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CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

In our complex society, becoming literate demands more than just acquiring language skills or independent strategies for constructing meaning from text. It also requires making sense and meaning of the social processes that surround literacy learning.

These social processes can support or constrain students' access to the knowledge needed to become literate. Gaining access to this knowledge requires learning the norms and developing competence in acting and reacting in socially appropriate ways.

What counts as literacy, literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior can vary from one social context to another. The ability to make sense of these variations also contribute to students' literacy development.
As educators and researchers our aim is to find ways of providing the best possible start for all young students to become literate. This goal requires us to come to grips with the social issues surrounding early literacy development by foregrounding the study of literacy learning within the social framework of what counts as literacy.

This study sought to address issues of access and entry into the world of literacy for first grade students identified by their schools and teachers as at-risk of failure in learning to read and write. For these students, learning the "social text" (e.g., who can do what, with whom, when, where, for how long, and for what purposes) and the "academic text" (e.g., content, topic, themes, materials) (Green, Weade, and Graham, 1988; Rogers, Green, Nussbaum, 1990) meant learning how to make sense and meaning of the instruction they received in the classroom and in Reading Recovery (Clay, 1979), an early intervention program for at-risk first graders.

By assuming that "meaning" is central to the construction of literacy, this study explored the various ways in which these at-risk students made sense of the literacy instruction they received and how those constructions of meaning were shaped by the processes that occurred within these varying socio-cultural contexts.

In essence, the focus of this dissertation was on the meaning that at-risk students made of the instruction they
received in a regular classroom and an intervention program. I was interested in what it meant to be an at-risk student receiving instruction in two contexts. What were the expectations and opportunities for literacy learning? How were these expectations and opportunities similar or different within and across settings and schools? How were these expectations and opportunities communicated? Were these opportunities made accessible to these students, and if so, how?

Rationale of the Study

Populations that traditionally have been at-risk of failure in learning to read and write will be increasing through the year 2000 (Hodgekinson, 1988). Longitudinal studies of children's literacy development (Wells, 1986) clearly show that those who do not get a good start in learning to read and write tend to lag behind year after year, never attaining the skills and knowledge of their more successful peers (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 1988; McGill-Franzen, 1987; Pinnell, 1989).

The most feasible and effective remedy to the problem of meeting the needs of this growing population is to turn our attention toward the educational issues surrounding early literacy learning (Allen & Mason, 1989).

There is a large body of literature about early literacy learning and at-risk populations. Typically, students at risk of failure in learning to read and write
receive instruction in the classroom plus a remedial or early-intervention program (Allington, 1985; 1988; 1990). Participation in a specialized program requires at-risk students to be "pulled-out" of the classroom setting for regular extended periods of time.

Little is known about how at-risk students make sense of the instruction they receive as they travel between regular classroom instruction and intervention programs. We do not fully understand the range of expectations placed upon students in the variety of situations they encounter, nor do we understand the opportunities they have to make sense of it all.

Up to now, research has been primarily concerned with whether instruction occurring in and out of the classroom is "congruent" (Johnston, et.al., 1985). Results of this study suggest that such preoccupations with congruency has lead to limited notions of what it means to be an at-risk student receiving instruction in two contexts.

Each setting represents a unique communicative context that places demands on students to be competent in both structural and functional elements of language (Wilkinson, 1982). Mehan (1979) has argued, as cited by Wilkinson (1982) that:

Students not only must learn the content of academic subjects, they must learn the appropriate form in which to cast their academic knowledge. . . They must know with whom, and where they can speak and act, and they must provide the speech and behavior that are appropriate for a given
classroom situation. Students also must be able to relate behavior, both academic and social, to varying classroom situations by interpreting implicit classroom rules (p.133).

Identifying the rules of what counts as literacy, literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior in a given context is a complex issue (Bloome & Green, 1990). Students participate in a broad range of activities and structured events. The patterns of communication revolving around these events and the rules followed (Cazden, 1988), represent the social knowledge participants rely on in interpreting what goes on (Gumperz, 1982). As students move from one socio-cultural context to another, they must learn to make sense of various expectations and opportunities.

The purpose of this study was to explore the ways in which these students made sense of these variations as they received instruction within and across socio-cultural contexts. Such information is important if we are to gain a more complete picture of literacy learning for at-risk populations.

Studies within naturalistic research, particularly from ethnography as defined within cultural anthropology (Heath, 1982) and ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1972; Saville-Troike, 1982), and socio-linguistics (Gumperz, 1982; Green, 1990) provided a theoretical framework for this study of the ways in which students made sense of the literacy instruction they received and how those constructions of meaning were shaped by the larger socio-cultural context.
Such frameworks emphasize the need to examine the socio-cultural influence of classroom life on students' understandings. These understandings are constructed through the on-going communicative processes that occur between students and their surrounding world.

In school these communicative processes tend to be structured as events couched within lessons (e.g., reading at the rug in the classroom, math, science, journal writing with a teacher in the pull-out program). The meanings constructed during these events are unique and situated in the given context. In this study, the contexts were (a) two team taught first grade classrooms located in two schools, and (b) the pull-out instructional programs taught by the same teachers.

The focus of the study was on the experiences of five at-risk students. Participants in the study were the teachers providing the instruction in these settings and the student class members. For the purposes of this dissertation, two of the five at-risk students experiences are presented.

Green (1990) argues that when we view something that is bounded by different contexts, we can begin to see how those contexts contribute to the interpretations students make. Green goes on to describe this approach to classroom research as an exploration of part/whole relationships, where the instructional context represents a "tapestry" of
closely woven patterns of meaning. From this tapestry we can pull a thread forward to examine its detail closely, and then reembed it in the fabric without disrupting the intricacies of the pattern.

Drawing on this metaphor of the tapestry and its threads, this study explores the various ways in which students interpreted and came to make sense of literacy instruction occurring within and across socio-cultural contexts. This required me to begin by exploring the cultural processes of the classrooms and their sub-cultures, the pull-out programs, before narrowing my focus to instruction and literacy instruction in particular.

Locating literacy within the larger instructional context enabled me to identify the cultural patterns of literacy instruction as it related to time, space, actions, events, and goals (Goodenough, 1981). This was accomplished by shifting my focus inward, from the tapestry (socio-cultural contexts) to the thread (instruction, literacy learning, literacy knowledge), and back to the larger socio-cultural context.

The Study

The research reported here is part of an eight month long study of at-risk students' experiences in two socio-cultural contexts. Two schools located in a large midwestern city, each drawing upon populations diverse in socio-economic and cultural backgrounds, were the sites for
the research; the classes studied were two first grades and their corresponding pull-out instructional programs. Each first grade class was taught by a team of two teachers, both sharing the responsibilities for the pull-out program instruction. Five students identified by their schools and teachers as at-risk of failure in learning to read and write were chosen as focus students. Results of data collected for two focus students are reported in this dissertation.

Data collected during this study included the following:

1. Approximately 115 hours of field note observations of classroom and pull-out program instruction during the studies' sixteen week formal observation period.

2. Approximately 42 hours of videotape recordings of instructional activities during this sixteen week observation period.

3. Approximately 60 hours of audio recordings obtained with a remote microphone system of at-risk students' participation in the classroom context during this sixteen week observation period.

4. Approximately 133 hours of audio recordings (recorded by the teachers) of at-risk students' instructional lessons in the pull-out program, serving as a way of documenting their experiences from the beginning to the end of their program.

5. Periodic interviews with the four teachers about the instruction.

6. Periodic interviews with the five at-risks students whose experiences were followed closely throughout this study.

7. Samples of at-risk students' writing behaviors in both instructional contexts.

8. Records of at-risk students' reading behaviors in both instructional contexts.

9. Results of assessment tasks implemented by the teachers of at-risk students' reading and writing abilities.
Questions of the Study

Methods for data collection and analysis were prescribed by the research questions and my concern with the students' meaning making, or the emic perspective of the participants. This study addressed the following questions:

1.0 What is the range of literacy opportunities in these social settings?

1.1 How are the literacy opportunities in the classroom similar to or different from the literacy opportunities in the pull-out program?

2.0 What are the expectations and opportunities for literacy learning for these at-risk students?

Summary

The purpose of this study was to explore the ways in which students identified by their schools and teachers as at-risk made sense and meaning of the instruction they received in the classroom and an early intervention "pull-out" program.

Placing meaning central to the study of literacy learning and development allowed for the exploration of the various ways the meanings students made of the instruction they received were influenced by the socio-cultural contexts.

This study offers important insights into the range of expectations placed upon students in the variety of situations they encountered, and the opportunities they had to make sense of it all.
Acting as an observer/participant, various data were gathered over an eight month period in two schools. Five students identified by their schools and teachers as at-risk of failure in learning to read and write were chosen as focus students. For the dissertation, results of data analysis pertaining to two representative cases of the five focus students are presented. Data of the study consist of field notes of observations, video and audio recordings of instruction occurring in each context, interviews with teachers and focus students, assessment tasks implemented by the teachers, and records of at-risk students' reading and writing behaviors.

In this chapter I described the purposes and provided the background of the theoretical approach driving the research methods of the study. In Chapter II, I describe how a survey of related literature on differential treatment of poor readers and socio-cultural contexts for learning helped in framing the study. In Chapter III, I detail the methodological procedures used. In Chapter IV results of the analysis of data pertaining to the instructional settings and the two focus students are detailed. And in Chapter V I conclude with a discussion of the research findings, selected parameters of the study, and the implications for instruction and future research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The approach taken in this study of the early literacy experiences of five at-risk students in two socio-cultural contexts was influenced by research in the areas of differential treatment of poor readers and of social and cultural contexts for learning.

Differential Treatment of Poor Readers

Since the mid 1960s, improved efforts to educate children of disadvantaged families have been perceived as a key factor in addressing the needs of impoverished America (Hoffman, 1991). Because being literate is thought to be the greatest predictor of success in this country (Venesky & Winfield, 1970; Weber, 1971; Wilder, 1977), literacy for all has become a goal of education, making reading instruction a central activity in the elementary school (Shannon, 1989).

Populations that traditionally have experienced failure in learning to read and write continue to increase (Hodgekinson, 1988). While the literature suggests many
remedies to the problem of meeting the needs of this growing population, the research community can agree that when students do not get a good start in learning to read and write they tend to lag behind, year after year, never attaining the skills and knowledge of their more successful peers (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 1988; McGill-Franzen, 1987; Pinnell, 1989; Wells, 1986). Therefore, the most feasible course of action is to turn our attention toward the educational issues surrounding early literacy learning (Allen & Mason, 1989).

Since the inception of Chapter 1 of the Educational Consolidation Act of 1980, a federal program designed to provide funds to states and school districts for impoverished and low achieving students, schools have attempted to enhance the quality of at-risk students' instruction. This goal has manifested itself in various instructional formats designed to provide differential treatment of low achieving students.

Such differential treatments come in various forms of in-class and "pull-out" (out of class) instructional programs. There has been much debate over which instruction is more effective in helping the failing learner to be successful.

In the primary grades, in-class literacy instructional programs have traditionally been organized and implemented by grouping students according to ability (Barr & Dreeben,
Such within class groupings occur more commonly for reading than for any other subject area.

Movements toward more integrated curricula and less fragmentation of subject matter has forced educators and researchers to reexamine practices of ability grouping in the classroom (Barr & Dreeben, 1989). Findings relating to failing students' success in ability grouping instructional models (Allington, 1978; Barr, 1974; Hoffman & Clements, 1984; McDermott, 1976) suggest the need for more intensive out of class programs designed specifically to meet individual students' needs.

In response, school districts frequently make the decision to adopt some variation of the two models, where in-class programs are taught by the classroom teacher and/or instructional aides, and pull-out programs by resource teachers or reading specialists (Allington, 1989).

Allington (1989) reports that 90 percent of the schools with Chapter 1 programs choose some version of pull-out instruction. Participation in these specialized programs require students to be out of the classroom setting for regular and extended periods of time. Typically this period is 30 minutes every day.

The adoption of these models has prompted concerns. One concern has been with the quantity of literacy instruction students receive both in and out of the classroom. Allington (1989) argues that the goal of
remediation is to supplement not supplant classroom instruction. He contends that failing students' literacy learning can be accelerated if they are provided with "more and better instruction than is given their peers who seem to acquire reading rather easily" (p. 3). While the notion of just providing low-achieving students more literacy instruction than is typically offered the student population as a whole (Knap & Needels, 1990) may be too simple a solution, startlingly, participants in Chapter 1 programs often receive less classroom instruction than non-participants (Allington, et. al., 1986; Ligon & Doss, 1982; Vanecko, Ames, and Archambault, 1980).

There are several reasons for this trend. For example, when elementary teachers consider themselves to be generalists rather than specialists in literacy instruction they are more likely to leave the instruction of the low-achieving student to the Chapter 1 teacher. When there is little communication between the classroom and pull-out program teachers, low-achieving students' instruction becomes fragmented. Students are on their own to make sense of how what they learn in each context relates to the other.

Overcrowded classrooms leave teachers with little time for planning the instruction of low-achieving students and again, the literacy instruction offered them is left to the pull-out program teachers.
Schools with higher concentrations of poor students place less emphasis on literacy instruction and spend more time on math and science programs than do other schools (Berman et. al., 1987). Therefore, when students are out of the classroom participating in Chapter 1 instruction, they are likely to miss the literacy instruction offered in the classroom.

Good (1986) has argued that students lose too much time in transitions from one instructional context to the other, and low-achieving students often have a difficult time adjusting to moving from one teacher to another.

Another concern has been in the wide variability in the quality and effectiveness of literacy instruction offered in and out of the classroom. In 1989, Slavin added fuel to the debate concerning in-class versus pull-out instruction by arguing that the question "has been resolved: both are equally ineffective." While he now writes (Slavin, 1991) that we know more today about effective programs for failing students, he challenges:

Chapter One can be more than it is today. It can be an engine for change in the education of disadvantaged children . . . . It can help schools move toward the teaching of a full and appropriate curriculum for all students - but particularly for those who, by virtue of being "at-risk," too often receive a narrow curriculum that emphasizes isolated skills (p. 587).

The narrowing of the literacy instructional curriculum to the mere identification of deficits in students' learning and then teaching of skills through intensive isolated
remains a central concern. Allington (1990) charges that instead of identifying deficits and attempting to teach isolated skills in those deficit areas, students need to receive meaningful instruction that "builds upon, extends, reinforces, and balances the classroom lessons" (p. 3).

More often than not there is little carry over between instruction provided in the classroom and in the pull-out program. What counts as literacy in the pull-out program may differ greatly from what counts as literacy in the classroom. For example, when the focus of instruction in the pull-out program is on teaching isolated skills in identified deficit areas, often there is little carry over into classrooms where a more "meaning driven" approach has been adopted (Allington, 1989). When there is little carry over, students continue to fail in the classroom, and in subsequent years are identified for remedial services.

In response to concerns over students being placed in a continuous remedial cycle, others have argued for early intervention models of differential treatment (Carter, 1984; Guthrie, et. al., 1978; Clay, 1979; Slavin, et.al., 1990). The goal of these models is to target the most vulnerable students early and try to prevent failure before it occurs. Students are identified as "at-risk" of failure and receive early short term "intervention" as opposed to long term remediation.
The guiding definition for the term "at-risk" in this study refers to the ideologically shaped definition within the contexts studied (Richardson, et. al., 1989). According to Nelkin (1985), "It is the social system, the world view, the ideological premises of a group or a society that shapes perception of risk" (p. 16). Richardson, et. al., (1989) argues, "... the person considered at-risk, the reasons for this consideration, and the ways the school responds are viewed as being constructed in the context of the classroom" (p. 7). Therefore, while the purpose of this study was not to argue for or against the means through which student participants were identified as at-risk, it was a basic premise that this identification was socially and culturally defined.

In summary, issues of "congruency" of instruction in and out of the classroom have moved to the forefront (Johnson, et. al., 1985). Up to now, such concerns have dealt primarily with issues of (a) whether the instruction in the pull-out program complements the instruction in the classroom in terms of "skills versus meaning driven approaches," (b) instructional time lost in transition from one setting to another, (c) quantity and quality of instruction offered in each setting, (d) lack of communication between teachers, (e) early intervention versus remedial services, and (f) students' difficulty in adjusting from one teacher to the next.
One instructional model that provided a unique opportunity to explore these issues of congruency of instruction from an early intervention perspective, is a program developed by New Zealand educator and psychologist Marie Clay (1979).

Clay's model emphasizes the need for providing a second chance in reading for students who have been identified as "at-risk" of failure after receiving one full year of reading instruction. As an early intervention program, students are tutored for a short period (average of 12-15 weeks) toward the expressed purpose of bringing the students up to the average of their class in reading and writing ability.

Reading Recovery (Clay, 1979) teachers work with students to help them learn to use the strategies of successful beginning readers. These early strategies include self-monitoring (using their knowledge of text structures to monitor reading), checking and cross-checking (using text information to predict and check against other sources of information), searching for cues (from meaning drawn from pictures, from graphic representations, and text characteristics such as graphophonemic elements, syntactic elements, and semantic elements), and self-correcting (independently correcting miscues made during reading) (Clay, 1989; Pinnell, DeFord, Lyons, 1988).
Clay (1979) argues that when students learn to read and write whole text through such an intensive one-to-one instruction, they will be equipped to return to the classroom and continue without needing additional help.

While such models have proven to be effective in helping students to become literate, (Pinnell, DeFord, Lyons, 1988) little is known about how these students make sense of the instruction they receive in and out of the classroom when the instructional models are congruent and when they are not. We do not fully understand the range of expectations placed upon students in the variety of situations they encounter, nor do we understand the opportunities they have to make sense of it all.

While this study does not address issues of program success, such an instructional model provided the means of exploring the meaning of the experiences of at-risk students receiving instruction both in the classroom and in a pull-out program.

This study was part of an eight month long study of at-risk students' experiences in two socio-cultural contexts. Two schools located in a large midwestern city, each drawing upon populations diverse in socio-economic and cultural backgrounds, were the sites for the research. The classes studied were two first grades and their corresponding pull-out instructional programs.
This study is unique in that each first grade class was taught by a team of two teachers, both sharing the responsibilities for the pull-out program instruction as well. While the literature on at-risk populations has much to tell about the demands placed on students when the instruction they receive in the classroom is very different from that of the pull-out program, this study allowed for the exploration of the experiences of students taught by the same teachers in both settings, each teaching from similar philosophies, as specialists in early literacy development. This eliminated some of the variables that have plagued previous studies of at-risk students experiences in "pull-out" instructional programs.

Social and Cultural Contexts for Learning

This study of at-risk students in two classrooms located in two schools prompted a comparative perspective of how the social and cultural processes of the classrooms and pull-out programs might influence students' responses to instruction.

The literature on at-risk populations has much to tell about the demands placed on students when the instruction they receive in the classroom is very different from that of the pull-out program. This literature emphasizes the difficulties students encounter as they move from teacher to teacher, from context to context, and from one instructional philosophy to another.
Yet, when we view literacy development as a socially constructed process rather than as a set of acquired language skills we can begin to look beyond restricted conceptions of literacy and begin to explore the ways socio-cultural contexts either fosters or impedes learning. Moreover, the socio-cultural nature of literacy acquisition moves to the forefront of our concerns.

This study was concerned with the various ways in which students made sense of the instruction they received in the two socio-cultural settings. Because social norms differed from one context to another, students had to learn how to interpret the signals for socially appropriate behavior.

Zaharlick & Green (1990) argue:

Groups of people who engage in interaction with each other over time develop a set of norms and expectations, have rights and obligations placed on them for participating in the group, and develop roles and relationships among members of the group. In other words, a group develops patterned ways of engaging in life together, of seeing and interpreting the patterned ways of life, of holding members accountable to the norms and expectations of life, and of making sense out of the world around them. (p. 21)

Therefore, while what counted as literacy, literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior in each context was a central concern of this study, it was important to consider ways in which each setting represented unique communicative contexts that placed unique demands on students.
Heath's (1984) work demonstrates how each community or group has rules for socially interacting and sharing knowledge in literacy events. In school, the frames (Green, 1987) for appropriate behavior are constructed through the face-to-face interactions that occur between teachers and students. The content of these interactions provides a signal to students about what is important to know. Therefore, what occurred, how actions unfolded, how participants built on and made sense of these actions, and how students constructed meaning from these interactions were the focus of this study.

"To understand the observed behaviors of any social group we need to know what literacy means to that group" (p. 20) (Schieffelin, & Cochran-Smith, 1984). By looking at the more focused aspects of literacy learning that occurred within the events in each context, I was able to gain a greater understanding of how literacy was valued by the students. I was also able to explore what students were expected to know and do to participate in these various events. I was interested in how students came to understand the rules for participation that ultimately permitted them to engage in the activities that enabled them to make sense of literacy instruction.

To understand how students made sense of instruction I also needed to consider the socio-cultural issues related to the construction of an intertextual context by the learner.
According to Bloome (1989) "whenever people engage in a language event, whether it is a conversation, the reading of a book, diary writing, etc., they are engaged in intertextuality (p. 1)." The way texts make sense is largely through the socially constructed process of intertextuality. Attention to intertextuality is also important in understanding the socio-cultural relationships that exist within and across literacy events (Bloome, 1989; Lemke, 1985). Bloome (1989) has argued, "By exploring what texts are being juxtaposed, at what levels, for what purposes, and, by exploring how that juxtaposition is occurring, insights can be gained into the cultural ideology of the event (p. 32)."

Summary

As educators and researchers our aim is to provide the best possible start for all young students in order for them to be successful in learning to read and write. This goal has manifested itself in various differential treatments of low achieving students. Typically, these treatments have been in the form of remedial or early intervention programs (Allington, 1988; 1990).

Participation in these specialized programs requires students to be "pulled-out" of the classroom setting for regular extended periods of time. Little is known about how at-risk students make sense of the instruction they receive in and out of the classroom. We do not fully understand the
range of expectations placed upon students in the variety of situations they encounter, nor do we understand the opportunities they have to make sense of it all.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was two fold. My first goal was to develop a broader understanding of the range of literacy opportunities in these social settings. Recurrent literacy events were identified and explored in relation to what counted as literacy, literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior in each setting.

My second goal was to explore the ways in which students identified by their schools and teachers as at-risk made sense of the instruction they received in the classroom and an early intervention pull-out program. Placing meaning central to the study of literacy learning and development allowed for the exploration of the various ways the meanings' students made of the instruction they received were influenced by the social processes occurring in these socio-cultural contexts.

This study was unique in that it allowed for the elimination of some of the variables that have plagued previous studies of at-risk students' experiences in pull-out programs. It is the first study to examine in-class and pull-out program instruction taught by the same highly trained educators.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study explored the early literacy instruction occurring in two first grade classrooms, in two elementary schools located in a large midwestern city, each drawing upon populations diverse in socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. Acting as an observer/ participant, I gathered various data sources over an eight month period. Five students identified by their schools and teachers as at-risk of failure and in need of early intervention were systematically observed in-depth as they received instruction in the classroom and in the pull-out program. For this dissertation, results of the analysis of data on two representative cases of the five focus students are presented.

Careful consideration was given to the meaning of the experiences of these at-risk students. The following data were gathered: (a) field notes of observations, (b)
video and audio recordings of instruction occurring in each context, (c) interviews with teachers and focus students, 
(d) assessment tasks implemented by the teachers, and (e) written artifacts of at-risk students' reading and writing 
behaviors.

In this chapter I begin by presenting an overview of the research approach and questions of the study. A full 
description of the methods and procedures introduced are detailed in the following discussions of (a) the school 
selection process, (b) negotiating entry into the settings, (c) the identification of focus students, and (d) the phases 
of data collection and analysis.

Overview and Research Approach

Given the nature of the research questions and the need for an in-depth exploration of literacy instruction 
occuring in two social and instructional settings, a qualitative, naturalistic inquiry approach to research was 
warranted.

These questions were pursued with a research design that allowed for an in-depth examination of the 
instructional settings, the literacy instruction occurring within each context, and the experiences of the focus 
students. Data were collected on five focus student members' experiences in these instructional settings. For the 
purposes of this dissertation, results of the analysis of two representative cases of the five focus students (one
student from each school) are presented. The decision to limit the number of cases to two was due to the large quantity of data collected and the need for an in-depth multi-layered analysis of this data.

The two students selected were those who traveled from the classroom setting to the pull-out program each morning. Since this was the time of the day when most of the literacy instruction occurred in each classroom setting, a close examination of these students' experiences allowed me to focus on (a) literacy instruction in particular, (b) the norms and expectations placed upon students in each context during literacy instruction, and (c) the ways in which students made sense of shifts in these norms and expectations as they traveled from the classroom to the pull-out program, from one literacy event to the next.

A comparative model (Green & Zaharlick, 1990) of data collection and interpretation of data was used. Zaharlick and Green (1990) argue that:

... ethnography is always comparative, that to understand what one sees in one event may often require knowledge of performance in other events, ... events and people within them have a history that is visible in the face-to-face actions of the event if one knows how to "see" and what questions to ask ... (p. 27)

In-depth observation in each classroom and instructional setting occurred over a sixteen week period. I systematically rotated time spent in each site, following
one focus student per day. Details of this system of rotations will be elaborated on in this chapter.

After this 16 week period, I continued to collect data on the focus students. I visited each school at least twice a week to collect copies of written artifacts of students reading and writing behaviors in the classroom and the pull-out program. I also collected the audio recordings of each pull-out program instructional lesson.

Member checks were conducted throughout the field observation period and the extended data collection period.

Analysis of data was an on-going process concurrent to data collection. This strategy allowed me to identify consistent patterns in the data, develop and test working hypotheses of interpretations of the data, and alter collection procedures accordingly. More in-depth analysis was implemented at the point of exiting the field.

Methods for data collection and analysis were prescribed by the research questions, and by my concern in the discovery of the emic (insider) perspectives of the participants. The research questions guiding this study were:

1.0 What is the range of literacy opportunities in these social settings?

1.1 How are the literacy opportunities in the classroom similar to or different from the literacy opportunities in the pull-out program?

2.0 What are the expectations and opportunities for literacy learning for these at-risk students?
Questions 1.0-1.1 were concerned with (a) defining and exploring the class as a culture and the pull-out program as its subculture, (b) locating literacy within each socio-cultural context, and (c) describing the range of literacy opportunities within and across these contexts.

Green (1989) argues that to understand the meanings held by the members of a particular group we must begin by exploring how the flow of everyday life influences everyday learning. Locating literacy within the larger instructional context enabled me to begin to identify the cultural patterns of literacy instruction occurring in each context in relation to time, space, actions, events, and goals (Goodenough, 1981).

This approach enabled me to foreground the examination of students' responses to instruction within the framework of what counted as literacy, literacy knowledge, and socially appropriate literacy behavior. Therefore, my observations of the focus students' were never separated from their social origins.

For question 2.0 the focus of data collection and analysis procedures moved from the instructional contexts to the at-risk students. This allowed for an in-depth exploration into how these students made sense of the varying expectations and opportunities for literacy learning within and across contexts.
In the following section, I detail the process through which I gained entry into these school settings.

**Negotiating Entry into the Settings**

My initial task during this phase of the study was to select and gain access to the school sites. This process began in early July of 1990, and continued through the end of September of that same year. This process is detailed in the following section.

**Selecting School Sites**

The following list of criteria for the selection of the school sites was developed based on the particular needs of this study. These criteria highlight the uniqueness of this study from past studies of at-risk students.

1. **Locating an accessible school district drawing upon populations diverse in socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds that offered Reading Recovery services to at-risk first graders.**

Because of my interest in exploring the experiences of populations that have traditionally been at-risk of failure in becoming literate, I selected an urban school district located in a large midwestern city for the site for this study. This school district offered Reading Recovery services to their at-risk first graders.
2. **Locating accessible elementary schools offering Reading Recovery pull-out program services to at-risk populations.**

Due to a lack of funding and/or shortage of teachers willing to participate in the year long training program, a school district may not always be able to offer Reading Recovery in all their elementary schools. Therefore, after locating an accessible school district that offered Reading Recovery in some of its schools I also had to locate accessible elementary schools that offered the program.

3. **Locating accessible first grade classrooms taught by two pull-out program teachers.**

While some schools offering Reading Recovery services employ one teacher to teach Reading Recovery full-time, others have adopted a team approach where two first grade teachers share the teaching responsibilities of the classroom and the pull-out program. This study is the first to explore such a model.

4. **Locating accessible team taught first grade classrooms where at least two students were selected for the pull-out program.**

All the accessible elementary schools identified for this study had 2 or 3 first grade classrooms. Only one of these classrooms was taught by the team of Reading Recovery teachers. Since the students selected for Reading Recovery services came from this pool of first grade classrooms, students selected may or may not come from the team taught classroom. Since the focus of this study was on the team
taught first grade classrooms and the pull-out programs, I had to locate schools where students receiving Reading Recovery services came from the team taught classrooms.

Given the high mobility of this population of students (as reported by the teachers and principals of each school), I selected classrooms where at least two students were selected for Reading Recovery.

Criteria one through three were determined before the start of the school year. Criterion four could not be determined until students had been selected for Reading Recovery. This required me to enter the schools before the student selection process had been completed and to select new schools when it was determined that fewer than two students (from these team taught classrooms) had been identified for pull-out program instruction. Ultimately, I entered four schools and selected two for the study. Details of this selection process follow.

First, an accessible school district was identified and selected for participation in the study. Procedures for gaining permission to enter the field included submitting a signed request form and multiple copies of my research proposal. I was also required by the school district to provide evidence of approval from the Human Subjects Review Board of The Ohio State University. These materials were received and approved by a review board appointed by the school district.
Once district approval was obtained, I proceeded by identifying elementary schools offering Reading Recovery pull-out program services to at-risk populations. A list of schools was made available to me by two of the school district's Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders. First grade classrooms where two teachers trained in Reading Recovery shared the instructional responsibilities were identified. These teacher leaders helped me by identifying teams of teachers they deemed to be successful in the classroom and in the pull-out program.

My next task was to locate teachers willing to participate in the study. Through telephone contact I was able to locate teams of teachers agreeable to such an undertaking. While I ultimately entered four school settings and began observing classroom instruction, it was not until students had been identified for receiving the pull-out program services that two sites could be selected. For the sake of brevity I will only describe my negotiation into the schools ultimately selected for the study.

Table 1 (p. 35) depicts the general time line through which I entered each site, selected the schools for the study, gathered and analyzed data, exited the field sites, and proceeded with the formal analysis of data.
### Timeline of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kennedy School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oaks School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cedar School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Johnson School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gaining entree, systematic rotation of observation within and across settings, data collection, and analysis.
- Exiting field. (Data collection continued for students not yet discontinued from "pull-out" program.)
### Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

#### Phase I

**Research questions addressed:**
1.0 What is the range of literacy opportunities in these settings?
1.1 How are the opportunities in the classroom similar to or different from the literacy opportunities in the “pull-out” program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Focus Procedures</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Focus Procedures</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 1-2 2x/week per school</td>
<td>-Field entry</td>
<td>-Field notes</td>
<td>-Defining methodological procedures for recording cataloguing data sources</td>
<td>-Weekly reviews of field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 3-16 2x/week per school</td>
<td>-Describing culture of classroom and RR -Locating literacy instruction within the larger instructional context</td>
<td>-Field notes -Audio recording -Video recording -Collection of reading &amp; writing samples</td>
<td>-Describing culture of classroom and RR -Identifying cultural patterns of literacy instruction</td>
<td>-Weekly reviews of field notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Phase II

**Research questions addressed:**
2.0 What are the expectations and opportunities for literacy learning for these at-risk students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 3-16 2x/week per school</td>
<td>-Focus students</td>
<td>-Field notes -Audio recordings -Video recordings -Collection of reading &amp; writing samples</td>
<td>-Locating and defining expectations and opportunities for literacy learning -Developing and testing hypothesis of data interpretations</td>
<td>-Domain analysis -Analysis of &quot;key events&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (p. 36) summarizes the details provided in this chapter regarding the research focus and the techniques and procedures used for data collection and analysis.

**Gaining Entree**

During my first telephone conversations with the Kennedy School teachers, I arranged to meet with them to go over my research plan. We met at their first grade classroom before the first day of school. Meeting at the school afforded me the opportunity to see the classroom and to talk informally with the teachers. To assure anonymity I will refer to these teachers as Kelli and Angie.

During this initial meeting, I described the study in more detail. After giving a brief overview of my research focus, I explained that I planned to be in each setting two full days a week at the beginning and end of the observation time, but would shift to half day observations when I began focusing on the focus students. I planned to follow one focus student per day. To gain a sense of the cycles of instruction I would systematically rotate days of the week and times of the day (mornings or afternoons) I would observe.

We also talked about my role in the classroom and the data collection and recording techniques I planned to use (both of which will be described in this chapter). The teachers asked questions about whether I would be judging
their teaching. I assured them I would not be. Over the course of the study, I came to realize that my training as a Reading Recovery Teacher Leader might have precipitated these early concerns. The primary role of the teacher leader is to train teachers and continually oversee their progress. Therefore, it was sometimes difficult for these teachers to separate my training as a teacher leader from my role as a researcher.

The teachers also asked if I would be using the video and audio recorded data for anything other than research purposes. I assured them that I would never use this data for any other purpose without their permission.

When I met the teachers from Johnson School, the academic year was already underway. Our initial conversations were very similar to those shared with Kelli and Angie.

Though I entered the Johnson school two weeks after entering the Kennedy school, the teachers were still involved in the early stages of selecting students for the pull-out program services. These teachers, who I will call Samantha and Carol, were late in getting started since they had only just been assigned to this classroom and to one another.

This assignment was late because the school district had moved Carol's previous partner to another school. Samantha had just signed on to participate in the pull-out
program training and needed a partner to teach in the classroom. Carol agreed to be paired with her. Samantha's training class had only just begun when I entered the classroom.

In the following section I detail the process through which the teachers identified students for pull-out program services and how I selected the focus students from this pool of possibilities.

**Entering School Sites**

During the initial phase of observation my focus was on the instruction that occurred in each classroom. Concurrently, the teachers worked toward identifying the students for pull-out program services. I selected the focus students from this pool of names. A description of this process follows.

**Identifying the Focus Students**

The selection process through which students were identified for pull-out program services was conducted by the classroom teachers in each school.

All first grade students were rank ordered according to their reading and writing abilities as determined by results of individually administered diagnostic procedures.
Procedures for rank ordering first grade students included:

1. A Letter Identification Test (Clay, 1979) and an adapted version of Clay's (1979) Concepts of Print and Writing Test (see Appendix C) were administered to all first grade students.

2. Students' scores on these measures were tabulated. Each first grade teacher constructed a rank ordered list of students according to these scores. The Mat 6 Standardized Test was administered to those students whose scores fell within the bottom third of each rank ordered list.

3. Students whose scores on the Mat 6 fell below the 36 percentile were given a complete version of Clay's (1979) Diagnostic Survey (see Appendix C).

4. Six-eight of those students whose scores placed them at the lowest across all first grade classrooms, were selected for group instruction. Those students were expected to enter the one-to-one pull-out program instruction when spaces become available throughout the academic year.

Those students whose scores fell within the middle range of this list of the lowest students, were selected for the one-to-one instruction.

For the purposes of this study, only those students identified and placed in the pull-out program at the beginning of the school year were selected as focus students.

In the Kennedy School, four students were identified for the pull-out program and two were selected as focus students (James and Amy). In the Oaks and Cedar Schools, only one student was identified from each classroom and these sites were dropped from the study. In the Johnson School, three students were identified and two selected as
focus students (Salla, Terrence). Soon after my entry into this school, one student moved out of the school system. A third student was selected as a focus student (Martisha).

The focus students were selected according to the teachers they were assigned to for the pull-out program instruction. I was interested in exploring the range of literacy opportunities in these settings and wanted to examine instruction across teachers. Therefore, I chose one student who was tutored by the morning teacher and the other by the afternoon teacher. Table 3 depicts this distribution and identifies the participants by name. To assure the anonymity of the participants' names have been changed.

Table 3.

Teachers and At-Risk Students Tutored in Pull-Out Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennedy School</th>
<th>Johnson School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers - Kelli</td>
<td>Teachers - Samantha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie</td>
<td>Carol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students - Amy</td>
<td>Students - Terrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Salla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martisha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purposes of this dissertation two of the five focus students' experiences are presented (James and Martisha). As discussed previously, the decision to limit the number of cases to two was due to the large quantity of data collected and the need for an in-depth multi-layered analysis of this data.
The two students selected were those who traveled from the classroom setting to the pull-out program each morning. Since this was the time of the day when most of the literacy instruction occurred in each classroom setting, a close examination of these students' experiences allowed me to focus on (a) literacy instruction in particular, (b) the norms and expectations placed upon students in each context, and (c) the ways in which students made sense of shifts in norms and expectations as they went moved from context to context, and event to event.

Parental permission for conducting research in these respective classrooms was obtained. Separate forms were used for student class members and the focus students. Copies of these forms have been included in Appendix E.

In the following section I provide details of data collection and analysis procedures.

Data Collection - Phase I

The focus of my concerns during this phase of data collection were in entering the field, negotiating my role as researcher, describing the culture of the socio-cultural settings, and in locating literacy instruction within the larger instructional contexts. In the following sections, I detail the techniques used to address these concerns.
Negotiating Role as Researcher

The initial decisions involved in designing a research study are influenced by the conceptual framework adopted by the researcher (Zaharlick & Green, 1990). The researcher attempts to define ways of discovering the patterns of observed behavior through careful analysis of the data as opposed to entering the field with preconceived notions of what will occur. Still, the researcher cannot enter the field as a "blank slate" of knowledge about the culture observed (Zaharlick & Green, 1990). Instead, he or she must build into the design methods of exploring not only the culture, but also his/her preconceived notions derived from previous research or experiences in the social settings explored.

In this study, it was important for me to consider the assumptions I held about each social setting. As a teacher who has been trained in the principles and practices used in the pull-out program instruction I owned special insider knowledge that aided me in understanding the meanings and motives of the behaviors observed.

Still, as the researcher, it was important for me to consider ways in which this "knowledge" may have limited what I was able to see. I had to be concerned with finding ways of making my assumptions visible and challengeable.

Therefore, my first concern was in the establishment of my role as the researcher. My role could best be described
as an observer/participant (Sevigny, 1981). This role differs from the traditional models of observation in that emphasis was placed on observing rather than participating. While I was not a concealed observer (the participants were well aware of my presence and role) I did not participate in the instruction. The decision to adopt this role was in response to three factors that developed out of my data gathering needs.

First, because of my training as a trainer of teachers in the pull-out program instruction, it was important for me to establish my role as an observer rather than as an instructor or evaluator.

Secondly, I was strongly aware that whenever I approached students to observe and talk with them about their work, I was in effect disrupting the very process I hoped to capture.

Third, while my video and audio recording devices enabled me to be less disruptive in capturing these goings on in each setting, use of the equipment required constant attention, particularly in the classroom settings. One example was when I entered the classroom settings with my video equipment. I noticed that the students wanted to be as close to me as possible. Gradually, I came to understand that the students thought that to be "on TV" (in the view of the camera) they had to be close to me. To accomplish this they frequently hung on to my legs or the legs of the
tripod. Fearful of accidents, I opted to remain as close to the equipment as possible.

My next concern in establishing my role as the researcher was to document shifts in my interpretations of the data, methodological procedures, and personal feelings about my observations. This was accomplished by adopting a method of field note taking established by Corsaro (1987) in his study of peer cultures in a preschool. This technique will be elaborated upon in the section detailing data sources gathered.

Focus and Techniques of Data Collection

The techniques and procedures of data collection during Phase I were guided by the following research questions.

1.0 What is the range of literacy opportunities in these settings?

1.1 How are the opportunities in the classroom similar to or different from the literacy opportunities in the pull-out program?

Identifying the range of literacy opportunities allowed for the discovery of how literacy was defined within each setting. This approach enabled me to begin by describing the culture of the settings prior to locating literacy instruction within the larger instructional context. This provided a way of examining the culture as a whole, and literacy as a part of that culture (Spradley, 1980).
I was also interested in discovering how literacy was defined by the members of each setting (emic perspective). I did not enter the field with preconceived definitions or expectations of what I would see. My goal was to identify the cultural patterns of literacy instruction through an analysis of time spent, the location and space allowed, the actions that occurred, the events constructed, and the goals initiated (Spradley, 1980). This goal was attained through the gathering of the following data sources.

Data Sources

Data gathered during Phase I and II were the same. Details of these data sources follow:

1. Approximately 115 hours of field note observations of classroom and pull-out program instruction were gathered during the studies' sixteen week formal observation period.

Systematic rotation of daily observations in each school setting occurred. In keeping with the metaphor of the tapestry and the thread, I entered the field with the purpose of exploring the general patterns of the instructional settings. When focus students were identified I narrowed my focus to the threads of the tapestry, looking specifically at the experiences of the focus students.

Concurrent to this focus on the at-risk students, I continued to gather data pertaining to the larger instructional contexts. This process of data gathering was
driven by the on-going analysis of data. As I began to interpret data gathered on instructional contexts, I would triangulate interpretations with those made of the focus students. Also, as I began to interpret data gathered on the focus students, I triangulated interpretations with those made of the instructional contexts. For example, early observations suggested the need to examine more closely the rules for participation in each context. I wondered what students needed to know to participate in each event. Many of these rules were introduced by the teachers early in the school year, but as the year progressed shifts occurred in relation to what, when, how long, and how often these rules applied and who they applied to. This data was triangulated against observations of the focus students. These early triangulations aided me in interpreting the data and suggested the need for further analysis of the rules and norms for participation within and across literacy events. Spradley (1980) describes this process as the ethnographic cycle. Green (1990) building on this notion, describes this process as an interactive reactive cycle. This cycle is illustrated in figure 1.

Systematic rotation of observations allowed for the discovery of the cultural patterns of literacy instruction and literacy learning. Over the course of four days per week, I followed one focus student per day. To capture a sense of the whole, the decision was made to rotate days and
times spent in each school setting, following one focus student per day. This provided me with important insights into the various ways in which students' responses to literacy instruction varied across events and settings.

Near the beginning of the study, I spent two full days per week in each school setting. Soon after the focus students were selected, I began spending two and one half hours each day, rotating mornings and afternoons. When students moved to the pull-out instructional program while I was observing, I went with the students and continued to document my observations.

As the study progressed, I began to spend two successive days in each school setting rather than rotating
days spent in each school. Since most of the literacy instruction occurring in each first grade classroom occurred in the mornings, I began to shift my time spent in each school to the mornings only. I often returned in the afternoon when the focus student I was following on a particular day received pull-out program instruction in the afternoon.

My observations were documented with fieldnotes. Fieldnotes of observations provided a method of collecting and cataloging data, triangulating data sources, tracking my assumptions, theoretical interpretations, and shifts in methodologies used (for examples of data see Appendix F). Adopting Corsaro's (1981) method of field note taking, fieldnotes were organized into the following categories: (a) descriptive (describing in detail, my observations of instruction and students' behavior), (b) personal (describing in detail my personal feelings about what I observed), (c) theoretical (detailing theoretical interpretations of data made while in the field), (d) methodological (detailing shifts in methodology used, e.g., placement of video and audio equipment, time line for data collection).

2. Approximately 42 hours of videotape recordings of instructional activities were obtained during this sixteen week observation period. Video equipment included an 8 mm video recorder and a tripod. Video was used after my
initial entry and the introduction of audio recording devices.

The video equipment was placed in areas of the room that allowed for close observation without disruption of instruction. I rarely moved the equipment after it had been placed in a particular area for the day's observation.

Since remote audio equipment could not be used in concert with the video camera, it was necessary for me to have an audio recorder running simultaneously to capture the interactions surrounding the focus students.

3. Approximately 60 hours of audio recordings obtained with a remote microphone system of at-risk students' participation in the classroom context during this sixteen week observation period.

The remote microphone system also was eased into the field settings after initial entry and the introduction of a small table top audio recorder.

Since I followed one focus student per day, only one remote microphone was used at a time. The remote microphone system consisted of a microphone that was attached by a long cord to a remote transmitter (2"X 3"X 1"), and a remote receiver. The remote microphone was attached to the focus student's blouse or shirt. I fastened the remote transmitter to a small belt and attached the belt around the waist of the focus students. The remote receiver (wireless) could be placed anywhere in the room of each field setting.
The students responded well to the use of the remote microphone system. In fact, wearing the microphone became somewhat of a status symbol. I once overheard James comment to another student that he got to wear the microphone because he was "one of Mrs. White's students." The other student class members were always asking to the wear the equipment and I wrestled with whether I should take the time to allow them to do so. I opted not to, given the time constraints and my concern for disrupting the daily schedules.

4. Approximately 133 hours of audio recordings (recorded by the teachers) of at-risk students' instructional lessons in the pull-out program were gathered. This served as a way of documenting the students experiences from the beginning to the end of their program and allowed for a more complete data set given my constraints as the researcher in attempting to move back and forth from setting to setting.

This was accomplished by providing each team of teachers with an audio recorder and audio tapes. High quality 60 minute audio tapes were used. Since lessons lasted for approximately 30 minutes, teachers recorded one lesson on each side of the tape.

I collected the recorded tapes from the teachers regularly. When I gave them new tapes I always made certain to have them ready for immediate use, e.g., opening the
packets and pasting the labels on. This made the recording task less taxing for the teachers and ultimately assured the availability of the recordings as a data source for the study.

5. Periodic interviews with the four teachers about the instruction were gathered.

Generally, the interviews with the teachers could best be described as informal conversations about my observations and interpretations of the data.

Often times, it was difficult to find time to talk with the teachers. While they were always happy to talk with me, they were also very busy teaching or planning for the next day. While I was successful in getting my questions answered "on the run," after a few weeks in the field I found that I had compiled many questions that needed to be addressed. At this time, I took each team of teachers to lunch and conducted a more formal interview of my questions and concerns.

I asked questions such as: "How do you feel the project is going so far? Do you find my presence to be disruptive? How would you describe the students' responses to my being in the classroom and the Reading Recovery room? Do you feel this project has changed the classroom or your teaching? How did you decide on the students' seating arrangement?"
6. Periodic interviews were conducted with the five at-risks students whose experiences were followed closely throughout this study.

Interviews with these students could best be described as on-going conversations about their work, their interests, and their concerns. As often as I could be away from the video and audio recording devices, I attempted to walk around the room, listening and watching.

At times I would sit next to a focus student and engage him/her in a discussion about his/her work. All the students seemed to enjoy having an adult sitting next to them paying attention to their work. If they were working on a writing activity, I would ask them to tell about what they were working on and they would respond with elaborate explanations about their stories or illustrations. If they were reading a book, I would ask if I could listen as they read and they responded by continuing in their reading before stopping to talk about the story.

7. Samples of at-risk students' writing behaviors in both instructional contexts were gathered.

Samples of students' writing behaviors were gathered throughout the study. In the classroom, these data consisted primarily of samples of students writing (originals and photocopies) and fieldnotes of observed comments and behaviors.
In the pull-out program, these data consisted of various instructional materials used in the program, e.g., writing journals, books made, and the teachers' lesson plans.

8. Records of at-risk students' reading behaviors in both instructional contexts were gathered.

Records of students' reading behaviors were gathered throughout this study. In the classroom, these data consisted primarily of written records of books selected for reading by these students. In the pull-out program, these data consisted of various instructional materials used in the program, e.g., running records, and teachers' lesson plans.

9. Results of assessment tasks implemented by the teachers of at-risk students' reading and writing abilities were gathered.

Records of students' assessment scores were documented throughout the course of this study. Results of the assessment scores for James and Martisha are included in Appendix A.

Data Collection - Phase II

Primary concerns during this phase of data collection were in defining the expectations and opportunities for literacy learning for these at-risk students. The same data sources were used for this phase of data collection, therefore, the same procedures were used to gather data.
Focus and Techniques of Data Collection

The techniques and procedures of data collection during Phase II were guided by the following research question:

2.0. What are the expectations and opportunities for literacy learning for these at-risk students?

The focus of this phase of data collection was on the at-risk students' experiences in these social settings. Data sources and the techniques through which they were obtained remained the same throughout Phase I and Phase II of data collection.

In the following sections, the discussion shifts to the phases of data analysis.

Data Analysis - Phase I

In the following sections I provide details of the procedures for data analysis during Phase I of the study.

Focus and Techniques of Data Analysis

The focus and techniques for data analysis during Phase I of the study involved the following techniques: (a) defining and carrying out methodological procedures for recording and cataloging data sources, (b) defining and describing the ecological environments (Cook-Gumperz & Corsaro, 1976), and (c) defining the instructional events (Erickson, 1982; Green & Harker, 1982; Wallat & Green,
1982). The following is a description of these methods of analysis.

**Cataloging Data Sources**

In a previous section I presented a detailed description of the various data sources gathered throughout this study. Such a large data set required the development of a system of cataloging sources. In the following sections, I describe the various systems employed for particular data sources.

**Fieldnotes**

During the first month of field observation I reviewed and transcribed my notes daily and constructed a method of cataloging these observations using the database Notebook II.

According to Strauss (1990) the transcription of early field note data is necessary to begin to organize and develop a method of cataloging and categorizing. Once a method of cataloging was constructed I began to organize my fieldnotes in the same fashion and no longer transcribed each entry.
Table 4 is an example of a database entry for fieldnotes.

Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>/90/09/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY</td>
<td>/Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>/10:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>/Kelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>/James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>/Kennedy School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td>/Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>/Journal writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
<td>/writing, drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA SOURCES</td>
<td>/FN(fieldnotes), audio (recordings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>/James sat at his desk and drew a picture of &quot;his cousin.&quot; I asked him about his picture and he responded by writing his cousin's name -BABA- on the top of the page. When I asked him what he had written, he started to read, stopped, wrote &quot;I&quot; before &quot;BABA&quot; and read &quot;I like my cousin BABA.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This method of cataloging field note data with the database and my record keeping allowed me to search field note data sources by date, time, teacher, school, student, event, activity, and category of entry. This process aided me in the selection of "key events" and enabled me to triangulate data sources, e.g., searching across days, students, teachers, events, times.

Audio and Video Recordings

All audio and video recorded data were grouped together, numbered, and catalogued using the same database. Table 5 is an example of an entry for recorded data.
Table 5.

Database Entry for Video and Audio Recorded Data

| NUMBER | /001 |
| SCHOOL | Johnson School |
| FORMAT | /audio |
| SIDE A | /classroom observation, 90/09/13, mike and video used |
| SIDE B | /classroom observation continued, 90/09/13 |
| TRANSCRIPTION | /(transcription of event entered here) |

This method of cataloging afforded the ability to search and locate video and audio recorded data according to school, format (audio or video), date, observation setting (class, pull-out program), and student. This also allowed for a systematic tracking system that supported my commitment to ensuring total anonymity of the participants.

Formal and Informal Interviews

Many interviews with the participants were audio recorded and catalogued with all audio and video recorded data. When an interview, or a portion of the interview was transcribed, these transcripts were entered into the database under the transcript heading.

Written Artifacts and Instructional Records

Written artifacts of students' reading and writing behaviors and teachers' instructional records served as sources of information in the gathering of confirming and disconfirming evidence of the expectations placed on students during each literacy event. For example, the collection and analysis of students' journal entries from the classroom and the pull-out program allowed for the
exploration of the social processes that occurred during independent versus teacher supported constructions of text. An inductive interpretation of the meaning of these social interactions and the expectations placed on students' during each event required the collection and on-going review of overlapping data sources such as the instructional comments made by teachers during these teacher supported events.

Collected artifacts of students' literacy behaviors and teachers' instructional records were sorted and catalogued by focus student. Examples of these catalogues are included in Appendix B.

**Defining the Ecological Environments**

Mehan (1982) argues that the most pervasive feature about a classroom is its temporal organization. Students and teachers come together every morning and spend several hours a day together in the same room. Over the course of an academic year patterns of behavior take form, reflecting the values of the culture that has been constructed.

The physical organization of the classroom also reflects these values and expectations. To discover the 'group' that formed, the bonds they shared, and the social structure and organization of behavior, it was necessary for me to spend time long periods observing the stream of behaviors across time. Mapping of the physical dimensions of the environments was one way of entering this process. Diagraming the room, its contents and position, aided me in
Diagraming the room, its contents and position, aided me in understanding the behaviors and interactions observed within the various areas of each instructional context. Figures 2, 3, 4, & 5 illustrate the ecological environments (classroom and pull-out program) of the Kennedy and Johnson Schools.

**Defining the Instructional Events**

I began the process of defining the instructional events occurring in each context by reviewing the field note data and identifying the patterns of instruction occurring in each setting. In my review of this data I also noted the terminology used by the members of each culture in describing each event. I was also interested in the time spent during each event and the phases and behaviors signaling the shifts from one event to another.

For both the Kennedy and Johnson Schools and their respective instruction in the pull-out program, I was able to identify a general framework or schedule that remained consistent throughout the 16 week observation period. These schedules are discussed in-depth in Chapters IV & V.

**Data Analysis - Phase II**

In the following sections I provide details of the procedures for data analysis during Phase II of the study.
Figure 2

Figure 3
Focus and Techniques of Data Analysis

The focus and techniques for data analysis during Phase II of the study involved the following techniques: (a) conducting a domain analysis of literacy events, and (b) conducting an analysis of the communicative events occurring during "key literacy events" in the classroom and the pull-out program (Spradley, 1980; Saville-Troike, 1989). In the following sections, I detail these techniques of data analysis.

Domain Analysis

At this level of the analysis I was concerned with how literacy was defined, the forms' literacy took, and the purposes' literacy served. A domain analysis (Spradley, 1980) served as a way of identifying the semantic relationships of these components of literacy and aided me in my interpretation of the experiences of these at-risk students.

I began the process of conducting a domain analysis by returning to the maps of the instructional events and locating literacy instruction from within this larger framework. Using Spradley's (1980) methods of identifying domains of semantic relationships, I proceeded to analyze each literacy event. This analysis served as a preliminary step in the identification and analysis of the key events occurring in each setting.
The following excerpt of the domain analysis of the categories of semantic relationships identified for the literacy event called "reading time on the rug" in the Kennedy School illustrate this process:

1. The rug was a place where reading occurred.

2. Getting to "go to the rug" was a result of getting journal writing done; therefore, going to the rug to read was a reason for getting journal writing done quickly.

3. The rug was used as a way of getting students closer to the teacher when she reads to them.

4. Not joining the rug was a way to get attention from the teacher.

The next step in this process was to return to the ecological maps and the domain analysis and identify (a) who participated in the events, (b) what occurred, (c) where the events took place, (d) when they occurred, (e) the purposes they served, and (f) the expected outcomes. This phase aided me in identifying the rules and social norms of behaviors occurring within these literacy events as evidenced in the actions and interactions of the participants and provided a more comprehensive view of the range of literacy opportunities within and across settings.

The techniques and procedures employed during this phase of analysis provided a framework for the identification of key events occurring in these social settings. This process is detailed in the following sections.
Analysis of Key Events

Results of the domain analysis of the literacy events occurring in the classrooms and the pull-out program provided a framework for the next layer of analysis, the analysis of the focus students' experiences during key literacy events. The method of analysis used is based on system developed by Saville-Troike (1989).

Looking at these students' experiences through the lens of the domains of semantic relationships, I was interested in how their experiences looked in relation to (a) who participated in the events, (b) what occurred, (c) where the events took place, (d) when they occurred, (e) the purposes they served, and (f) the expected outcomes.

To explore the range of experiences offered in each context, examples of early and later classroom observations of literacy events were selected and analyzed. In the case of the Kennedy school, early and later episodes of "quiet reading" and "writing the class news" were selected and analyzed. In the Johnson school, early and later episodes of "journal writing" and "writing the class news" were selected and analyzed. Early and later episodes of entire lessons occurring in each pull-out program were selected and analyzed since the length of each lesson was approximately the same as the analyzed events occurring in the classroom setting.
These events and lessons were selected after a careful review of video taped data, fieldnotes, and copies of the teachers' instructional records, and systematically sampling of the larger data set of audio taped data. This review revealed that events occurring in each of these classrooms varied on certain dimensions. The first dimension that appeared to be stressed in each classroom was related to the ratio of teacher/student direction (individual versus group structured events). I chose to explore representative cases of each type of event.

The second dimension of variability was related to focus. While some events were considered to be reading activities others were considered to be writing activities. While this focus was not exclusive since reading often occurred during writing events, it was interesting that the teachers and the students referred to each event as though there was an exclusive focus on either reading or writing. To explore this dimension of variability I attempted to select representative cases of early and later episodes of both reading and writing events for analysis. I was successful in doing so in the case of the Kennedy school's classroom instruction but was unable to locate cases of both reading and writing events occurring in the Johnson school classroom that also included dimensions of variability in related to group versus individual work. Therefore, in the Johnson school I selected one writing event where students
worked individually and one writing event where students worked as a group.

The last dimension of variability considered in the selection of events for micro-analysis related to regularity of occurrence. While some events occurred every day of the week others occurred less frequently (every day versus 1-4 days per week). Rather than exploring this dimension of variability, I made the decision to select events that occurred daily rather than those occurring on a limited basis.

These key events were viewed as communicative events where meaning emerges through the verbal and non-verbal exchanges that take place. Each event held distinct beginnings and endings and was analyzed according to the sequence of acts, rules and norms of interpretation, level and nature of involvement, and areas of room and materials used. A detailed description of these categories follows.

Data were analyzed according to:

Setting: The setting and location for each event occurring in the classroom settings shifted from one event to the next. For each event analyzed, the setting and locations of the room where it occurred are identified. This information was gathered in order to examine the patterns of interactions surrounding each event and how those patterns were related to shifts in settings and locations.
Participants: The number of participants for each event was listed for comparative purposes.

Functions, Purposes, Goals: Each event was described in terms of the functions or purposes each activity served in achieving the overall goals established by the teachers. For example, the function or purpose of quiet reading in the Kennedy school classroom was for students to read quietly to themselves. Yet, the overall goal of the event was to provide opportunities for the teacher to observe students' reading behaviors. These observations informed her decision making in the selection of "level appropriate texts" for student reading.

Act Sequence: An act sequence included information about the ordering of communicative acts within an event (Saville-Troike, 1989). Events were analyzed according to the sequence of actions and interactions. Actions and interactions were identified, transcribed, and organized according to "real time." Each interval of "real time" was reported as a statement of action.

Rules for Interaction: The social processes occurring during each literacy event held unique rules for how participants "should" act to be successful. Early observations in each setting revealed that while these rules were constructed by all the participant members of each social setting, the teachers held the primary role in initiating, defining, and enforcing these rules. For
example, quiet reading in the Kennedy school classroom was a time for students to read while the teacher observed. To be successful, students were expected to read quietly to themselves. At the beginning of the school year they were also expected to point to each word as they read. The teacher enforced this rule by circling around the room and verbally reminding students to point as they read.

**Norms of Interpretation:** While each event held unique rules for how participants "should" act to be successful, everyone did not respond to a given rule in the same way. Instead, a "standard" or "range" of interpretations of these rules existed. These norms of interpretation of the rules for interaction shifted from one event to the next, from participant to participant, and from instructional context to context. For example, in the previous discussion of the rules for interaction during quiet reading in the Kennedy school classroom, students were expected to read quietly to themselves and point to each word as they read. Results of the analysis of the norms of interpretation of these rules for interaction revealed, however, that students did not always read or point as they read, even during those times when the teacher circled the room and verbally reminded the students to do so.

**Levels and Nature of Involvement:** Data were organized according to evidence of the level and nature of the participants' involvement during each event. For example,
results of the analysis of an early episode of quiet reading in the Kennedy school revealed that only three of the fifteen student class members read throughout the entire event. The remaining students talked, read intermittently, or threw books in the air.

**Areas of the Room and Materials Used:** Data were analyzed according to the various materials used during each event as well as the areas of the room in which events took place. This information was helpful in defining shifts in the ecological environments.

This last level of analysis served as a tool for interpreting the events that occurred in each setting as well as a way of exploring the experiences of the at-risk focus students experiences during these "key literacy events."

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to explore the ways in which students identified by their schools and teachers as at-risk made sense of the instruction they received in the classroom and an early intervention pull-out program.

Placing meaning central to the study of literacy learning allowed for the exploration of the various ways the meanings' students made of the instruction they received were influenced by the social contexts. This information yielded important insights into the range of expectations placed upon students in the variety of situations they
encountered, as well as the opportunities they had to make sense of it all.

Acting as an observer/participant, various data sources were gathered over an eight month period in two schools. Five students identified by their schools and teachers as at-risk of failure in learning to read and write were chosen as focus students. For this dissertation, results of the analysis of data pertaining to two of the five focus students are presented.

Seven types of data were gathered: field notes of observations, video and audio recordings of instruction occurring in each context, interviews with teachers and focus students, assessment tasks implemented by the teachers, and records of at-risk students' reading and writing behaviors.

Two phases of data analysis were described. Data analysis during Phase I of the study involved the following techniques: (a) defining and carrying out methodological procedures for recording and cataloging data sources, (b) defining and describing the ecological environments (Cook-Gumperz & Corsaro, 1976), and (c) defining the instructional events (Erickson, 1982; Green & Harker, 1982; Wallat & Green, 1982).

Data analysis during Phase II of the study involved the following techniques: (a) conducting a domain analysis of literacy events (Spradley, 1980), and (b) conducting an
analysis (Saville-Troike, 1989) of the communicative events occurring during "key literacy events" in the classroom and the pull-out program.

Results of the analysis of data collected in these two schools are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

In Chapter III the phases of data collection and analysis were detailed along with the tools and techniques used in each phase (table 2, p. 36). In this chapter I present results of the multi-layered analysis of data conducted during each of these phases. The studies' research questions serve as an organizing tool for the presentation of these results. These questions were:

1.0 What is the range of literacy opportunities in these social settings?

1.1 How are the literacy opportunities in the classroom similar to or different from the literacy opportunities in the pull-out program?

2.0 What are the expectations and opportunities for literacy learning for these at-risk students?

These questions were directly related to the two primary goals of the study. The first goal was to develop a better understanding of the range of literacy opportunities
made available in these classroom settings and their respective pull-out programs.

Through the methods detailed in the previous chapter recurrent social processes and literacy events were identified and explored in relation to what counted as literacy, literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior. Questions 1.0-1.1 address this first goal of the study by attempting to (a) explore and define the culture of the classrooms and the sub-culture of the pull-out programs, (b) locate literacy processes within each of these socio-cultural contexts, and (c) explore the range of literacy opportunities made available within and across these socio-cultural contexts. To understand what it meant to be an at-risk student receiving instruction in each socio-cultural context it was important to begin by attempting to explore ways in which the flow of everyday life and the development of these cultures influenced students' learning. This required me to begin by examining the cultures from the broadest sense before narrowing my gaze to literacy instruction and the at-risk focus students' experiences in particular.

The second goal of the study was to explore the ways in which these at-risk focus students made sense of the instruction they received in these two socio-cultural contexts. Therefore, for question 2.0 my focus moved from the instructional contexts to the at-risk students
themselves. This allowed for an in-depth exploration into how these students made sense of the varying expectations and opportunities for literacy learning within and across contexts.

To frame this chapter it is important to reiterate that when I describe the "researcher's stance," "level of gaze," or "angle of the lens" I am not referring to a linear process of moving from the whole to the parts and back to the whole. Instead, this process can best be described as cyclical in nature in much the same way as Green (1990) and Spradley (1988) refer to the ethnographic cycle (see figure 1 page 46).

In the first section of this chapter I address question 1.0 by presenting results of the analysis of data pertaining to the Kennedy first grade classroom and the pull-out program followed by results of the Johnson first grade classroom and its pull-out program.

The second section of this chapter addresses research question 1.1 and offers a comparative perspective by looking across classrooms and pull-out programs. In the third section, addressing question 2.0, I present results of the analysis of data pertaining to the two at-risk focus students.
Research Question 1.0

1.0 What is the range of literacy opportunities in these social settings?

Looking Within Contexts

The Kennedy School First Grade Classroom

To understand the actions and interactions occurring in this socio-cultural setting I begin by introducing the members of the Kennedy school's first grade classroom.

The Class Members

Members of the Kennedy school first grade classroom consisted of two teachers, Kelli and Angie, the first grade students, and an instructional aide who worked in the room every morning until the lunch break.

Kelli taught in the classroom during the morning session of the school day and in Reading Recovery every afternoon. Kelli was a veteran teacher, having taught for approximately 15 years, and held a masters degree in education. As a single parent of a pre-teen daughter with an active social life, Kelli described her life as a teacher as hectic and rewarding. She characterized herself as a lifelong learner and was considered by her peers in Reading Recovery to be a veteran teacher.

Angie taught in Reading Recovery every morning and in the classroom every afternoon. Angie was working toward a masters degree in education. She had been a classroom
teacher for approximately three years and had taught in Reading Recovery for two years.

While Kelli and Angie worked as a team in making long term instructional decisions, there appeared to be clear divisions between the planning of the morning and afternoon instruction occurring in the classroom. When I arrived in the morning and began setting up for my observations, I would find Kelli and Angie working quietly at their desks pausing occasionally to discuss overlapping issues such as how a particular student was progressing in Reading Recovery or in the classroom, discipline strategies, etc. During my conversations with the team, Kelli usually offered up an immediate response or decision while Angie remained a quiet yet constructive participant in these dialogues.

The instructional aide helped Kelli in the classroom during the morning sessions. She tutored students in reading and math, helped in the preparation of instructional materials, and helped in all areas relating to classroom management; such as discipline, the distribution of instructional materials, grading of papers, collecting books, etc.

During my observations I noted that there were usually twenty-three student class members. But, this number varied as students moved in and out of the school system. Both Kelli and Angie described the population of students who attended this school as highly mobile. During the time I
spent observing in the classroom I noted that 4 new students came, and 3 students left the school.

The remaining students seemed used to these comings and goings of class members. While it took some newer students longer to become 'members' of the class, generally the students appeared to be accepting, almost matter of fact about these new arrivals.

For example, when a new student entered the classroom for the first time Kelli was most likely the first of the teaching team to meet him or her since she taught in the classroom during the morning. Whenever she was alerted by the principal's office of new students' expected arrival, Kelli would immediately greet the students when they entered the classroom. Kelli would help them to get settled in by showing them to their desks, helping them to hang up their coats and book bags, and then introduce them to the class. Prior to these introductions the other students rarely made inquiries about the new students, e.g., asking his or her name, where he or she had gone to school before, etc.

Kelli worked in helping the new students' transition to "class membership" by carefully selecting and reselecting the desk assignments, grouping students with similar work habits and compatible personalities. An example was when Kelli assigned a new student named Janie to a desk located near the front of the classroom. By her third day in the classroom Janie began having difficulty getting along with a
neighboring student named John. Kelli, having observed these difficulties, quickly and effortlessly moved Janie nearer to the back of the desk area of the classroom. Since Janie was now able to sit closer to a girl she got along well with, Kelli was able to ease Janie's membership into the classroom just by rearranging her work space.

In the next section I introduce the Kennedy school at-risk focus student, James.

The Kennedy School Focus Student: James

James, an Afro-American male, was six years, 3 months at the beginning of this study. As a class member of the Kennedy School, Angie tutored him in the "pull-out" program every morning until he was discontinued from the program.

James, always neatly dressed and carefully groomed, was open and very sensitive to everything that went on in the classroom. In fact, he was one of the first students to notice and question my presence in the classroom, immediately leaving his seat to come and investigate.

James was often uncomfortable with the daily routine of school. His outbursts seemed to come whenever the pressures of the day overwhelmed him, seemingly serving as a way of avoiding working on projects he perceived as too difficult. He would shout out "oh man" and "what" when he wanted to avoid getting started. He also would play around his desk, talking to those around him, tapping on the tops of their desks, or sliding his desk back and forth.
Part of James' instructional time in the classroom was spent learning the "social text" of rules and norms for behavior. This was evidenced in his interactions with the teachers, other students, and the materials and objects in the room around him. These interactions will become more visible in the discussion of his behaviors during key literacy events analyzed for this dissertation.

James had two friends in particular that he enjoyed talking with. Their names were Randy and Andre. During work center time and indoor recess he and his friends liked to play math games on the class computers. He and one of his friends would share a computer, working together solving math problems. Students were permitted to work in pairs at the computer when they were able to get along with one another and share the keyboard. When they did have difficulty negotiating rights of use with one another they lost their privileges to use the computer for that day. Since James enjoyed these shared ventures at the computer he felt particularly motivated to cooperate with his friends and peers. Therefore, during those times when cooperation was necessary to retain ownership rights of the computer, James had little difficulty working along side another student.

When James saw less of a need for sharing and cooperation during a classroom activity he often had difficulty getting along with other students. For example,
during reading time at the rug, James would join the rest of
the class after the event was well under way. At first he
would sit near the back of the rug area. As the event
progressed he would slide to various other areas of the rug.
He would stop and listen for a moment, talk to a neighboring
student about the text being read or about seemingly
unrelated topics, and then moved on to another space on the
rug. More often than not these dialogues with other
students ended as arguments over space on the rug. This
would result in Kelli stopping long enough to quiet the
argument before returning to her reading of the text.

Initial observations of the various ways in which
James' behaviors and responses shifted from one event to the
next lead me to consider whether he perceived some
activities to be too difficult, what these activities were,
how they were presented, and how the ways in which he
responded to these tasks and activities changed over time.
Results of this layer of the analysis of data are reported
in the discussion of James' participation during key
literacy events occurring in the classroom and the pull-out
program in the section addressing results to question 2.0.

The Classroom Arrangement

The first time I entered this classroom I was
immediately struck by the colorful art work suspended from
the walls and ceiling of the room and with the teachers'
creativity in maximizing the small space.

The classroom was located at the far corner of the basement level of the very large older school building. Since the windows were small very little light entered the room. The teachers used the artificial light and colorful art work to add life and cheerfulness to the classroom. They did this very effectively by using all the available wall and ceiling space for colorful art displays. The center of the Kennedy school first grade classroom was dominated by students' desks (see figure 6). At the beginning of the year most of the desks were grouped in table like formations where four desks were pulled together to form a rectangular table for four students (see Figure 6,
larger table formations). The teachers and students called these groupings tables 1 . . . table 5. It was interesting that as the year progressed many of the students' desks were pulled out of these table formations and placed alone around the perimeter of the groupings. These shifts occurred whenever the teachers felt a particular student was having difficulty in sharing a table space with other students and therefore needed his or her space to work more effectively.

Since all the desks were no longer in table formations this changed the way in which Kelli referred to these groupings. "Tables" became "desks," and students were called on by name rather than as members of a table. For example, near the beginning of the year, at recess time both teachers would instruct students to line up by table groupings calling out "would table 4 line up now?" As the year progressed, the teachers would call students to line up by name or would announce "those on the left side of the room can line up now."

On my last observation day I noted that ten of the students' desks were out of the table formations. As mentioned, the decision to pull a desk away from this formation was usually prompted by some sort of behavior deemed inappropriate. These changes generally occurred at the start of the day before the students arrived. While some students' seat assignments never changed, others knew they might need to go in search of their desks when they
entered the room. For example, since James often slid his desk back and forth on the floor his desk remained off by itself in the front of the classroom. Mike and John would lean back on their chairs and fall to the floor up to 5 times a day. This behavior made it difficult for them to have their desks positioned close to other students and their desks were also separated from the others.

The location in the room where the desks were placed was due in part to the lack of light in the room. Being on the basement level meant that the ceilings were lower, and the windows smaller than those found on the upper floors. The lights were left on for most of the day and the room was organized around the major light sources in the room.

On the top, stretching across the front of each student's desk were three strips of thick laminated paper. On the strip of paper closest to the front of the desk was a number line representing numbers 1-20. This number line was used as a resource for math and counting activities such as counting the days of the week during calendar time.

The center strip held the student's first and last name. Above the first letter of their first name was a small dot. At the beginning of the year the teachers encouraged the students to refer to this dot when they needed help in knowing where to start (left to right) when they wrote their names or other words. The teachers would say, "If you can't remember where to start check your name."
The third laminated strip, located just below their names, held the alphabet. Surrounding each of the letters were small arrows suggesting the directional movement for forming each letter. Again, the teachers encouraged the students to refer to this strip when they needed help in forming letters. For example, when a student asked, "I forget how to make a "d"?" Kelli responded, "Where can you check?" The student was then encouraged to start with the letter "a" and point while she read the alphabet up to the letter "d." If a student did not know the alphabet well enough to do this independently, Kelli helped by reading and pointing for him/her.

Around the perimeter of the room was a rug for reading time, a computer center area, two listening center areas, coat rack areas, storage areas, a sink for washing up after lunch and recess, and a time out space in the corner. Except the rug area, these remaining work areas served as extensions to the desk area of the classroom. The rug area appeared as a very separate area of the room since its parameter was lined with book cases and teachers' desks. When the teachers sat at the rug and read to students these partitions obstructed their view of the rest of the room making classroom monitoring a much more difficult task.
Discipline and Class Management

To understand the patterns of behavior that occurred within this social setting it was important to consider how expectations of rules and norms for acceptable behavior were communicated and how the class members held each other accountable for adhering to these rules.

Primarily these rules were defined by the teachers and were called discipline or classroom management. These rules were communicated to the students by the teachers early in the school year. The teachers employed various methods of reinforcing adherence to these rules. These enforcements were patterned in the following ways. First, both teachers used their ability to control the amount of light in the classroom as a way of signaling to the students when they needed to stop what they were doing and turn their attention to the teachers. The lights were turned off after an event and back on again after the teachers had announced and described the next event.

The lights were also turned off when the teachers felt that the students had became "too loud" or "disruptive." The length of time that the lights remained off was an indicator of the teachers' perceptions of, or responses to, these behaviors. For example, when few disruptions occurred during a school day the lights were turned off and on in a very quick fashion. On the other hand, on these days when
many disruptions had occurred, the lights were left off for increasing amounts of time.

The teachers also employed a more formal system of discipline in the classroom. This was a system that had been adopted by the entire school district. It required the teachers to enforce the following levels of procedures:

1. Putting students' name on chalkboard served as a warning.
2. One check mark beside a name indicated "time out."
3. Two check marks beside a name indicated a lost recess.
4. Three check marks indicated a trip to the principal's office.

"Time out" was an area of the room where students went to be alone. I observed that an average of two students went to "time-out" a day. Usually when a student was sent to "time out," the teachers would set a timer and the students returned to their desk when the time on the timer ran out. The length of time students remained in "time-out" ranged from 5-10 minutes.

Losing a recess meant that students spent recess time in the classroom reading at their desks. Going to the office generally meant that the students would go to the "peak room." This was a special room in the school set aside for disciplinary problems. Students were expected to bring school work to do in this room, and to sit quietly at a desk. The length of time students remained in the room was
determined by the classroom teachers and varied according to the offense.

**Curriculum Schedule**

The patterned ways of participating and demonstrating socially and academically appropriate behavior were associated not only with discipline and classroom management rules, but also with particular instructional events (Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Michaels, 1981; Zaharlick & Green, 1990). I was interested in locating the literacy instruction that occurred in this social setting, therefore, it was important for me to define the patterns of instruction that occurred throughout day.

Classroom instruction in the Kennedy school first grade generally went according to the schedule detailed in Table 6 (page 87). This schedule was altered to allow time for "specials" such as music, art, gym class, library, and computer centers.

**Locating Literacy Instruction**

Most of the literacy instruction offered in this first grade occurred in the morning session when Kelli taught. Angie included two literacy events in the instructional program during the afternoon session of every school day.
Table 6.

Kennedy School Class Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quiet reading</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at calendar, singing songs</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing class news</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest room break</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal writing</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal sharing</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading at rug</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work centers</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting ready for lunch</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch break/recess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading books at seats</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest room break</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon recess</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading at rug</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting ready to go home</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this section, I describe each event and include information pertaining to (a) where in the room the event occurred, (b) who participated in the event, (C) the activities involved, (d) the materials used, and (e) what the members were attempting to accomplish. These features of this social situation provided a point of entry or framework for my observations, and provided the necessary groundwork for the identification of the "key events" that were committed to more detailed analysis.

Quiet Reading

At around 9:05 AM every morning, the school principal announced over the school's intercom system that silent sustained reading time had begun. The students in this classroom knew that silent sustained reading meant "quiet
reading" time. The teachers in this first grade classroom had renamed this time "quiet reading" since students were encouraged to "whisper read" to themselves, as opposed to reading silently or to reading aloud in a disruptive volume.

Quiet reading was time for the students to read and for Kelli to observe them reading. This was the first instructional event of the day, occurring concurrently to the brief amount of time spent taking lunch count and hanging up coats and book bags. The event took place in the desk area of the classroom. Students were expected to remain in their seats, until their names were called for lunch count. At this time, they were expected to hang up their coats and book bags in the coat rack area of the room, returning immediately to their seats to continue reading.

The primary activity during this event was the independent reading of books by the students. Even those who could not yet read, would "tell a story" aloud by looking at the illustrations of the book and relating what they knew about the persons, places, and things present in these illustrations.

At the beginning of the school year students read books selected by Kelli. Often times these selections were books that Kelli had read aloud to the class during the morning and afternoon reading time at the rug. Kelli would place 2-3 books on their desks in the morning before the students arrived. Often times she selected books that were also used
in the pull-out program. These were called "little" books because they were small in size. As the year progressed, students selected their books to read during this time. I observed that they selected many same books that had been selected previously by Kelli.

Kelli selected books according to levels of difficulty and her observations of students' interactions with texts. The level of text difficulty was determined by a book list published by the pull-out program.

While the basal text was not a dominant source of reading material, Kelli was required by the school district to include it as a resource for reading instruction and assessment. Each student had a copy in their desks and read from this text at least twice a week. Often times when Kelli wanted to focus on a story in this text she would instruct the students to read the story independently during this event. The stories that she requested they read were selections that had been revisited often during reading time at the rug. Students were familiar with the story since it had been read to them by Kelli several times before they were expected to read it independently during quiet reading time.

Kelli had two primary roles during quiet reading time. First, she worked on taking the class lunch count. Second, when lunch count was completed, she would select one or two students at a time per day to sit next to and listen as they
read. When students came to a difficult part in the text, she would instruct them to look at the text illustrations and think about what would make sense in the story. Also, she would ask questions or direct the student's behavior, e.g., "I want to see you pointing to each word as you read." "Look at the picture and think about what would fit there." "Did that make sense?" A specific example was when James read a book about pigs and read dogs for pigs. Kelli asked him to look at the pictures of the story and to think about what would make sense. When Kelli noticed that James was focusing on the end of the word pigs as he read dogs, she pointed to the "p" in pigs and asked James to "think of a word that looks like that and would make sense in the story." She rarely just told him the word, instead offering a high level of support in questions and comments relating to the text.

The role of the instructional aide during this event was to sit next to one or two students at a time per day and listen to them read. While she usually just listened quietly as they read, she could be heard asking the same sorts of questions asked by the Kelli. To my knowledge, Kelli did not instruct the aide in these questioning strategies.

Though the class schedule that hung on the chalkboard in the front of the room listed "saying the pledge to the flag" as an activity that occurred after quiet reading time,
this was not the usual sequence of events. Saying the pledge to the flag was an activity adhered to throughout the school. The principal would announce that it was time to say the pledge to the flag just before his announcement that silent sustain reading had begun. Often times, these announcements were late in coming. Since quiet reading in this class began when students entered the classroom, reading was interrupted by these announcements and the saying of the pledge to the flag.

Reading the Calendar and Singing

The next event of the day included reading the calendar, and sometimes singing a song. These activities were defined by the members of this first grade class as a literacy event that occurred just before the writing of the class news.

The students remained at their desks during this event. Quiet reading ended and this event began when Kelli walked to the front of the room, pointed to the calendar and announced "it's time for us to read our calendar." The students looked on as she pointed to various parts of the calendar (days, name of month) and responded to her questions as a group. Students were not required to hold up their hands to be recognized to give a response. Instead they called out their answers to the questions posed by Kelli.
This event usually began with Kelli asking the students to recall the previous day's information such as the month and the day of the week. Students were then expected to predict the current day's calendar information. Any special events such as a school assembly or an upcoming field trip was discussed at this time.

This part of the event was considered a literacy activity since students were required to locate and read information from the calendar. Consider the following excerpt from an early observation of calendar time in the classroom around Veteran's Day. This episode illustrates the ways in which the purposes and goals of the interactions lead by Kelli are related to literacy and the learning of appropriate literacy behaviors.

Kennedy School Episode: 11/02/90

T = Teacher, Kelli
S = Student class members
S1 = Student member whose answers differed from the rest of the class.

(1) T Let's look at our calendar. What number comes after 8?
(2) (Teacher points to number 9)
(3) S Nine
(4) T Nine. All right, Friday was the ninth of what month?
(5) (Teacher looks on to class waiting for response)
(6) (Students look toward calendar and back to teacher and begin calling out responses)
(7) S November
(8) S1 October
(9) T Could that word be October?
(10) S1 November
(11) T November, and the next day?
(12) S Tenth
(13) T After Friday was?
(14) S Saturday
(15) S1 Eleventh
(16) T Saturday. Do we have school on Saturday?
(17) S No, no.
(18) T Saturday was?
(19) S1 Eleventh
(20) T November, tenth
(21) T What comes after Saturday?
(22) S1 Eleventh
(23) T You tell me, what comes after Saturday?
(24) S1 Eleventh
(25) S Sunday
(26) T Sunday, the first day of the week. And Sunday was?
(27) S The eleventh
(28) T The eleventh. It was a special day, it was Veteran's Day. Today some people do not have to work and there will be no mail today. You can't go to the bank and put money or take money out of the bank because it's a holiday for Veteran's Day. Does anyone know what veteran's are?

In this episode students are expected to look at the words on the calendar and predict what will come next, using their background knowledge of the sequence of numbers (interactions 1-4). While only one student had difficulty in predicting the correct response to the name of the month, Kelli continued to rephrase the question until this student got it right (interactions 6-11). This occurred again in interactions 18-28. While the student was correct in responding that the next day would be the eleventh, Kelli worked toward a response in the form of the day of the week, rather than the day's date. This act of working toward a preferred response was also evident in the results of the analysis of key events, and will be discussed more fully in this chapter.
The last activity of this event was singing a song. Sometimes Kelli wrote the words to these songs on long sheets of chart paper and hung them from the chalkboard at the front of the room. She would point to the words and lead them in singing one or two songs each morning. Near the beginning of the year, few of the students knew the words to the songs, but would attempt to follow Kelli's lead. As the year progressed, I observed many students following along reading the words from the chart paper.

Writing Class News

At around 9:30 AM every morning the class engaged in an event called writing the class news. The students sat at their seats while Kelli stood at the front of the room (in front of the chalkboard). As Kelli led the students in constructing text she wrote these constructions on a piece of chart paper clipped to a clothesline hanging on the chalkboard. Kelli often called this time shared writing.

The sequence through which this occurred was as followed. Kelli would call upon a student to construct a sentence, e.g., "what would you like to say today? What would you like to have in the news?" The students' responses usually began with "I" such as "I like pizza" or "I'm going to my dad's house." When Kelli wrote these contributions on the chart paper she would change the "I" to the respective student's name. On the average, five
students were called upon to contribute to the news of the day.

Near the beginning of the school year, Kelli wrote everything on the chart paper herself. As the year progressed, she often selected students to write a word or two on the chart paper. Near the beginning of the year, Kelli often used another procedure that allowed the students to do their writing. She would pass out one rectangular shaped piece of thick cardboard to each student with a piece of chalk and a paper towel for erasing. These boards were called "magic boards" or just "boards." On the left side of the board were three circles. The top circle was green, the middle yellow, and the bottom red. As Kelli wrote the class news she would select words for the students to write next to a circle on their boards. She would instruct them "just write what you can hear."

When the students had written their words on the magic boards they would hold the boards up in the air to show Kelli. This behavior was established by Kelli early in the year and she did not instruct them to do so after this time. When they held up their boards she would write the word on the chart paper, instructing the students to check what they had written and to "make their corrections."

Often times, for words not selected for writing on the magic boards, Kelli would pause before writing to ask students to predict what they would expect to "come at the
beginning" or the "end of the word." Near the beginning of the year, the words selected by Kelli for writing on the magic boards were what she considered to be high frequency words, or words commonly found in text, particularly text for beginning readers; e.g., a, the, I, can, cat. As the year progressed, many of these words included as spelling words were included on this list of words selected for writing by the students on the magic boards.

Kelli would often ask students who had contributed a piece of news (sentence) to select the ending punctuation. She would then lead the students in rereading each sentence contribution, using a voice intonation in line with the punctuation selected by the students. For example, when "excited marks" were selected, Kelli would lead the students in altering their intonations in a way appropriate for exclamation marks.

Near the end of the event, Kelli led the students in rereading the entire day's news. Each day's work was displayed around the room and approximately every two weeks, students whose names appeared on a particular day's work were eligible to take a page home to share with their families.

Journal Writing

The signal that journal writing time had begun came when Kelli and the instructional aide began passing out the students' journals. The students were expected to begin
writing immediately. The journals were made of approximately 30 sheets of 8 1/2" X 11" unlined white paper, each covered with the same color of construction paper, and stapled on one of the 11" sides. During use, the journals were opened like a book on its side so that students could draw an illustration on the top sheet and write text on the bottom sheet.

Students generally wrote a single one page entry each day. As the year progressed they were less likely to include an illustration. As the students wrote, Kelli walked around the desk area, stopping to talk with students about their entries. These conversations usually consisted of Kelli asking the student to read what s/he had written thus far, which the student did, and Kelli responding by asking what they will write next.

The topics students wrote about were entirely of their choosing. Usually these topics were about family members, friends, or a favorite television character.

Students were permitted to talk quietly to each other as they wrote. They were not permitted to talk about things unrelated to journal writing. They could ask a neighboring student for help in writing words and they were permitted to ask Kelli for help. When they wanted help from the teacher they were expected to raise their hands. Unless students were in route for writing supplies, they were not permitted to be out of their seats during this event.
Reading at the Rug

Reading at the rug came after journal writing time. Kelli signaled the beginning of the event by first announcing it was time to put the journals away and then walking to the rug and sitting on her chair.

Soon after this announcement, students would stop writing, put their journals away in their desks, and would join Kelli at the rug.

Students were expected to sit on the rug, facing Kelli as she read. They were expected to be quiet and not talk with one another during this event. Before, during and after each book read, Kelli talked about the book and asked questions such as "what do you think will happen next, how would you feel, what do you think?" These questions were addressed to the entire group of students and students were expected to call out their responses.

Usually two or three books were read by the teacher during this event. Books read were selected according to a common theme such as butterflies, bears, or the alphabet. The level of text difficulty was not a major concern in the selection process since Kelli read these books to the class and students were not expected to be able to reread each text independently.

The event ended with Kelli sending the students back to their seats.
Work Centers

The last literacy events occurring during the morning session were held at the work centers. These centers were located around the room and included two listening centers, a computer center, and a table set up for special projects. Students were assigned to each center in groups of 5-6. They would spend approximately 15 minutes at each center before Kelli would announce that it was time to move on to another center.

There were two listening centers. One was located to the side of the teachers' desks and the other near the rug. On each table was an audio player, an audio tape of a book, and 5-6 copies of that book.

The students seemed to enjoy their time spent at the listening centers. This was evidenced in the smiles on their faces at the start of the event and the excitement in their voices as they sat and selected their copy of the text. They enjoyed having a copy of the book as they listened to the audio recording of the story. One student was selected by Kelli to be the listening center leader. The student selected for this well sought after role was responsible for turning the audio recorder on and off and making certain that the center's participants listened and read.

The books placed at the listening center varied in terms of text level and subject matter. Students were not
expected to read independently, but rather follow along and read what they could. In attempt to keep up with the pace of the audio recording, students would look on to one another's books to check page numbers. Near the beginning of the year, a great deal of social interaction occurred at these centers. As students listened to the audio recordings of the stories a tone sounded signalling it was time to turn the page. Students' often had difficulty keeping up with all this activity. They attempted to help each other and working together assisted them in "reading" with the recordings. As the year progressed and students' reading abilities increased, the shared interactions among students occurred less frequently.

The computer center held three Apple computers and one printer. Usually two students shared a computer, working together on the math, science, and language arts educational programs. Students were expected to pick partners for sharing from the work center group they belonged to for the day. Often times students used manipulatives, such as a basket of small multicolored rectangular blocks, along side the computer for help in working with the math computer games.

The middle table, located in front of the teachers' desks, was often used as a center. The activities available at this table included puzzles and on-going art projects.
These art projects were often related to the many field trips that the class took during the school year.

When students had completed their work at the centers they were permitted to retrieve a long stick, called a pointer, from the back of the room and walk around pointing to the words as they read "around the room." The students seemed to look forward to this activity, walking around pointing to the charts of writing samples, displays of the previous days' class news, and songs that hung from the walls and ceiling.

When time permitted, Kelli would often end this event by asking the students to join her at the rug for a story. She would read one or two books before sending the students back to their seats to prepare for the lunch break.

**Reading at Seats**

Reading at seats was the first literacy event occurring in the afternoon session when Angie taught in the classroom. This event was very similar to the quiet reading event that occurred in the morning. It was called "reading at your seats" rather than quiet reading. For approximately ten minutes students sat at their desks and read books quietly to themselves. The books read were selected by the students.

There were two primary purposes of this event. Angie felt it was necessary for students to have many opportunities to read their favorite books. Therefore,
students were permitted to make their selections. Angie viewed this event as helpful in "calming" the students after lunch and recess break so they could return to the instructional schedule.

Reading at Rug

The time spent in the afternoon reading at the rug was also very similar to the morning event. Angie sat in the teacher's chair on the rug and read 4 or 5 books of shorter length at the beginning of the year, and 2 or 3 books of longer length as the year progressed.

Summary

Before moving on to a discussion of the literacy instruction provided in the Kennedy school pull-out program, I will summarize the results of the analysis of data relating to question 1.0: What is the range of literacy opportunities in these social settings?

Structured literacy events occurred predominately during the morning session in the Kennedy school first grade classroom. The literacy opportunities made available to students during these events came in a variety of reading and writing activities.

Both Kelli and Angie shared a common goal in attempting to provide many opportunities for students to read alone and to be read to. While they allowed students to select their texts for reading, at the beginning of the school year both
teachers spent more time making "level appropriate" text selections for each student. The teachers made these selections because of their concern that many students lacked experience with books. They felt students needed access to texts they could learn to read successfully and that by selecting texts for students they would be providing this accessibility. This selection process was emphasized more at the beginning of the school year and appeared to decrease over time. However, the teachers continued to monitor the texts selected by students and when they recognized that a student showed interest in a particular topic or subject area they would continue to make suggestions.

Results of the analysis of data relating to each literacy event occurring the classroom suggested that the teachers appeared to place a greater amount of emphasis on the independent writing done by students as opposed to writing done as a group. For example, journal writing was an independent structured literacy activity. During journal writing students were expected to develop stories to write about and to write those constructions in their journals. This writing was accomplished through small amounts of support from the teacher as she circled the desk area of the classroom. Writing the class news, on the other hand, was structured as a teacher led group activity. During this event Kelli stood at the front of the classroom and called
on individual students to offer a sentence that she wrote on chart paper that hung from the chalkboard. The writing done by students during this event consisted of the independent writing of single words on the magic boards and the infrequent writing of single words on the chart paper. Even though Kelli observed students' writing on the magic boards, students were expected to work individually and independently of her.

The literacy events that occurred during the morning session varied on certain dimensions. These events were distinctly identified by the teachers and the students as either reading events or writing events. Though reading events consisted primarily of reading activities, writing events usually included some form of reading but were exclusively referred to as writing events. While on the one hand Kelli sought to incorporate a variety of literacy experiences into the curriculum, special attention was given to making clear distinctions between what counted as a reading activity or a writing activity (e.g., "now we will do quiet reading; now we will write our class news") though there was a great deal of overlap or integration.

The activities that occurred during these literacy events also varied on the amount of teacher direction. During some events Kelli led the activity and students were expected to work independently of her and the other students, e.g., whisper reading to oneself during quiet
reading, independent writing in journals, or working independently at work centers. During other events, Kelli led the activity in explicit ways and students were expected to work as a group, e.g., listening and following along as Kelli read books to the class during reading time at the rug.

Events also varied on levels of teacher support and the amount of interactions students had with the teacher. For example, during quiet reading Kelli often sat with one to two students at a time and listened as they read, offering specific teaching support when it was needed. When she worked one-to-one with a particular student the rest of the class was expected to read independently and were not permitted to interfere with her interactions with the student she was working with. At other times, such as during journal writing, Kelli would walk around the room stopping to talk with students about their journal entries. Students knew that they could ask questions and often stopped her to ask for help in spelling words. Kelli responded in the same way that she would when she worked one-to-one with a student, helping students in learning how to problem solve themselves, e.g., "say the word slowly and write what you can hear," "check your alphabet strip on your desk," etc.

Literacy events also varied on the regularity in which they occurred. Quiet reading and writing the class news
occurred daily while the occurrences of other events ranged from 1-3 times per week.

The location in the room where literacy events occurred also varied from event to event. But, each location was established early in the school year and remained unchanged. These locations reflected the goals, purposes, and functions of the event. For example, journal writing was a time for students to write independently. Sitting at their desks facilitated this independence. Reading time at the rug was a time for students to be close to the teacher and the text as she read a story to the entire class, therefore, students sat on the rug rather than remaining in their seats. Movement from one location to another served as a way of signaling beginnings and endings of each event. At the beginning of the year, Kelli would announce each new event, asking students to move to another location in the room. As the year progressed, these shifts from one event to another became less formal. Events were no longer announced according to name but instead location. For example, early in the year, during the interim between journal writing and reading time at the rug the teacher, the teacher would say, "its time to put your journals away and move to the rug for reading." By late October and early November, when Kelli stood at the rug area and announced "its time to put your journals away" students put their journals away and went directly to the rug for reading.
Shifts from one location to another also served as a way of aiding those students just returning from the pull-out program in knowing what event was in progress and what they were expected to do. For example, James usually left the classroom to go to the pull-out program near the end of quiet reading time, returning after the start of writing the class news. When he returned to the classroom and saw that students were in their seats facing the teacher, he knew that writing the class news was in progress. Whenever the morning schedule had been changed and writing the class news was not underway, he was able to determine what event was in progress without having to ask for help.

Events also varied in the types of materials used. Trade books, text books, and "little" books (such as those used in pull-out instruction) were used during quiet reading, reading time at the rug, and at the listening centers. Audio recordings of books were used at the listening center. Writing journals and "magic boards" were used during writing the class news. Three computers and various computer software packages were available in the classroom during work center time and different software was used at each computer.

In this section I have presented results of the analysis of data relating to the literacy events occurring in the Kennedy school classroom. In the next section I present results of the analysis of data relating to the
Kennedy School pull-out program. This discussion is followed by a presentation of the results of the analysis of data relating to the Johnson school classroom and pull-out program. Throughout this chapter I continue to weave the discussion of the similarities and differences found in the macro-level ethnographic analysis of data relating to the literacy events that occurred in each context. In the last section of this chapter I present the micro-level ethnographic analysis of data relating to the focus students' experiences as participants in these events.

Kennedy School Pull-Out Program

The pull-out program instruction in the Kennedy school occurred in a room called the Reading Recovery Room. This room was located on another floor from the classroom and the other end of the school building. Angie tutored three students (one-to-one instruction) every morning, and Kelli tutored the same number of students in the afternoon. Each lesson lasted for approximately 30 minutes each day and included the same general framework of activities. Time spent on each activity varied across lessons and teachers.

The Room Arrangement

The teacher and student sat at a table located near the center of the room (see figure 7). The table was pulled out away from the wall to facilitate use of a nearby chalkboard. The instructional materials used during the lesson included
books, pens, pencils, scissors, chalk, a "writing book" for each student, magnetic letters, a shallow box filled with salt, and long strips of thick paper. Information relating to the uses of these materials is included in the description of the lessons.

**Locating Literacy Instruction**

The format of the lessons taught in the pull-out program followed the general sequence or framework adopted by the program. When students entered the room the teacher would ask them to write 1-3 words on the chalkboard. These words were considered "high frequency words" that had been written in a previous day's writing journal. High frequency
words were defined as words used most often in written communication (e.g., the, and, like, or, ninja turtles). Writing on the chalkboard lasted only 2-3 minutes.

**Familiar Rereading**

The first formally structured activity during the event called a lesson, was referred to by the teachers and the pull-out program as familiar rereading. The teachers signalled the start of this activity by turning away from the chalkboard and asking the students to select a book to read. Students' selections came from the small stacks of books placed on the desk earlier by the teacher. The students would look through these stacks of books and select a book to read. Sometimes, if students had a particular book in mind they would request that title and if it were readily available the teachers were willing to locate it for them to read.

Reading was exclusively the focus of this portion of the lesson. The teachers provided support directed at developing independent reading strategies. If, for example, a student had difficulty reading a word or sentence the teacher would respond by instructing the student to reread the sentence by saying "try that again." If the illustrations in the text lent information that might help the student to solve the problem independently and make a successful prediction, the teacher would refer the student
to the illustrations rather than just giving the correct answer.

**Running Record**

The second activity was called the running record. During this portion of the lesson students read while the teacher noted his/her reading behaviors using Clay's (1979) system of notation. The books read were those that had been introduced as a new book at the end of the previous day's lesson.

During the running record portion of the lesson, the teacher developed an "observational" demeanor as a way of gaining information about the student's progress and reading behaviors. Teachers observed the students as they read, and using Clay's system of notation, recorded students' error patterns, self-correction rates, and levels of accuracy in reading. For example, if a student read 90% of the words in the book accurately and self-corrected every error, the teacher noted that the student read at a rate of 90% accuracy with a 1:1 self-correction rate. This information (along with information gained from observations made throughout the lesson) aided the teacher in the selection of books. Also, the teacher studied students' error patterns and used this information in formulating questions posed to students when they came to difficult sections in the text. For example, when Angie noted that many word substitutions James made early in the program were meaningful in relation
to the story but showed that he needed to attend more to the grapho-phonemic elements of difficult words, she shifted her questioning strategies accordingly.

**Writing**

At the start of the writing portion of the lesson, the teachers would ask the students to construct a story to write about. If a student had difficulty in deciding what they wanted to write about they were encouraged to think about a book read or a story written on a previous day.

The students wrote in journals or "writing books." These books were made of approximately 50 sheets of bound plain white 8 1/2" x 11" paper. The books were opened and turned on their side to allow students to use the back of the previous page for "practice" writing, and the front of the lower sheet for writing the continuous text. Conventional spelling was used in the writing journals. When errors were made, the teachers used thick white tape to cover them.

The stories students wrote were usually one to two sentences in length. After these sentences had been written in the journals, the teacher wrote the sentences on long strips of paper and cut the paper into segments, marking words, letters, and phrases. The student was then expected to reassemble these cut-up sentences. The teachers usually cut the sentences into words.
There were noticeable shifts over time in the length, topic, and composition of the sentences students contributed. For example, near the beginning of the year, the teacher prompted students for writing by asking them about a book that had just been read. The length of these contributions were generally 3-6 words, e.g., "I like brown bears." As the year progressed, students began to construct sentences without the teacher having to identify a theme or topic and their constructions became longer and more complex, e.g., "I talked to Denequia on the playground today." Students were able to write more of the sentence as the year progressed.

Except the cut-up sentence and writing on the chalkboard, the instructional activities occurred during every lesson, in the same format, sequence, and general length of time. The cut-up sentence and writing on the chalkboard were omitted when a student was near discontinuance from the pull-out program.

Reading of New Book

Each day a new book was introduced by the teacher and the student was expected to read the book at least once with support from the teacher. This support usually came as questions. The teachers often praised the students for reading behaviors they wanted to foster. An example of this was during Amy's lesson on 10/05/90. Amy had just read a book called Bubbles. During the introduction of the book by
the teachers, Kelli spent a great deal of time discussing the illustrations. When Kelli invited Amy to read, her response was "no I don't know how to read it." Kelli responded by reading herself. By the second page, Amy had joined in and Kelli gradually stopped reading. When Amy had finished reading the book Kelli commented, "I really like how you are looking at the pictures to help you with the hard parts."

During the reading of the new book the teacher provided a great deal of support. This support came as questions and prompts. The types of questions and prompts used by the teachers during these activities shifted over time. For example, as students began to read more difficult texts, and showed they were beginning to use the strategies taught in this instructional program (e.g., one-to-one matching; searching, checking or cross checking semantic, syntactic, and graphophonemic information from text) the teachers tailored their use of questions and comments accordingly. For example, near the beginning of the year, using their background knowledge of the book and the supporting illustrations, students' would often invent text when reading. A way teachers encouraged students to attend more to the print in the story was to ask them to use their index finger to point to each word as they read. As students became more strategic readers, teachers would only encourage
students to point during the reading of new or novel texts such as the new book read at the end of the lesson.

The completion of the new book generally marked the end of the 30 minute lesson. The teachers often invited students to select 2-3 books to take home to read before sending them back to their classrooms.

Summary

The literacy opportunities made available to students in the Kennedy school pull-out program also came as various reading and writing activities which occurred during a single 30 minute lesson. These lessons held a distinct structure and sequence of activities. The teachers did not alter this sequence unless a student was close to being discontinued from the program.

Reading was the focus during "familiar rereading," the "running record," and "reading the new book." Writing rarely took place during these events. During the writing portion of the lesson students were as much involved in the reading of their stories as they were in writing them down in their journals.

Each portion or lesson activity varied in level of teacher support. During familiar rereading the teacher provided a small amount of support directed at developing independent reading strategies. During the running record the student was expected to read independently. During the
writing and reading of the new book the teacher provided much support in questions, prompts, and the sharing of the pen.

The types of materials used in each activity included trade books, "little books," journals, marking pens, and strips of paper for the cut-up sentence. Also, there were noticeable shifts in the levels of difficulty of the books selected for reading.

The location in the room where instruction occurred remained the same throughout the lesson. The teachers always remained seated at the instructional table and students remained in their seats unless they were required to stand and write on the chalkboard.

In the next section, I move to the Johnson school and present results of the analysis of data relating to the first grade classroom.

The Johnson School First Grade Classroom

In the previous sections, I discussed the results of the analysis of data relating to the Kennedy School setting. In the following section, I present results of data about the Johnson School. In keeping with the organization used in the presentation of data about the Kennedy school, I begin by presenting the members of the Johnson first grade classroom.
The Class Members

Members of the Johnson school first grade classroom consisted of two teachers, Samantha and Carol, the first grade students, and an instructional aide who worked in the classroom every morning.

Carol taught in the classroom during the morning session of the school day and in Reading Recovery every afternoon. Carol had been a classroom teacher for approximately three years and had taught in Reading Recovery for one year before the start of this study. Carol completed course work for her masters degree in education during her participation in this study. Carol was married and had a toddler son.

Samantha taught in Reading Recovery every morning and in the classroom every afternoon. Samantha had been a classroom teacher for one year before this study, held a masters degree in education, and was a Reading Recovery teacher in training.

Carol and Samantha worked well as a team. Though this was their first year working together, they quickly became close friends both in and out of school. Carol was very supportive of Samantha's training in Reading Recovery and spent as much time as possible helping her in this new role. Whenever I arrived in the morning and began setting up for my observations, I would find the two teachers actively engaged in conversation. There was always much laughter and
teasing back and forth. As they worked together setting up for the day they talked about the class as a whole (e.g., what was working instructionally, changes that needed to be made, etc.), individual student's progress both instructionally and behaviorally, made instructional plans, and shared ideas for changes to be made. This atmosphere remained consistent throughout the day. I will elaborate on their relationship in this section and in the section detailing comparisons across classroom settings.

The instructional aide worked with the students in reading every morning.

During the time I spent observing in this classroom there was usually 20 student members. This number varied as students moved in and out of the school system. I observed that 4 students came, and 5 students left the school.

While the remaining students seemed used to these comings and goings, when a new member entered the room everyone wanted to know his/her name and whom she/he would be sitting with. For example, on one occasion a new student entered the classroom with her mother. Her mother sought out Carol, introduced her, and attempted to arrange for getting her daughter settled into the classroom. When Carol and the mother began talking the little girl suddenly realized that her mother intended to leave. She grabbed hold of her mother's leg and began to cry. Having observed this interaction very carefully, the group of students
sitting closest to the little girl rushed over and began talking with her. They asked her name and invited her to join them at their table. After her mother left, these same students remained interested in helping the little girl feel welcome. Obviously, this behavior made it easy for Carol to ease new students' entry into classroom membership. It was interesting that the mobility level of this student population was described by the school district as very similar to the Kennedy school.

In the following section, I introduce the Johnson school at-risk focus student, Martisha.

The Johnson School Focus Student: Martisha

Martisha, an Afro-American female, was 6 years, 3 months at the beginning of the study. As a class member of the Johnson school classroom, Samantha tutored her in the pull-out program every morning.

Martisha received instruction in the pull-out program for the full academic year, and while she made a much progress, was never discontinued from the program. This was not unusual since this was Samantha's first year as a Reading Recovery teacher, and Martisha's experiences with text before first grade were limited.

Martisha often appeared shy and reserved not only with the adults in the room, but also with the students. It took me longer to get to know Martisha than it did any of the other students. At first she was uncomfortable with my
observations of her in the pull-out program. When I observed in the classroom, it took her longer than the rest of the other focus students to become accustomed to wearing the remote microphone. Unlike James, who loved wearing the remote microphone equipment, Martisha seemed concerned with being noticed by the other students as she wore the microphone. Gradually she came to feel comfortable with the equipment and the attention paid to her by the other class members. While I might have considered not using the remote microphone system with Martisha, her voice was so quiet and soft spoken I felt it necessary to capture her responses during instruction.

The Classroom Arrangement

The Johnson school first grade classroom was located on the first floor of the building, next to the main office. An adjoining room held the teachers' and the instructional aide's desks, and served as the space used for the pull-out program instruction.

The classroom itself was dominated by two connecting focal areas (see figure 8). These were the tables where students sat, and a rug area that took up over one quarter of the floor space.

The tables where students worked were spaced far enough apart to allow room for students who liked to walk around as they worked. Three or four students sat at each table. The
areas of the table assigned to each student were called "spaces." The center of each table held a small plastic basket containing pencils, crayons, scissors, and markers. Students shared these supplies and were expected to keep the baskets on the tables.

Only one student sat at a desk instead of a table. Samantha and Carol had decided to give this student a desk (and a space at a table) since she often lost her temper and hit students or took their pencils as they tried to write. Though she liked having a desk all to herself, sometimes she would move back to her space at a table. She was allowed to keep this old space, but, when she misbehaved she was quickly invited back to her desk.
While students' assignments to spaces rarely changed, there were some exceptions. Like the teachers in the Kennedy school classroom, Samantha and Carol would "try out" seat assignments and make changes as needed. When students sitting next to each other had difficulty getting along, one strategy for solving the problem was to separate them.

Near the beginning of the school year each student's name was written on a strip of thick paper and taped to seat assignments at each table. As the year progressed and the "name tags" became torn and frayed they were removed but not replaced.

The area of the room identified as the "rug" held a large over stuffed couch. Once a week every student got a turn at sitting on the couch. Being a "couch potato" was considered a special privilege. This was evidenced in the students' responses whenever Carol read the list of couch potatoes each morning. Those whose names were not called showed their disappointment in their groans and sighs. Those selected for the day were always openly pleased. The teachers' purpose in placing the couch in the room was to help create a "home like" atmosphere for literacy learning. When they read to the class, the teachers would announce "get comfortable for a story" and everyone would lie down. The couch potatoes would stretch out and dangle off the edges of the couch.
Located off to the side of the desk area next to the rug, was a storage area for students' books and papers. These storage areas or "cubbies" were distributed across four shelves. All students had a "cubby."

Along the perimeter of the room was a "computer center" area where three computers and a printer lined the wall. Next to this area was a small circular table where the instructional aide sat when she tutored students in the mornings.

On the opposite end of the room was a round table called the listening center that held one audio player and four earphones for listening. Above the listening center table hanging from the wall was a television monitor that was used for playing movies or documentaries. Whenever Samantha and Carol took the class on field trips they video taped the event and replayed the tapes for the class during in-door recess.

**Discipline and Class Management**

The patterns of behavior that occurred within this classroom setting were important considerations in understanding the ways in which the rules and norms for acceptable behavior were communicated and how the class members held each other accountable for adhering to these rules.

These rules were defined by the teachers and the student members of the classroom on the first day of school.
Both teachers led the students in generating a list of classroom rules. The teachers employed various methods of enforcing these rules. These enforcements were patterned in the following ways. On my first day of observation, both of the teachers in this room mentioned to me that they were determined not to send any of their students to the "Peak" room this year. They felt they should be able to handle any of the discipline problems. I did not observe any students being sent to "Peak" for disciplinary action. I did observe two methods of discipline and class management employed. The first was "time-out." I only observed students being sent to the "time-out" chair twice during my observation in this room.

The second form of class management strategy employed most often by the teachers was the use of two key phrases: "room six" and "freeze." The first phrase I would hear from each teacher whenever the students became too loud was "room six," and then a long pause followed by, "freeze." The students would immediately stop whatever they were doing and turn their attention to the teachers. This method was also used as a way of signaling the beginning and end of instructional events. For example, at the end of the time spent on the rug, Carol would say "room six, freeze." She would proceed by explaining their morning seat work assignments and would follow up by saying "thaw out." The students would move on to the activities of the next event.
Curriculum Schedule

The patterned ways of participating and demonstrating socially and academically appropriate behavior were associated not only with discipline and classroom management rules, but also with particular instructional events (Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Michaels, 1981; Zaharlick & Green, 1990). I was interested in locating the literacy instruction that occurred in this social setting, therefore, it was important for me to define the patterns of instruction that occurred throughout the day.

Classroom instruction in the Johnson school first grade generally went according to the following schedule. Like the Kennedy school, this schedule was altered to allow time for "specials" such as music, art, gym class, library, and computer centers.

Table 7.

*Johnson School Class Schedule*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal writing</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing class news</td>
<td>20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading at the rug</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual and small group seat work activities</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch break/recess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent sustained reading</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science or reading at rug</td>
<td>20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent projects/centers</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting ready to go home</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Locating Literacy Instruction

Most of the literacy instruction offered in this first grade occurred in the morning session when Carol taught. In the afternoon, Samantha offered many opportunities for literacy learning. For example, math and science content areas often included reading and writing activities.

In this section, I describe each event and provide information about (a) where in the room the event occurred, (b) who participated in the event, (c) the activities involved, (d) the materials used, and (e) what the members were attempting to do. Again, these features of this social setting provided a point of entry and a framework for my observations and for the more focused analysis of the communicative structures occurring within and across each event (Zaharlick & Green, 1990).

Journal Writing

The first literacy event of the day was journal writing. Students' journals were constructed in the same format as those used in the Kennedy school, except that they were opened up on the left side like a book.

As the students wrote, Carol would walk from table to table stopping to talk with each student about his/her writing. She usually had an opportunity to stop and talk with each student at least twice during this event. If a student was just getting started, Carol would ask "what are you going to write about today?" If she/he was well under
way, Carol would ask, "tell me about what you wrote." If she felt that a student needed prompting to keep going, she would ask questions such as, "what's going to happen next?" Usually, before she moved on to another student, she would write a comment on each student's entry page. For example when one student wrote about her mom, Carol responded by writing, "she must be very nice!"

The types of support given shifted over time. For example, near the beginning of the year Carol spent longer periods of time with each student helping him/her in getting started, e.g., opening journal, getting pens ready, constructing the text, and putting pen to paper. As the year progressed Carol still talked with each student, but, these conversations gradually began to focus more on the content of students work, e.g., "this is really great, what else could you add?,"can you tell me more?"

Journal writing time was always noisy and busy. Students would get up from their seats to get a book or to move closer to the alphabet hanging on the wall. They were encouraged to use this alphabet to check on letter formations and they used books as sources of story content and accurate spelling.

During this time, and throughout the remainder of the morning, the instructional aide tutored students at her table. When she called out a student's name, she/he would stop writing and join her at her table.
Writing Class News

Immediately after journal writing, Carol would instruct the students to join her at the rug. Students would often share their journals with the rest of the class before the start of the next event called writing the class news.

Carol sat at her chair for this event and called on students to make contributions to the class news. Carol wrote these contributions on a large sheet of chart paper that hung from an easel next to her chair. While students' contributions were expected to be in complete sentences, the students' own language constructions were accepted and written down by Carol. For example, when a student who was having a difficult time selecting a sentence to share with the class, became exasperated and yelled out "I don't got nothing to say," Carol quickly responded with, "well that can be your news" and wrote the sentence on the chart paper without altering the syntax or form.

Shifts occurred over time in relation to the types of contributions students made. Near the beginning of the year students responded with one or two words or a short phrase. Carol continued to encourage them to "put it in a sentence" and gradually all students began to do so regularly.

Near the end of this event Carol would call on one or two students at a time to come up to the easel. Using a long stick as a pointer, these students led the class in
rereading the day's news by pointing to each word and reading aloud.

**Reading at the Rug**

After writing the class news, Carol would instruct the class to "get comfortable for a story." Students would stretch out on the rug and Carol would begin reading aloud to the class. She usually read 2 or 3 books during this time. As she read she held the books up for all to see. While most of the students were content to remain on the rug or the couch as they listened to the teacher read, one student would always come to the front of the rug area and stand next to Carol as she read and hold on to Carol's arm or leg. Carol never commented or discouraged this from happening nor did she attempt to move the student away. Instead she would pull her closer, hugging her as she continued to read.

At least once a week the material read during this time included a story from the basal text. Reading of the basal text changed the order of the seating arrangements on the rug. Carol would sit on the rug rather than the chair and would instruct the students to circle the perimeter of the rug area. Students did not sit on the coach during the reading of the basal text. After the students were seated, Carol would instruct one student to pass out the basal texts for everyone to read. Carol would instruct the students to turn to a particular page, would give brief introduction to
the story, and would begin reading aloud to the students. She would encourage the students to join in and read with her when they could. Students were expected to follow along, pointing to the words as she read and turning the pages at the appropriate times. Carol occasionally would pause to check to see if everyone was on the correct page. She would stop and ask questions about the story such as "why do you think . . . , what do you think about . . . ? What do you suppose will happen when . . . ?"

Reading time at the rug ended with Carol giving instruction for the next event, individual and small group activities at spaces, and sending the students back to their seats.

**Individual and Small Group Seat Work Activities**

The activities that students engaged in during this activity ranged from using one page teacher-made work sheets to writing and illustrating books. Book making activities lasted 2 or 3 days while one or two page cut and paste projects were expected to be completed on the same day assigned. When students had completed their daily assignments they were expected to work at the computers (if it was their turn to do so), read books at the rug, and reread the day's news hanging from the easel.

On one occasion during this event, I observed four students "construct" and "play" a game at the rug. Each student had finished working on his/her activity and had
opted to move to the rug to read. One student pulled a chair onto to the rug, sat and began to read. Four students followed by doing the same thing. When two other students joined in, one suggested that they "play school." After a few moments of negotiation, a student was selected to play "teacher" and the chairs were lined up in a long row. The "teacher" stood facing the chairs and "instructed" the remaining students to begin reading a particular story. Before long other students in the class had begun to join in and soon the entire class had moved their chairs to the rug for a game of "school." Carol was so fascinated with the goings on that she went and sat near the chalkboard area, listening and watching as she pretended to be busy looking at students' papers. This "game of school" lasted for the remainder of the morning until students left for lunch break.

Silent Sustained Reading

Before leaving for lunch, Carol would announce that it was time for students to select books for silent sustained reading, an event that occurred every afternoon, immediately after lunch. When the students returned from lunch they knew to go directly to their spaces and begin reading independently the books they had selected. Students read aloud to themselves and to their neighbors.

Students were encouraged to select up to ten books to read or look at during this event. Near the beginning of the
year, students appeared to just randomly select books from the shelf, rushing to grab as many books as they could carry back to their seats. As the year progressed, students' habits for selecting books shifted. Gradually, they began to take longer periods of time selecting books, pausing to look at the book covers and illustrations before placing them on their pile to take back to their spaces. Most of the class members returned to the same titles several times before moving on to new selections.

Students were allowed to share books with one another and often did. This event ended with Samantha announcing that it was time for the students to put their books away. The books would go back on the shelves to be selected another day.

Science or Reading at Rug

Every afternoon Samantha would instruct the students to join her at the rug for a story. Here she would begin her science lesson by reading a science based information book. At the end of the text reading she would instruct the students in the science activity they would be participating in before sending them back to their seats.

Summary

Before moving into a discussion of the literacy instruction provided in the Johnson pull-out program, I will summarize the results of the analysis of the Johnson
classroom data relating to questions 1.0: What is the range of literacy opportunities in these social settings.

Structured literacy events occurred primarily during the morning session in the Johnson school first grade classroom. The literacy opportunities made available to students during these events came in a variety of reading and writing activities.

The analysis of these events revealed variations on certain dimensions. First, as in the Kennedy school first grade, events identified as reading activities focused exclusively on reading. On the other hand, events identified as writing activities included components of reading. For example, during reading at the rug, reading was the focus and writing did not occur; during journal writing and writing the class news, the focus was on writing, but the teacher and students were continuously engaged in the rereading of the text constructed.

Events also varied in the amount of teacher direction. During many events, as the teacher led the activity, students were expected to work independently, e.g., writing in one's own journal during journal writing time, reading quietly to oneself during silent sustained reading. During other events, Carol led the activity in explicit ways while the students were expected to participate as a group, e.g., offering news to be written on chart paper during writing the class news time, listening and following along as the
teacher read books to the class during reading at the rug time.

Events also varied in terms of the levels of teacher support. During journal writing time, the teacher walked around the room, talking with each student once or twice about his/her journal entries. She wrote comments on their journal pages as a way of encouraging students to continue writing. During writing the class news, the teacher sat on a chair in the rug area and called on one student at a time to contribute to the class news, leading the students in a group structured activity.

Events also varied in relation to the regularity in which they occurred. While journal writing time and writing the class news occurred daily, the occurrences of other events ranged from 3-4 times per week depending upon the number of scheduled "specials."

One event, individual and small group activities, varied daily in relation to the activities presented and the length of time spent on each activity while the other events remained consistent in the materials used and the activities presented.

The location in the room in which events occurred varied from event to event. The teachers established the areas of the room where each event occurred early in the school year and these locations remained the same throughout the school year. The areas of the room selected for each
event reflected the functions, goals, and purposes of the event. For example, journal writing occurred at the table area of the room since students needed a surface to write on. Students were not required to remain in their seats as they wrote. They shared writing materials located in a basket on the center of each table and were permitted to talk with one another about their journal entries. The tables served to facilitate these dialogues since students needed to interact with one other to share the materials and the space at the table. Writing the class news occurred at the rug area of the room since the morning teacher wanted the students to be close to her and to the easel used for writing. Reading time at the rug also occurred at the rug area of the room since the morning teacher wanted the students to be close to her as she read to them. At the start of every book reading she would announce "get comfortable for a book."

Events varied in terms of the types of materials used. Trade books and "little" books (such as those used in the pull-out program) were used during reading time at the rug, silent sustained reading, and at the listening centers. The books read during reading time at the rug ranged in topic and level of difficulty. On some days the teacher opted to read 2-4 books of various topics and levels of difficulty. On other days she opted to read 2-4 books of similar topics such as different versions of the story "the three bears."
The books read during silent sustained reading were selected by the students and not the teachers. Audio recordings of books were used at the listening center with multiple copies of the text for students to follow along as they listened. Since students were not expected to read independently, there was a broad range in the level of difficulty of texts selected. Teacher-made journals were used during journal writing time and students were expected to write in the journals every day. Two computers and various computer software packages were available in the classroom during individual and small group activity time. This software was selected and loaded by the teachers before the start of the school day and these selections remained the same throughout the year.

In the next section I present results of the analysis of data relating to the Johnson school pull-out program.

The Johnson School Pull-Out Program

The pull-out program instruction in the Johnson school occurred in a room called the Reading Recovery Room, located next to the first grade classroom. Carol tutored three students (one-to-one instruction) every morning, and Samantha tutored the same number of students in the afternoon. Each lesson lasted for approximately 30 minutes each day and included the framework of activities outlined previously in the discussion of the Kennedy school pull-out program instruction.
The time spent on each activity varied across lessons and teachers, particularly for Samantha who was new to the program and had a more difficult time limiting the lesson to 30 minutes.

The Room Arrangement

The instruction in the pull-out program occurred in a room adjoining the classroom (see figure 9). Just like the Kennedy school pull-out program, the instructional materials used during the lesson included books, pens, pencils, scissors, chalk, a "writing book" for each student, magnetic letters, a shallow box filled with salt, and long strips of thick paper for the cut-up story.

Figure 9
Locating Literacy Instruction

The format of the lessons taught in the Johnson school pull-out program followed the same general sequence or framework adopted by the regular Reading Recovery program. Details of this sequence and the components of each activity were outlined in the discussion of the Kennedy school pull-out program. Therefore, for the sake of brevity, I will not repeat this discussion since the sections that follow (results of question 1.1) address in detail the ways in which the two elementary school programs differed from one another.

Summary

The first goal of this study was to develop a better understanding of the range of literacy opportunities made available in these classroom settings and pull-out programs. In the first section of this chapter I presented results of the analysis of data relating to research question 1.0: What is the range of literacy opportunities in these social settings?

The next section addresses question 1.1: How are the literacy opportunities in the classroom similar to or different from the literacy opportunities in the pull-out program? In this section the discussion shifts to a comparative discussion of the literacy opportunities made available in these social settings.
Research Question 1.1

1.1 How are the literacy opportunities in the classroom similar to or different from the literacy opportunities in the pull-out program?

Looking Across Contexts

In this section I present the results of the comparisons of the literacy opportunities provided in the classrooms and the pull-out programs. I begin with the comparison of the classroom settings, followed by the comparison of the classrooms with the pull-out programs, and the pull-out programs with each other.

Structured literacy events occurred predominately during the morning session in both first grade classrooms. The teachers in these classrooms referred to each event as either reading or writing. Reading events focused exclusively on reading, while the writing events also included various components of text reading, e.g., rereading of text during construction, using written text as a source of reading material.

In both classrooms the teachers shared the common goal of attempting to provide many opportunities for the students to read alone and to be read to. While they shared a concern over many students' lack of experience with books, the ways in which they responded to this concern differed. In the Kennedy school classroom the teachers attempted to support students by spending time at the beginning of the year selecting "level appropriate" books for each student to read
independently. Therefore, at the beginning of the year more emphasis was placed on the reading of texts selected by the teachers. In the Johnson school classroom the teachers provided opportunities for students to collaborate with each other in the selection of texts. Special time was set aside for selecting texts and more emphasis was placed on the reading of texts selected by the students.

In the Kennedy school classroom more time was devoted to independent activities done by students as opposed to activities done as a group, e.g., independent writing versus writing done as a group. In comparison, a greater amount of group structured collaborative activities occurred in the Johnson school.

The instructional materials used in both classrooms were very similar, e.g., pens and markers, journals, audio recordings of books, computers, etc. Teachers in both settings used the same published materials for determining text reading levels and provided similar types of reading materials. The same basal reading series had been adopted in both schools and the teachers in each setting used the text as a source of reading material in similar ways and amounts of time. Both classrooms incorporated journal writing in the class curriculum and provided students with similar types of resources for independent writing, e.g., alphabet and number displays throughout the classroom.
In both classrooms literacy activities varied in relation to teacher support and direction, and in the amount of interaction students had with teachers during each event. Also, in both classrooms the location where events occurred varied from one event to the next. Similar types of events occurred in both classrooms and the locations in the room where events occurred were very similar, e.g., reading at the rug, journal writing at seats. One exception was writing the class news. In the Kennedy school students remained in their seats during this event, whereas in the Johnson school the teacher and students worked together at the rug.

Methods of classroom management differed across schools. In the Kennedy school, a non-verbal method of classroom management was used. Here the teachers turned the lights on and off as a way of signalling beginnings and endings of events and controlling the noise level in the classroom. In the Johnson school, the teachers used the verbal phrase, "room six freeze," for the same goals.

School settings differed significantly in relation to the location of the pull-out instructional programs to their respective classrooms settings. The Johnson school pull-out program was located in a room adjoining the classroom, whereas, the Kennedy school pull-out program was at the other end of the school building. In the Johnson school setting, the transition from classroom to the pull-out
program resembled that of a teacher and student moving to another part of the classroom to read and write together. The close proximity of the pull-out program to the classroom made each setting highly accessible to the other from the teachers', and the students', points of view. For example, during the morning session when Samantha taught in the pull-out program and Carol taught in the classroom, Samantha moved freely from room to room, often stopping to talk to Carol when she brought a student back to the class, and waited for the next student to get ready to go to Reading Recovery. During these conversations they shared their concerns about students, asked one another for advice on instruction in the classroom and the pull-out program, shared ideas for further field trips or units of instruction, etc.

In comparison, the distant location of the Kennedy school classroom to the pull-out program did not allow for the same types of collaborative social interactions between teachers. Since it took a longer time for students to move from one context to the other the teachers were not as accessible to one another and the students were not as accessible to the teachers. Also, the ways in which the teachers structured the transition from one context to the next, was more abrupt and de-emphasized the "crossover of like members" from one context to the other. An example was during the morning session when Angie taught in Reading
Recovery and Kelli taught in the classroom. To reduce the amount of time it took to go from one context to the next, Angie worked toward helping students to feel comfortable traveling back and forth from the classroom to the pull-out program by themselves. Therefore, unless Kelli and Angie got together during their lunch breaks, they only saw each other at the start and end of each day. This meant that the teachers had less time for impromptu kinds of interactions during the school day, therefore, for these teachers team teaching meant only sharing the responsibility of teaching in two settings, and for the most part, working independently of one another.

These differences across schools challenge the notion of the Kennedy pull-out program as a sub-culture of the larger classroom culture though the members of each context remained the same. Also, the transitions from one context to the next were more "contextualized" when the pull-out program was located in close proximity to the classroom setting and may have served in making the instructional processes more contextualized as well.

The classroom settings also differed in relation to the ways in which the organization of the classrooms facilitated group versus independent structured activities. One example is in the use of tables or desks for student seating. In the Johnson first grade, tables were used and students were expected to share materials from the supply baskets located
in the center of each table. While all students were assigned "cubbies" for storing personal belongings, books and papers to take home, etc., to participate in activities at the tables, students were required to share the materials that remained at each table. This helped them to work together as a group. For example, during journal writing students were primarily expected to work independently in the writing of their journals. Since they had to share materials such as pencils for writing and markers for illustrating, various levels of group negotiation were always going on. These negotiations served to facilitate collaborative discussion between students about the work being done. For example, when Martisha needed a special colored marker to illustrate her story she had to negotiate its use with another student. She did this by sharing a part of her story by commenting, "See my trees, I drew trees in my picture, I wanna color them green." Drawing the interest of the other student, and setting up a discussion for sharing the marker, she negotiated use of the green marker. She was forced to do this since no one "owned" the marker and therefore could not claim ownership rights for its use.

In contrast, in the Kennedy school first grade desks were used and each student was responsible for his/her supplies. Student owned markers, pencils, paper, books, and personal belongings were stored in the desks. At the
beginning of the year, Kelli and Angie had placed most of
the desks in table like formations. As the year progressed,
students who were having difficulty sitting in the table
formations were moved. By the end of this study, most of the
desks had been pulled out of these formations and students
were situated apart from one another. Unlike the Johnson
school classroom, during independent structured activities
students did not have reasons for interacting with each
other about the instructional activities. Even during group
structured events, such as writing the class news, students
worked at their desks, wrote on their magic boards, and
raised their hands to be recognized by the teacher when they
wanted to make a contribution to the news. Therefore, during
group structured events students interacted with the teacher
about instruction but not with each other.

In the Kennedy school the distance apart marked clear
divisions between the pull-out program and the classroom.
The patterned behavior related to these divisions was
consistent with the way in which the organization of the
classroom (e.g., student ownership of materials, use of
desks instead of tables, remaining at desks during group
activities) served to emphasize independent work by the
students.

In the Johnson school the seams dividing the pull-out
program and the classroom were less visible, and therefore,
transitions from one context to the next was more fluid.
Here the patterns of behavior relating to the location of the pull-out program to the classroom were consistent with the way in which the classroom organization of the students' work space and distinctions between individual and group structured activities were also more fluid (e.g., sharing of materials and space at tables required ongoing student interaction across group and individually structured activities). Therefore, in the Johnson school, collaboration between students was necessary even during individual structured activities.

The comparison of the classroom contexts with the pull-out programs revealed similarities and differences. The similarities between contexts seem natural since the same teachers taught in each setting, each teaching from similar philosophies, as specialists in early literacy development. The differences also appear to be understandable and natural outgrowths of a comparison between one-to-one versus whole class instruction. For example, the literacy opportunities made available to students in the pull-out programs were similar to those in the classroom with regards to the variety of reading and writing events offered. The quantity of time spent on each event in the classroom was much greater than that spent on each event (activities within a lesson) in the pull-out program. This was understandable given the time constraints of individual lessons, and the goal of providing an intense short term intervention student
program in Reading Recovery as compared to the year long instructional goals inherent to the classroom settings.

Just as was true in the classrooms, the teachers in the pull-out programs referred to each lesson activity as either a reading event or a writing event. Each reading event focused exclusively on reading, while the writing events also included various components of text reading, e.g., rereading of text during construction.

In both classrooms the teachers attempted to provide many opportunities for students to read alone and to be read to. In contrast, teachers rarely read to students in the pull-out program, except in the very beginning of a student's instructional program. They often read with students, e.g., in the reading of the new book, in the reading of a familiar text as a way of demonstrating fluent reading to a student, and in the reading of students' writing.

As discussed previously, the comparison of the classroom settings revealed differences in the ways in which teachers supported students in the selection of texts. The Kennedy school teachers supported students at the beginning of the school year by selecting "level appropriate" books for each student to read, whereas the Johnson school teachers provided opportunities for student to student collaboration in selecting texts. In both pull-out programs the teachers selected "level appropriate" books for students
to read. While the teachers often selected several options of texts for students to choose from, the selection process was clearly controlled by the teachers.

One dimension of variation that applied to both the classrooms and the pull-out programs was in the levels of teacher support. In the classrooms, it ranged from highly supportive to little or no support. For example, during quiet reading time in the Kennedy school the teacher sat with one or two students at a time each morning and listened to them read. If a student had difficulty, the teacher would offer support in questions and comments about the text and the student's reading behaviors. When the teacher sat with one student, the remaining class members were expected to work independently. During journal writing in the Johnson school classroom the teacher walked around the room talking with the students, one at a time. When the teacher was talking with one student, the remaining class members were expected to work independently without support until the teacher had an opportunity to talk with them.

While there were variations in the levels of teacher support offered in the pull-out programs, the range of support was more narrowly defined. Again, this can be attributed to the ways in which the contexts differed with regards to group versus one-to-one instructional features. For example, while the teachers adopted an observational demeanor during the running record portion of the pull-out
program lesson and did not directly help students in their reading, they were still providing support through their focused observations and through the questions and comments made after this reading. Angie often complimented James' reading by stating, "I love to listen to you read." Samantha would support Martisha when she commented, "I like what you did on this page, you went back and fixed it so it made sense." In essence, students were never expected to work without some form of support from the teacher.

The analysis of teacher support offered to students in each context revealed similarities in terms of the types of support offered during particular events or activities. For example, the types of support the teacher provided students during quiet reading in the Kennedy school first grade were similar to the support offered to students during the familiar rereading portion of the pull-out instruction. These similarities were apparent in the types of questions asked by the teacher when the student had difficulty during reading. Both the morning and the afternoon teachers in both schools incorporated supportive questioning strategies used in the pull-out programs into the class setting, e.g., "Does it make sense to say that? Does that word look like it could be 'when'?

Looking across pull-out programs revealed similarities in relation to the activities included in each lesson, the amount of time spent on each activity and lesson, and the
sequence of activities. Though the Johnson school pull-out program room was located in an adjoining room, it took approximately the same amount of time for teachers and students to go from one context to the next since the teachers in the Johnson school often engaged in conversation during these transitions.

Summary

In the previous sections I presented results of the analysis of data relating to questions 1.0 and 1.1. These questions were directly related to the goal of developing a better understanding of the range of literacy opportunities made available in the classroom settings and in their respective pull-out programs.

Each community or culture has rules for socially interacting and sharing knowledge (Heath, 1984). Results of this layer of analysis offered comparative insights into the structure and sequence of expectations placed on members of the classroom culture, e.g., working individually versus group structured events, how to respond when a teacher is working with you or another student or the whole class. It also offered insight into what students needed to know to go from event to event, and context to context.

What this level of analysis did not offer was insights into how these at-risk focus students made sense of the actions and interactions that occurred, and what they needed
to know and what they were expected to do to participate successfully.

Bloome (1990) argues that the meanings associated with a given moment go beyond an isolated or specific lesson and are related to the set of cultural meanings assigned over time and space by the members of the culture. Therefore, in the last section of this chapter, addressing question 2.0: what are the expectations and opportunities for literacy learning for these at-risk students, I look specifically at students' experiences during "key literacy events" and attempt to define the patterns of behavior as related to the cultural meanings assigned over time and space rather than as discrete and segregated points in time.

Research Question 2.0

2.0 What are the expectations and opportunities for literacy learning for these at-risk students?

The At-Risk Focus Students' Experiences

For question 2.0 the focus moves from the instructional socio-cultural contexts to the at-risk students' experiences in these contexts. Through the methods detailed in the previous chapter, recurrent social processes and "key" literacy events were identified and explored in relation to what counted as literacy, literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior. The following discussion is based on results of the analysis of these "key events"
occurring in the classrooms and in the pull-out programs (see appendices G & H).

This last section of Chapter IV has been organized into two parts. In the first part, I discuss the results of the analysis of data relating to James' experiences during "key events" occurring in the classroom and in the pull-out program. I follow this with a discussion of Martisha's experiences in the Johnson school classroom and in the pull-out program. While this discussion focuses on the students' experiences during these particular events, it is not limited to these events alone. Examples of other events are included as well.

The Kennedy School Focus Student: James

In the classroom. In the two previous sections of this chapter I described the usual activities taking place every morning in the Kennedy school classroom. This discussion included information about the curriculum schedule, the types of literacy instruction that took place, and how the instruction was organized. While it provided insight into the design of this classroom culture, it provided little in the way of insight into the everyday "school lives" of the individuals who met there together everyday.

Earlier in this chapter I introduced James, one of the two at-risk focus students, whose experiences I detail in this section of the chapter. James' experiences were very different from those of the other focus students in that he
was very creative, yet boisterous in making his needs known. He made certain that everyone around him knew what he wanted, what he didn't like, and how he intended to change things.

Early in my observations in the Kennedy school classroom, I discovered that James seemed to follow his schedule in terms of getting work done and moving on to the next event. I was curious about this behavior, and equally curious about the teachers' responses.

An early example that illustrates this behavior occurred during journal writing. Journal writing was a time when students were expected to remain in their seats to work. I observed that, often, James did not remain in his seat. If he had not finished writing (not finished as determined by James and not necessarily the teacher) when the rest of the class had moved to the next event, he would opt to remain at his desk and continue working.

At 10:05 journal writing had begun. In keeping with her usual routine, Kelli announced the beginning of this activity, instructed the students to take out their journals, and began walking around the room talking with each student regarding what he or she planned to write about.

When Kelli reached James' desk he had his journal out and wanted to read to her what he had written the day before. He read the entry and since it was about his
mother's upcoming birthday, Kelli suggested that he make a birthday card for her rather than writing an entry in his journal. He agreed very excitedly and promptly went in search of paper to make his card.

James began making his card by attempting to write the word "happy." Remembering that there was a birthday chart in the back of the room, he went there for help in spelling the word correctly. He copied from the bulletin board display, but used invented spelling for "happy" and conventional spelling for "birthday." Once he had written this portion of the card, he proceeded to walk around the room looking for more print to copy.

Seventeen minutes later, James was still walking around the room. Finally, he sought the help of the instructional aide and asked "Can you make my card for me?" She declined explaining that he needed to make the card himself, but added that she would be happy to "help" him make the card.

By this time, James had thrown away his earlier attempt and had started over on a new sheet of paper. They worked together on the card throughout the remainder of journal writing time and well into the next event before it was completed.

This early example illustrated the need to examine the events occurring within these social settings according to the rules that had been constructed for interacting versus the norms for interpreting these rules (Saville-Troike,
In the previous chapter I outlined the methods used in selecting and analyzing the "key events" described here. These key events were viewed as communicative events where meaning was constructed through the verbal and non-verbal face-to-face interactions that took place.

The social processes occurring during each literacy event held unique rules for how the students and teachers "should" act to be successful. But, everyone did not respond to these rules in the same way. Instead there was a "range" of norms for interpreting these rules. During each event, teachers and students negotiated the range of these norms for interpreting the rules for what counted as appropriate literacy behavior. Therefore, since each event held a unique communicative context for constructing meaning, these negotiations aided students in weaving the "intertexual" threads of meaning within and across events and socio-cultural contexts.

This early example of James' experiences during journal writing illustrates the socio-cultural process of James' engagement in "intertextuality." Journal writing was a form of personal writing where students wrote about their experiences, thoughts, likes and dislikes, etc. While students were expected to use journals during this event, Kelli encouraged James to move beyond the genre of journal writing to the construction of a birthday card for his mother. This juxtaposition of various conversational and
written texts, their genres, and the situational contexts in which they occurred, illustrate the ways in which Kelli and James negotiated the construction of the intertextual threads of meaning of one text to another by assigning meaning to "what counted as literacy," expectations for "what counted as literacy learning, and rules for "what counted as appropriate literacy behavior."

Bloome (1989) argues that the juxtaposing of text is not in itself sufficient for intertextuality. As a social construction, intertextuality requires the interactional recognition and acknowledgment of the social significance of the process (Bloome, 1989). For the most part, the teachers in this study held the primary role in initiating, defining, and enforcing the rules for interaction and norms of interpretation for each literacy event. Therefore, they played an important role in validating the appropriateness of students' responses. This was accomplished in several ways.

I showed previously that James often kept his own schedule for participating in the activities that occurred in this classroom. In keeping his own schedule, he was not always actively engaged in intertextual processes of constructing meaning from text. These experiences will become more visible in the following discussion of the analysis of key events occurring in the classroom.
An early episode of quiet reading was analyzed (see Appendix G for details of the analysis). This event began when students entered the classroom in the morning. Imbedded in the event was the sub-event of taking lunch count. Students were expected to begin reading and remain in their seats until their names were called for lunch count. At this time they responded "hot" if they planned to purchase a lunch, and "cold" if they had brought their lunch to school. If they were purchasing lunch students were expected to give the money to Kelli before proceeding on to the coat rack area, to hang up their coats and book bags, and return to their seats to continue reading quietly. On this day, Kelli also collected money from students for school pictures.

When James' name was called, he responded by calling out "hot" (for hot lunch), got up from his seat, went to Kelli to give her his lunch and picture money, and returned to his desk for his coat. On his way back to his desk he stopped twice to talk to other students. After he retrieved his coat he proceeded to the coat rack, hung up his coat, and returned to continue his conversation with another student. Instead of sitting at his desk he remained standing and continued his conversation for more than half the event. During this time Kelli did not ask him to return to his desk to read, but instead allowed him to continue
talking throughout the event. His conversation was not quiet and could be heard around the room.

Quiet reading time was a time for students to read quietly to themselves. At the beginning of the year, Kelli selected "level appropriate" books for students to read and placed 2 or 3 options for them to choose from on the top of their desks. When James entered the classroom he was expected to sit at his seat, select a book from the pile on his desk, and begin reading quietly to himself. On this day the sub-event of taking lunch count and collecting money for pictures also held rules for interacting and norms of interpreting these rules. James was expected to respond when his name was called, take his money for lunch and pictures to Kelli, collect his coat, take it to the coat rack area, return to his seat, and begin reading quietly again.

While it was expected that students would read quietly to themselves and to listen for their name to be called for lunch count, the norms for interpreting these rules for interaction ranged from reading quietly to not reading at all. Tacitly, students were deemed successful if they could let Kelli know if they wanted to buy lunch, give her their lunch and picture money, and hang up their coats. Though reading quietly was considered the function and goal of this literacy event, and lunch count was only a sub-event, students were not required to do so. Therefore, if students
had learned how to "do lunch count" they considered themselves successful in "doing quiet reading."

During a later episode of quiet reading there was no sub-event, since Kelli had already taken lunch count (see Appendix G for details of the analysis). Later in the school year students were expected to select their books to read quietly to themselves. But, James did not select a book for quiet reading. Instead, he sat at his desk and talked with a neighboring student for the entire time. When Kelli asked him to take out a book and begin reading, he took a book out of his desk and returned to his conversation with the other student. He never read the book and his conversation, which could be heard around the room, was unrelated to the text selected. Instead, his conversation focused on what he and his friend hoped to do during recess.

Again, while the primary rule of interaction during this event was to select books and read quietly, the norms of interpretation ranged from quiet reading to not reading at all. When the norms of interpretation allowed students to opt out of participation altogether, these norms were in direct conflict with the purpose and goal of the event, which was for students to have opportunities to read and for the teacher to have opportunities to listen and help them in their reading.
These episodes represented James' behavior during literacy events structured for independent work by students, as outlined in the analysis of key events that are located in Appendix G (See Appendix G for details of the analysis). In contrasting these three episodes, it was only during the journal writing episode of making a card for his mother that James had the opportunity to engage in intertextuality by being actively involved in the juxtaposing of various forms of text. In this event, Kelli validated this process by encouraging him to move to another genre and make his mother a birthday card. The instructional aide also validated this process by working with him when he became frustrated with having to work alone. Separately, they supported James by recognizing how important it was for him to make this card for his mother and allowing him to continue working and opt out of joining the rest of the class for the next event. In this instance, not participating in the next event was deemed appropriate literacy behavior since he was actively involved in completing his birthday card for his mother.

While his lack of involvement during the two episodes of quiet reading may not have been considered by Kelli to be "appropriate literacy behavior," the seemingly tacit validation of this behavior may have been confusing for James in his interpretation of the norms. When the range of norms of interpretation was broadly defined, the expectations for participating in the event were limited,
and therefore, the kinds of literacy James had access to was limited as well.

Episodes of the event writing the class news were also analyzed. This event represented a group structured activity that occurred in the classroom every day. During an early episode of writing the class news (see Appendix G for details of the analysis), students were expected to join the teacher in rereading the text that had been constructed by the class on the previous day. James did not attend to this activity, instead he sat with his back to the chart paper. When he did not read with the class, Kelli stopped and asked him three times to join in. He turned and faced the chart paper but did not read with the class.

After the rereading, students were expected to raise their hands and volunteer contributions for the day's news. Kelli wrote these contributions on the chart paper, stopping occasionally and asking students to write words on their "magic boards." James did not hold up his hand for the entire event, nor did he attempt to contribute to the news in any other way. Instead, for the remainder of the event he wrote words on his magic board. He wrote the words that Kelli had instructed the class to write along with other words.

During a later episode of writing the class news, students were expected to contribute something they knew about the Persian Gulf War. While it was atypical for Kelli
to select a topic for students to write about, she was concerned about how the war was affecting students and wanted to provide opportunities to discuss their fears and concern.

James responded to Kelli's request by quickly raising his hand and waiting to be called on. When he was called on he asked, "Why did they have a war on Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday?" Kelli responded that the "deadline" issued by President Bush, not the war, fell on Dr. King's birthday.

Having perceived James' response as a question rather than a contribution to the news, Kelli moved on and called on another student who had his hand up. James recognized that it was no longer his turn and therefore called out his next question rather than waiting to be called on again. He called out, "then why did they have the deadline on Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday?"

This time Kelli did not respond to James' question. His response was never validated. Therefore, he stopped participating in the discussion and rereading of the news and focused his attention on writing words on his magic board.

These episodes represented James' behavior during literacy events structured for whole class group work by students, as outlined in the analysis of these key events that are located in Appendix G. In contrasting these two
episodes, James had few opportunities for group interaction or for participation in the construction of text. In the last episode, James attempted to engage in intertextuality when he asked questions he felt merited consideration in the discussion of the Gulf War. He was frustrated that the news of the war overshadowed Dr. King's birthday, and responded accordingly when asked to offer news about his feelings about the war. But, when his oral text was not validated by Kelli, he stopped participating in the discussion. Instead, he sat and wrote on his magic board. Though students were expected to write on the boards only when Kelli instructed them to, again he received tacit support for not participating in the discussion and writing on the board for the rest of the event. Again, when the range of norms of interpretation were so broadly defined that James could opt out of participating altogether, the kinds of literacy learning he had access to was limited.

In the following section I describe James' experiences in the pull-out program.

In the pull-out program. The analysis of data relating to James' early and later experiences in the one-to-one pull-out program revealed less variance in relation to the rules for interaction versus the norms for interpretation.

Early observations of James' experiences in the pull-out program revealed differences in relation to the expectations placed upon him to follow the rules and norms
for interaction. The following example illustrates these differences.

During the first ten days of instruction in the pull-out program, teachers spend time engaging students in a variety of reading and writing activities as a way of learning about students' literacy knowledge, beyond the knowledge obtaining during the initial diagnostic assessments.

James spent much of this time learning how to respond to the teacher's requests and learning what was expected of him during their interactions. For example, consider the following excerpt of James' fourth session in the program.

Kennedy School Episode: 9/27/90

T = Teacher
S = James

S entered the room bringing with him a favorite book from home. The book was called The New Walt Disney Treasury. (T has not yet turned on the audio recorder, this portion of excerpt taken from field note observations.) They look at the book together and T comments as they look at the pictures "What's happening here?" S responds with a comment about a Disney movie he once saw called Bambi. T does not respond to his comments, instead signals the beginning of a new activity.

T  I have a book I want to share with you called The Wolf's Chicken Stew. Have you ever seen this book before? [S nods his head in affirmation.] You have? You can turn the pages.

As T reads, S turns the pages of the book. When T's intonations rise at the end of every sentence, S's looks up at T's face. Her intonations serve as a way of signaling the key elements of the story and established rules for
reading behaviors. In this next excerpt, midway through the book T begins to pause and ask S questions about the story.

T [reading text] First he made a hundred scrumptious pancakes. Then late at night he left them on the chicken's porch. Eat well my pretty chicken, he cried. Get nice and fat for my stew. [question addressed to S] Do you think you could eat all of those? Do you think that chicken's going to eat all those?

S [responded by pointing to the chicken in the picture.]

T The next night he brought a hundred scrumptious - [pauses and looks at S for response]

S Doughnuts

T Doughnuts. [T reads to end of book.] Who do you think ate all the pancakes?

S The wolf

T The wolf or the chicken? [S points to picture] Yea, what about all those doughnuts. S points to character in picture.]

S I got a baby wolf at home.

T A baby wolf. Oh, a real one?

S Huh?

T Or a dog?

S A dog

T That looks like a wolf?

S I got a bear dog, too.

T Does your dog bake you cookies?

S I got a bear dog, too.

T Miss Campbell read you this book called _Space Journey_.

S What is it? [S looks down at book and back again at T] My big dog was at my grandma's, my bear dog is over at my house.
This example illustrates the ways in which Angie worked to teach James how "to do" a lesson, how to interact, how not to interact, what counted as literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior. While on the one hand, Angie was leading James to the "preferred response," she was also communicating the rules for interaction and establishing limits for the range of the norms for interaction. Therefore, the range of the norms for interaction were more narrowly defined in the pull-out program. This is evidenced in the following discussion of the results of the analysis of James' early and later experiences in the pull-out program.

At the beginning of an early lesson in the pull-out program (see Appendix G for details of the analysis), James was expected to write the word "on" on the chalkboard. He responded by quickly picking up a piece of chalk and writing the word correctly on chalkboard. At the start of the next activity, Angie placed three books on the table in front of James. He was expected to select one of these books and begin reading. He did so without hesitation. James knew, through experience, that if he had trouble reading the text, Angie would provide immediate support in the forms of questions and prompts. This served as a vehicle for creating a discussion about the texts read and James'
experiences with the text, and provided immediate validation of James' intent.

During the reading of the book for the running record portion of the lesson, James was expected to read while Angie observed and recorded his reading behaviors. Again, he read without hesitation.

During the writing portion of the lesson, Angie asked James to construct a sentence based on a book he had just read called *Pat's New Puppy*. Here, the expectation was that James would construct a sentence to write about. While he chose not to write about *Pat's New Puppy*, he quickly thought of a sentence about another book that he had read during this lesson called *Nick's New Glasses*.

The analysis of James' experience during the lesson that occurred later in the year revealed the same sorts of interactions between James and Angie. When asked to write on the chalkboard, select books for reading, write in his journal, and read a new book, he did so without hesitation. While reading, whenever he came to a difficult part in the story he was expected to go back, reread, and attempt to problem-solve independently. Early in the program James had learned these expectations, and Angie did not have to remind him to do this during either of these lessons.

During the writing portion of both lessons, James was expected to construct a sentence and write as much as he could, with the expectation that Angie would provide support
when necessary. During the reading of the new book during
the second lesson, James had difficulty when he came to the
word "when." Angie responded by bringing out a shallow box
of salt and asking him to "write" the word with his finger
in the salt. When James hesitated and she responded, "put
your pen down and write it fast," he quickly put his pen
down and began writing the word "when" with his index finger
in the shallow salt box.

When James returned to the text and read on he skipped
a line of text. Angie immediately responded by saying, "Is
that what the book says? Read it again." These examples
illustrate the ways in which Angie clarified the
expectations for appropriate behavior, narrowed the norms of
interpretation, provided James with the opportunity to
respond accordingly, validated his responses, and
ultimately, provided more opportunities for James to engage
in literate behavior.

The descriptions above portray James' life in the
classroom and the pull-out program. In the following
section, I describe Martisha's experiences in the Johnson
school classroom and pull-out program.

The Johnson School Focus Student: Martisha

In the classroom. Earlier in this chapter I introduced
Martisha, one of the two focus students, whose experiences
I detail in this section of the chapter. Martisha's
experiences were very different from those of James in that
she was very quiet and reserved. While James tended to follow his own schedule in terms of getting work done and moving from one event to the next, Martisha happily followed the Johnson class schedule.

An early episode of journal writing was analyzed (see Appendix H for details of the analysis). During journal writing, students were expected to do independent writing. Independent writing meant that students were expected to write their entries in their journals. They were encouraged to use invented spelling, and to use various resources around the room for assistance in spelling words. They relied on words written on the chalkboard, color, alphabet, and number charts that hung on the walls, displays of art work, etc. As students wrote, Carol walked around the room talking with students about their entries. She would ask students to read to her what they had written, or tell what they wanted to write about.

As Martisha wrote, she talked with a neighboring student. They talked about their clothes, recess, and about the texts they were constructing in their journals. While students were expected to write sentences of text, Martisha wrote lists of words (e.g., love, like, hi), copied Carol and Samantha's names from the chalkboard, and wrote lines of letters (e.g., ssss, mmmm, nushumtooghfoh). When she was done writing these words and letters she drew boxes around sections of the page. Whenever Carol stopped to talk with
her about her writing, Martisha began to write more. While journal writing was an event structured for independent writing by students, they were encouraged to talk with one another. As discussed previously in this chapter, the way in which the room was organized facilitated these dialogues since students needed to work together in the sharing of materials for writing and illustrating their stories in their journals. The conversation students had together during this event was expected to be related to the texts constructed. These dialogues served as a vehicle for the interactional recognition needed in the juxtaposition of various texts since students were able to validate one another and did not rely on Carol for constructing these intertextual relationships.

When Carol walked around the room, she was able to initiate, define, and enforce the rules for interaction during this event. Therefore, unlike the Kennedy school classroom, the norms of interpretation of these rules for interaction were more narrowly defined. Students had less of an opportunity to opt out of participating in these events and had more opportunity for interaction (and validation) with one another.

During a later episode of journal writing, Martisha talked to a neighboring student throughout most of the event. As usual, Carol circled the room, talking with students about their journal entries. Martisha held her pen
in her hand, writing in her journal whenever Carol came near her table area. On that day she wrote "I see AWiuey, mmmmmmmmmmm, byasss33bcc, t21ccc, lc2222, lc+2+ccc,cc+cnc+l,zlyz (commas designate lines of text)."

When Carol asked her to read her entry, she quietly shook her head, indicating that she could not read it back. Carol quickly responded by prompting her to tell what it was about. Martisha quietly declined again. Not wanting Martisha to feel discouraged and to help her to see what she had been able to do in her journal writing, Carol responded by turning the pages of the journal back to a previous day's work and discussing that entry with her.

These episodes represented Martisha's behavior during literacy events structured for independent work by students in the Johnson school classroom, as outlined in the analysis of key events that are located in Appendix H. In contrasting these two episodes, while students were expected to write independently in their journals, they had many opportunities to engage in various levels of interaction about texts with Carol and with each other. Group interaction was facilitated through the organization of the tables and the need to share materials for writing and illustrating stories. Carol facilitated this process of group interaction by circling the room, engaging students in dialogues about their journal entries. But, these conversations were not limited to the entries constructed
that day, but extended beyond to constructions done on previous days.

During an early episode of writing the class news, students were expected to sit on the rug together and participate in the group activity. The event began with the Carol reading the story *Good Morning Chick* (Ginsberg). As the Carol read, Martisha sat and listened quietly. Next, Carol announced "we are going to do what we did last week. We are going to make a story and draw pictures about our story on Monday." She then led the whole class in constructing a story about "things we do when we get up in the morning." While most the class began calling out sentence constructions, Martisha sat and quietly observed as others volunteered their ideas. She did not raise her hand to volunteer a sentence in the story during the entire event. Carol did not push her for a response, nor did she discourage her when she began talking quietly to a friend near the end of the event.

Though many students called out their contributions, Carol reminded them that they were expected to raise their hands to be recognized by making remarks about appropriate behavior, such as, "I like the way Denequia is raising her hand," and by only writing the contributions made by students who had raised their hands. This prompted students to raise their hand rather than calling out their responses.
Martisha did not raise her hand to volunteer a sentence contribution.

The purpose of this event was for the entire class to work together in writing an account of students' personal events. Each sentence contribution was to come from one student. But, students' were permitted to talk with each other about these contributions, e.g., "remember your new shoes,"I'm goin to write 'bout goin to my dad's, what are you goin to write about?" Personal conversations about seemingly unrelated topics were also permitted, unless the noise level of these conversations interfered with the pace of the event.

A later episode of writing the class news was also analyzed. At the beginning of the event Carol led the class in saying the days of the week forward and backward. Martisha quickly joined in. While she was able to say the days of the week forward, she was not able to say them backward.

After saying the days of the week, the class began to work together in the construction of the days' news. Again, Martisha sat in the middle of the rug area close to a friend and whispered back and forth to her friend for most of the event. Carol never called on her to make a contribution to the news and did not ask her to stop talking with her friend.
When Carol wrote a student's sentence on the chart paper, she periodically stopped and asked questions such as, "what would you expect dog to start with?" Students were expected to call out their responses rather than raising their hands. After writing each sentence, she lead the class in rereading the previous sentence. Martisha read with the class whenever prompted to do so.

These episodes represented Martisha's behavior during literacy events structured for whole class group participation, as outlined in the analysis of key events that are located in Appendix H. In contrasting these two events, it appeared that while Martisha did not actively participate in making contributions to the class news, she was actively involved in the ongoing student interactions that occurred throughout the event. Students were permitted to talk with each other and were required to raise their hands only when they wanted to volunteer contributions to the news. Again, the range of the rules for interaction and the norms for interpretation were narrowly defined. While some students did not contribute to the days news, they were not permitted to opt out of the event altogether. Participation was defined as sharing in the group interaction, through contributions or dialogues with one or more students.

In the pull-out program. The results of the analysis of data relating to Martisha's early and later experiences in
the pull-out program were similar to the results of James' experiences in the Kennedy school program. Here, the range of rules for interaction versus the norms for interpretation was much narrower than those defined in the classroom setting. Lessons tended to follow the same general framework, sequence, and length of time spent on each activity.

At the beginning of an early lesson (see Appendix H for details of the analysis) Martisha was expected to the word "and" on the chalkboard three times. She did so quickly, without hesitation. After writing on the chalkboard, she and Samantha moved to the instructional table and sat. Samantha had placed three books on the table before the lesson and Martisha was expected to select a book to read independently. Very quietly she made her selection and began to read.

Samantha had observed that Martisha had difficulty monitoring her reading. She often skipped words, invented text, and sometimes skipped lines of text when the book had more than three lines of text on the page. To help her to monitor her reading, Samantha encouraged her to use her index finger to point to each word as she read.

During this lesson, Martisha pointed to each word during the familiar rereading, running record, and writing portions of the lesson (see description of lesson components in first section of this chapter). Near the end of the
lesson, during the reading of the new book, she did not point as she read, even when Samantha reminded her. When she continued to have difficulty in reading the text, rather than letting her continue on without pointing, Samantha held Martisha's hand and helped her point to each word as she read with her.

The interactions surrounding Martisha's pointing to the words in the text illustrates the ways in which Samantha clarified the expectations for appropriate behavior, narrowed the norms of interpretation, provided Martisha with the opportunity to respond accordingly, validated his responses, and ultimately provided more opportunities for her to engage in socially constructed literacy processes.

During a later lesson (see Appendix H for details of the analysis), Martisha independently selected books to read, wrote in her journal, and read her new book with assistance from the Samantha.

The descriptions above portray Martisha's life in the classroom and the pull-out program. While Martisha was rarely called upon to display her academic knowledge, the organizational structure of the classroom and the emphasis on peer group interaction served as a vehicle for engagement in intertextuality through the ongoing juxtaposition of texts.

In the pull-out program the range of norms of interpretation for appropriate literacy behavior were
narrowly defined, and therefore, Martisha had more access to the knowledge needed in understanding what counted as literacy, literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior.

Summary

In this chapter results of the analysis of data relating to the two classrooms, their respective pull-out programs, and the focus students' experiences were detailed. In Chapter V, I provide a discussion of the studies findings, limitations, and implications for further research.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS, SELECTED PARAMETERS OF THE STUDY, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR INSTRUCTION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Purpose of the Study

As educators and researchers our aim is to provide the best possible start for all young students to be successful in becoming literate. This goal has manifested itself in various differential instructional treatments of low achieving students. Typically, these treatments have been remedial or early intervention programs (Allington, 1988; 1990).

Participation in these specialized programs requires students to be "pulled-out" of the classroom setting for regular extended periods of time. This present study helped clarify what at-risk students face when trying to make sense of the instruction they receive in and out of the classroom. It helps in defining the range of expectations placed upon students in the variety of situations they encountered, and the nature of the opportunities available to make sense of it all. This study offered the first step in directing research toward capturing the complexity of these students' experiences and the understanding of what can be gained from
this knowledge and offers a different approach to research of at-risk students.

Up to now, research has been primarily concerned with whether instruction occurring in and out of the classroom is "congruent" (e.g., Johnston, et. al., 1985). Studies touting congruency of instruction for at-risk students had the underlying assumption that if we can just provide more quantity, better quality, and more consistent instruction, then students will become literate (Allington, 1988; 1990; Johnston, et. al., 1985). Such assumptions have been based on limited comparisons of students' experiences in highly incongruent situations, resulting in preoccupations with restricted conceptions of congruency of instruction as well as limited notions of what it means to be an at-risk student receiving instruction in two socio-cultural contexts.

This study, therefore, had two purposes. The first was to develop a broader understanding of the range of opportunities for literacy learning. Recurrent literacy events were identified and explored in relation to what counted as literacy, literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior in different settings. The second was to explore the ways in which students, identified by their
schools and teachers as at-risk, made sense of the instruction they received in the classroom and in the early intervention pull-out program.

By assuming that "meaning" is central to the construction of literacy, this study explored the various ways in which these students made sense of the literacy instruction they received and how those constructions of meaning were shaped by the varying socio-cultural contexts.

Research Questions

The following questions were addressed in the study. Results of the analysis of data relating to each of these questions were presented in detail in the previous chapter. These questions are:

1.0 What is the range of literacy opportunities in these social settings?

1.1 How are the literacy opportunities in the classroom similar to or different from the literacy opportunities in the pull-out program?

2.0 What are the expectations and opportunities for literacy learning for these at-risk students?

Discussion of Findings

Based on the macro-ethnographic analyses of these varying socio-cultural contexts and the micro-analysis of the face-to-face interactions occurring during "key literacy events" this study illustrates how intertextuality as a social construction (Bakhtin & Medvedev 1928; Bloome, 1989)
might be used to understand literacy instruction, cultural ideology, and the experience of at-risk students traveling from one context to another.

An outline of the results of the macro and micro analysis of data presented in the previous chapter is included on the following pages in tables 8-12. Tables 8, 9, and 10 summarize results of the analysis of research questions 1.0 and 1.1, while results of question 2.0 are presented in tables 11 and 12.

In these tables I have attempted to define and elaborate on the differences that existed at each level of the analysis. These differences appeared to interact with one another, and it is noteworthy that differences existed within each socio-cultural context and focus student's experiences.

In summary of tables 8, 9, and 10, the literacy opportunities provided in each socio-cultural context consisted primarily of reading activities that focused on reading and writing activities that included various components of reading as well. A broad range of instructional materials were utilized during each event and the various locations of the classrooms where events occurred were closely related to the purposes and goals of each event. Looking across contexts revealed differences in the classroom settings in terms of the focus on independent, versus group structured, activities. The similarities and
differences that existed between the classroom settings and the pull-out programs were found to be closely related to issues relating to whole class versus one-to-one instruction. School settings differed in relation to the location of the pull-out program room to the respective classroom setting. These differences affected students' transitions from one context to the next, teachers' and students' access to each other, and the types of social and collaborative relationships that existed between teaching teams.

In summary of tables 11 and 12, the exploration of the experiences of the two at-risk focus students revealed that when the norms of interpretation of appropriate literacy behavior did not serve to facilitate, or were in conflict with the purposes and goals of literacy instruction, the threads of intertextual ties of meaning were narrowly constrained.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of literacy</th>
<th>Kennedy School Classroom</th>
<th>Kennedy Pull-Out Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various reading and writing activities; focus on independent structured activities; reading material selected by teacher for students at beginning of year was selected for ability level rather than topic, content, genre; types of writing was mostly personal narrative</td>
<td>Various reading and writing activities taught one-to-one; focus on independent work done by student with high amount of teacher support; reading material selected by teacher according to ability level rather than topic, content, genre; types of writing was mostly personal narrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of student involvement in framing literacy tasks</th>
<th>Kennedy School Classroom</th>
<th>Kennedy Pull-Out Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varied according to activity and event, e.g., near beginning of year students read texts selected by teacher, near end of year students selected own texts for reading, writing topics in journals were personal in nature, writing done during writing the class news was determined by teacher</td>
<td>Varied according to activity and event, e.g., teacher selected texts read during lessons, teachers selected materials used during each activity, while writing topics were personal in nature, often times teacher requested that students write responses to particular texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of teacher involvement in framing literacy tasks</th>
<th>Kennedy School Classroom</th>
<th>Kennedy Pull-Out Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varied according to activity and event, e.g., near beginning of year reading material prescribed by teacher, writing tasks during writing the class news were also prescribed by teacher; teacher selected materials used during each event; teachers selected sequence of activities, location of room, and content of each event</td>
<td>Varied according to activity and event, e.g., reading material selected by teacher, during writing activity teacher often requested that student write responses to particular texts; teacher selected materials used during each lesson; teachers followed sequence and content of activities as prescribed by pull-out program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Student - Teacher Interaction</td>
<td>Kennedy School Classroom</td>
<td>Kennedy School Pull-Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varied according to activity and event, e.g., during quiet reading students were expected to work independently of teacher, while teacher sat with 1 or 2 students and listened as they read, during writing class news teacher lead activity while students wrote on magic boards without teacher support.</td>
<td>While level of teacher support varied according to activity and event, there was less variance in comparison to classroom, e.g., teacher always engaged in some level of observation, giving support in form of questions and prompts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literacy environment</th>
<th>Kennedy School Classroom</th>
<th>Kennedy School Pull-Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Events occurred in various areas of classroom, locations shifted from event to event; noise level was controlled by teachers, interspersed periods of talk during group structured events</td>
<td>Every lesson occurred in same area of pull-out room, reading and dialogue between teachers and students occurred throughout lesson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Literacy</th>
<th>Johnson School Classroom</th>
<th>Johnson Pull-Out Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various reading and writing activities; focus on group structured activities; reading material selected by students, writing consisted of personal narrative, retelling of picture books.</td>
<td>Various reading and writing activities taught one-to one; focus on independent work done by students with high level of teacher support; reading material selected by teachers according to ability level, rather than content, topic, or genre; types of writing was mostly personal narrative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10
Comparison of Literacy Opportunities Provided in Classrooms and Pull-Out Programs - III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of student involvement in framing literacy tasks</th>
<th><strong>Johnson School Classroom</strong></th>
<th><strong>Johnson Pull-Out Program</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varied according to activity and event, e.g., students selected texts for reading, writing topics for journal writing and writing class news</td>
<td>Varied according to activity and event, e.g., teacher selected texts read during lessons, teachers selected materials used during each activity, while writing topics were personal in nature, often times teachers requested that students write responses to particular texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of teacher involvement in framing literacy tasks</th>
<th><strong>Johnson School Classroom</strong></th>
<th><strong>Johnson Pull-Out Program</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varied according to activity and event, e.g., teachers selected materials used during each activity, teachers selected sequence of activities, location of room, and content of each event</td>
<td>Varied according to activity and event, e.g., teacher selected texts read, materials used, during writing teacher often requested that students write responses to texts read, teacher followed sequence and content of activities as prescribed by pull-out program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of student-teacher interaction</th>
<th><strong>Johnson School Classroom</strong></th>
<th><strong>Johnson Pull-Out Program</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While nature of interaction varied across events, focus was on group structured activity, students had opportunities to interact with each other</td>
<td>While level of teacher support varied according to activity and event, there was less variance in comparison to classroom, e.g., teachers were always engaged in some level of observation, giving support in form of questions and prompts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literacy Environment</th>
<th><strong>Johnson School Classroom</strong></th>
<th><strong>Johnson Pull-Out Program</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Events occurred in various areas of room, locations shifted from one event to next, noise level controlled by teacher, student talk occurred throughout independent and group structured activities</td>
<td>Every lesson occurred in same area of pull-out room, reading and dialogue between teachers and students occurred throughout lesson, room adjoined classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.

Comparison of Students' Experiences During Independently Structured Key Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rules of Interaction</th>
<th>Norms of Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>James - Early Episode of Quiet Reading</strong></td>
<td>Read quietly; listen for name to be called; take lunch and picture money to teacher; hang up coat and bookbag; return to desk and read quietly</td>
<td>James did not read; instead he listened for his name to be called, took lunch and picture money to teacher, stopped and talked to another student on way back to desk; hung up coat; talked to another student on way back to desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Later Episode of Quiet Reading</strong></td>
<td>Select a book for reading; read quietly to self</td>
<td>James talked with another student throughout entire event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Martisha - Early Episode of Journal Writing</strong></td>
<td>Construct a sentence to write in journal; negotiate sharing of supplies for writing and illustrating stories</td>
<td>Martisha wrote strings of letters and numbers in journal; negotiated sharing of supplies and talked with neighboring student about clothes, recess and journal entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Later Episode of Journal Writing</strong></td>
<td>Construct a sentence to write in journal; negotiate sharing of supplies for writing and illustrating stories</td>
<td>Martisha talked with a neighboring student; wrote in journal whenever teacher stood close enough to her desk to observe her directly; wrote strings of letters, words, and numbers in journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 12.

**Comparison of Students' Experiences During Group Structured Key Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Rules of Interaction</strong></th>
<th><strong>Norms of Interpretation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>James - Early Episode of Writing the Class News</strong></td>
<td>Sit at desk; reread yesterday's class news along with class; hold up hand to volunteer contribution; write words on magic boards whenever teacher makes request</td>
<td>James listened and did not read along with class; looked on at chart paper, wrote on magic board throughout event, wrote words teacher instructed class to write and other words as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Later Episode of Writing the Class News</strong></td>
<td>Listen as teacher talks about Persian Gulf War; hold up hand to contribute to day's news; contribution was to be about war; write on magic board whenever teacher makes request</td>
<td>James listened and quickly held up his hand to ask question about war; Called out next question when teacher did not write his question on chart paper; wrote on magic board for remainder of event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Martisha - Early Episode of Writing the Class News</strong></td>
<td>Sit at rug; read with class; students take turns making contributions; raise hand to contribute something to discussion; listen; talk quietly</td>
<td>Martisha talked quietly to neighboring student; did not volunteer a contribution to the news; listened to discussion and to teacher talking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Later Episode of Writing the Class News</strong></td>
<td>Sit at rug; read with class: students take turns making contributions; raise hand to contribute something to discussion; listen; talk quietly</td>
<td>Martisha talked quietly to a neighboring student; did not volunteer contribution to news; listened to teacher talking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Much of the research exploring various models of literacy instruction for at-risk students has focused on the importance of congruency. Results of this study demonstrate that, while valuable, the insights gained from this perspective have been limited because of a restricted conception of congruency. Such limited notions of congruency has limited our understandings of the complexity of the social systems that exist within each socio-cultural context. Each setting represented a unique communicative context. While what counted as literacy, literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior varied from one context to the other, teachers and students continuously constructed intertextual relationships of meaning by assigning rules and expectations for literacy learning. When the norms for interpretation of appropriate literacy behavior did not serve to facilitate, or were in direct conflict with the goals and purposes of the literacy event, the threads of the intertextual ties of meaning were narrowly constrained.

As students learned to participate in the broad range of activities and structured events provided in each context, they were also learning how to make sense of the patterns of communication revolving around these events. Each setting represented a unique communicative context that placed demands on students to be competent in both structural and functional elements of language (Mehan, 1979;
Wilkinson, 1982). As students moved from one socio-cultural context to another, to be successful, they needed to learn to recognize what counted as literacy, literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior. Gaining access to literacy knowledge involved learning the norms and developing competence in acting and reacting in socially appropriate ways. Also, what counted as literacy, literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior varied from context to context and therefore, was situated within the socio-cultural contexts. The ability to make sense of these variations and demonstrate their knowledge by acting in socially appropriate ways, also contributed to students' literacy learning.

Careful analysis of the behaviors occurring within these literacy events, as evidenced in the actions and interactions of the participants, provided a more comprehensive view of the rules for interaction (how the participants "should" act) and the norms for interpreting these rules (cf. Saville-Troike, 1989).

One example occurs in the case of James. Quiet reading was a time for students to read and for the teacher to listen to them read. It was also a time for other activities such as lunch count and the collecting of picture money, etc to take place. During the first episode analyzed James was able to display appropriate behavior for "doing lunch count" but was never engaged in the reading of text.
In the second episode, he was permitted to sit at his desk and talk without ever having to open a book.

At other times, the threads of intertextual ties of meaning and the juxtaposition of texts was supported, though James was permitted the "latitude" of opting out of participating in an event.

In all the literacy events occurring in the Kennedy school classroom, the teacher had the primary role in validating students engagement in intertextuality. This was not necessarily the case in the Johnson school classroom since the instructional focus was on group interaction rather than independently structured events. For example, while Martisha was rarely called on by the teacher to display her academic knowledge, her engagement in intertextuality was often validated by her student peers through the dialogues and negotiations they shared while working together on literacy tasks.

In the pull-out programs, the range of the norms of interpretation were more narrowly defined since the teacher and students worked one-to-one in an intense situation where the student received immediate direction in what was expected and what counted as literacy, literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior. Because gaining access to literacy required students to learn the norms and develop competence in acting and reacting in socially appropriate ways, the one-to-one learning situation may have provided
students with clearer insights into ways of developing such competencies. In the Kennedy school, James was able to display his knowledge of how to complete the academic tasks presented in the pull-out program because the range of the norms of interpretation for appropriate literacy behavior was more narrowly defined, and thus more comprehensible. Whereas, in the classroom, the range of norms was so broadly defined that often they conflicted with the purposes and goals of each literacy event.

In both schools the range of the rules for interaction versus the norms of interpretation was broadly defined. For these at-risk students, the teachers allowed more "latitude" in the classroom for demonstrating appropriate literacy behavior. This may have been because they had many opportunities to observe the students' literacy knowledge in the one-to-one contexts. But, while the teachers were attempting to validate students' knowledge and support development, when the parameters for acceptable behavior were so broadly defined they may have been confusing for students attempting to make sense of it all. Students may have needed more direction in knowing when they were headed in the "right direction" and how to get there.

In the pull-out program, the range of the rules of interaction versus the norms of interpretation was more narrowly defined. Here, the teachers were able to provide
students with clues about what counted as literacy, literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior.

This study allows us to begin talking about literacy beyond differences across contexts and highlights the social processes through which learning gets accomplished. Until now, concerns have been over "congruency" of instruction and have dealt primarily with issues of (a) whether the instruction in the pull-out program complements the instruction in the classroom in terms of "skills versus meaning driven approaches," (b) instructional time lost in transition from one setting to another, (c) quantity and quality of instruction offered in each setting, (d) lack of communication between teachers, (e) early intervention versus remedial services, and (f) students' difficulty in adjusting from one teacher to the next.

Previous studies have dealt with comparing in-class instruction to remedial instructional models. Therefore, based on these limited contrasts, our preoccupations with "congruency" have resulted in too narrow a focus on the contexts rather than the social processes that occurred.

Classrooms are complex social systems or cultures constructed by teachers and students. While many studies have explored at-risk students' experiences in highly incongruent settings, this study offered an exploration into the social processes of classrooms and pull-out programs
taught by the same teachers simultaneously with the individual students' experiences in these contexts.

One instructional model that provided a unique opportunity to explore such issues, including congruency, from an early intervention model was the Reading Recovery program. Two schools located in a large midwestern city, each drawing upon populations diverse in socio-economic and cultural backgrounds, were the sites for the research: Two first grades and their respective pull-out instructional programs were studied. These settings were unique in that each first grade class was taught by a team of two teachers, who also shared the responsibilities for the pull-out program instruction. Until now, research has only looked at models where the instruction that students receive in the classroom is different from that of the pull-out program. This study allowed for the exploration of the experiences of students taught by the same teachers in both settings, each teaching from similar philosophies, as specialists in early literacy development, thereby providing as much congruency as possible. This eliminated some variables that have plagued previous studies of at-risk students' experiences in pull-out instructional programs.

While much time has been spent focusing on the various forms literacy instruction takes, little time has been spent exploring the ways in which the rules and expectations for literacy learning are communicated. While an exploration of
the ways in which the opportunities for literacy learning provided in each setting (class versus pull-out instruction) revealed many similarities and dissimilarities. It was only through the examination of the communicative rights, obligations, and demands placed on students in each context that I could begin to understand students' responses to these opportunities (cf. Bloome & Green, 1990; Cazden, 1988; Gumperz, 1982; Mehan, 1979; Wilkinson, 1982).

Selected Parameters of the Study

The conclusions drawn can only be generalized to the participants of this study. An in-depth exploration of these students' experiences required limiting the number of focus students followed and the number of schools entered. Yet, such an in-depth look at the experiences of these at-risk students receiving instruction in two socio-cultural contexts was enlightening.

Research such as this is necessary to gain a more complete picture of the needs and experiences of these at-risk populations and holds important implications for researchers and educators alike.

The focus students were unique in that each attended first grade in schools drawing upon populations diverse in socio-economic and cultural backgrounds, and each was identified as at-risk of failure in learning to read and write. While such factors limit the comparative value of the
study (e.g., results should not be compared to similar studies of mainstream middle class populations, with average or high ability first graders), this study has helped in presenting new insights into at-risk students' experiences.

Finally, there were strengths and limitations of the design of the study. First, while an in-depth exploration was needed to provide a "thick description" of these students' experiences over time, the methods employed for data gathering and analysis were time consuming enterprises. Data gathering took place over an eight month period. My being the schools for this length of time required a high level of commitment by the teachers and student participants of the study. Since commitment over an eight month period is rarely a constant, I had to be constantly aware of issues relating to maintaining access to the school sites by attempting to be sensitive to all the participants interests and needs.

The selection process of schools and participants proved to be a difficult task. As discussed previously in Chapter III, I had to enter four schools and begin collecting data before the Kennedy and Johnson schools could be identified as offering the needed criteria for this study.

The literature on at-risk populations has much to tell about the demands placed on students when the instruction
they receive in the classroom is very different from that of the pull-out program. This literature emphasizes the difficulties students encounter as they move from teacher to teacher, context to context, and instructional philosophy to instructional philosophy. Therefore, the classroom sites identified for this study offered a rare opportunity to explore students' experiences in classrooms taught by the same team of teachers both in and out of the classroom. This was especially the case since this was the last year that this school district used this team teaching approach in implementing Reading Recovery.

Implications for Instruction and Further Research

This study complements and extends previous research on at-risk populations and their experiences in and out of the classroom. While answering some questions it raises others.

Results of this study suggest that instruction offered to at-risk populations in and out of the classroom can be highly congruent in relation to instructional aims, philosophies and procedures, teacher support, and use of materials. But, when we explore what it is like to be an at-risk student receiving instruction in these settings, by examining the opportunities and expectations placed upon students in each learning environment, we can begin to see
that a quest for congruency is not the direction we need to be pursuing.

This study explored the range of opportunities and the expectations placed on students in learning what counts as literacy, literacy knowledge, and appropriate literacy behavior in a given context. The results suggest the need for further investigation. Recognizing that teachers have the primary role in determining the nature of instruction and its academic agenda, as well as the primary role of validating literacy knowledge and appropriate literacy behavior, it appears that issues of congruency are more important from the teachers perspective. For, it is the teacher who must recognize the complexity of literacy learning from the students' point of the view, and must help students learn how classrooms work in order for them to gain access to literacy.

Yet, it is the student who must ultimately make sense of it all. For him or her, congruency of instruction may be only part of the answer. Becoming literate demands more than just acquiring language skills or independent strategies for constructing meaning from text, it also requires making sense of the social contexts that surround literacy learning. Further investigations of at-risk populations must include explorations into the expectations being placed on students as they attempt to make sense of instruction, both in and out of the classroom. Results of this study
suggest need to delve further into an investigation of what students are thinking about as they negotiate these norms and expectations, over time.
APPENDIX A
FOCUS STUDENT ASSESSMENTS
Initial Assessment: James

Based on the assessments (Clay, 1979) described in the section on selection of focus students, James was identified as at-risk of failure and in need of extra help in learning to read.

James' scores on the entry diagnostic assessments and the teachers' notations about these scores are given below.

1. On the letter identification portion of the assessment James scored 52 out of a possible score of 54.

   The teacher administers this part of the assessment by placing a sheet of upper and lower case letters in front of the student and asking "what do we call these?" The teacher then proceeds by pointing to each letter, asking the student to identify each by its letter name. If the student is unable to identify the letter by name the teacher prompts "do you know the sound it makes?" and/or "do you know a word that starts like that?"

   His teacher noted that James was "able to identify 52 letters. Confuses letter l for number one. Calls them letters."

2. On the word test James scored 0 out of a possible 20.

   To administer this portion of the assessment the teacher places a list of high frequency words (Clay, 1979) in front of the student and asks him/her to identify each word. One point is scored for each known word.

   His teacher commented that "two attempts are visually similar: cat/can and dig/did."


   For this portion of the assessment the teacher reads one of two books called Sand (Clay, 1972) or Stones (1. As the teacher reads she/he stops and asks the student's questions. The purposes of these questions are to give the teacher preliminary information concerning about the student's "concepts of print." For example, to gain a sense of James orientation to books the teacher began this portion of the test by passing the book to James upside down with the spine facing him and asking "Show me the front of the
book." James quickly took hold of the book and showed her the front.

To discover if James had a concept that print carries the message the teacher said to him, "I'll read this story. You help me. Show me where to start reading. Where do I begin to read?"

For directional rules the teacher asked James, "Show me where to start. Which way do I go? Where do I go after that?"

His teacher noted that James "knows all book handling concepts: front of book, print contains a message, upside down print, left page before right. Knows directional items: where to start, which way to go, return sweep. Unable to locate first/last concept or line order altered. Unable to locate any visual scanning items. Knows meaning of period comma and locates t and a. Unable to locate capital letter. Knows one/two words."

4. On the writing vocabulary test James scored 9. For this task the teacher prompts the student to write all the words she/he can. If necessary the teacher is allowed to give prompts such as "can you write I, can you write any color words like red?", etc.

James' teacher noted that he could write his first and last name and was able to "write cat, no, yes, the, to, I, A." She also added - "Mixes lower/upper cases. Problems with directionality. Writes letters for three attempts: u/you, Q/queen."

5. On the dictation test James scored 20 out of a possible 37.

For this test the teacher says a sentence (slowly and asks the student to "write what you can hear." The sentence read depends upon the time of year testing occurs. His teacher chose to read "The bus is coming. It will stop here to let me get on." James wrote The/The, B/bus, ez/is, km/coming, et/it, woe/will, setp/stop, het/here, to/to, leot/let, ml/me, got/get, Iaot/on.

His teacher noted that James "locates space between words. Able to say words slowly, attempts first letter in most words. Some attempts are visually similar: setp/stop, leot/let, got/get."

The final portion of the test is text reading. James read level B at 100% accuracy, level 1 at 80% accuracy, and
level 2 at 75% accuracy. Obtaining a score of 100% for level B showed he was able to read and point to "no, no, no" on page 7 of Eric Carle's *Where's Spot* book.

For level 1 he read *A bird Can Fly* (Scott Foresman, 19). For level 2 he read *Hats* (Scott Foresman, 19). His teacher's summary notes for this entire initial assessment were:

"[James] text level is B, so level 1 books will be needed for text reading. [James] has control of book handling and directional concepts. He needs to become consistent at one-to-one matching. He has nine known words that can serve as anchors during text reading and to link to new words. He is beginning to write a consonant framework. He can hear and write sounds in words."

End of Program Assessment: James

James was discontinued from the pull-out instructional program on January 11, 1991, after receiving 43 instructional lessons. The end of program assessment included testing on three of the measures: writing vocabulary, dictation task, and text reading.

James scored 42 on the writing vocabulary test, 35 on the dictation task, and read at a level 12 on text reading, with 90% accuracy.

Spring Assessment Scores: James

At the end of the school year, all students receive the same diagnostic assessments. James scored 57 on the writing vocabulary test, 37 on the dictation task, and read at a level 24, with 90% accuracy.
Initial Assessment: Martisha

Based on the assessments (Clay, 1979) described in the section on selection of focus students, Martisha was identified as at-risk of failure and in need of extra help in learning to read.

Martisha's scores on the entry diagnostic assessments and the teachers' notations about these scores are given below.

1. On the letter identification portion of the assessment Martisha scored 52 out of a possible score of 54.

   The teacher administers this part of the assessment by placing a sheet of upper and lower case letters in front of the student and asking "what do we call these?" The teacher then proceeds by pointing to each letter, asking the student to identify each by its letter name. If the student is unable to identify the letter by name the teacher prompts "do you know the sound it makes?" and/or "do you know a word that starts like that?"

   Her teacher noted that Martisha was "Identified 23 capitals and 16 lower case letters by name. She self-corrected on B for P, and T for X. Her confusions are mostly visually similar or she had a letter name confusion. Two letters were unknown with no attempts - n & g."

2. On the word test Martisha scored out of a possible 20.

   To administer this portion of the assessment the teacher places a list of high frequency words (1 in front of the student and asks him/her to identify each word. One point is scored for each known word.

   Her teacher commented that she "did not attempt any of the words. Was able to read the word can."


   For this portion of the assessment the teacher reads one of two books called Sand (Clay, 1972) or Stones. As the teacher reads she/he stops and asks the student's questions. The purposes of these questions are to give the teacher preliminary information concerning about the student's "concepts of print." For example, to gain a sense of Martisha's orientation to books the teacher began this
portion of the test by passing the book to her upside down with the spine facing Martisha and asking "Show me the front of the book." Martisha quickly took hold of the book and showed her the front.

To discover if Martisha had a concept that print rather than the picture carries the message the teacher said to her, "I'll read this story. You help me. Show me where to start reading. Where do I begin to read?"

For directional rules the teacher asked Martisha, "Show me where to start. Which way do I go? Where do I go after that?"

Her teacher noted that Martisha "identified 4 of 5 book handling items (front of book, print contains a message, bottom of picture, left page before right. She was able to show where to start, which way to go and return sweep. Identified a period, and matched T and Bb. She was able to show one word, two words, does not have first and last word concept."

4. On the writing vocabulary test Martisha scored 9. For this task the teacher prompts the student to write all the words she/he can. If necessary the teacher is allowed to give prompts such as "can you write I, can you write any color words like red?" etc.

Martisha's teacher noted that she could write a portion of her first name.

5. On the dictation test Martisha scored 7 out of a possible 37.

For this test the teacher says a sentence (I slowly and asks the student to "write what you can hear." The sentence read depends upon the time of year testing occurs. Her teacher chose to read "The bus is coming. It will stop here to let me get on." Martisha was able to write "b/bus, k/coming, t/it, r/here, t/to, t/let, e/me."

The final portion of the test is text reading. Martisha read level B at 0% accuracy, and level 1 at 87.5% accuracy. Obtaining a score of 0% for level A indicated she was unable to read and point to "no, no, no" on page 7 of Eric Carle's Where's Spot book.

For level 1 she read A bird Can Fly (Scott Foresman, 19 ) at 87.5% accuracy. Her teacher's summary notes for this entire initial assessment were:
"Martisha's reading level is A. She is able to use meaning picture cues and structural cues when there is a pattern in a simple book. Her directionality is very good. Her letter identification is weak, but she is able to hear sounds and record them. She is starting to notice visual cues that will help in the reading process. Her willingness to risk and try things will be a major strength."

Spring Assessment Scores: Martisha

Martisha was not discontinued from the pull-out instructional program. At the end of the year assessments, Martisha scored 44 on the writing vocabulary test, 32 on the dictation task, and read at a level 6 with 90% accuracy.
APPENDIX B
EXAMPLES OF FOCUS STUDENTS' RECORDS OF OBSERVATIONS AND DATA SOURCES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FOCUS OF OBSERVATION</th>
<th>CLASSROOM DATA</th>
<th>READING RECOVERY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/09/18</td>
<td>entry-classroom focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/09/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/09/20</td>
<td>classroom focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/09/24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/09/25</td>
<td>casestudy-other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/09/26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/09/27</td>
<td>casestudy-class/RR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/09/28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/03</td>
<td>casestudy-other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/05</td>
<td>casestudy-other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* casestudy other = in class following other student
* RR = Reading Recovery
* L = lesson #

ITK = "Roaming in the Known" session, first 10 days of instruction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FOCUS OF OBSERVATION</th>
<th>CLASSROOM DATA</th>
<th>READING RECOVERY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Fieldnotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/09</td>
<td>casestudy-class</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/11</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/12</td>
<td>casestudy-other</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/15</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/17</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/18</td>
<td>casestudy-class/RR</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/22</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/23</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/26</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/30</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/10/31</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

casestudy other = in class following other student
RR = Reading Recovery
* = data obtained
ITK = "Roaming in the Known session, first 10 days of instruction
L = lesson #
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FOCUS OF OBSERVATION</th>
<th>CLASSROOM DATA</th>
<th>READING RECOVERY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/01</td>
<td>casestudy-class/RR</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/02</td>
<td>casestudy-other</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/12</td>
<td>casestudy-class</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

casestudy other = in class following other student  
* = data obtained  
ITK = "Roaming in the Known session, first 10 days of instruction  
RR = Reading Recovery  
L = lesson #
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>L#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90/11/27</td>
<td>casestudy-other</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>L#28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/29</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>L#29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/11/30</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>L#30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/12/03</td>
<td></td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>L#31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/12/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>L#32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/12/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>L#33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/12/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>L#34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/12/07</td>
<td>casestudy-both</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>L#35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>class/RR</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/12/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L#36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/12/14</td>
<td>casestudy-both</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>L#37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91/01/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L#38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91/01/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L#39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91/01/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>discontinued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91/01/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91/01/17</td>
<td>classroom focus</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91/01/23</td>
<td>classroom focus</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

casestudy other = in class following other student
RR = Reading Recovery
* = data obtained
ITK = "Roaming in the Known session, first 10 days of instruction
L = lesson #
APPENDIX C

EXAMPLES OF ASSESSMENT FORMS USED IN
PULL-OUT PROGRAM INSTRUCTION
TEST #3 CONCEPTS ABOUT PRINT SCORE SHEET

Date: __________________________ Stones: _______ Sand: _______ TEST SCORE ______/24

Name: __________________________ School: __________________________

Recorder: __________________________ Classroom Teacher: __________________________

Use the script when administering this test.

**Scoring:** ✓ (Checkmark) correct response. ● (Dot) incorrect response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Front of book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2. Print contains message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | 4/5   | 3. Where to start  
4. Which way to go  
5. Return sweep to left  
6. Word by word matching |         |
| 6     |       | 7. First and last concept |         |
| 7     |       | 8. Bottom of picture |         |
| 8/9   |       | 9. Begin 'The' (Sand) or 'T' (Stones) bottom line, top OR turn book |         |
| 10/11 |       | 10. Line order altered |         |
| 12/13 |       | 11. Left page before right  
12. One change in word order  
13. One change in letter order |         |
| 14/15 |       | 14. One change in letter order  
15. Meaning of ? |         |
| 16/17 |       | 16. Meaning of period/full stop  
17. Meaning of comma  
18. Meaning of quotation marks  
19. Locate M m H h (Sand)  
OR T t B b (Stones) |         |
| 18/19 |       | 20. Reversible words was, no |         |
| 20    |       | 21. One letter: two letters  
22. One word: two words  
23. First and last letter of word  
24. Capital letter |         |
TEST #4

WRITING VOCABULARY TEST SHEET

Date: _______________________________

Name: _______________________________  School: _______________________________

Recorder: _______________________________  Classroom Teacher: _______________________

(Fold heading under before child uses sheet)

©Clevy, 1983. Adapted with permission by The Ohio State Univ./5/9/1990
### TEST #2

**WORD TEST SCORE SHEET**

**TEST SCORE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: ______________________________</th>
<th>School: ____________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recorder: _________________________</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher: __________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Record Incorrect Responses ✓ (Checkmark) Correct Response ● (Dot) No Response
(Use appropriate list of words.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Words</th>
<th>LIST A (Entry)</th>
<th>LIST B (Discontinuing)</th>
<th>LIST C (End of Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>can</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>see</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>ran</td>
<td>big</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty</td>
<td>said</td>
<td>ride</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has</td>
<td>her</td>
<td>him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down</td>
<td>find</td>
<td>for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let</td>
<td>live</td>
<td>may</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here</td>
<td>away</td>
<td>in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am</td>
<td>are</td>
<td>at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over</td>
<td>put</td>
<td>some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>make</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>did</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what</td>
<td>who</td>
<td>an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>walk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>play</td>
<td>red</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>saw</td>
<td>have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© Clay, 1985. Adapted with permission by The Ohio State University 1985-1990.
TEST #5  DICTATION TEST SHEET

Date: ________________________________

Name: ________________________________  School: ________________________________

Recorder: ________________________________  Classroom Teacher: ________________________________

Circle Form Used (A, B, C, D or E): (Fold heading under before child uses sheet)

© Clay, 1985. Adapted with permission by The Ohio State Univ./1990
APPENDIX D

EXAMPLES OF RECORD KEEPING FORMS USED IN

PULL-OUT PROGRAM INSTRUCTION
| Initial Testing | NAME: ___________________________ | RR TEACHER: ____________________________________________________ |
| In the Known    | DATE OF FIRST LESSON: ___________________________ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Week 10</th>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>Week 12</th>
<th>Week 13</th>
<th>Week 14</th>
<th>Week 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 16</th>
<th>Week 17</th>
<th>Week 18</th>
<th>Week 19</th>
<th>Week 20</th>
<th>Week 21</th>
<th>Week 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I see a red cardinal.
The cat scared
away the bird
APPENDIX E

EXAMPLES OF PARENTAL PERMISSION FORMS
Dear Parents:

I am a graduate student at The Ohio State University. For my dissertation, which will be conducted under the supervision of Dr. Robert J. Tierney, I am interested in learning more about how young children learn to read and write. During the next 16-20 weeks I will be visiting your child's school, observing certain children as they receive instruction in the classroom and in Reading Recovery, an early literacy program for students in need of extra help in learning to read and write.

From time to time I will need to videotape or audio record these observations. Classrooms are busy places, and while I do not intend to purposely include your child in any of these recordings, there is always the possibility that he or she might also be captured in the view of the camera. For this reason, I would like your permission to video and audio record in the classroom. These recordings will be used for research purposes.

Please sign your name indicating whether you give permission.

Yes. You may have my permission to video and audio record in my child's classroom.

__________________________________________

No. You do not have my permission to video and audio record in my child's classroom.

__________________________________________

If you have any questions, you can reach me at your child's school, The Ohio State University, (#) or at my home (#). Thank you for taking the time to complete this form. I am looking forward to observing in your child's classroom.

Sincerely,

Nora L. White
Dear Parents:

I am a graduate student at The Ohio State University. For my dissertation, which will be conducted under the supervision of Dr. Robert J. Tierney, I am interested in learning more about how young children learn to read and write. Your child has been selected to participate in the Reading Recovery program and I am interested in following ______'s progress.

During the next 16-20 weeks I will be observing as your child receives instruction in Reading Recovery and the classroom. From time to time I will need to ask your child questions about what he or she is learning. I will need to photocopy your child's records in Reading Recovery as well as samples of his or her writing done in the classroom. I will also be using video and audio recording as a way of documenting my observations. However, all of my observations and records will be kept confidential, and will be used only for research purposes.

I would greatly appreciate your permission to video and audio record your child's experiences in these instructional settings as well as conduct interviews and photocopy the records described above. Please sign your name on one of the two lines below.

Please sign your name indicating whether you give permission.

Yes. You may have my permission to video and audio record in my child's classroom.

No. You do not have my permission to video and audio record in my child's classroom.

If you have any questions, you can reach me at your child's school, The Ohio State University, (#) or at my home (#). Thank you for taking the time to complete this form. I am looking forward to observing in your child's classroom.

Sincerely,

Nora L. White
APPENDIX F

EXAMPLE OF FORMAL STUDENT INTERVIEW
Formal interview with James - 9/27/90

(This interview took place in a corner of the classroom. While it seemed quiet enough, my recorder picked up so much background noise making it difficult to hear J's responses.)

R First of all can you go and find some kind of writing that you have been doing?

J Um. Everything.

R Everything?

J That, that, that (points to bulletin board in front of where we are sitting. There is nothing on board which is student made.)

R Show me what you have been writing. I need you to sit still because my recorder is going to fall.

J Um. (inaudible)

R Do you have any writing-

J Here (points around room)

R Do you have any writing that you have been doing at your desk? That you could go and get and show me?

J She told us to erase it and -

R You don't have any papers in your desk? Is there anything else around the room that you have been writing that you would like to tell me about?

J inaudible. Um, I got a few.

R Okay. Would you go get them and get a couple of books that you like to read too and bring them back real fast.

(J returns to desk and retrieves reading and writing samples.

R Okay, this is something you have been writing. What is this?

J Easy work.

R Easy work? Tell me about it.

J inaudible and um,
R so what do you do with it?
J Teacher says we can make lines and circles.
R So what is this writing?
J We have to write, um, the, um numbers that we are writing here.
R Oh.
J One, two, three, four, five six.
R Oh. Well while you were getting that and your book, I went and found your journal. Can you find something in here that you really like. Something that you have written in your journal that you really like?
J Um, when -
R You have written allot of pages. Where is one that is your real favorite that you like the best?
J This one. (begins reading) September 21, I put 1990 down here. I like my, I like when my sister makes traffic patrol.
R Oh so that is something that really happened?
J Yea
R So what makes this one your favorite?
J Because
R Because why, what made you choose that one.
J Because its my favorite
R Because its your favorite just because?
J And I was going to draw me.
R Do you have one in here that you don't like as well?
J This
R How come you don't like that one?
J Cause
R Cause why?
J: Cause, cause I. I just wrote those numbers.

R: Oh, so you didn't do everything the way you wanted to do it?

J: I got one, two, three, four, five, I got one, two, three, four. And I drew um this thing that about my brother.

R: Do you ever write about the stories that you read?

J: Um, Yea like -(begins reading from journal) I like Mickey, I like cartoons like, like Mickey Mouse.

R: Yea, but did you read a story about cartoons, or is that about a cartoon that you watch on t.v.?

J: And this one is about colors. (shows me another page)

R: What happens to this when you are done?

J: Oh boy, I write nothin' (looking at a blank page)

R: Okay, now here are some of the books that you brought over. Now which one of these is your favorite?

J: (points to a book) And (points to another)

R: So you have two favorites?

R: The New Walt Disney Treasury and When Goldilocks went to the House of the Bears. So, what makes these your favorites?

J: Cause, I was keeping them allot, and my teacher let me keep those books in my desk allot.

R: Do you read them everyday?

J: nods affirmatively

R: do you? okay. Can you think of a story that you don't like as well?

J: Uh, no. (begins reading) Mommy bear and father went out to three bears house and uh, the four of the three bears (inaudible)

R: Is that a story that you read?

J: Yea
R Okay, what do you do when you are writing and you come to a word that you are not sure how to write, what do you do?

J Uh. Sometimes I, Um, sometimes I tell teacher I need help and she helps me. And sometimes I can figure it out.

R How do you figure it out? What do you do?

J think

R You think? Why do we learn how to read?

J cause

R But why?

J So we can learn how to read better, and so you will know how to read when you grow up, like when you don't how, when you like be a teenager and you like be a grownup, and you don't know how to read you, you, you go back to school and they say you can't go back to school, you never learned how to read.

R Oh, well when you read and you come to a word that you don't know what do you do?

J Uh, I skip it.

R You just skip it?

J Yea

R Why do we learn how to write?

J Write?

R huh

J Read and write?

R Well why do we learn how to write?

J So we can write better. Some people don't know how to write like us.

R What's writing for?

J Uh, your health

R Your health?
J And for (pause) things that, things that -(looks at page in journal) who wrote that?

R I think your teacher wrote your name up there.

J And do you 'possed to do things, sometimes people tell you how to write and people, um, teach you how to write. So you get to learn how to write.

R Well great. We're all done.
APPENDIX G

ANALYSIS OF KEY EVENTS OCCURRING IN THE KENNEDY SCHOOL
Episode 1: Early Observation of Quiet Reading

Setting

This event occurred in the Kennedy school first grade classroom on 11/01/90. The event began at the start of the day. As students entered the classroom they were expected to go directly to their desks, take out a book, and begin reading.

Participants

Teacher
James
Students - Fourteen student class members

Function, Purpose, Goals

Quiet reading was an opportunity for the students to read and for teachers to observe them reading. The teachers renamed this event quiet reading, from silent sustained reading, since students were allowed to "whisper read" to themselves.

At the beginning of the event as the students read, the teacher took the attendance and lunch count. On this particular day, Kelli also used this time to collect money for school pictures. When an intercom announcement came from the principal's office stating it was time to say the pledge to the flag, all students stopped reading, stood facing the flag, and recited the pledge.

This event was typical in terms of time spent, levels of interactions and involvement, and norms for participation.

It was atypical in two ways. First, in the choice of reading materials. Usually, the teacher selected 2-3 books for each student to read and placed them on their desks before they entered the classroom. These selections included trade books and the "little books" used in the "pull-out" program. On this day, the teacher instructed the students to read from the basal text (referred to in the discussion as the book with the orange cover). Secondly, the teacher did not spend time observing the students as they read. Instead she monitored whether they had a book out and were reading. On other days, I had observed her sitting with at least three different students each morning, listening, commenting, and questioning as they read. These comments and questions were similar to those heard in the "pull-out" program instruction, E.g., "I want to see you pointing to each word as you read." "Look at the picture and think about what would fit there." "Did that make sense?"
Act Sequence

The analysis of field notes, transcripts, and video taped data sources revealed the following sequence of acts.

1. Students entered the room with the teacher and went directly to their desks. James went to his desk, sat down, took out a book, and began reading.
2. Teacher announced that school pictures would be taken today, adding that she would be collecting money from those who wanted to order pictures.
3. Teacher instructed the students to place last night's homework assignment on the corner of their desks, stating she would be "around to pick them up."
4. Students placed their homework pages on the corner of their desks.
5. Four students took a book out of their desks and began reading.
6. Teacher requested that students bring picture money to her along with their lunch order.
7. Teacher sat at her desk and took attendance and lunch count. James stopped reading when his name was called for lunch count. He took his picture money to teacher, stopping to talk with another student on way back to desk.
8. James returned to his desk, collected his coat and book bag and hung his coat up on the rack. He stopped to talk with same student on way back to desk.
9. James returned to his desk.
10. Teacher began walking around the room checking if all the students were reading.
11. Teacher turned lights off and on again.
12. Students stood and gave pledge to flag. James stood and gave pledge to flag.
13. Students sat back down and begin reading again. James sat back down, took basal text from his desk and began reading.
14. Teacher reminded students to use whisper voices. Wrote a student's name on board as a warning for talking too loud. James stopped reading and watched as teacher wrote student's name on chalkboard.
15. Student entered room, arriving late. James continued to read aloud to himself.
17. Teacher announced end of event

Rules for Interaction

Data were analyzed according to the rules for interaction, or the rules for the use of speech applicable to this communicative event (Saville-Troike, 1989). These rules refer to how the participants "should" act, and are tied to the shared values of the speech community.
1. When the students entered the classroom they were expected to go directly to their desks, take their chairs off the top of the desk, place the chairs on the floor, sit, select a book, and begin reading.

2. When books had been placed on the desk tops, students were expected to read from this selection.

3. When books had not been placed on the desk tops, students were expected to select a book from their desks to read.

4. When the teacher stated she wanted the students to read a story in the basal text, students were expected to take out their books and begin reading.

5. The students were expected to read and to remain attentive to the teacher's requests for lunch count, picture money, and "whisper reading."

6. The students were expected to "whisper read" to themselves. "Whisper reading" was a form of oral reading in soft voices. 7. The teacher was the judge of what counted as "whisper reading" and "whisper voices."

8. When students names were called for lunch count they were expected to respond with "hot" or "packed," to take their picture money to the teacher, and to hang up their coats and/or book bags on the rack.

9. Students were expected to stop reading and stand at their desks for the pledge to the flag.

10. Students were expected to read a particular story from the basal text. When they had finished reading that story they were permitted to read another story from the basal text.

11. Students were allowed, but not expected, to ask questions when they had difficulty reading. If the teacher was walking around the room, students were permitted to call out their questions without holding up their hands first to be recognized. When the teacher was listening to a student read, students were expected to hold up their hand and wait their turn.

12. Students were expected to hold up their hand if they wanted to ask questions not pertaining to lunch count or picture money.

13. The teacher was responsible for taking lunch count, collecting picture money, and adhering to school wide "silent sustained reading time" and "pledge to flag time."

14. Near the beginning of the year, students were expected to point under each word as they read.

**Norms of Interpretation**

Data were analyzed according to the norms of interpretation of these rules for interaction. This information pertains to the range of interpretations participants made of the rules for interaction.

1. During 01:24-02:12 (real time) of this event seven out of fifteen students were engaged in reading. The
remaining students were engaged in talk not related to text reading.
2. During 05:14-09:12 all the students were reading from their basal text.
3. When approximately six of the fifteen students took their basal texts out of their desks, they checked to see what stories their closest neighbor was reading, and chose to read that story as well.
4. Students sitting close to one another and reading the same story, could be heard trying to "keep up" with one another. As they read in unison, their voices became louder.
5. Seconds after the teacher commented that voices had become too loud, all the students lowered their voices.
6. Within one minute from the time the teacher commented that voices had become too loud, and the students had lowered their voices, the volume began increasing again.
7. Approximately six of the students pointed to the words as they read the text.
8. Near the end of this event, all students had the basal text on their desks for reading. At least three different stories from the basal text were read.
9. When James' name was called for lunch count, he left his desk and took his picture money back to the teacher. On his way back to his desk he stopped to talk with another student. He returned to his desk for his coat and book bag, took them to coat rack area, and stopped to talk with same student on way back to desk.

**Levels and Nature of Involvement**

Data were analyzed according to evidence of the nature and level of participants involvement during this event.
1. Approximately three of the fifteen students continuously read throughout this event, stopping only to respond to the lunch count and pledge to the flag.
2. Approximately four of the fifteen students talked to a neighboring student throughout this event, turning their attention back to the text when the teacher commented about the volume of their voices.
3. One student sat at his desk and began throwing his book up in the air, watching it fall to the top of his desk. The teacher responded by writing his name on chalkboard, stating that this was a warning for "talking too loud."
4. Soon after student's name had been written on the board, another boy sitting near Sam began throwing his book up in the air.
5. The remaining five of the fifteen students read intermittently, stopping to watch the goings on around the room and reselecting texts to read.
Areas of Room and Materials Used

Data were analyzed according to the various materials used and the areas of the room in which events occurred.

1. Materials used during quiet reading included trade books and "little books" which were also used in the pull-out program.

![Diagram of Kennedy School Classroom with labeled areas: sink, door, chalkboard, desk area, teacher's desk, computer center, bookcases, aide's table, coat racks, and learning center.]

Figure 10
Episode 2: Later Observation of Quiet Reading

Setting

This event occurred in the Kennedy school first grade classroom on 1/17/91. The event began at 9:10 AM near the start of the day. The teacher had just led the students in the pledge to the flag. When they sat down in their seats she instructed them to begin reading.

Participants

Teacher
James
Students - 17 student class members
Instructional Aide

Function, Purpose, Goals

Quiet reading was an opportunity for the students to read and for the teacher to observe them reading. The event was renamed quiet reading, from silent sustained reading, since students were allowed to "whisper read" to themselves.

This event was typical in terms of the interactions the teacher and the aide had with the students. It was atypical in terms of the time spent. Quiet reading generally lasted for fifteen minutes each morning.

Act Sequence

1. The teacher stood at the front of the room and instructed the students to take out a book to read. Students began reading aloud to themselves. James talked with a neighboring student sitting at the desk across from him.

2. The teacher stood next to one student's desk and listened to him read. James continued to talk with neighboring student. Their talk was unrelated to the event. The teacher sat down next to one student and listened to her read. The teacher stood listening and did not comment about student's reading.

3. Teacher secured a chair to sit on and placed it next to the same students desk. She looked around the room and asked a student who was still looking for a book to begin reading. She immediately went back to the student she was sitting next to. At 01:52 James got up from his desk and walked over to another student and began talking with her. He remained at her desk talking until 02:00.

4. The teacher turned to James and another student and asked them to take out a book and begin reading. James quickly took a book from his desk. He did not open the book, instead continued to talk with neighboring student.
5. The teacher turned her chair to another student and began listening to her read. When the student began having difficulty the teacher read the page, pointing to each word as she read. James continued to talk with other student.

6. The teacher announced the end of the event with "quiet reading time is over, you need to clear off your desks."

Rules for Interaction

Data were analyzed according to the rules for interaction, or the rules for the use of speech applicable to this communicative event (Saville-Troike, 1989). These rules refer to how the participants "should" act and are tied to the shared values of the speech community.

1. At the start of the event students were expected to select a book from their desks and begin reading quietly to themselves.

2. Students were expected to remain attentive to the teacher's comments and requests and read throughout this event.

3. Students were expected to "whisper read" to themselves.

4. The teacher was the judge of what counted as "whisper reading."

5. Students were allowed to get up out of their seats and go to the teacher to ask questions.

6. Students were allowed to select any book from their desk to read.

Norms of Interpretation

Data were analyzed according to the norms of interpretation of these rules for interaction. This information pertains to the range of interpretations participants made of the rules for interaction.

1. Not all students participated in selecting a book to read.

2. The students who did read during this event, read quietly to themselves.

3. James did not read during this event.

4. When the teacher asked James to begin reading he selected a book from his desk but did not read from it.

5. James engaged in talk unrelated to the event.

Levels and Nature of Involvement

Data were analyzed according to evidence of the nature and level of participants involvement during this event.

1. From 00:00-03:03 (real time) two girls spent this time selecting a book to read from their desks.
2. James and a neighboring student did not read during this event.

3. All but four students appeared to be actively involved in reading quietly to themselves. Students read quietly to themselves, stopping only to discuss their stories with neighboring students.
Areas of Room and Materials Used

Data were analyzed according to the various materials used and the areas of the room in which events occurred.

1. Materials used during quiet reading included trade books and "little books" which were also used in the pull-out program.
Episode 3: Early Observation of Writing the Class News

Setting

This event occurred in the Kennedy school first grade classroom on 11/01.90. The event began at 10:22 AM. The students had just returned to the classroom after a rest room break. When they entered the room, the lights were out. Students were expected to go directly to their seats and sit down.

Participants

Teacher
James
Students - 15 student class members

Function, Purpose, Goals

During the writing of the class news the teacher stood at the front of the room, led the students in constructing a text, and wrote that construction on a piece of chart paper clipped to a clothesline that hung on the chalkboard. The teacher often called this time shared writing.

This event was typical in relation to the sequence of activities occurring during the event and in the types of interactions occurring amongst the participants.

The teacher called upon students to construct a sentence. Students' responses to this request frequently began with "I" such as "I like pizza," or "I am going to my dad's house." When the teacher wrote these contributions on the chart paper the "I" was replaced with the respective student's name.

On the average, five students were called upon to contribute to the news of the day.

Near the beginning of the year the teacher wrote everything on the chart paper herself. As the year progressed, she often selected students to come up to the chart and write a word or two.

Near the beginning of the year the teacher often used another procedure that allowed the students to do their writing, thus enabling her to check on their progress. She would pass out one rectangular shaped piece of thick cardboard to each student along with a piece of chalk and a paper towel for erasing. These boards were called "magic boards" or just "boards." On the left side of the board were three circles. The top circle was green, the middle yellow, and the bottom red. As the teacher wrote the class news she would select words for the students to write next a dot on their boards. She would instruct student to: "just write what you can hear."

When students had written their words on the magic boards they held the boards up in the air to show their responses to the teacher. She quickly glanced at the writing on the boards
and then wrote the word on the chart paper, instructing the students to check what she had written and to "make their corrections."

Often times, for words not selected for writing on the magic boards, she would pause before writing on the chart paper to ask students to predict what they would expect to "come at the beginning" or "end of a word."

The teacher often asked a student who had contributed a piece of news to select the ending punctuation. She then would lead students in rereading each sentence according to the punctuation selected. For example, when "excited marks" were selected, students learned to alter their intonations accordingly.

Near the end of the event, the teacher would lead the students in rereading the entire day's news.

Each day's work was displayed around the room and approximately every two weeks students whose names appeared on a particular day's work were eligible to take the page home.

**Act Sequence**

The analysis of field notes and video taped data sources revealed the following sequence of acts.

1. When students had settled into their seats the teacher turned on the lights. The teacher began talking about a recent field trip to the "pumpkin patch." James' desk was positioned at the front of the room next to where the teacher stood to write the class news on the chart paper. He sat at his desk, but did not appear to be paying attention to the teacher's prompts for the class to turn to reread yesterday's news. She asked him three times to turn around and at 00:50 he did so.

2. The teacher walked to the right side of the desk area and pointed to yesterday's class news that was hanging on an easel. Teacher pointed to each word as she led the class in reading "Our trip to the Pumpkin Patch." When the class began to read, James turned back in his seat and did not read with them. He did not appear to be reading or writing, just sitting.

3. Teacher returned to the front of the room and announced that yesterday's news was about things they did on their trip and today she wanted them to write about things they saw on their trip. James sat at his desk with his arm stretched across the top, and his head resting on his arm.

4. The teacher brought out the magic boards and distributed them to entire class. James sat up and listened and then turned back away from the direction of the teacher and sat quietly.

5. The teacher walked back to the front of the room and picked up a piece of chalk and wrote a star next to "table one" and "table three," (table numbers written on chalkboard) commenting that these tables were ready to begin writing.
6. The teacher called upon a four students (one at a time) for contributions to the news.

7. Students responded with sentences (one at a time).

8. The teacher wrote sentences on chart paper (immediately after each contribution was given), stopping to have students write words on magic boards. James wrote on his magic board after each prompt by the teacher, holding up the board for her to check each time.

9. The teacher led the class in rereading the entire day's news entry, pointing to each word as she read. She stopped twice to ask two students to joining the class in rereading. After each interruption she began reading again. James read with the class.

10. The event ended with the teacher selecting two students to collect the magic boards and the chalk.

Rules for Interaction

Data were analyzed according to the rules for interaction, or the rules for the use of speech applicable to this communicative event (Saville- Troike, 1989). These rules refer to how the participants "should" act, and are tied to the shared values of the speech community.

1. When the students entered the room they knew to go directly to their desks, sit, and wait.

2. In response to the lights being turned off when the students entered the room, three of the students put their heads on their desks as they waited for the event to begin.

3. The teacher directed the pace, sequence, talk, and activities of this event.

4. Students were expected to respond quickly to the teacher's requests for writing on the magic boards.

5. Students were expected to use the magic boards only when instructed to. They were expected to write and erase only when prompted to do so.

6. Students were expected to write words on the magic boards, writing "what they could hear." Afterward, when the teacher wrote the words on the chart paper, the students were expected to check their spelling and correct their errors.

7. The teacher wrote on the chart paper using conventional spelling.

8. The chalkboard was used as a resource for practicing and working toward "hearing the sounds in words."

9. The chart paper was used as the final copy.

10. When called upon, students were expected to contribute to the day's news with complete sentences.

11. The content of these contributions was expected to pertain to their trip to the pumpkin patch.

12. Students were expected to reread sentences, and parts of sentences, whenever prompted to do so by the teacher.

13. Students were expected to hold their magic boards up after they wrote each word.
14. Students were expected to hold their hands up when the teacher asked for a contribution to the news.

**Norms of Interpretation**

Data were analyzed according to the norms of interpretation of these rules for interaction. This information pertains to the range of interpretations participants made of the rules for interaction.

1. All the students wrote on their magic boards when the teacher instructed them to.
2. At least four of the students continued to write on the boards when the teacher did not tell them to.
3. Three to four students were able to write the words on the magic boards using conventional spelling. The remainder of the students wrote using invented spelling.
4. Only seven to eight of the students checked their spelling when the teacher wrote the words on the chart paper.
5. Three to four of those students who checked their spelling on the chart paper, corrected their errors.
6. Eight to ten of the students read during each rereading.
7. None of the students' first contributions to the news were in complete sentences.
8. Eight to ten of the students responded to the prompts by the teacher when she used the boxes on the chalkboard.
9. When the teacher asked for contributions to the news, seven to eight of the students raised their hands every time.

**Levels and Nature of Involvement**

Data were analyzed according to the nature and level of participants involvement during this event.

1. Students appeared to be more actively involved in this event when the "magic boards" were used. This was evidenced in the excitement they showed when the boards were being distributed as well as in quickness of their responses.
2. Students appeared to be more involved in the writing on the "magic boards" than in the checking and correcting of errors. This was evidenced in students' posture, e.g., sitting up close to their desks when asked to write on boards, as opposed to sitting back looking inside their desks when asked to correct their errors.
3. From the beginning to the end of this event, the number of students who raised their hands when the teacher asked for a contribution to the news decreased.
4. From the beginning to the end of this event, the number of students who held their "magic boards" in the air after writing decreased.
Areas of Room and Materials Used

Data were analyzed according to the various materials used and the areas of the room in which events occurred.

1. Materials used during writing the class news included the journals, magic boards, chalk, and paper towels for erasing.
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Figure 12
Episode 4: Later Observation of Writing the Class News

Setting

This event occurred in the Kennedy school first grade classroom on 1/17/91. The event began at 9:40 AM. The teacher has just led the students in reading the calendar.

Participants

Teacher
James
Students - 17 student class members

Function. Purpose. Goals

During the writing of the class news the teacher stood at the front of the room, led the students in constructing a text, and wrote that construction on a piece of chart paper that was clipped to a clothesline that hung on the chalkboard. The teacher often called this time shared writing.

This event was typical in relation to the sequence of activities occurring during the event and in the types of interactions occurring amongst the participants.

The teacher would call upon students to construct a sentence. Students' responses usually began with "I" such as "I like pizza." When the teacher wrote these contributions on the chart paper she changed the "I" to the respective student's name.

On the average, five students were called upon to contribute to the news.

This event was atypical in terms of the content of the written constructions. The war in the Persian Gulf had just begun and immediately after quiet reading time the teacher began speaking with the class about the war. She began this discussion by asking if anyone in the classroom had a friend or family member in Saudi Arabia. As the discussion continued, she held up a copy of the front page of the day's newspaper that had "War" in large black letters across the front of the page.

Near the beginning of the year the teacher wrote everything on the chart paper herself. As the year progressed, she often selected students to write a word or two on the chart paper.

Near the beginning of the year the teacher often used another procedure that allowed the students to do their writing, thus enabling her to check on their progress. She would pass out one rectangular shaped piece of thick cardboard to each student along with a piece of chalk and a paper towel for erasing. These boards were called "magic boards" or just "boards." On the left side of the board were three circles. The top circle was green, the middle yellow, and the bottom
red. As the teacher wrote the class news she would select words for the students to write next to a dot on their boards. She would instruct them, "just write what you can hear."

When the students had written their words on the magic boards they held the boards up in the air to show their constructions to the teacher. She glanced quickly at their writing and then wrote the word on the chart paper, instructing the students to check what she had written and to "make their corrections."

Often times, for words not selected for writing on the magic boards, she paused before writing on the chart paper to ask students to predict what they would expect to "come at the beginning" or "end of a word."

She often asked the student who had contributed a piece of news to select the ending punctuation. She then led the students in rereading each sentence according to the punctuation selected. For example, when "excited marks" were selected, students learned to alter their intonations accordingly.

Near the end of the event, the teacher led students in rereading the entire day's news.

Each day's work was displayed around the room and approximately every two weeks students whose names appeared on a particular day's work were eligible to take the page home.

Act Sequence

The analysis of field notes and video taped data sources revealed the following sequence of acts.

1. Teacher selected students to pass out the magic boards. James showed his disappointment in not being selected to pass out the magic boards by throwing his piece of chalk back to the student who was selected.

2. As the teacher waited for the magic boards to be passed out, she held up the front page of the day's newspaper announcing that the country was at war.

3. The teacher taped this front page to the chalkboard next to the news print.

4. The teacher called on students to contribute to the day's news. She announced that contributions should be related to the war. James responded to the teacher's request by raising his hand and waiting to be recognized. When the teachers called on him he asked "why would they have a war on Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday?" The teacher did not write this sentence, but instead restated asked for contributions to the news.

5. Students began offering sentences. James sat quietly and listened.

6. The teacher instructed students to write words on magic board.
7. The teacher called on students to come to the chart paper to write words in the sentence. Students were called on to write a word on chart paper.

8. The event ended with the teacher asking students to line up at the door for a rest room break.

Rules for Interaction

Data were analyzed according to the rules for interaction, or the rules for the use of speech applicable to this communicative event (Saville-Troike, 1989). These rules refer to how the participants "should" act, and are tied to the shared values of the speech community.

1. The teacher directed the pace, sequence, talk, and activities of this event.

2. Students were expected to respond quickly to the teacher's instruction for writing on the magic boards and to write only the words the teacher instructed them to write.

3. As students wrote on the magic boards they were expected to say the words slowly and write only the sounds they could hear.

4. The teacher wrote on the chart paper using conventional spelling.

5. When students wrote on the chart paper they were expected to use conventional spelling.

6. The chalkboard was used as a resource for practicing and working toward "hearing the sounds in words."

7. The chart paper was used as the final copy.

8. When called upon to contribute to the day's news, students were expected to respond using complete sentences.

9. The content of these contributions was expected to pertain to the Persian Gulf War.

10. Students were expected to copy the words war and Iraq from the daily newspaper that hung on the chalkboard.

11. The students were expected to raise their hands when they wanted to contribute to the day's news.

12. Students were expected to remain in their seats unless called upon to write a word on the chart paper.

Norms of Interpretation

Data were analyzed according to the norms of interpretation of these rules for interaction. This information pertains to the range of interpretations participants made of the rules for interaction.

1. All the students wrote on their magic boards when instructed to by the teacher.

2. Two of the class members began writing on the magic boards when they were passed out, and continued to do so for the entire event.

3. The teacher often extended the students' contributions to the news.
4. James wrote all the words he was instructed to write on the magic board.
5. James was often the first student to write his word on the magic board.
6. James held up his hand when he wanted to be called on.

Levels and Nature of Involvement

Data were analyzed according to the nature and levels of participants involvement during this event.
1. Students responded quickly to all the teacher's instructions.
2. James displayed disappointment in not getting to write all the words on the chart paper.
3. James displayed disappointment in not getting to locate the word Iraq on the news page.
Areas of Room and Materials Used

Data were analyzed according to the various materials used and the areas of the room in which events occurred.

1. Materials used during writing the class news included journals, magic boards, chalk, and paper towels for erasing.
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Figure 13
Episode 5: Early Observation of James' Pull-Out Instructional Program

Setting

This event occurred in the Kennedy school pull-out program instructional room on 11/01/90. The event began when James entered the room.

Participants

Teacher, Angie
James

Function, Purpose, Goals

The pull-out program instruction provided an opportunity for James, a student identified as at-risk of failure in learning to read, with one-to-one instruction. The teacher works to provide an instructional program that will enable James to become an independent reader and to be able to function independently in the classroom and no longer in need of this one-to-one instruction.

This event was typical in terms of the sequence of activities, time spent on each activity, and in the interactions that occurred throughout the lesson.

On this day, James has been in the program for 20 instructional days. This event represents lesson number 13.

Act Sequence

The analysis of field notes and video taped data sources revealed the following sequence of acts.
1. The teacher instructed James to write word can on chalkboard three times.
2. The teacher placed two books on the table in front of James and asked him to select a book to read. James read two of these books.
3. The teacher placed writing journal in front of James. A sentence was constructed and James wrote the sentence with assistance.
4. The teacher wrote sentence on a long strip of paper and cut it into words as he read. James reassembled the cut-up sentence.
5. The set a new book on table in front of James. After talking about the illustrations and asking three questions, teacher handed the book to James for him to read.
6. The lesson ended with the teacher closing the book and James getting up to leave the room.
Rules for Interaction

Data were analyzed according to the rules for interaction, or the rules for the use of speech applicable to this communicative event (Saville-Troike, 1989). These rules refer to how the participants "should" act, and are tied to the shared values of the speech community.

1. When James entered the room he was expected to go directly to the instructional table.
2. When the teacher handed a book to James he was expected to attempt reading it.
3. When the teacher held the book in her hands and talked about the pictures, James was expected to listen and respond to her questions and prompts.
4. James was expected to reread the sentence when he came to a difficult part.
5. James was expected to point to the words as he read.
6. James was expected to run his finger under the difficult words, looking at the whole word.
7. James was expected to write about a book he had read.
8. James was expected to think of a sentence to write about the story.
9. James was expected to write the words he knew.
10. When James did not know how to write a word he was expected to say it slowly and write the sounds he could hear.
11. James was allowed to ask the teacher for help.
12. James was allowed to talk about his responses to the text.
13. When James wrote words on the chalkboard he was expected to write quickly.

Norms of Interpretation

Data were analyzed according to the norms of interpretation of these rules for interaction. This information pertains to the range of interpretations participants made of the rules for interaction.

1. James always reread the sentence when he came to a difficult part.
2. James wrote on the chalkboard quickly.
3. James did not point under each word as he read. Instead he quickly slid his finger under the words.
4. When the teacher suggested that James write about Pat's New Puppy he chose to write about Nick's Glasses.
5. When writing, James wrote the words he knew quickly.
6. When James attempted to write a word he did not know, he repeated the word slowly to hear the sounds.
7. During the reading of the new book, James often stopped and yawned when he came to a difficult part.
Levels and Nature of Involvement

Data were analyzed according to the nature and levels of participants' involvement in this event.

1. James appeared to be actively involved in all the activities of this lesson. This was evidenced in his posture, e.g., sitting up close to the table as opposed to leaning back on his chair.

2. James appeared to be more actively involved during the writing portion of this lesson. This was evidenced in his posture, e.g., sitting up close to the table as opposed to leaning back on his chair, the quickness of his responses, and his voice intonations.

3. James appeared to be less involved in the lesson during the reading of the new book. This was evidenced in the way in which he would stop reading, sit back in his chair, and yawn.
Areas of Room and Materials Used

Data were analyzed according to the various materials used and the areas of the room in which events occurred.

Episode 6: Later Observation of James' Pull-Out Instructional Program

Setting

This event occurred in the Kennedy school pull-out program instructional room on 1-11-91. The event began when James entered the room.

Participants

Teacher, Angie
James

Function, Purpose, Goals

The pull-out program instruction provided an opportunity for James, a student identified as at-risk of failure in learning to read, with one-to-one instruction. The teacher worked to provide an instructional program that would enable James to become an independent reader and to be able to function independently in the classroom and to no longer need one-to-one instruction.

This event was typical in terms of the sequence of activities, time spent on each activity, and in the interactions that occurred throughout the lesson.

On this day, James has been in the program for 53 instructional days. This event represents lesson number 43.

Act Sequence

The analysis of field notes and video taped data sources revealed the following sequence of acts.

1. The teacher instructed James to write the word went on the chalkboard three times.
2. The teacher and James sat at table. The teacher placed a shallow box of salt in front of James and instructed him to write the word went quickly with his finger.
3. The teacher placed 3 books on the table in front of James.
4. James read two of the books with little difficulty.
5. James read the third book called Greedy Cat and had difficulty with the text. The teacher read the book with him.
6. The teacher took a running record of James reading. The teacher talked with James about the book and his reading.
7. The teacher placed writing journal in front of James. The teacher asked him what he wanted to write about, he quickly responded with a sentence and wrote the sentence easily.
8. The teacher set a new book on table in front of James and began talking about the story.
9. James read the book with ease.
10. The lesson ended with James closing the book and getting up to leave the room.

**Rules for Interaction**

Data were analyzed according to the rules for interaction, or the rules for the use of speech applicable to this communicative event (Saville-Troike, 1989). These rules refer to how the participants "should" act and are tied to the shared values of the speech community.

1. When James entered the room he was expected to go directly to the instructional table and sit down.
2. When the teacher set books in front of James to read, he was expected to select one book at a time and read.
3. James was expected to reread a sentence when he came to a difficult part.
4. James was expected to write the words that he knew how to write on his own.
5. James was expected to reread his sentence as he wrote each word.
6. James was allowed to ask for help.
7. When James wrote on the chalkboard and in the salt he was expected to write the word went as quickly as he could.
8. When James read books during the familiar rereading portion of the lesson he was expected to read without pointing to the words.
9. When James skipped over a line of text he was expected to reread and self-correct his error.

**Norms of Interpretation**

Data were analyzed according to the norms of interpretation of these rules for interaction. This information pertains to the range of interpretations participants made of the rules for interaction.

1. James always reread the sentence when he came to a difficult part.
2. James was able to write all the words in his sentence.
3. When James stopped to talk about the book he was reading, teacher always said "go on."
4. When the teacher wanted James to write when in the sand at a faster pace she said "[James] put the pen down and write it fast."
5. When James skipped over a line of text and did not reread to self-correct on his own, T said, "is that what the book says? Read that again." When James reread and self-corrected, T said, "you skipped over that, you need to read all the words on the page, you can't skip over the words."
6. When the teacher talked with James about his reading after the running record, he commented, "I didn't read it." T responded, "Oh yes you did, I love listening to you read."
Levels and Nature of Involvement

Data were analyzed according to evidence of participants levels of involvement during this event.

1. James appeared to be actively involved in all the activities of this event. This was evidenced in the quickness of his responses and his posture, e.g., sitting up close to the table versus leaning back.

2. James appeared to be more actively involved during the writing activity of the lesson. This was evidenced in the shift of his pace, quickness of his responses, and the way in which he sat close to the table as he wrote.

3. James appeared to be less involved in the lesson during the reading of the new book. Throughout the reading of this text he leaned back in his chair and responded at a much slower pace.
Areas of Room and Materials Used

Data were analyzed according to the various materials used and the areas of the room in which events occurred.

1. Materials used an instructional lesson included trade books, "little books," writing journals, pens for writing, strips of paper for cut-up sentence.
APPENDIX H

ANALYSIS OF KEY EVENTS OCCURRING IN THE JOHNSON SCHOOL
Episode 7: Early Observation of Journal Writing

Setting

This event occurred in the Johnson school first grade classroom on 11/09/90. The event began at the start of the day. As students entered the room, they went directly to the coat room, hung up their coats and book bags, and then proceeded to their spaces, sat down and began writing in their journals.

Participants

Teacher
Martisha

Students - Nineteen student class members

Functions, Purposes, Goals

Journal writing was an opportunity for students to write and for the teacher to observe them writing. This was the first literacy event of the day. Students wrote in journals that were constructed in the same format as those used in the Kennedy school, with the exception that they were opened up like a book rather than being turned on its side.

This event was typical in terms of the interactions between the teacher and the students, and students with other students.

Act Sequence

The analysis of field notes and video taped data sources revealed the following sequence of acts.

1. The event began when the first student started writing. Martisha began writing when she sat down.
2. The teacher went from student to student, talking with them about their journal entries. Teacher wrote comments on each students' page. If students did not have the days' date written on their page, the teacher wrote it for them at this time.
3. The event ended with the teacher asking the class to close their journals and move to the rug for the next event.

Rules for Interaction

Data were analyzed according to the rules for interaction, or the rules for the use of speech applicable to this communicative event (Saville-Troike, 1989). These rules refer to how the participants "should" act and are tied to the shared values of the speech community.

1. When the students entered the room they were expected to go directly to the coat room and their spaces.
2. Students were expected to begin writing in their journals as soon as they were seated.
3. Students were expected to construct sentences to write about.
4. The teacher talked individually with all students about their journal writing.
5. Students were permitted to ask the teacher questions. If the teacher was busy talking with another student, he/she was expected to wait and not interrupt.
6. Students were expected to use a finger for help in spacing between words.
7. Students were permitted to talk with other students.
8. Students were expected to use the alphabet strip hanging on the wall above the chalkboard as a resource for writing letters.
9. Students were expected to say words slowly and write the sounds they could hear.
10. Students were permitted to use invented spelling rather than conventional spelling.
11. Students were permitted to ask the teacher how to spell words.
12. The teacher directed the pace and activities of the event.

Norms of Interpretation

Data were analyzed according to the norms of interpretation of these rules for interaction. This information pertains to the range of interpretations participants made of the rules for interaction.
1. During 05:20-8:01 (real time) two students walked around the room.
2. One student interrupted the teacher's interactions with other students four times by asking questions.
3. When students asked the teacher how to spell a word, she would respond by asking them to say the word slowly aloud to her and then asked them to tell her what sounds they could hear. The students wrote these sounds.
4. One student wrote lists of words rather than sentences in her journal.
5. One student stood at his space as he wrote. He danced as he wrote.
6. During most of this event, Martisha held her pencil in her hand, and talked with a neighboring student. She wrote lists of words (e.g., love, like, hi), copied the teachers' names from the chalkboard, and wrote lines of the same and different letters (e.g., ssss, mmm, nushuntooghfoh). When she was done writing these words and letters she drew boxes around sections of the page.
Levels and Nature of Involvement

Data were analyzed according to nature and level of participants involvement during this event.

1. Twelve students wrote continuously throughout the event, stopping only for conversations with T when she came to their space.

2. Two students walked around the room from 05:20-08:01 and did not write in their journals during this time.

3. One student talked with other students, asked the teacher questions, and got up and down out of her seat throughout this event.

4. Two students (Martisha and neighboring student) talked with one another throughout the event and wrote in their journals whenever the teacher stood near them.
Areas of Room and Materials Used

Data were analyzed according to the various materials used and the areas of the room in which events occurred.

1. Materials used during journal writing time included journals and pens or pencils for writing.
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Figure 16
Episode 8: Later Observation of Journal Writing

Setting

This event occurred in the Johnson School first grade classroom on 1/15/90. The event began at the start of the day. As students entered the room, they went directly to the coat room, hung up their coats and book bags, and then proceeded to their spaces, sat down and began writing in their journals.

Participants

Teacher
Martisha

Students - Nineteen student class members

Functions, Purposes, Goals

Journal writing was an opportunity for students to write and for the teacher to observe them writing. This was the first literacy event of the day. Students wrote in journals that were constructed in the same format as those used in the Kennedy school, with the exception that they were opened up like a book rather than being turned on its side.

This event was typical in terms of the interactions between the teacher and the students, and students with other students.

Act Sequence

The analysis of field notes and video taped data sources revealed the following sequence of acts.

1. The event began when the first student started writing. Martisha sat at her space and talked with another student.

2. The teacher went from student to student, talking with them about their journal entries. The teacher wrote comments on each students' page. Martisha began writing.

3. An intercom announcement from the school principal. Three students stopped writing and sat and listened. The remaining students continued to write.

4. The event ended with the teacher asking the class to close their journals and move to the rug for the next event.

Rules for Interaction

Data were analyzed according to the rules for interaction, or the rules for the use of speech applicable to this communicative event (Saville-Troike, 1989). These rules refer to how the participants "should" act and are tied to the shared values of the speech community.
1. When the students entered the room they were expected to go directly to the coat room and their spaces.
2. Students were expected to begin writing in their journals as soon as they were seated.
3. Students were expected to construct their sentences to write about.
4. The teacher talked individually with all students about their journal writing.
5. Students were permitted to ask the teacher questions. If the teacher was busy talking with another student, he/she was expected to wait and not interrupt.
6. Students were permitted to talk with other students.
7. Students were expected to use the alphabet strip hanging on the wall above the chalkboard as a resource for writing letters.
8. Students were expected to say words slowly and write the sounds they could hear.
9. Students were permitted to use invented spelling rather than conventional spelling.
10. Students were permitted to ask the teacher how to spell words.
11. When students asked the teacher how to spell a word, she would respond by asking them to say the word slowly aloud to her and then asked them to tell her what sounds they could hear. The students were expected to write these sounds.
12. The teacher directed the pace and activities of this event.

Norms of Interpretation

Data were analyzed according to the norms of interpretation of these rules for interaction. This information pertains to the range of interpretations participants made of the rules for interaction.
1. One student interrupted the teacher's interactions with other students four times by asking questions.
2. Martisha talked to a neighboring student throughout the majority of this event. She wrote in her journal whenever the teacher stood near her. She wrote "I see A Wiuey, mmmmmmmmmmm, byasss33bbc, t21ccc, l02222, l+c2+ccc, cc+cnc+l, zlyz (commas designate lines of text)."

Levels and Nature of Involvement

Data were analyzed according to the nature and level of participants involvement during this event.
1. Fifteen students wrote continuously throughout the event, stopping only for conversations with the teacher when she came to their space.
2. Two students wrote in their journals for short periods of time and then walked around room talking with other students.
3. One student talked with other students, asked the teacher questions, and got up and down out of her seat throughout this event.
4. Two students (Martisha and neighboring student) talked throughout the event, writing in their journals only when the teacher stood near them.
Areas of Room and Materials Used

Data were analyzed according to the various materials used and the areas of the room in which events occurred.

1. Materials used during journal writing included journals and pens or pencils for writing.

Figure 17
Episode 9: Early Observation of Writing the Class News

Setting

This event occurred in the Johnson first grade classroom on 11/08/90.

Participants

Teacher
Martisha
Students - Nineteen class members

Functions, Purposes, Goals

Writing the class news occurred immediately after journal writing. The teacher would instruct the students to join her at the rug. Students would often share their journals with the rest of the class before the start of the next event called writing the class news.

The teacher sat at her chair for this event and called on students to make contributions to the class news. The teacher wrote the students' contributions on a large sheet of chart that hung from an easel next to her chair.

At the end of the event, the teacher would call on one to two students at a time to come up to the easel. Using a long stick as a pointer, these students led the class in rereading the day's news by pointing and reading aloud.

This event was typical in the way in which the event was structured.

Act Sequence

The analysis of field notes and video taped data sources revealed the following sequence of acts.

1. When students were all seated at the rug the teacher took out a story to read to the class called Good Morning Chick (Ginsburg, 19 ). The teacher read book to class. Martisha sat in the middle area of the rug, and whispered to another student throughout the reading of this book.

2. The teacher announced that they would be writing a story about the book read and would illustrate the story on the following Monday.

3. The teacher asked students to tell about what they do when they get up in the morning. Martisha listened quietly.

4. Four students were called on to contribute to the news (story).

5. The teacher led students in rereading story. Martisha continued to whisper to her neighbor.

6. Event ended with the teacher requesting that students return to their spaces.
Rules for Interaction

Data were analyzed according to the rules for interaction, or the rules for the use of speech applicable to this communicative event (Saville-Troike, 1989). These rules refer to how the participants "should" act and are tied to the shared values of the speech community.

1. When students were called upon, they were expected to give a contribution to the news.
2. Students' contributions were expected to be related to things they did in the morning.
3. Students were expected to read along when the teacher led the class in rereading the days' news.
4. The teacher directed the pace, sequence, talk, and activities of this event.
5. The teacher decided what counted as appropriate contributions to the news.
6. Students were expected to take turns talking and making contributions to the news.
7. Talk that occurred during this event was expected to pertain only to the writing of the class news.

Norms of Interpretation

Data were analyzed according to the norms of interpretation of these rules for interaction. This information pertains to the range of interpretations participants made of the rules for interaction.

1. On four occasions students had to be reminded to be quiet and take turns talking.
2. Martisha whispered quietly throughout most of the event.

Levels and Nature of Involvement

Data were analyzed according to the nature and level of participants' involvement during this event.

1. Sixteen of the students appeared to be actively involved in this event. This was evidenced in the ways in which they focused their attention on the teacher and the chart paper, and responded verbally to her on-going questions.
2. Three students (including Martisha) talked and/o whispered to one another throughout this event. Their talk was unrelated to the event.
Areas of Room and Materials Used

Data were analyzed according to the various materials used and the areas of the room in which events occurred.

1. Materials used during writing the class news included an easel, chart paper, pens for writing, and long sticks for pointing.
Episode 10: Later Observation of Writing the Class News

Setting

This event occurred in the Johnson first grade classroom on 1/15/91.

Participants

Teacher
Martisha
Students - Nineteen student class members

Functions, Purposes, Goals

Writing the class news occurred immediately after journal writing. The teacher would instruct the students to join her at the rug. Students would often share their journals with the rest of the class before the start of the next event called writing the class news.

The teacher sat at her chair for this event and called on students to make contributions to the class news. The teacher wrote the students' contributions on a large sheet of chart that hung from an easel next to her chair.

At the end of the event, the teacher would call on one to two students at a time to come up to the easel. Using a long stick as a pointer, these students led the class in rereading the day's news by pointing and reading aloud.

This event was typical in the way in which the event was structured.

Act Sequence

The analysis of field notes and video taped data sources revealed the following sequence of acts.
1. The teacher called the students to the rug. Students sat down on the rug. Martisha sat and listened quietly.
2. The teacher led students in saying the days of the week forward and backward. Martisha said the days of the week forward, but not backward.
3. The teacher turns to chart paper and writes the days date.
4. The teacher calls on four students to contribute to the days' news. Martisha talked with a neighboring student.
5. When last student responds that he cannot think of any news, the teacher writes on the chart paper [Michael] can't think of no news.
6. The teacher selected student to come to chart paper and led class in rereading days news three times.
7. Event ended with the teacher taking out a book and reading a story to the class.
Rules for Interaction

Data were analyzed according to the rules for interaction, or the rules for the use of speech applicable to this communicative event (Saville-Troike, 1989). These rules refer to how the participants "should" act and are tied to the shared values of the speech community.

1. When students were called upon, they were expected to give a contribution to the news.
2. Students' contributions could be related to anything of their choosing.
3. Students were expected to read along when the student led the class in rereading the days' news.
4. The teacher directed the pace, sequence, talk, and activities of this event.
5. Students were expected to take turns talking and making contributions to the news.
6. Talk that occurred during this event was expected to pertain only to the writing of the class news.

Norms of Interpretation

Data were analyzed according to the norms of interpretation of these rules for interaction. This information pertains to the range of interpretations participants made of the rules for interaction.

1. On two occasions students had to be reminded to be quiet and take turns talking.
2. Martisha whispered quietly during this event.

Levels and Nature of Involvement

Data were analyzed according to the nature and level of participants involvement during this event.

1. Seventeen students remained actively involved in this event. This was evidenced in the students posture, e.g., sitting up looking at the teacher and the chart as opposed to lying down and looking around the room.
2. Two students continued to talk about topics unrelated to the event. They spent most of this time lying down and looking around the room or at each other.
Areas of Room and Materials Used

Data were analyzed according to the various materials used and the areas of the room in which events occurred.

1. Materials used during writing the class news included an easel, chart paper, pens for writing, and a long stick for pointing.
Episode 11: Early Observation of Martisha's Pull-Out Instructional Program

Setting

This event occurred in the Johnson school pull-out program instructional room on 11/27/90. The event began when Martisha entered the room and sat down.

Participants

Teacher
Student - Martisha

Functions, Purposes, Goals

The pull-out instructional program provided an opportunity for Martisha, a student identified as at-risk of failure in learning to read, with one-to-one instruction. The teacher words to provide an instructional program that will enable Martisha to become an independent reader and to be able to function independently in the classroom and no longer in need of this one-to-one instruction.

This event was typical in terms of the sequence of activities, time spent on each activity, and in the interactions that occurred throughout the lesson. This lesson represented Martisha's 24th day in the program, and was lesson number 14.

Act Sequence

The analysis of field notes and video taped data sources revealed the following sequence of acts.

1. The teacher instructed Martisha to write the word and on the chalkboard three times.
2. The teacher placed 3 books on the table in front of Martisha.
3. Martisha pointed as she read one of the three stories.
4. The teacher took a running record of Martisha's reading. The teacher talked with Martisha about the book and her reading.
7. The teacher placed writing journal in front of Martisha. A sentence was constructed and she wrote the sentence with support from the teacher.
8. The teacher set a new book on table in front of Martisha and began talking about the story.
9. Martisha read the book with support from the teacher.
10. The lesson ended with Martisha closing the book and getting up to leave the room.
Rules for Interaction

Data were analyzed according to the rules for interaction, or the rules for the use of speech applicable to this communicative event (Saville-Troike, 1989). These rules refer to how the participants "should" act and are tied to the shared values of the speech community.

1. When Martisha entered the room she was expected to go directly to the instructional table and sit down.
2. When the teacher set books in front of Martisha to read, she was expected to select one book at a time and read.
3. Martisha was expected to reread a sentence when she came to a difficult part.
4. Martisha was expected to write the words that she knew how to write on her own.
5. Martisha was expected to reread her sentence as she wrote each word.
6. Martisha was allowed to ask for help.
7. Martisha was expected to point to each word as she read and wrote.

Norms of Interpretation

Data were analyzed according to the norms of interpretation of these rules for interaction. This information pertains to the range of interpretations participants made of the rules for interaction.

1. Martisha pointed to each word as she read each story and as she read what she had written in her journal.
2. When Martisha had difficulty reading the new book, the teacher held her finger and helped her point to each word as she read with her.

Levels and Nature of Involvement

Data were analyzed according to the nature and level of participants involvement during this event.

1. Martisha appeared to be actively involved in all the activities of this event. This was evidenced in the quickness of her responses, the excitement in her voice over the texts read and the story generated, and her posture as she sat close to the table next to the teacher.
Areas of Room and Materials Used

Data were analyzed according to the various materials used and the areas of the room in which events occurred.

1. Materials used an instructional lesson included trade books, "little books," writing journals, pens for writing, strips of paper for cut-up sentence.
Episode 12: Later Observation of Martisha's Pull-Out Program Instruction

Setting

This event occurred in the Johnson school pull-out program instructional room on 1/15/91. The event began when Martisha entered the room and sat down.

Participants

Teacher - Samantha
Martisha

Functions, Purposes, Goals

The pull-out instructional program provided an opportunity for Martisha, a student identified as at-risk of failure in learning to read, with one-to-one instruction. The teacher words to provide an instructional program that will enable Martisha to become an in independent reader and to be able to function independently in the classroom and no longer in need of this one-to-one instruction.

This event was typical in terms of the sequence of activities, time spent on each activity, and in the interactions that occurred throughout the lesson.

Act Sequence

The analysis of field notes and video taped data sources revealed the following sequence of acts.

1. The teacher instructed Martisha to write the word do on the chalkboard three times.
2. The teacher placed 3 books on the table in front of Martisha.
3. Martisha pointed as she read each of the three stories.
4. The teacher took a running record of Martisha's reading. The teacher talked with Martisha about the book and her reading.
5. The teacher placed writing journal in front of Martisha. A sentence was constructed and she wrote the sentence with support from the teacher.
6. The teacher set a new book on table in front of Martisha and began talking about the story.
7. Martisha read the book with support from the teacher.
8. The lesson ended with Martisha closing the book and getting up to leave the room.
Rules for Interaction

Data were analyzed according to the rules for interaction, or the rules for the use of speech applicable to this communicative event (Saville-Troike, 1989). These rules refer to how the participants "should" act and are tied to the shared values of the speech community.

1. When Martisha entered the room she was expected to go directly to the instructional table and sit down.
2. When the teacher set books in front of Martisha to read, she was expected to select one book at a time and read.
3. Martisha was expected to reread a sentence when she came to a difficult part.
4. Martisha was expected to write the words that she knew how to write on her own.
5. Martisha was expected to reread her sentence as she wrote each word.
6. Martisha was allowed to ask for help.

Norms of Interpretation

Data were analyzed according to the norms of interpretation of these rules for interaction. This information pertains to the range of interpretations participants made of the rules for interaction.

1. Martisha pointed to each word as she read each story and as she read what she had written in her journal.
2. When Martisha had difficulty reading the new book, the teacher pointed to each word and read with her.

Levels and Nature of Involvement

Data were analyzed according to the nature and level of participants involvement during this event.

1. Martisha appeared to be actively involved in all the activities of this event. This was evidenced in the quickness of her responses and in her posture as she sat up close to the table next to the teacher.
Areas of Room and Materials Used

Data were analyzed according to the various materials used and the areas of the room in which events occurred.

1. Materials used an instructional lesson included trade books, "little books," writing journals, pens for writing, strips of paper for cut-up sentence.
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