children: No! Leave a space!

Mrs. L: (Shakes her head as if she's really stumped.)<On board: I'm tren to> Think. What should I put for think?

Children: F...

Mrs. L: Mmm...say fish...and think. Are they the same? (Children say fish and think.) Your tongue is in the same place when you start them but fish starts with f and think...there are two letters that make that sound.
Whenever a new word or event was on the board, Mrs. L asked the children to make predictions about what they "thought" it might be and she gave them hints to help them figure it out. She also used this literacy event to remind children about her expectations during a particular activity. For example, when going through the schedule during the middle part of Phase I, Mrs. L asked the children why they thought she underlined READING in free reading. They had been discussing the differences between free play and free reading during and after free reading, as some children were exhibiting "play time" behavior during this portion of the day. One child responded: "Because it's reading time, not play time."

Children relied heavily on the schedule throughout the course of the day to serve as a "countdown" to recesses and lunch. Mrs. L would choose a child or two to "mark off" (put a line through) the things they had already completed. While children were making the transition from one
literacy event to the next, they would frequently remark: "Only two more things until recess" or "This is the last thing and then comes lunch!". Kenny was particularly concerned that Mrs. L make sure that someone marked off each activity immediately after it occurred. He would frequently remind her to have someone "do the schedule" or would volunteer to "mark off" several events long after they were completed.

Kenny, as well as three other children, monitored the schedule quite closely. In fact, there was one instance in Phase I where Mrs. L had decided NOT to put the schedule on the board for one day. During journaling, Kevin announced to the class that he didn't see a schedule on the board and they suggested that Mrs. L do something about it. (She had violated a social norm by not following the structures that she had initiated!) She invited the children to stop journaling for a few minutes and the entire class participated in a Shared Writing of the schedule for that day. Mrs. L invited children to tell her the letters they heard, and she wrote them where they belonged and filled in other letters for them. This is typical of one way she structured Shared Writing experiences in the early part of the year. During this Shared Writing, Mrs. L directed children's attention to beginning sounds, long vowel sounds, and -ing chunks. Figure 5 shows what the board looked like following this exploration. The underlined letters are the letters that the children told the teacher that they heard. The abundance of "ing" words provided a natural context for the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Journaling</th>
<th></th>
<th>Recess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fire Drill</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Recess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Free Reading</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Story Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5
Shared Writing of the Schedule
discussion of "ing chunks" in the context of text which had meaning from
the perspectives of the children.

Experiences with discussing, reading and referring to the schedule
on a daily basis provided children with a firm foundation for many of
their subsequent experiences with literacy during Phase I. It is
important to note, however, that although the interactions between the
children and Mrs. L served to focus attention on specific strategies and
aspects of print, what each child actually attended to and took away with
them varied from child to child. There was, in each interaction,
something for everyone.

**Story Floor**

At the beginning of the year, Mrs. L used Story Floor for a variety
of purposes. Story Floor was the place where children gathered as a group
to discuss books and things they were learning within the unit of study.
Story Floor was located in the back northwest corner of the room, near the
book display shelves. In many ways, Story Floor could be considered the
place where the "thought collective" (Dyson, 1989) of the entire group
could be shared and expanded upon. When children came to Story Floor,
they expected to be involved in a "meeting of the minds." They talked
about familiar and new texts, compared various versions of *Goldilocks and
the Three Bears* (Galdone, 1973; Cauley, 1982; Watts, 1984; Brett, 1987),
learned about various authors, discussed the style of the Author of the
Month, participated in Shared Book Experiences with big books, were
involved in Shared Reading and Shared Writing experiences, participated
in choral readings of poems, rhymes and chants (texts were written on
large charts), retold stories using sequence pictures, played games,
discussed classroom rules and planned what they would do in the next literacy event. Story Floor was both a place and an event in which a multitude of literacy events occurred. The literacy events which were housed within the larger event of Story Floor are described in the following paragraphs.

Introduction of New Texts: When introducing a new text, Mrs. L established the following routine. She would show the cover of the book and read the title, asking the children to predict what they thought it might be about. Children freely shared their predictions and often interacted with one another about WHY they thought what they had shared. The phrase "What's your evidence?" became a common question as the teacher explored ideas about books with children and as they shared their ideas with one another in this setting. After making predictions about the content of the new book, Mrs. L would read the cover again; this time drawing attention to the name of both author and illustrator or author-illustrator. She would then proceed through the text, reading both the title page and dedication page before beginning the story. For the most part, children were free to ask questions and share ideas as Mrs. L was reading. This would be similar to interactive storybook reading as described by Teale and Sulzby (1986). Mrs. L frequently paused when reading books with patterned language and recurring refrains to let the children join in. After reading the book, Mrs. L would invite children to talk about the content and share what they especially liked about the book.

Frequently, children would ask Mrs. L to read the book again. Her response to this usually depended upon the type of book, length of time
children had already been at Story Floor and how it fit in with her plans for the time that remained. She often would happily begin the story again, starting with the cover, title page, dedication page and then moving into the text. The second reading of the book was more like a Read Aloud, with Mrs. L pausing only to confirm someone's earlier prediction or to invite children to join with her on predictable refrains. Children frequently noticed more details during these rereadings, and Mrs. L was usually quite interested in hearing about their discoveries.

Rereading of Familiar Texts: Children also participated in the rereading of familiar texts during Story Floor. Because the class met at Story Floor on the average of three times a day, there were many occasions where children requested that Mrs. L revisit a text that had been introduced on a previous day. She would open this segment of Story Floor by inviting a child to choose a "familiar" book to revisit. This typically culminated in the rereading of at least two or three more familiar books as well. The children enthusiastically "entered into" these rereadings by joining Mrs. L on portions of text that were rhythmic and predictably patterned. In fact, children's choices reflected their interest in participating in the rereading of familiar texts. Although they frequently referred to books such as Jumanji and A Weekend with Wendell as "favorite" books, they were rarely requested when Mrs. L invited a child to choose a familiar text to revisit during "familiar reading" at Story Floor. The books that they chose most frequently were patterned texts such as If You Give a Mouse a Cookie, I Was Walking Down the Road, Dear Zoo, The Very Busy Spider, Incy Wincy, King Bidgood's in the Bathtub, The Napping House, and Why Can't I Fly? A list of the texts
that were introduced and the frequency of their rereadings by Mrs. L at Story Floor and by the focal children themselves is included in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Introduced at Story Floor</th>
<th>Rereadings at Story Floor</th>
<th>Bobby</th>
<th>Candie</th>
<th>Elijah</th>
<th>Kenny</th>
<th>Krystal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown Bear</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Bear Class Book</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bears Live Here</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caps for Sale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious George Rides a Bike</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text on Charts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookie's Week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dear Zoo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heckedy Peg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have You Seen My Cat?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incy Wincy Spider</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Was Walking Down the Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If You Give a Mouse a Cookie</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jump Frog Jump</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumpanji</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Bidgood's in the Bathtub</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label's Big Book</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Red Riding Hood (Hyman)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once Around the Block</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peanut Butter and Jelly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papa Please Give Me the Moon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosie's Walk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Eggs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Little Monsters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Hungry Bear</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Grouchy Ladybug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Little Pig</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Napping House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Three Bears (Ainsworth)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Three Bears (Galdone)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Three Bears (Hyman)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Three Bears (Watts)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Very Busy Spider</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Very Hungry Caterpillar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Z Was Zapped</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why Can't I Fly?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where the Wild Things Are</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where's Spot?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shared Book Experiences: During Phase I, children participated in
Shared Book Experiences with a variety of big books. These experiences
were analogous to Mrs. L's introduction of new texts and her subsequent
revisiting of familiar texts and paralleled children's "contribute what
you can" experiences during the reading of the daily message and the
schedule. Big books provided the teacher with an opportunity to model
early strategies (left-to-right, top-to-bottom, return sweep, 1:1
pointing, etc.), while making and confirming/disconfirming each other's
predictions as they used graphophonic, syntactic and semantic cuing
systems to "make meaning" within the context of the stories. After
reading the big books together as a group, Mrs. L often provided each
child with a copy of that trade book to explore individually or with a
peer as the group practiced reading together. Sometimes she invited
children to practice pointing during these explorations. At other times,
she invited children to "partner read," with each child contributing
whatever he/she could to the reading of the text. At other times, the
entire class would read the texts chorally, with Mrs. L modeling pointing
and return sweep on the big book while the children read from the trade
books she had given them.

The children noticed a great deal about the organization of specific
texts during these explorations, and often asked questions about the
things they were noticing. For example, when participating in a Shared
Reading of *I Was Walking Down the Road* (Barchas, 1975) on the fourth day
of school, an encounter with the word "wheelbarrow" provided a nice
opportunity for discussion. Some children insisted that it had to be a
wagon because the illustration looked like a wagon. As most inner city
children have had more experiences with wagons than wheelbarrows, this was a valid assumption. Mrs. L affirmed children for using the illustrations to help "make meaning" while reading this text. Kenny, however, was at a different point in his own thinking about how to approach texts. He looked at the print and surmised: "It can't be a wagon, cuz wagon's got a 'n' at the end of it!" Mrs. L invited the class to think about Kenny's suggestion. Chrystal offered: "Wheelbarrow sounds like a long word and this one is long, too!" After thinking about and discussing the two words, the children decided that Kenny had a good point. It must be "wheelbarrow."

Shared Writing: Children also had opportunities to participate in Shared Writing experiences as they created Story Maps of various texts, kept lists of facts about bears, expressed their preferences during a porridge tasting party, made a list of questions that they decided would guide their focus when exploring various "Three Bears" books, and planned for the creation of comparison charts and Story Maps of these versions. The ways in which Mrs. L structured Shared Writing Experiences varied, depending upon her assessment of children's needs and her purposes at that point in time. Mrs. L would typically invite children to "give her letters" for specific words as she wrote. She would sometimes write their invented spellings exactly as they gave them to her, and at other times she would incorporate the letters they gave into conventional spelling as she wrote. She never asked the children to provide all the letters for all the words, but provided them with opportunities to contribute what they did know as they actively participated in the experience. Sometimes she invited children to come up and write the word on a chart, using
invented spelling or soliciting suggestions from the group. There were a few occasions when Mrs. L accepted the letters that children contributed, and asked the group to stretch them out and listen carefully for more sounds. Much of what happened during Shared Writing at Story Floor depended upon the purpose of the experience, the children's interaction throughout the experience, and the goals which Mrs. L had identified for the group at that particular point in time.

Story Floor, then, provided all children with multiple ways of observing "literacy in action." They were immersed in an environment that was rich with print and where the teacher encouraged them to use literacy for ways which paralleled the ways in which "literate others" use literacy in the world outside the classroom. They were encouraged to become part of experiences where people use literacy not only to exhibit knowledge, but to learn new things—new things about life, literature and literacy. Story Floor was a place where they could broaden their expanding notions of literature and literacy through observing demonstrations provided by a literate other and engaging in meaningful and supported literacy activities.

**Literature Extensions**

Literature extensions were a natural outgrowth of Story Floor, in which the discussions and explorations of literature and literacy "spilled over" into children's responses to texts. During Phase I, most literature extensions involved the whole group in one specific activity such as creating a class alternative text of *Brown Bear, Brown Bear* (Martin, 1983), making individual alternative texts of *Brown Bear, Brown Bear, Cookie's Week* (Ward, 1988) and other predictable books, creating a mural-
sized story map of Rosie's Walk (Hutchins, 1968), adding conversation
bubbles to Rosie's Walk big book and contributing to class story maps of
other texts which were introduced at Story Floor. During the Bear unit,
children made story maps of various Three Bears versions, created
comparison charts of various versions, wrote examples of the most amazing
bear facts they had learned, made Peanut Butter bears for Parent Night,
created Where's Goldilocks? posters; and made bear masks to aid in
reenacting the three bears stories at home.

All literature extensions were tied to books that the group had
experienced as a whole. Many of them were designed as part of the
thematic unit of study or as a way to get the children "back into" the
texts which they had been exploring as a group. Multiple copies of texts
were available to the children as they reread and scanned through them in
order to seek new information, confirm facts, or create new versions.
Literature extensions generally took place following Story Floor two times
during the day. Mrs. L scheduled the last Story Floor of the day so that
she could introduce new texts, and reread familiar texts immediately prior
to the children's movement into Free Reading.

Free Reading

Free Reading was a time where children could explore any of the texts
in the room independently or with others. Children were "free" to explore
big books, trade books, charts and other environmental print. They could
write messages to each other, create messages for persons outside the
classroom, or write in their journals during this time. They were also
encouraged to read the "footbooks" which were rhymes such as "One, Two,
Buckle My Shoe" and "One Potato, Two Potato" written on little feet (by
phrase) and taped to the floor. Children took advantage of this new form of text, and frequently did a quick "hopscotch" jaunt through the footbooks while reciting the rhymes whenever they were in the vicinity. There was a great deal of interaction as children moved in and out of each other's explorations of "text".

For most of the children, Free Reading yielded opportunities to develop and maintain relationships with their peers through the exploration of texts. The following example from expanded fieldnotes typifies Free Reading at the beginning of the year.

The children have just left Story Floor and are moving into Free Reading. Micheal is laying on the floor with Jack and the Beanstalk (Cauley, 1983). He is looking at the pictures. Elijah walks by him and asks: "What do you have?" Elijah gets Where the Wild Things Are (Sendak, 1963) from the book display shelf, saying: "This looks like a good book." He lays down next to Micheal and begins leafing through the book, showing Micheal the pictures. Micheal puts Jack and the Beanstalk back and returns to explore Where the Wild Things Are with Elijah. They are looking at the pictures and talking about the monsters when Josh passes by. Elijah tries to get him interested in the pictures. Josh, who seems to be searching for an available copy of Brown Bear to read to Mrs. L, asks Elijah for the card to Where the Wild Things Are so he can check it out overnight. <Josh is more concerned about reading with Mrs. L than with E, who is emerging as a class leader.> He sees Kenneth put Brown Bear back and takes it back to where Mrs. L is reading with Toya. He explores Brown Bear independently until Chancy walks by and asks Josh if he can read it with him. They are on the "white horse" page when they hear Gordon and Kevin doing a reenactment of The Napping House (Wood, 1984). Chancy joins the two boys, leaving Joshua alone with Brown Bear. He watches as Micheal and Jason try to stay together on a choral reading of Dear Zoo (Campbell, 1986). Micheal has Dear Zoo big book, and Jason has a trade book. The choral reading turns into a parallel reading experience <like parallel play>, where Micheal explores the big book on his own and Jason is immersed in the trade book—seemingly oblivious to the other child's actions but still physically quite close together. Brandon has taken Arrow to the Sun (McDermott, 1974) (which he calls a video game book) and is "enacting" the story by himself. He told me earlier that he's never seen this neat video book before <hence the term enactment>. Krystal asks Josh for Brown Bear and takes it over to Candie, Kevin and Kenny. They each have a
copy of *Brown Bear* and line up their chairs to "play school." They join in a choral rendition of *Brown Bear*. Kenny seems to be looking at the print while reading. It looks as if Kevin is "reading" the pictures, as he turns the page early in order to see the next animal. Candie and Krystal appear to be reciting the text from memory, yet looking at the text periodically to confirm predictions or hold their place. Krystal told me earlier today that this was "her favorite book" and that they "said it alot in kindergarten." Gordon has just gotten paper to write a love message to Candie. (Most of his messages are love notes to Candie!) Elijah and Bobby are embroiled in a debate over a word in *Heckedy Peg* (Wood, 1986). Elijah is certain that it's "crackers," but Bobby thinks it might be cookie. They asked Mrs. L, but she told them to see if they could figure it out. They are looking quite closely at the illustration to see what's on the plate.

Notice the fluid nature of this literacy event and the emphasis on social relationships. Children seemed to move freely from one text to another, or more appropriately, from one person to another during Free Reading. It was not unusual for a child to explore up to 15 texts during Free Reading, which lasted from 15-30 minutes during Phase I. Frequently, a child would flit from one text to another, and then alight on one particular text, explore it in great detail and then be off again. Children were involved in a variety of explorations as they reenacted familiar texts, enacted unfamiliar texts, explored pictures, engaged in parallel readings, read environmental print, wrote messages and worked on their journals.

The children were actively engaged in exploring literacy WITH others as they sought membership in this literacy community through "learning to know" both texts and one another. They frequently made comments such as: "I heard that one before!" or "Hey, you wanna free read together this afternoon?" Free Reading generally occurred twice daily, once before lunch and once in the afternoon, usually prior to going home. Children
checked out books to take home during Free Reading, often changing their selection several times with the literacy event and making recommendations to others.

Free Reading was the most demanding literacy event for Mrs. L and the children as they negotiated the participant structures during Phase I. Children were accustomed to free play from kindergarten, and naturally tended to shift into a "free play" mode when they were faced with the vast amount of choices during Free Reading.

At times, Mrs. L caused the transition from Free Reading to Free Play by the options which she introduced during this literacy event. After reading Paul Galdone's versions of Goldilocks and the Three Bears and comparing it with Bernadette Watts' version, Mrs. L invited children to "act out" the story by using some masks which she had recently been given. There were four masks: Mama Bear, Papa Bear, Baby Bear and Goldilocks. Mrs. L told children that they could take turns being the actors. Anyone could be the audience during Free Reading or they could simply read books if they wanted as well. She provided support and guidance for the first three renditions of their creative skits. Upon noticing that all the masks were spoken for, Gordon offered to be the chair and contorted his body into a chair position. This action prompted much laughter and giggling from everyone involved. When Mrs. L left to read with other children who were involved in exploring other texts, the three bears began doing the footbooks when they left for their walk. There was a great deal of confusion and the pitch and tone of the talk in the room escalated considerably.
For three days, Mrs. L watched as the children reenacted the Three Bears stories. For three days, Mrs. L puzzled over the frenzied nature of the room during this literacy event. On the fourth day, she invited the whole class to make their own sets of Three Bears masks to take home (during Literature Extensions) so EVERYBODY could act out the play for their families. The masks were removed from the Story Floor area (children could explore books anywhere during Free Reading) and it took Mrs. L approximately three more days to assist the children in returning to the structures of Free Reading that she had outlined on the first two days of school. They continued to negotiate and renegotiate the rules and norms for "doing" Free Reading as they explored the possibilities of writing on Mrs. L's chart paper and using thick markers to write in their journals during this literacy event throughout the remainder of Phase I.

Rest Time

Due to the physical constraints of sharing a room with another teacher, children from both classrooms engaged in Rest Time immediately upon return from lunch recess. For Rest Time, Mrs. G turned off the lights and played a quiet record. Children were instructed to sit in their seats, with their heads on their tables without talking during this time. Three weeks into the year, Mrs. L invited children to explore books quietly at their tables while they listened to the record. It became a very quiet free reading time, where children needed to get the books they wanted to explore when they came in from recess and remain seated until the record had finished or one of the teachers turned the lights back on. Mrs. L typically used this time to prepare for afternoon activities.
Authors' Workshop

Mrs. L introduced Authors' Workshop toward the end of the first phase of data collection. Through observing children while they were engaged in writing experiences within other literacy events, she noticed that they were now ready to begin the process of writing rough drafts of books to be edited and revised with the goal of publishing for the class to enjoy. Authors' Workshop took the place of the afternoon Literature Extensions and, in many ways, served as a form of literature extension itself as children wrote about their own life experiences and created stories to share with others. Their books included elements such as cover, title page and dedication page. Mrs. L talked with children about the writing process a great deal during the early stages of this literacy event.

They discussed thinking and THEN writing, and rereading what they had written. Mrs. L emphasized the importance of writing a book about ONE idea or thing. Hints of other experiences within other literacy events subtly manifested themselves in the children's talk and products. Children freely shared ideas. They stretched words and looked at books for help in creating illustrations. Conversation bubbles found their way into many of the children's illustrations. This was not surprising, as the children had added conversation bubbles to Rosie's Walk big book at Story Floor, Mrs. L had drawn these "talk circles" in some of her daily messages, and they had explored the conversation bubbles utilized by Colin and Jacque Hawkins in Incy Wincy Spider (Hawkins & Hawkins, 1985) and This Little Pig (Hawkins & Hawkins, 1985). Many children decided to create alphabet books during Authors' Workshop and used the alphabet books which Mrs. L had been sharing with them during Story Floor as resources.
Children were required to create a rough draft of three completed books before signing up for an Author's Conference with Mrs. L. A sign-up sheet was taped to the side of the Art Center bookcase on which children could write their names at any time during Authors' Workshop. Conferences usually involved the following: reading each book TO Mrs. L and telling her WHY a specific topic or style was chosen (Mrs. L took notes so she could type the book in conventional spelling at a later time), choosing one of the books to officially publish, discussing the book with Mrs. L, and jointly making any expansions or changes that evolved from the conference. Mrs. L would then type the child's story onto a page of "copy" and return it to the child with a bound book which was filled with the appropriate number of blank pages. The child would then "publish" the book by cutting out the copy and pasting it onto the blank book and making the accompanying illustrations.

While working at their tables, much talk centered around reading and writing books. On one occasion, Kevin remarked that HE was an author! Mrs. L responded affirmatively, and Kevin replied: "I help my dad in his workshop. He's an author... makes caterpillar books." (Eric Carle was the Author of the Month at that time.) Gordon, who was sitting across from Kevin at the same table, gave him an incredulous look. "That's what MY dad does!" he exclaimed. Gordon turned his attention to the volcano which he was in the process of "erupting" with brilliant orange and red crayons and further expanded: "My dad writes the words and I do the pictures."

Children frequently wrote books about the same topics during Phase I. A group of boys decided to write about volcanoes because they had seen
that Gordon and Brian (sitting at the same table) were writing volcano books. They asked Mrs. L if she would make sure they could all sit together for the next few days so they could "talk about volcanoes" while they finished their books. She responded by honoring their request as well as making available beautifully crafted texts such as Volcano: The Eruption of Mount St. Helen (Lauber, 1986), other volcano books and a collection of volcano articles from the school's encyclopedia collection.

Children conferred with one another a great deal and often learned about their lives outside the school setting as they shared plots of the books which they were engaged in creating. Candie and Elijah discovered that they had something in common when Elijah wrote a book about the wedding of his mother and stepfather. Candie, whose Wedding (a book about the wedding in which she was a flower girl) had sparked Elijah's idea for his wedding text, read Elijah's book and reminisced about her mother and stepfather's wedding as well. There was much talk that day about how many mothers, fathers and grandparents children had as well as who knew and didn't know who their "real" dads were.

Mrs. L modeled and supported children during this time, much the same as she did during journaling with the exception of her concern for audience. She often asked: "Would the reader understand what you mean here?" or "Do you think you told the reader enough? See what _____ says when they read it" when walking around and reading children's work-in-progress each day. For some children, Authors' Workshop became a race to see who could get the most books completed. For other children, it was an event in which they could share from their everyday lives. And for others, it was an opportunity to learn more about the world (volcanoes)
or create imaginary worlds (Dyson, 1989) within the real-world life of the classroom. It appeared that for all children, Authors' Workshop was a time when one could continue to build and maintain relationships with others through interactions with texts and with one another.

**Booksharing**

On the first day of school, several children asked if they would have Show and Tell in first grade. Mrs. L responded that she really didn't want them to bring toys and other "things" in, but she would like it if they would bring favorite books from home to share with the class. A few children responded by bringing in books periodically.

Mrs. L reserved the last portion of the day for their "book sharing" where she invited children to show the book, read the title and author (with Mrs. L's help), tell what they liked about the book, and show a few pictures. For many children, this was an extremely important social event, as it gave them an opportunity to share their knowledge of a specific book with their peers. It was interesting to observe, however, that the activity as Mrs. L had structured it, didn't seem to meet the needs of the children who were sharing books. By the end of the first full week of school, children were bringing their books to Story Floor and asking Mrs. L to READ them to the group. Although Mrs. L wasn't overly excited about the quality of the books which children brought for "booksharing" (Little Golden Books, books acquired at McDonalds and Chick O Fillet, etc.), she read them as Read Alouds to the children and thus, Booksharing found its way into Story Floor.

The previous description of the ontogenesis of literacy events at the beginning of the school year was provided to highlight the evolution
of a literacy community within the walls of Room 100A. This brief glimpse into the life of Mrs. L's classroom portrays a community in which most activity centered around the children and evolved through their experiences with creating texts. The classroom structure centered around the children. The children, however, focused on utilizing literacy in purposeful ways. They were weaving a collective social history as well as building on individual interpretations of classroom experiences with one another and with texts. As children's understandings and knowledge of life, literature and literacy changed, the participant structures of specific literacy events were transformed. What took place within each literacy event, how children interacted with one another and with texts, and the ways in which children used literacy continued to shift to meet the needs and expectations of the children and their teacher. Mrs. L continually adapted her role as a means of facilitating children's growth as emergent readers and writers. The next section of this chapter will briefly outline the categories which emerged in regard to the ways that children used literacy.

Functions and Uses of Literacy in Room 100A

Throughout the course of the study, all participants utilized literacy for a variety of purposes. As categories emerged, it was noted that they were similar to the categories which Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines (1988) and Taylor (1983) had expanded from Heath's classic study (1983) of children's language use in three southern communities. Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines (1983) developed a comparative theoretical frame in which they compared the functions and uses of reading and writing as separate
activities across the three communities in Heath's study (1983), the suburban families in Taylor's (1983) study, and the Shay Avenue families in the study which they were reporting. The categories used by Taylor and Dorsey-Gaines (1983) were expanded for purposes of this study and are briefly described in Table 3. Reading and writing were not treated as separate categories when identifying the functions and uses of literacy within this study. Rationale for this decision is as follows:

1. The discussion of literacy in the first chapter of this document dispels the myth that literacy is simply a discrete set of skills which involved reading and writing. Although reading and writing are distinct processes and will be addressed as such in specific portions of this paper, separating those two processes when discussing the functions and uses of literacy would be in violation of the framework undergirding this study.

2. When writing, one engages in reading. Reading and writing are processes which are dialectically linked.

The functions and uses of literacy for each literacy event will be described in greater detail in the next section.

All the children in this study utilized literacy in ways that parallel the ways adults use literacy outside the school setting. Although the children's primary purposes for using literacy were similar to those of the participants in studies cited, the ways in which they approached both function and form were not equivalent to those processes of adults. The next section of this chapter will focus on each literacy event across the course of the year and will highlight the major changes as they were observed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions and Uses of Literacy</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social-Interactional</td>
<td>Using literacy to establish, build and maintain social relationships.</td>
<td>Book dedications, incorporating a peer into one's writing, writing messages to one another, written conversations, co-authoring books, sharing journal entry with a peer, celebrating published books, reading or writing with a peer for purposes of spending time together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Using literacy to meet practical needs in conducting daily life.</td>
<td>Reading the daily message, reading the schedule, making charts for the Listening Center, reading the schedule for Special Reader, sign-up sheets for Author conferences, using the Library Chart to locate a specific book, putting papers into mailboxes of peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efferent</td>
<td>Using literacy to gain information about the world and specific topics of interest.</td>
<td>Learning about reading strategies during Shared Book Experiences, reading books about specific topics and themes, writing letters to others requesting information, reading charts and informational texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation/Documentational</td>
<td>Using literacy to confirm and/or document facts or beliefs.</td>
<td>Recording predictions, reading to locate specific information, making seed diaries to record plant growth, using the Listening Center chart to settle disputes, rereading journal entries, rereading portions of text, checking spelling words with master copy, using the Library Chart to settle disputes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Creating or utilizing environmental print for various purposes.</td>
<td>Reading charts, message, schedule and other environmental print during leisure time, copying environmental print, copying specific portions of environmental print, display cards for science experiments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expository</td>
<td>Reading, writing, singing or storytelling for a specific audience.</td>
<td>Practicing reading books that will read to the class or other classes in the future, writing books for an intended audience, participating as Special Reader, presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autobiographical</td>
<td>Using literacy to document happenings in one's own life or to learn about someone else's life.</td>
<td>Writing about life events while journaling, sharing journal entries with peers or teacher, reading one's own journal from beginning to end, writing about a specific life event during Authors' Workshop, recording monumentous events and displaying them on the Message Board, written conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Reading or writing for recreation or pleasure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading or singing during transitions, choosing to write during free reading, choosing to stay in from recess and read by one's self, choosing to stay in from recess and write, taking books home, taking paper and pencil home, listening to stories, watching plays, watching video of Charlotte's Web, reading by oneself for pleasure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory-Aids</td>
<td>Using literacy as a way of helping to remember something or helping someone else to remember.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asking the researcher to write a note to remind a child to bring a book back, writing notes to peers and teacher as reminders, copying spelling sentences, using spelling papers while practicing spelling words, Listening Center schedule, Special Reader schedule, Library Chart, Authors' Conference sign-up sheet, using the schedule to help guide independent/morning work, writing notes notes to oneself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Thinking</td>
<td>Using reading or writing to plan or brainstorm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning for Authors' Workshop in Journaling, creating rough drafts of books in Authors' Workshop, making lists of ideas and plans in small groups, webbing at Story Floor, reading texts to think of ideas, topics, or ways of writing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute for Oral</td>
<td>Using literacy to communicate when direct oral Messages communication is impossible or impractical.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing and receiving letters and autographs from authors, voting, writing letters asking teachers if they can read to their class, writing notes to the teacher when she is unavailable, writing letters to people from the school who are gone for short periods of time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Playing with forms and configurations of text orally or while reading or writing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singing songs, chants and rhymes with language from books, creating alternative texts, experimenting with art media and illustrative styles, experimenting with print conventions such as conversation bubbles and punctuation marks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Literacy</td>
<td>Using literacy to fulfill the requirements as established by the teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting like writing a journal entry, copying from environmental print while writing in one's journal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Metamorphosis of Routine Literacy Events Across Time

A comparison chart which highlights characteristics of each literacy event during the four data collection phases is included with the discussion of each literacy event. It is important to note that, although each literacy event was "routine," the explorations that occurred within them were novel and unique each and every day. The changes which took place within each literacy event over the course of the year will be described in regard to the basic structures and format of the literacy event itself, the ways in which the children used literacy, children's interactions with text and with one another, and Mrs. L's role as participant in these literacy events.

Arrival Time

Children's Arrival-Time routines remained basically the same, with a few exceptions (see Table 4 for comparison chart). Toward the end of Phase I, children continued to "preview" books as they returned their books from the night before but they didn't seem as anxious about reserving a book to take home. Mrs. L consistently introduced several new books each day at Story Floor. The "rush" for a particular book moved to the time period immediately following her introduction of these new texts.

In February (Phase III), Mrs. L introduced a lunch graph which served as a manipulative bulletin board. It was located to the left of the chalkboard and began near the floor, continuing vertically past the halfway mark on the board. Children taped their namecards onto the appropriate column of the graph when they arrived each morning. They were expected to add to the side labeled "sack lunch" or to the side that was labeled "hot lunch." Mrs. L would transfer the information onto her
### Table 4
Comparison Chart of Arrival Time Across Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARRIVAL TIME (8:45-9:00)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Children arrive.&lt;br&gt;Return books.&lt;br&gt;Check out books.&lt;br&gt;Find seats (locate journals).&lt;br&gt;Mrs. L takes roll/lunch count.&lt;br&gt;Classroom &quot;business&quot;.</td>
<td><strong>ARRIVAL TIME (8:45-9:15)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Children arrive.&lt;br&gt;Return books.&lt;br&gt;Find seats (locate journals).</td>
<td><strong>ARRIVAL TIME (8:45-9:20)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Children arrive.&lt;br&gt;Return books.&lt;br&gt;Find seats (locate journals).</td>
<td><strong>ARRIVAL TIME (8:45-9:05)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Children arrive.&lt;br&gt;Return books.&lt;br&gt;Find seats (locate journals).&lt;br&gt;Purchase bland books.&lt;br&gt;Mrs. L takes attendance/lunch count.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOURNALING (9:00-9:15)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Much talk about stretching words and content of entries.&lt;br&gt;Mrs. L models on board often.&lt;br&gt;Lots of talk about purpose of journals and what to write about.&lt;br&gt;Children frequently write about same topics.&lt;br&gt;Lots of environmental print copied for their entries.&lt;br&gt;Children typically draw before writing.&lt;br&gt;Entries appear to be autobiographical, social and school literacy in purpose.&lt;br&gt;Mrs. L circulates, talking with and encouraging each child.&lt;br&gt;Mrs. L reads each child's entry daily.</td>
<td><strong>Begin Journaling.</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Much talk about outside lives.&lt;br&gt;- Children read each other's entries and monitor each other's writing.&lt;br&gt;- Most children draw first, but some children have become flexible in whether they draw or write first.&lt;br&gt;- Entries are social, creative and autobiographical in nature.&lt;br&gt;- Some children try to read the board message while journaling.&lt;br&gt;- Mrs. L circulates, encouraging children.&lt;br&gt;- Mrs. L spends large blocks of time with children who seem to need her support.&lt;br&gt;- Mrs. L doesn't read each child's entry daily. She reads as she talks with children every so often.&lt;br&gt;- Personal styles and motifs emerge.</td>
<td><strong>Begin Journaling.</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Much talk about outside lives.&lt;br&gt;- Children revisit previous entries and read them independently and with peers while working at tables.&lt;br&gt;- Flexibility in drawing and writing. Some children don't draw anymore.&lt;br&gt;- Children use journals for social, autobiographical and planning purposes.&lt;br&gt;- Children frequently race to read Mrs. L's message.&lt;br&gt;- Much talk and exploration of punctuation marks.&lt;br&gt;- Children are using environmental print as a resource to write their messages.&lt;br&gt;- Children take their entries to Mrs. L when they want to share them with her.&lt;br&gt;- Mrs. L reads journals occasionally.&lt;br&gt;- Children appear to be quite involved in helping to write entries of children at their tables.&lt;br&gt;- Children transition into Free Reading when finished.</td>
<td><strong>Begin Journaling.</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Much talk about outside lives.&lt;br&gt;- Flexibility in drawing and writing. Some children don't draw anymore.&lt;br&gt;- Journals serve social, autobiographical, recreational, school literacy, efferent, creative and confirmational functions.&lt;br&gt;- Children use environmental print to check their own spellings and as a resource for spelling.&lt;br&gt;- Continued explorations of punctuation marks.&lt;br&gt;- Mrs. L doesn't read children's entries at all, unless they show them to her or a child has been exhibiting 'unjournaling-like' behavior.&lt;br&gt;- Children are encouraged to share their entry with a peer when they have finished.&lt;br&gt;- Children move into Free Reading when their journal entries are completed and their journals are put away.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attendance and lunch count before sending it to the office each day. The lunch graph was discontinued near the end of Phase III.

Toward the end of the year, Mrs. L's class participated in the Young Authors' Conference and children began talking about their desire to write books at home. Many children expressed their concern about "what they were going to do about being authors" during the summer months, as paper was not readily available in many of their homes. Mrs. L was able to purchase a large quantity of "blank" books which she sold to the children for a reduced price of ninety-five cents. The books were 8 1/2 inches by 6 1/4 inches and were hardbound with a white cover. Some covers were blank, and other covers had drawings on them of princesses, unicorns and other characters. Children purchased their blank books from Mrs. L during Arrival Time. They took great care to choose the cover that would enhance what they were planning for the content of the book. Several blank books found their way into Authors' Workshop despite Mrs. L's firm encouragement to save these special books for home use only.

Journaling, as a routine literacy event, became the predominant activity of Arrival Time. Children seemed to become secure in the knowledge that they would have many opportunities during the day to find a book to take home and often waited until Mrs. L had introduced some new books during Story Floor to make their selections. Once children appeared to be more confident in their abilities to actually draw or write a message, Mrs. L began taking attendance and lunch count while they were writing in their journals. Journaling was actually a subevent which was housed within the broader event of Arrival Time and had participant structures which changed over the course of the year.
Functions and Uses of Literacy Across Time: Throughout all phases of data collection, children socialized a great deal while writing. Their talk often centered around their home lives, playground happenings, the content of their writing, the process of writing, spelling of words, books they had taken home, books they wanted Mrs. L to read to them, and other happenings within the school and classroom settings. Children softly sang songs, did raps, read the Message on the Board, and recited poems while they worked. For the children, journal time was a social occasion in which they could talk with their peers about important events in their lives.

At the beginning of the year, the children's journal entries provided Mrs. L with important information and insights into their lives outside the school setting. She learned about topics of interest to the children, games they enjoyed playing, their family structures, what they did after school, etc. Early in the year, Jason read "My father tried to strangle me" while sharing his entry with Mrs. L. Further probing revealed the authenticity of Jason's message. The red marks around his neck prompted the social worker to visit the home. Jason, and his mother and sister moved in with Micheal's family for several weeks.

During Phase I, the children wrote in their journals because they were expected to write in their journals. Journaling was, for them, simply a part of "doing school" in Mrs. L's classroom. Because many of them didn't feel comfortable with invented spelling at that point, they tended to copy environmental print. Kenny's journal entries from the beginning of the year have several variations on the same theme. He simply copied "8 CRAYOLA CRAYONS" from his crayon box and proceeded to
copy the color words from individual crayons. Other children copied the first sentence of Mrs. L's message or copied the titles of books she had read to the class. Bobby continued with his familiar string of letters for several days until Mrs. L asked him to tell her a message and they "stretched the words" together. At this point in time, journaling functioned as a type of school literacy. It was important to "look" like a writer (Cochran-Smith, 1975), or in this case, appear to be journaling. Mrs. L's affirmation of children's attempts to write words the way they heard them, and her marvelous ability to read their messages provided children with the assurance they needed to write freely. They began to use their journals for a variety of purposes. Toward the middle and end of Phase I, children were using their journals to document important events in their lives (autobiographical). They wrote about the fire which took place in the house across the street while they were coming to school and documented activities from their home lives as well. Children tended to make labels for pictures or wrote "I can" messages.

During Phase II, children's journals began to take on new functions as they wrote and talked about spellings and supported one another's efforts in "making meaning" while writing. There was no evidence of journaling as a "schooled" activity. Instead, children wrote to document happenings in their daily lives (autobiographical), created mini-stories with eloquent illustrations (creative), or wrote to maintain social status in within the literacy community (social).

They often used environmental print as a resource for their entries. Children often copied a word from the schedule, someone else's journal, Mrs. L's message, a chart, poster or bulletin board as they wrote their
messages. They used each other as resources to "stretch out" words and locate letters on the alphabet chart.

Some children spent much time writing journal entries to their peers and often included them in their entries. Krystal and Micheal sometimes raced to see who could finish their entries first. Other children kept track of how many pages they "did" each day, and closely monitored who was going to be the first to fill up all their journal pages. Several children wrote a sequence of "I can" entries which served as both autobiographical as well as promoted them socially when they read their entries proudly to their tablemates. There was much talk about "knowing" how to form specific letters and much attention to the quality of drawings by one's peers. Mrs. L's insistence on reading everyone's entry (or entries) periodically and the high value she placed on children's support of one another through their interactions promoted the collaborative nature of their writing at this time.

Personal styles and motifs for several children seemed to emerge during Phase II. Following are two such examples. Kenny seemed to develop a formula or archetype for writing journal entries during Phase II. He thought about what he was going to write in his journal while walking to school each day and for the remainder of the year, Kenny used his journal primarily as a way of documenting the activities of his busy home life. He recorded where he went with his mom, what he did at the babysitter's, the antics of his younger brother, what he bought at the store, and what he did with his grandparents and father when he was with them on weekends. (Kenny's parents were recently divorced.) Kenny's entries were filled with camping trips, Nintendo games, items recently
I got a G.I. Joe.
A good guy and a bad guy.

Tomorrow
I am going
to see The Land Before Time.

I saw
Kenneth
at the
store last night
at Krogers.

Tonight my mom has
a surprise. I think I
know what it (is) I think it
is going golfing.

Figure 6
Kenny's Journal Across Time
acquired, and usually began with "Last night," "This weekend," or "I got". He usually wrote first and often didn't draw any pictures to accompany his writing. Examples of Kenny's journal entries during all four phases are included in Figure 6.

Bobby, for whom journaling was a difficult and laborious "school literacy task," began writing a series of entries about himself and his male counterparts. His drawings had included elaborate designs from the beginning of the year. He now began incorporating a star into many of the designs as he drew pictures of himself and his classmates (Figure 7). This star motif became Bobby's trademark for the rest of the year.

At various times throughout the year, children used their journals to find information about something (efferent). Their questions were usually about a classroom activity or their personal lives and were most often directed toward Mrs. L. In Phase II, Bobby requested information from Mrs. L as he wrote in his journal. The first book order had just arrived, and Mrs. L had placed each child's book order at their seat so that they could look at their books upon arriving to school that day. Bobby didn't understand why he didn't have books at his chair, although he had not ordered any books. A rather distraught Bobby crafted the following message (Figure 7).
8). When he took it to Mrs. L, she explained what had happened. Kenneth offered to share his books with Bobby for the day, and the two boys explored these texts at every opportunity. Children most frequently used their journals as vehicles for requesting information when the questions were directed to Mrs. L. They rarely requested information from one another through journals, but reserved this practical literacy use for writing messages during Free Reading.

The children continued to expand the ways in which journaling could serve as a literary tool for their classroom lives. In Phase III, they enjoyed revisiting previous journal entries and often read favorite ones to their tablemates. This recreational and social activity prompted much talk among children at their tables. They continued to use journaling to build and maintain social relationships.

Krystal, who had experienced difficulty in developing friendships, used her journal as a means of "buddying up" to her peers. She often wrote nice things about her classmates, her teacher and the researcher; always certain to read her entries to the involved persons upon completion. When Toya and Rashanna were at odds one day, Krystal took advantage of the situation by writing a message to Rashanna to let her know she was a "BFL FD" (beautiful friend). Krystal read the entry to Rashanna. Rashanna's lack of response spurred her into action. She
returned to her table and began drawing vibrant flowers all over the page with her crayons. "It's GOT to be beautiful!" she muttered under her breath. Krystal ripped the page from her journal, folded it up like a note card, wrote Rashanna's name on it and hand-delivered it to her at the table where she was sitting.

Children also collaborated on entries a great deal during this time and monitored one another's writing. It was not unusual for a child to pause from his/her work to lean over and say: "You forgot a T there" or "Happy has two p's." The children continued to write about their personal lives and sometimes used their journals as a place to plan for their books in Authors' Workshop. At several points during Phase III, a child's drawing would spark a story. That child would make notes or begin to write a story which would actually become a rough draft for Authors' Workshop. This was not typical of children's journaling during Phase III, but it occurred often enough among the focal children that it bears reporting.

By the end of the year (Phase IV), most children were writing fluently in their journals. Elijah and Kenny were usually finished with their entries in two or three minutes. Journaling continued serve as a way of recording events as well as providing children with a vehicle for social networking. For some children, the purpose for journaling changed a great deal during this phase of data collection. This may be due to the fact that Mrs. L rarely looked at their entries unless they invited her to read them.

Both Candie and Bobby stopped writing messages in their journals for periods of time during Phase IV, but for different reasons. Candie
remarked that she was beginning to "love to draw these illustrations" and she "really wanted to practice making things." Journaling, from Candie's perspective, provided her with an opportunity to do something she enjoyed (recreational) as well as enabled her to get the practice she felt that she needed. Candie was heard to say many times throughout the year: "Practice makes perfect. That's what my mom says!"

When asked to share about his journaling activities, Bobby replied: "I can't think of anything to write about. Nothin' much is happening at my house, except for riding bike. . .and I already wrote about that." For Bobby, journaling was a literacy activity he was supposed to do because he was part of Mrs. L's classroom and that's what children did when they entered her room every morning. He took great pains to make it appear as if he was journaling! He always moved to another part of the room if Mrs. L had him seated at the table nearest her desk (children were free to journal on the floor at the Story Floor area with a friend during Phase IV). He would typically draw a few objects with pencil, cross them out, begin a new page, and start drawing again. When he saw that two or three other children had completed their journals and were moving into Free Reading, Bobby would put his journal back on the shelf and join his peers in exploring books. This form of mock participation (Green and Weade, 1982) would occur over a period of several days until something would happen at home that Bobby deemed worth writing about. The cycle would then begin again.

Children also used environmental print a great deal during Phase IV. Not only did they see ALL print in the classroom as a resource, but they would use portions of words when thinking about writing something specific
in their journals. For example, Elijah wanted to write that his hobby was "playing with his friends." He looked at the schedule where Mrs. L had written "Play Practice" and copied "play" while directing his actions with a mumbled "and an i-n-g!" as he wrote. At the beginning of the year, children copied environmental print just to have something to write down. At the end of the year, they used environmental print only when it served a useful function within their message. They also used the print in this "print rich" environment to confirm or disconfirm their spellings of words once they had written them down.

Interactions with One Another and With Texts: The children's interactions with one another and with texts provided a springboard from which to explore many aspects of literacy. Social relationships were quite important to the children throughout the year. Discussions about important aspects of the children's lives such as playground fights, family presents, home situations, new acquisitions, clothes and haircuts, what the Message on the Board said, etc. were sanctioned as valuable and viable resources for children while they journaled. These discussions sometimes resulted in disagreements, but did not appear to detract from their journaling experiences. In fact, interactions between children seemed to breathe life into their entries. The social nature of Arrival Time, and more specifically Journaling, did not change much during the course of the year. What children talked about and attended to as they journaled did, however, undergo subtle transformations.

At the beginning of the year, children wanted to "do it right." They were quite dependent upon Mrs. L to tell them if what they had written "looked" like what they had intended to write. They often asked
her: "Is that how YOU would spell it?" or "How do you spell it, really?". Much conversation evolved around favorite books, stretching out words, knowing how to write a needed letter, the content of their messages, as well as a multitude of other happenings in their daily lives. They would typically lean over and inquire as to the nature of their neighbor's journal entry, but did not tend to critique each other's drawings or writing. They did, however, help one another upon request. Candie and Chrystal, for example, would frequently seek out the other (whether seated at the same table or not) and inquire: "What do you hear in ____?" Everyone at that table would usually stretch out the word, offering their suggestions to the inquirer.

As children became more adept at expressing themselves through writing, they began to monitor the writing of their peers. This was especially notable during Phase II. Many children, while seemingly disinterested in editing and revising their own writing, were quite eager to read other people's entries and make suggestions. On several occasions, children provided unsolicited spellings for their peers. They also made suggestions concerning illustrations. Kenneth told Bobby one day: "You really need to have lights at the top of your police car." Bobby responded with: "Oh, yeah. And those little lights up there with the big ones."

Although most children did not appear to be monitoring their own writing and drawing in Phase II, they were beginning to reread words, phrases and entire messages as part of the writing process. There was much evidence of subvocalizing and self-directed speech as children simultaneously negotiated the complex tasks of articulating their thoughts
through written and oral forms as they wrote in their journals and contributed to the ongoing life of the classroom. A more detailed description of children's explorations when journaling is included in Chapter 5.

During Phases III and IV, children began monitoring their own writing and drawing both as they wrote and after they had finished a message and reread it. Elijah frequently would add words or short phrases to his journal entries. He did this by "squishing in" or tacking on a word at the end of his entry. Other children, like Kenny, would erase the entire entry and start over so that the message looked like he wanted. Several children continued to be concerned that their drawings supported and expanded their entries. Both Candie and Bobby spent a great deal of time attending to the details of both writing and drawing.

Beginning in Phase II, and continuing throughout the course of the year, children became quite flexible in the order in which they did things. Sometimes they would draw first and then write their entries. At other times, they would write first and then enhance their message with an illustration. Candie and Krystal expressed that they wrote first on days when they "knew what they wanted to say" and on days when they weren't sure, they drew first because "it gave them ideas." On one occasion, Candie began drawing because she didn't know what to write. There had been a violent storm the previous night. Candie drew a thunderstorm and then remembered that her father had once told her that he likes thunderstorms (Figure 9).

Both Elijah and Kenny frequently wrote their messages and did not draw at all. Bobby took another approach. He would often begin writing
and then stop for awhile to more fully develop his message. In doing so, he would draw lively pictures and then turn back to his writing. One might refer to this exploration as "phrase writing" and "phrase drawing." It was not unusual for Bobby to go through this process several times within one journal entry. He sometimes would leave out words while engaged in this process, but would easily rectify that situation when a tablemate would notice his error or he would discover it while rereading.

Mrs. L's Role as Participant: As noted earlier, Mrs. L provided a great deal of support for children as they journaled at the beginning of the year. She acted as demonstrator, encourager, observer, and responder as she circulated among the children and responded to their "in-process" entries. As the year progressed and Mrs. L observed that children's needs were changing, she pulled back in significant ways. Although she was always available to the children, she circulated less frequently and let the children's interactions guide their explorations while journaling.

When a child appeared to be having difficulty "getting words down" during journaling, Mrs. L structured her time so that she could spend a concentrated amount of time with that particular child on several consecutive days. She always responded to children's journal entries when they were directed to her. When Kenny wrote to ask if he needed to bring two dollars if he wanted to ride the horses at zoo (a class field trip the
following day), Mrs. L responded by writing "No" under the question he had written in his journal. By the end of the year, Mrs. L was rarely involved in the children's writing process as they crafted their journal entries and frequently was unaware of what they were writing about during this time. In fact, when new children were introduced into the classroom, she would invite one or two children to explain why they journaled, who journals were for, and how to write a journal entry.

Mrs. L did, however, observe the group as a whole during this time. She responded to children's spontaneous reading of selected journal entries by inviting children to read their daily entries to a peer before putting their journals away and transitioning into Free Reading. It was interesting to note that once this reading of entries to peers was a formally introduced activity, children's interest in it seemed to lessen considerably. It was, however, a part of "doing" journaling during Phase IV.

Message on the Board

The daily message provided Mrs. L with diverse opportunities to demonstrate various reading and writing strategies, as well as to engage the children in exploring these strategies while reading as a group. Although the basic format for reading the message and talking about literacy remained the same from the perspectives of the children, the function of the message board and Mrs. L's participation in this event changed significantly over time. (See Table 5 for an overview of the message across time.) An example of the daily message from each phase can be found in Figure 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MRS. L'S MESSAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>MRS. L'S MESSAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>MRS. L'S MESSAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>MRS. L'S MESSAGE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message was 2-3 lines in length. Usually accompanied by line drawings.</td>
<td>Message was 3-5 lines in length. Rarely accompanied by drawings.</td>
<td>Message is much longer. Written in paragraph form.</td>
<td>Message fills the left half of the board. Written in paragraph form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. L points (1:1) while leading group in a Shared Reading.</td>
<td>1st Reading: Mrs. L points (1:1) while leading the group in a Shared Reading. Children mumble read along with her.</td>
<td>1st Reading: Mrs. L points (1:1) while children chorally read. She reads with them only when they appear to need her support.</td>
<td>Children decide who the pointer will be, based on alphabetical order by children's first names.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children mumble read along with her.</td>
<td>2nd Reading: Child points (1:1). Children echo read along with her.</td>
<td>2nd Reading: Child points (1:1). Mrs. L moves away from the board and observes as children read chorally and child points.</td>
<td>Child points (1:1) while children read the message chorally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much talk about early strategies, semantic cues and beginning sounds.</td>
<td>3rd Reading: Child points (1:1) or Mrs. L points (sweeps words and phrases). Children read chorally.</td>
<td>Much talk about:</td>
<td>Mrs. L rarely reads with the group. She stands to side or back of room and observes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mrs. L modeled strategies for what to do when what they read didn't make sense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Making predictions about content of message based on prior knowledge and message format</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During last three weeks of school, the message was eliminated.
Functions and Uses of Literacy Across Time: Although Mrs. L's message primarily served an instrumental function of providing information about the day's upcoming events, both Mrs. L and the children used it in a variety of ways. During Phase II, Elijah, Kenny and Kevin took great delight in trying to read the message---often with the collaborative assistance of children sitting at their tables. Their interest in reading the message BEFORE Mrs. L formally structured the event made the transition from being a collaborative social event to a friendly game of "one-upmanship." The three boys often raced to see who could complete a reading of the message first. They actually explored the message in this way during Journal Time, showing that what took place within various literacy events often "lived into" subsequent events as well. For Kenny, Elijah and Kevin, the ability to actually read the message enhanced their
social status. Ironically, other children did not appear to be impressed or concerned with this activity, and the elevated status of the "winner" was limited within the confines of the developing relationships between the three boys.

At the beginning of the year, Mrs. L generally led the children in a Shared Reading of the message while pointing to each word as the class "mumbled" along with her. She used this time to talk about early strategies and often referred to pictures and other classroom events to provide children with a context for making predictions. She was clearly the leader of this exploration. As time went on, however, she moved from leader to passive observer.

In Phase II, Mrs. L initiated the shared reading. She pointed during the first reading and then invited a child to come up and point for the second and third readings of her message. As children moved from mumble reading (first time) to echo reading (second reading), and then to choral reading, Mrs. L began read with a softer voice. The message was much longer at that point in time, and rarely had accompanying pictures. One several occasions, Mrs. L pointed during the third reading of the text. This time she avoided "word pointing" by sweeping across each phrase and sentence with the pointer in one large movement.

Mrs. L used the message to teach children about specific reading strategies: what to do when encountering an unknown word, thinking about the context, utilizing graphophonic cues (especially beginning and ending sounds), etc. She also talked about hard and soft sounds, silent letters, capitalizing people's names, and uses of various punctuation marks (exclamation mark, questions mark, period, comma, quotation mark). Mrs.
L made sure that each message included a variety of punctuation marks and drew attention to them on a daily basis.

Phase III brought new changes as well. Mrs. L would point to the words during the first reading, but would not read with the children unless they were experiencing a great deal of difficulty and appeared to be overly frustrated. Everyone had opportunity to contribute as they felt led. When miscues were made, Mrs. L would continue pointing until the children had read the entire phrase or sentence and ask: "Does that make sense?" She would then reread it the way the children had read it and would invite them to "make it make sense" by directing their attention to the word/s in question. Elijah and Kenny emerged as the leaders during these choral readings. In fact, it appeared that they had actually assumed Mrs. L's role of leader during the initial reading of the message. Kevin was the child who often figured out the "hard words" when children were trying to make sense of the text. During the second and third readings of the message, Mrs. L would step to the side or back of the room, allowing the pointer and the children to "take charge" of the choral reading.

At the beginning of Phase IV, Mrs. L initiated a new structure into reading the message on the board. Because children frequently fought over who would get to point, Mrs. L decided that they would go in alphabetical order, by children's first names. This provided children with many opportunities to talk about alphabetizing words. On the day after Candie had pointed, Mrs. L asked: "Whose turn is it to point today?" Some children thought that it was Chancy's turn and others thought that it was Chrystal's turn. Mrs. L wrote both names on the board (one directly under
the other) and the children helped her to mark off the "alike" letters. Much to Chrystal's amazement, Chancy's name actually came before hers "if you're going in abc order!".

While reading the message on the board during Phase IV, Mrs. L stood at the side of the room and did not participate in the reading at all. She observed as children talked about and puzzled over "long words" and "hard words" as they worked to "make sense" of the written symbols. At times, she intervened, but worked to keep that at a minimum. From the perspectives of Mrs. L and the children, this print was never decontextualized (Donaldson, 1984; Olson, 1977). The meaning was contexted in the context of daily life in this classroom and in the format of "message." The children made predictions that showed their awareness of this. Because the children were involved in rehearsing for their plays based on Lizard's Song (Shannon, 1981), Dance Away (Shannon, 1982), and Mushroom in the Rain (Shannon, 1984) during the last three weeks of school, Mrs. L used the entire board for the schedule and no longer wrote a daily message.

Throughout the course of the year, the message on the board was considered to be environmental print for the children as they used it as a resource for their own spellings as well as the spelling of their peers. Several children also used the pointer and explored the message while participating in Free Reading at all phases of data collection. Such explorations of the message became especially meaningful to Bobby toward the end of the year. He frequently walked over to the chalkboard during Free Reading and worked to make sense out of the words Mrs. L had written. This was quite different from his involvement during the choral reading
of the message earlier in the day as he appeared to be paying attention, but rarely orally "chorused" with the group until the third reading.

**Interactions With One Another and With Texts:** The classroom climate was such that children felt the freedom to "join in" whenever they had something to contribute. Mrs. L's attitude of "just try it and you'll be able to read along with me" permeated all activities that took place throughout the course of the year. Children were eager to participate and responded to Mrs. L's invitations to participate with great zeal. During Phase I, although many of the children could not actually "read" the message, they engaged in a form of "mumble reading" where they sounded like they were reading along with Mrs. L as she lead them in reading the text. She paused frequently for them to make predictions based on their semantic knowledge and referred them to graphophonic cues pointing to words and saying: "Yep, you're right! And look, violet has a V!"

When Mrs. L initiated rereading the message in Phase II, children's interactions with the text changed significantly. They had a good sense of what the message was saying, as Mrs. L had already led them in a reading which would be similar to echo reading. They were able to make meaningful predictions on-the-spot as they reread the text, and responded to Mrs. L's contextual and visual hints. The third reading of the message typically sounded like a choral reading. Their collective voice was stronger, their phrasing now fit the form of "message," and their intonation reflected knowledge of punctuation and prosody.

Throughout Phases III and IV, various children emerged as leaders. The initial reading often sounded like a choral reading, with Kenny, Elijah, Kevin and sometimes John assuming the role that Mrs. L once had
as leader. One day, when Elijah was absent, Kenny discovered that he could read a little bit ahead of everyone and help keep them together. Much discussion during these two phases focused on strategies for figuring out unknown words and making sure that what they were reading actually made sense. When things seemed to "fall apart" during a choral reading, Mrs. L invited children to go back to the part where things stopped making sense and try again. During Phase IV, children read the message once chorally and then moved onto the daily schedule.

Mrs. L's Role as Participant: As noted in the previous paragraphs, Mrs. L continued to fade out of this event as the year progressed. In other words, her stance changed from that of leader to that of observer over time. She was quite careful to construct messages that would invite children to problem solve and utilize all three cuing systems, and exhibited concern that the children get support from the message itself and from one another. She continued to increase the opportunities for their independence while also increasing the amount of text and the variety of formats as the year progressed.

For Mrs. L, this activity was clearly efferent. It gave her a forum in which to demonstrate and talk about reading strategies and subtle aspects of print. For the children, it was a time of discovery—a time to discover how they, as a group could make print work FOR them, and a time to learn about what would take place during the day. From a researcher's perspective, during Phase II and III, the message on the board played a paramount role in the children's literacy development. It provided avenues for children to explore their changing notions about "text" and their roles as readers and writers in a group setting. They
subsequently carried these explorations into other literacy events as well.

**Schedule on the Board**

The basic format of the daily schedule remained the same through phases I and II of this study (Table 6). Mrs. L wrote daily activities on the board in order of occurrence, using numerals to signify the order of the activities. With the onset of morning work in Phase III, the appearance of the schedule changed so that children knew at what time they would be meeting with Mrs. L in their small groups. There were actually two schedules during this time period: a schedule for morning work (independent work) and a schedule for group meeting times.

The daily schedule during Phase IV was so detailed that it occupied the entire board. Children were now moving into long periods of independent work during both the morning and afternoon. The schedule included: a list of children's names beneath the title of the play in which they were participating, a list of tasks they should accomplish independently throughout the course of the day, and the goals for each group as they met with Mrs. L and independently. Routine literacy events such as Authors' Workshop and Free Reading were housed under the auspices of Independent work during the last three weeks of school.

**Functions and Uses of Literacy Across Time:** For the most part, the children viewed the schedule as an instrument through which they could keep track of their daily activities. They monitored the schedule throughout the year, using it to confirm which activities they had done, and to learn how many more "things" they needed to do before lunch. In Phases III and IV, the children worked in small groups. This contributed
### Table 6
Comparison Chart of Schedule on the Board Across Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHEDULE ON THE BOARD</strong></td>
<td><strong>SCHEDULE ON THE BOARD</strong></td>
<td><strong>SCHEDULE ON THE BOARD</strong></td>
<td><strong>SCHEDULE ON THE BOARD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itemized list of daily events in order of occurrence.</td>
<td>Itemized list of daily events in order of occurrence.</td>
<td>Small Group schedule is listed on a time block grid.</td>
<td>Schedule for each group’s meeting times, and what they will do each day is listed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each item has only one or two words.</td>
<td>Mrs. L adds subheadings to inform children specifically what will occur within certain events.</td>
<td>Itemized listing of Morning Work activities.</td>
<td>Itemized list of Independent Work activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. L leads a Shared Reading (1:1) of the schedule.</td>
<td>Mrs. L leads a Shared Reading while pointing (1:1).</td>
<td>Daily Spelling activities are listed by day of week.</td>
<td>Mrs. L reads Independent Work assignments quickly, explains new activities, and asks if there are questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In middle of Phase II, she no longer reads WITH the group, but continues pointing (1:1) as they read.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toward the end of Phase II, Mrs. L rarely invites children to read the schedule as a group. They do refer to it periodically when discussing daily events at Story Floor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much talk about:</td>
<td>Much talk about:</td>
<td>Much talk about:</td>
<td>Very little talk about the schedule or what they should do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Content of the schedule</td>
<td>- Beginning sounds</td>
<td>- Questions children have about Morning Work activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Beginning sounds</td>
<td>- Making predictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Making predictions</td>
<td>- Using semantic, graphophonic and syntactic cuing systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Using semantic, graphophonic and syntactic cuing systems</td>
<td>- Silent letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Silent letters</td>
<td>- Sounds that various letters make</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sounds that various letters make</td>
<td>- Blends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Blends</td>
<td>- Suffixes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to the changes made in the schedule and the complex nature of the schedule during these two data collection periods. Children used the schedule as a memory aid to help them remember what they were supposed to do each day and frequently went to the board to mentally "check off" the things they had accomplished. Many children also used the schedule as environmental print. They copied needed words during Authors' Workshop, Journaling and while writing messages. Some children used the pointer while reading the schedule during Free Reading. The schedule on the board provided children with the guidance they needed in order to maintain their independence when Mrs. L was working with small groups.

**Interaction With One Another and With Texts:** At the beginning of the year, there was much lively discussion about the words that were on the schedule. The children worried about how they would tell the difference between "Recess" and "Reading." On one occasion, Chrystal was convinced that "Gym" was "Go home" and she couldn't figure out why Mrs. L would have them go home before lunch since half-days had been over for several weeks. In the discussion, Mrs. L prompted the children to come to Chrystal's aid. Many of them determined that Chrystal was correct, because they couldn't think of anything else they would do that had a "g" at the beginning. Mrs. L encouraged Chrystal to explain other ways she could confirm her prediction. She came forth with a question which was heard over and over again throughout the course of the year: "What's your evidence, Chrystal?". The children couldn't find an "h" in the word, but still couldn't figure out what "G word" they would do in Mrs. L's room. The teacher provided them with a hint: "It's where you go to another room and you have to wear your tennis shoes." "Oh, yeah! Gym!" a smiling
group of first graders chorused. Mrs. L expanded their notion of "G-ness" as she explained that the letter G often had two sounds: "One is a soft G, like juh in gym and one is a hard G like go home or garden."

Children moved from discussing HOW to read the schedule to actually reading it with help from Mrs. L. She would often add a few extra words to a typical literacy event so that children would have something challenging to read. For example, during a thematic study of plants and trees in Phase II, Mrs. L wrote: Story Floor---Celery Experiment. The children were constantly thinking about and working to make meaning from these new words. Mrs. L would sometimes read it for them at the beginning of the year. As the year progressed, she encouraged them to puzzle it out for themselves. Children, free to contribute their ideas, frequently came to the right conclusion after some discussion and a few hints from Mrs. L.

The schedule, during Phases III and IV, tended to be much more individual for the children. They used it in guiding their work during the day, often referring to it and counting the items they had left to do while keeping a steady eye on the clock. When there were questions about the schedule, a willing helper was often nearby to offer assistance. The children relied heavily on the daily schedule as an instrument for providing them with the information they needed in planning the format and sequence of their independent work.

**Mrs. L's Role as Participant:** In many ways, Mrs. L's participation in reading the schedule with the children each day paralleled the ways in which she structured and participated in the reading of the message. At the beginning of the year, there were distinct differences, however.
During Phase I, children were quite interested in the schedule and seemed to feel more comfortable in reading this itemized list than they did in reading the daily message. Mrs. L took advantage of their fascination with daily events and spent a great deal of time reading and rereading specific items on the schedule. While reading the schedule, children discovered the incongruencies of the English language. After all, "writing" and "reading" sound the same, but they don't start with the same letters! They located familiar words that had intrinsic meaning for them. "Recess" and "Lunch" were the most-loved words during the first two weeks of school. Candie looked at the board on the fourth day of school and remarked to Chrystal, who was standing nearby. "Oh, no! Not that J-thing again!" She was referring to Journaling, which was her least favorite activity at this point in time. Two weeks later, when children returned from a three day weekend to discover that Journaling was the first item on the schedule, Candie and Chrystal clapped in celebration.

Mrs. L seized many opportunities and "teachable moments" when reading the schedule with the children during the first month of school. The message soon became the locus for much of her directive instruction, and the schedule became something that Mrs. L and the children conducted a quick "read-through" of before moving onto Story Floor. By the middle of Phase II, Mrs. L didn't read the schedule with the children everyday. She encouraged them to read it on their own, but did make note of any changes or new additions as they occurred. In Phase III and Phase IV, Mrs. L read through the schedule with the children, using this time to explain their work. She rarely talked about strategies, sounds, or other aspects of literacy. At that point in time the schedule was, from her
perspective as well as the perspectives of the children, purely instrumental in that it was fundamental in helping children participate in vital classroom activities without her guidance. As with reading of the daily message, Mrs. L continued to turn more and more over to the children as they began to successfully negotiate the text both independently and as a group.

**Story Floor**

As mentioned previously, Story Floor was a larger event which housed a variety of routine literacy events such as: the introduction of new texts, rereading of familiar texts, Shared Reading, Shared Writing, planning for classroom activities, and Booksharing. These events remained constant throughout the year, with the addition of other literacy events of which some were initiated by the children while some were initiated by the teacher (Table 7).

When children began publishing books during Authors' Workshop, Mrs. L invited them to celebrate their books with the group at Story Floor. They would introduce the book, using the same format as Mrs. L did when she introduced new trade books to the class. They would read the title, author, illustrator, and the dedication page and then begin reading their book to the crowd that was huddled around them in a semi-circle. Some children had difficulty remembering to SHOW the pictures during the onset of this event in Phase II. Classmates would plea for a chance to view the accompanying illustrations. Mrs. L began working to structure morning Story Floor/s as a time for her to introduce new books. She used afternoon Story Floor as a time to revisit familiar texts during Phase II. Children began doing science experiments as a group during this phase.
### Table 7
Comparison Chart of Story Floor Across Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STORY FLOOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>STORY FLOOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>STORY FLOOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>STORY FLOOR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction of new texts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Introduction of texts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Introduction of new texts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Introduction of new texts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Children make predictions about content.</td>
<td>- Similar to Phase I with the exception of:</td>
<td>- Similar to Phase II with the exception of:</td>
<td>- Similar to Phase III with the exception of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Children talk a great deal during first reading.</td>
<td>- More texts with rich, literary language introduced.</td>
<td>- Mrs. L often invites children to make predictions and then begins reading without pausing unless the children bid for such action.</td>
<td>- Mrs. L gives book talks and reads only the first few lines/pages of some books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less talk during second reading.</td>
<td>- More talk about illustrations.</td>
<td>- Children discuss different ways the author/illustrator could have approached making the book.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Children make links to other texts.</td>
<td>- Many informational books about plants and trees.</td>
<td>- Children in front row try to read.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Children join in on repeated refrains.</td>
<td>- Much talk about different ways of writing and illustrating.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Many predictable, patterned books introduced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rereading of familiar Texts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rereading of familiar Texts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rereading of familiar Texts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rereading of familiar Texts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Children join in on familiar patterns and repetitive refrains.</td>
<td>- Similar to Phase I with the exception of:</td>
<td>- Child who chooses book may read it to the class.</td>
<td>- Similar to Phase III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Child who chose the book sits next to Mrs. L as she reads.</td>
<td>- Child who chooses book holds book and helps Mrs. L turn pages. She sometimes asks that child to help her read familiar sections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction of new activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Introduction of new activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Introduction of new activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Introduction of new activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Written conversations, Authors' Workshop, etc.</td>
<td>- Fewer occurrences than in Phase I.</td>
<td>- Takes place at seats more often than at Story Floor.</td>
<td>- Similar to Phase III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7 (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shared Reading
- Much Shared Reading of charts that were created by group.
- Much Shared Reading of big books after they've been introduced.
- Much Shared Reading of poems on charts.

### Shared Writing
- Mrs. L invites children to tell her the letters they hear as she writes charts/lists.
- Sometimes Mrs. L writes words in the invented spellings that children give her.
- Sometimes Mrs. L writes the letters they suggest and adds other letters for conventional spelling.
- Sometimes Mrs. L invites a child to write directly on the chart.

### Shared Book Experiences
- Mrs. L introduces big books and invites children to read along with her.
- Mrs. L frequently provides multiple copies of trade books with the same title for children to explore while she models with the big book.

### Review of Room Rules
- Occurred daily during first two weeks of school.

### Shared Reading
- Fewer occurrences than in Phase I and II.
- Mrs. L creates texts which are much more complex and have no pictures.

### Shared Writing
- Fewer occurrences than in Phase II.

### Shared Book Experiences
- All big books have been introduced by now. Mrs. L and children participate in rereading of these big books as familiar texts.

### Celebrations of newly published books
- Similar to Phase II.

### Celebration of newly published books
- Similar to Phase III.
Table 7 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning for Literature Extensions</th>
<th>Planning for Literature Extensions</th>
<th>Planning for Thematic Units</th>
<th>Planning for Thematic Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Often becomes part of a chart that was written as Shared Writing and then read as Shared Reading.</td>
<td>- Similar to Phase I.</td>
<td>- Children share what they know and what they would like to learn prior to beginning the next thematic unit of study (themestorming). Mrs. L and the children create unit webs which they display in the room for reference.</td>
<td>- Because the last unit involved writing plays, rehearsing them, and performing them, most of the talk centered around making decisions as to whom they would invite to their performances, props, and when they would be ready to perform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Thematic Units</td>
<td>- Children share what they know about plants and tell Mrs. L what they want to learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booksharing</td>
<td>Booksharing</td>
<td>Special Reader</td>
<td>Special Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Children bring in books from home frequently.</td>
<td>- Less frequent. Sometimes children don't share their book, but put it on the bookshelf for others to check out.</td>
<td>- This replaces Booksharing. One child is invited to choose a book and read it to the class.</td>
<td>- Similar to Phase III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Experiments</td>
<td>Science Experiments</td>
<td>Science Experiments</td>
<td>Science Experiments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pertaining to unit of study.</td>
<td>- Similar to Phase II.</td>
<td>- Similar to Phase II.</td>
<td>- Similar to Phase III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much talk about:</td>
<td>Much talk about:</td>
<td>Much talk about:</td>
<td>Much talk about:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Authors</td>
<td>- Authors</td>
<td>- Authors</td>
<td>- Authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Words associated with books: author, title, dedication page, illustrations, cover, etc.</td>
<td>- Content of book</td>
<td>- Contents of books</td>
<td>- Content of books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Content of book</td>
<td>- Beginning and ending sounds</td>
<td>- Comparing styles of authors and illustrators</td>
<td>- Art media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Beginning and ending sounds</td>
<td>- Semantic, graphophonic and syntactic cuing systems</td>
<td>- Links to other texts</td>
<td>- Language of texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Semantic, graphophonic and syntactic cuing systems</td>
<td>- Links to other texts</td>
<td>- Texts children were creating</td>
<td>- Literary devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appropriate behavior at Story Floor</td>
<td>- Why the author wrote the text</td>
<td>- Links to other texts</td>
<td>- Links to other texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Links to other texts</td>
<td>- What makes a book &quot;good&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Phase III, children were given opportunities to share what they had done during their small group activities when at Story Floor. Since each group was studying something different, they were encouraged to present new information in a creative way. Small groups actually met at the Story Floor area and were considered to be small group Story Floor experiences. Children continued to celebrate their newly published books at whole class Story Floor during this phase as well. A Special Reader was also invited to read to the group, usually during the second morning Story Floor. Mrs. L had created a chart labeled "Special Readers This Week" so that each child was given an opportunity to read TO the class during Story Floor. They could choose any book that they wanted to read to the class and the children were expected to act as a polite audience during this time.

Mrs. L made concerted efforts to encourage and support children's explorations of texts they had never met before during Phase IV. At Story Floor, she gave "book talks" which told about a wide variety of new texts which were displayed around the room at that time. She often told the children a little bit about the plot of the book or read the first several pages to give them an idea of what the book might sound like. Mrs. L also "planted" books throughout the room, anxious to observe children as they explored these books in the coming days. Many of these books found their way into the communal life of Story Floor, as children suggested that EVERYONE would enjoy this book and that she should read it to the class.

Small group Story Floor experiences during Phases III and IV focused on the content under study as well as reading strategies. Much of the talk that was initiated by Mrs. L during small group discussions was
informed by her observations of children during other portions of the day and who was in each small group. She frequently created unofficial small groups which met with her for a few days if she felt that several children needed help with the same strategy.

Throughout the year, children explored literacy at Story Floor through participating in a wide variety of experiences with texts. Because of the diverse nature of the literacy events which occurred within the context of Story Floor, it provided children with the broadest range of ways to use literacy for real purposes in their lives together.

**Functions and Uses Of Literacy Across Time:** Story Floor was a social event in which children were free to share their ideas about the world, literature and literacy in the context of a supportive literacy community. Throughout the year, children's interactions with texts and one another opened new vistas and broadened their horizons. At Story Floor, children's understandings of what it means to be "literate" became apparent as they talked about "having seen that book before", reading fast, and "really reading the words." They were free to challenge one another's ideas and ask questions. Mrs. L worked to affirm all children for their ideas and throughout the year showed that each child was part of this literacy community of "readers" and "writers." She continually told children that there were some things they could read and some things they couldn't read, "but that was just part of being a reader."

Introductions of new texts were typically social, as the children and Mrs. L shared their predictions as to what might happen in the text. Her first reading of the text often served to document or confirm children's predictions. When she read the book again, children continued
to seek new information, find new ways of confirming their earlier theories and often simply enjoyed the recreational aspect of this reading. Rereadings of familiar texts tended to be mostly aesthetic (Rosenblatt, 1976) and were sometimes viewed as social by children who tried to read loudly and stay ahead of the rest of the group. Rereading of familiar texts often evolved into a creative activity as children created new language and new verses to texts such as Wheels on the Bus (Raffi, 1988), If You Give a Mouse a Cookie (Numeroff, 1985) and poems which Mrs. L had written onto charts. At the beginning of the year, however, most of Mrs. L's introductions of patterned big books and other predictable books of which she had multiple copies were efferent in nature from her perspective. She used these introductions and subsequent rereadings to teach children about literacy.

During thematic units, Mrs. L introduced a wide variety of informational books on specific topics. The children and Mrs. L explored these texts together in a search for new information. Sometimes the teacher would read entire picture books to the class which dealt with the topic they were studying. On several occasions, Mrs. L "talked around" the text as she shared the illustrations and paraphrased the information to make it more interesting. She also featured specific chapters or sections of books, when the information seemed applicable to the children's interests and the study evolved. Their interest in knowledge didn't stop with merely reading the books, however.

Within each phase, the class participated in recording new facts and authentic questions so that they could use them for later reference. They used these charts frequently as memory aids as well as for comparing and
confirming facts in other sources. They recorded their hypotheses when beginning science experiments and then used those charts to discuss what happened, what they learned, and what they were going to do next. Charts at Story Floor became environmental print which children used as resources when writing during other literacy events.

The literacy function which changed the most over the course of the year was children's understanding of expository reading and writing; that of writing or reading for a particular audience. During Phase I, they became acquainted with a wide variety of authors. They were immersed in learning about Eric Carle and reading his books as the highlighted author of the month. The children began to ask questions about Don and Audrey Woods and tried to find ways of relating them to Eric Carle as they explored *The Napping House* (1984), *King Bidgood's in the Bathtub* (Wood, 1985), *Heckedy Peg* (1986), *Quick as a Cricket* (1982), and *The Mouse, the Strawberry and the Very Big Hungry Bear* (1984). They asked Mrs. L to read bookjackets where it talked about the authors and frequently asked to see author pictures when they were included in a book.

The initiation of Authors' Workshop near the end of Phase I and children's subsequent celebrations of published books at Story Floor dramatically changed the ways in which the children responded to various texts. Their discussions began to reflect an understanding of various literary styles and forms. They moved beyond simply making and confirming predictions to making suggestions as to how the author/illustrator could have done things differently. They were, in a very real sense, talking like authors! Children's awareness of audience also changed as they
practiced reading books when it was their turn to be the Special Reader at Story Floor during Phase III.

*Interactions With One Another and With Texts:* Although children spent a great deal of time talking about literature and literacy throughout the course of the day, discussions at Story Floor provided opportunities for children to share their ideas and notions with the group as a whole. This provided Mrs. L with an on-going forum in which to observe children's thought-processes. She learned a great deal about children's understandings about texts and language through these discussions. She also had opportunity to guide them toward new vistas in their thinking as she shared books with rich literary language and books with predictable sequences or patterns. The nature of interactions at Story Floor appeared to rely a great deal on the nature of the text and what Mrs. L and the children thought it could "teach." (Meek, 1988)

At the beginning of the year, children talked a great deal about texts during book introductions regardless of the nature of the text (informational book, folktale, encyclopedia article, patterned book, other picture books, etc.). Mrs. L sanctioned their input and questions, often encouraging these interactions to become full-fledged discussions. During Phase I, much of the talk that centered around books tended to center around Mrs. L. It was as if she were having a short dialogue with one child in the presence of the rest of the children. These interactions began to change subtly so that children actually began dialoguing with one another during literature discussions at Story Floor. The following excerpts highlight this shift. They also exemplify the interactions between Mrs. L, the children and the text when they explored books with
rich literary language; books which children at the beginning of the year would not typically have chosen to try and read on their own.

The children had been reading and comparing various versions of "the three bears" during their first thematic unit of the year. They noticed that, in some books, the bears wore clothes, while in others, they did not. Although they agreed that the story probably couldn't have REALLY happened, as bears don't live in houses, make porridge and sleep in beds, they wondered if the versions in which the bears didn't wear clothing were in some ways "truer" than the versions in which the bears wore human apparel. Mrs. L took this opportunity to expand their notions of fantasy and reality in books. As the group talked about stories that could really happen (reality) and stories that really couldn't happen in real life (fantasy), they started pointing out the reality and fantasy elements in the Three Bears books they were exploring. Mrs. L decided to share *Jumanji* (Van Allsburg, 1981) with the class in an attempt to more deeply probe their understandings of reality and fantasy.

Following are some excerpts from this Story Floor discussion, as Mrs. L introduced and read this new text. The interactions between the children, Mrs. L AND the text were integrated parts of the whole experience. Children were invited to dialogue throughout the reading of this text, interrupting Mrs. L when they had comments and/or questions, and "reading" her pauses as opportunities to contribute what they were thinking.

Mrs. L shows the children a new chart which they will be discussing today at Story Floor. On the chart there are three columns: Reality, Fantasy, Reality and Fantasy. Kevin asks what the chart says. Mrs. L invites the children to make predictions as to what it might say. Kenny reads: Reality and Fantasy! She tells the children that they will keep this chart
by the easel, and they can write the names of books that fit under the appropriate categories as they read them. She then introduces *Jumanji* by telling them that it's written by the person who wrote one of Brandon's favorite books. Brandon gets *Polar Express* and tells the class that "it DID really happen." Mrs. L shows the cover of *Jumanji* and asks the children to make predictions as to whether it is reality or fantasy.

Micheal: Reality.

Mrs. L: Apparently something helped you decide that. Can you tell us how you reached that decision?

Micheal: The monkeys are up on the table... eating bananas.

Mrs. L: And that seemed real to you?

Micheal: Yeah.

Mrs. L: Any more ideas?

Kenny: I think there was a show of it... I think there was... on Disney. They couldn't catch the monkey. It was cool.

Mrs. L: Okay... Candie.

Candie: Well, um, I seen it on Kangaroo... .

Mrs. L: Captain Kangaroo?

Candie: Yeah. They show books.

At this point, Mrs. L was working toward facilitating a discussion about fantasy or reality. Several children had some relevant things to share from their home lives which might have impacted their predictions about this book. Through this portion of the discussion Mrs. L learned that Candie watches Captain Kangaroo and seems to enjoy the book segments. Kenny's background experiences with a specific Disney program definitely impacted his conjectures as to the nature of this text. Other children benefited from the information that was shared. (During Free
Reading later that day, several children asked Candie when Captain Kangaroo was on, and other children talked about watching Reading Rainbow.) Mrs. L redirected the conversation back toward reality and fantasy while showing respect for what Kenny and Candie had offered.

Mrs. L: Okay. Any ideas whether this is going to be fantasy or reality?

Kevin: Fantasy.

Mrs. L: Kevin says fantasy. Kevin, can you tell us why?

Kevin: It couldn't happen.

Mrs. L: Tell me what couldn't happen.

Kevin: THAT couldn't happen! (points to monkeys on cover page)

Mrs. L: You mean the monkeys?

Kevin: Yeah.

Gordon: There are REAL monkeys!!!!

Kevin: Yeah. At the zoo, but not in your house!

Mrs. L: Okay, that could be-

Rashonna: Maybe they broke in!

Kevin: You'd have to look at the window.

John: They probably bought them!

Mrs. L: Oh, they may have bought them! So you think it might be a story of reality. Is that what you're saying?

John: (nods head "yes")

Mrs. L: Good ideas. I like the way you're thinking! Using those heads! Elijah?

Elijah: They're wild. That couldn't happen.

Mrs. L: They're supposed to live in the wild?
Elijah: (nods head "yes")

Mrs. L: So what do you think---is it reality or fantasy?

Elijah: Fantasy.

Mrs. L: Brandon, what do you have to share about this book?

Brandon: We'll have to wait till we get that part to see.

Mrs. L continued to probe as she sought to clarify what Kevin meant by his response. There was a real "meeting of the minds" as the children dialogued with one another, and listened to ideas which may have been new to them. Kevin was certain that the monkeys were not real. Several children offered alternatives to his view while he continued to hold his ground. Mrs. L affirmed everyone's contributions to the discussion and prompted more discussion about fantasy and reality. This moved the focus away from one person's defense of his ideas, and back to the book and what other children might be thinking. Brandon signalled that this portion of the discussion was nearing an end by suggesting that they look at that part of the book before deciding for sure. Brandon loved Chris Van Allsburg's books, and appeared quite anxious to "enter into" the story. The children appeared ready to confirm or disconfirm their predictions through interacting with the text.

As typical of any new text introduction, Mrs. L and the children talked about the title, author, illustrator, dedication page, and title page. She began reading the story, stopping to ask questions or respond to children as they initiated conversation. Their discussions included: why they see only four monkeys in the picture when the text says there
are a dozen, the differences between buffalos and rhinoceroses, where to
start and end on a game board, the importance of reading instructions,
and what could happen if the volcano erupted (Gordon was writing a book
about volcanos during Authors Workshop at that time, and saw this as an
opportunity to teach the class about lava.). Part-way through the book,
Mrs. L asked the children what they thought about the book and the
following interaction occurred.

Mrs. L: What are you thinking so far about this book?
Kenny & Kevin: It's GOOD!!!!
Elijah: It's fake.
Mrs. L: Reality or fantasy?
Children: (Some say reality and some say fantasy)
Mrs. L: Krystal said it's reality. Why?
Krystal: Cuz it looks real.
Mrs. L: It looks real. The pictures sure look real! Chancy?
Chancy: Cuz it's fake.
Mrs. L: Parts of the story may be fake. What parts
of the story could be real?
Kenny: The game part, where they saw the game.
Mrs. L: That could happen! Chrystal with a C, what
were you going to say?
Chrystal: There's one picture that IS reality!
Mrs. L: One picture? Can you tell me what that
picture is about?
Chrystal: When he fell asleep.
Mrs. L: Yeah, that could happen. He could fall asleep.
Elijah: The lions are real.

As the children listened to the story, looked at the illustrations, and participated in the verbal discussions that took place, they were presented with a wealth of new information which enabled them to confirm or disconfirm their predictions. Elijah seemed puzzled by the realistic illustrations of the lions. Although he viewed the story itself to be "fake," the illustrations seemed to be subtle contradictions. Mrs. L, aware that various literary elements were contributing to the children's predictions, summarized the story so that children could focus on what happened within the story line.

Mrs. L: The lions looked real, didn't they? Okay, tell me this, with your hands down. When it started out and I said that the mother and father were going to a show...an opera, actually...and they left the boy and girl alone.

Kevin: That could be real.

Mrs. L: . .and the mother said: I'm bring guests home. Don't mess up the house. What'd you say about that part, Kevin?

Kevin: Um, that could really happen.

Mrs. L: That could really happen. Your mother could leave you at home and tell you not to mess up the house.

Krystal: The part where she said: Don't mess up the house and the part where she read it and then they played, well...I forgot. Oh yeah. She ran. That could really happen.

Toya: No it couldn't.

Mrs. L: Some of you think it could really happen and some of you think it couldn't. So what we're going to do now is...I'm going to stop reading the story here and we're going to take a little break. You can think about it a little bit. You can think about how you
think it will end. Who thinks they know how it's going to end? Micheal thinks he knows how it's going to end. Listen to Micheal.

Mrs. L continued to accept everyone's opinions as to whether the story was reality or fantasy. She invited them to share their predictions as to how the story might end before taking a short break. The children clearly showed their understanding that book endings usually have some sort of resolution.

Micheal: All the animals are going to be gone.
Mrs. L: You think they're going to be gone at the end. What's gonna chase them away? How are the going to get them out of the house?
Micheal: The city. Get to the city.
Mrs. L: So you think they're going to get to the golden city? What do you think will happen to the animals then?
John: They'll be gone.
Kenny: They'll disappear.
Mrs. L: Chancy?
Chancy: They're gonna be back where they was at.
Mrs. L: Kenneth, what do you think is going to happen?
Kenneth: I think... that when they get to the golden city... the animals will go away and the furniture will be all better.
Mrs. L: Oh, who's gonna fix the furniture?
Kenneth: Nobody! They just get fixed themselves!
Mrs. L: Oh, you mean kind of like magic?
Kenneth: They're imagining!
Mrs. L: Oh, he thinks they're imagining! That could be!
Candie: Fantasy!
Elijah: The rhinoceroses are going to disappear!
Mrs. L: Now that we made some predictions, we'll take a short break and I'm going to read the rest of it to you and we'll see how it ends.

Kenneth's perspective provided a different twist. He felt that the children were simply imagining all of these bizarre things, and that when they get to the golden city, they will "imagine away" all of the animals and broken furniture. The house will return to normal. For Candie, Kenneth's comments provided the clincher. *Jumanji* must be fantasy with all that imagining!

The children returned from their break, and Mrs. L finished reading the story to them. At the end, they talked about what parts they liked the best and then returned to their discussion of reality and fantasy.

Mrs. L: Tell me this. Did it start out as fantasy or reality?
Children: Reality.
Mrs. L: What happened then later in the story?
Children: Fantasy!!!
Mrs. L: And how did it end?
Children: (Some fantasy and some reality)
Mrs. L: It could have been fantasy or reality. Either one. There are some books which have both fact-
Elijah: Reality!
Mrs. L: ...reality and fantasy in them and this is an example of that. When you find books like this (holds *Jumanji* up), they'll go in this column here (points to Reality and Fantasy column). Okay. I'm going to have Kevin write this title. Are we all in agreement
that it was both fact...reality and fantasy, boys and girls?

Children: Yeah.

Kevin: (Comes to the chart and begins writing)

Children: (Look at cover of the book and spell out J-U-M-A-N-J-I while Kevin writes)

Mrs. L: We underline the names of books. (Show Kevin how to underline it. He does and returns to his seat at Story Floor)

The children had a multitude of opportunities to explore reality and fantasy through interacting with this text and with one another. They left Story Floor with a wealth of information. They had discussed two literary genres, learned about the world around them (twelve makes a dozen, artists draw the closest objects bigger and the objects that are farther away are smaller, etc.) and also explored writing book titles. This discussion and other, similar discussions at Story Floor contributed to the children's knowledge of literature and "lived on" as they tested out their expanded notions of literature, literacy, and the world throughout the course of the year.

Throughout the year, Mrs. L struggled to get the children to talk about the story line without referring to the pictures. When reading picture books with rich literary language, children would frequently use an illustration from the book to share their preferences for "best part" or "a part they liked." Perhaps this paralleled the children's initial stance (during Journaling at the beginning of the year) that the illustrations were an integral part of the message or story. Mrs. L continued to work toward getting children to talk about specific parts of "story plot" without referring to an illustration. Reluctantly, the
children became more and more comfortable with this more "decontextualized" way of talking about books. Near the end of the year, many of the children contributed in this manner without much prodding. The illustrations, however, remained a guiding force in almost everyone's discussions about both familiar and novel texts.

Mrs. L structured interactions with patterned texts in a much different way at the beginning of the year. She typically used these books to "teach" children specific strategies. They used these experiences to talk about reading as a process. Much of the talk centered around beginning and ending sounds, using the illustrations to create meaning, and reading from left to right. As the year progressed, Mrs. L continued to share patterned texts (books, poem, songs, rhymes) with the class. Her introductions of these texts changed noticeably. Toward the end of Phase II, Mrs. L began talking more about rhyming and she spent a great deal of time making up chants and rhymes with the children. In her introductions of new texts which had patterned language, she focused less on sound-symbol relationships and reading strategies. Instead, she drew children's attention toward identifying patterns and creating meaning for the story as a whole.

Mrs. L's Role as Participant: Although Mrs. L viewed her role during Story Time as that of facilitator, she was much more than that during all phases of data collection. She directed conversations toward specific topics and frequently identified new issues and topics as they emerged. At the beginning of the year, Mrs. L spent a great deal of time problem-solving with children as they talked about helping specific children sit "on their bottoms" at Story Floor. In fact, their book
discussions tended to move into a mutually collaborative effort as children sought to find evidence which would prove or alter their earlier predictions. From the children's perspectives, they were working TOGETHER as a group. Mrs. L was simply part of that group. Yet as teacher, Mrs. L closely monitored what children were attending to and supported the directions in which conversations moved. She was part of the whorl and weave of these collaborative explorations, yet she had the authority to alter the texture and final appearance of their efforts.

With each phase, Mrs. L encouraged children to take more leadership within the events which took place at Story Floor. In Phase I, she and the children established the rules and norms for discussions at Story Floor and they continued to renegotiate these participant structures throughout the year. Mrs. L clearly looked like "the teacher" in Phase I as she led the discussions that took place. She did most of the initial reading, while inviting the children to participate in a variety of ways. In Phase II, she began turning the responsibility for specific literacy events over to the children. When celebrating a newly published book, children sat or stood next to Mrs. L and controlled this portion of Story Floor. Mrs. L provided support, but rarely intervened—even when the author neglected to show the pictures. The other children (audience) made requests such as "read louder", "show the pictures," etc. During this phase, Mrs. L also invited the child who had chosen a familiar text for the group to enjoy to sit beside her. She often invited that child to hold the book or turn the pages. Her shift from leader to participant-observer-supporter at Story Time continued as the year progressed.
Although she was often the leader when talking about the content of thematic units, Mrs. L continued to find ways for children to act in leadership roles at Story Floor. During Phase II, she would often invite the child who chose the familiar text to lead in the choral reading if it were a book which worked well with such exploration. On various occasions during Phase III, Mrs. L actually sat on the floor as part of the group while children celebrated their newly published books or read to the class as the Special Reader. Children often brought books from home to "share" during Phase IV. At this point in time, Mrs. L invited them to read their books to the class if they could. If a child seemed to be having a difficult day, Mrs. L would sometimes choose a familiar text and invite that child to read the book or poem with her or to the group, depending upon the child and the text.

Free Reading

In many ways, Free Reading can be described as the literacy event in which the children had opportunities to "put it all together." They continued to engage in a variety of self-selected activities with texts, constantly experimenting with strategies which Mrs. L had demonstrated within other literacy events. Free Reading, throughout the course of the year, provided children with multiple opportunities to encounter new texts as well as utilize familiar texts to discover new ways of getting to familiar places (Table 8).

During Free Reading, children's preferences tended to emerge. At various points in time, specific children appeared to prefer writing over reading or vice-versa. For example, Elijah expressed an affinity toward writing early in the year. His mother told the teacher that he had been
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FREE READING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FREE READING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FREE READING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FREE READING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily a social activity in which children explore social relationships through sharing books and writing messages.</td>
<td>Became much more &quot;text-centered&quot;, although social relationships were important.</td>
<td>Much practicing of reading books to prepare for Special Reader or reading to another class.</td>
<td>Children take turns reading to each other and partner read a great deal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &quot;flit&quot; from one exploration to another, spending short amounts of time with one text.</td>
<td>Children began spending more time with books and with one group of peers.</td>
<td>Children begin spending concentrated amounts of time on one text. More independent reading. Much interest in reading chapter books (Little Bear, etc.) and other books which are easier to read (Happy Birthday Sam, Charlie Needs a Cloak, etc.).</td>
<td>Children tend to develop a bond with a particular book, which they explore many times during one Free Reading period. Children frequently revisit books they took home the night before during Free Reading. Much interest in being able to read a text that has never been introduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much evidence of:</td>
<td>Much evidence of:</td>
<td>Much evidence of:</td>
<td>Much evidence of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reenactments of familiar texts</td>
<td>- Monitoring one another's reading</td>
<td>- Monitoring others' reading</td>
<td>- Monitoring one's own reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enactments of novel texts</td>
<td>- Reenactments of familiar texts which evolved into actual readings of that text</td>
<td>- Some parallel reading, but less than Phase I</td>
<td>- Attempts to match words with text on a variety of books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parallel reading</td>
<td>- Some parallel reading, but less than Phase I</td>
<td>- Partner reading</td>
<td>- Trying to &quot;race&quot; through familiar texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Playing school</td>
<td>- Collaborative reading</td>
<td>- Much imitating Mrs. L --- reading as if to an audience</td>
<td>- Reading environmental print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Negotiating the rules and norms for Free Reading</td>
<td>- Much imitating Mrs. L --- reading as if to an audience</td>
<td>- Some playing school</td>
<td>- Finding spelling words in books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options available for exploration:</td>
<td>Options available for exploration:</td>
<td>Options available for exploration:</td>
<td>Options available for exploration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trade books</td>
<td>- Trade books</td>
<td>- Monitoring one's own reading</td>
<td>- Monitoring one's own reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Big books</td>
<td>- Big books</td>
<td>- Reading books to learn to read them</td>
<td>- Reading books to learn to read them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Charts</td>
<td>- Charts</td>
<td>- Excitement over reading books that have &quot;lots of words&quot;</td>
<td>- Excitement over reading books that have &quot;lots of words&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sequence cards for familiar stories</td>
<td>- Footbooks</td>
<td>- Reading independently while seated next to a friend and talking about one another's texts at various points</td>
<td>- Reading independently while seated next to a friend and talking about one another's texts at various points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Footbooks</td>
<td>- Writing messages</td>
<td>- Writing messages to teachers, school personnel, parents and researcher</td>
<td>- Writing messages to teachers, school personnel, parents and researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Journaling</td>
<td>- Reading the Message Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing messages</td>
<td>- Listening Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reading the Message Board</td>
<td>- Child-produced published books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Childcraft Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
writing spontaneously since he was three. Elijah often chose to write messages and write in his journal during Free Reading during Phase I. This bothered Kenny, as he thought that Free Reading meant that "you are supposed to read and not write." He would often march over to Elijah, who was immersed in a writing activity, and inquire: "Who told YOU you could do that?" As Mrs. L continued to sanction such activity, more children began exploring the worlds of writing during this literacy event. Although Elijah also engaged in reading books by himself and with others, the majority of his literacy explorations during Free Reading at the beginning of the year involved writing. Elijah's preferences shifted as the year progressed. By November, he was an avid reader and rarely chose to write during Free Reading unless he had a message he wanted to write to someone.

In contrast, Bobby's fascination with writing as an act in and of itself surfaced in November (Phase II). His extemporaneous writing during Story Floor often reflected a desire to explore print as a written form. Bobby made lists of people whom he might see when he accompanied his parents to Parent-Teacher conferences. He lamented the death of Charlotte and wondered about her babies. Bobby's explorations did not appear to serve a social function. He wrote simply because he felt an intense need to write at this point in time. Phase II was the only period of research observation in which Bobby exhibited a strong preference toward writing during Free Reading.

**Functions and Uses of Literacy Across Time:** For the most part, many of the children's explorations at the beginning of the year were social. They were using books as ways of developing relationships with their
peers. Although talk centered around books, it soon became clear as to who was welcome to read with whom on any given day. The social nature of free reading also included showing others one's expertise in reading a specific book. *Brown Bear* quickly became a classroom favorite, as all children had been involved in a variety of other literacy experiences with it outside the setting of Free Reading. They seemed to know that reading familiar texts repeatedly would help them become readers! Children spent a great deal of time re-enacting texts for one another. They would often begin re-enacting a text, using story pitch, voice and intonation. This would draw a small audience to listen to their retelling or enactment of a book. Free Reading, then, was also aesthetic at the beginning of the year.

As the year progressed, children continued to use literacy for social and recreational purposes. In Phases III and IV, three other functions of literacy emerged. Children began practicing reading books that they planned to read to the class as the Special Reader or to another teacher's class. They appeared to be quite aware of their audience as they practiced reading the text, holding the book so others could see it and turning pages at the appropriate times. They also began to write letters to teachers, requesting an opportunity to read to their classes (substitute for oral messages). The teachers would then respond, usually inviting them to come on the following day at a specific time. Reading TO others during Free Reading often appeared to be mostly social. Reading to the group during Story Floor and other classes appeared to be both expository and social.
Children also used literacy to learn about topics of interest or the topic under study at that point in time. They did not appear to often select particular texts so that they could find information. They tended to select texts that they enjoyed or were of particular interest to a friend. Learning new information was a by-product of their interactions with peers and texts as they structured explorations to include others.

**Interactions With One Another and With Texts:** During Free Reading, the room buzzed with activity! At the onset of the year, children moved quickly from one text to another, and often from one peer to another. As the year progressed, they began spending larger amounts of time with one specific text and often involved a variety of peers in their explorations. In April, it was not unusual to see one child read a book five to six times within the Free Reading period AND with a different set of children with each rereading! Children freely moved in and out of one another's explorations with great ease.

The ways in which children explored texts and the types of texts they chose to explore underwent a subtle transformation as the year progressed. During Phase I, children began writing messages to one another and frequently posted them on the Message Board. This activity expanded as these messages began to look more like dialogues in Phase II. Children took their recently crafted message to the person to whom it was written and that child would respond by writing a response. Brandon wrote the following message to Candie in early November (Figure 11). Brandon and Candie had been involved in a disagreement earlier in the day, and Brandon was feeling a bit insecure as to his status as far as Candie was concerned. He wrote: DUme From BrandonCandy (Do you like <like is
understood me? From Brandon

To Candie) He read it to Candie, who was exploring a text with Chrystal. Candie replied by saying "Just a minute!". She stomped over to the nearest table, grabbed a pencil and wrote while emphatically stating: "NO! NO! NO! NO! NO! NO!" Candie slammed the pencil onto the table and presented the scorned Brandon with her reply. Many of the messages during Phase II asked peers questions about playing together at recess, reading together or involved friendship in some way. Two days later, Brandon wrote another "Do you like me?" message to Candie. He was quite pleased with her smile and reply: "YES YES" and he posted this message proudly onto the Message Board. Other children initiated messages to one another which eventually evolved into a long sequence of dialogues which were quite similar to written conversations.

Writing messages seemed to decrease greatly in Phase III and was renewed somewhat in Phase IV. Children's messages to Mrs. L and other teachers were posted on the Message Board. Many of the messages they wrote to one another were kept in special places in their mailboxes. The majority of the messages written at this time were addressed to Mrs. L, other teachers, the principal, and professional authors.

Reenactments and enactments of texts occurred at every phase of data collection. At the beginning of the year, children enjoyed telling or
retelling the story. They frequently re-enacted texts for a peer audience, and often enjoyed retelling the story to themselves. As time went on, children appeared to begin with a reenactment or an enactment, and then moved toward actually reading the text part-way through the book. This was especially notable during Phase III. During Phase IV, children began choosing books that they had not "met" before. They typically did a preview of the book, which involved looking at all the pictures before beginning to read the print. They would sometimes invent text on pages that appeared too difficult, and would resume reading again once they found something to "hook" into. The frequency of text re-enactments and enactments reduced considerably during Phases III and IV.

During Phase II, children spent a considerable amount of time with predictable, patterned texts. Mrs. L had taken great care to introduce a wide variety of these texts during the beginning of the year and continued to find such texts to share with the children. Children's explorations of these texts altered considerably as they began to use the reading strategies that Mrs. L was teaching them. Krystal's explorations of Jump Frog, Jump! (Kalan, 1981) provide a nice example. This predictable text has a repetitive pattern throughout the text, usually occurring on every other page. The other pages have three to four lines of text which rhyme, but are not as predictable to the emerging reader. Krystal, who typically spent a great deal of time engaged in lively reenactments of familiar texts, began to read the print which was on the more patterned pages. She would invent text for the "hard pages," move to the predictable page and read the print. She often pointed with her right index finger or voice-pointed as she read these pages. Krystal
continued to explore *Jump Frog, Jump!* with great intensity throughout the year. She would frequently read it to an imaginary audience. By February, Krystal was beginning to point as she invented text for the more difficult pages, and often reworked her created text to match the number of words in the text itself. During this time, Krystal was beginning to read other patterned texts with patterns that were much less complicated. She continued her explorations of *Jump Frog, Jump!* and began to, as she put it, "really read" texts such as *The Big Fat Worm* (Van Laanen, 1987).

Another evolving aspect of children's explorations throughout the year was their monitoring of one another's reading, which ultimately led to self-monitoring when exploring texts independently. In Phase I, there was little monitoring behavior exhibited. The children focused more on one another than on specific aspects of text. As they became more familiar with one another and with various texts, they began to correct each other when engaging in partner readings or sitting next to someone while they were exploring a particular text. A child did not need to be participating actively in another child's exploration to monitor his/her reading. In Phase II, it was not unusual for a child to pause from exploration of a book such as *The Bus Stop* (Hellen, 1988) to remark: "That's not the flop page." to a group of children who were exploring *Why Can't I Fly?* (Gelman, 1974). Children continued to become more aware of the match between what they were reading and what was printed on the page throughout the course of the year. This varied from child to child and from text to text. Candie, whose explorations of *The Bus Stop* continued to change, called frantically one day for the researcher to come to her. The urgency in her voice called for expedient accommodation. Candie
displayed the first double page spread of the book and exclaimed with excitement: "Mrs. Nussbaum, ya' know what? I just figured out I can read the LITTLE words, too!" During Phases III and IV, children tended to revisit familiar texts by themselves more frequently. They began to really work at, as Kenny noted, "making the words fit." This became a common phenomena on both new and familiar texts toward the end of the year.

Throughout the year, children made links from text-to-life and life-to-text (Cochran-Smith, 1984) when they were interacting with texts and one another during Free Reading. During Phases III and IV, children began comparing various versions of the same texts spontaneously (text-to-text). They talked about all the "Billy Goat" books they had, compared *Ten in a Bed* (Rees, 1988) to *Roll Over* (Gerstein, 1984), and contrasted books with similar titles. Kenny began talking a great deal about "circle books" as he began a list of books that "could just start all over again." Books which Kenny put into this category were *If You Give a Mouse a Cookie*, *Roll Over*, *Where is My Duckling* (Tafuri, 1984), *The Big Fat Worm*, *Where's the Baby?* (Hutchins, 1988), *William Where are You?* (Gerstein, 1985), *The Doorbell Rang* (Hutchins, 1987) and *Jumanji*.

Elijah and Chancy discovered *There's an Alligator Under My Bed* (Mayer, 1987) and *The Alligator Under the Bed* (Nixon, 1974) one day while looking for books together. They wanted to investigate whether both books had the same text on the inside. Both boys predicted that it was probably the same on the inside, but that they each had different covers. This made sense, based on their experiences with the hardback and softback copies of *Bread and Jam for Frances* (Hoban, 1964) and two paperback copies
of The Three Bears, both of which were written by Paul Galdone but were of differing size and cover color.

They decided that the only way to discover whether their predictions were correct was to open both books, and page-by-page, compare the words and the illustrations. Together, they began reading aloud. Chancy was reading The Alligator Under My Bed and Elijah was reading There's an Alligator Under My Bed. Both texts were rather lengthy. The reading was slow-going, but both boys persevered. When Chancy got to the bottom of his page and Elijah was still reading, they decided that they were probably right. Yet, they wanted to explore a bit further. Elijah suggested that they turn a few pages and then do some "checking." They each counted five pages and Elijah placed the books on the floor so that one was directly above the other. He then began comparing each word, pointing word-by-word on the page and reading each word as he compared the two books. "Yup," he said to Chancy. "We were right." Chancy smiled and picked up There's an Alligator Under My Bed to explore further. Elijah turned back to the title page of the remaining book and began reading to himself. They shared information about their respective books as they explored independently. Although children constantly made connections between texts throughout the course of the year (especially at Story Floor), their text-to-text links during winter and spring seemed to play a central role in their explorations during Free Reading in the last two phases.

In Phase III, many children seemed to equate "fast" reading with "good" reading. When involved in a choral reading of Old McDonald Had a Farm (Abner, 1970), Toya raced through the text in order to show Kenny how
well she knew it. Kenny, whose agenda was different, wanted to attend to
the print. He tried to slow Toya down, but she was not easily diverted.
Kenny gave up, sped through the text with Toya, and then took the book to
another place so he could "pay attention to the words" while he read.
This type of interaction occurred on several occasions, and with several
children. While reading Little Bear's Visit (Minarik, 1961) one day in
Phase III, Elijah claimed that he had "sped through this book." Children's
fascination with speed gave way to their new interest in reading books
that they had never seen before and reading books with "lots of words" on
one page in Phase IV.

Free Reading, as a literacy event, remained fluid throughout the
year. Children played "school" continuously as they chorally read big
books and multiple copies of texts. They "read the room" and argued over
words as they collaborated together and listened to one another read. On
the surface, Free Reading appeared to be similar from day to day. Focused
observations revealed that the children's literacy explorations were
undergoing a metamorphosis of their own. As they began to gain more
control over print, their explorations of text appeared to increase in
length. Children began spending longer amounts of time with specific
books as they worked to make print work for them. WHAT was happening
within children's explorations, HOW explorations were constructed, WITH
whom and WITH which literacy artifacts will be discussed in greater detail
in Chapter 5.

Mrs. L's Role as Participant: In the early weeks of school, Mrs. L
spent a great deal of time channeling children's explorations into
directions which she felt would be helpful to them. She responded
positively to many of their spontaneous activities and observed as they added to the options which were available during Free Reading. Elijah, for example, began working in his journal during Free Reading on the fourth day of school. Upon reflecting upon this experience and what happened when other children followed Elijah's lead and began journaling, Mrs. L decided to continue to offer journaling as a legitimate option during Free Reading.

When Krystal and Jason began writing on chart paper during Free Reading, Mrs. L considered their explorations with great interest. She felt that they were benefiting greatly from the dialogues which they constructed at the chart paper easel, but was concerned that she would run out of chart paper (a highly valued commodity) prior to the end of the year. Mrs. L considered the possibility that children's interest in this activity may wane after a few days. She continued to sanction and support their "chart writing" until she noted that it was becoming a favorite activity of Free Reading. Mrs. L introduced written conversations on the following day. She told the class that they could write to one another on regular paper instead of using the chart paper. The chart paper was reserved for her, as teacher. The propensity for written conversations never reached the magnitude that chart writing had attained, but did show that Mrs. L valued the children and their ways of exploring literacy naturally.

Once children seemed to have a sense of Free Reading as a routine, Mrs. L was free to participate in Free Reading much like the children. She frequently read with and to children. On several occasions, the principal entered the room to talk with Mrs. L and had difficulty finding
her because she was on the floor or seated among the children. This continued throughout the year. Mrs. L supported children as they worked to "make sense" of print and often acted as an impartial observer. She rarely corrected a child's miscue. When asked, she would either provide information or ask questions that would guide the questioner to his/her own solution.

Mrs. L did not relinquish "control" over children's explorations at any time during Free Reading. This is in contrast to the literacy events that have been described thus far. She could not gradually give children more responsibilities as to the reading and writing of texts, as she never had that responsibility herself in the first place. Each child was a full participant in the explorations which he/she constructed. Mrs. L directed children toward specific texts, sanctioned specific activities, and observed as children interacted with one another and with texts. On a daily basis, she became part of children's explorations, but was not the facilitator within any given exploration. The children took the lead. Mrs. L moved in and out of their explorations as fluidly as did the children themselves.

As the year progressed, Mrs. L did guide the explorations of certain children in very specific directions which she felt would meet their needs at that point in time. In May, when Candie was exploring *Love You Forever* (Munsch, 1986), Mrs. L sat on the floor beside her. Candie had been attempting to read the text, but appeared a bit overwhelmed by the amount of print on each page. Mrs. L asked if she could read with Candie. They decided to partner read. Mrs. L would read one page and Candie would read the next. Mrs. L chose the page on which she would read, leaving Candie
with the pages on which the same song appeared over and over again. She knew that Candie could probably read the entire text, but felt that Candie needed the support of the patterned pages to help her feel successful while reading such a long book. (This was one of Candie's earliest attempts to read a text with so much print.) They read together for awhile, with Candie increasing in confidence. Halfway through, Mrs. L looked at the clock and suggested that Candie take the book home and read the rest with her mother just like they had done it together. Candie skipped over to the Library Chart, checked the book out and prepared to go home. The next day, Candie returned with the book. She remarked to the researcher: "I read this with Mrs. L and my mom last night. I'm gonna read it with my Book Buddy today. I never practiced or ANYTHING!" (Mrs. L's class is partnered with a fifth grade class where a fifth grader and a first grader read together once every other week. "Book Buddies" was written on the schedule for the day.) She then asked Mrs. L if they could "read where they left off yesterday" during Free Reading. Mrs. L told her that she would "see what she can do."

Free Reading provided Mrs. L with many opportunities to observe children as they read books TO and WITH one another and engaged in writing messages and written conversations. Free Reading, as well as other literacy events, informed her instruction and guided her planning of whole group and small group activities throughout the course of the year.

Authors' Workshop

Early in the year, children were required to write three rough drafts before signing up for a conference with Mrs. L. This was a part of Authors' Workshop for the entire year (see Table 9 for a comparison chart
### Table 9
**Comparison Chart of Authors' Workshop Across Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUTHORS' WORKSHOP</strong></td>
<td><strong>AUTHORS' WORKSHOP</strong></td>
<td><strong>AUTHORS' WORKSHOP</strong></td>
<td><strong>AUTHORS' WORKSHOP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk centered around what children were going to write, who they were going to write about, stretching out words, and getting to know one another while writing.</td>
<td>Much collaboration as children helped each other stretch out words and responded to ideas. Talk focused more on each other's books and school experiences than those of home.</td>
<td>Children began conferring with one another and asking for ideas and opinions as they wrote.</td>
<td>Children consulted class experts when needs arose. Much collegial support and critique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children began monitoring each other's writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Children monitored their own writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Much support from Mrs. L as she circulated around the room, listened to ideas and helped stretch out words.</td>
<td>Mrs. L held Author's Conferences and circulated briefly in between her appointments.</td>
<td>Mrs. L rarely participated in Authors' Workshop as she was busy with small groups and keeping conference appointments while children worked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author's Conferences dealt with broad issues such as staying on the topic and including information that would help the reader.</td>
<td>Author's Conferences seemed focused on having a beginning, middle and end to the story as well as taking one's time and doing a good job.</td>
<td>Author's Conferences were much shorter at this phase. Mrs. L invited the children to critique their own work. She would then offer a few suggestions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Author's Conferences dealt much more specifically with particular children's individual needs at this time. Much focus on punctuation and continued attention to the reader as audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children wrote about life events and also made alphabet books during this time.</td>
<td>Children began co-authoring books and collaborating on writing and illustrating books. Books about a variety of topics.</td>
<td>Children were using stamps from Rosie's Walk during Authors' Workshop. This activity spurred a multitude of 'Rosie' books. Many children wrote sequels to books they had written earlier in the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children began utilizing trade books as resources regularly during this phase. Many children wrote books based on a particular story they had enjoyed.</td>
<td>Dedications continued to play a role in maintaining one's status in the literacy community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dedications became quite important in the social network of literacy community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of Authors' Workshop at all phases). In Phase III, Mrs. L instituted peer editing as a prerequisite for conferencing. Children were still expected to write three rough drafts. They then chose one of those drafts (or a draft from their already existing author's portfolio) to publish. Once they had chosen the book that they wanted to publish, they filled out a "Self-editing Sheet" and invited three peers to fill out an "Editing Sheet." Examples of these forms are included below (Figure 12). Once they had responded to their own suggestions and the suggestions of their peers, they were free to sign up for an Author's Conference with Mrs. L.

**SELF EDITING SHEET**

Author: Elijah

1. What is the title of your story? The Snowy Day
2. Does it have a beginning, a middle, and an end? Yes
3. Will others understand what you are talking about? Yes
4. What is the main idea? He had a friend
5. What is your favorite part? Winning the game

Elijah's Self Editing Sheet

**PEER EDITING SHEET**

1. What do you like about the story? Snow
2. Does it have a beginning, a middle, and an end? Yes
3. Does it make sense to you? Yes
4. How could it be better? Ever have the baby
5. What is the main idea? Ethan's Snow

Editor: Kenny

Author: Elijah

Kenny's Peer Editing Sheet

Figure 12

Editing Sheets for Elijah's The Snowy Day
What took place during the Author's Conference depended a great deal upon the child and what they had written. During Phase I, Mrs. L was mostly concerned with being sure that children wrote a book on one topic or story and that they took their time with making it "nice." Once that had been established, she began to talk with children about making sure their stories had a beginning, a middle, and an end. She also stressed the importance of telling the WHOLE story so that "the reader knew what they were talking about." In Phase III, Mrs. L began to focus on specific aspects of children's stories. There was much talk about using descriptive language, different ways of creating illustrations, expanding the story, and using punctuation.

Toward the end of the year, Mrs. L expressed interest that the middle portion of children's stories were expanded and avoided sudden endings because the writer had run out of pages. In Phase IV, the conference that Mrs. L had with Bobby, who had written a rough draft of Little Red Riding Mouse was quite different than the conference she had with Elijah, who had written an informational book entitled Dinosaurs. Bobby, who was the class artist, had spent a great deal of time on his illustrations. He "wrote" the pictures first and then developed the print to go along with his story. Mrs. L had difficulty reading his text, and invited him to read it to her while she wrote what he read. They talked about where to put the quotation marks, and she affirmed Bobby for his attention to detail in the story. In Elijah's conference, Mrs. L quickly read his book (it was quite readable) and talked with him about adding more information and expanding it more. Elijah told her that "kids liked it pretty well the way it was". She then moved to a discussion of punctuation marks and
drew attention to his realistic illustrations. Elijah had used Dinosaur Time (Parish, 1979) as a resource when drawing the dinosaurs in his text.

Functions and Uses of Literacy Across Time: For the most part, Authors' Workshop was audience-centered, and thus, an expository activity. Children viewed Authors' Workshop itself as a social event. It was social in that children were given the freedom to share ideas and talk a great deal. As early as Phase II, children began collaborating on books. They began by laying on the floor together and creating one text and then moved into crafting texts which were written by one person and illustrated by another. Book dedications became a very important social function of Authors' Workshop. In Phases III and IV, WHO books were dedicated to seemed to say a great deal about that child's social status in the group. The following interaction occurred when Bobby was publishing his Superman Saves the Kids during Phase III.

Bobby: (Writes dicat to Kenne)

Kenneth: (Leans over and reads Bobby's dedication page.) You don't spell my name that way. It has a th.

Bobby: I know. This book's for Kenny! See......KENN--EEE!

Kenneth: (Pause) You can dedicate to more than one, you know.

Bobby: I know. I already decided. (Turns page and begins pasting the text where it belongs.)

Several books were dedicated to as many as six people during Phase III. Children sometimes made an attempt to monitor book dedications when they saw someone beginning a new book. In some respects, membership in this literacy community was codified when a child's name was included in someone's dedication. Children also dedicated books to their parents,
siblings, extended family members, Mrs. Puckett, school personnel, and the researcher.

During Phase IV, there was a marked surge in the children's productivity of published books. Children were heard to say: "I wanna make five or six more books before we go home for summer." Some children kept a running tally of the books they had published throughout the year in an attempt to emerge on the last day of school with the distinction of having published "the mostest" books in Room 100A for the year. Bobby once told the researcher that he was beginning to like editing sheets "cuz it means you can publish quicker."

Interactions with One Another and with Texts: Throughout the year, children interacted a great deal with one another as they engaged in the writing process. Early in the year, children engaged in "getting to know each other" talk, which focused on their home lives as well as who could write and draw the best or fastest on any given day. As the year progressed, they continued to talk about important events in their lives. Their discussions about writing as a process and the books they were crafting became more specific as well. Children's conversations shifted from "I know how to make a g" to eliciting help when trying to stretch out a word. They began conferring with one another about the content of their books, asked for suggestions, and often invited a perceived "expert" to draw or help them write. For example, in Phase III, Toya was making a book entitled Another Story About Mog and Bunny. Mog and Bunny (Nicoll, 1987) was a book which children enjoyed. Toya's mother had donated Rosie (a white rabbit) to Mrs. L's class soon after Easter, and Toya had become quite fascinated with the idea of rabbit books. Hence, her Authors'
Workshop book was born! She did, however, face a serious problem as she began to write her book. She soon realized that she wasn't extremely adept at drawing bunnies. Candie, who had recently acquired a pet bunny herself, had been drawing beautiful black bunnies in her journal that week. Toya asked her if she would draw some bunnies for her book. The following interaction resulted:

Toya: Candie, will you draw me some bunnies for my book?
Candie: (Looks at what she has written so far.) What kind of bunnies do you want?
Toya: Huh?
Candie: What color?
Toya: Pink. . . pink bunnies.
Candie: Oh, I don't know. I do black ones best. . . but I'll show you how. (Candie shows Toya how to draw the outline of a bunny.) I'm working on something now, anyway.

Elijah was frequently called upon to help spell words and Bobby was often asked to critique or help with a drawing. In May, Elijah began asking Mrs. L if he could work in the hallway. When asked about this, Elijah replied: "When I'm in the room too many people come up to ask me things. I can't get anything done. So. . . . I work fast out here and then when I go back in, I don't mind it when people come to me."

During Phase II, several children began copying from published books that were in the classroom. Kenny began copying *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* (Carle, 1968) because he liked it so much and wanted a copy to keep at home. He abandoned this venture when he realized that he wouldn't be able to read his book to Mrs. L when he had his conference. Kenny and Elijah (on separate occasions) made a copy of *What's For Lunch?*
(Cowley, 1981). Both boys were enthralled with this small book and had explored it many times during Free Reading. In both cases, neither child published their copies of this text. This was the only part of the year where children copied from published books during Authors' Workshop. They did, however, write sequels to professionally published books and also included elements from a variety of books in their own writing. Mrs. L encouraged children to spend time reading books when they were getting ready to write a new book of their own. Children began using trade books as resources on a regular basis after Mrs. L invited them to make alternative texts of *Have You Seen My Duckling?*, *The Grouchy Ladybug* (Carle, 1977), and *The Bus Stop* as part of their independent work during small group time in Phase III.

In Phase II, children began monitoring each other's writing on a regular basis. This parallels the monitoring that emerged during Journaling in Phase II. As they progressed through the year, children stopped monitoring one another's writing during Authors' Workshop. Instead they engaged in informative discussions about deciding what to write, where the plot was taking them, experiments with various art media and other author-like topics. This task-focused talk stands in contrast to the chatter which was typical during Journaling. The children's interactions with one another were more focused on their writing during Authors' Workshop from the middle of Phase II until the end of the year. The children didn't exhibit a great need to talk about their home lives and playground happenings during Authors' Workshop. They had already done this while journaling in the morning and now appeared free to concentrate on the complexities involved in authoring. All the focal children engaged
in self-directed talking while writing their rough drafts throughout the year. They also exhibited such planning behavior as they "talked through" their copy when publishing their books. Mobility during Phases II and III provided children with a diverse audience and broader base of experts from which to learn.

Mrs. L's Role as Participant: Mrs. L began the year by spending a great deal of time WITH the children while they wrote their first several rough drafts. Her interactions with them during Authors' Workshop were similar to those at the onset of Journaling. However, instead of modeling HOW to write a rough draft of a book, Mrs. L talked with children about where to get ideas for writing books and used their products to make specific points. When Candie had finished her rough draft of *The Wedding*, Mrs. L asked for permission to share it with the rest of the class. She showed Candie's carefully drawn illustrations and talked about her obvious attempt at stretching out the words as she wrote. Children were quite impressed with Candie's book, and several of them made attempts to make their rough drafts look "nice" as well.

Children's overall sense of ease with this literacy event coincided with the onset of Author's Conferences. Mrs. L continued to support children by walking around the room and acknowledging their efforts in between conferences. On several occasions, Mrs. L shortened a child's conference so that she could be more available to children while they worked. During Phases III and IV, Mrs. L rarely walked around the room. Most support came from the children themselves. Mrs. L concentrated on challenging and supporting children at their conferences. She had, once again, faded into the background while still performing a central role.
Of all the observed literacy events, Rest Time underwent the most dramatic transformation as the year progressed (Table 10). These changes were a result of Mrs. L's discomfort with Rest Time as a formal activity. Because two classes were occupying the same room, both Mrs. L and Mrs. G needed to work together in a variety of ways. Mrs. G felt strongly about providing a rest period for children immediately following their return from lunch recess and was fairly determined that the noise level of the total room be kept to a minimum. Mrs. L, in an attempt to show respect for Mrs. G, consented to playing a record and having children rest with their heads on their tables quietly at the beginning of the year. The children, however, were a bit confused by this activity. Talk was encouraged and valued throughout all other portions of the day. They experienced great difficulty when it came to keeping their heads on their tables and refraining from talking to their peers. All other "returning to the room" experiences were filled with much talk, sharing and laughter.

In response to the children's obvious displeasure with this activity, Mrs. L gave this literacy event a new name: Quiet Time. Children were expected to enter the room, find a few books to take to their tables, and "look at" the books until one of the teachers turned the lights on or stopped the record. "Lights Out" soon became Mrs. L's signal for the class to become quiet in other literacy events. Again, children responded with confusion. Their lives as a literacy community revolved around "talking about books" and now Mrs. L expected them to read by themselves, without talking! Some children began drawing during this time, an activity which Mrs. L sanctioned with great relief. Others
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REST TIME</strong></td>
<td><strong>CLAY TIME</strong></td>
<td><strong>CLAY TIME</strong></td>
<td><strong>CLAY TIME</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children return after lunch recess, sit down with heads on tables and listen to songs from record player. Lights are dimmed.</td>
<td>Children return from recess and choose a bag of clay and a table mat. They go to their seats and begin sculpting clay. Mrs. L reads from Charlotte’s Web during this time or invites them to talk quietly. Lights are dimmed.</td>
<td>Children return from recess and choose a bag of clay and a table mat. They go to their seats and begin molding the clay. Mrs. L allows them to talk quietly during this time. She sometimes reads from a chapter book during this time.</td>
<td>Children return from lunch recess and choose a bag of clay and a table mat. They go to their seats and begin molding their clay. Mrs. L either reads to them from a chapter book or encourages them to talk quietly. Some children choose to explore books during this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REST TIME -----› QUIET TIME

Children return from lunch recess, choose several books and take them to their tables. They are expected to read quietly while the record is playing. Lights are dimmed.
looked at books, and tried to share special pages and thoughts with their peers in their quiet voices.

During Phase II, Mrs. L phased out Quiet Time and introduced another activity in its place. She took the record player into Mrs. G's room and indicated that the record would not bother her class when they returned from recess. She then instituted Clay Time, a quasi-literacy event which remained part of the children's daily schedule for the rest of the year. Upon return from recess, each child picked out a bag of clay and a little tablemat and sat in their seats. They were encouraged to make letters, storybook characters, models of objects they were studying, numbers, etc. as they worked with their clay. Mrs. L read a chapter from Charlotte's Web (White, 1952) to them while they talked quietly and molded their clay. Sometimes she didn't read to them at all, but allowed them to talk quietly and enjoy the soft music that could be heard from Mrs. G's room. Throughout the remainder of the year, children enjoyed Clay Time immediately following their return from lunch recess. Mrs. L continued reading chapter books to the children while they sculpted their clay.

**Functions and Uses of Literacy Across Time:** Although children wanted to use literacy in social ways during Quiet Time, the very narrow structures constrained such activity in a very real sense. In many respects, they were looking at books because that's all they were allowed to do at that time. Several children did appear to enjoy independent explorations of books, but they had learned that books were to be shared with other people. The structures of Quiet Time did not allow for such interaction. The advent of Clay Time broadened children's options and permitted them to share with one another, reflect on stories and story
characters and to simply enjoy the books that Mrs. L was reading aloud to them. It became a social and recreational time for many of the children, although they learned a great deal along the way.

Interactions with One Another and With Texts: Within the confines of Rest Time and Quiet Time, there was little "sanctioned" interaction between children. Quiet Time did allow for more quiet talk than had Rest Time. During Clay Time, children talked about what they were making out of clay, planned their next "thing," talked about the book which Mrs. L was reading to them, and interacted in a variety of ways. On some days, there was a great deal of talk about problems that occurred during recess. Mrs. L, in an attempt to circumvent such chatter, provided children with a Tattlebox. They could write their problem or gripe and place it in the Tattlebox for her to read after school. Some children wrote their complaints at this time. Often, by the time they completed their message, the situation had been remedied. Mrs. L rarely looked in the Tattlebox after school.

Mrs. L's Role as Participant: Due to the children's reluctance to fit into the structures which were imposed upon them during Rest Time and Quiet Time, Mrs. L found herself functioning more as a police-person than as an equal participant or neutral observer. She spent a great deal of time talking with individual children about their actions. Once she provided herself and the children with an alternative by initiating Clay Time, she was able to return to her role of supporter, responder, observer, and lover of books. At various times, Mrs. L prepared for the afternoon during Clay Time. Children were content to work on their clay sculptures and talk quietly while Mrs. L attended to her own agenda.
Again, this literacy community had negotiated the structures of classroom life so that children could explore literature and literacy independently, yet with the subtle directing of a knowledgeable teacher.

Other Routine Literacy Events

Several routine literacy events occurred during the course of the year, but did not span the year as a whole. They will be outlined briefly in the following portion in order of emergence into classroom life.

Printing

Printing was a routine literacy event which both began and ended during Phase II of this study. Mrs. L was beginning to feel pressure from second grade teachers to make sure that her students knew how to form letters in good manuscript. She had reservations about teaching the formation of manuscript letters in isolation of meaningful activity, so she devised a way to incorporate printing into already existing structures.

Printing was actually a form of Shared Writing which focused on the content they were learning during their thematic study on plants or on a specific event in Charlotte's Web (which Mrs. L was reading aloud to the children during Clay Time). Children typically told Mrs. L what they wanted to write about and then together, they would decide upon a sentence or two which Mrs. L would write onto the board for children to copy. On several occasions, Mrs. L wrote a sentence and then invited children to read it, but this was not the norm. Sometimes Mrs. L would write the sentence herself; thus modeling fluent writing. On other days, she would invite children to give her the sounds they heard and she would fill in
the other letters so that the words were written in conventional spelling. Periodically, Mrs. L would leave blanks while writing the sounds they heard and would invite the children to try and fill them in. These three variations of Shared Writing were similar to the ways in which Shared Writing was structured during Story Floor.

Mrs. L would talk a great deal about the formation of letters and beginning, medial and final sounds while writing. The children, as a group, appeared to hear medial sounds much more at this point in time. Children then copied the sentence from the board onto lined paper.

**Functions and Uses of Literacy Across Time:** From the children's perspective, Printing provided them with an opportunity to share what they were learning. On several occasions, Mrs. L decided what the Printing sentence would be. She would leave blanks so that children could expand the sentence and personalize it. They used Printing, then, to document various facts and to learn about one another.

**Interactions with One Another and with Texts:** For the most part, children appeared to be copying letter-by-letter from the board when they copied the Printing sentence onto their papers. There was a great deal of talk about forming the letters and trying to remember what the sentence "said." Several children had difficulty in reading the sentence and often elicited help from a tablemate. It was not unusual to observe an entire table collaborating to decipher the sentence. They usually had contributed to the formation of the sentence, but Mrs. L had written the final version.

Bobby, who at this point viewed his drawings as a representative form of writing, frequently used an illustration as a means of filling in the
blank. Following is a photocopy of Bobby’s written product and a description of what happened when Bobby copied the sentence, responded by drawing, and then showed it to Mrs. L (Figure 13).

Bobby writes:

I'm BobbyK (B copies letter-by-letter from board)
Trees give us many things
My favorite thing is

Bobby gets out his crayons. Reads the last sentence. Draws a picture of people picking cherries from a cherry tree. Tells Mrs. L he's done. Mrs. L asks him what his favorite thing is. He says: "Cherries." Mrs. L tells him to write "cherries" and leaves. Bobby looks on the Tree Products chart. He can't locate cherries. Asks Mrs. L. She talks about the "chuh" sound. Bobby still doesn't know. He asks Elijah. Elijah tells him it's "ch." He writes "ch" and then stretches the word, saying "cherries" several times as he writes. He writes: chres. Elijah looks at his spelling and then checks the Tree Products chart. Elijah: "There are 2 r's and an i." Bobby asks Elijah if he wants to write it. Elijah says no. Bobby leaves to look at books (Free Reading). Ten minutes later, when Mrs. L reads from Charlotte's Web, Bobby locates "cherries" on the Tree Products chart. He erases his invented spelling and copies the word onto his paper.

This example was indicative of children's interactions with their peers and texts within the literacy event of Printing. Such interactions were quite complicated and quite frequent. Bobby utilized the resources which were available to him (teacher, peers and environmental print) to complete the task at hand. As Mrs. L observed the children as they printed, she discovered that they were able to form letters correctly and
didn't seem to need further instruction. She then ended Printing as a formal literacy event, and continued to incorporate Shared Writing into many literacy events in the days to come.

Mrs. L's Role as Participant: Mrs. L was clearly the leader during Printing. She had a great deal of control over the content of sentences and maintained a teacher-like stance throughout their generation. Once the sentence/s had been written on the board, Mrs. L circulated around the room. She observed as children wrote and expected them to show their written products to her upon completion. She talked with children about putting spaces between their words and including punctuation. She encouraged invented spelling when children were expected to provide information which was not printed on the board, but required that children copy all sentences from the board correctly. Printing was the only observed literacy event in which Mrs. L intervened in overt ways.

Morning Work/Independent Work

When Mrs. L began working with children in small groups after Christmas, she provided meaningful activities for children to do at their seats. Small groups actually replaced one of the morning Story Floor events and their morning work subsequently took the place of whole group Literature Extensions. Children created their own alternative texts for several patterned books which had become classroom favorites. They also engaged in Free Reading, Spelling, and group projects at this time.

This activity during Morning Work continued until the children began working on plays during Phase IV. Because small groups extended into the afternoon, Morning Work became Independent Work. Children were involved in going to small group with Mrs. L, practicing with their small group
independently, and working on their independent work throughout the entire day. Independent Work expanded to include Authors' Workshop as well as continuing with Spelling, and Free Reading. Children were also involved with completing activities in a Fun Magazine and experimenting with alphabet stamps and stamps of the hen and fox from Rosie's Walk.

**Functions and Uses of Literacy Across Time:** Because Morning Work/Independent Work actually housed literacy events which have been previously discussed, there is no need to reiterate at this point. Children continued to use literacy in a variety of ways throughout Morning Work and Independent Work Time which paralleled their uses of literacy in the literacy events which have already been described. Because of the more complex nature of meeting in groups and keeping track of their work, children consulted the schedule more frequently during Phases III and IV than in other phases of data collection.

**Interaction with One Another and With Texts:** One interesting by-product of having children move through the day in small groups was the limitations it placed on their activity as a whole class. Although children were free to talk with anyone in the class (with the exception of people meeting with Mrs. L) during "work time," they often engaged in specific literacy events at different times. For example, while Bobby and Candie were at small group, Elijah was engaged in Free Reading. Kenny and Krystal were working on Spelling independently and were not seated in close proximity to one another at all. Children talked with one another about what they had "gotten done" and "how much they had left to do" throughout this literacy event. They were clearly free to talk with one another, but many of their explorations were independent or with one
particular child during this time. Many children spent considerable amounts of time working on Authors' Workshop projects during Phase IV. They were anxious to publish several more books before the school year ended.

It is interesting to note that literacy events such as Authors' Workshop, and Free Reading did not seem to be bounded by space or time. Children moved into an "Authors' Workshop" mode when they began working on their books during Independent Work. They took on the role of "Free Readers" when they began Free Reading during Independent Work. Perhaps this was because many of the social norms and rules were the same for many of the routine literacy events which occurred within the classroom by the end of the year. In most events, children were free to work wherever they wanted, with whomever they wanted, and with whatever materials they wanted as long as they appeared to be concentrating on the task at hand.

Mrs. L's Role as Participant: During Phase II, the children and Mrs. L were still working at negotiating what could take place during Morning Work. Mrs. L scheduled small groups so that she was free to check students' work and encourage them in between group meetings. As children became more adept at working independently and making positive choices during their "work time," Mrs. L began to monitor their work less frequently. By the time they moved into all day Independent Work at the end of the year, Mrs. L checked only the work of children who had appeared to be "goofing off" during various portions of the day.

Spelling

In January, Mrs. L decided to provide children with opportunities to learn to spell words that they were encountering frequently in their
reading and writing. She provided them each with the opportunity of choosing five words they wanted to learn how to spell each week. On Mondays, children would write a list of their five spelling words on a piece of lined paper. Mrs. L would read them during Clay Time or Free Reading. She would print the words in conventional spelling onto each child's paper, often calling them up and asking them what a particular word was. Children would then participate in a variety of activities with their words throughout the course of the week. On Tuesdays, they generally wrote each word two or three times and also practiced spelling their words with a partner. On Wednesdays, they again practiced their words with a partner. Thursdays were reserved for the pretest. Children who wrote their words correctly during the pretest were given Free Reading on Friday while the other children took their spelling tests. For the most part, children had their words memorized and would simply write them on their paper for the test. Mrs. L individually read the spelling lists of children who appeared to need extra support while others waited for her to help them with their tests. Spelling began as a separate literacy event and then moved into Morning Work after Mrs. L assessed that children knew what was expected of them.

After a few weeks of inviting children to generate their own word lists, several children began writing one long sentence for their spelling words. Mrs. L, who had been concerned that Spelling was "isolated" from the contexts of children's real-life worlds, took this cue from the children. She encouraged children to generate Spelling sentences instead of a list of words. They began writing their sentences onto paper strips and then cutting them up and arranging the sentences in their proper
sequence (Clay, 1986). They continued to spell with partners daily as well.

Functions and Uses of Literacy: Children took Mrs. L's invitations to write words that they wanted to learn how to spell quite seriously when she initiated Spelling as an event. They looked through trade books and their Authors' Workshop books and discussed words they wanted to learn. At this time, children were using literacy as a means of learning something new. As they wrote their spelling words and practiced with a partner, they used their spelling papers as ways of confirming the ways in which they thought the words should be spelled. Spelling papers also served as memory aids while learning the new words. As they moved into writing spelling sentences, their sentences took on the autobiographical nature of journal entries in some respects. Children frequently wrote about things that were happening in their lives, or things they especially liked. Bobby's sentence on one occasion was: I will get a kitten. Candie wanted to learn how to write: I like spelling because it is fun. Some children wanted to learn how to write titles of books as well.

Candie used her journal as a vehicle for practicing her spelling sentences once during Phase IV. Candie wrote her sentence three times during Journaling one day. It appeared that she was practicing for the upcoming test that morning. Her sentence: "I like spelling because it is fun." fit both the requirements for Journaling and Spelling.

Interactions with one Another and with Texts: Whether Spelling was a whole class event or a subevent which was part of Morning Work, children spent a great deal of time puzzling through and talking about how words are spelled. They gave each other hints as they practiced their
words together and frequently exclaimed "I got it now!" while writing their words. Talk during Spelling generally focused on the act of spelling itself, with the exception of generating or copying one's spelling words. Children often talked about what they were going to write and why, while they created their spelling lists or spelling sentences for Mrs. L to edit.

Mrs. L's Role as Participant: Since Mrs. L had introduced Spelling prior to the researcher's entry in Phase III, it is difficult to trace her initial involvement with the group. At the beginning of Phase III, Mrs. L was quite available to children as they made decisions as to the words they wanted to learn and the difficulty of those words. For example, Richie wanted to learn how to spell "caterpillar." Since spelling tended to be a very difficult process for Richie, Mrs. L suggested that he work on "only that one very long word" for his entire spelling list during that week. Once children appeared to have a good sense of Spelling as a literacy event, Mrs. L moved it to Morning Work. This meant that she was with a small group and unavailable while children were generating their spelling sentences and practicing their words. The children were definitely "in charge" of not only what words they learned, but how they went about practicing their words independently and with their peers.

Book Buddies

Every other Friday morning, children would meet with their fifth grade Book Buddies in Mr. K's room on the third floor of the building. They would select books to read WITH or TO their Book Buddies from the classroom library. This took the place of Free Reading for that morning. Each first grader was paired with a fifth grader during this time. On
some occasions, two first graders teamed with one fifth grader due to absentees or time changes, etc. There were also several occasions where two fifth graders teamed with one first grader. Much depended upon the demographics of both classes on that particular day.

On the first Book Buddies meeting, the fifth graders came to Mrs. L's classroom. They each brought two carefully selected books to read to their first grade partner. They had selected these books from the school library, which was quite sparse and outdated. Many of the books which they brought were moralistic and quite drab in appearance, compared to the books which were readily available in Mrs. L's room.

The first graders endured while the fifth graders read their books to them. Some children listened politely as the Book Buddy read both books in their entirety. Others pulled some books from the display book shelves and invited their Book Buddies to read "this one" to them. By the end of this literacy event, most of the partners were immersed in reading books from Mrs. L's classroom. Mr. K reported later that his fifth graders told him that they had never seen so many books in one place before, except at the library!

For all subsequent Book Buddies experiences, Mrs. L invited each first grader to choose three books to take upstairs to Mr. K's classroom. They could choose books to read TO their Book Buddy, to read WITH their Book Buddy, or for their Book Buddy to read to them.

Functions and Uses of Literacy: From the standpoint of all participants, it appeared that Book Buddies primarily served a social function, especially at the beginning of the year. The fifth graders seemed to enjoy "taking charge" of the younger children and showing their
reading prowess to these emergent readers. During Phases I and II, the first graders enjoyed the social relationships they were building with their Book Buddies. They learned that there were many books in their classroom that were new to the fifth graders, and enjoyed looking for books that they "have probably never seen before" while making their book selections. As the children became more confident of themselves as readers in Phases III and IV, they began selecting books which they could read TO the fifth grader. In some cases, this appeared to cause tensions between Book Buddies. For some fifth graders, it was a bit unnerving to have a first grader read a book that they weren't sure they could read themselves. On several occasions, Kenny chose informational books because he thought his Book Buddy "might like learning about this." Over all, children tended to choose books that they could read with and to their Book Buddies, as well as some books that their Book Buddies could read to them. Children also enjoyed sharing their newly published books with their Book Buddies.

**Interactions with One Another and With Texts:** From the very beginning, the fifth graders tried to control what took place during their literacy explorations with the first graders. This did not last long, however. Many of the first grade children had a specific agenda when they chose particular books to share with their new friends. In many ways, what took place during Book Buddies paralleled children's explorations of books and the nature of their social interactions during Free Reading at the beginning of the year. The fifth graders also often became so intrigued with a particular text that they began reading to themselves, seemingly forgetting their partners.
There was a great deal of interaction between partner groups. The first graders frequently traded books and the fifth graders often showed "neat pictures" to their peers. On several occasions, one pair of Book Buddies eased into the explorations of a nearby pair. This fluidity was also apparent during Free Reading.

Throughout the year, fifth graders and first graders were developing relationships around books. In fact, Bobby and his Book Buddy developed such a bond that his Book Buddy often asked if Bobby could stay "extra" to finish reading a book. On several occasions, he escorted Bobby into the room and then to the cafeteria where the rest of the class was lining up for lunch. These were monumental occasions to Bobby, who frequently talked about seeing his Book Buddy on the playground before school and "actually" talking with him!

During Phase III, the first graders began choosing books which they could either partner read or read TO their Book Buddy. This also paralleled their explorations during Free Reading, where they were spending enormous amounts of time reading to one another. At first, the fifth graders were a bit reluctant to listen to the first graders read TO them. As time progressed, many of the fifth graders responded to the first graders in much the same ways as Taylor and Strickland (1986) have described as family storybook reading activities. The fifth graders allowed their first grade partners to contribute what they could, filling in whenever needed. This was also quite similar to Mrs. L's interactions with the children earlier in the year. This subtle change in how the Book Buddies structured their explorations was apparent in their book selections in Phase III and IV. First graders tended to choose a variety
of books. They typically took one book that they wanted the fifth grader to read to them, one book that they could read to their partner, and another book that they could read together. Frequently, children took five or six books to Mr. K's room. Books circulated through the room quite regularly while engaged in this literacy event.

Mrs. L's Role as Participant: Mrs. L and Mr. K became observers during this time. They would make sure that everyone had a partner. Mr. K often worked at his desk during this time. Mrs. L circulated around the room, stopping to observe children as they interacted with texts and with one another. Children were responsible to be sure that they brought the same books back that they had taken up to the fifth grade room. Mrs. L was responsible to remember on which days the children had Book Buddies and make sure children arrived at the designated time.

Summary

This chapter described the evolution and socialization process of the literacy community in Mrs. L's classroom. It highlighted the mutual construction of routine literacy events at the onset of the school year and then documented how the structures within those and subsequent routine literacy events were negotiated and changed over time. The overarching theme was movement: the children's journey while "playing with" print as readers and writers and the teacher's shifting role as guide and neutral observer within the structures of each literacy event. Mrs. L never functioned only as guide across all events, nor did she take on the role of neutral observer within all events. Instead, she consciously chose to
alter her role within and across events, based on her growing awareness of the paths they had followed and the terrain which lay ahead.

The structures of each literacy event were transformed by the children themselves as their apprenticeship under Mrs. L and interactions with texts and with one another moved them to new levels of awareness. As teacher, Mrs. L continually facilitated the construction of literacy events in which children could explore literacy and in which she could observe and guide children's explorations. Together they negotiated the participant structures of events as they occurred. This, in a very real sense, determined the texture of subsequent negotiations. The events in which teacher and children collaborated as active participants were embedded in the context of living out daily life in the literacy community of Room 100A.

At the beginning of the year children used literacy primarily to develop social relationships with their peers. There was also some evidence of the children's use of literacy as fulfilling the requirements of "doing" school. As the year progressed, the children's use of literacy for a variety purposes broadened. There was little evidence of school literacy. Children continued to use literacy for social-interactional purposes throughout the course of the year. This function of literacy became part of the children's repertoire of literacy uses and did not constrain their abilities to use literacy for a variety of purposes. The children seemed to recognize that literacy is a socially constructed phenomenon and put the social-interactional functions of literacy in perspective within that frame. Figure 14 portrays the children's movement
from using literacy as a primarily social function to the wide variety of literacy uses which were described earlier in the chapter.

Children's interactions with one another and with texts were also transformed over the course of the year. Children's "getting acquainted" talk subtly moved to talk about literacy processes and a focus on textual content. Although their interactions with one another included much chattering about their lives outside the school setting, they focused primarily on the creation of text itself and specific ways in which to gain access to meaning. With the exception of Journaling, text was at the center of most of the dialogue. Journaling, as part of Arrival Time, provided children with opportunities to engage in lively interactions concerning their home lives. The position of Journaling at the beginning of the day and the routine or formulaic form of journaling provided a familiarity which allowed for such interactions to occur. Journaling
enabled children to build bridges from home to school.

The children's interactions with text also became quite focused as the year progressed. Many of them continually displayed an intuitive awareness of what they needed to know. At the beginning of the year, children used texts as a primary vehicle for getting know one another and carving roles for themselves within the literacy community. They focused more on what texts could do for them. As the year progressed, children's interactions with text paralleled their interactions with one another. They began focusing on what they could do with texts. This focus led to their attention toward literacy processes and content of specific texts
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Figure 15
Transformation of Children's Interactions With One Another and With Text in All Literacy Events Other than Journaling

(Figure 15). As they exhibited more control over the text, they turned their attention toward content and format; incorporating such learning in literacy explorations where reading and/or writing took place.

Mrs. L, as facilitator, provided direction for such changes.

At the beginning of the year, Mrs. L was the "chief architect" (Dyson, 1989) of the literacy events which occurred within the literacy community under study. Children were, in a very real sense, constructing
both real and imaginary worlds and structuring their own expeditions which led them to new heights of awareness. Yet, during the first three weeks of school, Mrs. L's role was primarily that of leader. The discussion of the changes in Mrs. L's role as participant in each literacy event highlighted her shifting role. These changes were negotiated and renegotiated on a daily basis by the children and Mrs. L. Specific patterns across literacy events will be summarized in the following paragraphs.

Throughout the year, Mrs. L had primary control over Story Floor and Small Groups. This does not mean that she never altered her plans for such literacy events and that her agenda was the only agenda which was respected. Instead, Mrs. L's role during Story Floor and Small Groups was one of responder, facilitator, moderator, tour guide, and intermediary. Mrs. L skillfully directed the course of these literacy events in ways in which she felt would be most helpful to the children. She planned to direct children's attention toward specific strategies or aspects of print, but did not always plan in advance the route which she and the children would take. Through discussion and experiences with texts, Mrs. L allowed such opportunities to emerge. When they didn't, she reflected upon her purposes. Based on her reflections, she either modified her goals or found ways of creating situations in which the needed dialogue would occur. Story Floor and Small Groups were the only literacy events in which Mrs. L sat in a central place with the children situated around her.

Figure 16 provides a visual representation of the roles of the teacher and the children within the literacy event of Story Floor during
all four phases of data collection. The figures in this section are provided as a heuristic for conceptualizing the shifts in roles of the children and the teacher in Room 100A within specific literacy events over time. They are symbolic representations of the narrative and should be treated as such.

In contrast to Story Floor, where Mrs. L invited children to take leadership roles but ultimately had the final authority, Free Reading was the one literacy event which was controlled by the children throughout the course of the year. With the exception of the onset of Free Reading during the first few weeks of school, the children had responsibility for carrying out their explorations with minimal interference from the teacher. Figure 17 provides an overview of Free Reading as a child-controlled literacy event over the course of the year. Mrs. L moved around freely during Free Reading as did the children.

Mrs. L served in a leadership role during the reading of Mrs. L's Message and the Daily Schedule at the beginning of the year. By the end of Phase II, she maintained control, but had moved into the background. She never totally relinquished control of the message, although she was physically removed from central visibility. Her control toward the latter
part of the year was marked by her ability to support the children when they appeared that they had exhausted their repertoire of strategies for creating a meaningful text (Figure 18). Children totally controlled reading of the daily schedule when Mrs. L stopped including it as a formal literacy event in which all the children participated as a group.

The most dramatic transformations of Mrs. L's role were observed in Authors' Workshop and Journaling. Early in the year, Mrs. L and the children began negotiating joint control of these events. This resulted in a continual process of turning control of these literacy events over to the children (Figure 19).
The following chapter will focus on the ways in which the focal children explored literacy within the previously described literacy events. This is not intended to provide a description of the literacy development of the five focal children in this study. Instead, Chapter V will foreground the construction of literacy explorations by the five focal children and identify key elements which impacted the ways in which these children explored literacy within the literacy community as a whole.

Figure 19
Shifts in Roles and Relationships During Journaling and Authors' Workshop Across Time
CHAPTER V

LITERACY EXPLORATIONS AS SOCIALLY CONSTRUCTED PHENOMENA

Introduction

In the previous chapter, the routine literacy events in which the children in room 100A participated were described. The changes that took place within those literacy events over time were analyzed and highlighted. Within each literacy event, a multitude of literacy explorations occurred. Within those explorations, the children used literacy for a variety of purposes and in diverse ways.

This chapter focuses on the focal children's construction of literacy explorations against the background of the classroom as a literacy community as a whole. The focal children are: Bobby, Candie, Elijah, Kenny and Krystal. Descriptive data was analyzed with respect to: how the focal children constructed literacy explorations, with whom they explored literacy, and the ways in which such constructions may have impacted their literacy development. The analysis is reported through discussion of patterns, following one constituent element (child, text, literacy event) through a specific cycle, and blending examples with exegesis. At certain points, data is presented in the ethnographic present (Van Maanen, 1988) in an attempt to draw the reader into the drama as it unfolds.

The chapter is divided into ten sections. Each section builds on the discussion of the previous section. The first section identifies the
contexts for discovery which the children created as part of exploring literacy in the community of Room 100A. These contexts are then highlighted in section two as the contexts change and overlap within the course of following Candie through one day in its entirety. The discussion then moves to literacy explorations as novel interactions. An example of Kenny and Candie's literacy explorations of the same spelling words on two different days is provided to illustrate the main points.

The fourth section describes the collaborative nature of literacy explorations and foregrounds two types of collaboration which were observed during the study: solicited helping and unsolicited helping within the literacy community. In the following section, the impact of children's opportunities to observe literacy in action is examined through Bobby's interactions with texts and with others at two different points in time. The links that children made across and within literacy explorations are then discussed in the seventh section with regard to intertextuality and conventions of print.

Section eight highlights common patterns that emerged across the five focal children and contrasts the experiences of four of the children with Krystal's experiences. This leads to the next section, in which gatekeeping within the literacy community is discussed. The ninth section provides insights as to the ways in which literacy artifacts contributed to and sometimes constrained children's explorations. The final section highlights variations in the ways in which children explored the same register of language across different literacy events.
Creating Contexts for Discovery

As literacy explorers, the children in Mrs. L's classroom had many options available to them. They made decisions concerning: the literacy artifacts they would utilize in most literacy explorations, where they would engage in such explorations, for what purposes, and with whom (and/or for whom) they would read and write. What took place during a child's explorations of text at any given time was influenced by that child's current understandings of life, literature and literacy and his/her individual expectations and/or agenda. The exploration was further impacted by those understandings, expectations and agenda of any other explorers with whom their paths merged along the way. The texts which were explored and the persons with whom they were explored framed the contexts in which literacy explorations were constructed, negotiated and renegotiated continuously.

Figure 20 depicts the various contexts that children created as they explored literacy in this classroom throughout the course of the year. At the center of each exploration was the text which was created by these emerging readers and writers as they practiced their craft. Children moved fluidly from one context to another within explorations. The following paragraphs briefly describe each context in the broader sense. The discussion will then focus on Candie's journey as she moved back and forth from one context to another across the course of one day.
Teacher and Group

This context was one in which Mrs. L and the class as a whole participated in a group exploration of text. Story Floor, Mrs. L's Message, the Daily Schedule, introduction of new events, and other whole class experiences are common examples of this context. Although children were actively involved within the context of Teacher and Class during a
literacy exploration, it was not uncommon for them to move into other contexts as well. For example, Printing typically began as a "whole group" activity and eventually became an independent activity where children's explorations at their respective tables overlapped.

Independent/One Child

There were many opportunities for children to work by themselves for extended periods of time each day. For example, children were free to read by themselves during Free Reading, and write by themselves during Journaling and Authors' Workshop. Because of the social nature of "doing school" in Mrs. L's classroom, children rarely engaged in literacy explorations in isolation of others. In fact, Elijah and Kenny often resorted to working in the hallway in order to experience the solitude they desired for specific activities. Candie, whose popularity made her a frequently sought partner, often told children that she wanted to read "by herself". There were several occasions when Candie expressed her desire to read "alone" and her peers did not respect her wishes. Sometimes she would begrudgingly agree to a mutual exploration. There were, however, many instances where Candie physically removed herself from the perpetrators and vehemently exclaimed: "I'm doing this myself now. Leave me alone!" Krystal, on the other hand, was often denied access into explorations with her peers during Free Reading. It was not unusual to see her sitting in close proximity to several explorations involving her peers, book in hand, reading as if to an imagined audience. Independent explorations often moved in and out of explorations with peers, depending upon the circumstances.
One Peer

Periodically, children were encouraged to work in partner groups by Mrs. L. Children practiced their spelling words/sentences in partners, engaged in written conversations with one peer, explored texts at the Listening Center in dyads, read with Book Buddies in twosomes, and often shared their journal entries in pairs. Children frequently chose to work in dyads as well. They collaborated on Authors' Workshop texts as partners and often explored texts together during Free Reading in groups of two.

Two or More Children & Teacher

Mrs. L would frequently join an "exploration-in-progress" during Free Reading, especially if it was a group of several children who seemed to be having difficulty in structuring their own exploration or if they came to her for assistance. She also invited small groups to meet with her during Small Group Time. Because these groups were heterogeneous in nature and changed frequently, they are included in this category. Mrs. L also frequently participated in children's explorations as they published their books during Authors' Workshop at the publishing table.

One Child With Teacher

Mrs. L worked with individual children on a daily basis. Children often involved her in their explorations as she circulated around the room. Mrs. L talked with children regularly at Authors' conferences, between groups, and frequently invited individual children to read with her during Free Reading. Children often sought to create this context by taking a book to the teacher while she was observing during Free Reading and asking if they could read to her.
Two or More Peers

Children had opportunity to involve all their table-mates in their explorations whenever they were working at tables (Journaling, Authors' Workshop, Printing, Literature Extensions, etc.). During small group studies, children frequently worked together in their small groups without the presence of the teacher. At various points in time, children also enjoyed structuring "school-like" Free Reading experiences where a group of children chorally read a text while one child acted as teacher. Contexts which began as a pair frequently merged with another pair or a child who had been involved in individual exploration nearby.

The contexts in which children interacted with texts and one another were transformed frequently within one particular literacy exploration. For example, during Free Reading a child who was reading a familiar text might be joined by one or two peers mid-way through the reading of that text. Children who were on the periphery of an exploration sometimes became part of that exploration and then moved back to their own explorations within a matter of seconds.

The Dynamic Nature of Contexts

The following description of May 10 as experienced by Candie provides a more focused picture of how children constructed literacy explorations while simultaneously creating contexts for such discovery. The contexts and the literacy explorations were dialectically linked. Portions of fieldnotes and discussion show the breadth of contexts which contributed to Candie's explorations of literacy over the course of one day. This day is representative of daily life in Room 100A.
8:50 Children enter. Talk about Todd (a child from this classroom) who got hit by a car last night. They find their seats and begin journaling. Candie is sitting at Table C with Jason, Kenny and Toya. Writes 5-10-89 in pencil. Much talk about Todd, how it happened, where it happened, blood on the street, etc. Kevin comes by and tells Candie that he was there and saw the whole thing. Candie draws a picture in her journal while participating in conversation. Looks like a spring day with a frame around it. Draws frame and sun with crayon and then begins drawing a girl in pencil (which she doesn't finish). Puts journal away when Elijah gives her Wheels on the Bus (she wanted to take it home last night, but he already had it checked out). Returns to table. Reads with singing intonation. Points 1:1 on some pages and phrases (no pointing) on others. Keeps the beat by tapping her hand on table. Candie takes Wheels on the Bus back to Story Floor area where Bobby is exploring Rain Makes Applesauce. He puts RMA away and Candie sings Wheels on the Bus to him while he looks on. Mrs. L calls children back to their tables midway through this exploration.

At this point, Candie has been involved in a variety of contexts within the literacy event of Arrival Time. She talks with her peers as they work (Two or More Peers). Although their talk centers around an event which occurred outside the school setting (Todd's accident), they have created a context within which to explore life, literacy, and/or literature. Candie moves to an independent context as she reads Wheels on the Bus (Raffi, 1988) at her table. She is totally absorbed in this exploration and appears to be oblivious to the chattering which surrounds her. Her table-mates also seem absorbed in their own activities and conversations. With her move next to Bobby at the Story Floor area, Candie signals an openness to collaborative exploration of text with one peer. Mrs. L's call for children to return to their tables for a choral reading of her message invites Candie to change from the context of exploring text with one peer to an exploration which involves the teacher.
and the whole class.

9:27 Mrs. L asks who's turn it is to point today since Chrystal did it yesterday. Children decide there are no more "C" names and no "D" names, so it's Elijah's turn to point today. Elijah points while children chorally read the message. Candie appears to be echo reading with the class---reading just a bit behind the leaders as they read.

Message on Board: Good morning. Todd is not here today because of an accident on his bike. Today is Wednesday, May 10, 1989. We will not come to school this Friday. We will learn more about rain today. We will do another experiment. My meeting was fun yesterday. I met a lot of teachers. They liked your work. Thank you for helping the substitute.

(// indicates movement to next line of text. // indicates new paragraph.)

9:29 Chancy asks Candie to read Wheels on the Bus to him. She continued where she had left off before Mrs. L called children back to their tables.

Candie moves from the whole class exploration to reading aloud to Chancy during this transition. Candie continues reading at the point in which her exploration with Bobby was interrupted. This decision, which was not typical of Candie, shows that Candie may not have been involving Chancy and Bobby in her exploration. They were merely an audience. There was no "talk between heads" as the children interacted with the text. Yet Bobby and Chancy both were engaged in their own types of explorations as they observed Candie as "reader-in-action" and attended to specific features of the text.

9:31 Mrs. L calls children to tables for science experiment. She put a chart on the board which has the water cycle on it. (She has made the chart similar to the story maps children have done throughout the year.)

Mrs. L: Look at the chart. Tell me what you think it's about.
Kenneth: It's like a circle. Water comes down and then evaporates and then starts again. It's like the Author's Cycle.

Mrs. L: Yes! It's like the Author's Cycle! Where does the circle start?

Richie: Clouds.

Elijah: With water.

Mrs. L: What water? Where does it come from?

Kenny: I'm not sure if it starts at the top or bottom.

Mrs. L: There's no real starting place. Remember the fact we talked about from that book? There's no new water on earth. It's been here for thousands of years.

Chrystal: It starts at the top like the Author's Cycle and goes round and round.

Mrs. L: Let's look at Candie's ring that I borrowed from her. Is there a beginning or end?

Chrystal: It NEVER ends!

Mrs. L: What happens to the water in the ocean?

Richie: It evaporates.

Mrs. L: What happens to the water that evaporates?

John: It goes up to the sky.

Kenny: Clean water rises.
Mrs. L: Do you remember what water rises? Warm or cold?

Elijah: Warm water.

Mrs. L: What on the chart would make the water warm?

Elijah: The sun.

Kenneth: The sun makes it hot and it evaporates.

Mrs. L explains condensation in clouds and water vapor which results in rain. Children read con-den-sa-tion on the chart. Mrs. L shows them how to break it up into smaller parts.

Mrs. L: Kevin, can you tell me what condensation is?

Kevin: (no response)

Mrs. L: Tell what you think. I'll help you if you get stuck.

Kevin: It's when water gets . . . heavy.

Mrs. L talks about precipitation. She shows them the word on the water cycle chart. They read it chorally like they read con-den-sa-tion. Pre-cip-i-ta-tion. Children talk about how Cloudy with a Chance of Meatballs and Rain Makes Applesauce couldn't be real. This moves into a discussion of pollution and what happens to water when it goes through dirty air.

Kenneth: If it's polluted and dirty, it doesn't go back up.

Kenny: I saw a mud puddle a couple of days ago and it's gone now.

Kevin: The mud water went up, but the mud stayed.

Kenneth: The mud was gone, too.

Mrs. L: Have you ever heard of acid rain?

Elijah: Yeah. Water gets dirty as it goes to sky when it touches the polluted smoke from factories.

Mrs. L tells children they are going to make dirty water today for their experiment and then check to see what happens when they try to make the water evaporate. They
put some dirt and water into a glass jar and mark the water level on the outside of the jar. Set it in a sunny window. She says they'll check it everyday to see what happens.

9:57 Mrs. L orally gives each small group assignments to do while she's working with another small group. No schedule on the board.

This discussion with the whole class under Mrs. L's direction provided children with a great deal of information. They made connections between the format of the text (water cycle chart) with the format of their own Author's Cycle chart which had been posted in the classroom since January. Children were invited to participate freely in the discussion. At points, the "group" discussion became a dialogue between two or three children. Although Candie did not participate orally in the discussion, she was actively involved in constructing her own explorations within this context. What she attended to, thought about, and connected to her already expanding notions of water, cycles, and print was uniquely her own and may have impacted future explorations in significant ways.

Candie's subsequent involvement in her small group's reading and subsequent creation of a presentation for the class illustrates the multifaceted nature of literacy explorations and the transfigurations of contexts within one literacy event. Changes in literacy explorations are denoted by separating paragraphs into sections.

10:00 At back table: Candie, Chancy, Kenny, Toya, Bobby. Mrs. L gives them each a copy of poem "One Misty, Moisty Morning" (Figure 21).

Tells them to read it independently. They all have trouble reading the first line. Mrs. L: "I'll read the title to you. 'One Misty Moisty Morning.'" They read title together chorally. Bobby begins reading and the others watch him. Candie begins echo reading, following slightly behind him, just like she did this a.m. when reading the message. Mrs. L leaves to help another
One Misty, Moisty Morning

One misty, moisty morning
When cloudy was the weather,
I chanced to meet an old man
Clothed all in leather.

He began to compliment
And I began to grin.
How-do-you-do?
And how-do-you-do?
And how-do-you-do again?

Figure 21
Copy of Text

group. Bobby: "What does this say?" Then he starts reading the poem. Children follow along and they help him, interjecting words when he falters. This moves into a choral reading, with the small group reading together. They read it once as a choral reading. (Two or More Children With Teacher — Two or More Peers)

Kevin comes over and reads his A.A. Milne poem to the group while they wait for Mrs. L. (Two or More Peers)

Mrs. L returns. They read it together two more times as a choral reading with Mrs. L's support. (Two or More Children and Teacher)

She asks them how they want to present it to the class. They decide to read it all together, but each wants to read it by themselves today. Bobby reads it aloud while the group listens. He monitors his own reading. (Two or More Children and Teacher)

Mrs. L stops Bobby and talks to the whole class about getting their morning work done. <Children seem to be having difficulty staying on task this morning. Maybe because their work isn't outlined on the board as usual?> (Teacher and Class/not a literacy exploration)

Mrs. L talks with the small group about reading with expression and about their audience. Toya suggests that they clap to make it more interesting. They try to read while clapping their hands on the table. They read it three times, trying new ways of doing it each time. Mrs. L leaves. Bobby asks Chancy how to say the refrain. (Teacher and Class)

Candie, Kenny, Bobby and Toya practice reading the poem together. They read it two times. Kenny leaves. Toya,
Candie and Bobby read it one more time. They seem to really enjoy hamming it up on the "How do you do" refrain! Mrs. L returns to hear their ideas. Candie, Toya and Bobby read it again. Candie stops reading to share her ideas for motions with Mrs. L while Bobby and Toya continue reading. Toya omits the "and" when reading: "And how do you do?". Bobby says: "It's AND!" They practice with Candie's ideas. They have motions for every phrase. Mrs. L affirms them by saying: "You got lots more ideas after I left!" She tells them they can keep practicing or start their morning work. (Two or More Peers ---> Two or More Children and Teacher----> One Child and Teacher ----> Two or More Children and Teacher)

Toya and Candie get Chancy and Kenny to show them their new ideas and motions. Kenny and Chancy watch as they do it. Bobby: "You know, we could make a play out of this!" They go to the easel and practice. As they practice, Candie gets more ideas for motions. Toya leaves to do her math. Kenny leaves, too. (Two or More Peers)

Bobby and Candie practice two more times at the table. (One Peer)

Then Toya joins them. They decide to write their names on their papers. They begin writing. (Two or More Peers)

Tamarcus and Michael (Third grade Helpers) decide to read with them. Candie begins reading it to herself again. Bobby and group join in on the "And how do you do?" refrain. They read it together again, this time chorally. (Two or More Peers/Note: Tamarcus and Michael were treated as peers at this point)

Michael (Todd's cousin) tells them about Todd's accident. He suggests that each person read one word and they can go around the table that way. They try to do it. (Two or More Peers) Confusion! They stop and giggle. Mrs. L comes and asks how things are going. Toya leaves.

Bobby and Candie practice. This time Candie reads and Bobby listens, joining in on a few parts. (One Peer)

Toya brings Miss D (high school helper) back to show her the motions. Bobby, Candie, Toya read it. Bobby recites and Candie and Toya do the motions. Miss D compliments them. She leaves. (Two or More Children and Teacher)
Bobby and Toya fight over the big chair at the table. Toya, Bobby and Candie all sit on Mrs. L's teacher chair and read the poem. (Two or More Peers) Toya finds Mrs. L and reads it (with motions) to her.

Candie and Bobby talk at the table. Toya joins them on the big chair and they all begin reading. Bobby starts reading REAL fast. He and Candie try to read it as fast as they can (looks like racing). (Two or More Peers)

They stop and Candie begins reading it by herself orally. Toya starts reading it by herself, too. Candie alters her pace so it becomes a choral reading. They read it once. Bobby is watching. (Two or More Peers)

Toya gives her paper to Rashanna (who is watching) to hold while she reads and does the motions. Candie leaves and begins reading poem by herself as she walks. She then joins Toya on the teacher's chair and they begin reading together. Rashonna is acting as an easel, following along as she can (reading upside down while holding the paper out for Toya and Candie to read). Bobby is at the chair reading it to himself. (One Child Independently --> Two or More Peers)

Toya goes and tells Mrs. L: "We're getting gooder and gooder at the words!" She goes to the restroom while Bobby and Candie read it again. Candie and Bobby begin reading it together. Bobby has been skipping the "old man all dressed in leather" line. Candie monitors his reading. (One Peer)

Candie begins reading it again. Bobby joins in. They talk about their hands and making the motions so people could see them better. Mrs. L announces that they may have 10 minutes of Pet Time. (One Peer)

The nature of Candie's explorations of "One Misty Moisty Morning" changed as she interacted with the text and her peers. The ways in which the children constructed their literacy explorations depended a great deal upon their purposes and the purposes of those persons with whom they collaborated. Candie explored this text in a variety of ways, for a variety of purposes, and within a variety of contexts for one hour. This was not one singular exploration of the text. As the contexts changed,
so did Candie's explorations. She shifted her behaviors to include participants in mutual explorations and sought to create new contexts when her purposes called for such action. Within the literacy event of Small Group Time (which actually spilled over into independent work as sanctioned by Mrs. L), Candie moved flexibly within all six contexts. Table 11 shows the frequency of the contexts in which she participated as she negotiated the construction process of 18 individual literacy explorations of "One Misty, Moisty Morning" and one non-related literacy exploration of Kevin's poem. Candie read the poem at least 31 times and moved in and out of 24 contexts during this time.

Table 11
Contexts in Which Children Explored Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES CANDIE PARTICIPATED IN THIS CONTEXT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES TEXT WAS READ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child/Independent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Peer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Peers</td>
<td>11 (a)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Child &amp; Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Children &amp; Teacher</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Whole Class</td>
<td>1 (b)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a This includes Kevin's reading of the poem he was practicing to Candie's Group

*b Mrs. L's discussion about staying on task during Morning Work was not an exploration of literacy, but was a context in which Candie participated as part of the whole class.
Literacy explorations, then, were not bounded by contexts. Instead, the subtle interplay between literacy explorations and contexts influenced the actions of the participants in real and significant ways. At times, the nature of the exploration took precedence over the context. Context sometimes altered the shape and form of the exploration. In many ways, the context and exploration were being simultaneously constructed and negotiated; serving to inform and transfigure the interactions between children, teacher and texts throughout each and every day.

11:00 Candie, Kenny, Rashonna, Toya play with Rosie the rabbit.

11:10 Lunch

12:00 Mrs. L calls children to Story Floor. John has asked her to read Clouds (Wandelmaier, 1985). He heard Elijah read it during Free Reading yesterday and worked at reading it this morning. Mrs. L reads the title, author, etc. Reads the story. Talks about terms such as "mild", etc. Children talk about the different shapes they see in the clouds. Mrs. L asks them if they remembered It Looked Like Spilt Milk (Shaw, 1988). She reads part of All Because I'm Older (Naylor, 1989). Reads another postcard from Stringbean's Trip to the Shining Sea (Williams & Williams, 1988). Mrs. L asks children if they remember Love You, Forever by Robert Munsch. She shows them two new books: Pigs (1983) and Murmel, Murmel, Murmel (1982) by Munsch and invites children to explore them during Free Reading.

Candie is again invited to participate in the context of teacher and whole class. She participates in the reading of various texts and the discussions that follow and then returns with her peers to their tables to make Mother's Day Coupon books for their mothers. Within this literacy event, Candie is involved in several contexts: independent exploration, working with two or more peers, and teacher and whole class participation.
12:45 Children return to their tables from Story Floor. Mrs. L writes on board: coupon. She tells children they will make a coupon book for their mothers for Mother's Day. The children talk about all the things they can do at home that would be special for their mothers. Mrs. L writes their suggestions on the board in conventional spelling. (Underlined words denote the words that children spelled for Mrs. L.)

On board:

hug
wash dishes
make my bed
clean the house
help with dinner
story
clean my room
mop
dust
kiss

They do a Shared Writing of: Mother's Day Coupon Book. Mrs. L leaves blanks and invites the children to make suggestions for filling in the appropriate letters.

Children at Candie's table talk about what they will do for their mothers. Candie doesn't enter into the conversation much. She listens, but doesn't initiate much talk. Is concentrating on making her coupons. Candie selects ideas from the board and copies them onto her paper with the exception of "help you Graden." <She copied "help you" from the board and then wrote garden.> She spends a great deal of time on the illustrations.

For the most part, participation with the teacher and whole class was much more formal than any other contexts. Children did, however, move in and out of explorations with another peer during this time. In many ways, they explored the worlds of life, literature and literacy independently while participating in whole group activities. As the context moved into that of working with two or more peers, Candie was more free to overtly construct her own explorations. At this point, Candie was quite intent on her mission. She was quite excited about the possibility
of "doing things to help her mom" and wanted her coupon book to be a work of art. She involved others in her explorations when she needed crayons, wanted suggestions, and wanted to see what they were doing. They did the same. When Candie was finished with the coupon book, she made a transition into Free Reading.

1:27 Candie finishes Coupon Book and gets Mouse Paint (Walsh, 1989). Reads it by herself. Kenneth joins her. They read it together. Much talk about the pictures. They take turns reading every other page (partner reading). Candie monitors Kenneth's reading. He monitors her reading somewhat, but is quite engrossed in the illustrations.

Candie's independent explorations of Mouse Paint involve her soft oral reading of the text and thorough investigation of the pictures. Kenneth joins Candie, thus altering the context. Candie was, however, free to tell Kenneth that she wanted to read by herself. They begin a partner reading of this text, taking turns in reading every other page. Before turning the pages, the two children talk about the illustrations. They make predictions about which colors the mice will make and about the sticky texture of the paint. Candie monitors Kenneth's reading and corrects words she feels are miscues. Kenneth monitors her reading in much the same way, although he is much more absorbed in the illustrations and finds little time to note any deviations from the text.

1:45 Recess

2:15 Authors' Workshop

(Candie fell and scraped her upper thigh and knee at recess. She's limping around with her pants rolled up.)

Candie gets her Authors' Portfolio and takes it to the floor near Chancy and John who are publishing today. Chrystal (also publishing today) tells Candie that she needs help. Candie takes her portfolio over to the desk where Chrystal is working. She sits on one side of the
desk, facing Chrystal, who is on the other side. They are using Rosie's Walk stamps (hen and fox) for Chrystal's book, *I Went to Rosie's House* (Figure 22), which is dedicated to Candie. Candie shows Chrystal how to put the green grass under Rosie. She helps Chrystal draw the illustrations. She is actually drawing upside down! They talk a great deal about illustrations, art technique, WHERE to put the fox, and the story line. Chrystal is really excited about this book and takes it to show Mrs. L frequently. Other children come to see how they made Rosie and the fox have a reflection when they are walking by a pond! Candie and Chrystal gets silly and "giggly" as they discuss the crazy antics of the fox and Rosie's way of handling him. Things disintegrate periodically as the two girls work together and then they move back on task again.

Candie began by creating an independent context which was near both Chancy and John. When Chrystal asks for assistance, Candie willingly shifts the context from one child's independent explorations to that of exploring with one peer. Chrystal had spent a considerable amount of time making the rough draft for this book about going to Rosie's house and Mrs. L had helped her create a nice ending during their conference last week. Candie was excited about using the "Rosie" stamps and Chrystal needed her expertise and ability to plan while creating the illustrations. When children come to look at their placement of Rosie and the fox on various pages, the context moves to one involving two or more peers and then back to one of collaborating with one peer. At times, when Chrystal goes to talk with Mrs. L, Candie is left alone at the desk. She joyfully engages in independent experimentation with the stamps. When Chrystal's book is completed on the following day, Candie declines many invitations to collaborate on books with her peers. She begins her own *I Like Rosie* book instead.

2:50 Children get ready to go home. Candie has *Wheels on the Bus* to take home. Children go home.
I WENT TO ROSIE'S HOUSE
written and illustrated by Chrystal Davis

I went to Rosie's House.

Before I got there I saw a fox.

Rosie said, "Don't worry,

I know what to do."

Dedicated to Candle

Figure 22
Chrystal's Published Book
Throughout the course of each day, Candie was involved in a variety of literacy events. Within these events, she created contexts of discovery as she explored texts by herself, with her peers, and sometimes with the guidance of a knowing teacher. Candie was not merely "looking at books" or "writing letters." She was the creator of expeditions---both great and small. When involved by herself or with her peers, Candie could maneuver explorations in directions which seemed to provide her with the information she so earnestly sought. When Mrs. L became involved in the creation of contexts, Candie was still "the boss" of what she noticed and whether, with whom and how she would ever travel that path again.

**Literacy Explorations as Novel Interactions**

Although preferences and patterns emerged at various stages of the focal children's literacy development, each literacy exploration was unique. Given the same text, context and participants, children's construction of literacy explorations reflected their current notions as well as their varying interpretations of the task at hand. In the following transcripts, Kenny and Candie are practicing their spelling words on two different days. Although they structured each exploration in much the same way, what was talked about and how they approached the task of spelling difficult words changed over time.

**Tuesday**

K: Here are my words. Kick, owl, dog, turtle.

C: Okay. Mines are kite, Faye. hey, we BOTH have owl!

K: Spell Faye.

**Thursday**

K: Spell rose.

C: R-O-S-E.

K: Okay.

C: How do you spell owl? Don't look! (points to her spelling
C: F-A-Y-E. How do you spell kitten?

K: I don't have kitten. I have turtle and kick.

C: Oh, how about... dog?

K: D-O-G.

C: How do you spell owl?


C: R-O-S. . . just S.

K: R-O-S-E (emphasis on the E). You haven't asked me to spell kick yet.

C: Okay. Kick. . . how do you spell turtle?

K: T-R-T. . . .

C: You missed a letter.

K: You have to spell it and I copy you.

C: T-U-R-T-L-E.

K: T-U?

C: Yep.

K: T-O. . .

C: No.

K: T-U-R-T-Y?

C: No.

K: (pause) T-U-R-T. . .

C: It's close to E.

K: D?

C: Yes.

K: Spell owl.

C: L.

K: W. . . I mean O-W-L!

C: Okay. Your turn.

K: Spell Faye.


K: R-O-S-E (emphasis on the long e sound).

C: Y-E. Spell kick.

K: K-I-C-K. Spell kite.

C: K-I-T-E. Spell dog.

K: D-O-G. Owl.

C: O-W-L. Spell turtle.

K: T-U-R (emphasis on the U).

C: Uh-uh.

K: T-U?

C: Yes!

K: T-U-R-T, what is it. . . U?

C: No.

K: L.

C: Yes!

K: I'm trying to think. T-U-R, that's tur. Tl. . . it's ul sound. . . (long pause)... mmmm.

C: Do you give up?
Both Kenny and Candie appear to have a mutually agreed upon "script" (Nelson, 1984) for practicing spelling words. On the first day, they spend a few minutes getting oriented to the words and the task at hand; an activity which they do not repeat when practicing together on Thursday. The structures of both explorations appear to be similar. Their general routine appears to involve asking their partner to spell a word and then responding affirmatively or negatively concerning the accuracy of the spelling. On Tuesday, Candie and Kenny do not seem to agree on what to do when a word is spelled incorrectly and what to do when one's partner appeals for help. Kenny's repair strategy is to simply "spell" the word for the other person to "copy." Candie appears to feel most comfortable in giving hints. She tells Kenny that he "missed a letter" when he leaves out the "U" in "turtle" and tries to help him with the "L" by indicating that it's near "E" (in turtle) which he mistakes as being near "E" in the alphabet. His response of "D" makes perfect sense at this stage of his spelling development and is next to "E" on the alphabet chart as well. Candie never does tell Kenny how to spell turtle so he can "copy her." They move to the next word, finishing their spelling lists and terminating the exploration as they each get a book to explore independently in Free Reading.

On Thursday, however, Kenny and Candie seem to have altered their strategies for supporting their partner when the words are difficult. When Candie has trouble remembering the "Y" in Faye (her middle name), Kenny appears to give her a hint. "You know, Can-deeeeee" may be Kenny's
attempt to help her generalize the y and the end of "candy" and "Kenny" or it may have been his way of giving her support and inviting her to think harder. Kenny's pronunciation and emphasis on the last syllable of the word provides impetus for thinking that Kenny meant "candy" instead of his partner's name.

Kenny experiences difficulty as he spells turtle again on Thursday. This time, his approach to spelling the word is quite different. On Tuesday, Kenny appeared to be relying on his memory of how the word is spelled and Candie's hints. He didn't appear to be using his advanced knowledge of phonemics much in this exploration. Yet, on Thursday, a new strategy for thinking about word spellings emerged. Kenny appeared to be using a syllabic approach when attempting to orally spell the word "turtle" to Candie. (This was similar to his spelling strategies when writing during Authors' Workshop and Journaling at this point in time.) Kenny's understandings of sound-symbol relationships seemed to surface as evidenced in his spelling of the word by syllables. His memory was also involved. Kenny remembered that there was another letter at the end of the word and asked Candie if it was an "E." They finish this exploration and move to the Listening Center together, thus sculpting this context into a new exploration during Free Reading.

The example above shows how both Candie and Kenny negotiated their roles as spelling partners and also highlights the similarities and differences between two literacy explorations involving the same text, the same children and within the literacy event of Spelling. Kenny and Candie were involved in a multitude of literacy explorations with one another and with others in a variety of contexts throughout the course of the year.
They carried what they learned about one another's preferences and ways of doing things as well as what they learned about literacy and specific texts with them into subsequent explorations. This was true for all the focal children in all contexts and with all texts. Whether the children were reading or writing, each literacy exploration had a life of its own.

The Complex Nature of Literacy Explorations

As shown in previous examples, children's literacy explorations evolved from children's responses to texts and one another as they constructed collaborative explorations as well as when they moved in and out of one another's explorations and/or when their explorations overlapped. Conducting life in this dynamic literacy community ultimately meant that one would rub shoulders with other persons intentionally and unintentionally throughout the course of any given day. The processes involved in actually creating text through reading and/or writing often involved much more than simply "getting it down" or "reading a story."

The complexities involved in writing a journal entry incorporated children's abilities to remember their intent amidst a multitude of interruptions while simultaneously using words as symbolic representation of their intended messages. This was also typical of all other literacy explorations. Figure 23 provides a detailed description of how Candie constructed a journal message during Phase III.

The manuscript text denotes what Candie actually wrote. Arrows depict rereading behavior. Brackets [ ] indicate a letter or word that was written and then erased. Slashes (/) denote the writer's movement to the next line. Notes made in cursive writing are written at the point in
Candie writes:

2-2-89
left to give
lunch & to Mrs. L.
Returned when she
returned.

left to get some-
thing from mailbox.
Subscribed the whole
way back.

"I get a bone."

Jason: "You got a bunny?"
Candie: "She is really soft. And
I can hold her. She is
only a baby."

Mrs. L tells chi, they can
make wanted posters for
Curious George after they
have finished with their
joints. She says she’ll put
them in the hallway to
help remind people to look
for George.

Candie listens to announcements
over the loudspeaker. Asst. Principal
says that Curious George (stuffed
animal) is missing from the
library.

Candie sharpens her pencil with
the sharpener she got out of
her mailbox. (Stays in seat)

"It" "is" "sev-seven" "works" "old" "oh...oh" "six"

"What do you want
This time?" (Rashanna
is getting something
from Candie’s pencil bag.)

"It is [a] a"

"go-got-girl" at me. "girl"

Candie draws
gol.

"go-got-girl" looks at me. "girl"

Candie draws

a rabbit and

colors it.

When rereading, Candie
erases Bone and
rewrites Bone, making the
letters closer. She adds an
exclamation mark after
Bone. Puts journal away.

Figure 23
Writing Record of Candie’s Journal Entry
which such "happenings" occurred. Any text that is printed above what
the child wrote and is enclosed within quotation marks denotes
subvocalizing, rehearsing or self-directed talking while writing. A
photocopy of Candie's completed product is included in Figure 24.

Candie came to school brimming
with her latest news. She didn't talk
about her new bunny, but began the task
of documenting this delightful morsel of
information by recording it in her
journal. Candie initially structured
this as an independent exploration. She
moved out of her own exploration to give
her lunch money to Mrs. L and then
reread what she had already written ("I
got") before continuing. When Candie
walked to her mailbox to get her pencil
bag, she subvocalized the sentence she
had just finished writing: "I got a
bunny." She repeated this sentence until she returned to her table. This
subvocalization appeared to serve the role of "place-marker" while she was
busy with other tasks. She was not rehearsing new text, nor was she
trying to decide which sounds to write as her sentence had already been
written.

Before she had an opportunity to continue her entry, she was
involved in related and nonrelated interactions. Jason's question about
her bunny prompted Candie to orally share some information. This
description of her bunny as "soft" and "only a baby" may have prompted Candie's next sentence: "It is 7 weeks old or 6 weeks old." On this day, Candie did not choose to continue her entry while the announcements were being read over the loudspeaker. She stopped and listened to the news about Curious George. Sometimes children listened while they wrote. At other times, they stopped and gave their full attention to the announcements. In some instances, they appeared to ignore them completely. Mrs. L provided children with a new option during Morning Work by inviting children to make Wanted Posters to post around the school in an attempt to locate the library's missing Curious George. Candie did not respond as children talked about the mystery in the library. She sharpened her pencil and commenced writing.

As Candie wrote the rest of her entry, she appeared to know exactly what she wanted to say. Perhaps she planned it during the interlude between finishing her first sentence and beginning the next one. Her writing behavior did appear to change at this point. Candie subvocalized words and syllables as she wrote. Her subvocalizations indicate that she considered "weeks old" to be one word. She was aware that she had already written "weeks old" and copied it when she needed it again. She did not do this for "It is." Perhaps these words have become more automatic for her, as may be indicated from her whole-word subvocalization when writing "It is" the first time. Rashanna borrowed Candie's eraser from her bag, thus briefly interrupting Candie from her writing. Candie seemed to monitor what Rashanna took from her bag and acknowledged her presence. This interruption didn't seem to fracture the continuity of Candie's
exploration at all. She returned to her writing with ease and proceeded to craft her next sentence: "It is a girl."

Candie's literacy exploration did not end when she had completed her writing. She drew a beautiful wide-eyed, black bunny with long whiskers and perky ears. After putting the finishing touches on her illustration (outlining major features with black crayon), Candie reread her complete journal entry as if to get a sense of the completed message as a whole. When rereading, Candie decided to bring the letters in "B o n e" together, indicating her knowledge of "wordness." She erased the word and wrote the letters closer together, adding an exclamation mark to express her excitement. After reading the entire entry again, Candie showed it to Jason and put her journal away.

With the exception of the encroachment of other persons into this exploration for unrelated reasons, Candie structured this particular activity as an independent exploration. She permitted Jason to take part in her exploration for a short time, which may have impacted what she eventually wrote. Whether exploring literacy independently, or with other peers, the children were continually making unconscious decisions as to the directions in which literacy explorations would move. Sometimes others (peers and Mrs. L) made decisions for them. These decisions sometimes supported and expanded their explorations. At other times, they constrained them. Nonetheless, literacy explorations were intricate and complex activities which involved negotiating text and relationships simultaneously and continuously. This negotiation required a great deal of involvement from all participants.
Providing Support: Collaboration Within the Literacy Community

Throughout the course of the year, children were invited to share what they knew when they were involved in reading and writing in small groups and as a class as a whole. Reading the message was a truly collaborative activity, with opportunities for children to contribute whatever they chose. They were working together to reach a common goal. Shared Reading and Shared Writing experiences also encouraged such collaboration. Mrs. L consistently provided needed information only when it appeared that no one else was able to contribute in that way.

Partner reading, journal writing, and writing during Authors' Workshop also became collaborative as the children began to rely on one another to help "fill in the gaps" especially when Mrs. L was not available. The nature of the children's literacy explorations as collaborative acts appeared to be sculpted by the intent of the collaboration. Many collaborative acts occurred while children were engaged in mutual exploration of a particular text or when two explorations converged for a period of time. These collaborations were generally unsolicited and were an integral part of exploring a particular text.

Unsolicited Helping in the Literacy Community

Bobby and Kevin's collaboration during journaling in November is a typical example of children's unsolicited collaboration. Both Bobby and Kevin have decided to write about skateboarding during journaling. There has been much talk over the past several weeks and this topic has found its way into many journal entries. Bobby and Kevin have been keeping each other informed as to their growing prowess as skateboarders. Although
both children begin their own independent explorations as they begin to journal, Kevin turns it into a mutual collaboration as he monitors Bobby's writing and provides support. Kevin becomes so engrossed in Bobby's journal entry (Figure 25) that he abandons his own entry, thus becoming a full participant in a jointly constructed literacy exploration with one peer.

Bobby has drawn a picture of himself and a friend skateboarding. He writes: I am hav. Kevin, who is also drawing about skateboarding, looks at Bobby's entry and reads: "I am having a good time!" Bobby asks him to say it again. Kevin dictates: "I am having a good time skateboarding!" while Bobby writes. Bobby writes: I am hav a Good toimb. He reads "I am having a good time skateboarding" to Kevin and tells him that he'll put three exclamation marks. Kevin tells Bobby that he forgot to write "skate-boarding" and shows him where it should go. Bobby writes: saTbordin. He colors in the clothing of the skateboarders while Kevin watches. Then Bobby reads his entire sentence. He erases "bordin" and puts a space in between "saT" and "bordin." Says: "They were too close together so I had to put a space in there...so people would know what it says." Bobby begins adding more exclamation marks while Kevin counts them. Kevin's excitement mounts as Bobby continues making exclamation marks (there are 12)! Bobby leans over to me and says: "I put so many because I was REAL excited!"

Although Bobby did not actively seek Kevin's "help" in writing his journal entry, he welcomed Kevin's collaboration in this process. Children collaborated as they read texts as well. They monitored one another's reading, pointing to words and saying things like "See, it has to be Thursday. Thursday comes after Wednesday, not Tuesday." or "Look at the picture. See what I mean!". Groups of children worked together to "read" texts and often came to the aid of a peer when it appeared that he/she was experiencing difficulty with a text.

In March, Candie was browsing through *How a Book is Made* (Aliki, 1980) after finishing her journal entry. She appeared to be reading the
pictures. As she began exploring the front and back of the book, she started to read the labels on the back cover. Chrystal, who had just finished her journal entry, came and joined her. Together, they tried to read the labels which correspond to the illustrations of people who work with books. They read: "author" for author, "illustrator" for editor, "publisher" for publisher, "decorator" for designer, and "copier" for copy editor. When they got to production director, they decided to skip that one "cuz it looks to hard." The next label was color separator. Candie read "color...color...c-o-l-o-r...color...". She seemed to know that "color" wasn't enough. Kevin walked over and said, "Hey, what ya' doing?" Candie told him that they're "reading the words here." She showed him the back cover. Kevin offered to help by asking, "What ya stuck on?" Candie and Chrystal didn't offer any information, but showed him the back of the cover. Together, they read first group of labels. When they got to production editor, Kevin read "production" and queried: "What's this book about, anyway?" Candie told him that she thinks it's about making books. He shook his head in affirmation. The exploration was terminated when Mrs. L called children back to their tables to talk about their Morning Work.

Candie, Chrystal and Kevin were free to contribute what they could to this exploration. The girls hailed Kevin's entrance into their
exploration as an opportunity to broaden the thought collective and work as a team in solving a problem. Unsolicited collaborations such as these occurred frequently. Children also solicited help from fellow explorers (including Mrs. L) as they encountered roadblocks along the way.

Solicited Helping in the Literacy Community

Children frequently solicited help or information from their peers by asking them questions or making oral appeals. When reading one of Elijah's published books, Jason encountered a word he couldn't decipher. He simply found Elijah and asked him what it said. Elijah provided a response while continuing his own exploration. When Krystal couldn't read the typed copy for the book she was publishing, she waited for Mrs. L to have a break in between conferences and asked her to read it with her so she would remember what it said. It was not unusual to hear someone say: "I'll ask _______. He's a good speller." or "Maybe ______ knows what to do." In fact, asking for and receiving help was a natural part of "doing school" in Mrs. L's classroom. When scheduled to be Special Reader at Story Floor in May, Richie attempted to read *The Art Lesson* (de Paola, 1989) to the class. Upon discovering that the text was too difficult for him to "really read," Richie asked Kevin to suggest a book he knew he could really read. Kevin suggested that Richie would "do a good job" with *Dear Zoo*. Richie got it and successfully read it to the group.

Children sometimes requested help by showing that they were having difficulty, but not actually asking for assistance. Their intonation, conversational patterns and body language signalled to their peers that they were requesting assistance. Richie's unspoken request during
journaling is an example of an unspoken, but clearly solicited appeal for help.

Richie has drawn a scene from the movie "Pee Wee's Playhouse" and is getting ready to label his picture. Candie, Micheal, Bobby and Jason are sitting at his table.

Richie:  

Pee Wee's Playhouse. . .you're supposed to make a P. . .(Candie, Bobby and Jason nod their heads in agreement.)

Richie:  

Now I gotta think how you make a P. . .(looks at Candie and rolls his eyes)

Candie:  

It's easy. Just a circle and a stick. (She and Micheal make it in the air.)

Richie:  

(Shrugs his shoulders and shakes his head "no". Candie shows him where P is on the alphabet chart.)

It appeared that literacy explorations were collaborative acts in and of themselves. Intentional and unintentional helping seemed to be natural processes that reflected the social construction of literacy in this classroom. Children had a great deal of knowledge which they willingly shared with their peers. At times, such knowledge was challenged. This led to challenging debates which Mrs. L encouraged the children to solve themselves. What children talked about as they worked together and what happened as a result of such collaborations continued to inform and direct them as they revised their expanding notions of life, literature and literacy.

Opportunities to Observe Literacy In Action

The children were surrounded by people who were engaged in a wide variety of literacy activities throughout the course of each day. They had opportunities to observe Mrs. L as she read new books to the class as
a whole and wrote on the board, on papers and on charts. They were engaged as "audience" when listening to a Special Reader or newly published author at Story Floor and benefited from collaborative explorations within the whole group context as children chorally read Mrs. L's message, the schedule, and participated in rereading of familiar text. Engaging in and observing one's peers while participating in written conversations, Free Reading, Journaling, Authors' Workshop and other literacy events was a viable option and frequently part of children's agenda throughout the course of the year.

These observations added to each child's backpack of knowledge which they carried with them into new explorations. Several examples from Bobby's explorations illustrate the impact of observing "literacy in action" which were representative of the class as a whole.

Profile of Bobby: Writers-in-Action during Phase I

Bobby was a reflective child, who spent a great deal of time watching his peers. He frequently watched as children explored a particular text and would rush to that text immediately after they had terminated their explorations. He tended to gravitate toward familiar texts at the beginning of the year and spent a considerable amount of time observing his peers and reflecting upon those observations. He was once heard to say: "You know, I think a lot." During Phase I, Bobby often drew the same type of car and alternated between writing a familiar string of letters or copying from environmental print when writing in his journal. In Authors' Workshop, he drew elaborate pictures for his book entitled If You Give a Mouse a Cookie, exclaiming that he would "draw" the words on another day. When that day came, Bobby used invented spelling
to write the title on the front page and proceeded to copy the schedule onto the pages within the book. *Caps for Sale* (Slobodkina, 1968), a text which he "already knew" from kindergarten days, was his most frequently explored text during Phase I. During the fourth week of school, Bobby was involved in a series of literacy events which may have altered his approach to invented spelling.

During journaling that morning, Bobby spent a great deal of time observing Candie as she created her journal entry. He drew a picture which is similar to the previous day's drawing as he watched Candie. She drew first and then labeled her picture with the names of the three girls who are jumping rope in her illustration: Chrystal, Candie and Oval. She knew how to spell her own name, but was concerned about spelling Chrystal's name correctly. Chrystal's namecard had been temporarily misplaced, so Candie appealed to Mrs. L for help. Mrs. L told Candie to write what she hears. Bobby watched closely as Candie "stretched out" the words and wrote "ChoL" for Chrystal and "[E]OViL" for Oval (The {} indicates an erasure.) Bobby was so intent in his observation of Candie's exploration that he didn't have time to create text to accompany his picture. When Mrs. L told children to put their journals away, he hurriedly copied the text from the previous day: I LIKSOKL.

Following is a transcript from a literature extension which occurred after morning Story Floor on the same day. The children are writing about the most amazing bear facts they have learned.

Children are at their tables. They have just returned from Story Floor where Mrs. L has finished reading *Bears Live Here* to them. They had been talking about all the Bear Facts they had learned during this study of bears, and Mrs. L had recorded some of them onto the Bear Facts chart which is hanging on the chart easel in the corner of the room. Mrs.
L has invited the children to write the most amazing bear fact that they learned so she can discover what they learned from their discussions so far. Each child has a sheet of white paper with "The most amazing bear fact I learned was:" written at the top. Mrs. L had reminded the group to think about sounds when they were writing and to put spaces between words so it would be easier for other people to read.

Candie: (Tries to read the text at the top of the paper) THE... MOST... hmmm. (She writes her name in the blank provided at the bottom of the page.) That's how you write my name for real! C-A-N-D-I-E! (She is expressing her displeasure that her name is spelled three ways in the classroom---Candace, Candie, and Candy.)

The children talk about how quiet it is without Mrs. G's class since they are on a field trip to the commissary this morning.

Chancy: What are you going to write about?
Kenneth and Bobby: Bears.
Kenneth: Please don't eat my bears. (This is the sentence he wrote yesterday when asked to write a letter from the perspective of a Mother bear.)
Candie: We're supposed to write a bear fact. I'm gonna write about bears eating ant hills.
Chancy: What will you draw?
Candie: You should write!
Chancy: ( Watches as Candie writes.)
Candie: ( Writes: ATH[Z] )
Chancy: You're supposed to leave a space.
Kenneth: ( Writes: FXO ) Ooh, I made a mistake.
Chancy: You did it right.
Candie: F-O-X.
Bobby: Candie, how do you write ant?
Candie: ( Shows Bobby her writing of "anthills".) Like me!
Bobby: (Erases what he had written <I couldn't see it> and copies from Candie's paper. Writes: ATHZ. He then erases the Z and writes LZ on it. Then he copies what Candie writes as she writes it.)

Kenneth: (Writes, while subvocalizing in phrases: Bears FOXS Shows his paper to table-mates.) I gots a problem. I wanted to write Fox, please don't eat my bears. (No one is able to help him, so he revises his plan.) Okay. Foxes eat bears.

Bobby: (Has erased his paper entirely. All that he had copied from Candie is now totally erased. He writes: Beare SL at the right and then writes: EtatHLz to the left of Beare SL.)

Kenneth, Candie, Chancy and Bobby tell secrets while they work.

Bobby: (Begins drawing.)

Candie: (Erases what she has written.)

Kenneth and Candie raise their hands for Mrs. L to help them. Candie plays with her dime while she waits.

Chancy: (Subvocalizes "bears" and adds and S to BZ for BZS. Subvocalizes "bears" again.)

Candie: You need a B.

Chancy: No! Ant Hills!

Candie: (Draws an anthill with ants in it.)

Mrs. L comes. Kenneth asks for a new paper so he can start over. She gets him one and helps him "stretch out" Bears.

Mrs. L: Chancy, what are you writing about?

Chancy: About how bears suck up ant hills.

Mrs. L: Read the words for me.

Chancy: BEARS (Looks at Mrs. L and she helps him finish his sentence.)

Bobby: (He has written EtatHLZ with Beare to the right of it. He erases Beare and puts it to the left of anthills.)
Within this collaborative activity, Bobby has opportunity to observe three other peers as they engage in writing as well as engage in discussion about the writing process itself. Bobby continues to seek guidance from Candie as he creates his text. When Mrs. L comes and helps children at this table, Bobby also benefits from watching the ways in which she guides and supports children in their efforts. He appears to hear specific sounds, as reflected in his adding L to HLZ/hills. As Bobby listens to Mrs. L and the other children, he rereads his text and realizes that he has the words written in the wrong order. He makes the necessary changes. Bobby does not seek help from Mrs. L, yet she does appear to inadvertently impact his exploration. Candie appears to influence Bobby a great deal at this point.

Later in the day, the children were again at their tables during Authors' Workshop. Bobby began a "book about birthdays." His behavior during this literacy event bears reporting, as he actually interacts with Candie as if she is the teacher. He begins subvocalizing, physically using his hands to stretch the word out "like a rubberband." He leans over and asks Candie to help him spell the word "day." They stretch it out together, much like Mrs. L did with them at the beginning of the year. Bobby writes the sounds that he hears and Candie tells him if he's right or not (something Mrs. L rarely did). Candie returns to her work, leaving Bobby to spell "birthday" on his own. When Candie doesn't respond, Kenneth and Chancy combine their knowledge, suggesting that "BRD" spells birthday. Bobby's move toward taking risks and utilizing invented spelling as a vehicle for expressing his ideas expanded in the coming days. It stood in striking contrast to his "copying" behaviors on
previous days. He continued to subvocalize, reread, and write the sounds that he heard. Soon Bobby was writing with great ease. His movement into reading was much more gradual. A discussion of Bobby's explorations of *The Three Billy Goats Gruff* (Stevens, 1987) illustrates the impact that demonstrations by peers and Mrs. L had upon him.

**Profile of Bobby: Readers-in-Action During Phase IV**

In May, Bobby was enjoying his status as resident artist in this literacy community and had become known for his ingenuity and creativity as the author of *Little Red Riding Mouse*. As a reader, Bobby spent long periods of time by himself in explorations of novel texts such as *Pigs, Peace At Last* (Murphy, 1980), and *The Art Lesson*. He generally previewed the book independently which involved intense exploration of the illustrations---going through the book from front to back and then from back to front again. Bobby would then begin telling the story to himself, often using both text and pictures to create meaning, but not necessarily focusing on the words. He took great pleasure in being able to "really" read books such as *Happy Birthday, Sam* (Hutchins, 1978) and *Charlie Gets a Cloak* (de Paola, 1973), and plays from *HBJ Odyssey* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1983) the basal series which Mrs. L made available to the children in the classroom) and explored them often.

Bobby was quite involved in discussions at Story Floor and often noticed minute details in illustrations and plots that everyone else had missed. He also seemed to be making contrasts with information that Mrs. L shared about literacy as a process during her reading of familiar and unfamiliar texts and Shared Writing activities. While the rest of the children moved onto a new place in their discussion of a text, Bobby
frequently pondered the information that had been presented. For example, on one occasion Jason told Mrs. L that she forgot to put an S on the Rain Poetry bulletin board, since there was more than one poem up there. He thought it should say "Rain Poetrys." They talked as a group about plural endings and then Mrs. L brought the discussion back to the rock. Bobby, sitting ever so quietly, cocked his head and subvocalized "rock. . . rocks. . . rock. . . rocks." He seemed to be internalizing and playing with information in ways that were real and sensible from his perspective. Although Bobby was at a very different stage in his literacy development than at the beginning of the year, his interactions with peers and Mrs. L throughout all available literacy events continued to impact his actions and understandings.

The following transcript shows what happened when Bobby and Harley encounter The Three Billy Goats Gruff by Janet Stevens (1987) on its first day in the classroom. They were both familiar with other versions of this folktale (Galdone, 1973; Hellard, 1986) and this knowledge served them well as they "walked" through the story together. Subsequent discussion will highlight how each literacy exploration impacts the next one as he explores this text in the coming days. What Bobby read is in ALL CAPS.

Conversation is indicated by lower case letters.

Bobby: (Shows book to Harley) You wanna see a big ugly ole troll?

Harley: (Moves over to Bobby and sits facing him) I'm a kid and you're the teacher.

Bobby: ONCE UPON A TIME THERE WERE THREE BILLY GOATS AND THEIR NAME WAS GRUFF. THEY ATE THE GRASS IN THEIR VALLEY UNTIL IT WAS ALL GONE. AND THEY WERE HUNGRY. (Shows Harley the picture. Turns page. Doesn't read the page, but shows Harley the
picture and then turns to next page.) This is a disgusting book!

Harley: Read it to me, Bobby!

Bobby: I can't read this one. (Turns a few more pages to the page where the Little Billy Goat Gruff is coming across the bridge.)

Harley: (Looks at picture and reenacts with a high, shrill voice) Don't eat me! I'm the Little Billy Goat Gruff!

Bobby: You mean the baby. See, he has a bottle. (points to illustration and turns the page.) Oooh, look at his hands and stuff! (Turns the page and takes book to himself, completely absorbed with illustrations. Turns another page--completely ignoring Harley)

Harley: Show me the picture!

Bobby: (Keeps turning pages and looking at illustrations until he gets to the Big Billy Goat in his leather jacket) Uh-oh, spaghettio!

Harley: (Leaning over to see) Show ME the picture!

Bobby: (Shows him picture quickly and turns page)

Harley: Show me the picture again!

Bobby: (Shows picture where the Big Billy Goat is crossing the bridge) Cool goat! (Harley and Bobby laugh)

Harley: Show Mrs. Puckett. (They both take it over to Mrs. L)

Bobby: (Shows Mrs. L the Big Billy Goat) Cool goat!

Mrs. L: What kind of story is that?

Harley: The Three Billy Goats Gruff.

Mrs. L: What's different?

Bobby: It's UGLY!

Harley: The troll!

Bobby: The goats.
Mrs. L: Oh. It's uglier than all the rest?

Bobby: (Turns page and shows Harley)

Harley: (Takes the book and begins turning pages and looking at illustrations while Mrs. L looks on)

Bobby: ( Watches while Harley leafs through book. Stops him from turning where the Big Billy Goat is almost to the other side of the bridge and the other goats are waiting at the picnic blanket.) Oh! That was the daddy goat. (Turns page.) Oh! Show Mrs. Puckett! It's a picnic. That wasn't in any stories.

Harley: (Takes the book and turns back to where the Big Billy Goat throws troll over the bridge. Shows Mrs. L)

Mrs. L: What's the role of the frog?

Bobby: He's helping the troll. (Bobby turns to the last page with picnic and shows Mrs. L. Bobby and Harley take the book back to the pillow, leafing through as they walk and sit down together.)

Elijah has been listening to the discussion while doing his math at a nearby table. He gets up and joins Harley and Bobby.

Elijah: Look! The frog is still in the picture! Is the troll there, too? (Elijah looks for the troll and finds him---he's in the water under the bridge)

Bobby: (Turns to last page where they are having the picnic. Looks at that page for a long time.)

Harley: Put that book away so I can read you Who's Hiding Here!

Bobby: I want to look at this again!

Harley: (Grabs book from Bobby)

Bobby: (Grabs it back. Harley begins reading Who's Hiding Here? (Yoshi, 1987). Bobby gets The Jolly Postman (Ahlberg & Ahlberg, 1986) and explores it while listening to Harley. Bobby is actually sitting on The Three Billy Goats Gruff.)
Bobby begins by confidently reading the text. He realizes, however, that he may not be able to read the words of the text. He structures this exploration in the same format of his previous independent explorations of novel texts, much to Harley's disappointment. Harley tries to pull Bobby toward his own exploratory style by re-enacting the story as he supposes it to be. Bobby does not appear satisfied with such general exploration and draws Harley's attention to the subtleties of the illustrations. This moves Bobby back into his "previewing mode." He investigates the illustrations with little apparent acknowledgment of Harley's presence. Harley demands inclusion in this exploration and suggests that they show the "cool goat" to Mrs. L. Elijah, who had been on the periphery of this exploration since it began, joins Harley and Bobby as they walk by his table to return to their exploration. His arrival adds a new dimension to the exploration of this text.

Elijah becomes interested in what happens to the frog and the troll after being sent "reeling over the bridge." Bobby, however, is quite interested in the goats' picnic. Harley, continues to request access into the exploration which he originally intended---that of reading Who's Hiding Here? (Yoshi, 1988) to his chosen audience---Bobby. During this initial exploration, all participants involved have had opportunities to observe how different persons structure beginning explorations of novel texts.

Bobby asked Mrs. L to read "this cool book" at Story Floor that afternoon, but Mrs. L told Bobby she would read it on another day. She wanted to see what would happen as this version of a familiar folktale circulated among the children. Several children explored it during
transition times and at Free Reading and Rashanna took it home that evening. On the following day, the children begged Mrs. L to read it to them at Story Floor. She responded to their requests by opening the book and reading the title page amidst twitterings of "the one goat is big and bad" and "Yeah! We know that one!".

Bobby leaned forward as he listened, completely absorbed in exploring the illustrations while Mrs. L read the text. The children talked about Janet Stevens' interpretation of the story and invited Mrs. L to read it again. Because of time constraints, she encouraged them to read it during Free Reading and promised to read it during "revisiting time" on another day. Elijah, noting the language at the end of the text, exclaimed: "One of the other billy goat books ends that same way!" Kenneth was certain that it was the "one he brought from home for everybody." He and Elijah searched for "billy goat" books while the class waited. Sure enough, Kenneth's book ends with: "Snip, snap, snout! This tale's told out!"

Later that afternoon, Elijah and Bobby decide to explore the text together. They have developed a strong friendship since Bobby moved next door to Elijah earlier in the year. The following transcript shows how Bobby's involvement shifts from previewer and observer to collaborator in the reading process as he explores this book with a peer who, at this point in time is a proficient reader. In this exploration, Bobby is now much more involved in actually reading the text. Although Elijah begins reading and Bobby reads along with him, there are points where Bobby actually takes the lead and Elijah reads along with Bobby. Bobby's previous exploration with Harley, observations of others with the book,
and participation in Mrs. L's Read Aloud at Story Floor have enabled him
to participate in a new way.

E: Okay, Bobby. Come on! (Opens book to first page and
begins reading) ONCE UPON A TIME THERE WERE THREE BILLY
GOATS AND THEIR NAMES WAS GRUFF. THEY ATE THE GRASS IN
THEIR VALLEY UNTIL IT WAS ALL GONE. AND THEY WERE
HUNGRY. (turns page) ONE DAY THEY...THE THREE BILLY
GOATS GRUFF KNEW THAT ON THE HILL BEHIND...

B: THE HILLSIDE

E: THE RIVER GREW SWEET GREEN GRASS. BUT UNDER THE BRIDGE
LIVED A GREAT BIG...A GREAT...

B: MEAN

E: GREAT UGLY TROLL WITH EYES AS BIG AS SAUCERS AND A NOSE
AS LONG AS A...AS...

B: AS A...

E: AS A POKER. AND THE TROLL WAS HUNGRY TOO. (turns page)
WHAT DO...TO DO? (turns page) (points at
illustration) It's the Baby Billy Goat. No, it's the
little billy goat. WELL, FIRST OF ALL CAME THE YOUNGEST
BILLY GOAT. See, they're just dressing him up like he's
a baby. (Richie joins them.) Know what? (to Richie)
They're putting a disguise on him. WELL FIRST OF ALL
CAME THE YOUNGEST BILLY-

R: Bobby, don't tell on Elijah, okay?

B: Well, it was-

E: GOATS GRUFF TO CROSS-

B: He said blast.

R: He should have written 'This IS a blast!'

E: THE BRIDGE. TRIP, TRAP, TRIP, TRAP! WENT THE BRIDGE.
(Richie continues to hold a conversation with Bobby
while Elijah reads. Elijah doesn't pay any attention
to Richie and Bobby.) WHO'S TRIP-TRAPPING OVER MY
BRIDGE ROARED THE TROLL. (In a tiny, tiny voice) OH,
IT'S ONLY I, THE TEENIEST TINIEST BILLY GOAT GRUFF AND
I'M GOING TO THE HILLSIDE TO EAT THE SWEET GREEN GRASS
SAID THE YOUNGEST BILLY GOAT IN A SMALL SMALL VOICE.
(changes to his troll voice) NOW I'M COMING TO Gobble
YOU UP SAID THE TROLL. (changes voice) OH, NO! PRAY
DON'T EAT ME. I'M TOO LITTLE THAT I AM SAID THE BILLY GOAT. WAIT A BIT (Now Bobby begins reading along with him——a little bit ahead of Elijah) TILL THE SECOND BILLY GOAT GRUFF COMES. HE'S MUCH BIGGER. (Bobby stops reading aloud and listens to Elijah as he continues reading) WELL BE OFF WITH YOU THEN SAID THE TROLL. (turns page) AN LITTLE WHILE AFTER CAME THE SECOND BILLY GOAT GRUFF TO COME ACROSS THE BRIDGE. TRIP TRAP TRIP TRAP TRIP WENT THE BRIDGE. (turns page) WHO'S THAT TRIPPING OVER MY BRIDGE ROARED THE TROLL. OH, IT'S THE SECOND BILLY GOAT GRUFF AND I'M GOING UP TO THE HILLSIDE TO EAT THE SWEET GREEN GRASS SAID THE BILLY GOAT AND HIS VOICE WAS NOT SO SMALL. NOW I'M COMING TO GOBBLE YOU UP-

B: (in a troll's voice) NOW I'M COMING TO GOBBLE YOU UP-

E: SAID THE TROLL. (changes voice) OH NO! DON'T TAKE ME. I'M MUCH TO THING... THING...

B: THING? (Richie leaves)

E: THING... THING THAT I AM WAIT A LITTLE TILL THE BIG BILLY GOAT GRUFF COMES. HE'S MUCH BIGGER VERY WELL. BE OFF WITH YOU SAID THE GREEDY TROLL. (turns page)

B: I like that!

E: Oh, I like that... The Big Bad Billy Goat Gruff! JUST THEN UP CAME THE BIG BILLY GOAT GRUFF. (changes voice and Bobby joins him for trip-trap——spoken very slowly as if to make creaking sounds going across the bridge) TRIP--TRAP----TRIP----TRAP----TRAP----TRIP----TRAP (Bobby continues reading with him) WENT THE BRIDGE FOR THE BILLY GOATS WERE SO HEAVY THAT THE BRIDGE CREAKED AND GROANED UNDER HIM. I thought you said you didn't know how to read!

B: (Smiles at Elijah and giggles. Puts both hands out and shrugs shoulders as if to say "Beats me!")

E: (Bobby continues reading with him) WHO'S THAT TRAMPING OVER MY BRIDGE? ROARED THE TROLL. IT'S I-

B: (in a very big voice) THE BIG BILLY GOAT GRUFF! Cool man! (Bobby is now taking the lead in reading. Elijah reads along with him.) SAID THE BILLY GOAT, WHO HAD AN UGLY HOARSE VOICE OF HIS OWN. (Harley has come to join them and tries to interrupt by saying: "I'm the cool man!") He tries to talk about the book, but Bobby and
Elijah continue their choral reading.) NOW I'M COMING TO GOBBLE YOU UP ROARED THE TROLL.

H: Ooh, he's ugly!

E: I know! He looks. . . look at him. Oooohooohhooohh. (Kenny comes over)

K: Do you know where to take the. . . take the troll. . . I'm takin' that book home so when you're done will you put it over there? (points to his seat)

H: I'm lookin' at it!

E: He's gonna look at it. I ain't takin' this home.

K: I am!

E: Oh-

B: Uh, Kenny! After you take it home, I got to! Okay?

K: (nods and leaves)

E: WELL COME ALONG! I'VE GOT TWO SPEAR, FOUR HARD HOOVES, AND UGLY EARS! I'VE AN ANGRY FEELING AND I'LL POKE YOU AND KICK YOU AND SCARE (Bobby reads along with him) YOU AND SEND YOU REELING RIGHT OFF THE BRIDGE. (Bobby stops reading along and listens) THAT WAS THAT. . . THAT WAS WHAT THE. . . WHAT THE BILLY GOAT DID. . . SAID. (turns page) AND SO HE FLEW AT THE TROLL AND POKE HIM AND KICKED HIM AND SCARED HIM AND SENT HIM REELING RIGHT OFF THE BRIDGE AND INTO THE RIVER. (turns page)

B: He is awesome!

H: I like them glasses!

E: I know. He walks here with-

H: It should say 'The Cool Man'. . . that I'm the big billy goat gruff, the Cool Man!

E: Mrs. Nussbaum! Thanks for this book. These are cool! THEN HE WENT UP TO THE HILLSIDE. THERE THE BILLY GOATS GRUFF ATE THE SWEET GREEN GRASS AS IF. . . AND IF THEY'RE STILL HUNGRY, THEY. . . THEY'RE STILL THERE. AND SO. . .

H: He's so bad!
E: I know! He's swimming. He don't want to mess with him (referring to the Big Billy Goat). The frog's still there. He won't... the frog, look at him. He doesn't want to mess with him. (turns page) SNIP SNAP SNOUT, THIS TALE'S TOLD OUT! (closes book) Come on, Bobby! I need another book.

Harley takes book from Elijah and begins reading it orally to himself. Elijah and Bobby explore The Sea (Childcraft, 1983). Harley asks for help periodically and Bobby and Elijah help him.

The entire class continued to explore this wonderful text in the coming days. Kenny hoarded it at home until his mother "had time to read it to him." This caused a great stir among the children, as there was a long line of children waiting to take the book home. When Kenny returned it two days later, Bobby continued his explorations. He was often observed sitting on the floor with his back against the book display shelves, READING the text and rehearsing the story. In all observations of Bobby's explorations of this book, it was noted that he spent considerable amounts of time looking at the Three Billy Goats as they picnic on the other side of the river.

Throughout the course of the year, children had opportunities to observe literacy in action as they participated in the wide range of literacy events that have been presented. The examples that have been included provide only a glimpse into the diversity of explorations and their impact upon the children as literacy apprentices. The children's observations of one another and their teacher as they were engaged in purposeful interactions with texts became the impetus for their changing notions and the ways in which they experimented with exploring literacy as emerging readers and writers within the supportive environment of literacy community.
Making Connections

The children were constantly making links to previous literacy explorations as they constructed new ones. Many of these links were made explicit through discussion. Children talked about the similarities between texts and frequently compared styles of authors and illustrators. They took great delight in recognizing characters from other Tomie de Paola stories when looking at the last page of *The Art Lesson* and exhibited surprise when they noticed that Nadine Westcott's *The Lady with the Alligator Purse* (1988) had the "same kids" as did the class favorite, *Peanut Butter and Jelly* (1986). During Free Reading children would often take a text to a peer and remark: "Hey, that's just like in YOUR new book!" (referring to a recently published Authors' Workshop text). They also talked about putting spaces between words and discussed reading and writing expressively when engaged in such activity.

Many of the links that children made were played out in more subtle ways. One literacy exploration lived into another as children experimented with print and made connections for themselves. Two types of links appeared to be the most prevalent throughout children's explorations. They occurred both overtly through children's discussions as shown in many of the transcripts included in this document. They also emerged quite subtly within the children's work itself, taking form in the "within head" explorations of the children and finding its way into the life of the literacy community in subtle ways. These links will be discussed briefly in the paragraphs that follow.
Intertextuality

As previously noted, children brought a great deal of "world knowledge" to their explorations and were quite adept at using what they knew as they tried to create meaning out of text. They also used what they had learned from texts to help them in their daily lives. The children also became adept at making links from one text to another. The influence of specific texts seemed to breathe life into future literacy explorations in symbolic ways. This subtle infusion found its way into children's writing and also enabled them to make predictions concerning the structures and format of particular texts. Bobby's creation of Little Red Riding Mouse is a good example of how literacy explorations build on one another, making bridges to new levels of understanding.

After the unit on Safety and Nutrition (which included comparative studies of various versions of Little Red Riding Hood) was completed, Bobby began crafting his own version of Little Red Riding Hood. He spent hours experimenting with different illustrative styles and finally decided to use crayon for the characters and sponge painting for the background. Bobby began drawing the illustrations and then gluing the text meticulously onto each page. With unfaltering purpose, he experimented with the sponges and paints until his technique had reached a certain level.

Bobby's book follows the same basic plot as does a typical rendition of Little Red Riding Hood. The similarities between "story" do not appear as striking as the process of decision-making in which Bobby engaged while crafting this text. Bobby had been writing several books which had mice as key figures in them. If You Give a Mouse a Pizza was one of these
books. It seemed quite logical that Bobby would choose a mouse as the main character for this story. When celebrating the book with the class, Mrs. L asked Bobby where he got his ideas. Bobby reminded her of "that book without any words" that another teacher had let them borrow one day. He was referring to John Goodall's version of *Little Red Riding Hood* (Goodall, 1988). Mrs. L asked Bobby to see if he could borrow the book again and he returned with it momentarily. Sure enough, the characters in this wordless picture book were all forest animals and Little Red Riding Hood was a mouse!

Someone asked Bobby why he used a bee for the fox, because there wasn't a bee in the wordless book. Bobby thought for a minute and responded: "I needed to have something that was real small. Smaller than the mouse and the grandmother...so I thought about a bee." Bobby's knowledge of tension, conflict and resolution in books seemed to be at work as he crafted this text. He took great care to make the bee appear to be smaller than Little Red Riding Mouse at the beginning of the story and then provided a closeup of a large bee after eating the little girl and her grandmother. He also created a small party after Little Red Riding Mouse and the grandmother had been rescued by the mouse woodcutter. The language of this text involved much dialogue which was not typical of Bobby's previous books. He seemed to be exploring new forms in this familiar but novel folktale.

Bobby's thorough investigations of illustrative styles are reflected in his illustrations of the text. Images from Keats and Lionni dance across the pages. He purposely made the bee quite large to portray his fullness after eating both Little Red Riding Mouse and her grandmother,
showing his knowledge of power motif as well as perspective in art. For Bobby, it seemed as if the familiarity of this story provided him with a framework for taking risks and created an environment conducive to rigorous exploration.

The language and images of other texts found their ways into the explorations of all the focal children at varying points throughout the year. They enjoyed playing with language and would frequently create songs based on the patterns of books she had recently explored. For example, after reading *Mary Wore Her Red Dress* and *Henry Wore His Green Sneakers* (Peek, 1985) earlier in the day, Candie skipped down the hallway to lunch singing "Candie gots her meal ticket, meal ticket, meal ticket. Candie gots her meal ticket. All day long." Krystal created raps and rhymes based on texts that she had explored independently or with the group. Bobby was often observed muttering phrases and lines from books as he returned a specific book to its place. After reading *Goodnight Moon*, he once whispered "Goodnight, chair. Goodnight, table. Goodnight, message board." as he returned to his seat. At some points, the parallels between other texts and the children's created texts (in both reading and writing) were deliberate. For the most part, the language and images of "text" found their ways into the life of children's literacy explorations on their own.

**Exploring the Conventions of Print**

As readers, the children were continually working toward gaining control over print. Examples of their movement toward conventional adult forms of reading have been shared in this document and need little further explanation. There were, however, instances where children responded to
Mrs. L's demonstrations by exploring new concepts when they were reading independently. During Story Floor in Phase III, the children wanted Mrs. L to read a favorite poem from _Jelly Belly_ (Lee, 1983). After quickly leafing through the book, Mrs. L decided to use the Table of Contents to provide her with the information needed to locate the poem. Kenny and Elijah both began using the Table of Contents of various books in the following days. That afternoon, Elijah was observed sitting at Story Floor with _My Parents Think I'm Sleeping_ (Prelutsky, 1984). He looked through the Table of Contents to find a poem which sounded interesting to him. Then he would, as he put it, "see if he could find it in the book." Kenny began using the Table of Contents in Minarik's "Little Bear" books to help him locate specific stories. Kenny had difficulty remembering in which book his favorite stories appeared, so he would use the Table of Contents to see if the story he desired was listed. If not, he would put the book back and get another "Little Bear" book. He continued this process until he located the story he was seeking. Children's movement toward written conventions also appeared to be influenced by whole group discussions and Mrs. L's directive teaching. Examples of this will be highlighted in the following section.

As early as the second week of school, children began experimenting with specific written conventions as they explored literacy during Authors Workshop and Journaling. The fire across the street from the school elicited journal entries in which the children drew a burning building with conversation bubbles extending from the windows. Enclosed in the conversation bubbles were the words "HLPHEL" (Help! Help!). The children had been exploring conversation bubbles in Mrs. L's message and as they
created conversation bubbles for the *Rosie's Walk* big book and spontaneously began utilizing them in meaningful ways.

Throughout the year, children responded to Mrs. L's discussions about punctuation, spacing, capital letters, and formats by creating forums for further exploration within their own work. Although Mrs. L often invited children to "see if they can find ______ in books today" when discussing a specific written convention, she never specifically told children to practice these conventions within their own explorations. In fact, it appeared that children explored such conventions during writing quite incidentally. Their discoveries concerning conventions while reading appeared to emerge within the exploration and were often added surprises as they encountered familiar landmarks while exploring texts.

In Phase II, Elijah went through a period where he put quotation marks next to each word he wrote in his journal when he was writing. He hurt his hand at recess before school one morning and began the following series of journal entries (Figure 26). When asked to explain what he did, he shared: "I put a conversation mark with each word cuz each word came out of my mouth!" Mrs. L continued to draw Elijah's attention to quotation marks in books and she used quotation marks a great deal in her message during this phase.

Bobby began exploring the use of question marks consistently during Phase II. In fact, almost everything he wrote within a two week
period of time had a question mark included in it in some way. The children's interest in exclamation marks has already been highlighted. This interest continued throughout the entire year. Krystal began exploring each form of punctuation that had been introduced during the year at the end of Phase III. She would typically write her message or story and then add commas, quotation marks, apostrophes, exclamation marks, periods and question marks within words. Candie and Kenny seemed to move toward using punctuation marks in their writing quite gradually.

Both Kenny and Elijah also became quite intrigued with apostrophes as a form of punctuation. During Phase IV, both boys frequently included apostrophes when the word ended with an s in their journals. They did not seem to use apostrophes very often in their Authors' Workshop books at this point. Journaling became a forum for many of the children's independent explorations of the written conventions of language. Perhaps the familiarity with the format of journal entries and the concise nature of their texts permitted such exploration whereas in Authors' Workshop the children were more involved in attending to other things.

**Changing Agenda**

As the children grew as readers and writers, the foci of literacy explorations changed to promote and accommodate such growth. Chapter IV describes the transitions that many of the children made in both reading and writing as they moved from using literacy to build and maintain social relationships to using literacy to get things done within the literacy community. This movement indicated that knowledge about forms and functions of literacy developed simultaneously and revealed itself in the
children's explorations recurrently. In fact, four out of the five focal children in this study appeared to utilize knowledge about form to broaden their understandings of function and vice versa once they moved beyond directing their focus toward the social aspects of literacy. A summary of the literacy behaviors of the focal children across data collection phases is included in Appendix B.

Kenny, Candie, Bobby and Elijah continued to view many literacy events as primarily social in nature, but began to structure literacy explorations in such a way as to explore with intensity the processes of reading and writing toward which Mrs. L guided them. Krystal's attention, on the other hand, remained focused toward exhibiting literacy knowledge to enhance her social relationships. The following paragraphs will discuss the commonalities between what children attended to and how they explored literacy. The discussion will then contrast Krystal's behaviors with the behaviors of the other four focal children during the first two phases of data collection and describe some factors which may have acted as impetus for Krystal's change in perspective in Phase III.

**Common Patterns**

The continuous drama of the focal children's literacy development appeared to unfold in similar ways as the year progressed. When writing, they began the year by "stretching out the words" and writing down salient sounds. This subtly transformed to subvocalizing words in syllables and recording the sounds they heard. This moved into subvocalizing one syllable words as complete units and subvocalizing longer words into syllabic units while recording the sounds they heard. Children began rehearsing in words and phrases, planning ahead as they wrote.
Throughout this process, they also began rereading while writing and also revising periodically while writing or after they had written a complete thought or sentence. During Authors' Workshop there was much evidence of self-directed talking as the children planned what they would write and "talked" themselves through the publishing experience. With the exception of Krystal, the focal children went through a period of time in which they wrote their ideas in phrases, including one phrase on each line of text. Bobby, Kenny and Elijah also began writing one word per line for a short period of time as well. For each child, the evolution of these writing behaviors was a bit different. Although they each exhibited these behaviors over the course of the year, they did not happen concurrently.

As readers, the focal children moved from reenacting text to working with manageable text at various points during the year. They began monitoring the reading behaviors of their peers, which somehow seemed to prepare them for monitoring their own reading behaviors in future explorations. Kenny, Candie, Elijah, Krystal and Bobby were quite involved in exploring predictable texts with other children at the beginning of the year. They seemed to focus on specific features of text and/or specific strategies and "played with" their foci in a variety of ways. In many ways, it appeared that these four children saw that the texts had a great deal to teach them. They began pointing 1:1 while reading patterned or predictable text and often invented text on pages that were less-patterned or more difficult.

All five children moved through a phase in which they worked at making their invented text correspond to the number of words on the page while they pointed to each word. On more familiar text, they began
sweeping across phrases with their finger and often pointed only when they were having difficulty with a particular section of text. As the year progressed, they began choosing books to read which had fewer patterns. *Happy Birthday, Sam, Titch* (Hutchins, 1971), *Little Bear* (Minarik, 1957), *Arthur's Nose* (Brown, 1976), and *Frog and Toad Together* (Lobel, 1972) are examples books which children chose to "read" although they continued to explore more "difficult" texts such as *Jumanji, Saint George and the Dragon* (Hodges, 1984), *Once Around the Block* (Henkes, 1987), *Mama One, Mama Two* (MacLachlan, 1982), etc. Each child appeared to have his/her own unique format for approaching various types of text. They each moved into "really" reading at different times, yet their reading behaviors across time had some elements in common.

Candie, Elijah, Bobby and Kenny used literacy to build and maintain social relationships with their peers, teacher and other important people outside the physical boundaries of literacy community throughout the course of the year. During the first two weeks of school, the social aspects of getting to know one another through talking about life, literacy and literature predominated their literacy explorations. As the year progressed, they continued to participate in the social construction of literacy. Their focus moved toward specific elements of text and using literacy for practical purposes within the context of socially constructed explorations. Krystal, on the other hand, perceived that exhibiting literacy knowledge would enhance her social relationships. Her attention to her status within the peer group as a literate other continued to guide her literacy explorations until Phase III. This changing agenda will be
described for Bobby, Candie, Kenny and Elijah and then contrasted with Krystal's behaviors and expectations for doing school.

Bobby, Candie, Kenny and Elijah

After the first few weeks of school Bobby, Candie, Kenny and Elijah, appeared to view literacy explorations as social endeavors in which they could conduct investigations about literacy. The persons with whom they interacted and the texts which they explored provided them with the essentials for conducting such research. At various points in time, each child appeared to have "preferred" companions with which to explore literacy.

Candie was the most popular child in the classroom. She enjoyed exploring with everyone and EVERYONE wanted Candie to spend time with them! At times, she appeared to spend a great deal of time with either Kenny or Kenneth. She was also frequently a leader during group reading or playing school during Free Reading. Chrystal had a tendency to be demanding of Candie's time and rather jealous of her interactions with other peers. At the beginning of the year, this appeared to limit Candie's options as to creating contexts for discovery. As the year progressed, however, Candie made choices without consulting Chrystal. She was clearly her own person. Candie discovered she could "really read" while exploring The Bus Stop during Phase II. She often chose to read alone during Phases III and IV, but not to the exclusion of reading with peers.

Kenny appeared to have great difficulty in building relationships with his peers. Kenny lived in a very "adult" world outside the school setting and often exhibited surprise toward the actions of his peers. He
took school quite seriously. If Mrs. L told the group to do something in a certain way, Kenny took great care to do it exactly as he was told. For example, when children were experimenting with the Rosie stamps a bit more than Mrs. L thought was helpful, she told them to be sure to write first and THEN work on the illustrations. Kenny interpreted this as a format for all writing during Authors' Workshop and responded by altering his writing behavior considerably. When asked about his decisions regarding writing and drawing, Kenny stated: "I used to sometimes draw first to get ideas. And then I'd write the words. That was before Mrs. L said to draw first and THEN write. That's what she told us to do and I've been doing it ever since!" Kenny's legalism placed him in the role of police person at the beginning of the year; a role which did not endear him to the other children.

Early in the year, Kenny appeared to enjoy small group activities such as playing school or reading chorally with a group during Free Reading. He was one of the first "readers." As the year progressed, Kenny began exploring books more and more with the other children. He often preferred to engage in independent explorations, but was a welcome companion for most children.

Elijah and Chancy were best friends at the beginning of the year and continued this friendship throughout first grade. Elijah was a popular child, yet he was quite selective in making choices about who he would include in his literacy explorations. These choices seemed to be closely related to playground happenings. Elijah's preferences often changed throughout the course of the day. He did, however, develop a strong friendship with Bobby and also spent a great deal of time with Richie
toward the end of the year. Elijah did not engage in many "group" explorations during Free Reading. He tended to prefer reading with one or two peers. Elijah was the first child to move into conventional reading. Although he frequently exhibited a preference toward reading alone, he was often observed reading to or with his peers.

Bobby expressed that he liked "reading to himself and reading WITH other people". He was a welcome addition to most explorations, but rarely successfully initiated collaborative endeavors himself. He seemed to spend a great deal of time choosing books and deciding whom to invite to read with him during Free Reading. By the time he had everything organized, almost all the children were involved in activities and were not eager to be interrupted. Bobby often would take a book and quietly say: "Anybody wanna read this with me?". His soft voice was rarely heard above the other children's chatter and he would simply begin reading the book on his own. Bobby was often chosen as a participant in explorations, thus giving him opportunity to observe and interact with his peers while reading and writing. He tended to act as participant observer when involved in explorations with his peers until the end of Phase III. Bobby became aware that he could read certain books while exploring Balloons (Scott Foresman, 1979) in Phase II although he didn't appear to view himself as a "real" reader until the very end of the year.

Kenny, Elijah, Bobby and Candie were immersed in literacy explorations which focused on aspects of literacy which were at the forefront of their thinking at the time. Their explorations were socially constructed WITH others. Krystal, who saw these explorations as opportunities to show her expertise as a reader and a writer, had other
intentions. From Krystal's perspective, such explorations were constructed FOR others.

Krystal

Although Krystal exhibited many of the behaviors as a reader and writer as were highlighted above, her literacy development was actually quite different. Her literacy explorations were quite intense, and were focused more on exploring social relationships than on exploring literacy. Krystal appeared to view all literacy explorations as an opportunity to "act like a reader and writer." Because of her tendency to be rather bossy during explorations with peers, Krystal often had difficulty finding someone to read and write with during Free Reading and other activities. Hence, she had few opportunities to collaborate with her peers and benefit from their strategies.

Krystal often structured her independent explorations of text as if she were reading to an audience. She would hold the book up and reenact the text by looking at the pictures. Krystal was a marvelous storyteller and her reenactments showed evidence of a well developed sense of both story and storying. After Krystal had observed Kenny and Toya's exploration of Old MacDonald Had a Farm, she picked up the book and began singing the song while showing the pictures to an audience (in this case whoever happened to be walking by). This audience was not imagined, as in the case of several other children's explorations early in the year. When asked to talk about why she "reads like that," Krystal responded: "Well, you know. . .if I read real loud and the other kids hear me. . .then they'll ask me how I learnt to read that book. Then I can tell 'em that I learned by hearing Toya read it and they'll say I read real good."
From Krystal's perspective, the class WAS the audience and such behavior would eventually provide her with the friendships she so earnestly sought.

Unfortunately, Krystal's loudness during Free Reading and her attempts to exert her knowledge made her an unwelcome collaborator from many of the children's perspectives. She spent much of her time in independent exploration of texts and frequently used self-directed talking as she worked (which appeared to be social as well). When she participated in explorations with her peers, the explorations often ended midstream due to a disagreement.

Most of Krystal's writing during Phases I and II were social in nature. She saw literacy as a means for gaining access into the social network of this community. Yet, her attempts to break into this network were met with great resistance by other children. These bids also seemed to constrain her literacy development. Mrs. L once noted: "Krystal spends so much time trying to look like a reader and a writer that she misses all the things she's supposed to be doing!"

Krystal tended to topic associate (Michaels, 1986) a great deal in oral conversation and as she wrote during Journaling and Authors' Workshop. This is in contrast to the other four focal children. Her stories appeared to be disjointed as did her journal entries. It was not unusual for Krystal to write three or four entries during Journaling. One entry seemed to spark another related message or thought. Her Authors' Workshop stories moved back and forth from one event to another, often appearing to be a series of disconnected thoughts or messages. Krystal's propensity toward checking to see if others were watching as she talked, hummed and sang to herself while she worked appeared to disrupt her own
explorations. This often caused Krystal a great deal of difficulty when she returned to her task.

In Phase III, however, Krystal's behavior changed drastically. She had received much attention through her creation of *Will You be My Friend?* in Authors' Workshop. This book was dedicated to Chrystal with an established pattern of: "________ will you be my friend? I'd like to be your friend." In the text, Krystal invites Chrystal, Toya and Candie to be her friend; more evidence of Krystal's concern with her status in the peer culture. Several things happened at this point in time which may have greatly impacted and altered Krystal's explorations of print.

Candie, Toya and Chrystal were quite impressed with their inclusion into the text of Krystal's book. The three girls began inviting Krystal to join them in their explorations. In fact, Krystal was inundated with invitations from all her peers for several days. It seemed that everyone wanted to be Krystal's friend. Many of them asked if she was going to write a "Part Two" and include them in it. This provided her with opportunities to enter into explorations with other children and to gain from and discuss their insights and notions. Candie and Toya were proficient readers at that point in time and Krystal appeared quite content to follow their lead in explorations, whereas she had been quite adamant about being the leader earlier in the year. Toya and Krystal creatively explored *I Was Walking Down the Road* in a variety of ways. They decided to read it together while walking around the room one day. They also created a rap rhythm to the pattern of the text. Throughout these explorations, Toya monitored Krystal's reading and guided her
through difficult places until she was able to maneuver this text on her own.

In the process of creating *Will You Be My Friend?*, Krystal remembered that "there was a book in here somewhere" that was quite similar in pattern. She searched for Eric Carle's *Will You Be My Friend?* (1987) and explored it with great zeal. She invented text for this trade book, moving closer and closer to the actual wording of Carle's text with each new exploration. When she needed assistance, she asked Stevi to help her read the conversation bubbles. Together, they read the words and Krystal returned to her own Authors' Workshop story. Several days later, Krystal began reenacting *Come Out and Play, Little Mouse* (Kraus, 1987). She noticed that the researcher was watching and remarked: "Let me get a book I can REALLY read!" Hence, *Will You Be My Friend?* became Krystal's watershed book during Phase III. She continued to monitor her own reading and explore texts independently and with others as a collaborator in the coming days.

Mrs. L had also been observing Krystal and several other children during Phase III. Although the children were already meeting in small groups, Mrs. L thought that Krystal and a few other children would benefit from some further small group instruction that reviewed the early strategies and was intended to help them "put it all together" at this point in time. She scheduled the mornings so that she could meet with each heterogeneous group (Safety and Nutrition groups), but could also have time to meet with children individually or in small groups to discuss specific strategies. Krystal was frequently involved in these meetings.
It appears that the combination of the events and explorations as described above moved Krystal to new heights of awareness in her thinking about friendships, language and print. Krystal's entrance into the friendship network freed her to focus on reading and writing in ways that she had not yet experienced. The opportunity to be mentored by "literate others" such as Candie, Toya and Elijah helped to direct and focus Krystal's vastly changing conceptions about working with text and being a reader. Mrs. L helped Krystal to narrow her focus through directive teaching individually and with small groups.

By the end of Phase III, Krystal was an avid reader who participated freely with others in all events, but frequently chose to explore texts independently due to the nature of her explorations. Her literacy explorations focused on the actual activities of reading and writing and seemed to be structured in much the same ways as those explorations of Kenny, Elijah, Candie and Bobby at that point in time. Unfortunately, Krystal was kidnapped by her mother in April and her whereabouts were unknown for several weeks. She did not receive any formal schooling for approximately one month and then completed the school year in a large neighboring city while living with her mother. Krystal was not part of Mrs. L's classroom during Phase IV.

Gatekeeping Within the Literacy Community

Mrs. L took great care to create a community-centered environment in which all children felt secure and accepted. She worked to help children think of themselves as a family and frequently talked with them about helping one another and taking care of "our" books. Pencils, paper,
books, and many other literacy artifacts in the classroom were considered to be community property. From the first day of school on, Mrs. L affirmed all the children as readers and writers. She called them "good readers" and told them they could read LOTS of things in their classroom. She referred to them as "authors" and consistently reminded them that they could write anything they wanted to write. All they needed to do was to stretch out the words and write what they heard. The children responded by acting as readers and writers. Within the first two weeks of school, it appeared that all children in Mrs. L's classroom considered themselves to be readers and writers. They also viewed their peers in the same way. In Frank Smith's terms, they all had equal access to the "literacy club."

Because of the transient nature of the local community, only 11 of the original 18 children remained in Mrs. L's classroom for the entire academic year. These children could be viewed as charter members of the literacy club within Mrs. L's classroom. They were members by virtue of having been there as founders of the society. The eight new children who entered this literacy community throughout the course of the year were readily given access by Mrs. L. She gave them their "gold cards" for admission into this rapidly changing literacy society. She accepted them by virtue of their presence as students in her classroom. The children, however, unconsciously seemed to require something more.

When Rashanna entered Mrs. L's class in early November, she was already reading. She moved with ease in and out of explorations with other children. In fact, she and Elijah became frequent reading partners, as he was interested in reading "books with lots of words" and Rashanna was the only peer who could join in such exploration. Her relationship
with Elijah was based solely on books and seemed to provide her with the status she needed in order to be accepted by the rest of the class. The children readily provided her with access into their explorations and taught her how to "stretch out the words" when she had difficulty conceptualizing invented spelling.

Richie entered room 100A several weeks after Rashanna joined the group. The children quickly warmed up to his amiable personality and began teaching him how to "do things" in their classroom community. Richie had great difficulty with the rudiments of print. He couldn't recognize many letters, didn't know the alphabet and exhibited much confusion when it came to actually forming needed letters. Richie, however, was quick to pick up cues as to what was important in this classroom. On his third day in the classroom, Richie and his foster mother brought a cassette tape of Where the Wild Things Are and the accompanying book to share with the class at the Listening Center. From that day on, Richie had the same status as reader and writer as anyone else in the group. In fact, Elijah once stated that "Richie's a good reader cuz he gets tapes and books and stuff at the library."

Ramond came to Mrs. L's classroom in early February. He preferred taking a leadership role whenever working with his peers. Ramond's expectations for his role in this classroom were quite different from the expectations of the children. Leadership roles had already been established. Most of the leaders were quite adept as readers and writers at this point as well. Ramond was not. Ramond enjoyed "exploring" books as long as the explorations went in the directions which he mandated. When they didn't, he became argumentative or would walk away and sulk.
This behavior was in contrast with the collaborative nature of literacy explorations that had been established at the beginning of the year and continually nurtured.

Ramond's greatest strength was his love for writing. He wrote with great vigor and soon had completed his first published book entitled Dinosaurs. Ramond was so excited about this accomplishment that he took his book home that evening to share with his family. He intended to bring it back to school on the following day to celebrate at Story Floor, but forgot it. For five days, a group of frustrated first graders asked Ramond if he brought his "dinosaur book" back. For five days, Ramond smacked the side of his head and responded with a vehement "NO!". During this period of time, children permitted Ramond to join in their explorations with great reluctance. On the sixth day, he entered the room with the heralded book. Mrs. L called children to a special Story Floor specifically to celebrate Ramond's book with the class. He read his book and displayed the pictures with intense pride. The entire group clapped for him as he sat down. Ramond had been properly initiated into this community of emerging readers and writers. He had fulfilled his responsibility as author. The children responded by willingly including him into many more explorations. In the next several weeks, Ramond was consulted frequently by many of his peers as they began working on their own dinosaur books.

Stevi, who began the year in Room 100A and then moved to California for several months, did not need to "make application" for membership upon her return. She retained her charter membership, as she was a participant in the beginning stages of forming this community. Stevi was readily
given access to the children's literacy explorations. They welcomed her back into the literacy community immediately upon her return.

The previous examples of children who entered the classroom during data collection phases provide some insights into what the children perceived as being necessary for membership into the literacy community of their classroom. Everyone had a Basic membership into the community once they exhibited behaviors which reflected readership or authorship. Yet as the year progressed, the children's criteria for being a "good reader" seemed to change. With those changes, evolved new networks (Meek, 1988) of membership into the community. Rashanna and Elijah seemed to be key players as gatekeepers at the beginning of the year.

Rashanna entered Mrs. L's class in early November, several days after Elijah had discovered that he could read. Elijah was terribly excited about his new-found abilities, but was also quite concerned about keeping it a secret. When children would walk near him while he was quietly reading Danny and the Dinosaur (Hoff, 1978) or The Snowy Day (Keats, 1962), Elijah would stop reading and glare at the intruder. If they lingered nearby (curious about why he was so concerned that they weren't there), Elijah would tell them to leave. He had already established himself as a leader so his requests were usually respected and obeyed. Upon a few occasions, Elijah would allow Chancy or Candie to sit with him while he read. He was not reading TO them at that point, but was merely involved in his own independent explorations while they observed at a safe distance.

Rashanna, who was also reading, provided Elijah with someone with whom to read. They frequently huddled in the corner of the room,
collaboratively reading "Little Bear books" and puzzling through difficulties as they arose. Mrs. L invited Elijah to read a chapter from Little Bear to the class at Story Floor several days later. As he read, Rashanna (sitting in the front row of the group) monitored his reading for the whole class to hear. Mrs. L invited her to listen and the class actually taught Elijah how to display the pictures while he read to them as his audience. When he finished reading the chapter, Krystal exclaimed: "Man, I didn't know you could read that book!" Elijah looked at Rashanna and smiled. The secret was out. They were both REAL readers. They continued to explore texts together in the coming days, carefully selecting those persons with whom they wished to include in such explorations.

In the coming days, other children also emerged as "real" readers. John decided to read Berenstain Bears and The Spooky Old Tree (Berenstain & Berenstain, 1978) to the group while at Story Floor one afternoon. When he read the title, Brandon asked: "Are you gonna read it or tell it?" John's response indicates that he planned to "tell" it. He turned the page to begin the story. To the surprise of everyone in the group (especially John), he began reading the text with meaningful substitutions. The following interaction occurred:

Brandon: Is that what it really says?

Mrs. L: Yes, it sure is!

John continues reading.

Brandon: He's reading the words?

Mrs. L: (Smiles and nods yes.)

Rashanna: Is that what it really says?
John was quite pleased with himself and kept the book with him as a constant companion for several days. He didn't appear to be interested in joining Rashanna and Elijah in their "private" explorations. Instead, he continued to amass a repertoire of books which he often displayed and exclaimed: "I can REALLY read this book, ya' know!".

During the next several weeks, children appeared to be discovering books that they could read. Bobby recorded this new accomplishment by writing a message and putting it on the message board for everyone to see. His message was: I nohow to red a Blonn BooK (I know how to read a balloon book). He had been reading Balloons. Most children celebrated their new accomplishments by sharing the news that they could "read this here book" and inviting others to gather around to listen.

Rashanna was threatened by other children's movement onto her "turf" and guarded her role with great vigor. She was especially disconcerted by Candie's movement into reading as illustrated in the following excerpt.

John, Toya, Candie, Chancy, Kenny, Chrystal, Gordon and Rashanna decide to get books from the "multiple copies" bookrack and read together in a circle. Rashanna and Candie take the lead in a choral reading of Dear Zoo. The children read. Kenny monitors their reading. They finish DZ and get Seven Little Monsters to read. This time, Candie and Rashanna begin as leaders, but Rashanna is not familiar with this text and can't keep up with Candie.

Rashanna: "It's too hard! This is a stupid book!"

Candie continues reading with Kenny reading along with her. The rest of the group goes to find more books to read as a group. Chrystal returns with multiple copies of Arthur's Prize Readers.

Rashanna: "We can't read those!"

Chancy: "Well, we can look at the pictures!"
They begin reading APR and Candie again takes the lead. Rashanna appears rather disgruntled by Candie's encroachment onto her territory and starts collecting books from everyone. Candie keeps the book and reads it to herself (with great difficulty) while Rashanna passes out copies of Why Can't I Fly?. She initiates a choral reading of WCIF. The group has difficulty with the text, but Rashanna reads a bit ahead of them and they echo read. Candie finishes APR and joins Rashanna's group. She enters the exploration with great ease and reads along with Rashanna in a leadership position. Rashanna grabs the books from each person (taking Candie's first) and tells them that "it's just too hard for you!". Candie gets her book back and finds a quiet place to continue her reading independently. The group disbands and they begin structuring new explorations.

As many of the children made the transition from simply being a part of the literacy community to being a bonafide reader within the literacy community, another level of membership emerged. Children began talking about reading books fast and often raced to see who would be the first to reach the end of a text. Elijah frequently exclaimed: "Wow! I can really book it on this one!" as he returned a book to the bookshelf. These shifts were quite subtle and appeared to go unnoticed by many of the children.

It did not appear that children overtly categorized one another as good readers and poorer readers. They were all readers and writers, engaged in many literacy activities which held meaning to them. It did appear, however, that many children wanted to read certain books that were held in high esteem by their peers. Being able to read books such as Little Bear, Little Gorilla (Bornstein, 1976), Happy Birthday, Sam was a gold card of sorts and provided access into new networks which were being formed within the various strata of this dynamic literacy community. There appeared to be a subtle intrinsic status which came with membership into these specialized groups. The rules for entrance into new levels of
the social structure were unspoken and entry into a new network went unlauded by the group as a whole.

In Phase IV, several children also began looking at the length of text as a criteria for success as a reader. The ability to read a book with over five lines of text on one page or a "long" book added to one's status within the group. Both Elijah and Kenny considered book length a great deal as they made decisions about choosing books toward the end of the year. After reading Little Bear's Visit in its entirety, Elijah marveled: "I read this in one day... just today! One little day!". Kenny, while immersed in reading The Three Billy Goats Gruff (Stevens) checked each page before reading it to see how much text there would be. After finishing the book, he leaned over and exclaimed: "I thought that book would never end! For awhile I thought there just HAD to be more than three billy goats. Wow! That's a lot of words!"

Early in the year, Rashanna and Elijah appeared to be self-appointed gatekeepers into the various levels of membership which emerged within the literacy community. As more children began joining the ranks of real readers, however, their power began to diminish. This was disconcerting for Rashanna, whose initial access into the literacy community had come because of her abilities as a reader and her partnership with Elijah. Elijah's options for exploring literacy with "real" readers had broadened and he often chose someone other than Rashanna when he wanted to read "hard" books. She turned her attention to the fragile and often explosive friendships among the six girls in the class. Elijah appeared to be satisfied with the status that being the first reader afforded him.
When filling out a peer editing sheet for Richie's rough draft of *Frosty*, Elijah suggested that Richie "chang The LETERS" (change the letters). Mrs. L took Elijah aside and talked with him about his lack of tact in responding. She asked Elijah to think about how he would feel if Richie (known as the math whiz of the class) said something like that about his math. Elijah clearly held Richie's math abilities in high esteem and asked Mrs. L what he could do to help. Mrs. L suggested that Elijah spend time reading with him. Elijah shifted his role from that of gatekeeper to that of mentor. During Spelling, he drilled Richie on his spelling words. He wouldn't let him move into Free Reading until he had successfully spelled each word. They read together a great deal during Free Reading. Elijah seemed to intuitively know which books Richie should read with him, which books Richie should read to him, and which books he should read to Richie. The two boys developed a reciprocal relationship which resulted in Richie helping Elijah with his math.

**Literacy Artifacts as Structures**

Throughout the year, the focal children seemed to relate various formats or styles with specific literacy artifacts. They seemed to know that one should use pencil to write journal entries but could use either pencil or crayon for their accompanying illustrations. Lined paper was available for them in all explorations, yet they only used it when engaged in Printing or when writing their spelling words. The children also appeared to associate certain types of reading behaviors when exploring specific texts. They designated specific books as being "books your parents gotta read to you" and categorized other books as books that "are
easy for little kids cuz the words are easy" and books they can "read with a friend." This portion of the chapter will highlight how the use of literacy artifacts supported and/or constrained the children's explorations.

Elijah's Extemporaneous Writing at Home

In February, Elijah asked Mrs. L if he could take some of her blank white paper home. He wanted to write a story at home and couldn't find any paper that suited his needs for this particular story. Mrs. L encouraged him to take whatever he needed for his project and invited him to share the story with her upon its completion. Several days later, Elijah brought his story to school. Much to Mrs. L's amazement, he had written a very long and detailed story about some animals who were looking for a doctor. Four pages of white paper were covered with Elijah's writing from front to back. Small illustrations were added at the beginning and end of the story.

The format of Elijah's text was quite different from the format he used during Authors' Workshop. Whereas he typically wrote a few lines of text at the top or bottom of the page and then included a large illustration above or beneath his text, this story included illustrations only at the beginning and end of the lengthy text he had written. Elijah used lines to signal page breaks within his text. It appeared that the size of the blank white paper lent itself well to Elijah's expanded text.

The plot of this story was also much more sophisticated and elaborate. When asked if he had solicited help from anyone at home, Elijah told Mrs. L that his mother didn't even know he could write such a story. He had planned and completed this project independently for the
sheer joy of doing it. This was much different from the child who, when asked several weeks earlier if his story had a beginning, a middle and an end responded with: "See Mrs. L, I wrote 'the end'."

The size and format of the already assembled half-sized books used in Authors' Workshop may have impacted how much children wrote and the nature of that writing. Bobby and Kenny frequently sighed as they went to get another book to "staple on" to the book they had already filled with a partially completed story. Upon closer inspection, children's Authors' Workshop books looked like small journals. The children acted upon this cue and made sure that there were a few lines of text on each page and an illustration to accompany it. Although there were other kinds of paper readily accessible to the children during Authors' Workshop, Mrs. L had never overtly signalled an openness to using other types of paper during their literacy explorations at this time. This leads to questions as to what might have happened with children's stories if they had been free to explore "storying" with various paper and various formats.

Characteristics of Texts

In many ways, all texts teach (Meek, 1988). In this first grade classroom it appeared that the partnership between Mrs. L's directive teaching, children's constructed literacy explorations, and the books which were available to the children supported their literacy development and growth over time. The format of the text impacted how children structured their explorations of literacy. Throughout the phases of data collection, children appeared to have a sense of what different types of books had to offer them and responded accordingly. No one ever picked up *Where's Spot?* (Hill, 1980) and began telling a story such as "Once upon
a time, there was a dog named Spot..." but several children reenacted *Wish I Were a Butterfly* (Howe, 1982) in that way. *Where's Spot?* tended to evoke a different kind of response from the children. They would typically find a cozy place and begin inventing text for the left hand side of the pages and try to read the text enclosed in conversation bubbles on the right pages. The ways in which children explored various texts changed as they began to move closer toward conventional reading and depended a great deal upon the contexts they themselves had created. The texts that were available to children in this classroom can be divided into three categories. They will be described in the following paragraphs.

**Books With Rich, Literary Language:** Books with rich, literary language overflow with a wealth of sumptuous prose—language which rolls eloquently off the tongue of the reader and inspired reteller. Throughout the year, Mrs. L read and reread books from this category to the children and observed their own independent and collaborative explorations of these texts. These books enabled children to move toward an understanding of story structure even though the print itself might be too difficult for the children to read independently. While the stories themselves were not necessarily more complex than the books in the following two categories, the language of these texts exemplifies the rich narratives which are associated with storytelling. The format and amount of print on each page might appear overwhelming to the emergent reader if expected to read the entire text aloud. Yet, discussions of a particular text coupled with several rereadings by a literate other freed children to reenact books in this category with great delight. On many occasions, children played with
the rich language and structure of texts such as *Jumanji*, *Two Bad Ants* (Van Allsburg, 1989), various versions of folktales, *Owl Moon* (Yolen, 1988), *The Relatives Came* (Rylant, 1985), and *Mama One, Mama Two*. (See Appendix G for a bibliography of texts in this category.)

Books With Repetitive Language Patterns and/or Predictable Sequences: Mrs. L provided the children with a wide variety of books which have repetitive language patterns and/or predictable sequences throughout the course of the year. Books such as *Jump Frog, Jump!* (Kalan, 1981), *I Was Walking Down the Road* (Barchas, 1975), *The Napping House* (Wood, 1984), various versions of *Goldilocks and the Three Bears* (Brett, 1987; Cauley, 1981; Galdone, 1973; Watts, 1984) and *King Bidgood's in the Bathtub* (Wood, 1985) appeared to support these emergent readers as they reenacted the stories and began to take control over various portions of the patterned and predictable text. The repetitive language patterns encouraged children to act as readers and provided a natural focus for their attention as they negotiated the texts as they revisited them over time. Because of predictable patterns and sequences, the children were freed to focus on other subtleties of these texts. Children were successful in their explorations of books in this category and explored them recurrently throughout the course of the year. As they revisited these books, they began to utilize the print more consistently whether reading independently or with a peer. They not only learned about literature, but made discoveries about literacy as they interacted with one another and these texts frequently throughout the year. A more complete listing of books from this category is included in Appendix H.
Although frequent rereadings of any text will encourage a reader to explore the conventions of print, a group of books in Mrs. L’s classroom seemed to serve this function at the initial introduction and with subsequent rereadings. The physical layout of these books and the children’s interactions with these texts place them in a category of their own, even though they are quite similar to the patterned, predictable books which have already been described. Books such as Where’s Spot? (Hill, 1980), Dear Zoo (Campbell, 1986), Have You Seen My Duckling? (Tafuri, 1984), and Rosie’s Walk (Hutchins, 1968) prompted the children to focus on specific aspects of print while supporting them with both real and often complex stories and illustrations which support the text. (See Appendix I for a bibliography of books in this category.) These predictable texts have one or two lines of print on each page. This allowed the children to explore the subtleties of print while “reading” the detailed illustrations which helped guide the construction of meaning. Throughout the year, many books from this category were known as classroom favorites. The children’s explorations such texts revealed that books which help young readers explore the conventions of print are not necessarily as simplistic as they might originally appear to the “knowing” adult. As the children interacted with these texts and with one another, they showed that books in this category offer a multitude of opportunities for the emergent reader to find new ways of getting to familiar places.
Contrasting Portraits: Inconsistencies Across Literacy Events

The wide variety of literacy explorations in which children participated provided them with opportunities to observe and experience literacy in action in a multitude of ways. Each literacy event appeared to hold a specific meaning or motivation for each child throughout the course of the year. As their preferences concerning specific activities (writing messages, reading with peers, reading independently, creating journal entries and making books) shifted over time, they began to exhibit behaviors that may be interpreted as competence in one area and construed as incompetence in others. In other words, one child's process of writing a message to a peer could be quite different from the process of writing a story for Authors' Workshop. Those two writing activities might stand in striking contrast to that same child's behaviors when journaling. Writing is not simply an act of writing. Writing within particular literacy events embodied the social function of the piece that was crafted, the intent of the writer, the writer's knowledge of both form and function, the child's understandings of the social norms within that literacy event, and the context around which the written piece was constructed. Reading can be considered in the same way.

Candie, for example, appeared to be quite prolific as a writer during Authors' Workshop at the beginning of the year. The complex and coherent text which she created about a wedding in which she had participated that summer held purpose for her. She wanted to share her experience with her peers. There was no forum for such exchanges in Mrs. L's classroom except through journal entries, writing books, and talking with peers while working. Candie's behaviors during Journaling, however,
stood in contrast to her writing during Authors' Workshop at the beginning of the year. She was quite reluctant to write and seemed to have difficulty interpreting the task. Observations of Candie's behaviors only while Journaling would leave the observer with a picture of a child who was unable to utilize written words to represent her thoughts. However, selective observations of Candie while writing books in Authors' Workshop would promote an image of Candie as an extremely proficient writer at this stage of her development. She wrote with great ease and appeared to utilize sound-symbol relationships in her invented spellings. As the year progressed, Candie continued to exhibit her proficiency as a writer in both Journaling and Authors' Workshop. At the end of the year, however, Candie's interest in practicing her drawing took precedence over "getting a message down." She took Mrs. L's mandate that "they were the boss of their journals" and that "their journals were only for them", using her journal as a place for experimenting with art technique. Observations of Candie only during Journaling at this point in time would also provide a skewed picture of her abilities.

During the Phase IV, Bobby's expertise as a writer appeared to be limited to his explorations during Authors' Workshop. Because he didn't feel like he had anything to say in his journal, he frequently didn't write anything. This could lead the casual observer to an incorrect assumption that Bobby was uninterested in writing, which was clearly not the case.

Krystal is another case in point. She was able to talk about literacy as a process during Story Floor in ways that did not appear to transfer into her own independent explorations while reading and writing.
At the beginning of the year, the literacy explorations in which Krystal appeared to have the most expertise were those in which she was involved in whole group discussions. She also appeared to be quite motivated during Journaling. The intensity of her explorations within Journaling as a literacy event were also contrasted with her rather flighty behavior during Authors' Workshop. This can be attributed to her style of writing, which has already been discussed. In journaling, it was not critical that children's entries appear to be coherent as a total piece. In fact, when other children wrote several entries for one day, their entries were often not linked in any way whatsoever. Krystal's multiple entries on a given day were generally associated with one another in some way. During Authors' Workshop, however, this style of writing made Krystal appear to be quite unorganized and incompetent. As the year progressed, Krystal's explorations in all literacy events continued with intensity but the products which she produced and the processes in which she engaged did not reflect the growth that was being observed with the other focal children.

Both Kenny and Elijah appeared to be quite consistent across all literacy events. Although their preferences regarding specific literacy activities shifted throughout the course of the year, their reading and writing behaviors remained congruous both within and across literacy events over time.

Summary

Literacy explorations are complex novel interactions which build upon the negotiations between the participants of the exploration and negotiations with text. The focal children in this study participated in
a multitude of literacy explorations throughout the year. They moved in and out of one another's explorations freely, structuring contexts which would expedite the investigations that they desired. Within the contexts of exploring literacy which were available to them on any given day, the children had opportunities to collaborate with one another in both intentional and unintentional ways. The children acted both as tour guide and guide as they interacted with one another and with texts throughout the course of the year. Their journeys down paths which were familiar and unfamiliar, converging and diverging, supported the connections they actively made within and across explorations.

The ways in which the children constructed their literacy explorations appeared to be impacted in part by the children's goals and agenda. This, then, impacted what the children brought to and took from their literacy explorations and subsequently influenced the children's literacy development as a whole. Reading and writing, then, were not simply isolated activities which involved a singular set of skills and processes. From the children's perspectives, reading and writing were constituent parts of a larger whole which embodied the knowledge that one needed in order to conduct daily life in the literacy community of Room 100A. They made decisions as to whom they would involve in their literacy explorations and negotiated the ways in which these investigations would be conducted.

When investigating how the focal children constructed literacy explorations in this classroom, it was necessary to identify with whom they constructed their explorations, the literacy artifacts they explored, their understandings and goals (agenda) for such explorations, when they
conducted such explorations and where these explorations took place. The literacy explorations of all focal children were triadic in nature. The construction of their explorations of literacy was impacted by the interplay between the texts, participants and the agenda with which they entered such explorations (Figure 27). Where the explorations took place and when they occurred did not appear to alter children's explorations. In order for children to construct an exploration within a literacy event, it was necessary for them to have knowledge of the social rules and norms for that event. They then began constructing and negotiating their explorations of literacy within these literacy events. This involved
interacting with texts and with one another in ways that had purpose and meaning from their perspectives while engaging in the ongoing life of the culture of Room 100A.

Chapter VI presents a summary of the study. It provides an overview of the purpose of the study, methods and procedures, summary of findings for each research question and then moves into a discussion of possible implications to educators and researchers as well as identifying questions for further study.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Purpose of the Study

Children are active explorers of the world as they attempt to make meaning in the things they see and do. This natural propensity toward exploration is first nurtured in the lives of young children within the culture of family. Children bring with them a disposition toward "negotiating the worlds of wonder" (Bruner, 1986) when they first enter school. Ideally, classrooms should support such joyful movement toward new discoveries. The ways in which teachers continue to support and guide children in their explorations of life, literature and literacy may be determined by our understandings of what occurs when children are provided with opportunities to engage in such explorations on a daily basis.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was two-fold. The researcher sought to develop a broad understanding of the nature of the literacy events in the classroom under study. Focal children and background children participated in a classroom with a teacher who ushered children into literacy through experiences with quality children's trade books and writing as part of the collective life of the community. The researcher identified recurrent literacy events which were established at the beginning of the year and traced the transformation of these literacy events throughout the remainder of the year. Changes in the ways the
children interacted with one another and with texts, differences in the ways children utilized literacy, and shifts in the role of the teacher were highlighted. The researcher then began a comprehensive probe into the ways in which the focal children, background children and teacher worked together to construct literacy explorations. The interplay among what the children did, how they interpreted events, their individual agenda, with whom they constructed literacy explorations, and specific factors which had an impact upon such explorations were discussed.

Methods and Procedures

The ethnographic nature of this study was guided by the development of a grounded theory throughout the course of the study. The investigator became a participant observer within the classroom during four thematic units of study in their entirety. Phases of data collection included observation within the classroom all day for the initiation and duration of each thematic unit of study. Phase I began on the first day of school and continued through the end of September. Phase II took place during the month of November. Phase III began at the end of January and culminated in mid-March. The final phase of data collection commenced in early May and continued until the end of the school year.

Data collection involved taking detailed fieldnotes and audiotaping children while they were engaged in explorations at their tables, in small groups, with the class as a whole and independently. The researcher also documented and collected literacy artifacts from the material culture of this literacy community. This included keeping detailed lists of all texts which found their way into the classroom, taking photographs of
environmental print, as well as photocopying products of the focal children's work. The literacy artifacts which children used during their explorations and the ways in which they used them were documented in descriptive fieldnotes.

Data were analyzed by using constant comparative method (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), taxonomic analysis (Spradley, 1980), and triangulating data with the teacher and the children. Typologies were developed. Data were then entered onto a data base and sorted by various configurations. This data was then foregrounded against the rich, thick description available in corresponding fieldnotes and transcripts.

Data were presented in two sections. The first section described the ontogenesis of routine literacy events as they were initiated by Mrs. L and the children at the beginning of the year and documented the metamorphosis of those literacy events as the year progressed. The changes that occurred in regard to structures of these literacy events, the children's interactions with one another and with texts within literacy events, the ways in which they used literacy, and Mrs. L's role as a participant within routine literacy events were described, compared and contrasted over the course of the year. The second section, Chapter VI, focused on the wide range of literacy explorations within each literacy event. This chapter discussed the complex and novel nature of children's literacy explorations; thus highlighting the collaborative nature of literacy explorations as socially constructed phenomena, with whom the focal children constructed such investigations, and ways in which the children's understandings of the nature of literacy explorations and their subsequent construction impacted their literacy development.
Summary of the Findings

The Nature of Routine Literacy Events

Question #1: What is the nature of the literacy events in which the children in this study participate?

Findings pertaining to the above research question will be presented in five sections. These sections are: 1) the social construction of literacy, 2) functions and uses of literacy, 3) the teacher's role, 4) the child's role and 5) the researcher's role.

The Social Construction of Literacy: The children and their teacher continually negotiated and renegotiated the participant structures of literacy events within the culture of Room 100A throughout the course of the year. Routine literacy events which were initiated at the beginning of the year and continued throughout the course of the entire year were: Arrival Time, Journaling, Mrs. L's Message, Daily Schedule, Story Floor, Authors' Workshop and Free Reading. These literacy events, as well as other routine literacy events in which children participated during portions of the year, underwent subtle transformations. The participant structures changed, resulting in vicissitudes in the way children interacted with one another and text, the ways in which they used literacy, and the teacher's role within each literacy over time.

Functions and Uses of Literacy: During the formation of "community" at the beginning of the year, the children viewed most literacy events as primarily social in function with the exception of Shared Book Experiences in which the teacher signalled that she would be teaching "reading" by referring to this event as "Reading" on the daily schedule. As the year
progressed, the children's focus moved from that of "getting to know one another through texts" to exploring literacy in a variety of ways. Within literacy events, children used literacy in diverse ways. The ways in which the children in Room 100A utilized literacy within all literacy events paralleled literacy uses outside the school setting as identified by Heath (1983), Taylor (1983), and Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines (1988). Story Floor was the literacy event in which the widest range of literacy functions were observed.

The functions and uses of literacy from Mrs. L's perspective differed greatly from those of the children. Mrs. L's primary goal was to teach the children how to read and write through activities which held meaning for them in the context of conducting daily life in Room 100A. From her perspective, all literacy events were efferent in nature. The children, however, responded to the purposeful nature of literacy events by using literacy to accomplish real-world tasks within the school setting. Categories of the functions and uses of literacy which emerged during the study are: social-interactional, instrumental, efferent, environmental, memory-aids, confirmational/documentational, expository, autobiographical, aesthetic, planning/thinking, substitute for oral messages, creative, and school literacy.

The Teacher's Role: The teacher, Mrs. L, initiated many of the literacy events so that children could learn about literacy as a process, become acquainted with various literary genres, and gain world knowledge. Her primary goal was to teach the children how to read. Mrs. L sanctioned child-initiated literacy events such as Special Reader and Book-Sharing because her observations of the children as they negotiated for the
emergence of such events informed her that her goals for the children would be met. As the teacher and the children jointly constructed each literacy event, Mrs. L directed the children's attention toward specific aspects of literacy. She consciously allowed for directed teaching and modeling of literacy processes, opportunities for children to explore what others have demonstrated, and reflection of both teacher and children on literacy processes.

Mrs. L's directed teaching evolved within the process of conducting life within the classroom and was not isolated from experiences which held meaning from the perspectives of the children. This type of directed teaching is similar to the ways in which families "teach" their children (Altwerger, Diehl-Faxon, Dockstader-Anderson, 1985; Heath, 1983b; Leichtner, 1984; Ninio & Bruner, 1978; Taylor, 1986a). Such teaching appeared most frequently during the routine literacy events of Daily Message, Schedule on the Board and Story Floor throughout the year. She also provided this directed instruction during Small Groups upon their initiation during the second half of the year. As Mrs. L directed the children's attention toward specific aspects of literacy, they began constructing explorations of literacy in which they experimented with their changing notions of life, literature and literacy. The teacher's demonstrations impacted these investigations.

Mrs. L gradually moved from the role of guide to that of supportive, neutral observer within the majority of literacy events over time. At the beginning of the year, she was clearly "chief architect" (Dyson, 1988) of literacy events by virtue of her role in introducing such events and her final authority within negotiations. As the year progressed, Mrs. L
relinquished such control and turned the construction process over to the children; acting as consultant only when the job demanded such participation.

The Children's Role: As the year progressed, the children's interactions with one another and with texts moved from focusing on what texts could do for them (provide opportunities for social interaction) to what they could do with texts (functions and uses of literacy). Within literacy events, the children constructed literacy explorations. They constructed such explorations without much intervention by the teacher during the routine literacy events of Journaling, Free Reading and Authors' Workshop. They also constructed explorations during all other literacy events in which Mrs. L was central. At times, the literacy event was an exploration in and of itself. For the most part, literacy explorations were constructed by the children within the participant structures which were established for the literacy event in which the exploration of literacy occurred.

Although the teacher was the final authority on sanctioning specific explorations within literacy events, the children considered themselves to be equal partners in negotiating the participant structures of each literacy event. They initiated two literacy events: Book Sharing and Special Reader.

The children in this study made conscious choices about exploring literacy, but were not overtly trying to teach themselves to read and write. They were aware of the decisions they made concerning with whom, with what, and how they read and wrote—whether these decisions were inherently contributing to or constraining their literacy development.
For the most part, children appeared to have an intuitive sense of what they needed to work on and which literacy artifacts and participants would be the most helpful in meeting their goals. This supports the findings of Bissex (1984), Ferreiro (1986), Harste, Woodward & Burke (1984), and Holdaway (1979) in previous studies of children in familial settings.

The Researcher's Role: The nature of educational anthropology suggests that the researcher has an impact upon the culture under study. Although this is not an investigation of the impact of participant observers within the culture of classroom, it is important to document the ways in which one's presence and interactions within the field may have influenced what occurred. The researcher had special status within the literacy community. She was neither child nor teacher, but was considered to be a literate member of the community.

Although all children viewed themselves as full participants in the study and focal children were not explicitly identified, attention to and frequent interactions with the focal children may have focused their attention toward specific aspects of literacy which they may not have attended to otherwise.

All children were effected by the many books which she donated to the already brimming classroom library as well as the autographs she frequently brought back from conferences. Opportunities to read into the tape recorders also altered the options available to the children.

Mrs. L and the researcher developed a collegial relationship at the beginning of the study. Frequent discussions after school and between data collection phases added to Mrs. L's comprehensive knowledge of literacy processes and provided new options as she considered activities
and instruction which would be most appropriate for the children. These discussions also prompted much growth on the part of the researcher as Mrs. L asked questions and asked for corroborating evidence as to specific findings. Mrs. L's thorough reading of field notes during the first two phases of research provided her with a detailed overview of daily life in her classroom as well as specific information as to the literacy development of various children. The teacher and researcher collaborated continually throughout the course of the year.

Upon several occasions throughout the study, the researcher and Mrs. L made presentations at professional meetings. On one occasion, they articulated the underlying whole language perspective which guided Mrs. L as a teacher. On two occasions, they collaborated in presenting current findings from the study. Mrs. L was invited to talk about her class at a school board meeting and also gave several presentations about Early Literacy during the course of the study. She also attended a presentation on Early Literacy in which the researcher shared several examples from her classroom as part of the discussion. Mrs. L was quite interested in growing professionally and often borrowed professional books and journals from the researcher.

Mrs. L's description of previous teaching experiences with first graders and her expertise as a reflective teacher promote confidence that the researcher did not significantly alter her perspective or teaching methods. In fact, from Mrs. L's perspective, the most exciting and beneficial unit occurred during the researcher's absence from the field. The researcher did, however, expiate Mrs. L's abilities to focus on specific children by nature of the role of researcher as participant
observer, expanded her knowledge of the field of emergent literacy, and provided her with resources and ideas throughout the year.

The Construction of Literacy Explorations

Question #2: How do the focal children in this study construct literacy explorations within the classroom setting across time?

The second research question dealt with the ways in which the focal children constructed literacy explorations across the course of the year. The literacy explorations of the five focal children were foregrounded against the literacy community as a whole. These findings will be discussed in two sections: the nature of literacy explorations and gatekeeping within the literacy community.

The Nature of Literacy Explorations: Within the structures of literacy events, the focal children constructed explorations of literacy. Within any given literacy event, a child could construct multiple explorations. Each literacy exploration was complex and novel, embodying a life of its own. These explorations were triadic in nature; they were negotiated as the agenda of participants, texts, and participants themselves interacted as contexts were created. These contexts are: independent/one child, one peer, two or more peers, teacher and group, one child and teacher, and two or more children with teacher. Children's literacy explorations frequently overlapped and converged for periods of time prior to diverging. The focal children collaborated with their peers as they mutually constructed explorations, moved in and out of explorations, solicited help from others, provided unsolicited or solicited help, and observed and participated in literacy-in-action. The children were apprentices to Mrs. L and to one another.
The focal children continually made links between explorations. They experimented with forms, functions and literacy processes. Form and function developed simultaneously as children investigated specific aspects of text which had been highlighted by the teacher or another peer. These investigations were sometimes consciously initiated. They often emerged as part of literacy explorations and were not contrived or anticipated by the participants a priori. Each literacy exploration "lived into" subsequent literacy explorations.

As children expanded, refined and redefined their changing notions about life, literature and literacy, they used literacy explorations as forums in which to investigate and practice ways to use literacy and ways of interacting with texts. What they learned from one literacy exploration provided impetus for the ways in which future explorations of literacy were constructed. Opportunities to explore the same text in a variety of contexts over time enabled the focal children to focus on specific aspects of print.

Children constructed literacy explorations that enhanced their development as emerging readers and writers. Exploration of texts with peers appeared influenced the focal children's literacy development in notable ways. The nature of such explorations, children's changing notions of reading and writing as processes, and their growing understandings of literacy uses provided a rich forum in which to test their hypotheses. Three of the focal children exhibited contrasting behaviors within the same language register across events during specific points in time. Candie appeared to be a prolific writer during Authors' Workshop at the beginning of the year, but looked like she was unable to
use written language to represent thoughts during Journaling. At the end of the year, both Bobby and Candie appeared to be reluctant writers during Journaling but were quite adept while creating books during Authors' Workshop. Krystal's actions during Story Floor at the beginning of the year provided an image of a child who was both knowledgeable about the reading process and was reading in conventional ways. This child's procedural display during Free Reading on daily basis highlighted her knowledge of what real readers look like. However, observations revealed that Krystal's knowledge of reading as a process was limited and constrained by her attempts to exhibit her knowledge in overt ways.

Literacy artifacts can both enhance or constrain children's literacy development. Size of paper, format of materials and types of texts influenced the options available to children in their explorations and altered both form and function.

Gatekeeping in the Literacy Community: Mrs. L welcomed all children as full participants into the literacy community. She referred to the children as "readers," "writers," "authors" and "illustrators" throughout the year. Children who were part of the classroom at the origin of this literacy community were granted unconditional membership and literary status into the community by their peers. This was noted when Stevi moved away and returned to the classroom two months later. Children who moved into the literacy community mid-year were required by the children to participate in a "rite of passage" event prior to being considered an authentic member of this community of emerging readers and writers. This event varied from child to child, but seemed closely related to the children's concepts of "authorship" and "readership" at those points in
time. The children's requirements for membership into the literacy community were unspoken.

The first two children who began reading conventionally created a gatekeeping role for themselves. For a period of time, they controlled who could read with them when they read together and with small groups. They closely monitored the progress of other children. As others began to join the ranks of "real reading," this role was gradually nullified. New networks within the literacy community began to emerge. Entry into these networks was determined by one's ability to read "fast," the length and size of books read, and one's ability to read books which have not been formally introduced by the teacher.

The ethnographic nature of this study prohibits generalizing the findings to another group of children. The literacy events were woven into the daily lives of Mrs. L and the children in Room 100A are unique to this teacher and this group of students during the period of time they were studied. What took place when children constructed explorations of literacy as they interacted with one another and with texts is "culture specific" and should be considered as such. Yet the findings that emerged throughout this study perpetuate contemplation. The issues that they raised and the questions that evolved are important for all educators as we consider how children "come to know" (Meek, 1988) as emerging readers and writers. Such questions and issues will be discussed in the following two sections of this chapter. The first section will be directed toward those educators who influence what happens within classroom settings: teachers, teacher educators and administrators. The second section will address researchers in the field of literacy.
Implications for Classrooms

Frank Smith (1983) likens teaching someone to ride a bike with teaching someone to read. Smith points out the futility of lecturing about the physics of bike-riding and testing to be certain that the student understands the dynamics of gravity, centrifugal force, overt motion and balance. He reminds us that what the person really needs is to get on the bike and ride! Thus, it is the same with reading and writing.

However, educators and researchers may have ignored another basic ingredient of most beginning bike riders' experiences—the person who runs breathlessly beside the bike with one hand steadying both bike and rider, one eye on the terrain ahead, and one eye watching the biker; awaiting that instant in which she senses that the child is steady enough to ride on his own. Frequently, the supporter simply lets go and watches as the young rider continues down the path while the child, focused on the task at hand is unaware that he is riding solo.

As teachers, we fill the role of steadier and supporter when we impose the bicycle metaphor onto the process of socializing children into literacy. What we draw children's attention to as we slowly walk with them while they develop a sense of "bikership" most likely will depend upon what they are showing us they need to know as well as what the situation demands. As we build momentum as a team and it appears that the child is steady enough to ride on his own, we let go. Continuing to run willy-nilly beside the biker would only serve to exhaust us as "teacher" and would restrain the child from experiencing the process to its fullest
capacity. Instead, we watch as the child rides away and make mental notes as to what we the child is showing us he needs to discover. The child, however, is making mental notes of his own.

Sometimes we choose to get on our bikes and ride along beside them. At other times, we hop on a tandem and ride together. The child who falls when braking suddenly while riding in gravel will come to his/her own conclusions about the pitfalls of such a surface. He may or may not be quite interested in talking about strategies for riding on such precarious terrain. The issues and questions that emerge are authentic and simply part of the process. They are not items to be drilled prior to or following such experiences. They naturally emerge within the course of becoming—in the case of the metaphor, in becoming bicyclists; in the case of this study, in becoming readers and writers.

The present study, along with the expansion of this metaphor, raises pertinent issues for teachers, teacher educators and administrators as we consider the ways in which children emerge as readers and writers throughout the grades. These issues are: trust, access, time, pedagogical theory, depth of knowledge, and curricular perspectives.

**Issues of Trust**

For classrooms to become forums in which children routinely construct literacy explorations, three things need to occur.

*Teachers must begin to trust children not only to learn through teacher-guided exploration, but to learn through explorations with one another.* Children can and do teach themselves and one another whether such interaction is sanctioned in classrooms. As in the case of the biker, the teacher must learn to let go. Children will make mistakes.
They will travel alternative paths. They will journey where no one has journeyed before. Yet they will think about and ponder these expeditions, taking with them those bits of knowledge which are appropriate for their needs at that given point in time.

Vygotsky (1986) introduced the concept of the zone of proximal development; the distance between what a child can do independently and what he/she can do with help from a more knowledgeable adult or, as Vygotsky states, "in collaboration with more capable peers" (p. 86). The teacher in the classroom was not the only person directing the children's attentions toward specific aspects of print. Through interaction with one another, the children were providing support for hypothesis testing and generation as well as moving one another to new heights of awareness in regard to their notions of life, literature and literacy.

Teachers must trust themselves and their abilities to respond to the changing needs of children in ways that will enhance their literacy development. They also need to be articulate in explaining this process to parents and administrators. Teachers must first become knowledgeable about research on children's literacy development in order to make effective observations of children as they are engaged in literacy explorations. Reflection upon such observations, then, should inform the nature of instruction in the coming minutes, hours and days. Teachers need to understand the complex processes of reading and writing, what is involved in moving toward and understanding of such processes, and the literacy artifacts which are most beneficial for the children whom they teach. They do not need to be bound by scope and sequence charts, but can use them as reference points periodically.
In this study, the teacher's directed teaching occurred within the context of literacy events which had meaning to the life-world of the classroom as a culture. As the children and the teacher negotiated the participant structures of this culture, the teacher consciously highlighted various aspects of text and demonstrated effective literacy strategies. Sometimes these demonstrations were pre-planned. Most frequently, the teacher had decided what she needed to highlight and worked to find ways of foregrounding such aspects of literacy within the ongoing life of the classroom culture. In other words, Mrs. L knew what she wanted to teach, but was quite flexible as to when and how she might best direct children's attention in specific directions throughout the course of any given day.

Administrators need to trust teachers as professionals and should be actively involved in the ongoing lives of classrooms. Too often, principals are the persons standing at the sidelines, yelling directions to the bicyclist and his teacher. One might refer to them as the "other parent." When administrators show respect for the knowledge base which teachers bring into the classroom and show confidence in teacher's abilities to provide children with the experiences they need to develop as readers and writers, teachers can and will respond with integrity.

In this study, Mrs. L submitted a proposal to the school district asking for permission to purchase children's tradebooks with the monies that were designated for the purchase of basal readers and workbooks. By submitting a proposal, Mrs. L showed integrity and knowledge as a professional. Her efforts were rewarded. After reading her clearly defined rationale, the administration permitted her to purchase children's
books and sanctioned the use of children's trade books in the teaching of reading and her philosophy of teaching and learning. The principal showed integrity by visiting Mrs. L's classroom for several minutes at least twice a week. She juggled these visits (she visited every classroom as she made her rounds) with a busy schedule and came at varying times of the day. This provided her with an overall picture of the literacy community.

The school district also followed through by inviting Mrs. L to present an overview of her "new methodology" to the school board along with a summary of the children's literacy development during a spring meeting. In all instances, the teacher, principal and district-wide administrators acted as learners as they collaborated together concerning what was taking place in the classroom. This learner's stance, from the researcher's perspective, exudes the high level of professionalism of all persons involved.

**Gaining and Maintaining Access**

If children's literacy explorations are to be optimized, children must have continual access at the following levels. These levels are: continual access to literacy explorations, a wide range of literacy artifacts within the material culture of the classroom, and access with persons with whom to explore literacy.

*Continual access to literacy explorations is necessary for children to test their hypotheses.* Children must be given opportunities to explore their changing notions about life, literature and literacy on a daily basis. This requires involvement in teacher-facilitated explorations of literacy in which the teacher, as guide, points to specific landmarks of interest along the way. Concentrated blocks of time must then be provided
for children to spend in reflection and active exploration independently, with one another, and with the teacher. During these child-facilitated explorations, the children should be allowed to explore literacy in ways that hold meaning for them.

A wide range of literacy artifacts with which to explore and opportunities to explore these artifacts within various contexts and in diverse ways provide children with needed options as they seek to learn those things which are important to them. Different texts teach different things. Children also attended to specific aspects of literacy at various stages in their literacy development. It was critical that the children in this study explore the broad range of texts which were available to them in a variety of ways. Literacy artifacts are not limited to texts themselves. The children explored various forms of art media, writing instruments, textual formats (pop-ups and fold-outs), environmental print, and chants from their rich, cultural traditions. Opportunities to revisit texts and to select texts which to explore provided the children with opportunities to attend to aspects of text which were salient to them at that point in time. Opportunities to explore these texts and other literacy artifacts with peers added to the children's repertoire of strategies for future explorations. Such explorations do not preclude teacher involvement. Instead, they pave the way for students to be "ushered into literacy" (Teale & Sulzby, 1986, p. vii) in a variety of ways.

Children's literacy development is enhanced when they have access to a variety of persons with whom to explore literacy. On the surface, it appeared that all children in the classroom under study were permitted
entry into the explorations of their peers. A more focused look, however, revealed that the children had developed unspoken requirements for who could do what, with whom, and when. Although all children were actively constructing literacy explorations at any given point in time, the options that were available to children such as Krystal were much more narrow than the options available to Elijah. The range of options available to the children and their abilities to avail themselves of such options appeared to influence their literacy development as observed by the researcher.

Time-Related Issues

Literacy explorations take time. Teachers must provide children with concentrated blocks of time in which to engage in explorations such as described within the pages of this document. A simple pass through a text was not enough for the children, especially as they began to read and write in conventional ways. They needed opportunities to conduct in-depth investigations of the texts which surrounded them. The framework which integrated units provides made it possible for Mrs. L to organize classroom life in such a way as to include literacy explorations in all content areas.

Teachers must also realize that, the process of becoming literate is both complex and slow. This became an issue for Mrs. L during Phase II of the study. The school district often sent other teachers into Mrs. L's classroom to see what she was doing. Mrs. L was quite articulate in describing the children's literacy development and where a particular child was at any given point in time. Yet people asked for other evidence. Bowing under such pressure, Mrs. L decided to administer the basal company's reading inventory which first graders in other classrooms
had recently taken. She compared the scores of the children in her classroom to the children in the other two regular classrooms. The results were quite discouraging. The children who were beginning to look like readers when engaged in authentic literacy acts appeared to be incapable of such endeavors from the scoring sheets. In other words, children who "looked" like readers in real life had not "scored" like readers in an artificial testing situation. After considerable reflection, Mrs. L decided that her students were at a disadvantage because they were unaccustomed to the format of the tests. She also began to realize that such formal evaluations did not "test" children's reading competencies. Instead, such measures tested children's abilities to take tests as well as placing children with nonstandard dialects or immature speech patterns at a disadvantage. She instituted "test-taking" sessions, in which she taught the children how to interpret and take tests. These sessions took place for thirty minutes every other Friday morning. In March, all first graders participated in the I-Step Test (a competency test mandated by the state). Every child in the classroom under study passed the test. This was the only first grade classroom in the school district in which all children passed.

Reflection upon this phenomenon leads to certain conclusions. The children did need experiences in which they could explore test-taking as a literacy event which was part of doing school. The issue was not merely one of format, however. It appears that the children's initial movement into conventional forms of reading and writing were less rapid than those of children in other regular classroom. Yet, once they began reading, their rate of progression appeared to accelerate. Their love of reading
and writing had been nurtured throughout the year and they were interested in such activity. During Phase II and especially during Phase IV, the children in this classroom devoured print. This was not the case in the other two classrooms.

**Pedagogical Debates**

At this point in time, there is heated debate which centers around WHAT teachers do and ignores HOW they do it. Mrs. L considered herself to be a whole language teacher. She was committed to teaching children within the context of meaningful activities. Her disdain for isolating skills and concepts was evident in the ways she allowed the children to change the requirements for doing spelling as well as her ability to take a fairly isolated task such as Printing and transform it into Shared Writing. Yet she overtly taught children about beginning and ending sounds, strategies for deciphering an unknown word, and ways of rereading while writing. She used language such as "hard g," "silent e", etc. For her, the issue appeared to be one of focus. She felt that children needed a well-developed sense of phonemics, yet believed that the most beneficial means of nurturing that development was within the contexts of authentic literacy experiences. From the children's perspectives, her comments were incidental. From her perspective, she was deliberately leading them down very specific paths which she felt would move them to new heights of awareness.

Educators and researchers need to move beyond WHAT teachers do and begin to look at HOW they do it. Frank Smith (1983) encourages educators to provide children with demonstrations and follow with opportunities for engagement. He then invites both teachers and children to utilize
sensitivity in reflecting upon where their explorations have taken them. Mrs. L, as teacher, made provisions for such activities to take place. Given the same literacy events, the same children and a different teacher, this might not be the case. What took place within the classroom was a result of the continual negotiation between the teacher and the children.

Curricular Perspectives

If curriculum is constructed by the participants when learning, it makes sense to encourage ALL participants to have input as to what is learned, how it is learned and whether it is worth learning. The children in this study, when provided with opportunities to engage in meaningful explorations of literacy, sculpted investigations that moved them to new heights of awareness. In this classroom, each new event was built on knowledge of previous events. Children learned how to make story maps as a group prior to making story maps in small groups. They then were given the option of making story maps as they worked independently and with their peers. Mrs. L's observations of and discussions with the children informed the ways in which she negotiated the participant structures of events with them. The children were actively engaged in talking about what they were learning, asking questions and providing ideas for new experiences which might be helpful to them in the coming days. When they were not talking about such explorations, they were involved in participating in them.

Implications for Researchers

Several issues emerged during this study which bear discussion in light of current research practices in the field of literacy research.
The Mutuality of Products and Processes

The processes involved as children created texts through reading and writing were extremely complex. They did, however, provide windows into their thought processes and subsequent literacy development. Collecting children's written products without attention to the process of their construction can also lead to misrepresentation of children's abilities as well as their intent. Journal entries, child-produced books, and messages were often collaboratively constructed. As noted in Candie's dialogue with Jason about her new bunny, children's interactions with one another also influence the construction of such products.

The same argument applies to reading. Knowing that a child can read at the first grade level or that a child can read a text with 87.5% accuracy tells one little about what they do when confronted with various types of texts as well as the strategies they used when reading one specific texts. Taking Running Records (Clay, 1986) and analyzing them provides an enormous amount of information about children’s reading strategies as does miscue analysis (Goodman, Watson & Burke, 1987). Designating a grade level or accuracy rate to a child's reading of a text without attention to what the child did while reading that text shows lack of consideration for the format and types of text being read. Such scores actually provide skewed pictures of children as readers. Knowledge that a child has read a book with rich, literary language such as Saint George and the Dragon (Hodges, 1988) with 92% accuracy provides the teacher with information that is quite different from the knowledge that a child has read Dear Zoo (Campbell, 1985) at the same rate.
Throughout the present study, process informed the researcher's interpretation of the product. Products also served to inform the researcher's understandings of the nature of the process. Product and process are mutually enhancing and should not be treated as separate entities while collecting and analyzing data both within and outside the field setting. Process includes not only what was done, but what was said.

Selection of Observation Periods

The data from this study suggests that observing children within the context of one literacy event provides information that is generalizable only to that literacy event. A single child's behaviors within a given literacy event with respect to one register of language (reading, writing, thinking, speaking or listening) is not representative of the wide range of behaviors which that child may exhibit with the same register within a different literacy event. Selecting a particular time period or literacy event to observe makes practical sense from the standpoint of busy professionals. It does, however, provide an incomplete portrait of the class as a whole as well as places children as individuals under the scrutiny of a rather narrow lens.

Children as Informants

Within the classroom as a culture, the children acted upon their understandings of the culturally-patterned norms which had been established and were renegotiated throughout the year. Informal interviews of children and in depth observations of their literacy processes while reading and writing within the life-world of the classroom provided the researcher with detailed information about their literacy
development and the ways in which they structured explorations of literacy. This classroom was part of a greater whole; embedded within the setting of school, within the community and broader world.

When children were removed from the classroom culture and invited to read, write and talk with the researcher about their understandings of literacy the hallway, their explorations were quite different than those explorations constructed within the classroom setting. They moved into a performance mode when asked to read and/or write for the researcher. Because the social demands (participant structures) were different, the children's behaviors were different during these formal interviews. They tended to focus more on the researcher's role as observer and did not appear as intent on focusing on the literacy exploration itself. In many ways, these acts of reading and writing were removed from both the cultural setting of classroom and were also artificial because they lacked purpose from the perspective of the student.

Goodman (1986) discusses the metacognitive awareness of young children and their abilities to articulate their understandings of literacy processes. Throughout the study, the children were more able to share insights into their processes when invited to discuss such processes while engaged in them within the classroom setting. Children were more specific as to exactly what they had done and could often provide information about the choices they had made. When asked the same types of questions outside the classroom setting while engaged in literacy explorations which were inauthentic, the children were not able to offer such specific information. They appeared to be concerned with providing the correct response.
The children did, however, provide the researcher with information about their perceptions of themselves and others as readers and writers when interviewed in the hallway. They also articulated their understandings of when and why people read and write. Such information could not as easily have been accessed through informal discussions with individual children within the classroom setting because the questions that would access insights would be intrusive and inappropriate in that setting. Researchers who are working to understand the complexities involved in reading and writing would do well to observe and document literacy activities within authentic classroom explorations. Taking Running Records (Clay, 1986) and Writing Running Records are easily done within the classroom setting and yield a more accurate picture of children's literacy explorations than do artificial acts of reading and writing that take place outside the life world of the whole classroom.

Recommendations for Further Research

Throughout the present study new questions emerged. Suggestions for studies related to the findings of the study and the questions that emerged will be highlighted below.

1. It is important to identify children who are experiencing difficulty with reading and writing activities and observe their explorations of literacy. We need to understand more about how children in this category organize these explorations, for what purposes, and how they make connections to previous investigations of text. If patterns emerge across children, such information would make a major contribution to the field.
2. Children's literacy explorations are not solely dependent upon the classroom environment in which they participate. All children are exploring literacy, regardless of the setting. It is important to understand the nature of literacy explorations in classrooms where children are not given concentrated amounts of time or support for such exploration. Such information may provide support for the integrity of non-traditional classrooms such as the one under study. Researchers may find that children (as part of peer culture) find ways of constructing explorations of literacy in traditional classrooms which are similar to those identified in the present study, although these explorations are not sanctioned by the teacher.

3. Subsequent follow-up studies of children as they move across grade levels would be important in providing a deeper understanding of the subtle elements which influence the ways in which children approach their investigations of text.

4. Studies of children's explorations of literacy in grades other than first grade would be helpful in understanding the ways in which children view the worlds of literacy in other grades.

Conclusion

The metaphor of Smith's biker was central to the perspectives of both teacher and researcher at the initial phases of this study. As the year progressed, another image emerged; Mrs. L, as teacher, carefully supporting the children as they struggled to maintain their balance, skillfully guiding them around and through bumpy terrain, and matching her speed with their demonstrated capabilities. Then instantaneously-----
the child was riding solo with a victorious Mrs. L watching and encouraging from a distance. What began as a study of how children constructed literacy explorations ultimately demanded the study of how the teacher facilitated and supported such explorations. Such is the nature of ethnography. In making the familiar strange one must avoid "seeing only the forest or only the trees" or vice versa. To be illumined is to be surprised.

Epilogue

The similarities between the family lives of the children in the classroom under study and the Shay Avenue families (Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988) are striking. Families struggled to find and keep affordable housing, sought jobs which would provide necessary income and still allow them to care for children, negotiated the complex institutional systems of welfare, and expressed interest in their children's educational development.

Chancy's mother somehow managed to stay in the "projects" throughout the renovation process. Mrs. L often marveled at her ability to raise six children on an income on which it would be difficult for one person to survive. On Chancy's birthday, he proudly passed out a special birthday treat to each child in the room. He ceremoniously presented each child with one peanut to complement the popcorn snack which Mrs. L had prepared for the celebration.

Jason's mother was forced to return to her husband after the family with whom she had been staying moved. She couldn't afford to feed and clothe the children on her limited income while living in an apartment on her own. Mrs. L's church provided canned goods periodically so that
Jason's mother could use what little money she had to purchase winter boots and clothing for Jason and his sister. Such subsidy was welcomed, but not adequate for the growing needs of her young children.

Kenny's mother was frequently torn between reading with Kenny each evening, keeping up with an active two year old, and completing all the household tasks that had been neglected while she was at work during the day. Candie's parents fought with great determination to maintain jobs which would allow for family time in the evenings and would still provide the income they needed for the lifestyle they desired. Bobby's parents continued to be supportive of Bobby's school endeavors and communicated through the older brother whenever necessary.

Krystal, who frequently wrote letters to her absent mother inviting her to come to special school events, was reunited with her mother in a way that she had not anticipated. In April, Krystal's mother brought both she and her younger sister back to the father. She was unable to care for them in her current situation. An argument ensued and Krystal's mother left again with the girls. For the second time that year, their whereabouts were unknown for several weeks.

The stories continue. Foster homes, extended families, and the vastly-changing demands of city life were all part of the worlds in which the children lived. The familial lives of children were not formally studied, but were discovered because children were encouraged to bring these worlds into the life of the classroom.

The classroom in the present study stands in striking contrast to those classrooms described in the Shay Avenue study. Taylor and Dorsey-Gaines (1988) express their frustration with "the fragmentation that takes
place as they (children) move from the hopes of their families and the promise of their early years through an educational system that gradually disconnects their lives." (p. 121). Mrs. L shared this concern, and consciously facilitated the creation of a classroom community which encouraged children to "come to know" in ways that made sense to them. This respect for the socialization processes in which children had already been engaged in familial settings extended their literacy apprenticeship into the setting of school.

Mrs. L did not seek to consciously build bridges between the children's home lives and their lives at school. To do so would be both presumptuous and overwhelming. Mrs. L, instead, did what made the most sense from the perspectives of the children. She encouraged them, as persons with unique and powerful social histories, to build their own bridges within the context of a supportive and diverse literacy community which accepted and extended the knowledge that each child brought as well as the ways in which such knowledge was communicated.

Research has documented that children with communicative styles that do not match the middle-class mainstream communicative styles of the school are not at a disadvantage when they enter the school setting, but are placed at a disadvantage by teachers who interpret their communicative performance in negative ways (Collins, 1986; Delphitt, 1990; McDermott, 1976; Rist, 1970). In interviews with the researcher in two large midwestern cities, teachers have expressed that "children from low socioeconomic backgrounds can't learn to read and write because they aren't read to in the home." Research has also dispelled the myth that these children aren't exposed to a wide range of literacy materials and

Many schools which have promoted classroom environments in which children have choices and are encouraged to create their own explorations of literacy are located in upper-middle class suburbs. This study clearly shows that the inner city children in this study were capable of making decisions as to their own literacy learning, benefitted from directed instruction while engaged in authentic literacy endeavors, and helped to facilitate one another's growth as readers and writers through simultaneous interaction with texts and with one another. The children, as constructors of the world, were given authentic occasions for exploring life, literature and literacy while simultaneously negotiating cultural norms within the literacy community of Room 100A. They naturally continued their roles as apprentices under the skillful guidance of Mrs. L (as teacher) and one another (as collaborators in the construction of literacy explorations).

Findings from this study do not advocate specific teaching methodologies nor do they suggest that one type of literacy artifact is better than another. These findings do, however, raise questions as to the types of experiences that children themselves will show us they need when invited to explore literacy in ways that hold meaning from their perspective. Mrs. L did not administer a whole language "program."
Instead, she taught with a perspective of teaching and learning that placed the child at the center and was committed to facilitating authentic experiences in which learning could take place. This included providing children with literacy artifacts which were representative of the literacy artifacts which would be found in settings outside of school.

Dyson (1990) states:

In the end, then, our most important teaching tool may not be any one teaching strategy or instructional material. Rather, it may well be the sort of stance toward children that we adopt. The most helpful stance would seem to include an appreciation of children... as interesting people with experiences, opinions, and ideas to share with us and, just as important, with each other. And then, the literacy tools that schools value may be embedded within relationships that the child values. Text, like talk, may thus further the child's sense of belonging, that feeling of community that makes our school lives together both personally satisfying and socially meaningful. (Dyson, 1989, p. 113)

Children need to be engaged in a multitude of authentic literacy explorations in which they, as apprentices, can develop hypotheses about life, literature and literacy within the context of negotiating the complex life world of the classroom culture. Such apprenticeship requires interaction with others; interaction with both the master and other apprentices as well as interaction with texts. The directed teaching of Mrs. L in Room 100A was similar to the ways in which we support young children's oral language development within the family setting. It was neither incidental nor calculated. Instead, Mrs. L allowed discussions about life, language, literature and literacy to evolve through the course of conducting daily life within the culture of Room 100A.

The culture of classroom, like the culture of family, should incite wonderment, provide opportunities for authentic explorations, and allow
children to reflect and talk about what things mean from their perspectives. Mrs. L's classroom was such a place.
APPENDIX A

SCORES OF FOCAL CHILDREN

ON FORMAL MEASURES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>LIT Score(^{(a)})</th>
<th>OWT Score(^{(b)})</th>
<th>Behaviors during Ohio Word Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bobby Phase I</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Looked at each word carefully, but did not make any guesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Attended to initial sounds in each word and some final sounds. Ex: plant/play. Wanted to skip words that he didn't know right away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Heavy reliance on initial sounds. Used them almost like a place marker. Ex: &quot;muh...me...mac...No, um...mac...&quot;/make. Also utilized ending sounds. Talked about words that are visually similar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Candie Phase I | 44 | 0 | Responded for 11 out of 20 words. Some attention to initial sounds, but not consistent through out the experience. |
| Candie Phase III | 53 | 12 | Heavy reliance on initial sounds. Some attention to medial and final sounds. |
| Candie Phase IV | 53 | 17 | Substitutions were visually similar. Ex: ham/him. Did some sounding out, letter-by-letter as she read the words. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LIT Score&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>OWT Score&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Behaviors during Ohio Word Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elijah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cued into initial sounds consistently. Provided letter names when having difficulty with a word. Also utilized some medial and final sounds. Ex: cold/could.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Exhibited confidence while reading the list of words. Self-corrected on 2 words: here/her and wow/who. Substitution was visually similar: side/said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Read the list quickly, with confidence. Was pleased with his fast reading of the list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Consistent use of initial sounds in reading the words. Some responses were visually similar: brown/down, white/what. Knew that his approximations were incorrect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Utilized initial, medial and final sounds consistently. Ex: pot/put, finned/find, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Showed knowledge that certain words are visually similar. Ex: &quot;That's either may or my&quot;. Substitution: ate/eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>LIT Score&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>OWT Score&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Behaviors during Ohio Word Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did not appear to look at the words much during this activity. Looked around the room and responded with objects from the environment (book, pencil, computer) and number names. Several responses were 2-word phrases (They're working, my teacher, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Attended to initial and final sounds. Some substitutions of visually similar words. Ex: was, would/who, was/saw, paget/put.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Letter Identification Task (Ceiling = 54)
<sup>b</sup> Ohio Word Test (Ceiling = 20)
APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF LITERACY BEHAVIORS
OF FOCAL CHILDREN ACROSS TIME
SUMMARY OF LITERACY BEHAVIORS
OF FOCAL CHILDREN ACROSS TIME

BOBBY

--- Phase I --- Phase II --- Phase III --- Phase IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observes others.</th>
<th>Spends long periods of time selecting books to read.</th>
<th>Revisits books he knows he can read.</th>
<th>Previews new books by 'reading' the illustrations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tends to stick with books which are familiar.</td>
<td>Reads silently until comes to a part he knows and then reads orally.</td>
<td>Evidence of 1:1. Works to make the print match his reading.</td>
<td>Often begins by 'reading' the pictures and then starts reading the text part-way through the book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Reads&quot; the pictures.</td>
<td>Beginning to monitor his own reading.</td>
<td>Pays attention to minute details in books.</td>
<td>Evidence of monitoring, 1:1, self-correcting, rereading and attention to meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Echo reads with peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoys reading plays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reads print in illustrations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sees pictures as a form of symbolic representation. Does not appear to view text in this way.</th>
<th>Creates illustrations to tell the story.</th>
<th>Rereads entire passages backwards on days when he is tired or ill.</th>
<th>Continued interest in illustrations. Much exploration of media.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copies from environmental print.</td>
<td>Enjoying collaborating with peers as illustrator.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rereads while writing and also after finished writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watches others as they write.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Writes entire passages backwards on days when he is tired or ill.</td>
<td>Subvocalizes words as he writes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitors his own writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CANDIE

**Phase I**
- Rereads familiar text.
- Doesn't enact when exploring new texts.
- Talks about the illustrations instead.
- Strong preference toward reading with children in small groups.
- Consciously tests out* those things Mrs. L has highlighted.

**Phase II**
- Begins by *reading* the pictures and then moves to reading the text partway through the exploration.
- Strong preference toward reading with children in small groups.
- Gaining control over patterned portion of texts.

**Phase III**
- Strong preference toward reading with one or two children or by herself.
- Moves back and forth from "working on text" to reenacting the story using invented text.
- Monitors her own reading.

**Phase IV**
- Exhibits preference for exploring text independently.
- Selects texts which are longer and more wordy.
- Interested in reading texts which are new to her.
- Makes print work. Matches words with what she says as she reads.

**Writing**
- Concerned about spelling words conventionally at first, but began exhibiting confidence as a writer.
- Subvocalizes in sounds.
- Sometimes rereads entire piece after rereading.

**Reading**
- Subvocalizes in words.
- Rereads as she writes--both phrases and words.
- Self-directed talking.

**Writing**
- Subvocalizes in words and phrases.
- Rereads as she writes and makes necessary revisions.
- Prefers to write by herself.

**Writing**
- Exhibits interest in art media and illustrative styles.
- Rereads as she writes.
- Subvocalizes in phrase units.
- Rehearsing as a placemaker.

**Writing**
- Enjoys collaborative writing opportunities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ELIJAH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitors own reading.</td>
<td>Leads most oral reading activities.</td>
<td>Explores poetry books and books that he perceives as difficult.</td>
<td>Concerned with reading fast and reading books that are long and difficult in appearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begins reading a text and when it gets too long or laborious, he invents meaningful text.</td>
<td>Prefers reading by himself or reading with selected persons.</td>
<td>Reads a wide variety of texts.</td>
<td>Reads a wide variety of texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locates words he knows and reads them to peers.</td>
<td>Reads with a variety of persons.</td>
<td>Reads with a variety of persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitors his own reading.</td>
<td>Usually acts as leader in collaborative explorations.</td>
<td>Began an interest in Ritchie's literacy development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Much attention to print. Is reading 1:1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W R I T I N G</td>
<td>Strong preference toward writing.</td>
<td>Writes messages in vertical lines during journaling sometimes.</td>
<td>Sometimes writes entire messages backwards as in a mirror image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in having the most Author Workshop books (works on several at a time).</td>
<td>Subvocalizes in phrases; rehearses, rereads and monitors own writing.</td>
<td>Subvocalizes in phrases; rehearses, rereads and monitors.</td>
<td>Rereads while writing and makes revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labels pictures with a word or &quot;This is ____&quot; phrase.</td>
<td>Much self-directed talk while writing.</td>
<td>Typically rereads after writing and then makes revisions.</td>
<td>Much self-directed talking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**KENNY**

--- Phase I --- Phase II --- Phase III --- Phase IV ---

**READING**

- Talks through a story, but doesn't reenact it.
- Much attention to initial and finals sounds when reading.
- Monitors the reading of others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEEKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPPORTUNITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TO READ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY HIMSELF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Seeks opportunities to read by himself.
- Reads print in illustrations.
- Beginning to monitor his own reading.
- Monitors reading of others.

- Gets frustrated when peers invent text and don't give him enough time to work on print.
- Attends to both illustrations and text.

**WRITING**

- Subvocalizes sounds and parts of words.
- Syllabic principle evident.
- Prefers writing by himself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBVOCALIZES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORDS AND PHRASES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Subvocalizes by words and phrases.
- Consistent rereading while writing and after.
- Writes words in vertical line; one by one.

- Consistent rereading and revising while writing and after.
- Enjoys collaborating with peers.

**WRITING**

- Writes in phrases.
- Subvocalizes as if to use a place marker while planning next phrase.
- Monitors his own writing.

- Writes in phrases.
- Subvocalizes as if to use a place marker while planning next phrase.
- Monitors his own writing.

- Enjoys partnership with Elijah during Authors' Workshop.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING</th>
<th>Rereads text after she has written it. Changes the text each time she reads it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOPIC -</td>
<td>Writes in punctuation marks after rereading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITING</td>
<td>Monitors own writing, rereads and revises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIEWS</td>
<td>Monitors own writing, rereads and revises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLUSTRATIONS</td>
<td>Monitors own writing, rereads and revises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEANING</td>
<td>Most of her writing is intended for others to read or to elevate her social status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LETTER IDENTIFICATION TASK
LETTER IDENTIFICATION TASK

LETTER IDENTIFICATION SCORE SHEET

TEST SCORE: 53/54

Date: 2/9/89

Name: Kenay

School:

Recorder: RK Keetshourm Classroom Tchr:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>I.R.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>I.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confusions: 0%

Letters Unknown:

Comment:

Recording:

A Alphabet name response: Checkmark

S Letter sound response: Checkmark

IR Incorrect response: Record what the child says

TOTALS
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APPENDIX D

OHIO WORD TEST
**OHIO WORD TEST**

**OHIO WORD TEST SCORE SHEET**

*Use any one list of words*

**TEST SCORE:** 12/20

Date: 2-8-89

Name: [Name]

School: [School]

Recorder: [Recorder]

Classroom Tchr: [Classroom Tchr]

*Record Incorrect Responses*  
Checkmark Correct Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIST A</th>
<th>LIST B</th>
<th>LIST C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice Words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>ran</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty</td>
<td>said</td>
<td>ride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has</td>
<td>her</td>
<td>him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down</td>
<td>find</td>
<td>for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let</td>
<td>live</td>
<td>may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here</td>
<td>away</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am</td>
<td>are</td>
<td>at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over</td>
<td>put</td>
<td>some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>did</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what</td>
<td>who</td>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>play</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>saw</td>
<td>have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use only one list (see testing guide)
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APPENDIX E

LITERACY KNOWLEDGE INTERVIEW
LITERACY KNOWLEDGE INTERVIEW

Learning About What Readers Do

Read the book *Cat on the Mat* (Brian Wildsmith). (Alternate books may be chosen.)

After the first reading, tell the child that you would like him/her to read (or pretend read) it for you. If the child appears unwilling to read it, then say that you will read it together. Give the book to the child so that the child sees the back cover of the book instead of the front.

Ask the child to read the book for/with you. While reading, ask the following questions when it seems most appropriate:

1. How do you/I know what to say?
   
   If needed, continue probing until you have a sense of the child's understandings of print as a means of carrying the message.

2. If the child says that the pictures show what to say, show him/her the words and ask: What are these for?
   
   Continue the dialogue until you have a sense of the child's notions of the relationships between the words spoken and the print observed and the function of illustrations.

3. Read a page (don't turn page) and ask: What should we do next?

4. Continue reading the book. Ask:

   a. Show me a word. What word is that?
   b. Show me a letter. What letter is that?
   c. (Point to a period.) What is this? What is this for?
   d. (Point to the exclamation mark.) What is this? What is it for?
   e. Show me the front of the book.
   f. Show me the back of the book.
   g. Show me a page.
Learning About How Text Works

In this portion of the Literacy Knowledge Interview, you want to see if the child can tell a story from the third person stance; looking to see if the child can "talk like a book."

Some options for discussion with the child:

1. Ask the child to get you one of his/her favorite books and invite him/her to tell you the story in his/her own words.
2. Ask the child to tell you a story about his/her life or a book.
3. Ask the child to tell you a make-believe story.

When and Why People Write

This portion of the Literacy Knowledge Interview is designed to provide the researcher with an understanding of the child's notions about the functions of writing. Use the following three questions as a guide in structuring an interview.

1. Have you ever seen anyone write?
2. Tell me about when people write. Why do people write?
3. What kind of writing do you do? When do you write?

How People Write

Have a selection of writing materials for the child to use: pens, pencils, crayons, magic markers, lined paper, unlined paper, construction paper, message pad, etc.

1. Please write a story for me. You can choose the materials you need. (Ask the child to read the story back to you when he/she has finished and record the child's reading behaviors.)
2. Please write a letter or message for me. You can choose the materials you need. (Ask the child to read the letter or message back to you and record the child's reading behaviors.)
3. Please draw a picture for me. You can choose the materials you need. (Ask the child to tell you about the picture.)
4. Invite the child to write his/her name on any of the written work throughout the interview.

This interview was based on the work of Clay (1986), Ferreiro and Teberosky (1982), Goodman and Altwerger, (1981), Hall (1987), and Harste, Woodward and Burke (1984).
APPENDIX F

EXAMPLE OF DATA SORTED BY:

CHILD, TEXT, EVENT, DATE

FROM PHASE III
**EXAMPLE OF DATA SORTED BY:**

**CHILD, TEXT, EVENT, DATE**

**FROM PHASE III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>02/14/89</td>
<td>soc</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ikaolb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>01/26/89</td>
<td>exp</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>jfs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>01/26/89</td>
<td>soc</td>
<td>jrn</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>jrl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>02/07/89</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>jrn</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>jrl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>02/13/89</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>jrn</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>jrl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>02/14/89</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>jrn</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>jrl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>02/15/89</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>jrn</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>jrl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>02/21/89</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>jrn</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>jrl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>02/22/89</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>jrn</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>jrl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>01/26/89</td>
<td>soc</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>kbitb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>02/15/89</td>
<td>exp</td>
<td>mwath</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>01/25/89</td>
<td>cd</td>
<td>lrrhfr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>lrrhfr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>01/26/89</td>
<td>cd</td>
<td>lrrhfr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>lrrhfr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>02/21/89</td>
<td>cd</td>
<td>lrrhfr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>lrrhfr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>01/26/89</td>
<td>cd</td>
<td>lrrhfr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>lrrhfr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>02/21/89</td>
<td>cd</td>
<td>lrrhfr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>lrrhfr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>02/07/89</td>
<td>rec</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>lrrhfr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>01/25/89</td>
<td>cd</td>
<td>lrrhfr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>lrrhfr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>02/22/89</td>
<td>pl</td>
<td>smallgp</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>smallgp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>02/15/89</td>
<td>ins</td>
<td>mwath</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>01/26/89</td>
<td>rec</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>01/24/89</td>
<td>exp</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>02/14/89</td>
<td>ins</td>
<td>isteppr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>01/24/89</td>
<td>sub</td>
<td>smallgp</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>02/07/89</td>
<td>soc</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>02/08/89</td>
<td>soc</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>02/08/89</td>
<td>soc</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>01/26/89</td>
<td>soc</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>01/24/89</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>splitg</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>splitg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>01/25/89</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>splitg</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>splitg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>01/25/89</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>splitg</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>splitg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>01/26/89</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>splitg</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>splitg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>01/27/89</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>splitg</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>splitg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>02/15/89</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>splitg</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>splitg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>02/21/89</td>
<td>cd</td>
<td>splitg</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>splitg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>02/21/89</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>splitg</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>splitg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>02/15/89</td>
<td>exp</td>
<td>mwat</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>swimmy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>02/22/89</td>
<td>rec</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>02/21/89</td>
<td>cd</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>02/22/89</td>
<td>rec</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>02/23/89</td>
<td>cd</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>01/30/89</td>
<td>rec</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>02/15/89</td>
<td>exp</td>
<td>mwat</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>tge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>02/22/89</td>
<td>cd</td>
<td>mwat</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>tge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>02/27/89</td>
<td>cd</td>
<td>mwat</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>tge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

EXAMPLES OF KEYED NOTES

FROM PHASE II
EXAMPLES OF KEYED NOTES
FROM PHASE II

C: Holy tamao! It's bigger than my pencil! (C measures with her pencil) This is on tape.

B: Is seeds are growing today.

B: It sprout.

B has tree book. Goes thru it, page by page. Looks at pictures. Seed picture of deep curly roots. "Look at the roots!" (Says to himself) Then to Brian: "Brian, come here. This is interesting." B shows Brian the page where a car is driving through the trunk of a redwood tree. I ask then if they have read the page. They say no. We read it together. B goes around the room showing people the book. He shows L the page with the roots on it. Asks L to help him read it. She reads it to him. He takes it and shows Brian. Then returns to looking at each page.

BB: It sprout.

C: Holy tamao! It's bigger than a pen! (C looks with her pencil) This is on tape.

B has Tree book. Goes thru it, page by page. Looks at pictures. Seed picture of deep curly roots. "Look at the roots!" (Says to himself) Then to Brian: "Brian, come here. This is interesting." B shows Brian the page where a car is driving through the trunk of a redwood tree. I ask then if they have read the page. They say no. We read it together. B goes around the room showing people the book. He shows L the page with the roots on it. Asks L to help him read it. She reads it to him. He takes it and shows Brian. Then returns to looking at each page.

BB: I can't fly! Lots of story for tertan to learn. Didn't latch words until got to I can fly. Can't fly... I can fly! Got it!... I can fly. (B continues reading.)

C reads Goodnight Moon. She is still working on meaning. Seems to be using text to guide her, but the guide seems to be keeping meaning in tact.

C reads Why Can't I Fly. Lots of memory for tertan and atta to meaning. Didn't match words until get to I can fly. Can't fly... I can fly! Got it!... I can fly.

C has TVMS. She tells herself the story while she looks at the book. MS came up and asked her if she was reading Charlotte's Web. C: No! Shows him the cover. They count the legs on the spider. B: 6 legs. MS: Spiders don't have 6 legs. C: All spider have 6 legs! MS: I see one that has 10 legs! C continues reading. She seems to work at text more with each page. On pig page, she tries to really understand more to print. C: We're in reading Thom with math, call it over. C: Check over to them and finisher reading the book. Attn to eng. EE comes over and pretends to be the teacher talking to chin. C: Irenement was close to the text. "Just like that!"
APPENDIX H

BOOKS WITH RICH, LITERARY LANGUAGE
BOOKS WITH RICH, LITERARY LANGUAGE

Various versions of:
- Three Billy Goats Gruff
- The Three Bears
- Cinderella
- Little Red Riding Hood
- Rumplestiltskin
- The Three Pigs
- Jack and the Beanstalk

Aardema, Verna.
- Why Mosquitoes Buzz in People’s Ears

Adoff, Arnold.
- All the Colors of the Race

Baylor, Byrd.
- Guess Who My Favorite Person Is

Bios, Joan.
- Old Henry

Bryan, Ashley.
- Beat the Story Drum, Pum-Pum

Bryan, Ashley.
- The Cat’s Purr

de Paola, Tomie.
- Strega Nona

de Paola, Tomie.
- One Foot, Now the Other

de Paola, Tomie.
- Legend of the Bluebonnet

Giovanni, Nikki.
- Spin a Soft Black Song

Greenfield, Eloise.
- Honey, I Love

Hall, Donald.
- Ox-Cart Man

Heller, Ruth.
- Chickens Aren’t the Only Ones

Heller, Ruth.
- The Reason for the Flower

Henkes, Kevin.
- Once Around the Block

Henkes, Kevin.
- A Weekend with Wendell

Howe, James.
- I Wish I Were a Butterfly

MacLachlan, Patricia.
- Mama One, Mama Two

Martin, Bill
- Knots On a Counting Rope

Rylant, Cynthia.
- The Relatives Came

Shannon, George.
- Lizard’s Song
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steptoe, John.</td>
<td>Stevie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolz, Mary.</td>
<td>Storm in the Night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steig, William.</td>
<td>Sylvester and the Magic Pebble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Allsburg, Chris.</td>
<td>Jumanji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Allsburg, Chris.</td>
<td>Two Bad Ants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Allsburg, Chris.</td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viorst, Judith.</td>
<td>The Tenth Good Thing About Barney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildsmith, Brian.</td>
<td>The Owl and the Woodpecker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Vera.</td>
<td>A Chair for My Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yashima, Taro.</td>
<td>Crow Boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolen, Jane.</td>
<td>Owl Moon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoshi.</td>
<td>Who's Hiding There?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zolotow, Charlotte.</td>
<td>Mr. Rabbit and the Lovely Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Adams, Pam.  
Ahlberg, Janet & Allen.  
Barchas, Sarah.  
Barrett, Judi.  
Baylor, Byrd.  
Becker, John.  
Bornstein, Ruth.  
Brown, Marcia.  
Brown, Margaret Wise.  
Brown, Ruth.  
Burningham, John.  
Carle, Eric.  
Carle, Eric.  
Carle, Eric.  
Carle, Eric.  
Carlip, Remy.  
Domanska, Janina.  
Galdone, Paul.  
Galdone, Paul.  
Galdone, Paul.  
Gelman, Rita Golden.  
Goss, & Harste, Jerome.  
Greenfield, Elouise.  
Hawkins, Colin & Jacqui.  

There Was An Old Lady Who Swallowed a Fly  
Each Peach Pear Plum  
I Was Walking Down the Road  
A Snake is Totally Tall  
Guess Who My Favorite Person Is  
Seven Little Rabbits  
Little Gorilla  
The Three Billy Goats Gruff  
Goodnight, Moon  
A Dark, Dark Tale  
Mr. Gumpy's Outing  
Papa, Please Get the Moon for Me  
The Very Busy Spider  
The Very Hungry Caterpillar  
The Secret Birthday Message  
The Grouchy Ladybug  
Fortunately  
The Little Red Hen  
The Little Red Hen  
The Three Bears  
The Three Billy Goats Gruff  
Why Can't I Fly?  
It Didn't Frighten Me  
Honey, I Love  
I Know an Old Lady Who Swallowed a Fly
Hooper, Meredith.
Hutchins, Pat.
Hutchins, Pat.
Hutchins, Pat.
Keats, Ezra Jack.
McClelland.
Mack, Stan.
Nerlone, Miriam.
Numeroff, Laura J.
Peek, Merle.
Sendak, Maurice.
Scherr, Jullian
& Bileck, Marvin.
Shannon, George.
Shannon, George.
Shaw, Charles.
Slobodkina, Esphyr.
Stevens, Janet.
Stobbs, William.
Tolstoy, Alexei.
Van Laan, Nancy.
Watts, Bernadette.
Wood, Don and Audrey.
Wood, Don and Audrey.

Seven Eggs
Titch
The Very Worst Monster
Where's the Baby?
Over in the Meadow
I Know an Old Lady
Ten Bears in My Bed
I Meant to Clean My Room Today
If You Give a Mouse a Cookie
Mary Wore Her Red Dress
Seven Little Monsters
Rain Makes Applesauce
Lizard's Song
Dance Away
It Looked Like Spilt Milk
Caps For Sale
The House That Jack Built
One, Two, Buckle My Shoe
The Great Big Enormous Turnip
The Big Fat Worm
Goldilocks and the Three Bears
King Bidgood's in the Bathtub
The Napping House

Handmade charts and poem books, rhymes, songs, etc.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, Ron.</td>
<td>Dear Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carle, Eric.</td>
<td>Do You Want to Be My Friend?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carle, Eric.</td>
<td>Have You Seen My Cat?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerstein, Mordicai.</td>
<td>Roll Over! and William, Where Are You?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginsburg, Mirra.</td>
<td>The Chick and the Duckling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginsburg, Mirra.</td>
<td>Across the Stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins, Colin &amp; Jacqui.</td>
<td>Incy Wincy and This Little Pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Eric.</td>
<td>Where's Spot?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchins, Pat.</td>
<td>Rosie's Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalan, Robert.</td>
<td>Jump, Frog! Jump!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraus, Robert.</td>
<td>Where Are You Going, Little Mouse?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraus, Robert.</td>
<td>Come Out and Play, Little Mouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraus, Ruth.</td>
<td>The Carrot Seed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maris, Ron.</td>
<td>I'Wish I Could Fly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tafuri, Nancy.</td>
<td>Have You Seen My Duckling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tafuri, Nancy.</td>
<td>Early Morning In the Barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tafuri, Nancy.</td>
<td>Spots, Feathers &amp; Curly Tails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Allsburg, Chris.</td>
<td>The Z Was Zapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward, Cindy.</td>
<td>Cookie's Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westcott, Nadine B.</td>
<td>Peanut Butter and Jelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westcott, Nadine B.</td>
<td>The Lady with the Alligator Purse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildsmith, Brian.</td>
<td>Cat on the Mat and All Fall Down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alphabet books of all varieties.
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