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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A study in contrast

In late January, 1989, Carrie was reading orally during her Reading Recovery program with me, her tutor. The story was about a boy named Fred who could not remember to return his library book to school.

Text: Then Fred heard a little voice say...
Carrie: (points and reads) HE (pauses and continues) THEN HE REMEMBERED... (pauses and looks at the pictures, restarts sentence) THEN FRED HEARD A LITTLE VOICE SAY.

After the book's reading I returned to her successful problem-solving and asked Carrie what parts gave her trouble. She quickly singled out 'Fred' and 'heard'. I asked her why she changed 'he' (her second miscue). She said, "Because there's not an 'h'!" (referring to the 'f' in 'Fred'). She carried the same line of reasoning to the questions for her subsequent self-corrections.

Carrie was a successful problem-solver who was able to make that problem-solving explicit. She informed me she could not rely solely on the accompanying picture to assist her reading. The picture
made sense not only for the actual text read but for her original rendition as well. She knew she had to go further, to check the visual detail of the print in order to integrate that information into her next attempt.

In early February Carrie was again observed reading, but this time she was in her classroom reading group. The children were proceeding "round robin," reading their basal story (Scott Foresman, 1987) about a surprise present that Carmen, a character in the story, found outside her bedroom. When it was her turn, Carrie read the last page. In this segment she was less successful in her problem-solving. Consider one attempt:

Text: Carmen said, "Now I see who did it."
Carrie: (reads) CARMEN SAID (stops, long pause)

At this point, Janice, her teacher, intervened and the two's interaction went like this:

Janice: OW (referring to 'now') THAT'S AN OW WORD. PUT THE 'N' IN FRONT OF IT AND WHAT DO YOU GET?
Carrie: NO?
Janice: THAT'S CLOSE...'NOW'
Carrie: (reads) NOW I SEE...
Janice: (immediately intervening) THAT'S A NEW WORD (who) WE HAD.
Carrie: (no response)
Janice: WHO
Carrie: (no response)
Janice: (Begins to sound out 'd' in the next word 'did'.)
Carrie: (interrupts and continues reading) DID IT.

In the two examples presented above Carrie demonstrated two different oral readings, one where she took control as a reader and another where she seemed to rely on the teacher to initiate the problem
solving for her. What might account for this dichotomy?

Carrie, a first grade child in a north central Ohio school, was considered "at risk" of failure in learning to read. Consequently she was participating in Reading Recovery, an early intervention program for children in difficulty (Clay, 1985). Beginning in September, 1988, Carrie began receiving lessons in Reading Recovery while continuing to receive instruction in her classroom. Through the ensuing year Carrie became increasingly successful with the tasks in Reading Recovery. However, her success was not paralleled in the reading group in the classroom. This apparent mis-match between Carrie's reading behavior in these two instructional settings prompted this investigation.

Background

Reading Recovery is a Chapter 1 early intervention program in many districts in Ohio schools. Recent criticism in the academic journals has questioned the effectiveness of Chapter 1 compensatory programs, this after the 1987 Congressional refunding of these programs for at risk children (Slavin, 1991, 1987; Slavin & Madden, 1989;). Slavin acknowledges that some programs showed effects, but those were, at best, meager given the outlays of funding and personnel; "Traditional Chapter 1 programs are simply not adequate for the job they're supposed to do" (Slavin, p.110).
Often intervention or remedial programs are judged as exemplary or ineffective by reports of outcome measures on standardized test scores earned by participating children. In addition to outcomes, judgements are often made about program cost-effectiveness. This leads educators to value high numbers of students served, even though moderate to low growth in student performance may result. What hasn't been as rigorously discussed are teaching/learning factors beyond the instructional program that may have potential for influencing the success or failure of Chapter 1 programs (Barr, 1984).

Reading Recovery (Clay, 1985) is a relative newcomer to the compendium of beginning reading instruction/intervention programs funded by Chapter 1. Developed in the mid-1970's by New Zealand child psychologist, Marie Clay, the program began in Ohio in 1984 with a pilot study, and state implementation began in 1985.

During School Year 1989-1990 in the State of Ohio, 21 Reading Recovery program sites involving 832 specially-trained teachers and teacher leaders served 3,994 students (Lyons, DeFord, & Pinnell, 1990). (Teacher leaders received extra training in order to establish and maintain a Reading Recovery training program for area teachers around the state.) By program mandate the students came from the bottom 15 to 20% of their class in terms of reading ability. Program children were those who received 60 lessons or more or who were discontinued from the program with fewer than 60 lessons. Of the
program children in 1989-1990, 3,401 children (85%) were discontinued, i.e., they were able to reenter their classroom performing within an average band of reading ability (+ .5 standard deviation).

A promising follow-up study of children who were part of the program in 1986 was reported. DeFord et al (1988) found that these 1988 third-graders were still achieving at the average level or higher in reading in their classrooms. Results such as these indicate that most students can successfully leave this one-to-one tutorial and continue to improve in the regular classroom over time.

Reading Recovery appears effective, but its researchers are no longer relying on program results or longitudinal studies as their primary evidence of success. To do so would have kept the discussion at that program level. Current lines of Reading Recovery research have asked "What is it that allows children to succeed or not succeed with teachers in this program?" This line of inquiry attempts to go beyond presenting relationships between the program delivered and the subsequent student outcome measures and to move to descriptions and observations of the teaching and learning as they play out with real people in real settings.

In this shift from the evaluation of program effectiveness, Reading Recovery research has explored such issues as home/school influences (Holland, 1991), the impact of inservice training on teachers' theoretical perspectives (Pinnell, 1991), supportive
classrooms for Reading Recovery students (Gnagey Short, 1991), and
teacher-student interactions during the reading of new text (Frazier, 1990). The present study also went beyond program outcomes and
specifically considered questions related to changes in student
responses in different instructional settings.

Statement and significance of the problem

The present research was concerned with two related questions. The broader inquiry sought to describe the range of activities and
responses the readers and their teachers were making during
activities in an early intervention program, Reading
Recovery, and in the regular classroom reading group.

The second inquiry sought to describe the range of self-reports
that at-risk children made as active participants in beginning reading
instruction. What were their perceptions concerning their
performance and abilities as they learned to read? How did these
perceptions play out and change in both the intervention program and
ongoing regular classroom instruction?

Both questions have received airing using both the qualitative
and quantitative research traditions. Unlike this study the questions
usually have been addressed in settings where the children were not
simultaneously receiving reading instruction in two settings (RANGE
OF RESPONSES: Clay, 1967; Collins, 1981; Durkin, 1979; Goodman,
1967; Ilg & Ames, 1950; McDermott, 1977. AWARENESS: Brown,
The present research examined and described the dynamic of learning to read experienced by the same children in two instructional settings. In order to capture the complexity of this dynamic, case study methodology was employed that called for sustained observation in each setting. Research questions emerged that allowed for rich, extensive descriptions of children learning to read simultaneously in two instructional settings. From this initial description, which only deals with instructional settings, future research will expand the boundaries of the current study to explore other factors related to success in helping low-progress readers.

**Research questions**

1. What were the patterns of instructional activities that occurred in each setting over time: the Reading Recovery intervention program and classroom reading group? How did these patterns of instructional activities differ between settings?

2. What were the patterns of verbal and non-verbal behavior which accompanied the instructional activities in each setting? How did these routines differ in each setting?
3. (A) Within one representative lesson at three points in time, what were the patterns of student participation across the lesson's activities in each instructional setting?

(B) Across three sets of time, what were the patterns of student participation during the reading of novel, continuous text in both instructional settings?

4. What instructional understandings were students reporting over time in each setting? How did these self-reports relate to their activity in each setting?

5. What interpretations were the reading teachers reporting concerning students' progress in each setting?

These questions were first posed in kernel form in a pilot study of one child learning to read (Schnug, 1989). During the 1988-89 school year Carrie and I worked together in the Reading Recovery program while she continued to receive instruction in her classroom reading group. Regular observations were scheduled in the classroom reading group. I was puzzled by my observations. After 46 lessons Carrie appeared to have distinct response patterns unique to the demands and activities of each instructional setting. For instance, during Reading Recovery Carrie consistently took the lead in monitoring her oral reading, often initiating attempts to reconcile any
difficulties she was having. In her reading group, though, Carrie continually waited for her teacher to assist her. She did not appear to be making connections between the two instructional settings.

This state of affairs was further confounded by Carrie's self-reports. In an interview with me she insisted that when she came to a word she did not know she sounded the word out or asked somebody for help. These two responses also characterized for her the marks of what good readers do. "Sounding out" and asking for help, though, were not strategies she employed during the observations in either the classroom or the Reading Recovery lessons.

Carrie appeared to be making few connections between the two instructional settings. Beyond an isolated link between a recognized text word in Reading Recovery to a classroom spelling word, her response patterns in each setting remained distinctively different.

Allington (1985, 1989) has suggested that the incongruity between a pull-out program and classroom reading instruction confuses the student about what is expected. Carrie's case may support this incongruency hypothesis since the classroom teacher's instruction adhered to a basal series which highlighted skill building and word recognition for reading competency. Her Reading Recovery program emphasized the integration of syntactic, orthographic, and semantic cues from the text to predict and construct a meaningful interpretation of what she was reading.
However, Pinnell (1987) reports that most Reading Recovery children are successful in classrooms whose reading practices are in conflict with Reading Recovery practice and theory. Therefore the question in my mind still remained. How can a reader look competent in one setting and not in another? The conflicting research coupled with Carrie's performance propelled the present research.

**Definitions of terms**

The following definitions explain terms specific to the present study and which are used frequently throughout the study. Expanded definitions of these terms will be presented in later chapters.

**activity.** Particular instructional pursuit whose characteristics "impose constraints on the behaviors of the members" (Berliner, 1983). For this study those characteristics were (a) materials used, (b) time allocated, (c) purpose of the activity, and (d) role of the members involved.

**at-risk reader.** Clay (1985) defines an at-risk reader as a low progress child who after one year of instruction uses a narrow range of reading strategies (p.7). Use of such a narrow range puts the child at-risk of reading failure. Systematic, observation assessments allow the teacher to describe the range of reading strategies being used to make the initial identification.
**case study.** "The study of a bounded system" (Smith, 1988).
Case studies allow the researcher to describe a "totality" within
chosen parameters.

**novel, continuous text.** New text that is a complete story or a
substantial part of a story.

**routines.** "Repeated patterns of verbal and nonverbal behavior
which the participants within the setting seem to be following" (Cazden, 1988).

**self-reports.** Understandings explicitly reported by the child
using talk or demonstrated within the reading act.

**setting.** The space in which reading instruction and learning
take place.

**student participation.** Verbal and nonverbal responses to the
activities, routines, and materials used in reading instruction.

The preceding definitions suggest limitations or "boundaries" to
the present research. Further boundaries can be found in the
theoretical perspectives which framed the research questions. These
perspectives will be explored in the next chapter.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The present study was influenced by a set of established theoretical perspectives that affected both the actual data collection and subsequent interpretations. These perspectives are outlined in the seven sections comprising the review of the literature: (a) a definition of reading, (b) a definition of the at-risk reader, (c) learning to read as an emergent process, (d) learning to read in school, (e) learning to read in Reading Recovery, (f) the congruency between intervention and classroom reading programs; and (g) the at-risk reader's developing conceptions of the reading process.

Definitions of reading

Reading is often defined synonymously with literacy. While defining reading and literacy are complex tasks, within the research literature three different approaches are of interest to the topic at hand. In the first approach, reading, along with writing and numeracy, is often understood within the broader concept of literacy (Venezky, 1990). Reading, writing, and calculating are skills used by a literate person. Venezky recognizes that there is no universal
definition of a literate person among scholars except to hesitantly
conclude that "literacy denotes a collection of abilities within which
specific ability zones can be designated for practical ends" (p.72).
Venezky's conclusion exemplifies the elusiveness of the defining task
in this first approach and relegates any extensive understanding of its
components, such as reading, to other approaches for defining.

The second approach describes literacy skills, such as reading,
by listing their purposes and functions. For example, Mikulecky
(1990) provides a contradictory compendium such as the following:
(a) literacy liberates, (b) literacy use is growing, (c) literacy use is
shrinking, (d) literacy spawns creativity and makes possible between
individuals links that span space, and (e) literacy serves gatekeeper
functions (p.24). Therefore to understand reading one must
understand the roles it plays in society.

The final approach defines literacy skills such as reading in
operational terms. Observations and measurements are used to
describe the phenomena (Farr & Carey, 1987). For example, to be
literate means to be able to read and comprehend texts equivalent to a
certain grade level. Chall (1990) concludes that a twelfth grade level
of literacy "permits the reading and learning of difficult materials
- high school level textbooks, technical manuals in industry and the
military, national news magazines....It includes...nine to twelve grade
levels on standardized reading tests and the Adept level on the NAEP
scale" (p.5). Thus normative and qualitative barometers have become
references for literacy criteria and are now part of literacy definitions.

Since the present study concerned children who were learning to read, it was necessary to define what was meant by the phenomenon as it is manifested by proficient readers, i.e., what is the nature of the phenomena that low-progress readers are acquiring. Rumelhart's (1985) definition articulates the nature of reading.

Rumelhart (1985) defines reading as a "process of understanding written language... It begins with a flutter of patterns on the retina and ends (when successful) with a definite idea about the author's intended message... It is at once a perceptual and cognitive process" (p. 722).

Two key words stand out in Rumelhart's definition which evidence why this particular description was chosen. Reading is a process, a phenomenon that denotes an interaction between the demands of the printed word and the reader. Reading is also understanding written language, another active, constructive process that allows for the reader's own meaning making (Rosenblatt, 1976).

Relying heavily on Huey's work (1968), Rumelhart posits four tenets in this reading definition. First, the perception of a letter depends on the surrounding letters, i.e., that successful readers need to have an understanding of how letters can be combined and what patterns seem to be common and acceptable. Second, perception of a word depends on the syntax within which the word is placed. Syntax, Rumelhart maintains, has to play a crucial role in the reading process
given the fact that if it didn't, all reading errors (or miscues) would be visually similar to the attempted word. Persuasive analyses of beginning readers' miscues indicate that this is not the case. Because the child is an expert language user, miscues are often syntactically based on what the child expects to sound right in what s/he reads. (Allington, 1984; Clay, 1967; Goodman, 1967; Ilg & Ames, 1950).

Third, perceptions of words and syntax depends on the semantic environment within which they are found. The reader has an anticipation of meaning (Smith, 1984), i.e., s/he expects that the string of words will make sense and will use that expectation in this level of perception. Finally, Rumelhart stipulates that meaningful interpretations of any phrases or sentences depend on the overall context of the reading passage.

Using the tenets outlined above, Rumelhart consolidated them into a model. The model is labelled interactive because the higher levels of processing (e.g., perception of semantics and overall context) can inform the lower levels (e.g., perception of letters). At the same time, the lower levels are informing the higher ones. He refers to this dynamic as parallel processing.

In order for the reader to perceive and hence initiate the different levels of processing Rumelhart maintains that s/he uses knowledge sources. These sources are the reader's current understandings of the orthography of the written language, lexical knowledge, semantic interpretations, and syntactic structures.
Of interest to this study are those knowledge sources that the beginning reader brings and that s/he will develop and refine with others in formal reading situations. As the next section suggests, the beginning reader's ability to use, build, and refine these knowledge sources may impact upon whether they are defined as at risk of reading failure.

**Definition of the at-risk reader**

As with the concept of reading, defining what it means to be at risk of reading failure is also an elusive task since there are many definitions currently competing in the literature. Slavin (1989) concedes that definitions of this term, like those of reading, aren't precise and do vary, yet he posits the popular view:

One possible definition is that students who are at risk are those who, on the basis of several risk factors, are unlikely to graduate from high school. Among these risk factors would be low achievement, retention in grade, behavior problems, poor attendance, low socioeconomic status, and attendance at schools with large numbers of poor students. (p. 5)

Au (1989) outlines similar "risk makers" such as socio-economic factors (family income and parents' education achievement), educational factors (tracking, reading group placement), and interactive factors (historical treatment of minorities and their education and future job ceilings for some tracked students).
Unlike Slavin and Au, Clay (1985) defines the term "at risk" in relationship to beginning reading behavior that is observed rather than using ex post facto characteristics correlated with poor reading achievement. This more specific approach was chosen for the present study.

Clay stipulates that beginning readers bring their sources of knowledge to the reading task. Such sources as their language, experiences with the world, and previous understanding of print become integrated as the reader meets the print demands of the text. The at-risk reader is one who cannot successfully integrate these sources of knowledge, and the following profile results:

...the low-progress reader or reader at risk tends to operate on a narrow range of strategies. He may rely on what he can invent from his memory for the text but pay no attention at all to visual details. He may disregard obvious discrepancies between his response and the words on the page. He may be looking so hard for words he knows and guessing words from first letters that he forgets what the message is about. Unbalanced ways of operating on print can become habituated and automatic when they are practised day after day. (1985, p.7)

Clay is explicit when the term "at risk" should be applied:

Early identification of children at risk in reading has proved to be possible and should be systematically carried out not later than one year after the child has entered formal programme (i.e., after kindergarten). This gives the shy and slow children time to settle in and adjust to the demands of a teacher. It also overcomes the problems of trying to identify those who fail to learn to read before some of them have had a chance to learn what reading is about. In many ways it is sensible to try to predict this only after all children have had some equivalent opportunities to respond to good teaching (1985, 3-4).
Inherent in Clay's statement is the caution that beginning readers need the opportunity to learn before labels are applied. The "at risk" identification comes only after the children have had this initial opportunity to respond to good teaching so as to develop the reading skill.

Clay's criterion that opportunities to learn along with good teaching be provided before the at-risk designation is applied reflects a theoretical assumption that the acquisition of the reading skill is an emergent process. (Clay, 1966; Strickland & Morrow, 1990; Taylor, 1986; Teale, 1982, 1986). The next section outlines this assumption and how the resulting theory can inform beginning reading instruction.

Learning to read

Marie Clay is credited with coining the term "emergent literacy." By her definition (1966) "emerging" refers to a process of ever-increasing sophistication with the skills of reading and writing. Durkin's seminal study (1966) of children who learned to read prior to entering formal instruction became a touchstone for researchers studying emergent literacy. The longitudinal study, conducted on the California coast and replicated in New York, followed the academic progress of early readers through four or five years of schooling. Durkin found that at the end of 5 years, the children who read prior to entering school had a mean level of achievement higher than their
counterparts with similar IQ's. Many researchers were not as intrigued with the long term results of Durkin's study as they were with systematically observing how children, without benefit of formal schooling or instruction, came into the academic setting already knowing the very skill that the school was charged to teach. This interest generated a wealth of research, the cumulative results of which indicate that not only do some children learn to read before school but that the majority of children begin to do so before they enter a classroom. (For reviews see Hall, 1987; Mason & Allen, 1986; Teale, 1986.)

Current perspectives within the research on emergent literacy have been influenced by the work of child psychologists Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky. Researchers using a Piagetian perspective consider the locus of literacy emergence to be within the head, i.e., a cognitive process. The perspective posits that the child acts upon the physical world (in this case, print) and constructs a network of meanings based on these actions. These actions become the unit of analysis that the researcher will use in order to ascertain the underlying logic the child is constructing about literacy, (Ferreiro, 1985).

Ferreiro uses the Piagetian tenet that action is the source of all knowledge as the foundation of her theory. The child brings to bear the biological predilections to infer, predict, and self-monitor; all in a complex problem-solving that leads to the creation of a network of understandings. This network of understandings, commonly called
schemata, organize and inform a child's experiences as s/he continues to act upon the environment, in this case, experiences with print found in the environment.

Cognitive development is also viewed as an interactive process in this perspective. The object the child acts upon incorporates social, cultural, and physical attributes that the child will use in conjunction with his or her organizing schemata.

The Piagetian perspective in emergent literacy research also considers cognitive development to be a dialectical process even before the child experiences formal instruction (Ferreiro, 1985). Once a child resolves any cognitive dissonance s/he may have around actions on "novelties" s/he encounters, new questions are invariably posed and new cognitive dissonance results. From there the child activates a self-regulatory system and seeks to either assimilate new experiences and problems into the existing schemata or to accommodate the schemata in order to adapt to this environment. In short, the child seeks equilibrium, a resolution to his or her dissonance.

From a Piagetian perspective, a common objective in emergent literacy research is to study the role of print and print awareness in the literacy emergence of the child. This commonalty is not surprising since print is considered to be an "object" upon which a child can "act." Hall (1987) refines the term "print" by delineating two categories: (a) environmental or contextualized print, i.e., print
that can be understood by its surrounding context and (b) decontextualized print, i.e., print that can be understood only by the context of the surrounding print.

A child's awareness of and action on environmental print can develop prior to formal schooling, often within the home. Schickedanz and Sullivan (1984) report the prevalence of environmental print in the households they studied. Of the 300 events involving reading and writing that they studied, 75% of those involved children's attention to environmental print such as grocery lists, catalogues, and telephone books. In their landmark study, Goodman and Altwerger (1981) described children's action upon environmental print. They presented to children a series of labels from products and signs found in the environment. The graphic information on the labels was first presented in its full context, e.g., a Comet label on the cleanser can. The surrounding colors and stylistic features were progressively withdrawn until all that was left was a manuscript form of the labels' graphic information. As the situational context was withdrawn, the children paid more attention to the specific graphic forms. Goodman and Altwerger concluded that a child's increasing awareness of environmental print will eventually lead to an increasing awareness of decontextualized print.

Smith (1984) offers an explanation for Goodman and Altwerger's conclusions. He suggests that as children increasingly come to deal with print in a situational context, they form two assumptions: (a) the
assumption of contextualization wherein the child assumes that 
environmental print means something, and (b) the assumption of 
conventionality wherein environmental print can become the basis for 
anticipating meaning in later events where print is present again.

Smith's assumptions are supported in Kelly's (1953) Theory of 
Personal Constructs. Kelly maintained that as an individual interprets 
events (environmental print) s/he constructs meaning for it. These 
events, then, become a source of anticipation for future, similar 
experiences. Patterns of meaning are applied over and over again 
when the print is experienced either in its environmental or 
decontextualized form. Hence, new "novelties" are experienced and 
the process of self-regulation and schema refinement occurs.

Mason (1980) concurs with Kelly and Smith, reporting that 
emerging readers develop expectations about the functions of print 
such as (a) words say something and (b) that different words say 
different things. Children also anticipate forms of print using their 
knowledge of letters and their emerging phonemic awareness of how 
those letters sound (Read, 1975). For example, "magician" is read as 
"mom" because of the /m/ and conventional sign used to represent 
/m/ that the child has become so familiar with in the many 
experiences with "mom." Mason also reports that children develop 
expectations about the conventions of print (Clay, 1967 & 1985) such 
as an increasing awareness of how print moves across the page and 
how print should look. These expectations then focus and lead
children's actions on print that is experienced later.

Piagetian researchers studying emergent literacy also ask how the child uses oral language to find out about written language. Language is what the child contributes to any problem-solving along with his or her actions and developing network of meanings. In short, the child uses oral language as s/he explores print. Haussler (1982) found in her year-long study that self-reports provide insights into the child's emerging conception of the forms and function of print. She describes one boy who, when asked why a stop sign said "stop" replied, "Because it is red and has a stop sign on it!" (p.14). For that child, color and a familiar patterns of marks were what said "stop."

Mason and Allen (1986) report that children also use oral language in a series of analytical tasks such as word games, alphabet naming games, rhyming and alliteration, and inquiries into print such as "What's that?" or "How do you make a...?"

In summary, for Piagetian researchers studying emergent literacy, print is an object that the child acts upon while constructing interpretations and networks of meanings for the phenomena s/he experiences. Through oral language and ongoing problem-solving the child develops an ever-increasing sophistication with the demands of print.
A Vygotskian researcher of emergent literacy, on the other hand, examines what occurs "between heads" (Taylor, 1987). Employing a social interactional approach to studying emergent literacy, the researcher uses as a unit of analysis the child's interactions with adults or significant others (from now on referred to as adults, though other children could be considered significant). The researcher also approaches a study believing the child and adult construct meanings or understandings about literacy together.

Cognition is always occurring in a setting and it is that setting which will define literacy acquisition (Teale, 1982). Within the setting, patterns of activities and interactions (Wertsch, 1985), such as those using or surrounding reading and writing. These patterns of activities accomplish practices that constitute one's culture. Cochran-Smith (1984) and Heath (1982) refer to these patterns as "literacy events."

Vygotsky (1978) found that actions that were accomplished mainly through social interactions later became part of a child's higher mental functions. The child, involved in literacy events with the adult over time, will construct an understanding of the activities in a process of internalization. As defined by Vygotsky (1978), internalization is a process wherein activities and interactions external to the child (interpsychological events) underlie later mental activity within the child (intrapsychological events). This is not to imply that it is a one-to-one shift from inter to intra. Wertsch (1985) stipulates,
for example, that the child must voluntarily regulate and consciously realize the higher mental functions s/he uses (p.25). Thus the child becomes an active participant in the literacy events, changing and manipulating the forms and functions of the interactions while using the signs found in print to mediate thought.

The shift to intrapsychological events begins to occur within what Vygotsky (1978) called the Zone of Proximal Development. The "zone" is described as the distance between the child's actual development as defined by any independent problem-solving and his or her potential development as defined by this problem-solving under adult guidance.

It should be emphasized that the role of the adult is to construct a "scaffold" (Bruner, 1975) during any interactions with the child. Clay and Cazden (1990) define this active process as "interactional support, often in the form of adult-child dialogue, that is structured by the adult to maximize the growth of the child's intrapsychological functioning," (p.219). When an adult scaffolds a literacy event for the child, limitations are placed on the degrees of freedom the child has in responding to a task not yet under control. It is a support that Wells (1985) calls a "leading from behind," because it is the child's ultimate initiative to make use of the scaffold, to actively change the forms and functions of the interactions with the adult. Therefore the scaffold is not something that is imposed on the child. As s/he becomes more and more proficient in responding to the literacy events, the scaffold
is shifted by the adult. Clay and Cazden (1990) describe this shift as keeping the adult support "always at the cutting edge of the child's competencies, in his continually changing zone of proximal development," (p.219).

A typical interest of emergent literacy research using the Vygotskian perspective is to study social settings and shifting participant roles relative to literacy events. Researchers do not seek to describe a universal, generalized setting or interactional patterns. As reading and writing are practices that constitute a culture (Teale, 1982), and as cultures differ, so will these practices differ.

Results from Heath's six-year ethnographic study (1983) of various communities in the Piedmont Carolinas are illustrative of differing cultural practices. She found that in the white, working-class culture, the children were immersed in an environment of print, pictures, and nursery rhymes. The children were expected to be active participants in the parent-initiated question-and-answer routines and also were encouraged to initiate the routines themselves. This was contrasted with children in the Afro-American, working class community that Heath studied. In this community, "kids read to learn before they learn to read...Reading is always set in the context of immediate action" (Heath, 1983).

In her book Family Literacy (1983) Taylor reported that within all of the six families she observed, literacy activities were for doing specific things such as writing letters to absent friends, compiling a
shopping list or reading a cookbook. In an observational study of 15-17 diverse, ethnic families, Schieffelin and Cochran-Smith (1984) reported that a child's interest in print was not haphazard but was actively encouraged by the patterns of literacy activities used by members of the culture of which s/he was a part.

The studies report above demonstrate that literacy-learning means different things to different people and that patterns of activity (literacy events) are different from culture to culture. A child's and adult's mutual construction surrounding the meaning of and the uses of literacy practices will vary as well.

Since print use is culturally-determined, related research questions not only center on the descriptions of literacy events in various cultures but also address how these events foster emerging reading and writing skills. Since reading and writing are used to eventually get things done (Teale, 1982), it is from functional interactions that literacy skills first begin to emerge. Teale described the nature of these functional interactions in a 1986 year-long study of 22 homes, reporting that there were distinct literacy events that emerged from the data; e.g., messages left for family members, story-readings, and grocery list writing.

Taylor (1983) further suggests that the literacy event is a "medium of shared experience." Families in her study used literacy to solve problems or maintain social relationships. Teale posits that it is in these very interactions that the child is first put into touch with the
intents and purposes of reading and writing. Through the process of internalization (described above) the child increasingly becomes facile with the literacy skills needed to "get things done."

Scollon and Scollon (1981) maintain that familial interactions such as those reported by Teale and Taylor have a powerful influence on children's future literacy learning. The Scollons lived with the Athabaskan culture, a culture that defined literacy and the purposes of literacy differently than the researchers. Even though their young daughter was daily immersed in the Athabaskan community members, she actively internalized her parents' literacy definitions and functions. This process occurred in the recurrent literacy activities that the family conducted in their living quarters, apart from those of the Athabaskan culture.

In order to describe the active internalization of literacy definitions and functions, emergent literacy researchers observe and describe the child in the social interactions of the literacy events. Since the child actively transforms any interactions with others, s/he will move from a socially regulated understanding of literacy to a socially influenced, cognitive understanding of the literacy event. This move is made, in part, by a child intent on doing the activity and doing it legitimately. Though Gibson's study (1970) documenting written forms children acquire over time was not influenced by a Vygotskian perspective, she noted the enthusiasm and enjoyment the children displayed during her observations. She reported how the children
demanded she attend to their efforts and provide support and feedback. These requests came from children not only intently involved in writing, but children who actively sought to bring in adult comments about their work; to shape the event to meet their learning needs.

Similar research highlights this concept of the active learner. Bissex (1980) reports how her son not only wanted to be involved in literacy activities, but used reading and writing to get his mother's attention, passing her a note with the letters "R U DF" when she was not noticing or commenting on his work, even after his repeated requests. Giti (Baghaban, 1984) also knew how to bring her parents/researchers into her writing efforts when she made believe she was a waitress taking their "orders." The preceding research exemplifies emerging literates as active children, children who do not wait for adults to invite them into a literacy event but rather, initiate these patterns of activities in the service of their own learning. Once involved, the children solicit adult interaction and input.

Like the Piagetian researcher, the Vygotskian researcher also studies the relationship between oral language and literacy acquisition of the child. Teale (1982) puts oral language in the center of the interactions between child and adult. It is the medium of "obuchenie," a Russian term meaning both learning and teaching. The oral interactions induce the child and adult to actively participate and mediate their understandings. The oral interactions are also
internalized by the child as s/he moves from the interpsychological activities of the event to the intrapsychological activities of solo attempts at reading and writing (Wertsch, 1985).

Storybook time is illustrative of the central role oral language plays in literacy learning. Simple read-aloud sessions involving adults and children have been determined to be crucial for literacy development (Cochran-Smith, 1984; Teale & Sulzby, 1984; Wells, 1986).

Teale's longitudinal study (1984) of a household where parents daily read books to their children reported the following: (a) The parent actively mediated the story-reading, scaffolding the event with oral language so that the child could also actively and successfully participate. (b) The child, in subsequent rereadings with the parent or in isolation, increasingly used the language structures of the initial interactions.

In an earlier study, Ninio and Bruner (1978) reported similar phenomena with mother-infant dyads. They reported a progression where, at first, the mother provided most of the talk, including answering her own questions. At a later point the infant became adept at vocalizing proto-speech to a mother's queries. Ninio and Bruner also observed the infant appearing to use gestures and eye contact to "point" to things in the book. Heath (1983) found that these storybook interactions were also beneficial for the child who was learning what was important about the book, including the fact that print
carried the message. Adult and child interactions developed into routines of questioning and answering that the child used later and found to be an advantage when s/he came to a school that valued and used those same questioning and answering techniques.

The preceding research is illustrative of a Vygotskian perspective which considers the social settings and social interactions as key to understanding the emergent process of literacy acquisition. Though the perspective seems to be quite different from the "within-the-head" emphasis of the Piagetian approach, Pontecorvo and Zucchermaglio (1990) combine these perspectives in a way that proved useful to the present study.

Three components from both a Piagetian and Vygotskian perspective were combined: (a) The child is considered a builder of knowledge using his cognitive, metacognitive, and emotional wherewithal. (b) Print is considered an object that the child acts upon and which the child comes to understand in terms of its function, form, and social uses. (c) The child first develops these specific network of meanings in collaboration with others through social interactions in a social setting (Pontecorvo & Zucchermaglio, p.69). The resulting perspective colored the data collection and subsequent interpretations of the present study, particularly in light of the fact that once a child enters school, understandings established in the home environment must shift to include (and accommodate) understandings promoted in school.
Learning to read in school

Certainly the process of literacy acquisition continues once the child enters formal school settings. Within these settings will be certain patterns of activities that are socially presented and constructed and that will influence how reading is learned (Kantor, 1987).

In *Becoming a Nation of Readers* (1985), Anderson et al report that in 70% of the classrooms around the country, the patterns of learning-to-read activities revolve around the use of basal materials, i.e., readers, workbooks, and skill sheets. Their use is what Wolf and Perry (1987) refer to as a packaged program of reading experiences, experiences that are defined by the very materials and technology comprising the program. This framework, then, determines in part how reading is learned and how it will be observed and assessed. For example, daily drill sheets become the medium of presentation of, attention to, and assessment of such concepts as letter-to-sound relationships or decoding skills. Often the child learns concepts in isolation of other concepts and must work independently to draw applications to other settings.

Though basal program instruction in the United States is prevalent, this does not mean that students have equal access to that instruction. Even children within the same classroom have divergent reading experiences because of ability grouping (Shannon, 1989; Wilkinson, 1991) and the concomitant differences that such grouping
practices brings into the settings. Classroom teachers will often group the children according to perceived abilities and instructional needs. In a synthesis on grouping practices, Wilkinson (1991) reports that there is a bias toward ability grouping in most current reading instruction. The pervasive belief is that ability grouping "raises students' attentiveness and gives them more individualized instruction," (p.203). Groupings usually range from high to low student ability as defined by observed behaviors and teacher beliefs. This prevalent organizational structure influences what gets done in the name of reading, and therefore what is learned about reading.

McDermott (1976) found that children in the high ability groupings received more reading instructional time than did the children in the low reading ability group, a discrepancy that may be at least partially attributed to the way the teacher permitted turn-taking. High group children took turns participating in a round-robin fashion whereas in the low ability group the teacher often "tossed-up" questions or opportunities to participate and students had to "bid" by raising their hands. The latter teacher behavior consumed more instructional time for the members in the low-ability grouping, thus allowing less time for the children to actually be involved in the reading process.

Allington (1980) and Collins (1981) also found differential treatment between high- and low-ability groups. High group children spent more time reading continuous texts whereas students in the
lower group spent time on decoding or isolated skill work. Further, during oral readings of basal materials, high group children were more likely not to be interrupted if they miscued than were children in the lower group.

The teachers in Allington's, Collin's, and McDermott's studies usually justified the way they operated the instructional settings in terms of what they perceived to be the academic needs of the children. Michaels (1980), though, dramatically illustrated how teacher decision-making can move beyond considerations of instructional needs. Michaels documented subtle and unconscious manifestations of differential treatment. During sharing time in one classroom, she documented two very different styles of student sharing of a story or show-and-tell item: topic-centering and topic-associating styles used by white and black children respectively. She further reported the very different ways the teacher reacted to both styles. The topic-centering style used by the white children tended to mirror the expository, decontextualized use of oral language favored by and encouraged by the teacher. The topic-associating style, though, was perceived as "rambling" and not "sticking to the topic." Instead of jointly constructing the narrative as she did with the white children, the teacher often interrupted and evaluated the narratives the black children used.
Although the preceding citations concentrate on teacher behavior, the studies are included to illustrate that the children in classroom and reading instruction situations must learn the "social norms and expectations for behavior" (Kantor, 1987) if they are to be considered proficient or successful in their learning to read endeavors.

Green and Weade (1987) explain why the social dynamics of these instructional settings were considered for the present study:

Reading is viewed as a process that is embedded in and influenced by instructional and communicative processes and events. These processes serve as a broader context for reading. As such, reading, like other aspects of classroom life, is defined as a product of the interactions among teachers, students, and materials and thus is the result of interpersonal processes as well as intrapersonal ones. (p.3)

Paris and Wixson (1987) also emphasize the interpersonal processes which are in play during classroom reading instruction. Gaining access to these processes, they maintain, is of prime importance to the child. Access according to Paris and Wixson is defined as a set of enabling conditions that allows the child to successfully enter into and use the reading instruction provided by the teacher. Learning to read involves gaining access, "a set of sociological conditions that enable transactions of learning and teaching to occur" (1987, p.36).
Heath (1983) maintains that within instructional settings the child has to have access to effective ways of using language which are prized in the classroom. Michael's work (cited above) illustrates this very assumption. Dillon and Searle (1981) also report that in their case studies, classroom talk tended to be dominated by the teacher and that the children, if considered successful, recognized that and acquiesced, following interaction routines particular to the instruction.

Students who do not share their teachers' rules for communicating and acting during instruction will have limited opportunities to become literate (Green & Bloome, 1983). Since negotiation of access is thwarted, students will increasingly pull away from the instructional setting. This phenomenon is a dangerous possibility given the assumption previously stated that literacy acts are cultural acts (Schieffelin & Cochran-Smith, 1984; Scribner & Cole, 1981; Teale, 1982). Since the forms and functions of reading and writing are determined by the child's cultural group and since formal schooling adheres to a particular mode of literacy instruction, mismatches between a child's emerging conceptions/competencies and the formal instruction s/he receives can occur.

In summary, the research supports the theoretical perspective that learning to read takes place in social settings, settings where basal materials dominate and where differential instruction is offered to children perceived to be "at risk." Differential instruction occurs based on overt teaching decisions such as perceived student ability
and covert decisions such as differential access offered students. These decisions may be based on mismatches between the child's emerging conceptions and competencies with the conceptions and competencies promoted by the teacher in formal reading instruction. Such mismatches can result in a child responding differently in this setting than s/he would in another.

**Learning to read in Reading Recovery**

Child psychologist Marie Clay (1985) maintains that the cause of reading difficulties after one year of instruction are many, but that these difficulties often have a "largely learned component." Given the social dynamic at work (see previous section) Clay warns that the difficulties will only get worse if there is no plan for systematic intervention.

The program features are based on key concepts concerning the teaching of children who are at risk of reading failure. The first promotes detailed observation of what the child can do as a reader and writer (Clay, 1984, 1985; Goodman, 1973; Goodman, 1985; Pinnell, 1989; Pinnell & Fried; 1990). If subsequent, individual instruction is based on these detailed observations of the child's strengths, Clay suggests no time is wasted teaching something the child already knows or something with which the child can not yet deal.
One-to-one instruction is also assumed to be beneficial to the at-risk reader (Clay, 1985). Coupled with detailed, sustained observation the child will benefit from a program that scaffolds his or her emerging conceptions and competencies:

In their shared activity, the teacher is interacting with unseen processes - the in-the-head strategies used by the child to produce the overt responses of writing and oral reading. For any one child, the Reading Recovery program as a whole is such a scaffold. On a more micro level, we have seen many examples of the child functioning independently, both in reading and writing, where earlier collaboration between teacher and child was necessary. (Clay & Cazden, 1990, p.219)

Collaborative activity is withdrawn slowly as the child increasingly gains control of the reading process, the "degrees of freedom" with the task now expanded. Clay (1991) refers to this process as the development of a self-extending system, a third key concept of the Reading Recovery Program. As a reader the child's actual development (Vygotsky, 1978) allows him or her to assume control and to continue to learn about the process of reading even after collaborative interactions with the teacher halt. Clay & Cazden (1990) emphasize, though, that the development of a self-extending system is not a matter of simply removing the scaffold. As long as the child remains in the program the teacher will select increasingly difficult texts that are pitched at the child's instructional level, i.e., s/he will likely read these stories with 90-94% accuracy rate. In this manner "the scaffold of teacher support continues, always at the cutting edge of the child's competencies, in the continually changing
zone of proximal development." (Clay & Cazden, p.219).

Finally, Reading Recovery is based on the notion that there are reciprocal gains from reading and writing during instruction (Clay, 1985; Holdaway, 1974). Writing a whole message daily allows the child to slow down the meaning-making process, paying attention to letter-sound relationships, white space, and letter detail. The reading of texts pitched at an instructional level, then, allows the child to link his understandings gleaned from writing instruction to the reading of continuous text. Conversely as the child's written texts are read and reread, the detail of the text fades to the background allowing the child to read the text on the run, sampling the print and concentrating on meaning.

The concepts outlined above inform both the talk and activities that occur during a typical Reading Recovery program, the shape of which is described in the following sections.

Roaming Around the Known.

The initial ten half-hour sessions the child and teacher spend together in Reading Recovery are called Roaming Around the Known (RAK) (Clay, 1985). Clay lists a number of purposes for these ten days that precede the start of formal lessons: (a) In an unpressured situation such as RAK the child can demonstrate new responses. (b) The child and teacher also build a rapport with each other. (c) Activities in these sessions invite the child to read and write from the
start thus promoting the image of the child as a reader and writer. (d) The teacher goes over what the child knows in different ways, so that at the end of the 10 days there is a solid corpus of reading and writing strengths which then become the springboard for future instruction. (e) RAK's primary value, for Clay, is that it forces the teacher to observe and work from the child's responses rather than teaching from preconceived ideas about what the child needs (1985, p.55).

Whole texts are read and written both by the teacher and child during RAK. What the child cannot yet control, the teacher does. What the child has shown s/he can read or write becomes springboards for similar responses during RAK. At the end of the ten days the teacher has a more complete picture of the child as an emerging reader and writer while the child has gained increasing sophistication with text, suggesting the parameters of his or her actual knowledge (Vygotsky, 1978). Once formal lessons begin, the child and teacher will use this foundation as the teacher advances the child into the Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978).

Reading Recovery Lessons.

Though the intervention program is continually built on the child's responses, each Reading Recovery child is involved in similar reading and writing opportunities or parts of a typical one-half hour session. There are five major components. What occurs in each component is defined by previous student response and strengths.
The lesson begins with the reading of familiar texts. The child selects books which s/he has shown s/he can read successfully and fluently. The rereading of these texts allows the child to orchestrate the reading process while concentrating on the story line. Following the familiar reading the teacher takes a Running Record (Clay, 1985) on a child's oral reading of a continuous text. The text is one which had been introduced and read the previous day. Employing a shorthand developed by Clay the teacher records the child's oral reading noting the in-the-head processes, or strategies, that the child appears to be using. Following the Running Record the teacher selects the most powerful behavior to teach or confirm. Pinnell (1989) maintains that later, in-depth analyses of the child's oral reading allows the teacher to make hypotheses about reading strategies and sources of information in the text, or cues, that the child used or neglected as well:

More important, this analysis of miscues and other behavior informs instruction so teachers can respond to children in ways that use knowledge about children to develop new responses to them. Reading Recovery teachers call this process "following the child." (p.168)

According to Clay (1985) a powerful forum for examining the orthography and letter-sound relationships is in the next component of the lesson, the writing of a story. The child daily composes a story consisting of one or two sentences. Using procedures for sound analysis developed by Elkonin (modified in Clay, 1985) the child has
numerous opportunities to hear, organize, and encode sounds in words within a meaningful context. This process differs from traditional phonics instruction in that it is believed that phonological awareness is an outcome of reading and writing rather than a prerequisite to reading. The story is then copied onto a strip of tagboard and cut into parts (often single words) as determined by the teacher. The child reconstructs the cut-up story using the meaning and language parameters. Such predictors will then allow the child to search for print information which can be matched to the "sound" and meaning of his story.

The lesson concludes with an introduction of a new book that the teacher has selected. The selection is based on the child's past reading behavior and is one that the teacher thinks will provide a successful reading challenge. The introduction allows the teacher to assist the child in keying in on the message and language of the book such as unique concepts, unusual phrases, or important words that the child will deal with in the first reading which immediately followed the introduction. At this point in the lesson, if the book is selected at the appropriate level, the first reading will allow the child to do read without the process breaking down (Clay, 1979, 1985). The book, then, becomes the text for the Running Record during the next lesson.
Pinnell (1989) summarizes the value of the daily opportunities outlined above:

In Reading Recovery, teachers engage children in the acts of reading and writing. Then, through careful analysis, the teachers find evidence to support their assumptions about how children use strategies. By looking through children's eyes, teachers can discover that children know much, they can identify areas where children have done very little learning, they can trace the subtle shifts that indicate learning. Teachers then intervene in sensitive and measured ways to help children take notice of sources of information they are using or neglecting in reading. (p. 169)

In order to observe and intervene effectively, teachers daily maintain lesson plans that are a record of student work accomplished, reading behaviors observed, and teaching points addressed. These plans become guidelines for the teacher to use when developing an ongoing program and selecting books for each of the children. Weekly, the teacher also records words from the writing part of the lesson which have been added to the child's writing vocabulary. The teacher also graphs the results of a weekly Running Record. The Writing Vocabulary Chart and The Record of Book Level Graph, along with the lesson plans, allow the teacher to monitor and extend the child's progress in the program.

When receiving Reading Recovery lessons, the at-risk reader will also receive regular reading instruction in the classroom. A cursory rereading of this and the previous section reveals that it is quite possible for the at-risk reader to be daily immersed in disparate forms of instruction. The next section addresses this topic.
Congruency between the intervention program and classroom reading instruction

Much of the beginning instruction for at-risk readers in the United States takes place in ability groups (Allington & McGill-Frazen, 1989; Anderson, Hiebert & Wilkinson, 1985; Wilkinson, 1990). Though the efficacy of using such groups has yet to be established (Archambault, 1989), primary teachers have and continue to form small groups of students for reading instruction. These formations are usually based on a teacher's perceptions of student ability in relationship to the demands of the reading curriculum. Invariably, at-risk readers involved in Chapter 1 programs such as Reading Recovery find themselves in the classroom's "low" reading group.

As outlined in a previous section, there are also pervasive forms of beginning reading instruction such as the use of commercially developed basal materials that are based upon assumptions about how children should learn to read. Given the proclivities to group children and use certain materials, how will the low progress reader fare in an intervention program which uses one-to-one instruction and adheres to a different model of reading instruction? In a like manner, how will the child in moving back and forth daily between the reading group instruction and a one-to-one educational setting.

The study of congruency between support programs and regular classroom instruction has an established history in the literature (for a review, see Allington & Johnston, 1989). Research, though, has
tended to center around remedial rather than early intervention program congruency with classroom reading group instruction. Allington & Johnston (1989) state that in quantitative studies, coordination of curricula as experienced by learners and facilitated their teachers has correlated highly with success in learning to read. The absence of cognitive confusion (Vernon, 1958) is called upon to explain the high correlation.

Certainly Vernon's concept suggests that learning to read is a within-the-head process. As the child acquires proficiency, s/he may enter into a state of confusion wherein s/he mixes up the learning to an extent where further progress is impeded or substantially impaired. Of course it would have to be assumed that the child knows sufficiently the nature and demands of the task in order to enter into this confused state (Hall, 1987). An emergent perspective holds that such an assumption can not be tenable.

Nonetheless, at-risk readers have been viewed as being susceptible to cognitive confusion in more recent research (Allington & Johnston, 1989; Johnston, Allington, & Afflerbach, 1985). The belief exists that this confusion is due to a low level of tolerance for any type of variation in instruction:

There is the risk that with widely divergent approaches the children will be unable to integrate what they are being taught and will develop confused notions of the nature and purpose of reading...integration - the tough bit - is left up to the children. (Allington & Johnston, p.333)
Johnston, Allington, & Afflerbach (1985) also caution how the act of reading may become muddled:

It seems ill-advised to have a situation in which the hypotheses generated and strategies learned in an instructional setting will be unsuccessful if applied in a second instructional setting ... non parallel instruction would produce less complete instruction in a wider variety of strategies causing students to forget or distort some strategies. (p.466)

This belief in a child's cognitive confusion can not be tenable in the current study given the research perspectives outlined thus far in this chapter: (a) Learning to read takes place in specific settings in cooperation with significant others. (b) Learning to read is also an emerging process of ever-increasing sophistication in these settings. (c) There is no global nature or purpose of reading, a nature and purpose that Allington and Johnston (1989) state can become confused. The nature and purposes of reading are defined by the setting within which the child operates. The social setting and resultant mutual construction of reading understandings and practices will define and determine what learning takes place, rather than a particular set of instructional strategies or program. Hence, Hall (1987) suggests that a low progress reader is one who has failed to sort out the conventional knowledge as presented in the social setting. He takes the emphasis away from the child who is assumed to have muddled the within-the-head learning process and places it on the teaching/learning process or what Hall refers to as "the instructional categories and procedures which confound existing beliefs about the
content and process of learning" (p.59).

Nonetheless, the congruency literature is instructive because it suggests that the child must come to some baseline grip with the demands and rigors of an alphabetic orthography (Donaldson, 1978; Bussis, Chittenden, Amarel, & Klausner, 1985). An assumption of emerging proficiency implies eventual success with the demands of school literacy. Questions of a child's access to and practice with sorting out these demands of an alphabetic reading system of reading can now be asked in both instructional settings within which the low progress reader learns. It is conceivable that a child will learn to read in one setting and in another setting experiences distress. The theoretical perspective of reading as a social process and denial of access to that process, then, must take precedence over the assumption of any cognitive confusion within the child's head.

Although they cite cognitive confusion as a theoretical assumption/rationale for congruent programs, Allington and Johnston (1989) suggest alternative practices that are of interest for this study. The first deals with a call for instructional congruence between the classroom reading group and the supplemental program. Such congruence would provide the child with a breadth of responses to the demands of reading continuous text in all the settings within which s/he finds himself. The second alternative practice calls for differential opportunities to learn rather than differential instruction. For Allington and Johnston, helping an at-risk reader means providing
access to more and better opportunities to learn. Both alternative practices were possible learning situations in this study.

At-risk readers' developing conceptions of reading

Conflicting evidence over the past 30 years creates uncertainty as to whether children are aware of their developing conceptions concerning reading and writing. On the basis of 3 interviews of a dozen 5-year-olds over a period of 1 year, Reid (1966) reported that (a) the children were aware that they couldn't read, (b) they didn't know that the print carried the message, and (c) they were tentative about the nature of reading.

A review of the research of a child's developing metalinguistic awareness (Yaden, 1985) yielded similar conclusions:

Extant research on children's concepts of the functions and processes involved in reading and their awareness of the units of spoken and written language reveals that beginning readers are largely unaware of the overriding structure of the writing system as well as of their own speech. They have disparate notions as to what behavior comprises the act of reading and the necessary steps that they must take in getting ready to become a reader (p.61).

Perhaps it was the nature of the controlled studies reviewed and abstract researcher questions used that has led Goodman and Altwerger (1981) to challenge studies such as those reported in Yaden (1985) and found by Reid (1966). In their own work on the developing print awarenesses of children, Goodman and Altwerger found that children do indeed "turn language in on itself," using
language to talk about their developing constructions.

Donaldson (1978) posits a reason why researchers have found conflicting results. It isn't that children are or aren't "aware" but that many children have not yet acquired the ability to distinguish between situations when they are supposed to give primacy to language and situations when they are not. Once that ability has developed or been informally elicited, children can provide insights into their developing conceptions.

Considered one sign of higher mental functioning (Wertsch, 1985), conscious realization of reading begins to emerge at an interpsychological level. The child in literate, social routines with the adult begins to develop a logic (Ferreiro & Teberosky, 1982) about the very processes in which s/he is engaged. The child holds the activity at arm's length, so to speak, consciously considering the forms and functions of what s/he knows. Given this proclivity, Ferreiro and Teberosky (1982) offer an implication utilized in the present study:

To understand children we must hear their words, follow their explanations understand their frustrations and listen to their logic. (p.xii)

Clay (1985) offers a similar implication for teachers. She encourages teachers to listen and record children's comments about their actions on print. Clay also maintains that it is appropriate to elicit comments about what the children are doing, to bring their activity to conscious realization though she cautions this tactic can be
counterproductive to fluent, automatic reading work in which the child should engage.

Summary

The research perspectives outlined in this chapter led the study of at-risk readers learning to read in two instructional settings. To summarize:

1. Reading is a process, a phenomenon that denotes an interaction between the demands of the printed word and the reader.

2. A child at-risk of reading failure is one who has not begun to integrate the sources of knowledge that s/he brings to the reading of a continuous text or has developed inefficient strategies for reading text.

3. Learning to read is an emerging process of a child's ever-increasing sophistication with the demands of print.

4. Learning to read also takes place in a school setting that will affect what is learned and how the child learns.

5. Reading Recovery reflects the theoretical perspective of emerging literacy.

6. The congruency of an at-risk reader's classroom and intervention reading program is a variable for study when seeking to describe the child's emerging reading behavior.

7. The child can be aware of any developing conceptions of literacy, and when these conceptions are shared with the teacher or
researcher, valuable insights to the child's emerging logic of understanding can be obtained.

Certainly these perspectives spring from my understanding and experiences in the field of emergent literacy with at-risk readers. The next chapter explicates the research plan that was implemented to organize and interpret, in an ongoing way, these experiences.

Cochran-Smith (1984) eloquently articulates a rationale for this research plan and her words are used to summarize the major theoretical perspectives outlined above:

We can see [the children's] emerging and developing literacy as it occurs in everyday situations. Rather than seeing literacy as an endpoint based on a theory of what children need to know in order to become literate, we can see what children actually do know about print, and we can gain many insights about how they know it. (p.256)
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the present study's design and implementation. The following topics are considered: (a) the research design, (b) the issue of access, (c) the selection of students, (d) the data gathering, (e) the data gathering instruments, (f) the timeline implemented, (g) the study's settings, and (h) the validity of the observations.

Design

The objectives of the present study centered around an extensive exploration of experiences in learning to read. As the study was designed to explore such experiences, in-depth, descriptive case study methodology was used to gather data.

In a published interview (Stake, 1988), Lou Smith defines the case study as "the study of a bounded system. The crux of the definition is having some conception of the unity or totality of a system with some kind of outlines or boundaries" (p.255). Smith maintains that such a conception allows the researcher an "understanding of the particular case, in its idiosyncrasy, in its complexity" (p.256).
The term "bounded system" implies a sense of parameters in an in-depth exploration. The exploration of the dynamics that occurred during the students' reading instruction was accomplished within the parameters of a reading group and an intervention program. Other dynamics that may affect low-progress readers' success in learning to read such as previous background, home environment, and achievement in other academic areas were not considered. The resulting description of observed dynamics within boundaries are what Smith (Stake, 1988) calls "systematic connections among the observable behaviors, speculations, causes, and treatments" (p.255).

Stenhouse (1984) supports the adherence to boundaries and sets the case study apart from similarly controlled, experimental settings by arguing that the role of the case study is to generate skepticism. "We should treat accounts of behavior or events with skepticism and with a greater interest in the meanings they revealed than in their direct evidential status" (p.225). The case studies in the present study provided a rich, complex description of two limited systems and the teachers and students who were such an integral, shaping part of the systems.

Donmoyer (1990) suggests that this rich description plays an important role in development of educational theory. The purpose of case study research, he maintains, is not so much to find answers but to pose questions, questions which he posits are the initiators of the Piagetian process of schema building. Case studies add to the
"dramatic diversity" which confronts a researcher. This diversity can be thought of as novelties which the researcher then begins to accommodate and integrate into his or her cognitive understanding of the phenomenon under study. As the novelties are accommodated and integrated, a differentiated, sophisticated schema of the phenomenon will develop. The end result, Donmoyer maintains, is a researcher or reader who can "perceive more richly, and one hopes, act more intelligently" (p.91).

Case study research, then, can "expand the range of interpretations available" (Donmoyer, 1990), interpretations that in turn will enlarge and/or revise understandings of the phenomenon under study.

Gaining access

A school in a north central Ohio school system that had just undergone reorganization was tentatively chosen to conduct the study. It was housed in a 35-year-old brick building situated in an older neighborhood. The student population came from many city neighborhoods and was mixed in terms of SES.

Ongoing observation of children learning to read in two settings required gaining access to teachers' classrooms. I had previously worked with Jane, a Chapter 1 Reading Recovery teacher whose work had impressed me, and I approached her to negotiate a research plan with her. This plan included a description of the research, the
proposed data gathering techniques and time schedule, plans for published reports of the research, and guarantees of confidentiality. Erickson (1986) maintains that explicit negotiation is a crucial component of gaining access which can "create the conditions of trust that are necessary" (p.142).

Jane was preparing to begin her fourth year as a Reading Recovery teacher and her fifteenth as a teacher. During the data collection it was noted that she was well-respected by the primary classroom teachers for her concern for at-risk readers. She was usually one of the first Chapter 1 teachers to be approached to sit on select, city-wide committees dealing with early literacy.

Jane also told me about Barb, one of 3 first-grade teachers in the building. Barb was known for her success with low-progress readers. Beginning her 13th year as a teacher, Barb used teacher-made materials and the adopted basal series in her reading group instruction. Barb was going to take all the low-progress readers in the first grade with the other first-grade teachers taking the middle and high groups respectively. The research plan was also presented to her, and although Barb was anxious about the scheduled video-taping in the classroom, she agreed to the data gathering plan with her reading group.

As the data collection commenced I noted that Jane and Barb maintained a working rapport with each other. During their non-teaching time, they often talked in other's rooms, the faculty room, or
the hallway. They took opportunities to discuss children whose reading they were concerned about. These two teachers exhibited the collaborative spirit recommended by Allington (1989) for effective instruction of low-progress readers.

Permission from school officials to conduct the study was sought once permission was acquired to observe lessons in Jane's and Barb's rooms. In early September, 1989, the following people were approached for their consent to conduct the study: the superintendent of city schools, the Chapter 1 coordinator responsible for Reading Recovery implementation in the system, and the principal whose school had an established Reading Recovery program. The proposed research plan (Appendix A) was shared with the administration and all parties agreed to the study with the stipulation that parental permission be obtained for any child who was video-taped, even if they were not part of the study but were, nonetheless, captured on video. It was district policy to also inform all affected children's parents as to the nature and extent of the inquiry. Parental letters for the non-study children and permission slip used are included in Appendix A. All permissions were obtained in short order.

In exchange for permission to conduct the study, I offered to implement Reading Recovery tutoring to one case study student with the option of enrolling two more students once data-gathering was completed with the case study students. The Chapter 1 supervisor was supportive of Reading Recovery, and since she did not have the
funds for the type of coverage she wanted in the city schools, she welcomed the service.

Selection of students

Convenience sampling (Patton, 1980) was followed using the stipulations outlined below:

1. Federal Chapter 1 guidelines for selection of children to special intervention program such as Reading Recovery were followed. (See Appendix B for a description.) Briefly, each child must have scored below the 36th percentile on a Chapter 1-selected standardized test in order to be considered for Chapter 1 services and, hence, Reading Recovery. A group-administered reading test was administered to all kindergartners in Spring, 1989, the results of which were used to determine Chapter 1 eligibility in the upcoming school year. At the study site, 42 out of 65 first-grade children were eligible for Chapter 1 services, including Reading Recovery for School Year 1989-1990.

2. Following this initial determination, Jane approached the first-grade teachers within the first two weeks of school to ascertain which of the eligible students were of most concern to them as emerging readers. A list of 17 students was generated, and, according to program policy, each was given the Diagnostic Survey (Clay, 1985), a battery of standardized, informal reading assessments. The six tests assess such concepts as letter knowledge, print awareness, and
reading strategies that were used by the students on texts of increasing difficulty. The children also had the opportunity to write words which they knew and to listen to and encode a sentence read by the teacher.

The children's strengths as readers and writers were recorded and synthesized across tests. These syntheses determined which children were selected in the first wave of instruction with the Reading Recovery teachers. Generally, program policy stipulates that those students most in need, as revealed by the Diagnostic Survey, be served first. Once chosen for the program, the results of the Survey and its summary became the cornerstone of the instructional program the Reading Recovery teachers designed for the child. Table 1 summarizes the results of the children who received testing based on the requirements described above.

After consultation with Jane and Barb, two case study children were selected for inclusion in the study. Four additional guidelines were used in the selection of the students. First, the program children had to have daily access to both Reading Recovery lessons and to regular classroom reading instruction with Barb. Second, because children's self-reports were desired data, it was also necessary to select children who would be likely to talk to the researcher. Third, the children needed to have a consistent pattern of attendance during their kindergarten year. Finally, one child needed to have scored at the "lower" end of the Diagnostic Survey
Table 1

Diagnostic Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student name*</th>
<th>Letter ID</th>
<th>Word test</th>
<th>Concepts about print</th>
<th>Writing vocabulary (10 min)</th>
<th>Dictation</th>
<th>Text read test levels (A-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td>(+54)</td>
<td>(+20)</td>
<td>(+24)</td>
<td>(+37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essie</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusty</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellie</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginny</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Testing occurred the week of 9/4/89. *Pseudonyms are used for all students.
scores while the other one should have scored at the higher end. At this point, convenience sampling was replaced by maximum variation sampling (Patton, 1980). The new sampling allowed for a study of possible, unique variations, i.e., the sampling provided the opportunity to discern common or dissimilar patterns of reading behavior and self-reports from two children who quantitatively appeared to be different as emerging readers and writers.

Two criteria (student willingness to talk and variable entrance Diagnostic Survey test scores) figured heavily in the selection process. Peter and Daniel were selected for the study and their parents were approached to conduct the study. (See Appendix A for permission letter.)

**Peter.**

Peter lived with his parents, an older brother, and younger sister in public housing. He had what is commonly referred to as a gravel voice, deep and resonating. According to Barb he was a "cutie" who needed the extra help that Reading Recovery could provide. His Diagnostic Survey results were at the lower end of the range of scores.

**Daniel**

Daniel had recently moved from New York City where he and his twin sister and older sister lived with their mother. Newly divorced, his mother had moved her family to the north central Ohio town to be
near her parents. Daniel had attended a parochial kindergarten while in New York and had lived in an apartment building. Earning Diagnostic Survey scores at the upper-end of the range, both teachers agreed that Daniel was also considered a student who would benefit from Reading Recovery instruction.

Data gathering

Both participant and non-participant observer roles were assumed during the data collection. As the Reading Recovery teacher for Daniel, I conducted a typical intervention program, actively developing, changing, and reflecting upon an intervention strategy for him. The decision to be a participant observer placed me closer to the total participant end of Gold's continuum which describes the myriad of observer stances one can take (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). It was a stance that allowed me to actively experience and consider the dynamic of one-to-one instruction.

As a researcher in both the classroom and Peter's Reading Recovery program the complete observer (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982) or what Evertson and Green (1986) referred to as a passive participant was more the researcher stance. This stance allowed for the chance to "step back" and study the dynamics and uniqueness of the instructional process as a distant observer.

Erickson (1986) suggests that researchers bring a "frame" of reference or interpretation to a setting:
From this point of view the task of field work is to become more and more reflectively aware of the frames of interpretation of those we observe, and our own culturally learned frames of interpretations we brought with us to the setting. (p.140)

Diverse methods of data collection, outlined below, allowed for the sampling of participant frames of references beyond those collected in the role of distant observer.

**Data gathering instruments**

**Fairfax**: And thou didst see all this?

**Jack Point**: Ay, with both eyes at once - this and that. The testimony of one eye is naught - he may lie. But when it is corroborated by the other, it is good evidence that none may gainsay. Here are both present in court, ready to swear to [it].

_W.S. Gilbert (1888)_
_Yeoman of the Guard_  
_Act II_

Like Jack Point, the jester in Gilbert and Sullivan's comic opera, everything was observed with two eyes. Unlike Point, corroboration of varied data sources was instigated in order to eventually make key assertions (Erickson, 1986).

The instruments used were "open-ended" (Evertson & Green, 1986; Genishi, 1982), i.e., no preconceived categories were used to sort observations as they happened. Instruments were also used to "sample events" (Evertson & Green, 1986; Genishi, 1982;) with the beginning and ending of the instructional activities acting as the parameters which determined the schedule and time frames of data-gathering.
The following is a brief explanation of the major instruments used in the data collection:

1. Field notes. For observations in all settings, notes were compiled and logged into the data base.

2. Running records (Clay, 1985). These records of the children's continuous, oral readings of texts were gathered in both the Reading Recovery lessons and the classroom instruction.

   The Running Record is a systematic observation of a child's oral reading performance, wherein the teacher notes in a special shorthand such reading behavior as rereading, waiting, self-correction, repetitions, miscues or similar attempts to read text. (See Appendix C for an example.)

   Running Records are an example of oral reading assessments used in the study of beginning reading. Allington (1984) reports that with the landmark 1950 Ilg and Ames' study, researchers have increasingly viewed oral reading assessments as "potentially valuable sources of information about the learning processes" (p.843) which students are constructing as they learn to read. Clay (1967) and Goodman (1967) followed Ilg and Ames' lead, building much of their research program on the use of similar oral reading assessments.

3. Audio-tapes of Reading Recovery lessons. If an observation was not video-taped, it was audio-taped. For purposes of retrospection it was felt that the participant role assumed demanded that field notes be viewed and analyzed with the tapes and notes from those tapes.
4. Video episodes. Approximately once a month, Peter was video-taped in both instructional settings. The taping sessions usually lasted over a period of two or three days/lessons. Both Daniel and Peter were taped in the reading group settings with Barb. These sessions also occurred over two to three days and coincided with the taping of Peter in his Reading Recovery lessons.

Both audio- and video-tapes provided a "technical record" (Erickson, 1986; Evertson & Green, 1986; Genishi, 1982), a permanent record that allowed for retrospection once data collection was completed. Erickson (1986, p.145) suggests three strengths the researcher has by compiling a technical record: (a) a permanent record which can be revisited a number of times, (b) a safeguard against premature analytic induction, and (c) a record that reduces the researcher's dependence on frequently occurring events thus allowing him to focus on "rare events."

5. Informal interviews. At the end of the school year both Barb and Jane had a chance to view a sampling of video-tapes of Peter's and Daniel's work during the data collection period. Questioning focused on (a) their perceptions of the children as a reader, (b) the children's progress in learning how to read, and (c) their ideas on what the children needed as emerging readers and writers. This source of data was necessary to explicitly bring out the teachers' "frames of interpretations" (Erickson, 1986) which then could be added and compared to my data interpretations of field experiences.
One of the objectives of the study was to describe the at-risk students' responses over time. Hence, a longitudinal study, incorporating prolonged, persistent observation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was key. The plan also generated data from intense and continuous short-term slices of time so that the research questions could be answered using data from macro- and micro-settings.

In seeking the children's self-reports of their reading behavior, an interview schedule was drawn up incorporating the following:

1. Unstructured interviews (Lincoln & Guba, 1981). These interviews, conducted at the beginning of the study, did not have predetermined questions or order of questioning but were devised to "cover" certain topics. Topics which were considered: (a) concept of self as a reader, (b) concept of what makes a good reader and why, and (c) concept of difficulty or ease in own reading and why.

2. Field notes. Self-reports were also pulled from the field notes. These reports were either those spontaneously provided by the student or those elicited by the teacher within the reading setting.

3. Video playbacks. Four times during the inquiry I played back to Peter and Daniel samples of the children's reading and writing behavior in either the Reading Recovery setting or in the classroom reading group. Their reactions were noted and questions sought to follow what they seemed to be noticing about the behavior they were watching.
Table 2 lists the types and frequencies of data-gathering outlined above. Items listed include data which were not described above. As data collection occurred more data was collected than anticipated. For example, I was able to collect copies of Jane's lesson plans maintained during her tutoring with Peter. These plans recorded insights that Jane noted concerning Peter's progress, a source which invited comparison to my frames of interpretations. Another large source of data was the writing books completed by Peter and Daniel in their Reading Recovery program. As mentioned in Chapter II, each day the children wrote a sentence or two in an unlined book. Sentences were of their own invention and both Jane and I used sound analysis techniques (Clay, 1985) to help the boys hear, organize, and encode their sentences. A final example of unplanned data collection was the writing products completed by the boys in the reading group setting. Often these products were workbook pages that Barb completed with the children during the instruction.

Both Jane and I maintained required Reading Recovery records beyond the lesson plans and running records. Weekly, we recorded writing vocabulary which the boys were able to write fluently and in detail. We also weekly plotted a Running Record accuracy and self-correction rate earned by each boy on a new book.

These "unplanned" sources of data added to the scope and diversity of the observations conducted with the boys in each instructional setting. Such diversity added other "lenses" with which
# Table 2

## Inventory of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic surveys</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic summaries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roaming Around the Known:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session plans</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-tapes &amp; field notes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Recovery lessons:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-tapes &amp; field notes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running Records</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video-tapes &amp; field notes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing samples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAK</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of book level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly record of writing vocabulary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom reading group:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video-tapes &amp; field notes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-tapes &amp; field notes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written products</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews/video playbacks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Additional data:
1. Log - researcher's comments: 1
2. Informal interviews with teachers: 2
3. Generic classroom written products: 24
to consider the interpretations the boys and teachers were making about their experiences.

Discussion as to how the data sources were used in the analysis, specifically how the "trustworthiness" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of the data was established and how the data sources were systematically analyzed will be discussed in Chapter IV.

Study timeline

Figure 1 illustrates the timing of the data gathering. The primary chunk of field work occurred over a three-month period. Though the study was designed to collect data over a period of one school year circumstances dictated a shorter time frame. First, Daniel was successfully released from the Reading Recovery Program prior to the Christmas break, hence observations of his reading work after that were confined to the reading group in his classroom.

Second, Peter's mother withdrew him from the study school at Christmas break since his family was being forced to move from metropolitan housing to another residence that was outside his present school's service area. Jane and I later learned that Peter changed schools one more time, ending up in a city school two miles away from us in April, 1990. At that point, I arranged for more data gathering with Peter as indicated in Figure 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic test &amp; summary</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAK Data</td>
<td>PPPP</td>
<td>DDDD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Recovery lesson</td>
<td>PPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPP</td>
<td>DDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading group</td>
<td>PPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPPP</td>
<td>DDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDD</td>
<td>DDDD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Playbacks</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student interviews</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher interviews</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. P = Peter. D = Daniel. Multiple letters indicate multiple observations. Types of data in each category are listed in Table 2.

Figure 1. Data gathering timeline.
Figure 1 also illustrates an attempt at prolonged, persistent data gathering as recommended by researchers such as Erickson (1986), Genishi (1982), and Lincoln & Guba (1981). With this type of data gathering plan, safeguards against premature induction and interpretations could be safeguarded against.

**Settings**

Figures 2, 3 and 4 depict the physical layout of each instructional setting in which the teachers and students operated within.

**Peter and Jane's room.**

Jane maintained a small tutoring room down the hall from Peter's first-grade homeroom. The various pieces of furniture and their placement are displayed in Figure 2. Placed on and in the tutoring table were the various materials used during the Reading Recovery lessons. Jane rarely needed to move about the room to get something she needed. Attached to the wall to the left of Peter's seat was a magnetic chalk board on which were positioned numerous, white magnetic letters, both upper and lower case. One of the rare times that Peter moved around once a lesson started was when Jane asked him to stand up and work at the board next to him.
Figure 2. Peter and Jane — Instructional Setting
Figure 3. Daniel and Jim — Instructional Setting
Figure 4. Reading Group and Barb – Instructional Setting
My observation position and video camera was across the tutoring table. This allowed a full vantage point to the daily interactions. Although I was the passive participant (Evertson & Green, 1986) I was, nonetheless, a part of the morning routine with Peter who often acknowledged me with a large smile and "Hi Mr. Snug!" as he sat down. From that point, though, Jane took over and Peter consistently gave her his attention, i.e., once the lesson was underway, I seemed to "fade away" for Peter.

**Daniel and Jim's room.**

Given the school's limited physical plant, the Nurse's Office was the only private tutoring space available for me to work with Daniel. Figure 3 depicts the physical arrangement of the room. I carried everything I needed for a lesson and data-gathering in a brief case out of which I worked. I used a portable magnetic chalk board which rested on a low file cabinet. I kept magnetic letters arranged on a small slate which I positioned to my right on a school chair, allowing for easy access to them.

Typically I picked up Daniel at approximately 9:00 a.m. and escorted him to the Nurse's Office after he worked in his reading group with Barb. Sometimes our lessons were interrupted by a sick child whom the school secretary had sent to lie on the couch in the room. At those times or at times when the nurse was scheduled to use the room, Daniel and I worked in the school cafeteria on long tables.
Barb and the reading group room.

The physical arrangement of the Peter's and Daniel's reading group is shown in Figure 4. The kidney-shaped table was positioned in the northwest corner of the room next to the small lavatory which the children were allowed to use as needed.

The reading group sat in a semi-circle around the table away from the rest of the classroom. The children faced the chalkboard upon which hung colorful placards illustrating sound/symbol relationships and blank chart paper upon which Barb sometimes wrote during her lessons.

Barb kept all materials for her lessons close at hand as well. Materials such as basal texts, workbooks, scissors, and mimeo work were kept in the center of the table and were easily accessible to her.

Barb sat in an adult-sized chair which allowed her not only to supervise activities at the table but also gave her a clear view of the activities of the non-group children working at their desks.

My observation seat and video camera was positioned next to the class' computer and carpet area thus allowing a clear view of Barb, Daniel, and Peter.

A more extensive description of reading activities and patterns of behavior for both teachers and students are described in Chapter IV.
Validity of the observations

Stake (1988) describes the desired validity:

A case study is valid to the reader to whom it gives an accurate and useful representation of a bounded system...Researchers look for ways of directly and indirectly confirming their observations, and readers of case studies participate in the effort to understand the validity of the observations. (p.263)

In order to achieve such a validity, diverse sources of data were collected over time thus allowing for a more comprehensive representation of the instructional processes and interpretations of those processes that occurred. The research questions outlined in Chapter I were approached using the varied angles provided by the data sources. Chapter IV will develop interpretations and key assertions based on these varied sources.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The present study sought to describe the multifaceted instruction experienced by low-progress readers. Facets such as (a) patterns of instructional activities, (b) verbal and nonverbal routines which accompanied the activities, and (c) the students' participation and responses in each settings emerged as parameters which formed the boundaries of the case study. Both student self-reports and teacher perceptions were also added to check against subsequent interpretations.

The general approach used to analyze the data was inductive analyses. For each research question, the unit of analysis changed, though the broad context for analysis, i.e., children learning to read in two instructional settings, remained constant. Within each research question, various data sources were analyzed, and categories emerged inductively primarily through the basic 3 x 5 card shuffle (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Inductive analyses using the "shuffle" involves "making sense of field data "(p.202) which often results in categories of information which can then be checked to subsequent sets of data for comparison and discrepancies.
The sources of data used to address the research questions are summarized in Figure 5. The broader inquiry described the range of activities and responses the participants were making during activities in the early intervention program and in the regular reading group. Hence, specific data sources such as field notes, video tapes, audio tapes, and lesson plans were used to develop descriptions of the range of activities and responses.

The secondary inquiry utilized data sources such as Running Records and video playbacks in order to develop descriptions of student's self-reports and teacher perceptions. These descriptions became "member checks" (Lincoln and Guba, 1982) that allowed me to scrutinize developing interpretations of the broader inquiry.

Units of data used in the initial shuffle were sampled from various points of the observations. These points are herein referred to as "lesson sets." The time frames used in each set are summarized in Figure 5. Limited tapings and observations in the classroom setting dictated what observational dates comprised each set. Reading Recovery lessons were chosen with similar dates for comparison.

An extensive description of the analyses particular to each research question follows. The remainder of this chapter deals with each question in turn. The headings parallel the research questions of this study and are used to organize Chapter IV: (a) patterns of activity, (b) patterns of verbal and nonverbal behavior, (c) students' participation, (d) student self-reports, and (d) teacher perceptions.
Figure 5. Triangulation of Data Sources for Inductive Analysis
Patterns of Activities

In an instructional setting, reading and writing are used in different ways. Any extensive description of children learning to read in two settings is predicated, in part, on an initial description of how print was used in that daily instruction. Specific activities, time allocations, and material use were catalogued and sorted over the lesson sets. Revisits to field notes, video-tapes, and audio-tapes allowed for comparisons to subsequent categorical sets. Patterns of reading and writing activity emerged. These patterns of activity, or what Berliner (1983) refers to as activity structures, are described in this first section. Berliner suggests that activity structures can be delineated by describing characteristics that "impose[s] constraints on the behaviors of the members" (p.3). Emerging characteristics were: (a) the materials used, (b) the time allocated for an activity, (c) the purpose of the activity, and (d) the role of the members involved. The first three characteristics are self-explanatory, but the role of the participating members needs further explanation.

Cochran-Smith (1984) suggests that there are ever-shifting participatory roles as adults and children read and write together. These roles can be viewed on a continuum "with adults and children taking greater or lesser roles as participants and adults taking greater or lesser roles as intermediaries" (p.76). On one end the child "initiates, directs, guides and terminates" (p.76) the activity while on the other end the adult heavily scaffolds the activity for the child.
In between the end points is a myriad of combinations wherein the child and teacher share responsibility for the activity.

Descriptions of the activity structures that occurred in both the intervention program and reading group for both Peter and Daniel comprise the remainder of this section. As outlined in Chapter II, the Reading Recovery program consists of Roaming Around the Known sessions (RAK) and formal lessons.

RAK

During the first ten days that Peter and Daniel were enrolled in Reading Recovery, they spent daily, one-half hour sessions "roaming around the known" (Clay, 1985):

For the first two weeks of the tutoring programme stay with what the child already knows. Do not introduce any new learning. The Diagnostic Survey will have shown up some of the things that the child can do. (p.55)

Four distinct activity structures emerged consistently from the analyses of the RAK sessions: (a) Teacher read aloud (b) Teacher and child shared reading, (c) Teacher and child shared writing, and (d) Teacher-directed board work.

In terms of activity structures (Table 3 below) similar RAK sessions were conducted for both boys. This is not surprising since Clay (1985) outlines different types of activities that may take place during any RAK session such as the reading of "an easy book, a simple
Table 3

Activities - Roaming Around the Known

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Average Occurrence/Session*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter/Jane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher read aloud</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and child shared reading</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and child shared writing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-directed board word</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Calculated over 10 RAK sessions.

book about the child's own experiences, a very simple story you have read to this pupil, a simple story that you write for this pupil keeping to his known vocabulary, [and] a simple text he has dictated" (p.55).

The following activity structures for Roaming Around the Known Sessions are described in turn: Teacher read aloud, Teacher and child shared reading, Teacher and child shared writing, and Teacher-directed board work.
**Teacher read aloud.** Both Jane and I read books to our students during a typical RAK session. This was a teacher-controlled activity in terms of our intentions: i.e., both Jane and I chose books that we wanted the children to enjoy and discuss with us. Consequently, children's literature such as *Rosie's Walk* (Hutchison, 1968), *King Bidgood's In the Bathtub* (Woods, 1985), and *The Hungry Caterpillar* (Carlye, 1989) were used. Often the children joined in on any refrains or talk about the pictures.

Jane explained reasons for her book choices, citing factors as ongoing popularity with children and manipulative appeal. She also chose books that presented similar concepts or story lines so that the child could be "set up" to discover links among the various books they discussed. Similar book features also affected my book choices for Daniel with the lavish illustrations, repetitive book language, and predictable story line playing key roles in the selection process.

This activity was a dominant activity in Jane's and Peter's sessions, occupying almost one-third to one-half of the 30 minute session and usually occurring at the beginning of each session. On the other hand, a read aloud was not as dominant an activity for Daniel and me, occupying only 4-5 minutes per session on the average. It's placement during the sessions varied.
Teacher and Child Shared reading. During this activity structure the teacher and child shared control of the book. Often the books were pulled from the Reading Recovery collection and were characterized as having strong picture support, a short but complete story line, and repetitive language patterns for the low-progress reader's successful use. Both Jane and I also used Peter's and Daniel's previous, original writing for subsequent readings.

This shared reading usually followed the teacher read aloud in Jane and Peter's sessions, occupying on the average, one-third of the 30 minute session. (Average time was calculated from seven, timed sessions.) Approximately five books were read during a typical RAK session. For Daniel and me, placement of this type of shared reading was varied and involved, on the average, six books per session. One third of a typical session (averaged over nine timed sessions) was also spent with this type of activity. Often the same book was read two or three times during a session.

When the book was first introduced in a session, the teacher took more responsibility by inviting the child to discuss the picture or repeat a book's pattern. Usually during that same introduction, the child eventually and successfully read the book with little or no assistance. Subsequently Jane introduced 10 books to Peter over 10 sessions that Peter eventually controlled successfully while I introduced 17 books for student reading.
Two factors separate this type of shared reading from the teacher read alouds discussed above: (a) The student often chose which book he wanted to read in the shared reading. (b) These books eventually became a part of the student's reading repertoire in subsequent Reading Recovery lessons. Hence, more direction and guidance of the shared reading came from the child.

Teacher and Child Shared writing. During each RAK session both children co-wrote a story with their teachers. The activity always began with a discussion of what the child wanted to write. Daniel was invited to draw a picture first. Jane and Peter, on the other hand, orally discussed and generated a story with the picture coming after the message was co-written.

Following the message generation, the teacher and child shared the writing of a short story. Jane and I continually consulted results of the children's Diagnostic Surveys to ascertain what words the children demonstrated they knew how to write. If the message contained such words or letters the boys took over the writing. We also asked the children to articulate words slowly if we thought they could hear and encode a sound that they had heard or encoded on the Diagnostic Survey. Similarly, we produced any parts of the writing that were deemed as not yet under the boys' control.

Over one-third of a typical session with Daniel involved writing while Jane and Peter spent, on the average of 9 minutes in this activity.
Board work. Limited amounts of time were also spent at a magnetic chalk board with Peter and Daniel. Unlike the books read aloud, shared reading, and shared writing, this activity did not occur daily. Small, multicolored magnetic letters were used to construct words that the children knew how to write. These words were then scrambled and the students were invited to reconstruct the words quickly. The children were also asked to write known words such as their first and last names and words they had written on the Diagnostic Survey such as "mom," "dad," "I," and "the".

Though Table 3 (above) depicts close similarity between the types and numbers of activity structures accomplished in a typical session, it does not reflect the differing order or emphases implemented by their teachers. For example, as mentioned above, Jane always began a RAK session with a teacher-controlled read aloud which was consistently followed by shared reading and shared writing. On the other hand, Daniel's RAK sessions exhibited no such pattern of activity except that the shared writing generally took place toward the end of each session. Differing time allotments for each activity structure were also described.

Differences in time allotments and order of presentation were not generally seen in the activities that occurred in subsequent Reading Recovery lessons.
The Reading Recovery lesson

Activities in a Reading Recovery lesson are outlined in more detail in a teacher's training (Clay, 1985). Unlike Roaming Around the Known sessions, types of activities, instructional materials, and the order in which both occur are standard across Reading Recovery lessons. It should be noted, though, that similar activities as those found in RAK sessions, such as rereading of books and co-writing of a story, are also found in Reading Recovery lessons. Though literature books are often read to students during RAK, this activity is not part of a typical Reading Recovery lesson.

Similar characteristics of activities, as those described above for RAK activities, can also be used to describe a Reading Recovery lesson. Such characteristics as materials used, purposes explicated, time allotted, and participant control delineate and describe activity structures in the Reading Recovery lesson.

Rereading of familiar books. Reading Recovery lessons generally began for Peter and Daniel by an invitation to read one to three familiar books. Pinnell, Fried, & Estice (1990) explain the importance of this component in a Recovery lesson:

Rereading provides the opportunity to engage in fast, fluent reading because the child does not have to work so hard that the reading process breaks down. Selected texts provide some remaining challenges (e.g., difficult words or unfamiliar book language), thus providing opportunities for problem solving that must be done "on the run" while reading a text. (p.284)
The time allotments given to Familiar Reading over time for Peter and Daniel are summarized in Tables 4 and 5 respectively.

For Peter and Jane the reading of familiar books was a consistent activity over time in terms of time allocated and number of books read (3). Generally, Jane invited Peter to choose the books he wanted to read, limiting his choices to books read in recent lessons. This limit indicated that Jane was concentrating on "selected challenges" purpose outlined by Pinnell et al. (1990, p.284), giving Peter another chance to problem solve on more recent texts.

In each lesson set, Peter had favorites that he continually chose to read. For example, in the second lesson set, almost one-half of his book choices were either Feet (Cowley, 1983) or What Would You Like (Cowley, 1987).

Familiar reading for Daniel, on the other hand, was not consistent in terms of time spent. This part of the lesson became shorter as time went on, suggesting that I increasingly concentrated on the "fast, fluent, reading" purpose for familiar reading (Pinnell et al, 1990, p.284). Daniel's choices were limited to two to three books per lesson and he could choose from a wide array of reading books that promoted his fluent reading. In contrast to Peter, Daniel did not choose consistent favorites.

During the oral reading of familiar books, the children successfully read and enjoyed the text, factors which seemed to encourage "confidence and fluency in bringing reading behaviours
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Set 1</th>
<th>Set 2</th>
<th>Set 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiar Reading</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running Record Reading</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut-Up Sentence</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Try</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. The times were averaged for each lesson set from times taken on three lessons in each set.
### Table 5

**Daniel & Jim: Average Time (minutes) for Activities During Reading Recovery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Set 1</th>
<th>Set 2</th>
<th>Set 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiar Reading</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut-Up Sentence</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Try</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The times were averaged for each lesson from times taken on three lesson in each set except Lesson Set 1 where times were averaged from two lessons.
together" (Clay, 1985, p.68). A more detailed discussion of the student and teacher interactions during this activity structure will be outlined in later sections of the chapter.

**Running Record of text reading.** While the familiar reading allowed for participant's shifting control, the next part of the lesson was directly guided by both Peter and Daniel. Each boy independently read a book that had been introduced in the previous lesson. As it was read, Jane and I used a shorthand to record the boys' oral reading performance on a program form. Tables 4 and 5 (above) summarize average times spent per lesson on this lesson component.

Once Peter and Daniel had finished their oral reading, Jane and I engaged them in an interaction that centered on confirming the boys' successful attempts and/or teaching from the boys' running record responses. This interaction signalled a shift in control of the activity back to the teacher.

**Writing part of the lesson.** Clay (1985) outlines the rationale for including writing in a regular Reading Recovery lesson:

It is in the writing part of the daily lesson that children are required to pay attention to letter detail, letter order, sound sequences, and letter sequences, and the links between messages in oral language and messages in printed language...Reading and writing are interwoven throughout the programme and teaching proceeds on the assumption that both provide cues and responses which facilitate new responding in either area. (p.55)
The boys daily co-wrote a sentence with their teachers. Using a bound booklet containing 8 1/2 x 11 white pages and colorful markers Jane and I directly controlled the flow of the activity in this part of the lesson, using sentences generated from ideas the child discussed.

Tables 4 and 5 summarize average time spent on the writing portion of the lesson. It is not surprising that the time allocated increased for both boys as time went on. This is due, in part, to the boys' increasing competency in writing longer sentences.

Often Daniel's sentences comprised a story while Peter's sentences were either related topically, e.g., around Halloween, or were an original offshoot of the topic contained in the day's Running Record book. Each boy's writing book was turned sideways with the sentence written on the bottom page. The top page was reserved for practice and student exploration of the printed language.

The "exploration" part of the writing took many forms. Both Jane and I assisted the boys in sound analyses of words they were attempting to write using Elkonin techniques modified by Clay (1985). Clay maintains that the use of boxes for sound analysis "helps the child think about the order of sounds in spoken words, and to help the child to analyse a new word he wants to write into its sequence of sounds" (p.64). After the boys were asked to articulate the word slowly, they pushed pennies or poker chips into connected boxes that had been hurriedly drawn on the practice page. Each box represented one phoneme in the word the boys were attempting. As they pushed
the pennies, they again articulated the word slowly and without a break, pushing each penny into a box as a sound was made. This allowed them to practice isolating sounds within the slow articulation of the word. Subsequent interaction involved discussion concerning what sounds were heard and what letter(s) represented those sounds.

Another exploratory use of print on the practice page involved word analysis in which Jane and I showed the boys how written English worked. For example, we demonstrated how other words began or ended the same way as a word they had just written. For their part, the boys also generated words that often rhymed with or began with the same letter of a word they were writing.

Sometimes the practice page was used to take a word to "fluency" (Clay, 1985). In this activity a word that boys controlled in terms of sound analysis was written many times on the practice page to promote fluent, sequential writing. The practice page was also used as a checkpoint to "try out" words or letters they were attempting to write in their sentences. Tables 6 and 7 summarize the uses of the practice page over three lessons sets, each set involving six observations.

For both boys the dominant use of the practice page involved Elkonin boxes and generating of words. Any word analysis or fluency work often sprung from the sound analysis done in boxes. For example, in Lesson 20 Daniel successfully completed a sound analysis of the word "some" using the boxes. He heard and encoded both
### Table 6

**Peter & Jane: The Practice Page - Activities During Writing in Reading Recovery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Set 1</th>
<th>Set 2</th>
<th>Set 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sound Analysis with Boxes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Analysis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Checks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter Checks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Frequencies of activities accomplished over 6 lessons in each set.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Set 1</th>
<th>Set 2</th>
<th>Set 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sound Analysis with Boxes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Checks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter Checks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Frequencies of activities accumulated over 6 lessons in each lesson set.
consonants, and I wrote the rest. The word was taken to fluency and then he wrote a known word, "come," underneath "some" at my request. We discussed how the words were the same.

Pinnell, Fried, and Estice (1990) describe the writing part of the lesson as a "supported situation [where] children learn to analyze words and to make links between sounds and letters" (p.285). It is the links that Clay (1985) suggests are then used by the low-progress reader as s/he attempts new and challenging reading.

Cut-up sentence. Once the writing of the daily sentence was completed, Jane and I wrote it on a strip of paper and then cut the sentence as the boys read off each word. Next, the pieces were scrambled and the boys were invited to reconstruct their sentences. Clay (1985) maintains that this use of print "provides the child with practice for (a) assembling sentences, (b) one-to-one correspondence of words spoken and words written, (c) directional behaviors and breaking oral language into segments, and (d) word study from occasionally cut-up words" (p.67).

Tables 4 and 5 summarize the time spent in the cut-up component of the lesson over three lesson sets, each set involving three, timed observations. For both boys, this part of the lesson happened quickly (2-3 minutes).

The sentence was consistently cut up into its component words although there were opportunities in each lesson set for the boys to reconstruct parts of words. Once the reconstructed sentence was
checked by the student, the pieces were placed in an envelope and sent home for practice.

**New book - introduction and first reading.** Given the diverse activities that had occurred previously, Clay (1985) maintains that the teacher-chosen new book is best introduced and read at the end of the lesson due to the fact that "each previous activity has encouraged the child to work on his own problems and to actively engage in problem-solving" (p.56). Therefore the child will have a chance to apply his or her reading knowledge and abilities in a novel situation.

The book was first introduced to the boys by discussing the story line and pictures. The boys were also given a chance to hear unusual book language and to predict what letters they’d expect to see at the beginning of new and important words in the story.

Following the introduction both boys were invited to take control and read the text. Jane and I only intervened at points when the reading process broke down. Once the first reading was completed, Jane asked Peter to read the book or certain parts of the book again. This occurred consistently only in the first part of Peter's program and was for the purpose of giving Peter another "go" at parts with which he had trouble. This second reading was not consistently seen in Daniel's program.

Tables 4 and 5 (above) summarize the average amount of time spent on the first reading of the new book. The time limits suggest that the New Book provided a substantial amount of time for both boys
to orchestrate the reading process with assistance from their teachers. The following day, the new book became the Running Record book.

Typically Jane and I chose a new book from a 500-600 title collection that we each maintained. The books were leveled on an approximate gradient of difficulty from simple to complex (Peterson, 1989). Peterson describes this gradient:

Several factors interact to influence the choice of a level for a particular book, including: content in relation to children's personal experiences, language patterns, vocabulary, illustration support of the meaning of the text, and narrative style. Making a decision about the appropriate level for a book is a process of examining the relationship of such features within the context of an entire book. The process of levelling a book is also made easier by making comparisons to other books with similar characteristics. (p.4)

In the Reading Recovery program, books ranged in difficulty from Level 1-20. Table 8 summarizes the level placement of the case study children during the data collection.

There were also activity structures that were not seen in both Peter's and Daniel's programs. For example, at the start of Peter's program, Jane consistently spent time "establishing the task" (Clay, 1985), allowing Peter a chance to practice the "saying and pushing" task required for Elkonin boxes used in the writing. This explicit guidance and practice occurred after the Running Record interaction and lasted a few minutes. For Daniel, though, this activity was not necessary as he successfully accomplished the task in the first lesson.
Table 8

**Book Level Placement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Peter (a)</th>
<th>Daniel (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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a. lessons conducted from 10/03/89 - 12/07/89
b. lessons conducted from 10/04/89 - 12/15/89
A consistent activity for Daniel that was not seen as much in Peter and Jane's lesson was the "fluency check." This teacher-controlled activity often began the lesson and lasted 1-2 minutes. Previous words (two to three) that had been taken to fluency in the writing were constructed with magnetic letters by me on the chalkboard. The letters were then scrambled and Daniel was asked to reconstruct the word quickly. Daniel's responses were noted to ascertain if the fluency work had been effective in previous lessons.

In summary, the activities in a Reading Recovery lesson revolved around a set of components that were daily implemented during the lesson. These activities were the familiar reading of books, the Running Record of text reading, the writing of a sentence, the cut-up and reconstruction of the sentence, and the introduction and reading of a new book. Though the order and type of activities remained relatively unchanged throughout the data gathering, routines and patterns of student participation did vary within and between each boy's instruction. These variations will be analyzed and described in later sections in this chapter.

The classroom reading group

Peter and Daniel not only received instruction in the Reading Recovery program they daily attended the classroom reading group instruction. This instruction usually began around 8:40 a.m. and lasted until 9:10 a.m. for Peter and Daniel's group. Like Reading Recovery
there were also distinct patterns of activities in this group.

Table 9 (below) summarizes the frequency of observations upon which the following description of activities is based while Table 10 (below) outlines the patterns of activities that emerged from triangulation of the field notes, video-tapes, and audio-tapes.

Instructional activities in the classroom reading group centered around the following: (a) workbook pages, (b) basal stories, (c) teacher-made dittos, (d) mimeograph practice books, (e) teacher-made charts, and (f) print recall games.

Group completion of workbook pages. Over the observation time, teacher-controlled activities using workbook pages from the district-selected reading series was the dominant use of print in the reading group. Almost one-third of the time allocated to instruction was used on these skills practice sheets.

Each workbook page dealt with a specific reading skill designed for use with the basal stories. Such skills as identifying beginning or ending sounds, constructing contractions, or recognizing new vocabulary were presented. Student responses were written on the page within the constraints of lined spaces as illustrated in Figure 6.
Table 9

Observations in the Classroom Reading Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Observation Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9/21/89 - 10/26/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11/06/89 - 11/07/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11/28/89 - 11/30/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3/05/90 - 3/06/90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Daniel only
Table 10

Activities in the Classroom Reading Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Set 1</th>
<th>Set 2</th>
<th>Set 3</th>
<th>Set 4*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group completion of workbook pages</td>
<td>3 (21.00)</td>
<td>1 (10.00)</td>
<td>3 (29.75)</td>
<td>3 (24.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group reading of basal story</td>
<td>4 (16.50)</td>
<td>2 (18.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.25)</td>
<td>1 (11.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill completion with teacher-made handout</td>
<td>3 (16.00)</td>
<td>4 (20.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.75)</td>
<td>2 (18.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading of mimeograph practice books</td>
<td>4 (5.00)</td>
<td>1 (7.00)</td>
<td>1 (1.25)</td>
<td>1 (1.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill instruction on board chart</td>
<td>5 (21.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (3.75)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary recall games</td>
<td>1 (8.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>2 (10.75)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Daniel only
Hence, the children were required to pay attention to letter formation, i.e., handwriting, as they wrote their responses. Often the workbook pages contained colorful pictures for the children's use in formulating a response.

Barb kept all the workbooks in the center of the reading group table. As workbook page activities commenced, she tore out the desired pages from the workbooks and distributed these to the children at the table.

Instruction and interactions surrounding this activity occurred within the teacher-led group, i.e., the pages were not used as "seat-work" that the children completed on their own, away from the group setting. Other persistent patterns of activity were that both sides of any workbook page were completed in one sitting, and were completed toward the beginning of the instructional time.

Group reading of basal stories. Basal stories for oral reading and discussion were also a dominant use of print in the reading group. Used over one-fourth of the observation time, the stories were part of the district-selected reading series. In the first grade, three booklets and two hard-bound books comprised the series. Peter and Daniel began reading from the booklets (preprimers) which can be characterized as having controlled vocabulary and short sentences for the beginning reader's use. The preprimer stories were designed to support and apply vocabulary and reading skill development of increasing difficulty as outlined in the series' objectives. Each story
was read, in turn, and as one preprimer was finished, the next, more
difficult one was begun.

Once the children began reading the hard bound books (primer
and first reader), the stories were organized around themes such as
colors, feelings, and stories from "long ago." Nonetheless, reading
skills and vocabulary development from the first three primers were
revisited in these stories.

A stack of the current books was kept on the reading group table
next to the workbooks. As the story activities commenced, Barb
distributed a book to each child, telling them to turn to the table of
contents to find the page number of the next story.

Generally the reading of the basal stories occurred at the end of
the instructional time and involved a shared control. The stories were
read aloud in a "round robin" fashion wherein the children took turns
reading a page of text. Barb would assist the reader as the reading
process broke down.

Skill completion. Closely following the use of basal stories in
terms of time allocated was the use of teacher-made dittos to teach
and reinforce reading skills. These 8 1/2 - inch by 11- inch
mimeograph sheets of paper contained hand-written words, lists, or
sentences that were organized around a certain skill or vocabulary
Barb wanted to reinforce in her teaching. Skills such as contraction
use, following directions, and "new words" were often presented on
these sheets. Generally the dittos contained no pictures though the
students were often invited to provide illustrations, and children's responses could be written on a single line provided. The number of items on any ditto was small, usually ranging from 4-5, and only one side of the paper was used.

Dittos that were to be used during the lesson were also kept in the center of the table along with the basals and workbooks. As activities surrounding the dittos began, Barb distributed the sheets to each child and asked them to immediately put their name on it.

**Reading of practice books.** Though the use of workbook pages, basal stories, and teacher-made dittos was prevalent during reading group, the mimeograph practice book dominated children's attention at their seats away from the group. Barb wrote these practice books on 8 1/2 x 11 sheets of white paper. Each booklet had a front cover that contained the outline of an object such as a vase, owl, or pumpkin. A handwritten title and a line to record a name were also on the cover. Following the cover came an original story over two to three pages that was related to events or characters contained in the basal stories and that used the vocabulary to which the children had been exposed. The story was hand-written within the shape that was on the cover.

The children cut out the shapes on each page and practiced reading the story at their desks. When they met in their reading group they often brought the practice book to be stapled and read as a group in a round robin fashion. The books were also expected to be illustrated at their desks and taken home for reading with parents.
Skill instruction on board chart. Hanging on the chalk board behind Barb was a chart of lined paper. In the beginning observations she began the instructional group by initiating and maintaining control of activities surrounding the chart. Handwritten on this pad of large butcher paper was a list of vocabulary or sentences that related to a particular skill Barb wished to reinforce. Barb usually stood at the chart as she used it.

Vocabulary Recall Games. During the course of the observations, Barb sometimes employed the use of thin strips of paper or index cards upon which were written sentences or words. Again, the role of these games was to emphasize vocabulary words, either in isolation or in a sentence that the children had been using in their basal stories. When using these items, Barb often "dealt" them to the children and each one read the paper in turn.

In summary, activity structures in the classroom reading group delineated were those surrounding the following materials: (a) workbook pages, (b) basal stories, (c) teacher made dittos, (d) mimeograph practice books, (e) board chart, and (f) vocabulary recall items. Since the purposes and control of the activities appeared to be the same, activity structures were delineated by describing materials used and time allotted.
Summary

There are a variety of ways that reading and writing can be used in instructional settings. The activity structures for RAK, Reading Recovery Lessons, and Reading Group instruction discussed above certainly operationalize the term "variety." Two key characteristics emerge that assist in distinguishing activity structures between the intervention program and the classroom reading group: (a) materials used and (b) the role of participants.

The materials used in each setting reflect, in part, the underlying instructional theory chosen to teach reading. In Reading Recovery Lessons and RAK, materials were used which promoted the reading and writing of continuous text, i.e., complete, meaningful narratives. Clay (1985) suggests two aims for doing this:

One is to allow the child scope for practising the orchestration of all the complex range of behaviors he must use, and this is best achieved on easy or familiar tests. The other is to encourage him to use his reading strategies on novel texts and to support his tentative efforts. (p.68)

Unlike the Reading Recovery program, the activity structures in the reading group predominantly used materials that promoted the learning of a reading skill or vocabulary. Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson (1985) report that skill-based activities are found in the majority of classrooms around the country and reflect an underlying philosophy of learning to read as a skill-building process.
Another characteristic that separates the activity structures of the intervention program from the classroom reading group is the role of the participants and the time spent sharing the reading and writing experiences. In Reading Recovery the children were involved in more activities which allowed them to "initiate, direct, guide, and terminate" (Cochran-Smith, 1984, p.76) the reading and writing events. In RAK, the Shared Reading and Writing activities allowed for large chunks of time where, if the child wasn't in complete control, he was, nonetheless, sharing it. This was also true in the Reading Recovery lesson where such activities as Familiar Reading, Running Record, and First Reading of the New Book allowed substantive participation and control from the child.

In the classroom, though, control of activities tended to rest near the teacher end of Cochran-Smith's continuum. Even though the mimeograph practice book allowed for child control, that control occurred at the child's seat, away from the instructional group. When it was brought into the group, the teacher controlled how it was used.

The varied uses of reading and writing observed over time in both instructional settings suggest that Peter and Daniel were receiving differentiated programs. The next two sections will extensively analyze the role of the participants as a more decisive characteristic which distinguishes the instructional settings.
Patterns of Verbal and Non Verbal Behavior

The previous section outlined distinct activity structures that were implemented in two different instructional settings: an intervention program and classroom reading group. These patterns of instructional activities helped describe a part of the instructional setting, i.e., patterns of activities that Peter and Daniel were experiencing. This section of the analysis will discuss the patterns of interaction that revolved around the activity structures.

As discussed in Chapter II, learning to read is assumed to be a social process (Cazden, 1988; Green & Bloome, 1983; Green & Weade, 1987; Paris & Wixson, 1987). A broad description of the social norms and expectations (Kantor, 1987) that are playing out in each setting is conducive to understanding how the low-progress reader is learning. The norms and expectations can be described by first exploring what Cazden (1988) defines as "repeated patterns of behavior which the participants seem to be following." (p.43). In short, how were the verbal and nonverbal behaviors used by the teacher and student to collaboratively work together in each instructional setting?

Lessons captured on audio- and video-tapes were revisited in each of the lesson sets. Extensive written summaries of the verbal and nonverbal behavior in the initial lesson sets were applied to later sets to pinpoint general instructional interactions that were maintained or changed over time. The remainder of this section describes the
interactional routines that were a part of the intervention program and classroom reading group.

**Reading Recovery lessons**

The previous analysis revealed activity structures in the Reading Recovery intervention program that were consistently implemented. Cazden (1988) suggests that such a consistency can be instructionally beneficial:

> To the extent that a lesson structure is consistently enacted by the teacher...and learnable by her particular students, it can become sufficiently familiar and predictable to offer clear cues to the shifting contexts, and to the talk that is appropriate within them. Management problems will thereby be minimized, and teacher and students can all give more attention to the academic focus of the lesson (p.48).

Each activity structure of the Reading Recovery lesson was accomplished using distinct interactional routines over time that provided "cues" as to what was expected of the participants. These routines for each of the instructional activities, i.e., familiar reading, Running Record of text reading, sentence writing, cut-up sentence reconstruction, and introduction and reading of the new book, will be discussed in turn.

Slices of the interactional routines gleaned from transcripts of both Peter's and Daniel's lessons will be used to illustrate each the varied routines. These slices of time are used for two reasons: (a) The reader can "hear" how the interactions in and around activities
occurred. (b) The voices of the participants can emerge more fully than would be possible if interpretive narratives were used in isolation.

The presentation of the interactions comprising each routine closely follows the format used by Cochran-Smith (1984), i.e., the segments should be read left-to-right from top to bottom. Focal points are listed on the far left of transcript and are referenced to the numbered explanations following each transcript. Carat symbols (^) are used to display the extent to which each participant was involved in the activity. When the child predominantly controls the lesson three carats are used (^^^). Teacher control is displayed with one carat (^) while shared control is indicated with two carats (^^).

Conversation is recorded in capital letters while lower-case letters describe non-verbal behaviors. When conversation or actions occurred at the same time, a bracket is used across the transcript columns. A brief summary of negotiated rules and routines particular to each segment follows each transcript.

Familiar reading. For both Peter and Daniel, there were 4 distinct interactional routines surrounding this first activity structure: (a) opening move, (b) student reading, (c) discussion, and (d) transition move. A representative sample from an early lesson of Peter's and Jane's is used to highlight each interactional routine.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Peter</th>
<th>Jane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^^^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Segment 1**

_Familiar Reading - Peter & Jane - Lesson 13_

**Focal Point Text**

- Peter
- Jane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^^^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peter**

- A chooses
- The Farm Concert
- puts it in front of him

**Jane**

- PICK ONE YOU'RE YOU'RE GOING TO START WITH.
- WANT TO DO "THE FARM CONCERT"?
- no response
- leans in
- DO YOU HAVE A VOICE?
- UH-HUH!
- laughs
- I THOUGHT MAYBE YOU LOST YOUR VOICE.

- points & reads
- pulls back from him

**#2**

- The Farm Concert
- "THE FARM CONCERT"

- continues to read successfully

- p.8
- "Quiet!" yelled the farmer.

- points & reads, finger is hesitant where to point

- "QWOI-I-YET!" YELLED THE FARMER"
continues to read successfully to the end

#3
A I DON'T HAVE ANYTHING TO TALK ABOUT. YOU DID IT ALL.

^ turns to p.8

AA QUIET!
anticipating the spot she's returning to

^ DID YOU SEE WHAT YOU DID HERE?

AA THIS IS THE ONLY THING I CAN TALK ABOUT. YOU WENT "QWOI"... YOU HADN'T FINISHED THE WORD AND YOU MOVED YOUR FINGER, BUT YOU BROUGHT IT BACK AND FINISHED THE WORD.

AA interrupts "QUIET!

^ THAT'S IT. THAT'S THE ONLY THING...

[ YELLED THE ] FARMER. I CAN'T SLEEP.

GOOD JOB. YOU KNEW YOU SHOULDN'T MOVE YOUR FINGER, BECAUSE YOU WEREN'T FINISHED SAYING THE WORD. YOU FINISHED THE WORD AND TOOK OFF. WHAT DO YOU WANT TO SAY ABOUT THIS PICTURE.
I DON'T KNOW.

WHAT DO YOU WANT TO READ NEXT? IN THE STACK, HERE?

#4 My Home chooses My Home, opens it and reads title page, familiar reading continues

Rules and routines: Peter chooses a book to read at Jane's invitation. Jane relinquishes control of the activity as Peter begins to read. Peter works out reading problems as they occur. Jane provides wait time for problem-solving to occur. Following the reading Peter decides which of his previous responses they will discuss. Jane specifically confirms Peter's problem-solving. Peter can interrupt Jane to display what he knows.

1. Opening move. As the teachers and students took their seats at the instructional table, the routine commenced. A "fan" of books previously read was presented to them, and the students were invited to choose which one they were going to read first.

Similar invitations were made to Daniel, yet in the beginning of his program Daniel was not as willing as Peter to take up the invitation. He often asked to go back to the room or to the bathroom when the lesson started. He also commented on how he didn't like a certain book due to a name or character he "hated." I often countered these stalls by eventually choosing a book for Daniel and insisting he start reading.

Jane and I occasionally withdrew the invitation to choose, and a specific book was given to the boys along with an invitation to read.
2. Student reading. Whether the child or teacher chose the book, it was eventually expected that the child would take over the reading. It was a time when Peter or Daniel initiated and successfully maintained the reading act with little assistance or comment from us. Both used reading strategies such as finger pointing to accomplish one-to-one correspondence, searching the picture, restarting at the point of trouble, and even self-correcting any errors; all without teacher prompting.

If there was any interaction it often happened quickly for varying teaching purposes but with the ultimate objective being that reading resume with undue speed. For example, in Daniel's readings, I often interjected a comment about the story line or quickly commented on any problem-solving Daniel accomplished. In Peter's case, at any point of trouble, Jane came in after a brief wait by telling the word or engaging Peter in an interaction to assist him in using cues within the book to reconcile his difficulty. (Explication of this type of interaction will be discussed in the next section of Chapter IV.)

3. Discussion. Following the familiar reading, the teacher took an opportunity to confirm when reading problem-solving was used. It was also a time to revisit problem areas. At the beginning of the program, Peter decided what Jane and he would attend to after the reading, often evaluating his attempts and pinpointing his trouble spots. Jane rarely ignoring his input. In Segment 1, (above) Jane chose to confirm Peter's one-to-one correspondence.
There was little, if any, interaction after Daniel finished a book. Often I made a concluding statement about (a) the meaning of the story, (b) Daniel's use of phrasing or fluency, or (c) reading strategy work.

4. Transition. Once the discussion around a book was concluded, the next book was chosen. In Peter's case he consistently exercised his choice after Jane's invitation (as seen in Segment 1 above). For Daniel, I often picked the next book from the original "fan" of books offered him. Once the book was in front of them, both boys began the reading again.

In summary, the four routines delineated for this part of the lesson had distinct participation patterns. Both verbal and nonverbal behaviors from the teachers indicated this part of the lesson should be child-controlled. For example, the invitation to choose, the placement of the book directly in front of the child, oral invitations to start reading, and the teacher physically pulling back from the child were norms that signalled a general and consistent invitation for the student to take over. Similar routines were seen for the Running Record.

Running Record of text reading. The routines for the Running Record of text reading closely paralleled those described for familiar reading, yet differences did surface. The four routines observed over time were: (a) opening moves, (b) student reading, (c) discussion, and (d) closing moves. Segment 2 is used to illustrate the routines.
### Running Record - Daniel & Jim - Lesson 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Daniel</th>
<th>Jim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>The Red Rose</td>
<td>clears away books,</td>
<td>HOW ABOUT &quot;THE RED ROSE&quot;?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>places Running Record book in front of Daniel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td>begins to read</td>
<td>taps desk twice, opens book to p.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.3 &quot;Ah,&quot;</td>
<td>reads successfully.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>said a caterpillar,</td>
<td>&quot;I see a red rose.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p.3 "Ah," said a caterpillar, "I see a red rose."

I DON'T EVEN LIKE THESE

points to picture of caterpillar

KEEP GOING.
continues to read

to the end

continues to take Running Record

leans in as pencil is put down

HOW'D YOU THINK YOU DID ON THAT BOOK?

FINE.

I THINK YOU DID A BEAUTIFUL JOB. CAN I SHOW YOU SOME BEAUTIFUL THINGS YOU DID?

turns to p.11

YOU STOPPED, AND WHAT DID YOU DO?

p.11
"Gone," said the caterpillar, and it went back home.

I FORGOT THAT WORD.

points to 'back'

BUT YOU FIXED IT UP. AND YOU SAID

points and reads

AND IT WENT BACK HOME... HOW COME THIS WORD CAN'T BE 'HOME'?

points to 'home'

I FORGOT ABOUT IT.

WELL, HOW DID YOU FIX IT UP THEN? HOW DID YOU KNOW TO FIX IT UP? WHAT
LETTER WOULD YOU EXPECT TO SEE AT THE BEGINNING OF 'HOME'?

says word slowly.

H.

IS THERE AN 'H' THERE?

NO.

NO. YOU KNEW THAT AND YOU FIXED YOURSELF UP.

turns to p.15

AND YOU KNOW WHAT YOU DID ON THIS PAGE? WHAT PART GAVE YOU TROUBLE ON THIS PAGE?

I FORGOT ABOUT THIS.

points to 'went',
(during his reading he had originally made multiple attempts)

(interactions continue on other items)

GOOD JOB...YOU WERE REALLY SHAKING YOUR BRAIN UP THERE TO FIGURE THAT ONE OUT, WEREN'T YOU? OK!
Rules and routines: Jim decides when familiar reading is over and the running record will occur. Daniel takes over the reading and any subsequent problem-solving. Jim does not talk to Daniel during the running record even when Daniel invites him to do so. Jim asks Daniel to evaluate his reading. Jim chooses a few points in the reading to return to confirm Daniel's reading work. Daniel has to specifically discuss his problem-solving.

1. Opening move. The start of the Running Record activity involved placing of the Running Record book in front of the student. A shuffling of the forms by the teacher, the reading of the book's title, and the opening of the book to the first page were clear signals to the child it was time for him to take control of the reading.

2. Student reading. Both boys began to orchestrate the reading process after the teacher invitation. As they read, they attempted to independently reconcile any difficulties they experienced. Unlike the familiar reading, though, oral interaction was a rare occurrence during this activity. According to recording conventions, a teacher is limited in what s/he can say during the Running Record. Since the Running Record is designed to record a child's oral reading performance, the teacher is on guard from saying anything that would affect how the reader responds to text. Hence, the teacher will either (a) tell a word(s) if the reading has broken down or (b) ask the child to try a part of the text again if the child is in a "state of confusion and it is
necessary to extricate him" (Clay, 1985, p. 18). In Segment 2 (above) neither option was exercised, since Daniel did not experience such "confusion." He did, though, attempt to initiate a discussion about his "hates." I countered by reinforcing the norm, telling him to continue reading.

3. Discussion. At this point in the Running Record, the teacher assumed control of the interactions, specifying what would be attended to and how it would be attended to. Both Jane and I used the boys' previous responses and engaged them in a conversation to (a) confirm appropriate reading behavior or (b) verbalize the child's actions, and (c) teach from and extend the child's responses. In Segment 2 above, interaction centered around confirming and explaining, with his assistance, Daniel's use of monitoring to bring about self-corrections.

Within each category there were response norms that needed to be honored. For example, Daniel replied that on p. 11 that he had forgotten the word "back" yet I was pressing him to verbalize why his original error couldn't fit, i.e., to check his original response with the letter/sound information the text provided. The response of "forgot" was not acceptable and therefore I instigated further interaction to get him responding appropriately. (Further discussion of shifting teacher-student interactions occurs in the next section of Chapter IV.)
4. Closing move. For both boys, the close of interactions happened quickly. The Running Record book was put aside, and the writing book for the next part of the lesson was prepared with little verbal fanfare.

In summary, the Running Record had interactional structures that paralleled those found in the familiar reading. Interactions in both parts of the lessons mandated that the child also control this part of the lesson, directing and guiding his personal efforts. Unlike the first part of the lesson, though, interactional routines during the Running Record required that a solo attempt be made during the reading of the book and that the teachers direct the participants' attention after the reading.

Writing. As the Running Record book was put away, the routines surrounding the writing part of the lesson were put into play. Segment 3 (below) illustrates the following interactional structures: (a) transition to writing, (b) generation of the sentence, (c) writing of the sentence, interrupted by (d) practice page work and (e) rereading of the sentence, and (e) closing move.
Segment 3

Writing - Jane & Peter - Lesson 28

Sentence generated: They like to eat nuts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Peter</th>
<th>Jane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td><a href="#">WRITE!</a></td>
<td>LET'S WRITE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>QUICKLY!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>WHAT ARE WE GOING TO WRITE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>SOMETHING FROM ONE OF YOUR BOOKS THAT YOU READ TODAY?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>waits, looks ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WHAT BOOK? THIS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reaches over and points to Chipmunks, the Running Record book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WANNA WRITE SOMETHING ABOUT CHIPMUNKS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THEY LIKE TO EAT NUTS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>numbers and dates blank page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>turns writing book toward him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THEY LIKE TO EAT NUTS? I THINK THAT'S A GOOD SENTENCE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gives him a brown marker and one for herself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUR!

YEA. BUT A CHIPMUNK HAS BROWN WHAT?

YEA. THEY LIKE TO EAT NUTS.

#3 readies marker

^^^ THEY?

UH-HUMM.

writes sentence on the lesson plan

THEY...

pauses, looks around, writes in upper left hand corner of bottom page.

spells,


GOOD JOB! WHAT'S TH (that word)?

interrupts,

THEY!

(sentence writing continues with the words, "like" and "to" both of which Peter writes with little assistance.)

#4 rereads his sentence using his marker to point

^^^ THEY LIKE TO...EAT

#5 puts his hands on his head draws boxes on practice page for sound analysis of 'eat'

^^ begins to write 'eat' on the bottom page, ignoring the boxes

^^^ WHAT ARE YOU WRITING?
EAT writes 'e' OK. NOW YOU NEED AN 'A' WITH IT.

A?
writes 'a' and 'l'

laughs

slowly articulates 'eat' without a break

EEEEEETTT AND NOW LOOK WHAT LETTER YOU WROTE.

points to 'l'

 WHAT DO YOU NEED?

YOU JUST FORGOT TO CROSS IT.
OK, NOW READ IT.

#4

points to each word with his marker

THEY LIKE TO EAT

points to next blank space

NUTS.

HOW BOUT 'NUTS'

starts to draw 3 boxes on practice page

N!

LETS DO 'NUT'.

points to 1st box, smiles

N! /N-N-N/

NEED THE MARKERS (to push) OR DO YOU THINK YOU KNOW IT?
writes 'n' in the 1st box and starts to write 't' in the 2nd box. He stops, and sweeps his writing marker in a left to right fashion underneath the boxes as he slowly articulates...

NUT.

writes 't' in the 3rd box

UH-HUH!

using her marker, she writes a 'u' in the middle box, as she slowly articulates...

NUT.

(Sound analysis continues with a 4th box added to take care of the 's' which Peter hears and encodes, The word is then recorded on the bottom page)

#5 POINTS WITH HIS MARKER

THEY LIKE TO EAT NUTS.

OK. THAT'S THE END OF YOUR IDEA. HOW DO I KNOW YOU'RE DONE WRITING?

#4 PLACES A PERIOD AT THE END OF THE SENTENCE

YEAA. YOU'VE GOT TO PUT THE PERIOD IN. NOW YESTERDAY, WHEN I WAS LOOKING AT YOUR JOURNAL YOU DIDN'T DO A VERY GOOD JOB OF SPACING.

THIS ONE?
Rules and routines: Jane shifts the lesson to writing. Peter orally composes a sentence with prompted ideas from books read. Peter takes over the writing. Jane collaborates with him on parts Peter does no yet control. Jane decides how the practice page will be used. Practice page activities can be abandoned if Peter demonstrates that those activities are unnecessary. Sound analysis is collaboratively accomplished. Peter must reread before he continues to write. Peter must evaluate his response to writing conventions.

1. Transition to writing. Quick, nonverbal, teaching behaviors indicated that the writing part of the lesson was beginning. Running Record materials were cleared away and the writing book was prepared and presented to the child. As illustrated in Segment 3 (above) the transition routine was intricately timed and entwined with the sentence generation.

2. Sentence generation. Jane and I controlled this part of the lesson, differing in our routines that eventually produced the sentence. Jane invariably left the choice up to Peter, asking him what he wanted to write about and providing topics such as those found in the Running Record book. Though Segment 3 (above) demonstrates that Peter quickly generated a sentence, this was not always the case. In the beginning part of his program, Jane formed Peter's sentence, utilizing the one-word answers he gave her as they talked about what
would be written. By the later lessons, though, previous scaffolding interactions had allowed Peter to progress to generating his own sentences with little assistance from Jane.

Daniel, on the other hand, was consistently prompted to read previous sentences that had been written. I then invited him to generate a sentence that extended a previously written story or topic. Daniel either picked up on these invitations, generating another sentence or readily decided to initiate a new story or topic. Unlike Peter, there was never any difficulty on Daniel's part in generating a sentence.

3. Writing the sentence. Once the sentence was generated and repeated either by the student or teacher, the writing began. At this point, control of the lesson became fluid. Segment 3 (above) illustrates how Peter took control of the writing, initiating it with Jane's approval. As the sentence was written on the bottom page of the writing booklet, though, other shared routines were implemented.

4. Rereading of the sentence. A routine that often interrupted the sentence writing was the rerunning of the sentence. Often Jane and I prompted the boys to read everything they had written prior to writing the next word of their sentence. Focal Point 4 in Segment 3 (above) illustrates this routine.

5. Practice page work. Routines surrounding work on the practice page also interrupted the sentence writing. Again, routines surrounding these activities involved shared control of the practice
page. For example, Focal Point 5 in Segment 3 above illustrates how
Jane intended to do a sound analysis of the word 'eat' using sound
analysis boxes. If the boxes had been utilized, Peter would have had to
say the word slowly while pushing markers into the boxes. Interaction
then would have centered on sounds heard and letters used to
represent those sounds. As Segment 3 reveals, though, Peter ignored
the "interruption," proceeding to write 'eat' in his sentence. In this
way, he maintained a good share of control of the writing.
Nonetheless, Jane conducted a sound analysis of 'eat' when Peter
wrote 'l' for 't', insisting he say the word slowly and check what he had
written.

Both Jane and I shared control of the practice page in a way that
allowed the boys to actively respond. In a symphony of give and take,
Jane and I generally directed the routines surrounding the activities
accomplished on the practice page. If a "bit" was assumed to be too
difficult for the child or if the "bit" proved to be too difficult for the
child to handle, Jane and I provided it. This is illustrated in Focal
Point 5 (above) for the word "nut." Though Peter successfully used the
boxes to hear the initial and ending consonants of the word "nut," Jane
quickly provided the 'u' in the boxes and proceeded to invite Peter
back in to hear and encode the final 's' in 'nuts.'

6. Closing move. Like the opening move, this routine happened
quickly as illustrated in Focal Point 6 in Segment 3 (above). Writing
markers were capped and the writing book was closed and put away.
Though Segment 3 does not indicate this, a common occurrence in the closing move was the prompt for the boys to read their sentence one more time before the next part of the lesson, the cut-up sentence, was initiated.

In summary, the writing part of the Reading Recovery lesson had distinct interactional routines that delineated it from the other parts of the lesson. Since the purpose of the writing was to provide the child opportunities to explore English orthography in a detailed way while writing a meaningful sentence, interactions surrounding these detailed looks were geared toward that end. For the most part, the routines allowed for a shifting, shared control of the writing with total control relinquished to either participant as the work to be done was assessed by both participants.

The cut-up sentence and reconstruction. The child’s written sentence was copied on a strip of paper and cut-up into pieces. The pieces were scrambled and the child was asked to reconstruct it. Though this activity structure was a small part of the lesson (2 minutes on the average) it utilized three interactional routines: (a) the presentation, (b) the response, and (c) the check. Segment 4 (below) illustrates these routines. The dash (/) is an additional notation indicating how Jane cut Peter's sentence.
Segment 4

The Cut-Up Sentence & Reconstruction - Jane & Peter Lesson 19.

Sentence: We / were / playing / ball/ a/n/d/ I/ fell.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Peter</th>
<th>Jane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(she has prepared the sentence strip in the final moments of the writing component of the lesson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^</td>
<td></td>
<td>closes writing book</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOU'RE GOING TO CUT UP THIS ONE! holds strip up for him to see, scissors are poised.
points to 'we'

NO I'M NOT! YOU HEARD ALL THOSE SOUNDS. GOING TO CUT UP A HARDER ONE!

I CAN DO IT!

^        cuts off 'we' and lines up scissor for the next cut
WE...
cuts off 'were'
WERE...
cuts off 'playing'
PLAYING...
(cut-up continues in a similar fashion)

#2 SURE YOU CAN DO IT?
scrambles the pieces,
WE begins to prepare the envelope to receive the pieces finds it and places it on the far left edge of the table. writes sentence on envelope's face

WERE finds it and places it on the table, keeping a space between it and the first piece reconstructs the sentence in a similar manner he runs out of space on the far right edge of the table, so he moves all pieces up, he rereads what he has thus far and begins a second line of pieces on the table's edge

GOT IT TOGETHER!

#3 YOU SURE? YOU BETTER READ IT.

points and reads

I WERE...WE WERE PLAYING BALL AND I FELL.

YES YOU DID!

pulls new book from the pile and begins the introduction, gathering pieces into the envelope as she talks
Rules and routines: Jane decides how the sentence strip will be cut. Peter reads each word as Jane snips the word off the strip. Jane begins another activity as Peter assumes control of the reconstruction. Peter announces each word as he searches for it. Peter controls the display of the reconstruction. Peter evaluates the reconstruction by being prompted to reread.

1. Presentation. During the closing moments of the writing part of the lesson, both Jane and I quickly printed the boys' sentences on long, thin strips of paper using a bright marker. Once the closing move of the writing occurred, the strip was presented to the child, followed by the cutting procedure. Focal Point 1 in Segment 3 (above) illustrates the verbal and non-verbal behavior that introduced this lesson component. It is interesting to note, that even at this early stage of his program, Peter was already anticipating how Jane would "cut."

2. Reconstruction. Once the pieces were cut, Jane and I scrambled them on the table space in front of the child, usually accompanying this nonverbal behavior with an invitation to reconstruct the sentence. Simply scrambling the pieces was sometimes enough of an invitation for the child to take control. Of note in Segment 4 (above) is Peter's observation that he can do the task, an observation which both he and Daniel often announced as the sentence was readied for reconstruction.

The reconstruction routine involved, for the most part, total student control as illustrated in Focal Point 2 of Segment 4. Both boys articulated the sentence as they searched for the corresponding
pieces on the table. Once the piece was retrieved it was positioned in order on front of them on the table. Often the boys reread their attempts when they paused in their reconstruction. Breaks were due to (a) incorrect reconstruction as determined by the boys or (b) other rearrangement of the pieces - as in Peter's case above when he read out of table space.

3. Check. Although a teacher prompt usually initiated a student check of his reconstruction, the control of this task usually rested with the child, and his verbal and nonverbal behavior dominated the interactions. The check routine usually concluded this part of the lesson and the introduction of the new book began as the pieces were gathered and put into an envelope.

In summary, a relatively short part of the lesson involved distinct routines. As in the writing part of the lesson, the initial routine was teacher controlled. Once an invitation to reconstruct was offered, though there was a dramatic shift in control, not seen in the writing routines. This shift allowed the child a daily opportunity to orchestrate this puzzle-like task and to check it.

The new book introduction and first reading. The boys were daily introduced to a new book that the teachers had chosen. Following the introduction, the boys were asked to read the book with assistance. Segment 5 illustrates the new book routines: (a) transition, (b) shared introduction, (c) first reading interrupted by (d) shared problem-solving, (e) second reading, and (f) closing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Daniel</th>
<th>Jim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1^</td>
<td>front cover</td>
<td>HERE IS YOUR NEW STORY. IT'S CALLED &quot;CATCH THAT FROG.&quot;</td>
<td>HERE IS YOUR NEW STORY. IT'S CALLED &quot;CATCH THAT FROG.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^</td>
<td></td>
<td>SO THERE MUST BE A FROG ON THE LOOSE. AND YOU KNOW WHAT THIS IS?</td>
<td>SO THERE MUST BE A FROG ON THE LOOSE. AND YOU KNOW WHAT THIS IS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>picture of Carol &amp; her mother going into the store</td>
<td>IT'S A STORY OF THIS LITTLE GIRL, CAROL. CAROL'S HER NAME. CAROL AND HER MOTHER WHO WENT TO THE STORE.</td>
<td>IT'S A STORY OF THIS LITTLE GIRL, CAROL. CAROL'S HER NAME. CAROL AND HER MOTHER WHO WENT TO THE STORE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>WITH A FROG?!</td>
<td>WITH A FROG?!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^</td>
<td></td>
<td>YEA. SEE THAT FROG? WHAT DO YOU THINK IS GOING TO HAPPEN?</td>
<td>YEA. SEE THAT FROG? WHAT DO YOU THINK IS GOING TO HAPPEN?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IT'S GOING TO GET OUT!
pp.6-7
picture
of a frog
jumping
across
the
store

picture
of a frog
jumping
on a
boy's
shoulder

(p.23
resets book

UH-OH!
YOU BAD FROG!

THE FROG
JUMPED ACROSS
WHAT? THE
STORE.

YEA.

AND WHAT'S THE
LITTLE GIRL'S
NAME? REMEMBER?

does not respond
CAROL.

FIND 'CAROL' ON
THIS PAGE.

points to the
word

(introduction continues)

WHERE DID HE
JUMP HERE?

RIGHT HERE.
THAT'S ALL.

makes noise like a
a race car to describe
the frog going around
the store

(introduction continues in a like manner)

YOU READ NOW.

reads the title
page
AWWWW
REMEMBER
CAROL?
I THINK I'M
OUT OF IT.

reads
CAROL AND HER
pauses
continues
to read
MOTHER

pauses,
reads
HER MOM
HER WHAT?
HER

pauses
YOU SAID,'MOM'.
IT COULD BE
'MOM'. IT
STARTS LIKE
'MOM'. BUT
WE SAY?
voice rises
MOTHER
SO TRY IT AGAIN.

reads
HER MOTHER GOT
A CARROT. CART.

points to the
picture
HOW DO YOU
KNOW?
Carol put milk in the cart. CAROL PICKED MILK IN THE CART.

Now you just read 'Carol picked milk in the cart.' Does that sound right? Look at you! Try it out. See if it fits.

She put bananas in the cart. SHE /p/ PUT /b/ TROUBLE!
The frog was Carol's pet.  

BREAD.  

OR BANANAS.  

WHY? WHAT DID SHE PUT NEXT?  

IS THAT WHAT SHE PUT IN?points to picture  

HOW DO YOU KNOW IT'S BANANAS?points to the picture  

(points reading continues with similar interactions)

"THE FROG ONCE TILL"

I FORGOT ABOUT IT. I DON'T KNOW THIS ONE OR THAT ONE.points to 'was' & 'Carols'  

I THOUGHT THISpoints to 'was'  

WAS 'ONCE'.points to "THE"  

BUT IT'S NOT, IS IT? TRY THAT AGAIN AND THINK WHAT WOULD MAKE SENSE?points to restart  

reading continues
Rules and routines: A new book is always introduced by Jim before Daniel reads. Jim points out the title and relays the general story line. Daniel comments on the story line and characters. Daniel discusses pictures or finds words at Jim's request. After the introduction, Daniel reads with assistance. Daniel explicitly asks for help when he is at a troublesome spot. Jim tells word or prompts Daniel to use book cues that he has neglected in order to reconcile his difficulty. Daniel explains his self-correction behavior. Jim insists Daniel's response "sounds" right. Daniel must reread after collaborative problem-solving or at a point of appeal.

1. Transition. As the final routine for the cut-up was completed, the new book routines commenced. As Focal Point 1 (above) illustrates, the transition to the new book was quick, involving the nonverbal behavior of pulling the book and positioning it between the child and teacher. This behavior was accompanied by an announcement of the title that signalled that the new book was to be considered.

2. Shared introduction. Both teacher and child jointly considered the new book, the teacher directing the child's attention to the various cue sources that could and should be used in the first reading. In the example in Segment 5, I highlighted both the meaning of the story as well as emphasizing what I considered to be unusual story language such as 'Carol' and 'around'. Daniel readily joined the interaction, predicting what was going to happen.
3. First reading. Focal Point 3 in Segment 5 (above) indicates the approximate point that the control of the book shifted to the child. The book was usually placed squarely in front of him with the teacher physically pulling back, ready to record the child's responses on the lesson plan. For Peter, he usually accepted the invitation to read willingly, while Daniel initially was hesitant to take up the invitation.

4. Control shifted fluidly back and forth depending on the teacher's perception of the child's ability to continue with the reading. Often the child signalled that help was needed. In Peter's case, he made multiple, verbal and nonverbal attempts to continue to read at points when it started to break down for him. Such attempts as searching the picture or facing pages were not uncommon. Daniel, on the other hand, usually relinquished control quickly at points of trouble, often explicitly requesting help as in Focal Point 4 of Segment 5 (above), e.g., "Her what?"

If the reading act broke down for the child there usually followed verbal give and take, with the teacher physically pulling in closer to the child and the book. In these exchanges the teacher usually asked the child to reread and use a particular source of information. For example, in Segment 5 (above) Daniel was attempting to read the word "bananas," even going as far as articulating the first letter of the troublesome word. From then on he relinquished control by announcing, "Trouble." When I asked him to generally consider what mother might have put in the cart he seemed
to link his knowledge of what could go in the cart (bread) with the initial letter of the troublesome word. At that point, he had still not used the picture which clearly depicted Carol putting bananas in the cart. Daniel used the picture which I was pointing to and resumed control of the reading. A similar exchange occurred earlier around what I perceived to be a different neglected cue when Daniel invented a nonsensical statement, e.g. "Carol picked milk in the cart"). I asked him to pay attention to what would "sound" right, a different cue I wished him to use.

Interactions did not always have to occur at the point of "breakdown." For example, Daniel corrected himself early on in the new book, and I asked him to verbalize his initiative. He responded by pointing to the picture cue.

5. Second reading. Though Segment 5 (above) does not illustrate this routine, Jane and I both utilized a second reading of the book. The purpose of this was to give the child a second chance at the new book and to allow a sense of flow that had not been seen in the first reading. Second readings were rarely seen beyond the first part of each boy's program.

6. Closing. Since a typical Reading Recovery lesson involved many lesson components, time usually ran short. Closings for both boys can be typified in the above illustration. A quick, verbal prompt accompanied by the teacher closing the new book and spiriting it away signalled that the lesson had ended.
In summary, like the parts of the lesson preceding it, the new book introduction and first reading were implemented with patterns of behavior and interactions that signalled how the print would be used. Patterns of shifting participation can be described as teacher controlled in the book introduction with more of a shifting, shared control during the first reading.

Overall, the Reading Recovery lesson utilized a series of routines particular to each activity within each lesson. As the routines were implemented, general roles and expectations were both verbally and nonverbally marked throughout. The genesis of these general routines were first developed in the RAK sessions, a genesis that will be explored in the next section.

Roaming Around the Known (RAK)

Patterns of verbal and nonverbal behavior discerned in the Reading Recovery lessons were seen developing in the RAK sessions, the initial ten day sessions conducted prior to formal lessons. Two excerpts from Jane's and my work with the boys will be used to highlight these developing routines. In the transcripts (below), the focal points are those that parallel similar points in the lesson components. Underneath the points are the rules and/or routines that were developing and that were eventually established in activities of the Reading Recovery lesson.
Learning how to write a story in RAK. The boys daily co-wrote a story or messages with Jane and me. As previously mentioned this writing activity began with a discussion concerning what the child wanted to write. Topics often sprung from previous books read or stories written. The distinguishing factor between Jane's session and my own was that Daniel first drew a picture from which a story was produced. Jane, on the other hand, spent more RAK time discussing and establishing a topic with Peter. Once the sentence was written, an illustration was added by Peter to complete the writing activity.

In Segment 6 (below) Daniel is drawing a picture of a basket. He decided on the topic based on a book he and I just read together, Dear Zoo, which contained a snake in a basket. As he draws, the routines begin.

Segment 6
Writing in RAK - Daniel & Jim - Session 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Daniel</th>
<th>Jim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rules &amp; Routines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>draws a basket using colored markers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENTENCE GENERATION</td>
<td>WHAT STORY SHOULD GO ALONG WITH THAT PRETTY PICTURE?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel is responsible for a story.</td>
<td>continues to draw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WANT TO JUST SAY 'SNAKE?' LET'S THINK OF A STORY. THAT'S A GOOD WORD TO PUT IN OUR STORY.

continues to draw

THE BOAT. THAT'S GOING TO BE THE TITLE.

OK. "THE BOAT" IS THAT WHAT YOU DID IN CLASS, TODAY, WASN'T IT? MRS. MILLER'S GROUP.

YOU WRITE IT DOWN!

The first topic is the one which will be dealt with.

OK. BUT WHAT DO YOU WANT TO SAY ABOUT THAT SNAKE? WHAT'S YOUR STORY GOING TO SAY?

I'M GOING TO MAKE A LINE FOR THE SNAKE.

Written words must be kept separate from the pictures so they can be read easily.

OK. AND WE'LL PUT THE STORY DOWN HERE.

draws a line across the page separating his picture from the writing

points to blank space below the line

WHAT'S YOUR STORY? LET'S WAIT A SECOND.
A story is more than a title.

THE SNAKE!

WHAT ABOUT THAT SNAKE? THE SNAKE...

voices rises

I CAN MAKE HIM RUN AWAY FROM HIS MOM! LIKE IN THIS BOOK!

points to another book read

HOW SHOULD WE WE SAY THAT?

THE SNAKE...

voices rises

DID WHAT?

pauses

LOSED HER MOM.

THE SNAKE LOSED HER MOM.

copies sentence down on session form

WANT TO SAY IT LIKE THAT?

#3

CO-WRITING OF SENTENCE

THE

Picture & words are separate.

WANT TO START IT RIGHT HERE?

you know how to write, 'THE'.

Gives him a marker
A story is more than a title. The snake! stops Daniel from drawing

WHAT ABOUT THAT SNAKE? THE SNAKE...

voices rises

I CAN MAKE HIM RUN AWAY FROM HIS MOM! LIKE IN THIS BOOK!

points to another book read

HOW SHOULD WE WE SAY THAT?

THE SNAKE...

voices rises

DID WHAT?

pauses

LOSED HER MOM.

THE SNAKE LOSED HER MOM.

copies sentence down on session form

WANT TO SAY IT LIKE THAT?

gives him a marker

YOU KNOW HOW TO WRITE, 'THE'.

#3 CO-WRITING OF SENTENCE

Picture & words are separate.

THE WANT TO START IT RIGHT HERE?
#4
PRACTICE PAGE
TRY-OUT

proceeds to write 'k' in the story.

#5
RERUNNING ROUTINE

THE SNAKE.
writes 'losed'
OK. READ WHAT YOU HAVE.

THE SNAKE LOSED
pauses
HER.

Word choice changes within a sentence are OK.

IT'S 'HIS'!
demonstrates SORRY.
slowly articulates the word

(The sentence continues to be written.)

#6
CLOSING ROUTINE

THE SNAKE LOSED HIS MOM.

Stories can be expanded.

AND SHE'S CRYING.

GO AHEAD AND READ WHAT YOU'VE GOT.
repeats the sentence.
A quick review of the routines seen in the Reading Recovery lessons reveals that the genesis of these verbal and nonverbal behaviors began early in RAK. For example, the story generation routine (Focal Point 2 in Segment 6 (above) parallels a similar routine in lessons in that the verbal interchange implicitly signalled that a) a story was needed from the child, b) that a story had to be comprised of more than one word, and c) the first topic chosen by the child is the one that will be discussed. Other routines such as rereading what had been previously written were also encouraged early on.

Sound analyses routines were conducted in RAK as well. These were initiated based on what the teacher determined the child could successfully deal with. Such determinations were informed by the child's Diagnostic Survey which allowed the teacher to observe what sound analyses the child was able to conduct. For example, Daniel's Diagnostic Survey revealed that he could hear and encode the 's' in its initial position. Therefore when the opportunity to write 'snake' surfaced, a sound analysis routine was initiated to give Daniel another chance to successfully hear, organize, and encode the sounds he heard. Techniques such as Elkonin boxes, though, were not utilized as this would have been too teacher-directed. Yet verbal invitations such
as "Say it slowly," and "What do you hear?" emerged early on in RAK, signalling the child that similar activities accomplished in the Diagnostic Survey could be successfully replicated in RAK. Of course, such invitations became standard along with more teacher-directed routines once lessons began.

For Peter or Daniel, the writing and illustrating of stories during RAK was a time when they could share their imagination in their own language. Revisions and extensions to the stories were also comfortably offered by both boys.

Routines were also developing around the books that the boys were reading. These will be explored next.

**Learning how to read a book in RAK.** Both boys had an opportunity to independently read books that had been introduced in previous sessions. The routines that accompanied these independent readings mirrored those found in the familiar reading of books in subsequent lessons.

In Segment 7 (below) Peter is given multiple opportunities to read known books during RAK Session 4. The focal points outlined parallel similar points in familiar reading of a Recovery lesson. Included with the points are rules and routines Jane and Peter seem to be following.
### Segment 7

**Familiar Reading in RAK - Peter & Jane - Session 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Peter</th>
<th>Jane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rules &amp; Routines</strong></td>
<td><strong>OPENING MOVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>LET'S FIND THE ONES YOU KNOW CAUSE I HAVE THEM ALL TOGETHER.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter will choose a book to read.</td>
<td>UH-OH! THESE ARE MY FAVORITE BOOKS - &quot;GHOST&quot;!</td>
<td>displays the books for Peter to consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picks a book and readies it</td>
<td>OK. WANT TO TRY TO READ THAT FIRST?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The book is placed flat on the table for both to see.</td>
<td>holds book below the table, starts to read</td>
<td>GET IT UP HERE, SO I CAN SEE TOO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reads</td>
<td>&quot;THE GHOST&quot;.</td>
<td>YOU READY?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The pair read the first two pages together, Jane establishing the pattern. On page 4 the text reads &quot;I see the table.&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### #2

OK. TAKE OVER.
STUDENT READS, CONTROLLING THE BOOK

reads until p. 6 where he skips the word "the" in "I see the chairs." Continues on until the end.

On the last page he reads the word, "boo" quite softly.

#3 DISCUSSION

Jane will return to a page where the pattern of the book was not initially used.

I THOUGHT YOU WERE GOING TO YELL IT AGAIN!

turns back to p. 6, rereads sentence, reemphasizes the skipped word

A LITTLE SOFTER, HUH? GOOD JOB. THAT'S YOUR FAVORITE.

#4 TRANSITION TO NEXT BOOK.

chooses and readies the book

THE CAKE

"THE BIRTHDAY CAKE". IT'S NOT JUST ANY CAKE, IT'S "THE BIRTHDAY CAKE".

#2 "THE BIRTHDAY CAKE".

STUDENT READS

reads until the page that reads "a pink cake." Peter pauses, looks at pink marker laying on the table and reads...
Discussion can take place during the student reading.

PINK CAKE.

OK. GO AHEAD. YOU CAN READ IT BECAUSE YOU REMEMBERED THE COLOR, DIDN'T YOU?

NAH-UH!

points to the marker

OH! DID YOU LOOK AT THAT?

reads to the last page which says, "Happy Birthday to you!"

waits, stares at book.

READY?

points and reads with him, Jane leading the way

#3 DISCUSSION

I SAID IT!

OH. I DIDN'T HEAR YOU. OK. PUT YOUR FINGER ON MINE AND LET'S SAY IT A LITTLE LOUDER SO I CAN HEAR YOU.

(Together they read the last page.)

NOT SO QUIETLY THAT I CAN'T HEAR YOU BECAUSE I DIDN'T THINK YOU SAID IT.

I DID.

THAT PINK CAKE JUST GIVES YOU TROUBLE, DOESN'T IT?
Reading of familiar books was an ongoing activity for Peter and Daniel in both the Reading Recovery lessons and RAK. The genesis of the routines surrounding this use of print first emerged in RAK. Of particular note was the routine wherein both boys read continuous text. Discussions at points of trouble, teacher or student evaluations of what was read, and comments around the books' pictures or story line were common interactions that students and teachers first engaged in during RAK. Another similar feature seen in both RAK and the RR lesson was that the choice of reading material was consistently offered to the boys.

Though RAK was designed to be a time of discovery for both boys as well as a chance for further teacher observation of the students, it was also a time when future routines surrounding instructional activities began to be used.

The next part of the analysis will present routines that developed over time in the reading group instructional setting.

**Classroom reading group**

The previous analysis focused on the broad interactional routines that signalled the rules and expectations around which print was used by the child and teacher in the Reading Recovery lesson. Further analysis demonstrated how these routines first surfaced in RAK.
As previously mentioned, both boys also received daily instruction in the classroom. Recurrent instructional activities observed in the classroom centered around workbook pages, basal stories, teacher-made dittos, mimeograph practice books, teacher-made charts, and print recall games.

Interactional routines also emerged from the observational analysis of reading group activities. Field notes and transcripts from all the classroom observations were summarized according to the activities delineated in Question 1. These summaries were compared across the observation time and routines emerged inductively. The following analysis describes routines observed for the most frequently-occurring, reading group activities: (a) group completion of workbook pages, (b) group reading of basal stories, (c) skill completion using teacher-made handouts, and (d) reading of practice books.

Transcript segments will be used to illustrate routines that emerged for each activity. The standard display used previously will be employed here with the exception that the column listing verbal and nonverbal teaching behavior will come before the students column. Further, codes for Peter (P), Daniel (D), a student (s) or chorus of students (ss) are noted in each segment's heading.

**Workbook pages routines.** During the observation time, the activity most observed was the group-led, completion of workbook pages. Over one-third of the observed instructional time was used on these brightly-colored pages from the district-chosen basal series.
Typically, the children received one, two-sided workbook page that dealt with a particular reading skill or vocabulary list. Both sides were usually completed in the same sitting with teacher guidance. Workbook page activities also tended to occur toward the beginning of reading group activities.

The beginning of the workbook page activity began with Barb tearing out individual pages from a pile of workbooks. Segment 8 illustrates this and subsequent routines: (a) Distribution, (b) Focusing prompt, (c) Item completion, (d) Transition, and (e) Closing.

Segment 8

Workbook Page - Barb and Group - 11/28/89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Workbook p.23. I WANT YOU TO PUT YOUR NAME ON YOUR WORKBOOK PAGE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^</td>
<td>To identify cause and effect. tears out pages from books piled in front of her and distributes to the children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbered pictures on the left are the effects.</td>
<td>SS: write name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>PUT YOUR FINGER ON, PUT IT ON LETTER A. LET'S LOOK AT PICTURE A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lettered pictures on the right are the causes that the students must match to the effects by writing the appropriate causes' letter in the blank next to the effect.

LYDIA, TELL US ABOUT PICTURE A. S: responds

TELL US ABOUT B DANIEL CAN YOU TELL US ABOUT B? P: raises his hand
D: shakes his head 'no'

OH. I THINK YOU CAN. WHAT DO YOU SEE?
WHAT DO YOU SEE? D: no response, stares at page
P: hand is still raised

WHAT DO YOU SEE IN PICTURE B, PETER? P: A LADY SEWING!

SHE'S KNITTING, ISN'T SHE? THAT'S RIGHT. P: leans over to Daniel and points to the picture just described.

The remaining pictures on the page are considered in a like manner with Barb nominating a child to describe each.

#3 LET'S GO TO PICTURE ONE. A LITTLE GIRL IS RIDING HER BIKE. WHY IS SHE RIDING HER BIKE? P: raises hand.
nods her head to Peter

P: BECAUSE HER FRIENDS GAVE IT TO HER.

SO YOU HAVE TO PUT WHAT LETTER? P: A!
S: C!

YOU HAVE TO PUT THE LETTER C WITH PICTURE 1. WHY? SS: fill in the first blank.
BECAUSE THE LITTLE GIRL JUST GOT A BIKE FOR HER BIRTHDAY. A 'C'

OK. PICTURE 2. LET'S LISTEN TO DANIEL.
DANIEL, A BOY & A GIRL ARE DOING THE DISHES. WHY ARE THEY DOING THE DISHES? P: BECAUSE THEY'RE...

PETER, LET'S LET DANIEL HAVE A TURN, OK?

(Item completion continues in a similar manner to the end of the first side.)

OK. RED ROVER, RED ROVER, FLIP YOUR PAPER OVER.

SS: do so

Workbook p.24

#2 to identify nine pictures' final sound and encode the final letter in the blank next to the picture.

TRACE OVER THE 'B' IN BI-/B/. I LIKE THE WAY DANIEL ALREADY DID THAT.
TRACE OVER THE 'M' IN DRU-/M/.
WE'RE LISTENING FOR THE LAST SOUND SS: LAST!
PUT YOUR FINGER ON THE STAR.
THE FIRST ONE IS CRAB. MRS. MILLER WILL SAY THE PICTURE AND YOU WRITE THE LETTER. CRA-/B/

P: B!

(Barb proceeds through each item, heavily articulating the last sound as students write the appropriate letter on the page. Throughout, Barb reminds students of what the directions are and monitors their progress, often articulating the picture name multiple times.)

D: does not wait for Barb but proceeds on his own.

P: stays with Barb's pace

(As all students finish, Barb starts distributing the books.)

OK, WHEN YOU GET YOUR BOOK... SS: put pencils down and push workbook page aside

Rules and routines: A student must put his or her name on paper. Items under consideration are found by putting a finger on the announced number or picture. Workbook directions and pictures are discussed before the page is completed as a group. Daniel can turn down an invitation to respond. When a student doesn't respond, another student is nominated. Items on a workbook page are completed one at a time with group members writing answers given by Barb or a student. Nominated students are given a chance to respond. A student may proceed on his/her own, ahead of the group.
1. Distribution routine. The typical signal that a workbook page activity was beginning was when Barb tore out the chosen pages from a stack of workbooks kept in the middle of the reading group table. This is illustrated in Focal Point 1 of Segment 8 (above). As each was separated out, she distributed it to a child, and the children readied their pencils. Often she asked the students to put their name on the page as soon as they received it. The distribution of the pages was sometimes accompanied by confirmations to those students who were following directions and the repetition of the directions to those students who were not. Barb sometimes gave directions on how the workbook page was to be completed as she distributed them, though this happened rarely.

2. Focusing prompt. As soon as names were on the workbook pages or when the pages were turned over Barb prompted the students to focus their attention on the page's practice item. The practice item was often the first item listed on the page. Focal points 2 in Segment 8 (above) illustrate this type of routine. Often children were prompted to physically point to the practice item's number or locator symbol. In Segment 8, Barb asked the students to "Put your finger on #1" or "Put your finger on the star."

3. Item completion. Once students were focused on the item under consideration, it was completed with direction and questions from Barb. The practice item usually established how the page's items
were to be completed. Typically a student was nominated to read or talk about any item in a "round robin" fashion. Barb often repeated the student's response and then prompted for an answer. The nominated student sometimes responded with an answer, but other group members could interject or attempt to interject an answer. When the "right" answer was heard, Barb repeated it and gave directions to the group as to how the item's blank should be filled in. Sporadically, Barb reminded the students that they shouldn't shout out and to allow the nominated student his turn. If the nominated student lingered too long, another student was quickly nominated to attempt an oral answer. In Segment 8 (above) Barb took a major role in describing each item on both workbook pages with nominated students providing the answers.

When a workbook page's format was familiar to the group, Barb sometimes asked the students to complete the page on their own at the group table. As they independently worked (^^^) she monitored individual student's progress and assisted when necessary. The one rule that was consistently heard and enforced was "When our pencils are moving, our mouths are not."

4. Transition routine. When the final item was completed on the first side of a workbook page, Barb signalled that the next page was to be completed. The popular jingo, "Red Rover, Red Rover, let's flip our page over," was employed. This is illustrated in Focal Point 4 in Segment 8 (above). The students quickly picked up on the signal,
chorusing in and turning their pages over. As they did this, Barb began new focusing prompts and item completion routines as dictated by the format of the workbook page. The second side of the workbook page was usually completed as soon as the first side was done.

5. Closing routine. When the last item was completed on the second side, Barb concluded the workbook page activity. The closing routine happened quickly as in Segment 8 (above) and usually was intertwined with opening routines for a different type of activity. Most of the group members interpreted these "signals" and pushed the workbook pages aside, putting down their pencils and readying themselves for the next activity. Sometimes, Barb took a few moments to reiterate the importance of following her directions or being good listeners.

Throughout the routines, the pace of the workbook page activity was teacher-controlled. If there were interruptions or disruptions from the children outside the reading group or from within the group, Barb dealt with these quickly and reestablished interrupted routines. Of particular note is the persistent routine for getting the workbook page items completed. The steps of (a) teacher nominates, (b) nominated student or non-nominated student responds, (c) teacher repeats or extends. Similar steps were seen in the next most-frequently occurring reading group activity, i.e. the reading of basal stories.
**Basal story routines.** Basal stories from the district-selected series were used over one-fourth of the observation time for oral reading and discussion in the reading group. Generally, the reading of the basal stories occurred at the end of the observation time and involved more, extended student reading of print. The stories were read aloud in a "round robin" fashion, each child reading a page of text with a few lines of print.

A stack of currently-used books was kept on the reading group table next to the workbooks. As Barb distributed a book to each child, the routines surrounding the reading of basal stories commenced: (a) Distribution, (b) Pre-reading discussion, (c) Student reads, (d) Transition to next reader, (e) Close.

Segment 9 (below) will be used to illustrate each of the routines in turn.

Segment 9

**Basal story reading - 11/9/89**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Barb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| #1          | LET'S OPEN TO "MORTIMER HOPS".          | Peter: P  
Daniel: D  
Student: S  
Students: SS |
|            |      | D: goes to Table of contents. |
| ^           | distributes readers |
THE SECOND STORY

P: flips through pages.

P: WHICH PAGE?

MORTIMER HOPS.
PAGE 10. I LIKE
THE WAY DANIEL
WENT RIGHT TO THE
TABLE OF CONTENTS.

#2
(Barb reviews how they can use the new word sheet to help them if they get "stuck" on a troublesome word.)

MAYBE, IT DOESN'T
LOOK FAMILIAR, HERE

points to book

BUT IT DOES
LOOK FAMILIAR, HERE!

point to sheet

TO HELP YOU WITH
YOUR NEW WORD.

#3

WHO WOULD LIKE TO
GO FIRST? DANIEL?

P: AWWW

LET'S LISTEN AND
FOLLOW. OK DANIEL?

^^^”Sam, take a look at Mortimer. Come and see Mortimer hop," said Meg. points to troublesome word

"I don't want to see Mortimer "hop," said Sam. D: SAM waits with finger in his eye

TAKE D: TAKE A LOOK AT MORTIMER.
waits, looks at Barb

points to troublesome word

P: COME!

D: COME AND SEE MORTIMER HOP, SAID MEG.

continues to read successfully, finishes and smiles at Barb

#4

VERY NICE, NOW THERE'S SAM & WHAT DID SAM SAY? S: I DON'T LIKE FROGS

"I DON'T LIKE FROGS!" NICE JOB, DANIEL. THANKS FOR COOPERATING.

nominates Laurie to read the next page.

(The basal reading continues in a similar manner with students nominated to read in a "round robin" fashion. Mary reads the last page of the story.

MARY, WHERE DID THEY WANT TO TAKE MORTIMER? P: TO THE LAKE!

OUTSIDE! AND WHAT DOES THE TEACHER SAY? SS: NO!

#5

OK. I'D LIKE YOU TO CLOSE YOUR BOOKS.

Rules and routines: Distribution of books signals students to find the story to be read. Those students who use the table of contents are confirmed. Daniel is nominated to go first. Each reader reads one page of text. Daniel pauses at troublesome
spots in his reading. Barb briefly waits before telling the word. Other students can assist the nominated reader. Barb reviews what happens after each page is read by a nominated student. Another student can respond to a question directed at another student.

1. Distribution routine. The routines surrounding the reading of a basal story were consistently initiated with the distribution of the books. These books were kept in the center of the reading group table and Barb always distributed them to the children. As she did so, she often accompanied her action with prompts to open to the story's page number or to the table of contents. Many students did not wait for Barb to prompt them, but immediately opened to the Table of contents to locate the story OR flipped through the book to find it. Barb also confirmed students who followed the established routine and independently attempted to find the story. Focal point 1 in Segment 9 (above) contains all the elements of this first routine. Of particular note is Peter's asking for assistance and Barb responding by confirming the locating sub-routine that Daniel was following. Her response seemed to gently remind Peter that he could assist himself.

2. Pre-reading discussion. A teacher-led discussion or talk occurred once most of the students had located the current basal story. In Transcript 9 (above), Barb used this discussion time to remind students of a way they could assist themselves if they came to a troublesome word, i.e., to use the new word sheet with which they had just worked. Other types of discussions observed over time were (a)
reminders of rules that should be followed as a student reads and (b) group interaction surrounding the story's opening illustrations. This latter discussion was observed three times over the observation period and often promoted student prediction of what the story was going to be about.

3. Student reads. The next routine began with Barb nominating a volunteer or a student of her choice to begin reading. As illustrated in Focal point 3 in Segment 9, Daniel was the student often nominated to read first, though he never volunteered to do so. Since Daniel sat to Barb's immediate right, he was the "flank" that consistently began "round robin" reading. Peter and the other students never declined a nomination to read.

Generally, when students came to a troublesome word in their reading, they waited. The most common teacher response to the wait was for Barb to point to the word in the student's book and announce the word (a told). This teacher response occurred twice in Segment 9, yet other responses over time included (a) Barb asking the student to rerun a sentence containing the troublesome word, (b) or articulating the first sound of the troublesome word.

Segment 9 also illustrates a common response to a reader's pause at a troublesome word. Other students could interject the word with which the reader was struggling. In Segment 9, Peter announced the word (come) that Daniel was waiting at. The nominated reader could choose to use the input or simply proceed. In the above
illustration, Daniel repeated any input he received and continued reading.

Members of the reading group were encouraged to follow along so that they could "learn from our friends." This did not occur across the board. Members of the group could look around the group or the class. Some read ahead or flipped through the book, analyzing the pictures. In short, group members could choose to engage with the story or not as the nominated reader read. But if a group member was following along, s/he was allowed to assist the nominated reader.

The nominated reader was usually asked to read "loudly, clearly, and proudly" and sometimes Barb asked group members for a sound check, i.e., the extent they could hear the nominated readers initial attempts.

4. Transition routine. As soon as the nominated reader finished, Barb initiated comments or questions about what was just read. Often she gave a one or two sentence summary of the text. Focal point 4 in Segment 9 (above) illustrates another frequently-occurring teacher response. Barb asked short questions that elicited recall of what had happened thus far in the story. These questions were often "tossed-up" and group members could interject answers without being nominated. Other, less-frequently observed components of this routine involved Barb admonishing group members to follow along with the nominated reader or announcing the new vocabulary words just read.
Invariably, Barb quickly confirmed and thanked the nominated reader's cooperation and reading. The nomination of the next reader ended the routine.

5. Closing. Once the discussion surrounding the last page was completed Barb directed the students to close their books. Focal point 5 in Segment 9 (above) illustrates how quickly the basal story reading usually ended. Since the reading of the basal stories consistently occurred at the end of the observation time, this directive was usually followed with directions about what the group members should take back to their desks and what they should do once they arrived there. The students were then dismissed.

Interruptions were tolerated during the reading of a basal story. As reported above, these interruptions usually involved a group member assisting the nominated reader at a troublesome word. Barb sometimes discouraged these interruptions asking the group member(s) to "let him try." Interruptions from outside the group also occurred. Visitors to the classroom and non-group student behavior were the initiators of the interruptions. The reader stopped as Barb quickly dealt with the cause of the interruption, and verbally or nonverbally indicated for the reader to continue once the interruption had run its course.

The reading of basal stories occurred frequently over the observation time. Generally it was a time when a nominated student attempted to orally read a segment of continuous text. This sustained,
oral reading was assisted by Barb or fellow group members. When finished, the oral reading was closely followed with teacher-directed comments or questions concerning the meaning of what was read. A similar type of oral reading also occurred with the mimeograph books the students had constructed away from the group. This activity's routines will be considered next.

Reading of practice books. Though the basal stories dominated the reading group's oral reading opportunities, mimeograph practice books were also used for student oral reading. Seven observations of their use were recorded over the data-gathering in the classroom reading group.

The mimeograph practice books were teacher-created. Each booklet had a front cover that contained the outline of an object such as a vase, owl, or pumpkin. The cover was followed by two to three pages of a story, each page containing a handwritten sentence within the shape drawn that matched the cover. The story was related to events or characters used in the basal stories and employed the vocabulary to which the students had been exposed.

When not in the reading group, students were busy at their desks cutting out the shape drawn on each page and practicing reading the sentences. When they came to the instructional table, the mimeograph books were often stapled together and read aloud or illustrated as a group. Sometimes the mimeograph practice books were already assembled and were distributed to the group.
Segment 10 illustrates the routines delineated for this instructional activity: (a) Distribution or placement, (b) Silent reading, (c) Transition, (d) Read aloud, and (e) Closing.

Segment 10

Reading of Practice Book - Barb and group - 3/6/90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Barb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>OK. WHEN YOU GET YOUR LITTLE BOOK I WANT YOU TO START READING JUST THE FIRST PAGE, JUST THE FIRST PAGE.</td>
<td>Peter: P  Daniel: D  Student: S  Students: SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>distributes books in &quot;round robin&quot; fashion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^^^</td>
<td>SSSHHHH. JUST TRY TO HAVE YOUR LITTLE EYES READ TODAY.</td>
<td>SS: begin to read aloud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SS: continue to read aloud

D: reads silently, starts to turn to second page but firsts ask Barb if this is OK

TURN THE PAGE.
GO ON.
D: continues to read silently. When he finishes, he closes his book.

#3
OK. STOP WHAT YOU'RE DOING AND PUT YOUR BOOK IN FRONT OF YOU. RICH, KATIE, ELLIE, I'M WAITING FOR YOU.

#4
Many people like to go to the river. Some people like to watch the boats. They look at the lighthouse, too.

LORIEL, WOULD YOU READ THE FIRST PAGE FOR US? PLEASE LET'S FOLLOW WITH LORIEL AS SHE READS.

S: reads

I WANT YOU TO DRAW A PICTURE TO GO WITH THE STORY.

SS: begin to draw.

MAYBE YOU'LL NEED TO READ THE STORY AGAIN. AND WHEN OUR PENCILS ARE MOVING, OUR MOUTHS ARE NOT, SITTING UP IN OUR NICE, FIRST GRADE POSITIONS. I LIKE THE WAY LORIEL IS WORKING.

SS: continue to draw.

^ IN THE STORY, WHAT DO PEOPLE LIKE TO DO, RUSTY?

S: GO TO THE RIVER.
AND WHAT DO THEY LIKE TO DO THERE? FRED? WHAT DOES THE SENTENCE SAY?

SS: WATCH!

WATCH THE WHAT?

SS: THE LIGHT-HOUSE.

WATCH THE LIGHT-HOUSE AND THE WHAT?

S: BOAT

SO WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO MAKE SURE YOU HAVE IN YOUR PICTURE? YOU'RE GOING...

S: A LIGHT-HOUSE AND A BOAT

AND?

SS: PEOPLE!

PEOPLE. VERY GOOD.

S: AND A BRIDGE!

DOES IT SAY ANYTHING ABOUT A BRIDGE?

S: NO.

BUT YOU CAN ADD THE BRIDGE, BUT MOST OF ALL YOU NEED TO MAKE THE PEOPLE.

S: I MADE THE PEOPLE.

^*

VERY GOOD.

LET'S TURN THE PAGE. LET'S TURN THE PAGE. WE'RE WAITING FOR ELLIE.

D: continues to draw.
LET'S GO WITH JEAN.

(The exchanges continue in a similar manner with Barb controlling the pace & discussion of what needs to be included in each picture.)

3rd page

(Students are drawing a picture for the third sentence in the booklet)

I LIKE THE WAY JOSH IS BEING PATIENT FOR EVERY-ONE ELSE. THAT'S NICE.

OK. NOW LET'S TURN TO OUR LAST PAGE. THIS BOOK IS YOURS BOYS AND GIRLS, SO WHEN YOU GO BACK TO YOUR SEATS, IF THERE'S SOMETHING ELSE YOU WANT TO ADD TO THE STORY, THAT'S FINE.

(Exchanges and activity progresses in a similar fashion. Students are illustrating the last picture)

# 5

OK. WHEN YOU GET YOUR WORKBOOK PAGE, PUT YOUR BOOK IN FRONT OF YOU, PUT YOUR NAME ON YOUR PAPER AND YOUR ROOM #.

Rules and routines: Students read books silently before the group reads them aloud. Oral reading in a "soft" voice is accepted as "silent reading." Most students complete the reading before the group reads aloud. Barb waits for students to follow her directions. Students are expected to silently read along as a nominated student reads a page of text. A silent drawing activity follows a student's reading. Barb confirms students who are following directions. Barb directs students as to what should go in their picture. Students can choose to draw more than what is discussed. Barb controls the pace of the drawing activity. Students can share their drawings with Barb as these are completed. Students wait for others to finish their drawings before they turn to the next page.
1. Distribution or Placement routine. If the mimeograph book was already assembled, as in Focal Point 1 of Segment 10 (above), Barb distributed the book in "round robin" fashion and children placed it in front of them, ready to deal with it. Rarely did students start "browsing" the book but often put their names on it without prompting.

2. Silent reading. Unlike the basal reading story, students were consistently given a chance to preview the mimeograph book, silently reading the few pages. Though the expectation was for silent reading, the students often interpreted this directive to read aloud the book to themselves.

3. Transition to oral reading. Barb directed the transitional routine to oral reading. Often she encouraged the children to silently read along with the nominated reader and to attend closely in "nice, first grade positions." In Segment 10 (above) Barb asked the children to close their books and ready them for oral reading.

4. Read aloud. The children had an opportunity to orally read the mimeograph book by taking turns, each child reading one page. The read aloud began when Barb nominated a student to read. Nominations were readily accepted by the students. They promptly started reading, except for Daniel, who was the only student who was consistently allowed to decline an invitation to read.
If the nominated reader stalled or hesitated on a troublesome word, Barb or another group member said it. The student then continued to the finish, after which Barb confirmed the child's performance. Segment 10, though, reveals another follow-up activity within the read-aloud, i.e., the illustration of the sentence. This occurred twice over seven observations. Once any follow-up to the reading was concluded, Barb nominated another student to read the next page.

The pace of the read aloud and subsequent follow-up was controlled by Barb. This is explicitly seen in Segment 10 (above) when Barb assured the children that they could add further illustrations to each page when they left her.

5. Closing. As in previous instructional activities, summary statements or teacher directives were quick and often segued into a new activity. The students interpret this as a signal to push aside the previous activity and prepare for the next.

One rule that was observed in mimeograph books routines and which was also seen in other activities was that students were allowed to assist the nominated student at points of hesitancy or trouble. This rule was also observed in the next instructional activity, the use of teacher-made handouts.

**Skill Completion.** Mimeograph sheets of paper were also used in instruction. Listed on these papers were hand-written words, lists, or sentences that were organized around a certain skill or vocabulary
words. Skills such as contraction use, following directions, and "new words" were often presented on these sheets. Four to five items were typically displayed on a single side of the paper used.

The mimeograph sheets were kept in the center of the instructional table along with the basals and workbooks. Routines surrounding the ditto's use commenced when Barb distributed them to the students and asked them to write their name on them.

Segment 11 is used to illustrate the routines that emerged over the observation time: (a) Distribution, (b) Locating prompt, (c) Item completion, and (d) List reading.

Segment 11

**Teacher-made handout - Barb & Group - 9/28/89**

| Focal Point | Text | Barb | Daniel: D  
|-------------|------|------|-------------  
| #1          | ^    | distributes ditto sheets.  
| #2          | ^    | PUT YOUR FINGER ON NUMBER ONE.  
|             |      | LIKE THE WAY JOSH IS FOLLOWING DIRECTIONS.  
|             |      | SS: put their fingers on #1  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students: SS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| place their crayons in front of them.  
| ready their papers.  
| SS: put their fingers on #1  
| TO DO ANYTHING. LET |  

A list of six vocabulary words is listed at the bottom of the page. A list of nine phrases or sentences is included in the list of directions. The handout contains a list of vocabulary words listed at the bottom of the page.
MRS. MILLER TELL YOU THE DIRECTIONS.

TONY HAS HIS FINGER ON NUMBER 1 AND TONY IS GOING TO READ IT TO US.

S: A GREEN TURTLE

A GREEN TURTLE. IN THAT BOX I WANT YOU TO MAKE A GREEN TURTLE.

SS: draw a green turtle in the blank next to the phrase.

WE ARE GOING FAST, SO FOLLOW DIRECTIONS

RIGHT NOW. THE GREEN TURTLE. OK, NUMBER TWO. NUMBER 2. WE ARE GOING TO GO TO RUSTY.

S: THE BIG BALLOON

THE BIG BALLOON. DO WHAT YOU THINK YOU NEED TO DO IN BOX 2.

SS: start to draw.

S: WHAT COLOR?

SS: NO!

DID IT SAY A COLOR?

WHAT DID IT SAY PHIL?

S: A BIG BALLOON.

A BIG BALLOON.

S: YOU CAN COLOR IT ANY COLOR.
OR IT DOES NOT NEED TO BE COLORED. FOLLOWING DIRECTIONS USING OUR WORDS. THE WORDS ARE TELLING US WHAT TO DO.

#3 The brown plane. OK. NUMBER 3. NUMBER 3. WE ARE TO DANIEL. D: THE
waits
S: BROWN!

LET'S LISTEN TO DANIEL. OK DANIEL. D: THE
waits BROWN

ONE OF OUR NEW WORDS TODAY. S: PLANE

PLANE. THE...BROWN...
PLANE. SS: continue to draw.

(The items are completed. Students are nominated to read and Barb repeats their efforts. The students then draw with their crayons.)

#4 that, how, did, fit, with, make NOW AT THE BOTTOM OF YOUR WORKSHEET, I HAVE SIX NEW WORDS. WHO CAN READ ALL SIX OF OUR NEW WORDS?

^ nominates a volunteer to read.

S: reads
SOME OF THESE WORDS
WE ALREADY KNOW AND
SOME OF THOSE WORDS
WE'LL SEE TOMORROW.
OK.

Rules and routines: Barb distributes handout and announces locating symbol. Students who use locating prompt are confirmed. Students must receive directions before they can complete the item. Following directions is important if students want to keep up with the pace of the activity. A student is nominated to read any item. Teacher directions for completing each item are provided after a student reading. Students can assist each other or clarify the directions for each other as the item is completed. A nominated reader is given a chance to problem-solve troublesome words.

1. Distribution. The distribution of the skill handout happened quickly. Barb picked up the dittos from the middle of the instructional table and began to distribute them in a "round robin" fashion. Sometimes Barb accompanied her remarks with a directive to the students to put their name on the paper.

2. Locating prompt. Barb consistently asked the children to physically locate themselves on the ditto by asking them to put their finger on the number of the first item as in Segment 11, Focal point 2, (above). This occurred throughout the use of the dittos, not just on the first item.

3. Student reads. This part of the activity commenced with Barb nominating a student to read the word, phrase, or sentence on the ditto. If the nominated student paused or hesitated, other students were able to interject assistance, usually by telling the nominated reader. Barb consistently followed this response as well.
Once the item was read, Barb repeated the phrase and then directed the students to complete the item in a certain way. In the Focal Point 3 (above) the directions involved illustrating the phrase. Students needed to pay particular attention to the adjectives and noun clues.

Pace during the completion of the item was controlled by Barb. The nomination of the next reader concluded the item completion.

4. List reading. Usually the teacher-made dittos contained a list of words at the bottom of the page. The last routine around the ditto involved Barb asking a volunteer to read the words. This was one of the few times throughout the observations that reading opportunities were "tossed up," and volunteers were picked up. As the previous narrative consistently reveals, students were nominated and usually nominated one after the other. Often more than one volunteer was asked to read the words. If they hesitated on any word, Barb or students usually interjected the proper response. The list reading usually signalled the end of the activities around the ditto with Barb quickly moving into another group activity. Students pushed their papers aside and prepared to do the next activity.

In summary, two common rules or routines emerged for the instructional activities which used workbook pages, basal stories, mimeograph practice book, or skills handouts. First, the pace of the activities as in Reading Recovery lessons was controlled by the teacher. Barb moved fluidly from one instructional activity to another
within the usual, one-half hour observational time. Distribution and closing routines happened quickly. Therefore, three to four activities might be completed during any average group meeting. Barb maintained the pace of any activity by using focusing prompts. Such phrases as "put your finger on," or the red rover routine, signalled the children as to what they had to do and when they had to do it. Though interruptions from students and adults outside the group were tolerated, the pace was slowed but never halted since Barb consistently treated any interruptions as secondary to what the group was doing.

Second, a typical classroom discourse routine was seen consistently across group activities. The teacher nominated a student who responded. Following the response the teacher evaluated and/or confirmed the response. Non-nominated students were allowed to assist any response though this type of assistance was not explicitly encouraged by Barb. Their assistance, whether used by the nominated student or not, was usually part of Barb's evaluation.

The analysis of lesson group activities suggests that typical routines formed a lesson structure that was learnable by the participating students (Cazden, 1988). The preceding descriptions of the most common reading group activities outlined the patterns of verbal and non-verbal behavior that emerged and which signalled both teacher and students what was the particular action and talk to use in each activity.
As in the Reading Recovery lessons, management problems were rarely observed, and Barb and the students were able to focus attention and interaction on the learning to read activities.

Summary

Distinctive learning activities occurred in each instructional setting, i.e., Reading Recovery and the reading group. Both Daniel and Peter along with their teachers utilized distinct patterns of verbal and non-verbal behavior for each setting.

Routines for the Reading Recovery lesson allowed for shifting involvement of both child and teacher in the instructional activities. Since each lesson involved numerous, separate opportunities for the reading of continuous text, routines developed which Demanded a sustained, open-ended response from the student. In the reading group, routines centered more around close-ended responses to specific questions or challenges posed by the instructional materials such as workbook pages or handouts. When the student read continuous text in the reading group, the passage was short, sometimes consisting of a few sentences.

For each instructional setting the persistent routines created what Cazden (1988) refers to as familiar and predictable learning environments; environments where the "academic focus" was consistently observable no matter which setting the boys were in.
Both Peter and Daniel used the routines that they and their teachers had established. Yet learning to read involved more than just following the routines. In the following section, the analysis will focus on the extent to which the boys used or renegotiated the routines, making the instruction their own in their emergence as readers.

**Student Participation**

The previous descriptions of the instructional experience for Peter and Daniel have focused on the types of activities and the routines revolving around those activities. The present analysis will develop a description of how the boys actively participated in each learning-to-read setting.

The activities and routines particular to each setting were the mainstay of the boys' instruction. The next step is to describe the extent to which the boys used the activities and routines in collaboration with their teachers, i.e., to describe the boys increasing, emerging proficiency as readers.

Such a description is influenced by the Vygotskian theory of cognition. Through a process of internalization, the activities and routines external to the child (interpsychological events) will undergird the later mental activity within the child (intrapsychological events). The child will voluntarily regulate and consciously realize the higher mental function s/he uses (Wertsch, 1985) by becoming an active participant in the instructional setting. The child changes and
manipulates the forms and functions of the activities and interactions while using the signs found in print to mediate thought.

The shift to higher mental processing occurs with the Vygotskian zone of proximal development wherein the adult provides "interactional support" (Clay & Cazden, 1990). This support promotes the shift to intrapsychological thought, scaffolding the learner's attempts at learning. The child's ultimate initiative to use the scaffold, actively changing the forms and functions of the interactions with the adult, is necessary for the shift from inter to intra to occur.

This part of the analysis attempts to describe Peter and Daniel's initiatives to use the scaffold provided them in both Reading Recovery and their classroom reading group. The key objective was to describe or operationalize the students' increasing proficiencies with the learning presented and scaffolded for them in two settings.

Two supporting objectives were designed to develop this description. The first objective was to choose points over the observational time and analyze Peter's and Daniel's participation during the instructional activities. Representative lessons were selected for both Reading Recovery and the classroom reading group, one from each lesson set. The second objective was to describe over the lesson sets how the boys read novel, continuous text in each instructional setting, i.e., what were the patterns of students' participation in the very task that they were learning to do?
Transcripts from one representative lesson in Reading Recovery and the classroom reading group were chosen for analysis. For the second objective, transcripts for all novel, continuous text readings in each lesson set were also chosen for analysis. Table 11 summarizes the lessons used for analysis.

A number of factors contributed to a lesson's representativeness. For Reading Recovery, all parts of the lesson had to be included. For the classroom reading group, the most frequently occurring activities, workbook page completion and basal story readings, needed to have occurred. Further, the classroom lessons chosen generally were lengthy (approximately 27 minutes on the average), so that a more comprehensive description of student participation in this setting could be developed.

Novel, continuous text readings in Reading Recovery occurred daily in the first reading of the new book. Transcripts from the group's reading of the new basal story were used to analyze novel, continuous text readings in the classroom.

The selected transcripts were read repeatedly and both teacher and student actions and conversation were generally described. These descriptions were sorted and resorted, resulting in set of descriptive categories inductively emerging. Table 12 summarizes the categories and a representative list of descriptions that illustrate the definition of the description name.
Table 11
Representative Lessons Used for Inductive Analyses of Student Participation Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Set 1</th>
<th>Set 2</th>
<th>Set 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RR*</td>
<td>RG*</td>
<td>RR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representative Lessons for Reading of Continuous Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peter</th>
<th>Daniel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Notes. • RR = Reading Recovery lessons, RG = Reading Group lessons
Table 12

Descriptive Codes - Analysis of Student Participation

Code A - Student responds to a specific prompt directed at a discrete aspect of the reading/writing act
- uses the book picture at an unknown word
- rereads at point of unknown word
- talks about his past experience
- asks for help
- evaluates his work

Code B - Student selects response to a general teacher prompt
- describes his reading problem-solving
- chooses a specific book cue to use
- takes over the reading act

Code C - Student initiates an observation or use of a discrete aspect of the reading act
- talks about sound/letter relationships
- talks about the book picture
- links a word to another word
- says a word slowly
- comments on story line

Code D - Student initiates or maintains the reading writing act
- self-corrects his reading
- attempts to keep reading act going on his own
- evaluates his degree of difficulty with the task
- asks for help/clarification

Code E - Student attempts to control the lesson beyond the instructional agenda
- initiates another activity
- turns down a nomination to participate

Code 1 - Teacher prescribes a student response to a discrete aspect of the reading act
- shows student where to read
- emphasizes book structure
- directs student to the picture
- directs student to word or word chunk
- tells word/answer

Code 2 - Teacher generally prompts to facilitate student's choice of response
- invites student to retry a passage
- invites student to choose books to read
- asks student to evaluate their reading
- invites student to complete a workbook page item

Code 3 - Teacher assess/evaluates student's attempts
- confirms acceptable reading problem solving
- repeats student's response
- specifically confirms what she likes or dislike
If placed on a continuum (Figure 7) the descriptive categories generally describe the times when either the teacher was predominantly scaffolding an instructional activity to times when the child was predominantly using or maintaining the provided scaffold. Of particular interest to this portion of the analysis were the points on the continuum when the boys initiated or maintained observations and activities that represented a move to independence with the instructional activities.

The transcripts were coded using the descriptive categories. Appendix D contains a representative transcript that exemplifies the coding process. Frequency counts were used and compared within and across lessons as an initial attempt to paint a description in broad strokes. Based on these numerical results the original transcripts were revisited to cross check the coding results and to highlight student participation patterns in both instructional settings across time. The student participation patterns will be presented below using narrative segments which summarize illustrative transcript segments.

The present section describes and compares Peter's and Daniel's participation patterns in both instructional settings over time. Following this general description, a more detailed analysis of the boys' participation patterns surrounding the reading of novel, continuous text in both instructional settings will be presented.
Figure 7. Continuum of student response codes.
Peter and Jane daily worked together in the Reading Recovery intervention program. Earlier in the chapter, it was noted that specific parts of a lesson were enacted consistently over time: rereading of familiar books, running record of previous lesson's new book, generating and writing of a sentence, cut-up and assembly of the student's sentence, and the introduction and reading of a new book.

Throughout each daily lesson, Peter was consistently invited by Jane to participate in the instructional opportunities. Table 13 summarizes the categories and frequencies of Peter's participation at three, distinctive points in his intervention program. Of particular note is the consistent pattern of Code A seen over time in all parts of the lesson. Almost one-half of Peter's participation patterns involved him responding to a specific teacher prompt, a prompt directed at a discrete aspect of the task at hand. The following narrative segment (Narrative Segment 1) illustrates this typical pattern of participation:

Narrative Segment 1

Peter is reading the new book chosen by Jane for Lesson 19. The book is titled Goodbye Lucy. It is about a little girl named Lucy who is on her way to school, yet returns home a number of times to retrieve items she has forgotten. After a brief introduction in which Jane emphasized both the story line and the repetitive pattern 'You've got your...', she invites Peter to read the text.

Peter begins to read the story. On page 3, he attempts to read "Oops! I forgot something." At the word 'forgot', Peter articulates the first letter /f/ and stops. Jane asks "What happen? Why did she (Lucy) say 'oops'?"

Peter responds, "She forgot."

"That's what she said," Jane replies.
Table 13

**Peter - Frequency of Code Responses to Activities in Reading Recovery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Lesson 8 (10-17)</th>
<th>Lesson 19 (11-17)</th>
<th>Lesson 28 (11-28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A    B    C    D  E</td>
<td>A    B    C    D  E</td>
<td>A    B    C    D  E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar reading</td>
<td>16    3    5    16  0</td>
<td>10   7   0    14   0</td>
<td>15    15   2    13   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running Record</td>
<td>10    5    4    6  0</td>
<td>5    3    0    3    0</td>
<td>17    8    4    3    0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Writing</td>
<td>26    12   8    7  0</td>
<td>23   6    7    4    0</td>
<td>11    16   1    6    0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut-Up &amp; Reconstruction</td>
<td>9     3    0    1   0</td>
<td>1     1    1    3    0</td>
<td>3     1    1    1    0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>16    3    13   4   0</td>
<td>4     0    0    1    0</td>
<td>14    2    3    0    0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>8     9    2    9   0</td>
<td>14    1    0    13   0</td>
<td>24    4    2    19   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>85   30   32   43   0</td>
<td>57   18   8    38   0</td>
<td>84   46   13   42   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>45    16   17   23   0</td>
<td>47    15   7    31   0</td>
<td>45    25   7    23   0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. A = Student responds to a specific prompt directed at a discrete aspect of the reading/writing act, B = Student selects response to a general teacher prompt, C = Student initiates an observation or use of a discrete aspect of the reading act, E = Student attempts to control the lesson beyond the instructional agenda.
At this point, Peter and Jane read p.3 together, Peter pointing to the words. When he reaches the word "forgot" he begins to syllabically point, i.e., he points to 'forgot' and reads "for" and points to 'something' and reads "got." Jane warns him against responding in that way.

Peter continues on to page 4 which reads "Mom! I forgot my book." Again Peter points syllabically when he reaches 'forgot;' and Jane interjects, "You're not done saying the word (forgot) and she shows him how to read it.

On page 5, Peter is about to read "Here it is. Goodbye Lucy." He pauses at 'Here,' and Jane responds, "Where have we seen that word before?" She picks out the book Look for Me from a book with which he is familiar.

"There!" Peter responds.

"Oops!" Jane replies. She points to the word 'here' in Look for Me.

Peter revises his answer, "Here!"

Jane puts away Look for Me and pulls back from Peter who continues to successfully read page 5.

Narrative 1 illustrates how Peter consistently used the specific information that Jane prompted or demonstrated for in order to accomplish the activities successfully. In this case, Jane specifically asked Peter to "remember" both Lucy's persistent exclamation and a word that Peter had seen previously in a familiar book ('Here').

Peter also had numerous opportunities to initiate or maintain the reading act (Code D). This coding was the second, most frequently occurring participation pattern over time. This is not surprising since the Reading Recovery lesson is designed to include opportunities in the reading of familiar books, reading during the running record, and the first reading of the new book. The participation pattern is overtly seen in the reading of familiar books as illustrated in Narrative 2.
Narrative 2

Peter has chosen to read The Monster Sandwich from the fan of books Jane has presented him. This will be the third familiar book he has read since Lesson 8 began. It is a story containing a repetitive directive on what to put on a hero sandwich, e.g., "Put some lettuce on it." Strong picture support allows the reader to predict what should be added to the sandwich next.

As he reads, Peter gazes up to the picture as he begins to read the familiar directive. After he reads, "Put some meat on it," Jane asks him what letter starts the word meat. Peter says 'meat' slowly. Jane repeats the word slowly as well. He responds, "M?"

Jane uncovers the word, 'meat' on the page and asks, "Are you right?"

Peter snorts in agreement and smiles.

Jane invites him to continue to read page 6 which Peter does successfully, "Put some tomatoes on it." After he finishes, he independently goes back to 'tomato' and covers all but the chunk 'to' in the word.

"You find 'to' all the time!" Jane replies enthusiastically.

Peter continues to read without prompt.

In the above narrative, Peter is able to orchestrate the reading process by using a familiar book pattern and strong picture support. He lines up these cues along with his moving finger to successfully read. Even productive interruptions which direct attention to specific print cues such as the ones illustrated above, do not detract from Peter's successful orchestration.

Along with the opportunities to respond to specific teacher prompts (Code A) Peter's opportunities to initiate or maintain the reading act (Code D) were the most numerous participation patterns seen in Peter's intervention program. These patterns will next be explored, in turn, for each part of the Reading Recovery lesson over time. Other participation patterns not seen as frequently yet
particular to a lesson activity will also be highlighted.

Each lesson began with familiar reading of new books. Peter often chose the three books read each lesson from a fast-growing collection of books that had strong picture and repetitive pattern support. Since the books were familiar to Peter, he was able to successfully initiate and orchestrate the reading. If he came to a trouble spot as he read, Jane consistently responded by specifically directing Peter's attention to a specific cue source for his use in reconciling his problem. Sometimes Jane merely told the word to Peter who invariably repeated it and continued. In Lesson Set 3, a participation pattern emerged increasingly wherein Peter was invited to generally choose how he would respond (Code B). Narrative 3 illustrates this new pattern.

Narrative 3

Peter is reading The Pet Hamster, the third familiar book of Lesson 28. It is a nonfiction book with a non-repetitive pattern and strong picture support. The text tells such facts as where a pet hamster lives, what it eats, and when it eats. For Peter, it has been a particularly difficult book from the time it was introduced a few lessons previously. He has stumbled once already and Jane has specifically directed him to the print and how the sentence should sound.

On page 6 (The hamster eats leaves when it gets dark.), Peter reads "The hamster eats leaves with it gets dark." He shakes his head and says, "NO?"

Jane replies, "OK. See if you can fix it.

Peter tries again, reading, "The hamster eats leaves..." He checks the picture and then waits, his finger at the troublesome word. "Wet it gets dark," he says finally.

"What would we say? We wouldn't say it that way. How would we say it?" Jane covers the text with her hand. "Let's just think of the idea." She points to the picture and continues, "It eats the leaves," her voice rising.
"When?" Peter replies, then thinks otherwise. "No!"
Jane then begins a dialogue that forces Peter to check his response, 'when' with his letter-sound correspondence knowledge.

Peter was increasingly given responsibility in the rereading of familiar books to reconcile difficulties he was having. Such prompts as "Try it again," "Fix yourself up," or "Let's just think of the idea" became common teacher prompts. From this general invitations, Peter chose how he would respond (Code B), a choice that Jane often asked him to confirm or disconfirm with more specific prompts (Code 1).

The same participation patterns also occurred in the interactions that followed the Running Record book. In this activity, Peter read the book that had been introduced and read once in the previous lesson. As he read, Jane systematically recorded his oral reading performance. Her only involvement during this time was to infrequently tell Peter a troublesome word. Following the reading, though, Jane returned to specific parts of Peter's performance, confirming or extending what he did. Jane also returned to points in the reading where Peter experienced difficulty and directed his attention to varied cue sources he could use (Code A). Again, as in familiar reading, Jane tended to generally prompt Peter to choose (Code B) how he should respond in Lesson Set 3.

Opportunities to choose a response (Code B) were increasingly seen in the writing part of the Reading Recovery lesson as well. In the beginning of the intervention, Peter generally responded to specific
responses with Jane providing much directed instruction. The following narrative segment is illustrative.

**Narrative 4**

Jane has formulated the sentence that Peter will write for Lesson 8 using his initial responses to her question, "What did you do last night?" Peter replied, "We played."

"Who did?" Jane asked.
"Me and my brother."
"What did you play? What did you play?" Jane continues, leaning in close to him.
"Toys," Peter replies.
"'We played...with the toys? Is that a good one?"
Together the pair begin to write the sentence. Jane conducts a sound analysis of 'we' with Peter announcing that 'y' is the first sound he hears. Jane counters by showing him 'we' in a familiar book.
"M!" Peter shouts and begins to write.
"Whoop!" Jane warns and leans in with the book. "That's not an 'm'. What is it?"
Laughing, Peter replies correctly and finishes writing the word, 'we.'

Peter is invited to write the word a number of times on the writing practice page, after which Jane asks Peter if he hears any sounds in 'played.' Peter responds after a number of slow articulations that he does not, so Jane writes the word in his sentence.

Together they read what has been written thus far, and Jane asks Peter if he knows what 'with' starts with. Peter hesitantly replies, "y?"
"Starts like 'we'," Jane says, slowing articulating the initial letter and pointing to 'we' in his sentence. "What is that letter?"

she continues.
"We...M!" Peter replies. Jane does not respond.
"W!" Peter says.
"W!" Jane laughs. "Write it."

In this example, Peter is in the initial stages of learning how to hear and organize sounds and assign the appropriate letter to represent those sounds. Jane directs Peter's attention to positions of the sounds of words he wants to write as well as the letter referents
used to talk about those sounds. Even the generation of the sentence is guided by Jane's direct prompts. This early response pattern can be contrasted with Peter's responses found in Lesson 28 of Set 3.

Narrative 5

Peter has readily generated the sentence, "They like to eat nuts," referring to the chipmunks he had just read about in his Running Record book. Without prompt, he writes 'they,' in his writing book, spelling each letter as he does so.

Jane directs his attention to the 'th' and then invites him to write 'like' which Peter does so successfully. As he begins to write 'to' he writes the 'o' first and then asks if the 't' should be first.

"Where do you hear it?" Jane replies

Peter says the word slowly. (Code B)

Jane draws Elkonin boxes on the practice page and Peter responds quickly by writing a 't' and than an 'o' in each box without further instruction and copies 'to' into his sentence. Without prompt, Peter proceeds to write 'eat,' stopping after the 'e' is on the paper. Jane assists with the 'a' and Peter finishes the word.

Peter's responses in the above narrative can be characterized as much more independent than in the earlier writing. Direct instruction and guided practice allowed Peter to learn the code to such an extent that he was able to be a more independent writer (code B & D) in later lessons, even questioning his own responses.

This is dramatically seen in Peter's writing samples over time in Figure 8 (below). When Peter first entered the program he only heard and encoded two sounds on the Dictation test of the Diagnostic Survey. His competency with studying and writing the code he would be required to read is documented over time in Figure 8. Of note is the steady increase of words written in every detail and sounds heard.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESSON</th>
<th>SENTENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>We played with the toys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>We were playing ball, and I fell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>They like to eat nuts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- *letter*: Peter heard and encoded the sound.
- *letter number*: Order of sounds heard and encoded.
- *word*: Peter wrote the word without assistance.

**Figure 8.** Peter - Reading Recovery writing samples over time.
Even the responsibility of generating the sentence was taken over by Peter.

Following the lesson's sentence writing, Jane copied Peter's work onto a strip of paper and cut the sentence into pieces. Peter was then invited to reconstruct the sentence. Codings for this part of the lesson are fewer in number as compared to other parts of the lesson given the fact that (a) the cut-up and reconstruction happened quickly and (b) Peter was fairly successful over time with accomplishing the task (Code B & D).

Table 13 summarizes the types of responses Peter made in the new book introduction and first reading. Generally there was a decrease across sets in independent observations (Code C) in the book introductions. In the beginning, Peter would often comment about what he saw in the pictures as Jane introduced the book. As the books became more difficult and Peter was directed toward the print, such observations decreased, though Jane continued to highlight the meaning of the story in her introduction.

The first reading of the new book followed the pattern of interaction that is illustrated above in Narratives 1 and 2 (above). To repeat, Peter assumed control of the reading until he came upon a hard part. At that point, Jane specifically directed Peter's attention to a cue that Peter might use to reconcile his difficulty. Sometimes, Jane simply announced the bothersome word and Peter repeated it, regaining control over the reading. A more extensive description and
analysis of Peter reading novel, continuous text will be given below.

For Peter, learning to read in his intervention program involved responding to teacher prompts throughout the lesson activities. These prompts were directed at a discrete aspect of the reading task such as a letter-sound correspondences or the "sound" of story. Given the purposes of the instructional activities and Jane's prompts, Peter was also given numerous opportunities over time to initiate or maintain the reading and writing act. Similar response patterns were also seen in his classroom reading group.

Peter Learns to Read in the Classroom Reading Group

Peter daily received reading instruction in the classroom along with Jane's instruction in Reading Recovery. Activities such as completion of a workbook page or reading of a basal story consistently occurred over time.

As in Reading Recovery, Peter was consistently invited into the group's activities. He was a ready, if not over-ready, participant. Table 14 summarizes the codings assigned to the classroom reading group observations. (Limited observations of Peter's work within his reading group were made in Lesson Set 1 due to the concentration on Daniel's responses). Overall there are fewer codings for Peter when compared to codings in his intervention program. This is not surprising since Peter was working in a group situation where time and "airspace" had to be shared with six to seven other children. Nonetheless, a
### Table 14

**Peter - Frequency of Code Responses to Activities in Reading Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Lesson Set 1 (9-21)</th>
<th>Lesson Set 2 (11-08)</th>
<th>Lesson Set 3 (11-28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A  B  C  D  E</td>
<td>A  B  C  D  E</td>
<td>A  B  C  D  E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workbook Pages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7  2  3  3  0</td>
<td>14 1  2  0  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading of Basal Stories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7  1  4  11 11</td>
<td>4  0  2  4  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14 3  7  14 0</td>
<td>18 1  4  4  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>37  8  18  37  0</td>
<td>64 4  14  14  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.** Limited observations, codes taken from field notes. A = Student responds to a specific prompt directed at a discrete aspect of the reading/writing act, B = Student selects response to a general teacher prompt, C = Student initiates an observation or use of a discrete aspect of the reading act, D = Student initiates or maintains the reading/writing act, E = Student attempts to control the lesson beyond the instructional agenda.
dominant response pattern emerged over time.

Peter's general response patterns involved responding to specific teacher prompts to a discrete aspect of the reading act. Narrative 6 (below) illustrates the typical pattern of response for Peter when he was participating in the group completion of the workbook page.

Narrative 6

The reading group is completing a workbook page which accompanies stories in preprimer 2 of the basal series used in the classroom. The page deals with cause and effect relationships. A number of pictures are listed in two columns. In the first column, people are depicted performing activities whose causes are depicted in the second column. The students must choose a cause from the second column and write its letter identifier in the first column space.

Barb has asked various children to describe the pictures in each column and then proceeds to the activity.

"Let's go to picture one," she directs. "A little girl is riding her bike." Peter's hand shoots up. "Why is she riding a bike?"

Barb nods her head to Peter.

"Because her friends gave it to her," he replies.

"Because her friends gave it to her," Barb repeats. "So you have to put what letter..."

"A!" Peter interrupts.

"C!" Larry counters.

"You have to letter 'c' with picture one. Why? Because the little girl probably just got a bike for her birthday.

The students write a 'c' into the first blank as Barb continues. "OK. Picture two. Let's listen to Daniel. Daniel, a boy and a girl are doing dishes. Why are they doing the dishes?"

Peter quickly writes in the proper answer and interjects,

"Because they're..."

"Peter, let's let Daniel have a turn, OK?" Barb replies.

Again it is not surprising that Peter generally participated in his reading group by responding to specific prompts. Since Barb designed activities that promoted reading skill-building, her prompts
and Peter's responses generally revolved around those discrete aspects. Completion of workbook pages or teacher handouts promoted the type of response pattern illustrated above. In the above narrative, Peter also participated even when not nominated to do so. He often shared "airspace" with others who were attempting to respond to Barb's specific prompts.

There were opportunities, though, when Peter was able to "put it together" by reading continuous text. These opportunities occurred during the reading of basal stories.

Narrative 7

Barb is directing the group to prepare for the fourth activity of the day's instructional group, the reading of a basal story. She distributes the story books and asks the children to open their books to the Table of Contents and then to the new story.

Peter points to the frog on the front cover and asks, "Is that Mortimer?"
As the other children find the story, Peter quickly opens his book to the designated story and begins to quietly read.
"Excuse me, Peter. Before you start reading, I'd like you to read the title. Let's listen to Peter read the story. The name of our story is?"
Peter answers the prompt and proceeds to read beyond the title (Code D) without further direction. Peter reads the first page of "The Surprise" (HBJ, 1987). It is a story about Meg who brings her frog to school to share with her classmates. Peter reads up to the text, 'What do you have, Meg.' He pauses at the word 'what'.
Barb interjects /w/ (Code 1).
"What," (Code A) Peter continues. As he finishes the last line he makes two errors which maintain the meaning of the story, and Barb does not interrupt.
"And Meg has a little box," Barb begins as Peter finishes.
"Mortimer!" Peter predicts.
"But does Mrs. Less know right now that that's Mortimer? No! OK. Let's turn the page. Lydia, I like the way your hand is up.
Lydia mistakenly begins to read the right-hand page. Peter stops her by pointing to the left page print. As Lydia reads, Peter watches Lydia read as if he's listening to a story.

Peter readily read and sought opportunities to read the basal story. He invariably volunteered to read, even after his turn was over and often assisted those around him when their turn began by telling them a troublesome word or showing them where to begin, as illustrated in Narrative 7 (above). A more detailed analysis of Peter reading novel, continuous text is give below.

Of interest in Table 14 (above) which summarizes Peter's response patterns in the classroom is the consistent pattern of Peter initiating an observation about a discrete aspect of the whole reading task (Code C). As in Narrative 7 (above), Peter often commented about the pictures in basal stories. These comments parallel similar observations made in his intervention program. Peter also made independent observations during workbook activities as Narrative 8 illustrates.

Narrative 8
The group is completing a workbook page that contains four sentences. Each sentence has a blank space. In this cloze procedure, the children must read the sentence and choose from a pool of two words which word best completes the sentence.

Josh reads the first sentence ("Come and see Mortimer __," said Meg). Peter shouts out the answer, 'hop.' Barb cautions Peter that he must wait his turn and then asks the children to "try out" the other option (run).

Without prompt Peter observes, "Frogs can't run." (Code C) Peter desperately wants to try the next one, even verbally calling out his willingness, his hand raised. Essie, though, is nominated to read the second sentence (Sam said, "I ___ like
frogs.

Betsy hesitates on the first word and Peter, who is also considering it articulates what he thinks are the first sounds /sh/ (Code C).

Throughout reading group activities, Peter independently made observations about the items the group was considering. Often these observations revolved around a picture in the basal story or in a workbook page. Sometimes, as in Narrative 8 (above), he also independently explored the "code."

In summary, Peter was an active, willing participant in reading group activities throughout the observation time. He was generally successful in responding to specific prompts as well as reading broad stretches of text. Peter sought to explore and demonstrate his proficiency with the group tasks even if he was not called upon to do so.

Similar response patterns were seen for Peter in either instructional setting. Though different activities and routines were implemented, Peter's participation in those activities consistently involved responding to specific teacher prompts (Code A) and initiating and/or maintaining the reading act (Code D). Unlike Peter, Daniel, who will be considered next, had varied patterns of responses depending on what instructional setting he was in.

Daniel Learns to Read in Reading Recovery

Daniel received instruction in both his intervention program and the classroom reading group. Throughout each daily lesson, Daniel
was consistently invited by me to participate in the daily activities of each Reading Recovery lesson. In previewing his acceptance of those invitations as summarized in Table 15 (below) Daniel's response patterns can be characterized as "competency waiting to be discovered by the teacher." Daniel came into the program at the higher end of the Reading Recovery at-risk continuum as defined by the Diagnostic Survey. In considering the results of the survey, Daniel appeared on paper to have many reading strengths with which to enter his intervention program. Such abilities as being able to hear, organize, and encode many sounds in words, identifying most letter forms by their referent names, and writing a few words were encouraging to me as we entered into instruction together. More important, Daniel controlled many concepts about how books worked such as the ability to orient himself physically to the text and demonstrating how print moved across the page. When Reading Recovery lessons began, though, these emerging strengths seemed to be concealed by student behaviors.

Unlike Peter, a prevalent code found in each representative lesson for Daniel was the code describing behavior that attempted to control the lesson beyond the instructional agenda (Code E). Often that control involved a refusal to participate in the instructional activities or respond to the prompts as illustrated in Narrative 9.
Table 15
Daniel - Frequency of Code Responses to Activities in Reading Recovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Lesson 8 (10-17)</th>
<th>Lesson 19 (11-17)</th>
<th>Lesson 28 (11-28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A    B    C    D</td>
<td>A    B    C    D</td>
<td>A    B    C    D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar reading</td>
<td>9  1  4  15  7</td>
<td>2  2  5  6  0</td>
<td>2  3  0  12  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running Record</td>
<td>0  1  4  3  2</td>
<td>4  5  3  3  0</td>
<td>1  3  0  2  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Writing</td>
<td>14  6  11  0  0</td>
<td>11  12  2  12  1</td>
<td>15  10  4  5  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut-Up &amp; Reconstruction</td>
<td>2  1  0  0  3</td>
<td>2  4  1  0  0</td>
<td>1  2  1  0  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>9  0  4  1  0</td>
<td>7  1  5  1  0</td>
<td>8  0  1  1  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>1  2  0  4  2</td>
<td>8  15  0  24  2</td>
<td>5  13  0  5  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35  11  23  23  14</td>
<td>34  39  16  46  3</td>
<td>32  31  6  25  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>33  10  22  22  13</td>
<td>25  28  12  33  2</td>
<td>32  31  6  25  5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. A = Student responds to a specific prompt directed at a discrete aspect of the reading/writing act, B = Student selects response to a general teacher prompt, C = Student initiates an observation or use of a discrete aspect of the reading act, D = Student initiates or maintains the reading/writing act, E = Student attempts to control the lesson beyond the instructional agenda.
Narrative 9

Daniel has been given a choice of books to read in his familiar reading which starts off Lesson 13. He responds, "I'm a bit too cold." The window in the nurse's office where we worked was opened, so I closed it.

On returning to my seat I again invite him to pick a book he'd like to read. "I have a headache," he answered sternly. "It hurts so much I don't want to talk."

After picking a book for him, I invite him to start reading even suggesting that I read one page and he read the other. I begin to read and stop, waiting for him to join in which he does not do.

It is already a number of minutes into the lesson and we have not even begun. I decide to take him back to the classroom and tell Barb that he is complaining of a headache. On his return to the classroom, Daniel immediately goes to his desk and resumes coloring a picture he was working on when I picked him up to work.

Barb asks me to wait a minute and quietly talks to Daniel. Soon he comes back to the classroom door and returns with me to the nurse's room where he informs me "My nose it too runny," when I invite him to read again.

I get him a kleenex and he finally begins to read. I later asked Barb what she had said to him in the classroom. She responded that she insisted he cooperate with me, that I came every day just to work with him, and that he would work with me.

Daniel often had a reason for putting off the instructional activities. Headaches, bathroom needs, runny noses, or explicit demands to do different activities were common in the beginning.

The frequency of Code E as summarized in Table 15 (above) indicates these behaviors decreased over time. This is due to the teacher insistence that choice would be given within each activity and not between activities of the Reading Recovery lesson. In essence, Daniel learned to do Reading Recovery lessons.
As the decrease in Code E occurred over time a corresponding increase in Code B occurred as well. With a general teacher prompt, Daniel increasingly and willingly chose how to respond to a reading or writing task. This was especially evident in the first reading of a lesson's new book.

Narrative 10

The Fox and the Crow (Biro, 1983), a Level 15 book in the booklist, had been introduced in Lesson 32. I had discussed the front cover and Daniel immediately read the title without assistance. After reviewing the story line of this retelling of Aesop's fable, and emphasizing the trickster fox's language at the book's climax, I turn the book over to Daniel.

Daniel immediately begins reading page two, "One day a crow found some cheese and flew into a tree." On the word 'flew', Daniel waits and then attempts the word. "/fiilil/, Fillah". "Try that again (the sentence) and think what would match the picture. What would sound right there and match the picture?" I respond.

Daniel repeats the sentence from the beginning. Upon arriving at 'flew' he asks "and then what?" (Code B)

I insist he try something, which he does /fl/ and together we say the word 'flew'. I ask him to begin the sentence again and he proceeds on to read page 3 (A hungry fox saw him.) On 'saw', Daniel waits and tries a bit of it /ss/. He rereads and stops again. I ask him to reread and when he gets to the troublesome word to try something which he does, 'said'. He self-corrects when I invite him to reread the sentence again, using his initial attempt 'said' in the overall sentence.

As his competency was displayed, Daniel was increasingly invited to choose how he would reconcile his questions or problems during the lessons' activities, given general prompts from me. Also increasing over time was Daniel's willingness to initiate or maintain the reading act (Code D). This is especially seen in the increase of Code D between Lesson Set 1 and Set 2 in Table 15 (above) in the
reading of the lesson's new book. This increase will be explored later in the section.

Like Peter, there was a steady decrease in Daniel's independent observations over the lessons' tasks. Most of these observations centered around a book's picture or character. As Daniel was increasingly directed to the print, the observations continued, though their frequency declined. Over time, the instructional scaffold directed Daniel's attention to other cue sources he could use as he read, such as the print, and his observations about the pictures or characters were quickly integrated into teacher-directed attention to other cues.

Generally, Daniel's increasingly responded successfully to general teacher prompts (Code B) with a steady increase in attempts to initiate and maintain the reading act observed as well (Code D). A steady decrease in diversionary behavior (Code E) was also documented. These general patterns of response will next be described for each lesson activity. Other participation patterns not seen as frequently yet particular to each lesson activity will also be highlighted.

Each lesson began with familiar book reading. Two books were usually read in any lesson. Because of his familiarity with both the language and concepts contained within the books, Daniel was able to successfully initiate and orchestrate the reading (Code D). In the beginning of the intervention, there were a higher number of times
when he was asked to respond to a specific teacher prompt directed at a discrete aspect of the reading.

Narrative 11

In lesson 13, Daniel is reading the second familiar book entitled *Along Comes Jake* (Cowley, 1987). It is a story of family members who help each other until the youngest, Jake, comes along and messes things up.

Daniel successfully initiates and maintains the reading of the book (Code D). After page five, I ask him what he would do if Jake spilled his paint. Daniel replied (Code A), "I'd spank him."

He continues to read successfully, self-correcting 'mom' for 'dad' on p.11. The strong picture support allowed him to do so, yet after his successful reading I push him to explain why the word 'mom' would not fit given the print on the page, i.e., to cross-check the picture with the print.

"How did you know (to self-correct)," I asked.
"This is. This is 'mom'," he replies, pointing to the word on the opposite page. "Two 'm's."
"And there was no 'm' there ('dad') was there?
"Yea," he agrees.

Questions about the meaning of the story, letter-sound correspondences, his one-to-one correspondence, or strategy work were dealt with explicitly in the familiar reading in the earlier set. This explicit attention decreased over time as Daniel took more responsibility to initiate and maintain the reading act or initiate any observations he might make.

The Running Record of the previous day's new book was conducted next, and the number of codings across lesson sets (see Table 15, above) suggests that interaction surrounding Daniel's reading of this book were minimal. Any interaction usually involved confirmation or explicit talk of strategic work that Daniel initiated.
Narrative 12
Daniel has just finished reading *The Red Rose* (Cowley, 1983) in Lesson 21 with 98% accuracy and a self-correction rate of 1:3. I returned to a few of the self-corrections to confirm what he had done and to get him talking about how he did it.

On p. 15, I asked him to show me which part gave him trouble in the previous reading. Daniel pointed to the first line of text that read "Mr. Singh went to Mrs. Singh." "I forgot about this," he replied as he pointed to 'went'.

"But you know what?" I answered. "You tried a little bit of it, and that's what good readers do. You said, 'Mr. Singh and then you said /w/ went!' Because you were thinking about the story."

I next ask him to read p.8 (Mr. Singh went outside.) Daniel had originally read, "Mr. Singh went out."

"Something's wrong on this page," I prompt him to read. "I said, 'went!'"

"I know you did," I reply, "but that's not what the trouble is. Put your finger up there.
Daniel reads, "Mr Singh went out...side!"
We quickly review the parts of the word, Daniel demonstrating which part says 'out' and which one says 'side'.

Given the fact that Daniel's accuracy rates for the running records tended to fall above 95%, he generally was reading in his easy range of text difficulty over time. Hence, interactions following the running record were quick and tended to confirm or make explicit the strategic work he originally accomplished.

As with Peter, Codes B & D increased over time in Daniel's writing of his daily sentence, i.e., Daniel increasingly and successfully controlled the generating and writing of the sentence with a general teacher prompt or from his own initiative. Figure 9 (below) illustrates this, showing the increased number of words per sentence written over time, and words written independently. Since he controlled
### DANIEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESSON</th>
<th>SENTENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pumpkins say boo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 23456 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>It is going to be a skyscraper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Some of those are trucks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- **letter** = Daniel heard and encoded these sounds.
- **letter number** = Order of sounds heard and encoded.
- **word** = Daniel wrote these words independently.

**Figure 9.** Daniel - Reading Recovery writing samples over time.
much sound-letter correspondence knowledge when he first entered the program, there is not such a dramatic increase in sounds heard, organized, and encoded as there was with Peter. Given his initial control in writing along with additional directed instruction and general invitations to choose a response, Daniel was able to progress further as a writer. This writing progress is illustrated in Narrative 13 and 14 below.

Narrative 13
Daniel has decided to co-write the sentence, "Pumpkins say 'boo'." He informs me he hears two p's (Code A) when I ask him to say the word 'pumpkin' slowly. He writes the first 'p' and I follow by writing 'um' and hand him his marker back. He writes the second 'p'.
Playing off of my slow articulation of the word, Daniel informs me he hears a 'k' or a 'c' next in the word 'pumpkins' (Code A). He puts the 'k' and then informs me the next letter is 'i' (Code C), and he is invited to write the 'i'.
Again he plays off my slow articulation of the word to hear and encode the 'n' (Code A) and follows this immediately with an 's' (Code D).
After much sound analysis with Elkonin boxes and pennies for the word 'say' Daniel only hears and encodes the 's'. He insists he hears a 'yuh' in the final position, but this is due to his articulation of the word. I provide the 'ay' and he copies the word 'say' into his story.
He rereads his sentence and writes the next word, 'boo' at my invitation.

Narrative 14
In Lesson 21, Daniel elects to continue his story about a new building that was being built in his hometown of NYC. He generates a sentence for the story, "It will be a skyscraper."
Handing him a marker I say, "You know, 'it'."
He writes 't' in the upper hand corner of the writing page and then exclaims "Ooops!" Squeezing an 'l' to the left of the 't' he fixes up his problem and then announces, "Ha-ha-ha."
I produce the post-it tape and put a piece over his effort. He rewrites 'It' to his satisfaction and waits.
"What comes next?" I ask.
He responds slowly, "iiiissssss" (Code B) and writes 'Is' (Code D) into his story. I tell him that something is wrong and he quickly signals out his capital 'I' which he fixes after I tape over it.
Again I prompt him to reread and he independently writes 'go' and then 'ing'. Proceeding without prompt he writes 'to' (Code D) and then produces 'Be'. "Uuuggh," he exclaims, referring to the capital letter.

The two narratives (above) dramatically illustrate the shift that Daniel made in the control of his writing over a relatively short time. Though there was direct responding (Code A) to my prompts, the frequency of these codes remained static overtime. It was concluded that his increasing competence was more a direct result of his being invited to choose from many known responses rather than directly responding to explicit teaching. The increase in Code B (see Table 15, above) across lesson sets appears to bear this out. I became aware that in the writing part of the lesson, discovering what Daniel could do was more a priority than teaching him what to do, since he rarely volunteered this knowledge or quickly responded he didn't know something he was being asked to write. Simply, he didn't need much direct instruction, but the opportunity to use what he knew independently or in conjunction with my general invitations.

The cut-up and reconstruction of his daily sentence happened quickly. Frequency of responses were few and stable across time. Daniel successfully read the words of his sentence which I had copied onto a strip of paper. He did so as I cut each word off the strip and then proceeded to reconstruct the scattered pieces. Often he did so
silently or told me another story as he did it.

Narrative 15

During Lesson 21 I copy Daniel's sentence onto a strip of paper (It is going to be a skyscraper). Daniel successfully reads each word as I cut it off the strip. When I get to the word 'going' I ask Daniel, "Now I want to split that. Where should I do it?"

"Right here." Daniel indicates the space between 'go' and 'ing'. The cut-up procedure continues.

"I want to split this one, too," I say referring to 'skyscraper'. Tell me where.

"Right between the 'r' and the 'c'," he responds.

"Uh-umm," I caution. "Show me 'sky'."

Daniel does so and the cutting continues. During the cut-up procedure, Daniel attempts to order the words as they drop off the page. Laughing, I mix them up as the cutting ceases.

Daniel reconstructs the sentence quickly, telling me another story as he does so. "My sister and my th af s eight year old and made up that part, ahhhh. She made it as a tale, and called it Pip Squeak."

"Are you right?" I ask of his effort.

"Yea."

"Read it," I prompt.

Generally, Daniel's response to this activity tended to be independent, constrained only by the routines established for the cut-up sentence. Once again, Daniel seemed very fluent and at ease with the activity, so fluent in fact that he could reconstruct the sentence and tell another story at the same time! I was soon to discover that a similar ease was waiting to surface in the introduction and reading of his new book.

The response pattern that increased over time in the new book lesson component was Daniel's chosen response to a general teacher prompt. As illustrated in Narrative 10 (above) this increase surfaced with (a) Daniel's willingness to display what he knew and (b) my
allowance for that display to surface. A description of this emerging
dynamic will be elaborated on later in this section.

For Daniel, learning to read involved first learning how to do
Reading Recovery lessons, i.e., the rules and norms that made up the
basic routines between and within the activities had to be followed.
Once learned, Daniel was increasingly invited in to the lesson parts,
choosing and displaying his emerging competence to general teacher
prompts. Flashes of competence became more frequent as time went
on, and these observed "flashes" became the foundation for a shifts in
teaching prompts as well as shifts in how Daniel responded. Similar
flashes, though, were not observed in the reading group, the setting
which will next be considered.

Daniel Learns to Read in the Classroom

Daniel also daily received instruction in his classroom reading
group, joining Peter and other low-progress readers in activities
designed to teach specific reading skills. Table 16 (below)
summarizes the codes assigned to Daniel's response patterns over
time to these activities. Like Peter, the frequency of codes is much
lower than codings counted in the representative Reading Recovery
lessons. The group situation mandated shared "airspace" and
opportunities to display knowledge.
### Table 16

**Daniel - Frequency of Code Responses to Activities in Reading Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Lesson Set 1 (9-29)</th>
<th>Lesson Set 2 (11-08)</th>
<th>Lesson Set 3 (11-28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workbook Pages</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading of Basal Stories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.** A = Student responds to a specific prompt directed at a discrete aspect of the reading/writing act, B = Student selects response to a general teacher prompt, C = Student initiates an observation or use of a discrete aspect of the reading act, D = Student initiates or maintains the reading/writing act, E = Student attempts to control the lesson beyond the instructional agenda.
The prevalence of Code A (It comprised almost one-half of the codings in Set 1 - Set 3) was also noted for Daniel as well. Most of his responses were shaped by teacher prompts directed at a discrete aspect of the reading task. This is especially evident in the completion of the workbook pages.

Narrative 16

Barb and the group are completing a workbook page in late September. It is the second activity of the twenty-six minute instructional agenda. The purpose of the front side of the page is to hear and encode the ending sound (/p/ or /t/) of the pictured objects.

The group choruses the answer as Barb slowly articulates what each picture is. Daniel plays off of this articulation and writes in the letter as the students chorus the answer. He does not join the chorus but silently proceeds through each item.

After a brief discussion with the group on why pictures are important to use when reading, Barb instructs the children to turn over the workbook page and consider, in turn, the pictures on the left hand side of the page. Next to each picture are two sentences, one which describes the picture, the other, a detractor.

Barb begins the activity. "So we're going to start with Daniel and Daniel is going to tell us about the picture. Daniel, tell us...tell us about it...Who do you see in the first picture?"

Another student choruses in.

"OK," Barb replies, "but let's have Daniel tell us. "Who do you see?" she continues, looking at Daniel.

Daniel repeats answer he heard (Code A).

"And what are they doing?" Barb replies.

"They are rowing a boat," Daniel says (Code A).

Barb repeats his answer and then asks him if they are having a good time.

Daniel simply shakes his head, no (Code A).

Another student is nominated in a "round robin" fashion to read the picture's accompanying sentences and the one sentence that needs to be underlined.

The routine continues, and Daniel is asked to read the last sentence on the page (The dog is little). "The dog is..." There is a long pause.

"/L/" Barb prompts

"Little," Daniel replies (Code A).
"OK," Barb replies. "Very good. Was the dog little?"
"NO!" the students chorus in. Daniel remains silent.

Daniel consistently sat on the right of Barb, and he was generally nominated to begin any activity. As Narrative 20 illustrates, Daniel sometimes answered Barb's questions and followed along with the group's activities. Unlike Peter, though, Daniel seemed content to be a "silent partner" in the instructional interaction, only hesitantly answering when directly nominated to do so.

Daniel also refused invitations to participate (Code E). This response pattern was frequently noted in reading group observations of Set 2 (see Table 16, above).

Narrative 17
It is late November and the group has just silently read a mimeo practice reading booklet. Each page of the booklet had a sentence containing a contraction.

Barb begins the read aloud which always followed the silent reading. "Who would like to read our first page? Let's start with Daniel." She places her hands on her shoulder and then turns to help another group member.

Peter has exuberantly raised his hand and upon hearing the nomination replies, "Awww."

"OK Daniel? Loudly, clearly, and proudly," Barb continues assisting another group member to ready his book.

Daniel is staring at Barb. Peter, who is sitting next to Daniel, leans in and shows Daniel where to start reading. Daniel pushes Peter's pencil away and gives a mean look to him.

"It's right here," Peter persists, pointing to the starting place again.

"He's bothering me," Daniel says to Barb.

"OK, Peter," Barb cautions.

Peter looks at her, resigned.

"I don't want to do this," Daniel says in a plaintive voice.

Barb waits a beat and then continues. "OK. Peter, would you like to read the first page?"
Over time, Daniel's refusal to participate declined, though the decline was not steady. As in the case above, Barb allowed Daniel to refuse, though at other times she insisted he participate.

Daniel seemed content to remain a silent group member, practically unnoticed by the teacher. Though he often responded when nominated, his responses were succinct answers (Code A) to the teacher's questions. It was only when he was involved in the reading of the basal story that Daniel initiated and maintained the reading act.

Narrative 18

In early March, Daniel and the group are about to read another primer story. It is the second activity of the 30 minute group lesson. Barb distributes the readers and asks the children to open to the "The Little Red Lighthouse."

Immediately Daniel opens to the Table of Contents and begins to scan the titles (Code D).

Many group members are questioning what page they should turn to. Barb responds, "I like how Daniel opened up to the Table of Contents. Let's watch Daniel. He looked for the title."

Without pausing Daniel finds the appropriate page number and flips the primer open to the new story.

A student is nominated to read the first page and as she does so, Daniel appears to be following along, alternating scanning the pictures and the print.

Daniel is nominated to read the third page of the eight page story. He willingly begins and reads the twenty-eight words fluently without pause. He does not use his finger to assist him.

When he finishes, Barb nominates another student, and Daniel follows along, even reading ahead of the nominated students to the end of the story (Code D). He uses his finger intermittently.
The video tapes of the classroom reading group allowed Daniel's initiatives to be explored thoroughly. These initiatives, as exemplified above, provide clues as to the competencies that Daniel had used. Though not a vocal participant of the group, Daniel, nonetheless, still displayed what he knew. He did so increasingly and successfully "in the wings, off center stage."

The next part of the analysis will describe the nature of the competency and how both Daniel's and Peter's displays were accommodated by their teachers.

Peter Reads New Text

The previous description of Peter's participation patterns in both instructional settings paralleled each other. Generally, he was always very excited to read and be an active member of the instruction. He seemed to succeed with specific teacher prompts and willingly initiated or maintained the reading act. The present section contains descriptions of Peter's attempts to read new, continuous text.

Table 17 (below) summarizes the percentages of various student responses Peter made while engaged in the reading of new, continuous text over time in each instructional setting. Observations were gathered and coded in the three lesson sets as described earlier in this chapter. In each lesson set, incidences of Peter's reading of continuous text were gathered and coded for both Reading Recovery and the classroom reading group.
### Table 17

**Peter - Responses * to the Reading of Novel, Continuous Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Response Code</th>
<th>Set 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Set 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Set 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>57.66</td>
<td>42.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>36.07</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>30.84</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>45.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.** * Recorded at percentage of total responses coded. Frequency chart in Appendix E. RR = Reading Recovery  RG = Reading Group  A = Student responds to a specific prompt directed at a discrete aspect of the reading/writing act, B = Student selects response to a general teacher prompt, C = Student initiates an observation or use of a discrete aspect of the reading act, D = Student initiates or maintains the reading/writing act, E = Student attempts to control the lesson beyond the instructional agenda.
The same response patterns seen in the overall instructional settings' activities also were seen when Peter read new text. One of the most prominent codings was a response to a specific teacher prompt during the reading (Code A). Over time, the dramatic increase of specific prompts directed at a discrete aspect of the reading task which was followed by a student response was especially seen in Reading Recovery. When Peter began the program he read many patterned books with strong picture support, both features which he used well. Increasingly, these features' prominence were lessened and Peter had to pay closer attention to the print. This is illustrated in the following narratives.

Narrative 19
During Lesson 10 in late October, Jane is introducing the new book No, No. It is a patterned book that tells of a little girl who asks various animals to "Come and talk to me," to which the animals respond, "No, a (animal) is after me."

From the moment Jane puts the book between Peter and herself, Peter initiates attempts to take over. He reads the book's title without prompt and is actively involved in asking questions and predicting what the story will be about.

On the first page where the pattern is established, Jane asks Peter to compare 'come' to the 'come' in a previously read familiar book.

With much head bobbing between books, Peter responds "Come!" (Code A). With that, he proceeds to point and read without prompt. Jane quickly pulls out and lets him continue, the introduction, in essence, becoming the first reading.

The reading continues with Peter using the pattern he has established and the pictures on the first two pages. Jane emphasizes "after" before Peter reads it for the first time.

"Let's look at the picture. What's AFTER him?" Peter responds, "Him! (points) Bug!"

"What's trying to get the bug? Something's AF..." "Bird!"
Together the pair read page 4 with Peter pausing on the word 'after.' Again, Jane emphasizes the word. "Uh-humm," she continues. "That's what he just said. He can't talk to the girl because 'A bird is AFTER me.'"

As the first reading continues, Peter invariably pauses on the word 'after.' Jane responds by telling and reemphasizing the word in the overall pattern and in her questions, to no avail.

Later in the book, Peter begins to substitute 'chasing' for 'after' in order to keep the reading going. ("No, no. A dog is chasing me.")

Even though Peter has trouble with the word 'after' in this early, first reading, his responses can be characterized as successful problem-solving. He attempts to reconcile any difficulties he's having by looking at the picture or substituting a meaningful, consistent word for the troublesome word, 'after.' With specific prompts from Jane, he tries to use the word 'after.' This early attempt at new text can be compared to another, later attempt in Set 3.

Narrative 20

One month later in Lesson 30, Peter has been introduced to Two Little Dogs. It is also a patterned story that concerns a pair of puppies who escape their house and run after various animals until a big dog chases them back home.

Following her introduction which emphasized some of the patterned, book language, and the pictures, Jane resets the book and invites Peter to read page 2. (Look! The door's open)

With his finger, Peter begins, "Look! The door..."

"Doors" Jane emphasizes, using her finger to sweep across the word.

"O" Peter continues to read, his finger on the word, 'open.' He stops and looks to page 3, then returns to the troublesome word.

Jane leans in and points to 'open.' "The door's o..."

"Open!" Peter shouts.

"OK! Say the whole word," Jane replies.

"Open!"

"What's he say?" Jane continues, pointing to the next dog who is depicted as saying, "That's good."
Peter continues pointing. "What's go..." He stops and looks at Jane, then back down to the print. "You already told me that word," Jane replies pointing to 'good.'

Also pointing, Peter responds, "Go...Good!"

"OK. Now, what's he going to say?"

Peter returns to the word "that's" and replies, "this?"

"This good?" Jane asks. "No, but it starts like 'this."

The first reading continues with Peter taking control after the pattern is first established. As soon as the pattern changes, though, there is trouble, and Peter responds by attempting something that resembles the word or waits. Jane replies by recalling the story line or language and pointing out letter-sound relationships or the same word in a different book that Peter had previously read. Peter uses these prompts tentatively and doesn't seem to carry them over to new pages as he reads.

With the increase in responses to teacher prompts, there is a corresponding decrease in opportunities for Peter to initiate or maintain the reading of new text (Code D). The patterned texts and supportive illustrations in the beginning of the intervention program allowed Peter to be more of an independent reader. The scaffold of the book joined the scaffolding of the teacher, thus allowing Peter to independently read. When the books offered Peter shifted to using less pattern and picture support, Jane was forced to come in with more specific prompts dealing with the printed code as illustrated above in Narrative 20. This set up a routine that was increasingly observed in Reading Recovery lessons: (a) Peter reads up to a troublesome word. (b) Peter silently scans the text and pictures or attempts to reconcile his difficulty by attempting the word. Sometimes he orally rereads and self-correction. (c) Jane intervenes with a specific prompt for Peter to consider such as the "sound" of
what he's read, the story line, or, as in the case above, links to previously read words. (d) Peter uses the supportive prompts and continues reading.

The silent scan response was also prevalent from the beginning when Peter read new text in the reading group. Rarely appealing for help, Peter quickly scanned the page, searching, it seemed, for something to assist him onward.

Narrative 21

In early November, the reading group is reading "Mortimer Hops" from the HBJ (1987) preprimer Mortimer Frog. The six students have been nominated to each read a page of the basal story in a "round robin" fashion. Peter is the third student to read. Prior to his turn, he has anxiously wanted to read, even though it wasn't his turn. As the student before him read, Peter assisted her three times at points of trouble by telling her the word upon which she was stalled.

Peter is nominated to read the following:
"Look at Mortimer hop!" said Rita. Mortimer can take big hops."
"Mortimer likes to hop. I think Mortimer likes it here," said Todd.
"I do, too," said Meg.

Peter begins, using his pencil to point. "Like," he says tentatively, then waits.
"Is that 'like'? Take a look at that again," Barb prompts.
"LOOK!" Peter replies and continues reading successfully until he comes to the word 'think'. He waits and scans the page, then repeats the previous word, 'I'.
"Nice and loud," Barb says. "That's a new word that makes our tongue come out," she prompts.
"Thinks," Peter replies, continuing to read, "Mortimer likes it..." Again, he scans silently.
Barb points to the beginning of the sentence and invites Peter to start again.
Peter does so. "I thought Mortimer..."
"Likes," Barb replies.
"Likes it..." Peter pause and checks the picture.
"Here," Barb interjects, telling the word. "Here," Peter repeats and continues on to the end of the passage.

There was wait time on Barb's part before she intervened with a specific prompt. Prior to that, Peter silently searched the page and print. As time went on in the reading group, the silent scanning decreased and Peter took oral action to reconcile any difficulties.

Narrative 21 (above) can also be used to illustrate the prevalence of another consistent response that was observed in the reading group over time. Peter always responded to a specific teacher prompt. In the narrative, above, Peter's response was to repeat the word his teacher had told him and then continue on. This repetition of input from the teacher or other group members was very prevalent in Lesson Set 2 but decreased dramatically in Lesson Set 3. This is not surprising, since Peter did not need such assistance as time went on. Besides repeating others' input, Peter was also adept at answering the questions that Barb usually asked at the end of a reading page.

The increase in Peter's independent observations (Code C) during the reading of novel text in Lesson Set 2 did not occur as Peter read but while other students were reading. His observations were often silent consideration of the pictures that were upcoming in the story. This behavior was not observed at much in Lesson Sets 1 and 3 and, hence, must be considered as an interesting, but short-lived response on Peter's part.
In summary, as Peter read novel, continuous text in reading group lessons, the two most dominant forms of participation were (a) responding to specific prompts directed at a discrete aspect of the reading task and (b) initiating or maintaining the reading act. Of note for Peter was his consistent response of silently scanning the pages upon which he had faltered in his reading. This happened over time in both settings. That scan was answered with specific prompts from both Jane and Barb. Peter used those prompts and continued on until the act broke down again.

As in the other reading group activities, Peter was actively engaged in the reading of novel, continuous text. Of note was what appeared to be his intense desire to participate even when it wasn't his "turn." This intensity was not observed to such a degree in Daniel who's responses to oral text will be considered next.

Daniel Reads New Text

As described above, Daniel often refused or negotiated a role in his instructional activities. In the intervention program, Daniel was required to follow the rules and norms of the lessons' basic routines. Once learned, Daniel was increasingly able to display his emerging competence, even to general teacher prompts. His hesitancy in being involved with the group activities was also observed in the classroom. In Lessons Set 1 and 2, Daniel had the option to decline an invitation from his teacher, though such declinations were less noted as time
went on. Close observation of Daniel during the group time revealed that he increasingly, though silently, participated in the group activities.

Table 18 (below) summarizes the codings which describe Daniel's responses during the reading of continuous text in both instructional settings. The percentages of response patterns to novel text over time follow the same patterns of responses found for most activities he experienced in Reading Recovery and the classroom. Unlike Peter, Daniel's patterns of response during the reading of novel text shifted dramatically during the observation time in both instructional settings, and this section seeks to describe that shift.

The percentages of varied responses to novel, continuous text in Table 18 (below) indicate that Daniel had steady opportunities to initiate and maintain the reading act when he read novel, continuous text in Reading Recovery. Opportunities to respond to specific teacher prompts also remained stable during the teaching time. Of note is the dramatic decrease in diversionary behavior (Code E) from Lesson Set 2 to Lesson Set 3. This decrease was coupled with a corresponding increase in successful responding to general teacher prompts. This is not to suggest that once Daniel complied with my expectations, he took off reading. The basic routine for reading a new text was established and this allowed for increased opportunities for Daniel to respond to the activity at hand. Within that routine, he and I had negotiated a subroutine illustrated in the following narrative.
Table 18

Daniel - Responses * to the Reading of Novel, Continuous Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Response Code</th>
<th>Set 1</th>
<th>Set 2</th>
<th>Set 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>20.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>26.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>40.43</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>49.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. * Recorded at percentage of total responses coded. Frequency table in Appendix E. RR = Reading Recovery RG = Reading Group A = Student responds to a specific prompt directed at a discrete aspect of the reading/writing act, B = Student selects response to a general teacher prompt, C = Student initiates an observation or use of a discrete aspect of the reading act, D = Student initiates or maintains the reading/writing act, E = Student attempts to control the lesson beyond the instructional agenda.
Narrative 22

I have just introduced Bill's Baby to Daniel in Lesson 15. It is a story of Bill who mimics his mother's care-giving of his baby brother with his own teddy bear. I had spent most of the introductory time asking Daniel to tell me what kinds of things one does with babies. We also discussed the pictures. I also emphasized the book's structure, "He couldn't (action).

After resetting the book, I invite Daniel to read. "You read it."

"Bill's Baby," Daniel responds, reading the front cover. "I hate this book."

"Bill's Baby," Daniel reads on the title page. "I don't like him. I don't like the boy."

"Well, read anyway," I reply.

Daniel reads successfully through page 4 which reads: Mom could put a diaper on. Daniel reads, "Mom can...co..." and then announces, "I can't read this page!"

I immediately jump in with a specific prompt that talked about the meaning of the story and used the language (could). "What COULD mom do? Try that again, and let's think what would make sense with the picture." Pointing to the beginning of the line I say, "Mom?"

Daniel waits.

"/K/," I reply to his pause.

"/KO/," Daniel answers.

"What COULD mom do. Ready?" Again I point to the starting point. Together Daniel and I read the first two words with 'could' coming out of my mouth before Daniel's.

"Mom could?" Daniel asks. After my confirmation, Daniel continues reading, even self-correcting a few of his errors. On page 6 Daniel reads, "He couldn't have it," instead of the text which read, "He couldn't fold it (the diaper)."

"Try that page again," I prompt.

"Doesn't make any sense," Daniel replies.

Confirming his evaluation, I point to the beginning of the line and ask "What couldn't he do? He couldn't?"

"Fowl," Daniel says. "This doesn't make any sense!"

"What couldn't he do? Did you check the picture? Yea! C'mon. He couldn't /f/. Try that again.

"Fold," Daniel says quietly.

"Ah! There it is. Put your finger up there and try it."
Daniel's early attempts at novel, continuous text often paralleled the description in the above narrative. In the beginning stages, Daniel often made a comment about his dislike about a character or storyline which was accompanied by a teacher prompt to continue the activity. When coming to a troublesome word, Daniel often and explicitly announced he didn't know it or evaluated his original rendering. This was the beginning of a routine that went like this: (a) Daniel announces he doesn't know a word or waits. (b) I come in with a general prompt to try it again and use a specific textual clue to assist him such as a picture or language structure. (c) Daniel waits or makes an attempt. (d) I respond to the wait or attempt by repeating my prompt and articulating the first sound of the troublesome word. (e) Daniel uses the first sound and continues to read.

This routine became firmly established. Though Daniel was offered opportunities to choose a response to a general prompt (Code B), the ultimate response was that I continually gave enough "clues" to allow Daniel a chance to predict the word. It was only after an observation of Daniel reading novel text in his classroom reading group (below) that I intervened and attempted to change the routine.

Narrative 23

Seven lessons later in Lesson 22, Daniel is about to attempt Mrs. Wishy-Washy, a story of mud-loving animals who can't seem to keep clean for their ever-washing owner. Previously I had taken a few minutes to acquaint Daniel with the supportive pictures and the unusual pattern, "Oh, lovely mud," and "wishy-washy, wishy-washy." I also had him locate in the text the words, "oh," and "tub."
Resetting the book, Daniel was invited to read the first page: Oh lovely mud. Daniel reads, "Ah," and then waits, pointing to the word, 'lovely.' "I don't know what this is." "Remember what the cow said about that mud?" I reply in the typical routine. "Oh /l/..." "Oh lovely mud," Daniel reads and successfully reads on even self-correcting an error with my general prompt. On page 7 (And she paddled in it) Daniel reads, "And she /p/...And she what?"

At this point a different routine began, "C'mon. And she..." "Paddled in it." "See!" I exclaimed. "When you try a little bit of it. Don't give up so fast."


Daniel reads, "In wishy-wishy...In what?...In /w/ went the cow."

Again, his response is confirmed and he reads on till he gets to the text, "In went the pig." On this page, Daniel reads, "In went the...I forgot about this," pointing to the word 'pig.' "C'mon," I prompt. "We're running out of time."

Daniel looks at the picture and restarts, successfully reading.

The narrative vividly illustrates how quickly Daniel was able to use what he knew when given an opportunity to do so. The old routine of assisting Daniel with many clues at the point of his announced frustration was downplayed. The new routine developed in Lesson Set 2 began by the teacher requesting that Daniel do something first beyond his initial attempt and evaluation of his capability. Certainly this wasn't a crisp change-over, one routine to another. It developed over time, but once established, the new routine increasingly supplanted the old one. The new responses can be characterized as "competency discovered."
Daniel's competency increasingly grew as he progressed through the first readings of novel text. It was further illuminated when Daniel read *The Fox and the Crow* (described above). He had read the new text during Lesson 32 with little assistance. After the lesson, I discovered in the Reading Recovery booklist that the book had been relevelled four levels above the level at which I had been working with Daniel. This meant that I was working with him using material in his easy range of ability. He moved up to the appropriate book level and instruction continued.

The shifting subroutine that was identified in Daniel's reading of *Mrs. Wishy-Washy* came as a direct result of my observation of Daniel reading a basal page in his reading group that very same day. The dominant patterns of responses for Daniel reading novel continuous text in the classroom (Table 18, above) were (a) responding to teacher prompts directed at a discrete aspect of the reading act and (b) initiating and maintaining the reading act. When observing Daniel a page in the basal the following was observed:

**Narrative 24**

The group is about to read their new basal story, *Mortimer Hops*. Daniel has been nominated to read after first being complimented for knowing how to use the table of contents to find the new story.

The text he will read: "Sam, take a look at Mortimer. Come and see Mortimer hop," said Meg.
"I don't want to see Mortimer hop," said Sam. "I don't like frogs."
Daniel begins to read without his finger. "Sam..." He puts his finger in his eye. There is a long pause.
Barb points to the word 'take' in Daniel's book and tells him.
Without rereading, Daniel continues, "a look at Mortimer..." He waits and looks at Barb.
Again, Barb points to the word and Peter intervenes and says, "Come!"
Daniel repeats Peter's input and continues on successfully to the end. When he is done he smiles and looks at Barb who compliments him for cooperating.

When Daniel came to a troublesome part in his reading of novel text during reading group, he waited or silently appealed to the teacher until Barb or another group member provided the answer. This happened consistently throughout the entire observation time. His appeals or waits were consistently followed by a teacher told and Daniel would use that input to continue on with the reading. When he wasn't reading, the earlier observations in Set 1 and Set 2 revealed that Daniel often stared out over the group to the classroom, intermittently returning to the page being read, consider the text's picture or relocated himself in the text.

Daniel's observed routine with Barb and the group members challenged me to consider how Daniel and I interacted at points of reading breakdown. The renegotiated subroutine as illustrated in Narrative 27 (above) allowed for a shift in the way Daniel responded at breakdowns in the reading act during Reading Recovery. The resultant routine revealed competency which could be built upon. In the classroom, though, Daniel's routine coupled with Barb's proclivity to tell troublesome words in order to keep the meaning of the story
and the reading act going, allowed Daniel to negotiate out of reconciling his difficulty.

Nonetheless, as time went on, Daniel successfully read the basal passages he was nominated to read. In fact, after early November until early March there were only two additional observed incidences of waiting at a troublesome word. The remainder of the time, Daniel quietly and fluently read the passage assigned to him.

Summary

Initial questions in the research have sought to describe specific activities and materials particular to each instructional setting. Participant routines within and between these activities and materials were also delineated. The present analysis described how Peter and Daniel negotiated their own role and learning in the activities in Reading Recovery and the classroom reading group.

Peter was an active, willing participant in both settings. Peter was generally successful in responding to the specific prompts offered him as well as reading broad stretches of text. Invited or not, Peter sought to explore and demonstrate his proficiency with the tasks accomplished. When reading novel, continuous text, Peter often initiated or maintained the reading act until the act broke down for him. At such points Peter consistently and silently scanned the pages, searching, it seemed for a solution. His scanning response was often met with specific prompts from his teachers in each setting. Jane
responded often by reviewing the meaning of the story or the language structure as well as prompting Peter to visually link the troublesome word with the same word in a previously read book. In order to keep the reading act going in the group setting, Barb often told the word to Peter though there were also incidences of encouraging Peter to restart the sentence or reconsider the meaning of what he was reading.

Daniel was more hesitant when it came to his active involvement in the activities and routines in each setting. In Reading Recovery, Daniel sought to renegotiate the basic routines, putting off his participation in a particular activity by initiating another activity or stalling to get started. Once the basic routines were solidified, though, Daniel's increasing competency with the activities surfaced and he was better able to choose successful responses to general teacher prompts. When reading novel, continuous text, Daniel was able to initiate and maintain the reading act, even to the point of soliciting input from me so that he could continue. Once this routine was delineated, I began a renegotiation so that Daniel would take his own action when the reading act was breaking down.

In the classroom Daniel was sometimes allowed to turn down nominations to participate. Nonetheless, persistent observation of Daniel in the group revealed that he was often involved in all the activities, even finishing ahead of the group when completing a reading or workbook page. Daniel rarely, though, turned down an
invitation to read a part of the new basal story. For the most part he was able to initiate and maintain the reading act. When experiencing difficulty as he read, Daniel would wait or appeal to the teacher. This response was answered with a "told" by the teacher or another group member. As time went on, such a response was rarely seen and Daniel had no problem dealing with the demands of the new text, often reading fluently and effortlessly. In the classroom, Daniel's patterns of responses suggested a hidden competency that surfaced gradually as time went on.

The next part of the analysis described the boys' perceptions of their role and competencies in each instructional setting.

**Students' Self-Reports**

"And even the hard words I never learned before, I read!"

Daniel, (May, 1990)

Previous descriptions of Peter's and Daniel's learning to read in two different instructional settings have emerged from a researcher's and a teacher's perspective. Interpretations using multiple sources of information cross-checked with each other have also delineated patterns of activities and material use in both Reading Recovery and the classroom reading group. Patterns of instructional routines and the students' participation in those routines have also been outlined.
Even though multiple sources of information were used to
develop the previous interpretations, a nagging concern throughout
the data-gathering and analysis was "if the account (I) present, the
story (I) tell, is a trustworthy one" (Genishi, 1990):

Our approach to trust is relativistic since people have different
perspectives on the same phenomenon or event. To tap these
different perspectives, it's become common to triangulate the
analyst's view, primarily through two means: first multiple
sources of data, such as field notes, audiotapes, and documents,
and second, member checks or interviews with others in the
case study context. (p.4)

One of the challenges in establishing the validity of a researchers
interpretations is to "hear the voices of (my) informants" (Genishi,
1990) in those very interpretations. Two of the research questions
were specifically designed to "listen" and integrate the informants'
perspectives to an emerging interpretation of how Peter and Daniel
were learning to read. This current section will describe the self-
reports of the boys over time. What were they making of their
experiences?

Genishi suggests that finding out about others' views "takes some
imagination, especially when participants are unused to articulating
their viewpoint, for example, young children are fine demonstrators of
what they can do but less able to talk about their abilities without
careful or familiar questioning or visible props and cues" (p.5).
The "trickiness" of tapping a young child's perspective is reflected in the literature. Descriptions of self-reports from beginning readers has produced mixed messages in the field of emergent literacy. Some suggest that children are unaware of and cannot articulate their developing conceptions of their reading experiences (Reid, 1966; Yaden, 1985). Others (Donaldson, 1979; Ferreiro & Teberosky, 1982; Goodman & Altwerger, 1981) maintain that children can "turn language in on itself," and when comments are informally elicited in meaningful ways to the child, s/he can orally provide insights into his or her developing conceptions. The latter view was embraced for this study and flavored the data-gathering designed for the self-report question.

The primary source of data for gathering Peter's and Daniel's self reports were from informal interviews and video playbacks. Both boys had multiple opportunities to talk with me and view themselves on the video-tapes. Table 19 summarizes the frequency of the opportunities.

The data-collection primarily took place in the nurse's room where Daniel and I conducted our Reading Recovery lessons. The interviews and viewings were conducted individually and generally lasted no longer than fifteen or twenty minutes. The video playbacks involved showing each boy randomly chosen portions of themselves in either the reading group or within the Reading Recovery lesson. We sat in front of small VCR monitor, and the materials used during the
Table 19

Summary of Data for Student Self-Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peter</th>
<th>Daniel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Playbacks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

selected segment were at hand for the boys' reference and comment. As the boys watched themselves I looked for visible signs such as amusement, consternation, delight, or disappointment. Playing off these cues, I paused the tape and explored why the boys were responding the way they were. Once a video selection had ended I also asked each boy to comment on how they thought they did in the activity and 'why'.

Interview questions were modified from the reading interview designed by Goodman, Burke, and Watson (1987) and were used to explore the boys' general perceptions of the reading experiences.

A secondary source of data were the boys' daily running records of text reading. In Reading Recovery the boys had daily opportunities to read, without assistance, a book which had been introduced the previous lesson. Jane and I recorded the boys' responses using a standard shorthand (Clay, 1985). Responses over time were compiled and compared in order to glean patterns of self-reports as demonstrated in the reading act. In the data-gathering, the running record of text reading was the only time in both instructional settings where Peter and Daniel had an opportunity to use a sustained, "solo voice" to relay what they were understanding about the task. Granted, the boys' voices had been co-constructed by previous introductions and interaction surrounding the book. When the running record book is read, though, the boys had to choose the responses they would make, and these self-reports through demonstration provide insights
for comparison to their overt comments they were making about their learning. Six running records in each of the three lesson sets provide the database for an analysis of these demonstrations.

The remainder of this section will report for each boy in turn (a) their general perceptions of their reading experiences, (b) perceptions as related to specific video segments, and (c) how both sets of perceptions related to Peter and Daniel's demonstrations in the instructional settings during the running record of text reading.

Peters' Self Reports

When asked to identify a good reader he knew Peter usually named himself. This happened over the interview time with Peter citing his enjoyment with reading as the reason for being 'good.' To become a better reader Peter listed at various times milk, rest, eating breakfast, and reading books as conducive to growth. He enjoyed the books read in both instructional settings specifically citing Where's Spot (Carlye, 1980) and two basal readers as particular favorites. Reading books was a consistently-cited, favorite time for Peter during Reading Recovery. In the middle interviews, Peter also cited writing as his 'favorite part' "cause it's easy to write. The words ain't hard." In the reading group, Peter enjoyed "doing words."

He said that he enjoyed working with both his teachers, noting in the last interview what things his teachers wanted him to do when he came to a troublesome word. In the reading group, Barb wanted
him to "go down" (skip the word) when he got "messed up." This was a shift from the first interview when he cited the use of a pencil to point when the reading act was breaking down. With Jane, Peter said she wanted him to "think" or "sound it out" when he was stuck.

"Thinking about words" was also cited when he was asked what he did when he came to a word he didn't know. Peter also mentioned quitting as a possible option though if he were helping a buddy to read a troublesome word he would say, "What's the word?" or simply tell it.

When viewing the video tapes Peter was more explicit about his problem-solving and the reasons for his actions. With Reading Recovery segments, Peter cited his looking at the picture and "starting all over" as ways of fixing himself up on an observed error. On one particular error (else) I asked Peter how he figured it out. He looked at me and excitedly proclaimed, "Cause the 's'! You can hear it!"

Generally, less specific information was given after the viewing of any one segment. When asked how he did overall Peter usually replied, "Fine." When asked what made his reading so "fine," Peter answered that his good reading and the books' easy words contributed to his success.

During the interviews and playbacks, Peter was fascinated with seeing himself on the tape. Often he would read along and when he noticed his video persona stumbling, he'd shout the right word to the screen.
When comparing these overt responses to his demonstrations in running records, Peter's voice becomes much more specific. Table 20 summarizes the observations of his solo readings over time. Each book along with its level is accompanied by Peter's accuracy and self-correction rate. The accuracy rate is defined (Clay, 1985) as the number of the running words divided by the reader's errors. The resulting ratio is converted into a percentage. The self-correction rate is calculated by adding the number of errors with the number of self-corrections. The sum is then divided by the number of self-corrections with the ratio also being converted to a percentage.

Peter generally read in an instructional (90-94%) to easy (95-100%) range. Self-correction rates hovered around 1:1-1:4 in Set 1 but decreased as Peter continued in the program. Such numbers are reported here so as to demonstrate Peter's progress with increasingly difficult, relatively new text.

Of particular interest to this study is what was observed beyond the numbers. Table 21 summarizes the types of observed responses which Peter made over time to these newer texts. Peter's response that he thinks when he gets stuck is operationalized in the large number of "waits" that were increasingly observed by Jane and me. These times were deliberating times for Peter as his waits were usually followed by accurate reading.
Table 20  
**Peter - Running Records of Text Reading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Book Level</th>
<th>Accuracy Rate</th>
<th>Self-Correction Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ice Cream</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Houses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>No, No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Farm Concert</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1:nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Good for You</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1:nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Look for Me</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1:nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I'm Bigger Than You</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Good bye Lucy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A Pet Hamster</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1:nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The Seed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>At the Farm</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>One Sun in the Sky</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Chipmunks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1:nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The Red Rose</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Nick's Glasses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Two Little Dogs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Oh Jump in a Sack</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 21

**Peter - Frequencies of Reading Responses During Running Records of Text Reading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Response</th>
<th>Frequency of Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waits</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rereads portion of text</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rereads word</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-corrects</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks about the story</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks the picture</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses initial letter-sound correspondences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes multiple attempts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-to-one correspondence falters</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates one-to-one correspondence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skips a word</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks another page</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses intonation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inserts a word</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steady increases in rereading behavior at point of trouble and self-corrections were also noted. In fact, the increased rereading behavior at points of hesitation often resulted in self-corrections and correlates with one of his reported methods he cited during the interview.

Peter also reported in the interviews that he "quits" when the reading became difficult. Previous descriptions of Peter's responses during instructional activities as well as the relative absence of "appeals" during the reading of the running record book contradict this reported proclivity.

Another observed increase was Peter's use of initial letter-sound correspondences when he came to a troublesome word. For example, upon arriving at the word 'have' Peter responded, "/h/-have," and continued reading. Often such use of the initial letters resulted in Peter reading the word and proceeding on. Perhaps this increase illuminates what Peter later reported Jane wanted him to do when he came to an unknown word, i.e., to sound out. In the traditional sense he did not sound out a word, nor did Jane prompt him to do so, yet her attention to initial letter-sound correspondences as well as Peter's increased competency in their use might explain this particular report. Further illumination comes from the playback transcript when I asked Peter why Jane had complimented him on his successful reading of the word, "with" in the story. "Cause I said, '/w/-with," he replied.
In summary, Peter considered himself a competent reader who enjoyed working in both instructional settings. He reported a few strategies he could call upon when the reading act began to break down for him, yet analysis of his solo attempts at the running record book revealed an increasing variety of reading solutions he employed at points of breakdown. He just didn't talk or explicitly comment about them.

Daniel's Self Reports

Like Peter, Daniel considered himself a good reader, attributing his competence to being able to learn to read and that he was getting bigger. Unlike Peter, Daniel considered an academic course-of-action for becoming a better reader. "(You) need to learn words... can spell," he replied to my question as to his view of what makes a good reader.

In the last interview, (May, 1990) Daniel talked about his new reading group that he was in. (He had successfully left the intervention program in early December and moved to the high progress group in late March. This group met with another teacher.) He wavered on the degree of difficulty with the new group activities, reporting that, "Some of it's hard. Some of it's easy." Writing stories with words was the activity he specifically cited as being difficult. His new group, he reported, was "VERY" different than Barb's. He and his comrades were "WAY AHEAD" of Barb's group, even reading a different story every day and using different workbook pages. He also informed
me that he can usually get his work done. When I asked him the purpose of reading groups, Daniel answered, "Teachers are suppose to (have groups)."

Overall Daniel sounded very confident about his reading group experiences, even contributing the opening quote of this section as evidence of his ability.

Daniel reported in the end that he enjoyed reading books, especially "books that are of interest to me." Insect books were cited.

Over interviews, Daniel reported that he would (a) try a word or (b) sound a word out if he came to a hard part in his reading. Such behavior he would recommend to someone else who was experiencing difficulty. He also said he would tell the word if the reader had stalled.

After viewing the varied segments, Daniel invariably responded that he did fine. When asked to elaborate, the usual reply was, "I don't know." During the viewings, though, Daniel provided more specific information. When he viewed himself turning down one of Barb's nomination, he chuckled and put his hands on his cheeks. "I'm too nervous," he said, referring to his video persona. When he watched himself read part of a basal story, he turned to me and said, "Sometimes I don't wanna read all the words because it wouldn't be like in real life."

Like Peter, Daniel enjoyed watching the videos, but often did not want to discuss what he was seeing. "I want to watch some more," was often noted.
Explicit self-reports came through in Daniel's solo attempts during the running records. Table 22 summarizes the observations of his readings. Overtime Daniel was generally reading in his easy range of ability (95-100%) accuracy and self-correction rates stayed high throughout his time in the program. Even with increasingly difficult text, Daniel continued to overwhelmingly succeed with the demands of the text.

Table 23 summarizes the types and frequencies of observed responses which Daniel made over time to achieve his success. Of particular interest is the dramatic decrease in appeals to me during the running record as time went on. This decrease was coupled with a corresponding increase in self-correction behavior in Set 2. Perhaps it was the change in routines (See previous section of Chapter IV) that promoted this movement. Self-corrections usually came after rereading behavior. (Self-correction behavior was rarely seen in Set 3 because of his accurate reading.)

Daniel was also observed to wait before continuing on successfully with the reading. Like Peter, these waits appeared to be times of silent deliberation which usually ended with the increased use of initial letter-sound correspondences on troublesome words. Beginning letter use might have resulted in the continued, successful reading and illuminates what Daniel meant when he said he "sounded out" when he came to an unknown word.
Table 22

Daniel-Running Records of Text Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Book Level</th>
<th>Accuracy Rate</th>
<th>Self-Correction Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Along Comes Jake</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The Seed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Hogboggit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1:nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bill's New Baby</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1:nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nick's New Glasses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1:nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Two Little Dogs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The Red Rose</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Catch that Frog</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mrs. Wishy-Washy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The Wind</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>My Bike</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1:nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ten Little Bears</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1:nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The Fox &amp; the Crow</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sammy's Supper</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1:nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Sammy's Supper</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1:nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 23

**Daniel - Frequencies of Reading Responses During Running Records of Text Reading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Response</th>
<th>Frequency of Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waits</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rereads portion of text</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rereads word</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates voice pointing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-correction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks about the story</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks the picture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses initial letter-sound correspondences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates phrasing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discards finger-pointing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments about problem-solving</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a chunk of a word</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skips part of text</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments about the story line or characters as well as comments about his problem-solving also surfaced during the running records. The former type involved predicting what was going to happen or asking questions about the picture. There were also points when Daniel expressed his dislike for a certain character. The latter type involved explicit comments to me as he read. For example, in Set 2 (Lesson 21) Daniel read the text, "And it went back home." He read "home" for "back" and then immediately self-corrected. Looking at me, he announced, "Forgot 'back'!" Later in the same book he attempted the word "went," saying, "/wa/ /wa/...went! I forgot that word," he announced.

In summary, Daniel considered himself a good reader who felt equal to the demands of his new instructional group. The limited number of reading strategies he said he employed expanded dramatically when he was observed to read text. As in Peter's case, overt talk concerning his behavior or proclivities did not surface.

The limited number of Peter's and Daniel's responses to the interviews and playbacks when compared to their self-revelations during solo reading suggest that children do not need to be able to talk about what they do in order to learn to read. Nonetheless, any comments can allow the researcher to hear other 'voices' to order and make sense of his observations. For instance, Daniel's comment about his "nervousness" during the reading group can provide an explanation for Daniel's refusal of teacher nominations.
The children's voices as they demonstrated or discussed their learning provided a perspective that could have been easily overwhelmed by the study's interpretations if their self-reports had never been collected. The final question put to the data involves hearing the teachers' voices as they worked with the children in each instructional setting.

**Teachers' Perceptions**

"He had the meaning and then...and then you start moving toward a visual cue for him and all of a sudden he forgets about that and starts concentrating on the visual one!"

*Jane (May, 1990)*

As the analysis for the study continued, the need to hear the voices of the teachers became apparent. When data-gathering began, the initial delimitation of the case studies concentrated on describing the children's responses in two settings. Ongoing reviews of the audio tapes and video tapes expanded the "boundaries" (Stake, 1978) of the study. Activities, routines, and the children's participation in each setting highlighted the mutual construction of learning that was taking place. The teachers' roles were ever-present in the developing interpretations of these factors. It became necessary to "hear" the teacher's perceptions of the activities, routines, and child's changing participation in the instructional settings. Another member check entered into the study, i.e., to add and compare the teacher's voices with the researcher's interpretation of the description.
Unfortunately the data for this member check was limited. The need for the teacher member check became apparent after the bulk of the data-gathering (Fall, 1989) had occurred and analysis was well underway. Dissertation committee members suggested returning with video tapes and soliciting teacher's interpretations of what had occurred in the instructional settings.

Peter exited the Reading Recovery program and study school in early December. On his last day, Jane discussed with me what she felt he needed as an emerging reader and where she would have liked to go in his instruction if he had stayed. Fortunately this discussion was taped and added to video playbacks which were conducted with both Jane and Barb in early May, 1990.

Randomly selected video clips at various points in time were shown to both teachers. All the clips captured Peter or Daniel reading continuous text. As the tapes were viewed, the teachers' comments were noted and their reactions prompted discussion of what they were seeing. No set questions were used except one: "What does the student need as a reader?"

Teacher self-reports were recorded, summarized, and sorted according to the emerging factors listed above. Reading Recovery lesson plans for Barb and I were also used in order to compare our reactions to the tapes to what we were noting as the instruction occurred.
Each teacher's reactions will be considered in turn. General perceptions of Daniel and Peter as participants will be discussed first followed by reported descriptions of the teaching decisions and basic routines of instruction. Teachers' reactions and observations to the student's participation patterns in each instructional setting will be considered last.

**Jane's Voice**

Jane's general perception of Peter as a reader was, "(He) never gives up...EVER!" This emphatic description came through in both the December and May discussions and triangulates with a similar, consistent researcher interpretation that was developing in the analysis. As part of this "persistence" was Jane's perception that Peter takes from everyone and cues from others in order to keep going with the reading act.

According to Jane, Peter seemed to enjoy all aspects of the Reading Recovery lesson. When I shared with her that Peter cited the writing part of the lesson as a favorite time, Jane agreed. She explained that writing was "concrete" for Peter and that it was something at which he became increasingly proficient. His successful involvement, thus, promoted this "favored" feeling.

Jane also described the distinctiveness of her instructional routines that occurred with Peter. As she viewed the tapes she noted her use of fluent reading and how she emphasized the unusual book
language in the orientation to the new book. At one specific point in a
tape she noticed that she stopped Peter from reading the book as she
was trying to introduce it to him, but then reasoned that Peter needed
a complete orientation to the new book before he tackled it himself.
These types of self-reports matched up with the Reading Recovery
routines that were described in the earlier parts of the chapter.

When describing Peter's progress in his intervention program,
Jane vividly highlighted the co-construction of the learning that was
taking place. As she watched Peter read continuous text she noted
that Peter always used the book picture and his memory for the
patterned language in the book. At the point of his exiting the
program, Peter was still not "cross-checking" the picture/book
language with the print. He used all the cues, Jane informed me, he
just didn't put them together. She cited a particular teaching focus to
assist him as she watched a segment of Peter reading later in the
program. "I'm cueing him visually A LOT...What I'm giving him
back...what I take from the picture, but I seem to be stressing at least
beginning sounds so he can identify it using the picture." Peter's
responses during running records, pulled from later in his program,
correlate with this report. His increased use of the beginning letter-
sound correspondences was prevalent in Set 2 and Set 3. When I
reviewed her lesson plans in Set 3, Jane was also noting cross-
checking "needs" as she worked with Peter. Often she wrote down
instances of Peter's need to cross-checking cues.
Jane also challenged her participation in the routines, citing her "jumping in" quickly at points the reading faltered and how she might have promoted cross-checking of cues if she had added "restarting" prompts to the focus she had cited above: "I should have been doing more rereading," she said. "I was only allowing the meaning from the picture and not the sentence itself." These "what if I had" comments suggest a noticing teacher who, if given the chance with more time with Peter, might have shifted her participation in a certain routine; in this case, her response to Peter at the point of reading breakdown.

This interpretation is corroborated with comments Jane made when Peter left the program in early December. She felt he was ready to "take off" and that she needed perhaps 15-20 additional lessons with him so that she could get him using all reading cues in an integrated fashion.

As Jane viewed Peter reading in the classroom in late November, she again commented on his tenacity and his ability to know when he's at a "hard part." Of concern to her was Peter's silence at a troublesome part, even after Barb prompted him to (a) restart the sentence and then (b) linked the troublesome word with a word the group had analyzed on the chart earlier. "It was a disappointment, here, not (for him) to try something," she said. "At this point (in the program) at least he could have tried something."

When I asked her to explore the discrepancy in his responses to reading new texts in different settings, Jane speculated that the
support of the group was important to Peter, "and then he come to me...he had to do something."

In summary, Jane's perceptions indicate an awareness of not only Peter's shifting participation in the intervention program but also how Peter's and her participation patterns in both instructional settings could change in order for him to progress as an emerging reader. Unfortunately, Peter's untimely exit from the intervention program halted her plans to promote this progress.

**Barb's Voice**

The member check for Barb was limited, only occurring in May, 1990. Even after a period of months following the Fall data-gathering, Barb was able to provide insights not only into each boy's role in the instruction but also in her influence over the instruction and routines.

Barb enjoyed Peter in the limited amount of time that she had worked with him. "He seemed sure of himself," Barb said, "even when he was making mistakes." Specifically she cited his ability to make an attempt and "use his sounds." He used "anything" to figure himself out, she reported. Once again, Peter's tenacity was cited as a constant, this time by his reading group teacher.

When discussing Daniel, Barb was amazed at his progress over the year, citing the reinforcement he received in the intervention as a contributing factor to the progress. "It made him feel successful," she replied. She also believed that he might have been bored with the
material in the reading group. Therefore his progress was not readily apparent in that setting. In the early stages of the reading group instruction, Barb also observed that Daniel was more hesitant to make attempts at the activities and less sure of himself than Peter.

Comments gathered over the viewing of the different tapes also provide insights into Barb's view of the activities and basic routines that comprised the reading group. She "toyed" with the numbers in her reading groups, she reported. Though she taught all the low-progress readers in the school's first grade, she sub-grouped within this population, sometimes working with two to four different groups within a daily, two-hour period. The use of the basal tests and the student's work contributed to these sub-group decisions. Sub-group membership was often revised and fluid.

Barb also reported on a consistent proclivity of hers: "If it (error) doesn't change the meaning I don't interrupt them...you can only interrupt them so many times, especially in the beginning (of their instruction)." This attention to meaning also came out in another basic routine when she observed herself nominating another student to read the next page of the basal story without discussing the opening page with the group. "Are we reading those words or are we reading for meaning?" she announced. "Should have talked about the story," she continued. The basic routine which occurred after a nominated student's reading demonstrated that Barb often talked about the story, and that what she was viewing was the exception.
A source of frustration for Barb was how the non-nominated children did not follow along during the basal reading. She offered a possible hypothesis for this: "In the beginning (of the year) when they've started to read, they're interested (in what the nominated student is doing). Before the third book, they're independent. They don't need the support of the group. They want to do it all!"

Though Barb did not interrupt a meaningful reading, she also observed how the students reacted at troublesome parts. She challenged her instant response to them, saying that this was a problem because "they depend on me when they could use some skill, like the picture or whatever, to get the word." This corroborated with the routines reported earlier in the chapter for the reading of the basal story, wherein Barb often told the word or prompted the child to do something when the reading act broke down.

Barb's reports of Peter's progress came sporadically throughout the viewing of the tapes. Often she commented on Peter's tenacious responses. For instance, when viewing Peter in the group reading a basal story, Barb noted how he was looking "all over the place" when he stopped. "He really used the picture!" she noticed and then positively commented on her teaching prompt to reread at the point of trouble.

Barb had more to say concerning Daniel's progress with the group instruction. In a segment taped in late October she noted during his nominated reading of a basal page that "He acted as if it was
a struggle and I'm wondering if he could read it." In an early November segment, Barb expressed amazement that Daniel silently started to read in the basal passage even as the other children were opening the book to the right page. She also challenged her response to his breakdowns during his nominated reading: "Should have said, 'start over'...I helped him with two words...don't know why I did especially since he read it before (we started)." Later on in the segment she again mentioned the comfort factor for Daniel, feeling that he was more at ease with the group. Her consistent comments of Daniel's hesitancy in the group matches a similar self-report of Daniel's (described earlier) of how sometimes "I get nervous."

When viewing the March segment of Daniel reading in the group, Barb felt that he did very well but he seemed to be aware of the taping and me. The presence of the researcher who was Daniel's former Reading Recovery teacher might have impacted on his performance.

In summary, Barb's comments on the playbacks provide limited evidence that she was not only aware of many of the instructional routines which occurred but that she actively challenged her role in those routines. Her "what-if" statements, like Jane, seemed to reveal a teacher who highlighted ways in her own teaching to challenge (and change) the participation patterns of her students.

According to Barb's comments, progress for Daniel seemed to hinge on how comfortable he was in participating in the group setting.
Her reflective challenge to her response to Daniel's appeals for assistance might have also contributed to his progress as an emerging reader.

**The teacher who was a researcher**

The role of participant observer was assumed when I began the study. Not only was I teaching Daniel in Reading Recovery, I also was observing his responses to reading group instruction. Genishi (1990) suggests, "when researchers play multiple roles in the contexts they study, triangulation becomes more complex, because we have to triangulate with and sometimes study ourselves" (p.5). This type of talking to one's self involves articulating what Peshkin (1988) refers to as the "subjective I's":

> When researchers observe themselves in the focused way...they learn about the particular subset of personal qualities that contact with what their research phenomenon has released. These qualities have the capacity to filter, skew, shape, block, transform, construe, and misconstrue what transpires from the outset of the research project to its culmination in a written statement. (p.17)

This final section attempts to briefly document and describe some of those qualities Peshkin refers to as the Subjective I's and how those qualities were identified in developing perceptions and interpretations of Daniel learning to read in two instructional settings.
Reading Recovery I. When data-gathering began I conducted an intervention program for Daniel. He experienced the usual Reading Recovery procedures and activities, and I maintained the typical records and forms to document his progress. At first, Daniel attempted to negotiate his participation by trying to start different activities or declining invitations to participate, but once I had established that he would participate in the "batting order" of the lesson, his progress began. When reviewing his daily running records and my field notes, Daniel seemed to be making steady progress and I thought all was on course.

I took my "Reading Recovery I" into the classroom as I began to observe Daniel in the reading group setting. Though I was impressed with Barb's instruction which evidenced her effectiveness working with low-progress readers, my predisposition to Reading Recovery clouded my observations of what Barb was doing. She operated an effective basal program with her students, yet it wasn't Reading Recovery and my initial observations of Daniel struggling with these materials promoted the "incongruency hypothesis" (Allington, 1985, 1989). Daniel was struggling because he was receiving two different types of reading instruction and he was "confused." He was progressing with me, yet he seemed to be hesitant and struggling in the classroom. I hypothesized that if only Barb's instruction was like Reading Recovery instruction, Daniel would be more successful in the reading group.
It was after I observed Daniel in his reading group in early November (described above) that the "Reading Recovery I" was challenged and the smoke screen clouding my observations cleared. As I video-taped the reading group lesson, I was amazed to watch Daniel pause and appeal to Barb when reading novel text which I knew he could read. The instant pause and appeal unnerved me, and prompted me to review his Reading Recovery lessons plans and running records. I discovered that he took a much more active role with the texts in Reading Recovery.

It was also observed that Daniel refused opportunities to participate in reading group activities. Why was this happening? The "Researcher I" took over.

The Researcher I. On reviewing video tapes I also noted that Daniel often completed workbook pages ahead of the group. This "hidden competency" on Daniel's part prompted a review of his Reading Recovery audio tapes and field notes as well. What was discovered was the sub-routine Daniel and I had negotiated when he read new, novel text, i.e., he often appealed to me on unknown words and I would respond with a Reading Recovery prompt which offered "clues" for Daniel's use in reconciling his difficulty.

As described earlier in this chapter, this sub-routine was dramatically renegotiated, with Daniel prompted to first do something of his choosing at a troublesome part.
The Pro-active I. Though the researcher described the routines, it was the teacher who initiated the revisiting of the data. From this second perusal, the researcher also acknowledged the "Reading Recovery I," that was influencing the previous interpretations. A new teacher's voice came back into play with the renegotiation of Reading Recovery routines with Daniel.

As a teacher I took on a more pro-active role in assisting Daniel's progress in the classroom. I began sharing Daniel's writing and reading behavior during Reading Recovery with Barb, also sharing with her his hidden competency I observed in the classroom. Increasingly Barb insisted Daniel enter into the group's activities and with her support, his competency emerged and was successfully displayed in that setting as well. When Daniel discontinued from the Reading Recovery group in December, he was in the highest reading group of low-progress readers. Previously he had worked within the lowest.

Summary

For Jane and Barb there was a limited opportunity to elicit their comments and perceptions concerning Peter's and Daniel's instructional experiences in the classroom. Nonetheless, many of their comments highlight an awareness of the boys' responses and how the teacher's role was impacting on those responses. Of note were both teacher's challenges to their video responses to the boys and the ways they might have revised those responses to shift Peter's
and Daniel's participation patterns in the settings.

The recognition and acknowledgement of the Subjective I's not only allowed similar challenges to my work with Daniel but also challenged the way I was observing and interpreting his responses in a different instructional setting.

Woosley (1991) suggests that teachers are constantly making decisions concerning the instruction they are implementing:

Every day teachers of young children make a multitude of decisions as they organize and implement the classroom literacy program. They determine goals, select materials, and learning activities, evaluate student progress in reading and writing, and make plans for ongoing instruction (p.189).

In this interpretive study the teaching decisions and rationales that were gathered were limited. In future studies, ongoing discussions of the activities, routines, and participation patterns with both teachers and students need to be further integrated with the researcher's interpretations as "voices" which illuminate, explain, and even challenge the researcher's voice.
Summary of the findings

The main line of inquiry described the experiences of two boys as they learned to read with their teachers in two instructional settings: an intervention program entitled Reading Recovery and the classroom reading group. Within the boundaries of each instructional setting, attributes to describe the boys' learning experiences were delineated. These setting attributes affected and were affected by Peter and Daniel as they learned to read. Each of these attributes will be reviewed in turn.

Activities. Both boys were involved in different activities depending on the instructional setting they experienced. In Reading Recovery lessons, activities emphasized the reading and writing of continuous text. Standard lesson components were conducted in a one-half hour lesson which consistently involved the reading of many little books or the writing and reconstruction of a student-generated sentence or story. Within these activities, both boys had daily opportunities to "initiate, direct, guide, and terminate"
(Cochran-Smith, 1984, p.76) their reading and writing. In the reading group conducted in the classroom, Peter and Daniel were members of a small group of children who often completed activities centered around skills-teaching texts. These texts involved the presentation and practice of discrete reading skills. Opportunities were also available to read continuous text found in the school-adopted basal series. Most activities were directed by the teacher.

**Routines.** In order for the students to use the activities in each of the instructional settings, basic routines of verbal and nonverbal behavior were observed to be in effect. These basic routines were established and directed primarily by the teachers in each setting, helping to create what Cazden (1988) refers as familiar and predictable learning environments (p.48). Routines in Reading Recovery lessons permitted the boys and their teachers to shift their involvement in the reading and writing activities. Many times Peter and Daniel followed routines that required a sustained and open-ended reading or writing response. In the classroom reading group, routines were followed that generally produced more close-ended responses to the challenges posed by the instructional materials and interactions.

*Cazden's (1988) terms "familiar" and "predictable" are used here to describe each instructional setting in terms of the activities and routines delineated for both the Reading Recovery lessons and the classroom reading group. Though the materials used, activities implemented, and routines enacted were qualitatively different in*
each setting, their consistent presence in both types of instruction was observed over time. This consistency of instructional implementation in both settings is depicted in Figure 10. The closed circle represents a "holding together" of the lessons in terms of the consistent presence of the activities and instructional routines. Within the circle the participants attended to the instruction at-hand.

Students' patterns of participation. The main inquiry also described the students' patterns of participation in each instructional setting. The emerging patterns revealed how both boys negotiated their own role and learning in the activities and routines with which they came in contact.

Peter was an active, willing participant in both settings, generally succeeding with the demands of the instructional tasks scaffolded for him by his teachers. Using the materials, activities, and routines, Peter's predominate role in each setting was one who willingly responded to specific teacher prompts to aspects of the task at hand. His "degrees of freedom" (Bruner, 1975) with many of the lessons' activities were in response to specific teacher or group input, and he used their input to successfully progress through the activities presented him. Another prominent response pattern involved Peter using activities and routines to initiate and maintain the reading act. At points of reading problem-solving, Peter consistently searched the materials at his disposal to reconcile his difficulty. Teacher or
Figure 10. Standard instructional setting.
group input often provided clues (or words) for him to use in order to start-up the reading again. Figure 11 depicts Peter's most common patterns of participation in each instructional setting. The increasing spiral represents the increasing difficulty of the instruction he experienced over time. The ingoing arrows within the oval represent the input Peter used to respond to the demands of the instructional setting. His response to the input is represented by outgoing arrows to the activities. Outgoing arrows also represent his consistent attempt to initiate and maintain the reading act in both the Reading Recovery lessons and classroom reading group.

Daniel negotiated a more hesitant role when it came to his participation with the activities and routines in each setting. In his intervention program, Daniel at first sought to renegotiate the basic routines and activities. Once the basic routines and activities were reestablished, Daniel was invited in to the lesson activities, and this provided him chances to increasingly and willingly choose how to respond to a reading and writing task. The renegotiation of the basic routines is depicted in Figure 12 by shifts at the base of the spiral. The increase in Daniel's choice of response to general teaching invitations is depicted in the oval with an ingoing arrow from the teacher and outgoing arrows to the activities and routines. The upward shift of the spiral represents the increased difficulty of the activities over time.
Figure 11. Peter-Patterns of participation in each instructional setting.
Figure 12. Daniel-Patterns of participation in Reading Recovery.
In the classroom, Daniel was sometimes allowed to turn down invitations to participate. Persistent observation, though, revealed that Daniel was a "silent" participant in the activities and routines. When called upon to read, Daniel often obliged, silently appealing to Barb when the process broke down. Daniel's response patterns in the classroom are depicted in Figure 13. The increasing spiral represents the increasing difficulty of the classroom instruction he experienced over time. The ingoing arrows represent the input Daniel used to respond to the demands of the instructional setting. His response to the input is represented by outgoing arrows to the activities. The broken line emanating from the teacher (T) represents Daniel's invitation declines.

Daniel's response to appeal at points of reading breakdown in his classroom text reading prompted me to revisit our work together in early November. An emerging response pattern highlighted the fact that Daniel was explicitly appealing for assistance during his reading. Even though I generally prompted him to decide how he was going to reconcile his problem the prompts often involved enough clues for Daniel to use to predict the word and proceed. The old routine was eventually downplayed, and the new routine insisted that Daniel initiate problem-solving without clues, i.e., he needed to take the lead in his problem-solving. With the establishment of a new routine, Daniel's display of his competency increased with the reading tasks in his intervention program. An increase in Daniel's competency is
Figure 13. Daniel-Patterns of participation in the reading group.
depicted in a new spiral in Figure 14. The expanded "mouth" of the spiral represents not only how a response pattern changed, but how Daniel's subsequent responses to the new routines also prompted dramatic changes in levels of books he was given to read based on his new displays.

Information concerning Daniel's progress was shared with Barb over time which resulted in (a) Daniel no longer being allowed to decline a nomination and (b) a shift to a higher reading group where he continued to be a "silent partner" in the instruction but at a higher degree of difficulty. This shift is represented in Figure 15. The vertical line within the spiral represents the move to a higher, low-progress group where Daniel continued to respond willingly and successfully to the demands of the activities.

Once the activities, routines, and the boys' participation patterns in both instructional settings were described, the analysis next compared this broad description to the perceptions of the teachers and students involved in the learning-to-read process.

Teacher perceptions. Many of Jane's and Barb's comments highlighted an awareness of the boys' responses to the instructional activities and how the teacher's role was impacting on those responses. Both teachers challenged their teaching when viewing previously-taped segments of Daniel and Peter. Many of Jane's comments suggested that if she was given more time, she, too would
Figure 14. Daniel-Revised pattern of participation in Reading Recovery setting.
Figure 15. Daniel-Revised patterns of participation in the reading group.
have negotiated a change in Peter's response as he read new text. Perhaps Peter's "spiral" of participation would have expanded dramatically, as Daniel's "spiral of participation" did (see Figure 14, above) after a similar renegotiation. Unfortunately, Peter's early departure from the school and the study can only leave such a proposed expansion to speculation.

**Student's self-reports.** Peter considered himself a competent reader who enjoyed working in both instructional settings. He overtly described a few strategies he used to assist him as he read, one of which was to quit at the point of breakdown. Analysis of his solo, sustained attempts as revealed in his running records, though, revealed a variety of reading solutions he employed at points of hesitation during his reading. Daniel also considered himself a good reader whose limited number of reported strategies also expanded greatly when he was observed reading solo text.

**Trustworthiness of the analysis**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) maintain that to establish trustworthiness of the analysis in this qualitative case study, the researcher must "persuade" his or her audiences (including self) that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of" (p.290). They recommend four tasks to assist in establishing the study's worth: (a) establish the credibility of the findings, (b) discuss the transferability of the findings to new and
similar situations, (c) establish the dependability of the findings, (d) establish the confirmability of the analysis beyond the sole researcher's interpretation. This issues of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability as they are established for this study will be discussed in turn.

Credibility of the findings. A number of research decisions were made to insure that the findings were valid to the study itself. Multiple techniques of data-gathering were used simultaneously during observations in the field. The techniques of audio-taping and videotaping allowed for opportunities to revisit innumerable observations once I had left the field. Use of multiple techniques thus allowed for a review of the phenomena from different perspectives and vantage points during and after the time the observations ended. (For a review of the multiple data-gathering techniques used, see Chapter 3.)

Observations of two boys learning to read in different instructional settings occurred frequently over a sustained period of time. The conscious decision for "prolonged engagement" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) with the dynamic under observation primarily occurred over a two and one-half month period in Fall, 1989. Peter left the study in early December and Daniel was discontinued from his Reading Recovery program at the same time. Therefore the study's purpose became moot in early December, 1989. I reentered the field, though, for a brief observation time for Daniel in early March, even though he was solely receiving instruction in the classroom reading group, to
ascertain if his response patterns had changed in any way. The extensive time in the field along with multiple techniques of data-gathering safeguarded against premature interpretations of the dynamic under observation while at the same time allowing pertinent elements such as routines and activity structures to fully emerge. (See Chapter III for a review of the study's timeline.)

A third technique to establish credibility of the findings was the triangulation of data sources. To establish the validity of one piece of evidence used in the findings it became necessary to compare and align that evidence with other sources of data gathered. The introduction to Chapter IV reviews the plan of source triangulation which was used for this study.

Transferability of the findings. "Thick description" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) in the preceding chapters provides a data base for the reader to use for decisions as to whether the study's descriptions of two children learning to read in different settings might be considered in other times and places with different teachers, students, and instructional programs. The use of transcripts, codes, narrative segments, and numbers were employed in the overall narrative to allow the reader a comprehensive, varied, and extended view of the factors such as instructional routines and patterns of participation, i.e., factors which influenced the boys' progress in learning to read. The thick description along with a reading of the limitations and implications of the study (below) provide the reader
sufficient data to consider when deciding if the study's findings can and should be studied in another context.

**Dependability of the findings.** A limited number of interviews and discussions with the participants of the study allowed a "check" on the developing interpretations outlined in Chapter IV. For example, Jane's and Barb's challenges to their responses to Peter's and Daniel's reading permitted a clearer and surer description of shifting routines that allowed (or might have allowed) for increasing progress of the students.

The identification of my "Subjective I's" (Peshkin, 1988) for this researcher who was also a teacher in the study, i.e., the participant observer, allowed me to challenge the Reading Recovery lens with which I was initially viewing not only the classroom dynamic but the dynamic which was also occurring in Daniel's work with me. The challenge to my lens resulted in a "clearer" emergence of attributes (See Summary of findings, above) of the instructional settings both boys were experiencing.

Triangulation of data sources is also cited as lending to the dependability of the findings. For example, once numerical patterns of student responses were identified, these patterns were compared to transcripts and video tapes to "check" the credibility of the numbers.

**Confirmability.** Once again, the triangulation of data sources was used to confirm the findings and prevent one source from outstripping or overwhelming the views provided by other sources of information.
By articulating the credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability decisions made for this study, the trustworthiness of the findings is established for consideration, critique and judgement of the reader.

Discussion of the findings.

The present study provided descriptions of Peter's and Daniel's progress over time in learning to read in two instructional settings. Such descriptions of activities, routines, and each boy's participation patterns suggest that learning to read is closely entwined with learning to be a student and that both types of learning are socially constructed and redefined by participants in the instructional settings (Dorr-Bremme, 1982; Green & Bloome, 1983; Handerhan, 1990).

A definition of "studenting" (Green, Dixon, Lin, Floriani, & Bradley, 1991) can be used to theoretically place the study's findings. Green et al. maintain the following:

If teachers teach then students student and through studenting they may or may not learn the content the teacher desires. They may learn other aspects of social life, that is, how to be a participant in the group instead. This type of student builds particular ways of being in a class and may not reflect actual ability. (p.41)

Green et al (1991) further maintain that by teaching and studenting, participants negotiate and renegotiate what it means to take "literate action" within an instructional setting. The study's findings reveal that Peter and Daniel travelled different paths of
progress when taking literate action as both students and beginning readers.

Peter. Peter knew how to take literate action as a student, i.e., he knew how to "do reading" in each setting. He was facile at gaining access (Paris & Wixson, 1987) to the instruction offered him. For example, he took risks, he worked with the tutorial, he obliged invitations to participate, he knew when he was to solicit invitations to participate, he assisted others in his reading group, and he was persistent in seeking opportunities to display his knowledge and work out his problems. In short, Peter willingly and successfully collaborated with the participants of each instructional setting.

As a beginning reader Peter took "literate action" by predominately obliging his teachers' prompts to attend to discrete aspects of the reading task. He consistently used opportunities to collaborate with Jane in a controlled scaffold of instruction that emphasized the use of the book's pictures, links to known words, and sound/letter analyses. Further, Peter had daily opportunities to respond to the scaffold by initiating, directing, and maintaining the reading of continuous texts. In short, Peter made progress as a beginning reader.

Peter's progress was operationalized in assessments of his reading. When he entered the study, Peter was at the lower end of the scores earned on the Diagnostic Survey (Clay, 1985). He knew how to write a few words and hear and encode two sounds.
He identified many letters by name and knew a few concepts about books such as the purpose of a period, and that the left page is read before the right. He was not able to successfully read the lowest level book given him. Peter left the Reading Recovery program and the study in early December. After 34 lessons he was independently reading books four levels above where he started. He could hear and encode 26 sounds, and he wrote 21 words.

Peter progressed in his classroom reading instruction as well. Though he did not have as many opportunities in the classroom to independently take over the reading act as he did in Reading Recovery, his ability to be a "reading student" allowed him to enter into and generally succeed with the activities presented him. The nature of Barb's scaffold, like Jane's scaffold in Reading Recovery, also allowed Peter to use discrete aspects of the reading task such as ending sounds, contractions, and the relationships between pictures and words.

Both Jane's and Barb's comments revealed that they were aware of Peter's literate actions as a student and as a beginning reader. Both teachers were impressed with Peter's "tenacity" as a student, and both teachers challenged the ways they could renegotiate Peter's responses as a beginning reader. Such teaching challenges again reveal learning to read as a social process that is co-constructed (Green et al., 1991). Jane and Barb proposed a lessening of their grip on the instructional scaffold, thus allowing Peter to "put it all together" by independently
initiating, directing, and controlling the reading act. For example, Jane suggested that she would encourage Peter to cross-check the books' cue sources she had previously directed him to in order for him to increasingly choose how he would problem-solve, without her direct input. Barb suggested that she would promote more reading independence by encouraging Peter to reread instead of telling him a word at points of problem-solving.

Speculation can only enter into this discussion as to whether Peter's ability to "student" as well as his ability to succeed with his teachers' proposed changes in the instructional scaffold would have resulted in a reader. As mentioned earlier, Peter moved to another school in the district where the study took place. Even though the new school had a Reading Recovery program, Peter was unable to continue his intervention because the tutor already was working with four students, and her schedule did not allow her to "pick up" Peter. His family moved a third time during Peter's first grade year. Again, a full tutor schedule did not allow him to be picked up for Reading Recovery instruction.

Nonetheless, the potential for the scaffold to change in each instructional setting, increased opportunities for Peter to independently control more of the instructional activities, and his "studenting" ability in both settings all seem to point to a boy who was on his way to learning to read.
Daniel. Daniel took different literate actions in his progress as a student and beginning reader. Dorr-Bremme (1982) found in his study of first grade/kindergarten circle time, that "students play a collaborative part in structuring the classroom environment in which they are expected to learn and display what they have learned" (p.460). Collaboration, Dorr-Bremme maintained, allows the student to contribute to the "conditions under which their own education occurs" (p.461).

In both his Reading Recovery program and classroom reading instruction, Daniel negotiated a different student role than Peter did. In the reading group, he was a silent participant, a student who declined opportunities to participate in the group dynamic. Daniel was also hesitant to enter into the teacher-established routines which surrounded the Reading Recovery instructional activities. Rather, he sought to renegotiate the basic structure of the lesson, determining what activities would be accomplished and to what extent he would be involved in them. This initial collaboration with his teachers shadowed Daniel's competency as a beginning reader and it was only after Daniel's role as a student changed in both settings that his competency as a beginning reader was displayed to and expanded by his teachers.

Once the basic routines were reestablished in Reading Recovery, Daniel was able to increasingly use what he brought with him into the program. Given a different studenting role in the intervention
program that required Daniel to enter into the activities, he was able to choose his responses to the various reading and writing tasks. His competency as a beginning reader, then, steadily improved as Daniel daily initiated, directed, and controlled much of the reading and writing tasks presented him.

In learning how to be a reader, Daniel negotiated a routine with me that involved explicitly asking for help at points of reading breakdown. I consistently responded with enough "clues" for Daniel to use to reconcile his difficulty. This routine was discovered after observing Daniel silently soliciting help from Barb during an oral reading of a basal selection he could read. Barb's help often involved telling the word. As a student in both settings, Daniel had the "savvy" to bring his teachers in at the point of trouble, using what they provided to accomplish problem-solving. His "appeals" were different depending on which setting he was in. Over time the nature of the Reading Recovery instructional scaffold changed, and Daniel's new role as a reader involved him taking control over his problem-solving on increasingly difficult text without "clues" from me.

Once Daniel's increased competency was shared with Barb she also renegotiated with him his student role in the reading group, insisting that he join in the group dynamic when invited to do so. Daniel honored the requests though remained a silent partner in the instruction when not invited to participate. Barb's insistence on Daniel's participation allowed for a new collaboration that allowed
Daniel to display what he knew, his increasing competency now revealed in both settings.

Daniel's competency was operationalized in both assessments and reading group placement. When he entered the study, Daniel was at the higher end of the scores earned on the Diagnostic Survey (Clay, 1985). His responses revealed that he knew how to write many words and hear, organize, and encode 20 sounds. Further, he knew how print moved across a page. He, like Peter, was unable to read the lowest level of book provided him. When Daniel left Reading Recovery in early December he was reading book fifteen levels from where he began. He could write 36 words, and heard, organized, and encoded 36 sounds. In the classroom he had moved to a higher reading group where he continued to silently, but successfully succeed with the demands of the tasks presented him.

The findings of the study can now be viewed in a broader perspective. First, the descriptions of Peter and Daniel learning to read in two settings highlighted the closely entwined roles of both "student" and "beginning reader" that participants can negotiate as they take literate action in any learning-to-read experience. Second, given the multiple and varied roles taken by participants, learning to read, then, is more than a within-the-head process but also involves "between heads" interactions that form "patterned ways of acting, interacting, and evaluating what count[s] as literate action" (Green et al., 1991). Roles that children negotiate and the "patterned ways" for
implementing and renegotiating those ways when learning to read can be qualitatively different depending on which setting the child experiences. Such different ways of studenting and learning to read are now considered below in an expanded definition of "congruent reading programs" for low-progress readers.

**Congruency revisited.**

As outlined in Chapter II, the study of congruency between support programs like Reading Recovery and regular classroom instruction has an established history in the literature. (For a review, see Allington & Johnston, 1989). Consistent calls for convergent approaches (Allington & Johnston, 1989) between a support program and classroom instruction suggest that low-progress readers will be better able to effectively integrate their understandings if the instruction they receive in both programs is relatively similar.

The findings of this study suggest that the discussion move beyond the issue of instructional congruence to consider how students negotiate with their teachers, their roles as both students and beginning readers in each setting. Questions of a child's access to and practice with sorting out the demands of an alphabetic reading system must now be asked in both instructional settings. It is conceivable that child will "learn to read" in one setting and in another setting appear to experience "distress." Rather than relying on the explanation of differential instructional approaches as the cause of
such a dichotomy, the findings of this study concentrate on what Allington and Johnston (1989) refer to as differential access to more and better opportunities to learn.

First, differential access can refer to the very learning environments students experience, i.e., to what extent does the environment expand, allow, or deny a child access to the instructional opportunities? Cazden (1988) maintained that patterns of activities and routines within an instructional setting promote "familiar and predictable" environments for the student access, thus allowing the academic focus of the lesson to remain in full view. For Peter and Daniel, their learning to read experiences did occur in settings that were consistently and predictably enacted. Studies of instruction for low-progress readers (Allington, 1980; Collins, 1981; & McDermott, 1976) reveal that familiar and predictable environments for low-progress readers' access, especially in the reading group, are more the exception. Management problems, opportunity "toss-ups", and inconsistently-spent time in actual instruction are oft-cited factors that may negatively impact on a child's access to learning-to-read opportunities.

Second, low-progress readers might have differential access to each setting in terms of their negotiated roles, i.e., to what extent do students enter into the patterns of instructional opportunities? What factors beyond a predictable and familiar learning environment might impact on the child's negotiated role as a student in each instructional
setting? One factor is the extent to which the students are invited into the instruction. Nominations to participate, consistent turn-taking, and teacher expectations for active, student participation are negotiated behaviors that the study revealed opened up access to Peter and Daniel in their progress with their instructional opportunities. Invitations to participate can be effectively denied, though. Student discourse style (Green & Bloome, 1983; Heath, 1983; Michaels, 1980) and pervasive teacher talk (Dillon & Searle; 1981) might prevent the child from entering into instructional interactions, using the interactions to learn to read, and displaying what they know. A second factor that might impact on a child's negotiated role in each setting as a student is their style of participation (Bussis et al, 1985). As mentioned earlier, Peter and Daniel differed in terms of their style of participation and that difference impacted on (a) their display of what they knew and (b) their initiatives to enter into and use instructional invitations.

Finally, low-progress readers may have differential access to the changing scaffold of instruction in each setting, i.e., to what extent are students using the changing scaffold to learn to read in each setting? For Peter and Daniel, they were invited into the instruction of a familiar and predictable environment. As they progressed in their learning-to-read activities, the scaffold changed (or, in Peter's case, was proposed to be changed) and each was given increased opportunities to "initiate, direct, and control" (Cochran-Smith, 1984)
the reading activities in each setting. In Daniel's case, both his teachers increasingly insisted he access opportunities to "take over" his learning in both Reading Recovery and the classroom reading group. Grouping practices (Wilkinson, 1991) and packaged programs of reading instruction (Shannon, 1989 & Wolf & Perry, 1987), though, might (a) prevent any increase in the "degrees of freedom" that a child has with the instructional activities or (b) prevent the teacher from seeing the child's individual progress with the very instruction that is occurring.

In order to illustrate the way access to a changing scaffold can or can not occur, Carrie's case as both a student and beginning reader (Chapter I) is revisited. Carrie's pattern of participation in each setting was similar to Daniel's responses. Her active, successful participation in Reading Recovery lessons was not matched in the classroom, a setting where Carrie was a silent partner who, when she read aloud, was assisted with told or explicit direction to words or word parts. Though the instructional opportunities increased in terms of difficulty, Carrie and her classroom teacher continued to negotiate interaction that allowed Carrie access to immediate teacher assistance when she faltered in her reading instruction. This type of interaction kept the scaffold of instruction "static" and denied Carrie a chance to access strategies that she used in Reading Recovery to assist herself when experiencing reading difficulty.
Given the views of differential access (outlined above), a child's progress in learning to read in two settings may now be considered in three ways: (a) To what extent does each setting expand, allow, or deny a child access to instructional opportunities? (b) What is the negotiated role of studenting that the child is using in each setting? Specifically, to what extent do students enter into the patterns of instructional opportunities in each setting? (c) To what extent are students using the changing scaffold to learn to read in each setting? These questions reflect a theoretical view that Handerhan (1990) maintained "challenges the present understanding of reading as being a process defined solely in the head of the student" (p.223). These questions also expand the discussion of "congruency" from considering activities used in classroom instruction and the support program to a discussion of access issues and how these issues converge or diverge between settings.

Limitations as opportunities

The boundaries. Case study methodology developed "boundaries" within which the research questions were applied. In the present study, the boundaries of two instructional settings were formed and used to develop the descriptions of Peter and Daniel learning to read. Learning to read, though, is not limited to the instructional settings. For example, home influences (Bissex, 1980; Holland, 1991; & Taylor, 1987), the role of environmental print
(Hall, 1987), and the patterns of literacy activities and interactions beyond the instructional setting (Cochran-Smith, 1984) did not enter the boundaries of the study. Nonetheless, such influences beyond the instructional settings are recognized as having impact on learning to read. Green et al (1991) maintain that "several sources of external influence always exist within a group, while others are brought into a group by members of other groups external to the class" (p.26). Future inquiry might incorporate these sources as threads which help explain a child's progress in learning to read in an instructional setting.

The settings. As described earlier, both boys experienced instruction in "familiar and predictable" (Cazden, 1988) environments where instructional activities and routines were consistently implemented. The resulting descriptions provided a way to think about how each instructional setting provided one form of access to beginning readers. Questions of access in other settings with different routines, activities, and patterns of participation would certainly produce different descriptions. Along with descriptions of the instructional opportunities provided, the focus of inquiry should also include the nature of teaching-student interactions that are negotiated and which impact on what is learned, how it is learned, and what counts as learning. For example, a state wide study of early intervention programs in Ohio (Pinnell, Lyons, DeFord, Bryk, and Seltzer, 1991) explored student reading progress in five different
instructional settings: (a) Reading Recovery, (b) Reading Success, a program that employed one-to-one tutoring with similar activities, prompts, and materials, (c) Direct Instruction Skills Plan, a "one-to-one skills practice model," (d) Reading/Writing Group, a small group tutorial taught by Reading Recovery teachers that used similar materials and activities and which promoted similar reading strategy learning, and (e) a control group consisting of existing Chapter 1 service for first graders (pp.11-12). The authors found that the mean treatment effect on all four measures of reading and writing ability was significant only for the Reading Recovery group. "Reading Recovery emerges as the most powerful of the interventions that we tested" (p.27). When comparing the effects of Reading Recovery to Reading Success, another tutorial which used similar activities, materials, and prompts, the authors concluded that the "success of the Reading Recovery program goes beyond the individual factor and the instructional emphasis factor" (p.29). The authors continue:

Our interpretation of the differences between the Reading Recovery and Reading Success program effects lies in the intensity and effectiveness of the teaching within the reading/writing framework; and we recommend further research, including detailed qualitative analysis of interactional patterns. (p.229)

In a related study of four Reading Recovery teachers and students Handerhan (1990) picked up the challenge for research recommended by Pinnell et al. (1991). Handerhan reported that even
in Reading Recovery, teachers and students using similar procedures and enacting similar lesson structures with "common language," can produce different outcomes. For example, Handerhan found that differing instructional emphases during similar activities coupled with the teacher-student interactions that enabled or constricted opportunities to learn to read, help define what it means to succeed in reading instruction.

The social dynamic in learning to read, i.e., the negotiated issues of access (outlined above) are too powerful a presence to ignore. Future inquiry into the phenomenon of children learning to read in two settings that are different from the ones used in this study must include a description of what gets "accomplished" (Handerhan, 1990) through varying teacher and student interactions.

**Teacher perceptions.** In this study, limited teacher perceptions were gathered to check against the descriptions developed. Though the comments provided explanations for and challenges to the routines and activities the teachers used, the parcity of the data is a limitation to the study. Future inquiry to what Woosley (1991) refers to as "teachers' implicit theories and beliefs about literacy and learning in general" (p.189) can better highlight and explain the teaching side of the negotiation of studenting and learning roles that occur in any particular instructional setting.
Implications.

In 1990-1991, $5.4 billion was nationally allocated to Chapter 1 projects across the United State (LeTendre, 1991). Once year later the funding level was increased by 16% to 6.2 billion. With increases in Chapter 1 funding for programs such as Reading Recovery, effects of the funded program will be inevitably assessed (Slavin, 1991; Slavin & Madden, 1989).

This study highlights factors that must be included in future studies of instructional effects. Future inclusion of access issues (outlined above) as they play out in two instructional settings will promote expanded discussion as to why students might fail to learn to read in their intervention program. Incongruence between Chapter 1 instructional programs and classroom reading instruction is often cited as a primary reason Chapter 1 programs fail. Peter and Daniel's cases highlight the need to also consider the nature of differential access to both settings as an additional explanation to the congruency argument. Activities, routines, and patterns of participation both as a student and beginning reader must be actively explored in effects studies.

Though the present study did not explore the impact of various instructional activities on a student's emerging competence as a reader, the issue of "student control" over the reading act suggests activities which, by their very presence, would promote greater "degrees of freedom" (Bruner, 1975) with the reading act.
Gnagey Short (1991) suggests settings to assist the successful shift in the child's degrees of freedom with his learning:

All teachers need to establish a variety of literacy settings in their classroom, in which students experience different levels of support by the teacher or other readers and by the text. Students need to have opportunities continuously to read and reread familiar as well as challenging texts and to write their own text. They need opportunities to read independently as well as read with support from the teacher or other readers in the classroom. (p.106)

Gnagey-Short's description operationalizes settings which have potential to increase the child's control over the learning-to-read process. Her description also reinforces the need to consider activities within the complex interplay of routines and negotiated roles of student and beginning reader.

Another implication of the study involves the use of video-playbacks to promote a child's awareness of his role as both a student and beginning reader. During the study's playbacks Peter "coached" his video persona, and Daniel commented on his "nervousness" while viewing a reading group lesson. Though the video playbacks were intended to gather student perceptions about their learning, their comments point toward the use of the videos as an instructional device to engage children in reflection, observation, and possible renegotiation of their roles in studenting and learning to read.
A final implication considers the role of teacher's intercommunication as another medium of reflection, observation, and analysis concerning a child's reading progress. Allington & Johnston (1989) maintain the following:

[I]t is not possible to attend to the relationship between the learning in two program if one is aware only of the activity in one of the programs, as is frequently the case...[W]hen two teachers have extensive knowledge of how the other teaches, even if their knowledge structure differ, they are more likely to be able to build bridges between each other's programs. (pp.336-337)

Though Allington & Johnston were recommending reciprocal awarenesses of programs, persistent observation of low-progress readers learning and studenting in both settings would assist teachers in delineating activity structures, routines, and participation patterns that are expanding or thwarting a child's access to the offered instruction. To promote growth or change in the child's response to his or her experiences as a student and beginning reader, teacher communication and critical discussion is recommended.

Summary.

The present study described the experiences of two boys, Peter and Daniel, as they learned to read in two instructional settings. Both identified as low-progress readers (Clay, 1985), each received simultaneous reading instruction in Reading Recovery, an intervention program, and their first grade classroom reading group.
Persistent observation of the boys' experiences in both instructional settings over a two and one-half month period delineated patterns of activities, routines, and student participation patterns that were constructed and enacted in each setting. The resultant descriptions revealed learning to read as a social process as well as a cognitive one.

Each student's emergence as a reader in both settings was predicated, in part, on the realized and potential changes in the boy's role as student and beginning reader. Teacher observations and challenges to each boy's patterns of participation facilitated actual or proposed shifts in the instructional scaffold necessary to his emergence as a reader.

Student self-reports and well as participating teachers' perceptions of the boys' instructional experiences were also gathered to check against the teacher/researcher's interpretations.

Implications based on the case study research suggest that learning to read is closely entwined with learning to be a student and that both types of learning are socially constructed and redefined by participants. Issues of a student's access to learning provided by the instructional settings, invitations to the instruction, and the changing instructional scaffold were included in the discussion of classroom and program congruence experienced by low-progress readers as they experience the world of learning to read.
APPENDIX A

PARENT NOTIFICATION LETTER AND PERMISSION FORM
September 14, 1989

Dear Mrs. _________,

This year I will be working with your son, Daniel in the Reading Recovery program. We will begin our tutoring lessons, tomorrow, September 15.

Besides being a Reading Recovery teacher I am also a doctoral student at The Ohio State University. At this point, I am starting to collect data for my dissertation.

I am interested in studying how children, like Daniel, learn to read while attending both Reading Recovery lessons and reading group instruction in the classroom.

I write to ask your permission to include Daniel in my study. I chose him because (a) he qualified for Reading Recovery and (b) he seems enthusiastic about learning to read. I want to work with children, like Daniel, who will talk to me about their successes and problems as they move from Reading Recovery back to the classroom.

Let me share with you some of the ways I wish to conduct this study:

1. I will daily audio-tape our Reading Recovery lessons together.

2. Three times a year (September, January, and May) I wish to sit down with Daniel for 15-20 minutes and ask him questions about how he thinks he is doing when he has problems when reading.

3. Twice a month I wish to observe Daniel in his reading group with his first grade teacher, Mrs. Miller. One of those monthly visits will involve video-taping Daniel working in the group. Following the video-taping I will show back portions of the video to Daniel and ask him to discuss what he was thinking or doing during the lesson.

4. I will periodically confer with Mrs. Miller asking her to share with me how she thinks Daniel is progressing. These conferences are required of Reading Recovery teachers like myself.

PLEASE NOTE. WHEN THE STUDY IS COMPLETED AND I AM BEGINNING TO WRITE-UP THE FINDINGS, I WILL NEVER USE DANIEL'S NAME. RATHER, I WILL ASSIGN HIM A PSEUDONYM. THIS KEEPS THINGS CONFIDENTIAL BETWEEN HIM AND ME.
If the study is successful, I hope to publish the results in professional journals and present them at various organizational meetings. Again, Daniel's confidentiality will be maintained.

Mr. Joe Holland, principal, and Mrs. Barb Miller are allowing me to conduct the study with Daniel as long as you give your permission.

I see this study as an opportunity for me to try to understand what children, like Daniel, are thinking about as they learn to read. So often we bypass the kids as we try to figure out how they learn to read. This study included their thoughts and ideas right from the start. May Daniel join me in this study?

Please fill out the attached form and return it with Daniel by Monday, September 18 if you want him to be part of the study. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me.

Thank you and good things to you and your family.

Sincerely,

James R. Schnug
Reading Recovery
PERMISSION TO CONDUCT STUDY

To: Jim Schnug, Reading Recovery

I give my permission for Daniel _______ to be part of your dissertation study.

I understand that you will observe, audio-tape and video-tape Daniel in the manner outlined in the attached letter, and I give you permission to do so.

I also understand that you will use the data from this study to complete a dissertation at The Ohio State University and that you will seek opportunities to publish or present the study to professional organizations.

I also understand that my son's name will never be used in any written or oral reports, but that a pseudonym will be used instead.

It is also understood that the data and future written products will remain your personal property.

__________________________  ________________________
Name                      Date
APPENDIX B

READING RECOVERY SELECTION PROCEDURES
Reading Recovery
Guidelines for Program Entry
July 2, 1990

1. All children selected for the Reading Recovery must be in the lowest 20% achievement group of their first grade class in reading. This category will be determined by considering the classroom teacher's ranking and the Diagnostic Survey. In places where Reading Recovery teachers are "spread thin", the children may be selected from the lowest 15% of the class.

2. If Reading Recovery is supported by Chapter 1 funds, children selected must qualify for Chapter 1 according to district guidelines and the state guideline of an entry score on a standardized test of 36th percentile or lower. Chapter 1 requires that, within resources available, children scoring lowest on the standardized test must be served.

3. Retained first grade children should not be served by the Reading Recovery program since they are receiving an extra year of reading instruction. Since kindergarten retentions are based on a wide variety of factors, including attendance and age, previous retentions in preschool or kindergarten should not be a factor in selection for Reading Recovery.

4. Reading Recovery service will be available only for children in regular first grade classrooms. Children in "transition first grades" or "junior firsts" have been placed in those classrooms because they are not considered ready for a regular first grade curriculum. Since Reading Recovery depends for its effectiveness on bringing children to an average reading competence for the first grade school population, classroom instruction at those levels must be available. Children who are in transitional classrooms may, if they qualify, be served by Reading Recovery as first graders the following year.

5. Students to be served by Reading Recovery should be selected according to these procedures:

   a) For first grade classrooms, first ask the classroom teacher to do an alternative ranking for his/her class as described in the testing procedures. If possible consult the school kindergarten teacher(s) to confirm the ranking and offer information about any child who may be mistakenly evaluated at this early point in the school year.

   b) Next, test the lowest third of the class using the Diagnostic Survey. (If children are above the lowest third but the classroom teacher believes that they might qualify, they may be tested.)

   c) Within the lowest third, identify the children who qualify for Chapter 1. If Reading Recovery is funded by Chapter 1, eliminate all children who do not qualify; that is, who have standardized test scores above the 36th percentile. (If the classroom teacher strongly recommends Reading Recovery for a child who does not qualify, it might be wise to check the test data to make sure it is correct.)
d)  Remember that Reading Recovery may not be the only Chapter 1 program in any single building.

e)  From all the information available, select the lowest 15% to 20% of students. These children will be on the list to be served by Reading Recovery during the coming year.

6.  Once the pool of children have been selected, the teacher and teacher-leader must then decide who is to be served in the Fall and who will be placed on the waiting list to enter the program mid-year. This is a complicated matter because our system is somewhat different from the New Zealand school system. The procedure in New Zealand is to have children enter the program if they have not engaged in reading after one year of instruction in reading and writing. This instruction is not a "readiness" program or a workbook program; it involves actual reading and writing of texts. In the United States, children experience a wide variety of kindergarten programs; some involve reading books and others do not. In addition, some children may have been absent a great deal of time in kindergarten. In view of these special circumstances, the Reading Recovery teacher, consulting with the teacher-leader may decide that some children have not had an adequate time in reading instruction to benefit from the Reading Recovery program. This may be the case when children have been absent frequently during the kindergarten year. Another circumstance may be when information from the kindergarten teacher indicates that the child had little or no experience with handling books, reading, or attempting to read books, or writing during the kindergarten year. In such situations children may not have had enough classroom experience to acquire basic concepts about print and may benefit from a few months of classroom experience before entering Reading Recovery.

Holding children for mid-year placement requires a decision that the child has not had a full year of beginning reading instruction. The teacher and teacher-leader should make this decision carefully and when possible should consult the child's kindergarten teacher. Identifying children for mid-year placement depends on knowledgeable professional decision making of the teacher-leader, Reading Recovery teacher, and classroom teacher. These decisions must be conservatively, cautiously, and judiciously made and provision must be made to serve these children during the school year. Children so identified should be placed at the top of the waiting list and given priority as places are available unless they are determined at time of placement to have made enough progress not to need Reading Recovery.

7.  If Chapter 1 funds are used Chapter 1 guidelines must be followed. Students selected for mid-year placement who are among the lowest scorers on standardized tests should be provided another form of service until entering Reading Recovery.

8.  After selecting students who will benefit from mid-year placement, begin with the lowest children and select as many as can be served within the time allotted for Reading Recovery. Schedule these children for Reading Recovery lessons.

9.  Construct a waiting list of Reading Recovery students, giving top priority to the identified group of "mid-year" students and completing the list with all other students in the lowest 15% to 20% group.
10. Provide the classroom teacher with a list of students to be scheduled for immediate service and a list of students (in priority order) on the waiting list. Ask for the classroom teacher's feedback on the selection and make revisions if necessary. As far as possible, work with the classroom teacher to assure that all students will be served.

11. A final decision must be made for the small number of children who do not succeed in the Reading Recovery program.

   a) The teacher leader should monitor children's progress by examining teacher records carefully to identify children who are not making expected acceleration. Once children are identified, preferably within the first six weeks of service, the teacher-leader should follow procedures recommended in Early Detection and elsewhere to determine the source of difficulty, including frequent absence or instructional program, and all recommendations should be used during the next several weeks to help the child make faster progress. Teachers working with a hard-to-accelerate child should report regularly to the teacher leader about the child’s progress.

   b) If, after 15 calendar weeks of instruction, the child has not made progress and the teacher leader cannot, after intensive observation, attribute the lack of progress to the instructional program, the teacher leader and teacher may involve other professionals in the process of identifying the child for some kind of extended help, meanwhile continuing intensive instruction in Reading Recovery.

   c) If the child qualifies for another special program he or she should be removed from Reading Recovery and placed in that program, and another child should enter Reading Recovery.

   d) If placement is unavailable but it is clear that the child is not benefitting from Reading Recovery, the child may be removed from a regular lesson slot and provided a less intense kind of service until placement in long-term special help can be made.

   e) A note is appropriate in making these decisions. Of the children who have had a year of reading instruction, the number of children who cannot make satisfactory progress in Reading Recovery and will need long-term help is very small. It is not likely that all children served by a teacher will be in this category. If a teacher is having this kind of difficulty with the majority of children being served, both the teacher and teacher-leader must make an intensive analysis of the instruction.

   f) Provision should be made for an appropriate alternative program before any child is withdrawn from the program because of lack of success.
GUIDELINES FOR TESTING
STATE READING RECOVERY TEACHERS
FALL 1990

1. RR teachers will talk to the principal and to the first grade teachers about the program. They will let principals and teachers know that they will be:

   a. Testing the lowest 20% of 2-3 first grade classes. If there are more than 3 first grade classrooms, decide with the principal and the teachers involved which 3 classrooms will be involved.

   b. In order to determine the lowest 20% of each of the classrooms, RR teachers will work with each teacher and help that teacher alternative rank his/her students. This should be done during the second week of school.

      Alternative ranking: Take a class list for one entire first grade classroom. Choose the very highest student and the very lowest student. Next choose the second highest student and the second lowest. Continue on through the rest of the list. Rank the middle students even though distinctions will be difficult in the middle. The top and bottom rankings are the most important so just estimate when you get to the middle.

   c. RR teachers will then take the ranked lists for each of the 2-3 classrooms and test the bottom 20% of each class (must be at least 5 students). This testing should be done during the second or third week of school.

   d. First year RR teachers will also test 3 high and 3 middle children. From the 2-3 class lists that you have been using, choose the classroom which is the most representative for your school. Choose 3 high children and 3 middle children to test. This testing is part of first year RR teachers' training so that they will know the range of ability and have a better sense of their goals for bringing children up to the classroom average for their school. The testing is NOT for selecting RR students. It is part of a first year teacher's training.

   e. Select the lowest 8 students from all of those tested for Reading Recovery. From these 8 students, you will choose 4 to begin working with immediately and will put the other 4 on a waiting list to be picked up later as children are discontinued or withdrawn from Reading Recovery. Follow the Guidelines for Selecting Students handout which is included in the fall packet.
APPENDIX C

RUNNING RECORD OF TEXT READING
**RUNNING RECORD**

**NAME:** Daniel  
**RR TEACHER:** Schnug  
**DATE:** 11/11/89  
**TEXT LEVEL:** 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores:</th>
<th>RUNNING WORDS</th>
<th>ERROR</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>ACC.</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ANALYSIS OF ERRORS**

- Easy 95-100%
- Inst. 90-94%
- Hard 50-69%

- Evidence of cross-checking: ☑️
- No restart
- Evidence of phrasing

**CROSS CHECKING ON CUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>TITLE AND LEVEL: Pat's New Puppy</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>CUES USED E SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Checking picture)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;Capital H&quot; on Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;She's going to make a mistake!&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** 3

---

*Note: The image contains a reference to the Ohio State University, which is not visible in the text.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>layed @ picture before rereading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(talking about the story)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>away/1T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>here/A h-h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

EXAMPLE OF TRANSCRIPT TO ILLUSTRATE CODING PROCESS
The following transcript illustrates the coding process that was used to analyze the nature of student participation in both the Reading Recovery lesson and the instructional reading group. Code Descriptors are summarized in Table 12.

The example is from Daniel's (D) 13th Reading Recovery lesson with me (J). It begins where Daniel is about to read during the Running Record activity. Daniel reads The Seed (Cowley, 1987) which had been introduced and reading once in a previous lesson. The dialogue is presented in capital letters and in a linear, top-down fashion. Particular codings and explanations are written in lower case letters. Accompanying actions are also written in lower case letters encased in parentheses.

J: REMEMBER THE SEED FROM YESTERDAY?

   Code 1 - Teacher initiates new activity.

D: WHAT KIND OF BOOK IS THAT? (reaches for the lesson's new book)

J: WAIT TILL WE GET TO THAT. I WAS SO WORRIED WE WOULDN'T GET TO THAT TODAY.

D: (reads cover of the Running Record book) THE SEED

   Code D - Student initiates reading act without a prompt

D: HOW COME THESE GUYS DON'T KNOW? (points to picture)

   Code C - Student initiates an observation about the picture.

D: (opens book and reads title page) THE SEED

   Code D - Student maintains the reading act.
(Daniel continues to read the text while I record his oral reading performance. He self-corrects and rereads often (Code D). He notices the apostrophe on one page and asks for it (Code C). On the last page, Daniel invents a response, then self-corrects.

J: (laughing) I WAS WORRIED THERE AT THE NED. I THOUGHT YOU WERE MAKING UP ANOTHER STORY!

Code 1 - Teaches points out that author's message needs to be attended to.

J: THERE IT IS...A WATERMELON. (points and reads the words)

Code 1 - Teacher draws student's attention to the words on the text.

J: YOU'RE RIGHT. THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE A WATERMELON. HEY HEY-HEY! I REALLY LIKE HOW YOU WORKED ON THIS PAGE (p.14). YOU SAID, "ON. ON, IS THAT DAY?" AND THEN YOU WENT BACK AND FIXED IT ALL UP BY YOURSELF. NICE WORK.

Code 3 - General and specific confirmation of student's work.

J: AND YOU KNOW WHAT, DANIEL? THERE IS THE WORD, 'ON' RIGHT IN THAT WORD (one). BUT YOU PUT THE 'E' ON IT AND IT BECOMES 'ONE'.

Code 1 - Teacher draws student's attention to the chunk within a word and shows how the word works.

D: HOW COME IT (one) DOESN'T MAKE THE /WAH/ SOUND?

Code C - Student initiates observation about the letter-sound correspondences learned.

J: THAT'S A GOOD QUESTION. THAT'S JUST THE WAY OUR LANGUAGE WORKS.

(The exchange continues as I go back to the observation Daniel made about the apostrophe and a discussion ensues concerning contractions.)
Code 1 - Teacher directs attention to the specific convention of written language.

D: WHAT KIND OF BOOK IS THAT? (points to new book, again)

Code E - Student attempts to initiate a new activity even though the lesson routines have established that writing a student-generated sentence comes next.

END OF SEGMENT
APPENDIX E

FREQUENCY TABLES

RESPONSE CODES FOR READINGS OF NOVEL CONTINUOUS TEXT
Table 24

Peter - Frequency of Responses to the Reading of Novel, Continuous Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Response Code</th>
<th>Set 1 *</th>
<th></th>
<th>Set 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Set 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. * Limited observations - Codes taken from field notes. RR = Reading Recovery, RG = Reading Group. A = Student responds to a specific prompt directed at a discrete aspect of the reading/writing act, B = Student selects response to a general teacher prompt, C = Student initiates an observation or use of a discrete aspect of the reading act, D = Student initiates or maintains the reading/writing act, E = Student attempts to control the lesson beyond the instructional agenda.
Table 25

Daniel- Frequency of Responses to the Reading of Novel, Continuous Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Response Code</th>
<th>Set 1</th>
<th>Set 2</th>
<th>Set 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. RR = Reading Recovery  RG = Reading Group  A = Student responds to a specific prompt directed at a discrete aspect of the reading/writing act, B = Student selects response to a general teacher prompt, C = Student initiates an observation or use of a discrete aspect of the reading act, D = Student initiates or maintains the reading/writing act, E = Student attempts to control the lesson beyond the instructional agenda.
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