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CHAPTER I
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Where the paths of research and practice cross, scholarship is believed to contribute to the stimulation and advancement of informed, innovative classroom practice. This study was an investigation of basal readers — artifacts which stand at the juncture of research and practice. The purpose of this study was to explore the way literacy scholarship contributes to the development of basal reading programs and to identify the factors which help to determine how specific research-based contributions are ultimately accepted, rejected, or adapted. This was accomplished by examining the experiences of two literacy scholars who participated in the development of separate basal reading programs.

Background to the Study

During the 1980s, documents such as A Nation at Risk (1983) and Becoming a Nation of Readers (1985) called for far-ranging innovations in the way America schools its children. As the popular perception of American education began to coalesce around the image of "a rising tide of mediocrity," the consensus of opinion of these and subsequent reform-oriented works held that the problems facing contemporary public education were complex and structural. Noticeably out of line with respect to current research information, national requirements, and local expectations, the system was in need of major overhaul, not mere tinkering.
These currents of reform energized literacy scholars and researchers. However, while contributing to important shifts in the way literacy processes were understood, their efforts appeared to have less than dramatic effects on the way literacy instruction occurred. In the foreword to *Learning to Read in America's Schools*, Anderson (1984) lamented the fact that despite an increase in literacy research, this work appeared to be having minimal impact on the content and the format of elementary school literacy instruction. Anderson challenged researchers to "give a high priority to" interacting with publishers, teachers, teacher-trainers, and school officials in an effort to translate new ideas about literacy into classroom practice.

Today, a list of authors of basal reading programs contains the names of prominent scholars whose stature can be measured in terms of publications, positions of leadership in professional organizations, and academic affiliations.

With cadres of expert literacy scholars already well established at every basal publishing company, one might ask, "How then, can the outcome of their collaborations have been so much less than dynamic?" That is to say — with deference to Anderson — that the situation may not call for more (or different) scholars or even for more (or different) efforts. Those employed as basal authors are demonstrably highly motivated and highly successful individuals within their professional careers. Rather, one begins to suspect it is the system in which these scholars operate and not simply the individuals themselves which determines how innovations move from research into practice.

**Defining Areas of Innovation**

The struggle to reform literacy instruction is waged on three critical fronts. First, innovation aims to re-define the content of the literacy curriculum. As traditional skill instruction collides with literature-based and holistic approaches (e.g., Smith, 1982; Chall,
1983; Carbo, 1987; Adams, 1990) new conceptualizations of literacy ricochet about in response to the question "What to teach?". Profound confrontations pit reading comprehension against reader response, synthetic phonics against phonemic awareness, emergent literacy against reading readiness.

A second front focuses on the methods teachers employ to deliver literacy instruction. As scholars and veteran teachers address instructional options, this second question may be stated: "How to teach?". Again, theories of effective instruction (e.g., Brophy, 1979; Rosenshine, 1979; Hunter, 1986) have encountered strong opposition. Rebellious teachers, in appreciable numbers, have taken up positions against formulaic instructional rituals (e.g., Edelsky, 1991; Routman, 1991). A repertoire once dominated by scripted, step-by-step, teacher-directed formats now must fend off challenges from alternative approaches. Discovery learning (Canella, 1985), peer-teaching (Pickens & McNaughton, 1988), and cooperative learning (Stevens, 1991; Strickland et al., 1991; Slavin, 1990; Palincsar & Brown, 1986) are but a few items on the instructional menu which have pushed the envelope of convention just as they have pushed the teacher from the center of the classroom. Closely related to these are certain challenges to traditional methods of assessing literacy (Johnston, 1992; Valencia & Pearson, 1988; Wixson, 1987; Tierney, Carter, and Desai, 1991).

A third front is the literature itself. One cannot speak of an innovative literacy curriculum without simultaneously considering the texts children read. Here again, tradition is under attack, as the constructed, vocabulary-controlled basal anthology faces strong competition from literature-based programs comprised of student-selected trade books (e.g., McGee, 1992; Giddings, 1992).
These three theaters of struggle — content, method, and texts — provide exciting opportunities for everyone engaged in literacy development. Philosophically and financially, the stakes are high. Over and above these larger issues, the ideological shadows of conservatism, progressivism, and radicalism loom large. As responses to these issues become legitimized, new definitions of literacy and instruction emerge, and new orthodoxies begin to take shape.

But how do innovative ideas become legitimized? The conditions under which innovative ideas advanced by literacy scholars find their way into America's schoolrooms remain unclear. Short of legislative mandate, it is not generally understood what causes shifts in traditional practice.

Among scholars, legitimization occurs when new ideas become the focus of research and the topic of scholarly dialogue. As a by-product of their separate endeavors, researchers collaboratively illustrate (as a mosaic) what they mean by "literacy."

How then, does literacy get defined in the classroom? Teachers define literacy by what they say and do with the children they teach (Bloome & Nieto, 1989). Legitimized ideas pertaining to literacy are those imparted to students as a by-product of instruction. Thus it would seem reasonable to expect that dialogues among scholars would have natural implications for dialogues among classroom teachers. But transfer of information between research and practice has been tenuous, as Anderson's observation makes clear.

This study was an investigation into one pathway literacy scholars use to bring innovation to life in the classroom—via collaboration with educational publishers in the development of basal reading programs. It is also, inevitably, an inquiry into the nature of resistance to innovation.
In this sense, the ubiquitous basal reading programs arguably represent an embodiment of legitimated current (and traditional) concepts of literacy. For, to a large extent, the basal reader remains the primary source for most literacy instruction presented in the United States (EPIE, 1982). If the overwhelming utilization of basal reading programs can be taken as the reification of a national literacy curriculum (Shannon, 1987), it seems appropriate and worthwhile to consider how such programs are constructed, how innovative ideas become part of the canon, and in particular, the role literacy scholars play in this process. In other words, before scholars can address Anderson's exhortation to ally themselves with educational publishers, it would seem important to have a better understanding of what such an alliance entails. Furthermore, a clearer understanding of the nature of this collaboration ought to inform scholars (and consumers) what to expect from such an alliance.

Unfortunately, little detailed information is available about basal reading authors and their work. Popular conceptions of authorship (e.g., Murray, 1990) simply do not apply in this genre. The manner in which works of fiction and nonfiction are created differs considerably from the processes involved in the development of basal reading materials. In other words, while we have some understanding of the way novelists, essayists, and historians construct texts, (e.g., their intentions, their working procedures, their sense of authorship, their perceptions of audience, voice, etc.), the collaborative decision-making processes used to construct basal reading programs are largely unknown outside of industry circles. It is the aim of this study to elaborate on the meager information currently available.

The development of basal reading programs is a complex undertaking which requires skillful agents operating in a variety of capacities. The present study was confined to the actions and interactions of a limited set of operatives — literacy scholars, and the
senior personnel of educational publishing companies — and their mutual contributions to the development of two basal reading programs. These contributions may best be understood in terms of the three "fronts" (content, method, literature) described above. By exploring the nature of program authorship, this study also seeks to describe the extent to which individual beliefs about literacy find their way into the developmental process and, eventually, into print and quite possibly into classroom practice.

Finally, this investigation — while focusing attention on literacy scholars and the texts they create — has implications for innovation that go beyond mere metaphor. What "sells" in the marketplace of ideas is nothing less than a reflection of our communal values, beliefs, and goals as a literate society.

**Basic Assumptions of the Study**

Four assumptions frame this investigation. First is the assumption that basal reading programs make tangible a collection of literacy goals. In other words, these programs enjoy currency only insofar as they conform to public (corporate, professional, legal, and communal, etc.) notions of appropriateness. However, while these notions of appropriateness are not static, neither are they uniform. Thus, basal reading programs are assumed to contain a range of practices, many of which exist in mutual conflict with one another, and each of which paradoxically but arguably qualifies as "convention."

Second, this investigation reaffirms that basal reading programs are systems created by individuals and that no matter how intractable the situation, individuals exercise ultimate control over the systems and not the other way around. This is not to diminish the importance of powerful conservative historical, political, and economic forces. It is simply a reminder that basal reading programs are amenable to change and have a history of development.
Third, it is assumed that innovative ideas placed in basal reading programs stimulate innovative practice. This investigation assumes a link between innovations in a basal reading program and innovations in classroom instruction. Instructional materials, serving as classroom management systems, often direct the way teachers organize for instruction (Shannon, 1987; Goodman, 1987). For example, traditional reading programs have been built around (and have contributed to) the practices of grouping students according to ability and utilizing "levelled" readers and "levelled" instruction.

Finally, it is assumed that innovations spring from the contributions of multiple sources, and that literacy scholars make up only one set of voices engaged in the literacy dialogue. Central to this assumption is the notion that basal reading programs are designed to serve multiple purposes, each reflecting the views and interests of its contributor.

These assumptions, that basal reading programs

* contain ideas which enjoy broad based support
* are amenable to change
* affect classroom practice
* spring from multiple sources and multiple needs

do more than justify the present study. They provide a philosophical framework for making sense of the procedures used in this investigation and for interpreting its results.

**Rationale**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the way literacy scholars contribute to the development of basal reading programs. In particular, this investigation aimed to describe ways innovative ideas become defined by the development process, and ultimately to offer insights regarding factors which determine why certain innovative ideas become
incorporated (either wholly or partially) into a program while other ideas are rejected, and why still others are transformed.

Specifically, this study seeks to determine: (1) how the beliefs of literacy scholars affect the development of basal reading programs, (2) what roles authors play in the process of developing a new reading program, and (3) which critical factors impel or impede the incorporation of innovative ideas during the development of instructional materials.

**Summary**

The need to continue to upgrade the quality of American schooling has been accepted as a matter of national priority. The problems facing American education are in part, the result of systemic failure. Solutions to these problems may be found through the introduction of far-reaching innovations into the system. In terms of literacy development, basal reading programs serve as de facto national literacy curricula and are, as such, intimately linked to any notion of innovative literacy instruction.

It has been argued that research and scholarship can affect literacy instruction in three important ways: (1) by changing the content of the materials, (2) by changing the method of instruction, and (3) by changing the core literature. This study described the possibilities and limitations of the processes inherent in those endeavors.

The process of developing instructional materials occurs at the intersection of complex historical, social, economic, and political thoroughfares. These forces provide the context which literacy innovation seeks.
The following chapter reviews the literature related to this study. Chapter III describes the procedures employed in data collection and the methods used to analyze the data. Chapter IV presents analyses of the data. Chapter V summarizes the findings of the study, discusses the limitations and implications of the study, and proposes directions for further research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the ways literacy scholarship contributed to the development of basal reading programs. In particular, an attempt was made to identify factors which influenced decisions regarding specific research-based contributions and, ultimately, determined whether these innovative contributions became accepted or rejected. A related interest was to track how accepted contributions were adapted to the design of an emerging program.

This review is divided into two sections. The first section presents a rationale and review of the literature pertaining to the relationship between literacy scholars and the development of basal reading programs. The second section reviews literature relevant to the principles and procedures of social research employed in the present study.

Rationale

Fundamental assumptions equate authorship with issues of control (of topic and content, of setting, of tone, of perspective, etc.). To some extent, this study attempted to uncover relationships which control the process of developing a basal reading program. Personal experience suggests that the author of a basal reading program and the author of a work of fiction play qualitatively different roles in the process of creating their respective texts, and that the chief difference between them rests in the amount of control over the process each enjoys.
If literacy scholars exercise less than total control over the development of the basal reading programs they author, it would be helpful to identify the forces that complement their efforts — in the sense of collaboration — and the forces that oppose them — in the sense of resistance. Before authors can be expected to exert greater influence on the literacy curriculum via their collaboration with educational publishers, a clearer sense of the extent of an author's control over the program needs to be developed. Such an evaluation of the process would entail an exploration of the way authors utilize control in the process of negotiating ideas. Additionally, a more mature and complete image of other factors which compete for control of the process of developing a basal reading program needs to be examined.

Historical and contemporary analyses of trends in basal reading programs confirm that several key individuals influence the way innovations are presented and disposed. However, the contributions of those individuals must be placed in a social setting dominated by cultural and political values (Apple, 1986). More than mere currents in which innovative ideas originate and develop, the forces of culture and political economy articulate and advance their own agenda.

In her historical review, "American Reading Instruction," Smith (1934) describes the relationship between literacy scholars and instructional materials across specific periods — e.g., religious, moralistic, utilitarian. Smith suggests that materials produced during a specific period reflect, in a general way, the cultural, pedagogical, and economic values of those periods.

While it is true that the leading readers of a given period exhibit certain general characteristics, it is equally true that every period, after the period of religious emphasis, was marked by random shots in different directions, and that there were always some authors whose convictions varied from the great body of opinion. (Smith, p. vi)
After an analysis of three hundred years of reading instruction, Smith concluded that the social context influences but does not constrain the potential contributions of authors.

More relevant to the present study, however, is the aspect of Smith's work which attempted to define and assign "motives and influences which affected reading instruction." In other words, by organizing instructional materials into descriptive categories, Smith offered various explanations to account for shifts in instructional aims and formats of reading materials. Smith's list of fundamental influences "which, themselves, were responsible for bringing about change," included:

* shifts in widespread perception of the reading act and its function (e.g., the shift from oral reading, or reading as "expression," to silent reading, or reading as "attention")
* assessment strategies (e.g., the introduction of standardized tests and scales)
* significant individuals (e.g., Pestalozzi, Huey, Parker)
* critical publications (e.g., the Yearbooks of the National Society for the Study of Education)
* scientific study (e.g., Gray)

Smith's reconstructed history of reading instruction in America presents a view of scholarly inquiry and dialogue as powerful influences on facilitating innovation. The following is typical of the way Smith represents the authority of literacy scholars and their domination over the development of instructional materials. Writing in 1934, and attributing causes underlying the shift to contemporary programs, Smith observed:
The culminating influence in developing the new emphasis was the Twenty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education... In the second chapter, devoted to reading objectives, the committee formulated a set of objectives broader and more inclusive than any others that had yet appeared. This set of objectives has undoubtedly been more powerful than any other single influence in shaping the reading instruction in our present period. Nearly every course of study and basal textbook in reading published since the Twenty-Fourth Yearbook was issued, has set up these same objectives as the ones which its method and materials are designed to achieve. Frequently these objectives are rephrased, but they always convey the same intent. (p. 190)

More recently, Venezky (1987), sketching the history of basal reading materials, pointed out that instructional materials are shaped by the characteristics and values of individuals who create them. Venezky, himself a veteran author of basal reading programs, accords individuals (although not necessarily scholars) the role of primary influence on the fate of various innovations.

Preachers, businessmen, educational reformers, and child nurture advocates have all affected the style and content of reading texts. It should be no surprise therefore, that among the more prominent names in the history of American reading instruction are an army colonel (Francis Parker), a surgeon (Joseph Mayer Rice), and a public relations specialist (Rudolph Flesch).

These two perspectives present a picture of reading instruction as the reflection of individual and cultural beliefs. They also support the position that the aim of instruction is a reflection of a certain set of intellectual values. Together, these views illustrate the pervasive belief that innovation in the literacy curriculum is controlled by a community of scholars, researchers, and intellectual theorists. This belief provides an historical basis for Anderson's challenge to scholars to redouble their efforts through collaboration with educational publishers in the development of basal reading programs.

What are some mechanisms and roles authors employ during this collaborative process? In Learning to Read: The Great Debate (1967/83), Chall directly examined the characteristics and construction of basal reading programs. Through interviews and
document analysis, Chall offered insight regarding the process of developing a basal reading program. In her description of the process, Chall alluded to the collaborative nature of the task.

All basal-series teams pride themselves on cooperative effort. The larger the company, the more specialists involved — reading experts, psychologists, linguists, people with degrees in literature, and so on. (p. 190)

An opinion from a program editor provided an overview of the way this collaborative effort operated in practice:

Creative ideas must come from different people. Even the books suggested as supplemental reading at the end of the various lessons in our series are gone over by five people before they are listed. The books and the manuals are composites. About ten full-time writers, editors, and artists are involved. No one person is responsible. (p. 190)

With team members of diverse background experiences, it is imperative to understand how consensus was negotiated during the cooperative decision-making process of developing a reading program. Chall interviewed program authors to investigate the decision-making mechanisms authors employed.

Two mechanisms the authors mentioned were "tradition" and "competition." For example, one author remarked that decisions regarding the focus and the kinds of activities to be incorporated into a new program were frequently based on "tradition":

We included those used by primary teachers over the past fifty years. We believe it has "consensual validity". (p. 193)

Another author Chall interviewed explained that decisions were occasionally influenced by referring to the practices of their competitors, sometimes modelling a component after a competitor's successful design. As this author explained,
I made an analysis of when various phonetic and structural elements were introduced in five leading basal series, and I pretty much did the same thing... After we set up our plan, if something differed markedly from Scott, Foresman, we looked at it closely. (p. 194)

Although Chall also examined the texts themselves and analyzed them in terms of the general instructional philosophies they reflected, she did not attempt to make connections between the literacy views held by individual scholars and specific aspects of the programs they helped produce.

Recent studies have added a cultural perspective, analyzing instructional materials as socio-political artifacts (Woodward, 1990, 1986; Shannon, 1990, 1989, 1987). Apple (1986) describes the development of instructional materials in terms of "relationships between the political and economic (to say nothing of the cultural) spheres in education." (p. 104). Apple situates authors and editors within the context of the publisher's agenda in a relationship he describes as "relative autonomy."

Encapsulated within a changing set of market relations which set limits on what is considered rational behavior on the part of its participants, editors and other employees have "relative autonomy." They are partly free to pursue the internal needs of their craft and to follow the logic of the internal demands within the publishing house itself. The past histories of gender, class, and race relations and the actual "local" political economy of publishing set the boundaries within which these decisions are made and in large part determine who will make the decisions. (p. 101)

According to Apple, the factors which influence the development of basal reading materials reside within the structure and the routines of the publishing company. He continues:

...the internal labor market in text publishing, the ladder upon which career mobility depends, means that sales will be in the forefront ideologically and economically in these firms. 'Finance capital' dominates, not only because the economy out there mandates it, but because of the historical connections among mobility patterns within firms, rational decision-making based on external competition, political dynamics, and internal information, and because of these things, the kinds of discourse which tend to dominate the meetings and conversations among all the people involved within the organizational structure of the text publisher. (p. 102)
Apple's notion of relative autonomy presents a political-economic view of collaboration which grants "some autonomy to the internal bureaucratic and biographical structure of individual publishers, while at the same time recognizing the political economy of gendered labor that exists as well." (p. 101)

Bureaucratic structures which lie outside the domain of publishing companies also influence the development of innovative programs. By way of illustration, Apple offers the system of state adoption policies as an example of a force which dominates the development of texts. According to Apple,

Publishers themselves, simply because of good business practice, must by necessity aim their text publishing practices towards those states with such state adoption policies. The simple fact of getting one's volume on such a list can make all the difference for a text's profitability. Thus, for instance, sales to California and Texas can account for over 20 percent of the total sales of any particular book — a considerable percentage in the highly competitive world of elementary and secondary school book publishing and selling. Because of this, the writing, editing, promotion, and general orientation and strategy of such production is quite often aimed toward guaranteeing a place on the list of state-approved material. Since this is the case, the political and ideological climate of these primarily Southern states often determines the content and form of the purchased curriculum throughout the rest of the nation. (p. 98)

Apple's contention that basal reading programs are developed by individuals who enjoy "relative autonomy" within a context dominated by political, cultural, and financial influences underscores the complex nature of the collaborative relationship involving authors, editors, and educational publishers. Apple concluded that the manner in which individuals exercise autonomy, presumably in various negotiations, warranted further study.
What is required now is a long-term and theoretical and politically grounded ethnographic investigation that follows a curriculum artifact such as a textbook from its writing to its selling (and then to its use). Only then will we have a more accurate portrayal of the complete circuit of cultural production, circulation, and consumption. Not only would this be a major contribution to our understanding of the relationship among culture, politics and economy, it is also absolutely essential if we are to act in ways that alter the kinds of knowledge considered legitimate for transmission in our schools. As long as the text dominates curricula, to ignore it as being simply not worthy of serious attention and serious struggle is to live in a world divorced from reality. (p. 104)

The present study was undertaken, with the aim of addressing this need. The next section explores some of the theoretical issues which framed the conduct of this study.

**Naturalistic Inquiry**

Previous investigations pertaining to the relationship between literacy scholars and the development of basal reading programs have followed two main strategies — document analysis and self-report. Document analysis typically focuses on basal reading programs as products.

For example, Durkin (1987) examined several basal reading programs with the intention of exploring the connection between a program's design and its designers. Durkin concluded that ideas emerging from literacy research had a minimal impact on shaping the programs. In Durkin's view, if responsibility for program design was distributed among the collaborators, literacy scholars were apparently less effective than other members of the collaborative team. Durkin further suggested that both the content and the format of basal reading programs were indicative of the power of market research over scholarship. Durkin writes:

... manuals of the future will be no better and no worse than what is communicated to publishers about the interests and preferences of school districts and textbook selection committees. Or, to state this differently, it is safe to predict that marketing data will continue to be assigned primary importance by all the publishers. (p. 542)
Critical analyses have attempted to confirm inferences that basal reading programs are products of a bewildering, occasionally malevolent realm controlled (Bowler, 1978; Shannon, 1989, 1990;) by an association of publishers, marketeers, academics, and hired hands. Others describe a Wonderland in which publishers write (Goodman et al., 1988), texts teach (Duffy et al., 1987), and teachers manage (Woodward, 1986).

These reports provide valuable information about trends and values in basal reading programs. However, in general, these reports assign motives but fail to explain the way agenda are carried out. By focussing on basal reading products (rather than their development processes) these analyses ignore the intellectual or political pathways innovative ideas must travel as they make their way into basal reading programs. Currently, there exists only a clutch of impressionistic images regarding the role literacy scholars play in their attempts to influence those pathways.

For example, recent various “insider” reports (Graham 1978; Squire, 1987; Orrell, 1991) offer views of the basal author’s role and the process of developing a basal reading program. The self-reports of several authors (Winograd, 1989; Baumann, 1992; Pikulski, 1991) have identified strategic junctures at which authors may have significant input in the design of a new program. For example, Pikulski listed a variety of tasks in which authors are typically employed. These include gathering background information; checking applicability and workability of new ideas; selecting literature for the student text; developing specific plans, models, and guidelines; writing the program; reviewing and editing; and evaluating the final product.

Orrell (1991), a former executive editor, described critical tasks performed by literacy scholars who serve as textbook authors — (1) using the latest research and classroom evidence to help formulate a comprehensive program plan, and (2) monitoring
program development for adherence to the quality set forth in the developmental plan. Orrell comments further:

Contrary to statements in the Report Card on Basal Readers (Goodman et al., 1988) that authors contribute little to a program beyond their names, my experience is that authors commit a great deal of time and effort in all phases of the publishing cycle from planning through development and into marketing and sales.

The self-reports of insiders have helped to identify a range of "potentials" regarding literacy scholars and the roles they play as they attempt to attain and maintain control over the process of developing basal reading programs. What remains to be explored is the way these potentials are realized before, during, and after this development process.

The present study was an attempt to bring to light specific aspects of the interplay between actual authors and publishers in the negotiations that steer the course of program development from conception to delivery. In order to capture this sense of process, a naturalistic perspective framed the present study.

This study required a methodology which would be sensitive to the complexities of a creative, dynamic process and its environment. The qualities of naturalistic research are well-suited to these needs. As Patton (1990) suggests, the point of using naturalistic research methods is "to understand naturally occurring phenomena in their naturally occurring states." (p. 41)

Guba and Lincoln (1981) describe the aim of naturalistic inquiry as that of providing a view of intricately interrelated "multiple realities, and multiple truths."

Patton characterized the themes of natural inquiry as "real-world observations; inductive analysis; contextual sensitivity; personal contact and insight; attention to dynamic processes; appreciation of idiosyncrasies through a unique case orientation; and a stance of empathic neutrality." (p. 59)
These themes resonate with the aim of capturing the intricacies of complex social interactions as with in the process of developing a basal reading program. Perhaps most significant, this study is grounded (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) in the lived experiences which occurred during the course of that process.

Two naturalistic strategies were employed to collect such grounded data — document analysis and retrospective interviews. Guba and Lincoln (1981) define documents as "any written material other than a record that was not prepared specifically in response to some request from the investigator." (p. 228) Guba and Lincoln distinguish between "primary" and "secondary" source documents, with "primary source" documents described as those generated from first-hand experience. The intention here was to present the process of developing a basal reading program, not through a series of snapshots, but through a fluid replay of the exchange of ideas through the medium of first-hand documents.

Once primary source documents are collected as data, they must be subjected to analysis. Holsti (1969), in Guba and Lincoln (1981), described the process of document analysis in terms of the question: "Who says what, to whom, how, and with what effect, and why?" (p. 237). Internal documents such as the memoranda exchanged among basal collaborators "also can provide clues about leadership style and potential insights about what organizational members value" (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992). The large quantities of documents which accompany the development of a basal reading program provide an extensive paper trail along which answers to the above questions can be found.

Patton (1990) describes documents as a "behind-the-scenes look" at processes. Patton also added that without a well-developed background to the complex discussions that go on among members of an organization, it would be impossible to make sense of
their interactions. In terms of the present study, program documents provide a detailed history of various aims and actualizations which evolved over approximately four years.

Finally, Patton concludes that documents serve a dual purpose:

* they are a basic source of information about program decisions and background, or activities and processes, and
* they can give ideas about important questions to pursue through more direct observations and interviewing.

Unfortunately, direct observation was not possible in this study. Both of the programs which were analyzed in this investigation were completed before the present investigation began. The lack of direct observation placed even greater importance on the ability to gather data through retrospective interviews in which participants were asked to recall their experiences in the process.

When documents were unavailable or unclear, retrospective interviews were conducted to elaborate a specific incident or to provide an interpretation or point out a nuance embedded in a particular event.

Spradley (1979) described naturalistic inquiry, in terms of its ethnographic traditions, as "one of the best ways to understand complex features of modern life. It can show the range of cultural differences and how people with diverse perspectives interact."

In a way, retrospective interviews can be thought of as "mini" life histories. Spradley characterizes a life history as "the details of a single person's life and in the process shows important parts of the culture."

A thorough description of the factors which influence the development of basal reading programs ought to be of interest to teachers, literacy scholars, program authors, and historians, as well as to the publishers of basal reading programs. On the ability of naturalistic inquiry to achieve the objective of meeting such wide-ranging interests, Stake (1978) remarks:
One of the more effective means of adding to understanding for all readers will be by approximating through the words and illustrations of our reports, the natural experience acquired in ordinary personal involvement. (p. 6)

Summary

Investigators who have examined the relationship between literacy scholars and basal reading programs provide a complex image of the terrain this study set out to explore. Dealing directly or indirectly with issues of authority and control, previous studies suggest that no single factor or interest can claim total control over the process of developing a basal reading program. Instead, these materials are believed to be shaped under the direction of many forces. These forces include literacy scholarship, key individuals, traditional practice, cultural values, and political economy. However, the way ideas are negotiated and developed under this system of shared power remains unknown. This study attempted to look specifically at the contribution of literacy scholars in this process, and to observe how ideas they expressed moved through this process.

To capture this sense of personal involvement — to learn how scholars contribute to the development of the programs they author — it was necessary to begin with an understanding of the nature of the relationship between authors and editors. The aim was to view the process close up. Primary documents and interviews allowed each participant to add his or her voice to the reconstruction of events. Case study methods and document analysis were well-suited to this objective. A more detailed description of the procedures used in this investigation to collect and analyze case study data are discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore ways literacy scholarship contributes to the development of basal reading programs and to identify the factors which help to determine whether specific research-based contributions are ultimately accepted, rejected, or adapted into the design of an emerging reading program. This was accomplished by an examination of the experiences of two literacy scholars who participated in the development of separate basal reading programs.

This chapter presents the researcher's perspective, the questions which frame this study, a discussion of the methodology, the selection of case study participants, the data collection procedures, the methods of analysis, and the issues of validity and trustworthiness as they relate to the present study.

Researcher's Perspective

Guba and Lincoln describe the notion of the researcher-as-instrument as "one of the most difficult concepts involved in naturalistic inquiry."
The strength of such an instrument is its multidimensional quality. Human beings as instruments are most responsive to the very areas of social organization about which we know the least: the social, the value resonant, the cultural. The capability of human beings to comprehend and accurately reflect alternative value systems and to become resocialized to the values of others so that inquiry is grounded in real-world contexts...What is needed are those qualities that are uniquely human. These include the capacity to be responsive, to be flexible, to see social organizations as holistic entities rather than as components, to rely on both propositional and tacit knowledge, and to search for that which is expert, which is atypical, idiosyncratic, unique, singular, or uncharacteristic of the mainstream. (p. 151)

Guba and Lincoln also describe ways researchers may refine themselves as instruments of inquiry. These include "increasing self-awareness, enlarged understanding of one's own value perspectives and how they act as selection filters on observation and the like."

In fact, this study draws upon several areas of my own personal and professional experiences. No doubt, each experience contributed to my view of basal reading programs. These perspectives also contributed to the questions which precipitated this investigation.

Four personal histories — of a student, an elementary-school teacher, a writer of instructional materials, and a researcher — identify the perspectives I brought to this investigation. In this section, I briefly describe these histories and connect them to the present investigation.

I first encountered basal reading programs as an elementary school student. These programs were not only the foundation of my literacy education, they constituted nearly the complete range of reading. The most important implication of my personal history as a student is its contribution to a sense of the centrality of basal reading programs to the classroom community. Basal readers were not obtrusive, and certainly not foreign. On the contrary, they were natural components of my elementary school program.
Basal readers and their accompanying workbooks were a natural and integral part of classroom organization and instruction. Reading groups (and social interactions) were organized around performance with basal reading materials. And, as an achieving student, my experience contributed to a view of basal readers as a positive feature of schooling.

Since then, I have come to view basal reading programs from three very different perspectives: as a teacher, as a textbook writer/editor, and most recently as a literacy researcher. Each perspective carries its own set of values, intentions, and expectations.

As a teacher, basal reading programs played an important role in my elementary classroom. Not only did these texts constitute a valuable portion of my students' literary experience, they were sources which modelled for a novice teacher specific procedures for developing vocabulary, enhancing comprehension, and engaging children in reading activities. These instructional models, terms, and formats seemed uncannily appropriate to questions I had about what to teach and how to teach it. Reflection now suggests that in much the same way as the basal reading programs managed my students' development as readers (shaping their perceptions about literacy), these materials also managed my own development as a teacher — shaping my perceptions about literacy instruction.

My teacher's perspective contributed an impression and an expectation that basal reading programs were scientifically valid, authoritative, and expert. Basal reading programs were the standard for assessing literacy instruction. For example, when building principals made periodic observations of my classroom performance, the quality of reading instruction was measured in terms of expertise at implementing or applying the procedures presented in the basal reading program's teachers' manual. In much the same way, I measured a student's competence in terms of his or her ability to apply procedures presented in the basal program.
As a textbook writer and editor, first-hand participation in the development of several basal reading programs — including portions of programs discussed in this study — presented for the first time a view of the complex system required to produce a basal reading program. Also at this time I first became aware of the process of developing a text — from inception to bound books — and of the ways ideas or plans are altered throughout this lengthy process.

As a writer and editor of basal reading and language arts programs, I operated under a set of philosophical and pedagogical guidelines — developed or approved by the publisher — broad enough to permit me freedom of interpretation. These guidelines, such as the focus of specific skills or general lesson formats, would undergo frequent changes. Each change, filtered through levels of project directors, supervisors, and editors, ultimately resulted in many pages of revisions and corrections. In the process of constructing teacher editions or student workbooks (to introduce vocabulary, enhance comprehension, or engage children in reading activities), the likelihood that lessons would match child-appropriate materials and answer students' and teachers' needs came to seem much less scientific and much more fortuitous.

As a literacy researcher, I have been able to look even more critically at the relationship between reading materials and instruction and learning. My background in literacy research has helped me place the activities and procedures advocated in these programs in their theoretical contexts. No longer limited to concerns for child-appropriateness, clarity, and coherence — issues that mattered to me as a student, a teacher, and a writer — today I look at basal readers in light of their relationship to the principles of literacy and learning theory and the effects they are likely to achieve. Conducting this investigation of literacy scholars' contributions to basal reading programs has provided me a new vantage point from which to view the literacy landscape.
I believe it is appropriate, for several reasons, to acknowledge my personal experiences. Certainly personal experience can be expected to generate bias. Personal biases cannot help but cast shadows on the observations and narratives which follow. I am hopeful that these same experiences will help shed light on the complex issues pertaining to this study and will contribute to the credibility and reliability of its descriptions and analyses.

Together, these experiences had an impact on this study in several important ways. First, personal experience not only provided the background for my current interests, it contributed the focus of this study and the origins of the research questions themselves. Such was the inevitable outcome, I believe, of viewing the same artifact across a range of different times and perspectives — inevitable, in the sense that reflection on these multiple perspectives yields lines of incongruence.

However, these different perspectives seemed to have one theme in common. Each associated basal reading programs with the issue of control. That is, basal readers control teachers' and students' views of literacy. I believed it was plainly worth knowing who or what controlled the formats and contents of basal readers.

My personal experience with the decentralized process of developing a basal reading program led me further to believe that multiple perspectives were required to adequately address this issue. It also seemed likely that these perspectives would yield complex multiple interpretations, rather than a simple single answer. Thus, the second impact of my personal history was the effect it had on the ways I chose to investigate this topic. A naturalistic approach was required, one that would enable me to observe the process of development, the flow and exchange of ideas across communities (of scholars, editors, teachers, and students). That is, I intended this investigation, unlike previous studies of basal readers, to focus on the intellectual negotiations I had observed as a writer
and editor. This seemed to me a more direct approach than to attempt to make inferences about authors' beliefs and publishers' intentions based on the cold text of a published product.

Third, my experiences as an editor assured me that these decision-making negotiations were well documented in corporate memos, prototype lessons, and letters to staff members. I was familiar with the level of detail and explanation these directives usually carried and I was confident that a collection of such documents (like so many frames in a film) would provide a moving image of this process.

Fourth, after participating on a number of programs, I also had become familiar with the rhythms and cycles of the development process itself. This familiarity provided me with a general framework for organizing and interpreting the documents I was able to collect.

Fifth, personal experience contributed direction when events had not been documented or when documents were otherwise not available. That is not to say that I tried to infer causes or assign control based on transactions between authors and editors. Rather, at these points, experience led me to seek clarification and elaboration from an informant. In this way, I believe that personal experience enriched the interviews and casual conversations I had with participants during this study and that this contributes to an enhanced understanding of the events that transpired.

Proceeding from these personal experiences, this study began to take shape as an attempt to describe the way literacy scholars contribute to the development of basal reading programs. In particular, I wanted to examine the way authors' ideas are negotiated in the process of developing a basal reading program, and what controls the disposition of authors' contributions. In short, I intended this study to look at how ideas are accepted or rejected, adapted or transformed in the process of developing a basal reading program.
Questions Framing This Study

The rationale for looking at authors' contributions has been explained as a response to challenges which urge literacy scholars to collaborate with educational publishers, with the aim of bringing innovation into programs of reading instruction. It has already been suggested that we do not have a well-developed picture of how basal reading programs develop and how authors' ideas might contribute to those programs.

As the preceding section has explained, basal reading programs and the actions of key individuals should be viewed from multiple perspectives. This study was undertaken as an attempt to explore the relationship between literacy scholars and educational publishers and the basal reading programs they create. Previous studies and popular conceptions have presented conflicting views of this relationship. In particular, these studies have not made clear the factors that control this process.

In order to pull back the facade and expose the inner workings of the mechanisms which produce a basal reading program, three questions helped frame this study:

* What are the ideas an author brings to the process?

* What are the roles an author plays in the process?

* What are the factors which control the way an author's ideas are ultimately accepted or rejected, adapted or transformed?

The first of these questions was intended to explore the relationship between an author's scholarly beliefs and the specific features of the basal reading program he or she helps to create. An appreciation of this relationship is essential to gaining an understanding of the interaction between innovative beliefs and the traditional notions they seek to support or supplant.

The second question pertains to the actual work of the process of developing a reading program. This question aimed to define key junctures in the process at which ideas are initiated, screened, shaped, and finalized. By examining the various roles literacy
scholars might play in the process, the aim was to observe the way authors try to maintain control over the development of their ideas.

The third question is directed at the context in which the basal author operates. This question assumes that the process of developing a basal reading program is a negotiation among diverse interests, intentions, and perspectives, and it asks how conflicts and challenges are resolved.

**Case Study Methodology**

Yin (1989) defines a case study as an "empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident and in which multiple sources are used."

Stenhouse (1985) identified four subcategories of case study research — ethnographic, valuative, educational, and action research. The nature of the present investigation is more in keeping with the general purposes of ethnography than with other more critical and action-oriented objectives. This investigation reflects the ethnographic tradition, which includes multiple cases studied in depth and conducted by an outsider/observer. The data are collected mainly from formal and informal interviews. Above all, the aim is to offer accounts of individuals' actual, lived-through experiences. (Stake, 1978)

The personal views presented in this report are retrospective reconstructions. The task of developing case studies from a warp of in-the-moment documents and a weft of reflective interviews calls for weaving together immediate reactions and opinions which have been distilled through time. It compresses (and perhaps, distorts) the sense of time involved in developing a basal reading program. Much of the day-to-day interchange and work routine is not represented as it might have been in a true ethnography. However,
even these snapshots of the authors' experiences provide a rich sense of the natural experience acquired in ordinary personal involvement.

A summary of the strategies employed during data collection and analysis is presented in Table 1. The design was intended to identify important events or trends and to track their progress at different points in the process.

Table 1
Summary of Data Collection and Analysis Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA COLLECTION</th>
<th>DATA ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Define Author's Interest</strong></td>
<td>• What are the major interests?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sources:</td>
<td>• What are the implications for teacher &amp; student behavior?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author's Publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-development</strong></td>
<td>• Describe the initiation of collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sources:</td>
<td>• Compare author's intent with publisher's intent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Interview</td>
<td>• Compare author's intent with elements of prior edition(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Editions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental Process</strong></td>
<td>• How was author's idea adopted, elaborated, redefined, shifted, rejected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sources:</td>
<td>• What were the determining factors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Interview</td>
<td>• How were decisions made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor Interview</td>
<td>• Who controlled or dominated the decision-making process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Documents</td>
<td>• What were the stages of development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypes</td>
<td>• In what order did events occur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sources:</td>
<td>• How does the final program compare to author's original intent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Interview</td>
<td>• How does the final program compare to publisher's original intent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yin (1989) sets out five components of case study design — a study's questions, its propositions, its unit of analysis, the logic linking the data to the propositions, and the criteria for interpreting the findings.

First, a study question must identify the most significant focus of the study. As Yin (p. 20) points out, a case study method has an advantage over other designs when research investigations ask "how" and "why" questions regarding contemporary events over which the researcher has little or no control. In terms of the present study, these questions might be stated as follows:

* **How** do the beliefs, intentions, and actions of literacy scholars affect the development of the basal reading programs they author?

and,

* **How** do factors within and around the development of a basal reading program affect the disposition of the contributions literacy scholars make?

Here, the first question refers to the connections between the researcher's prior experiences and the intentions with which s/he approaches the task. The second question points to the relationships among intentions, processes, and outcomes.

The second step establishes a set of study propositions, each of which means to "direct attention to something which should be examined within the scope of the study" (Yin, p. 30). Personal experience led to the following study propositions:

* Publishers engage literacy scholars as authors because they value their specific beliefs and intentions.

* The extent to which literacy scholars' innovative beliefs and intentions affect the development of basal reading programs is subject to the nature of those innovations.

* When viewing basal reading programs, literacy scholars and publishing personnel operate from similar and dissimilar sets of beliefs and intentions.
The extent to which the beliefs and intentions of scholars affect the development of basal reading programs is subject to the nature of the collaboration between author(s) and publishing personnel.

These propositions helped guide the investigation. They provided a general framework for developing interview schedules, organizing data, and matching intentions to outcomes.

A third component of the case study design refers to decisions regarding the unit of analysis. In this study, the unit of analysis focuses on innovations authors sought to contribute, and on the aspects of the basal development process they experienced.

This investigation intended to explore authors' experiences through multiple perspectives, including those of editors and other members of the basal program team. Thus, while the study remains focused on authors' experiences, each case is defined by a set of authors and other individuals who collaborated on a specific reading program over a specific period of time.

My next decision was whether the investigation would employ single or multiple cases. The determination to look at the experience of more than one case evolved from several key considerations.

The intention of this investigation was to present an analysis of an author's experiences from multiple perspectives. For each case this entailed an author and various other personnel — editors, supervisors, and executives — from the publishing company. Because these relationships were assumed to be both powerful and unique contributors to the experience, it was reasoned that an exploration of more than one case would allow for comparisons across different individuals.
Multiple cases were expected to reflect diverse publishing aims and literacy goals. That is to say, as much as each case is comprised of the characteristics of many individuals, each individual case has its own characteristics as well. An exploration of more than one case would allow for comparisons across different philosophies.

Multiple cases were expected to reveal influences of time or context. That is, each case was constructed as an ongoing event occurring at specific times and under specific conditions. An exploration of more than one case would allow for comparisons across different political, economic, and philosophical contexts.

The decision to examine more than one case was not a result, however, of concern for sample size. The choice of pursuing multiple cases was intended to add to the investigation's overall trustworthiness. Yin (1989, p. 53) suggests that multiple case studies be viewed with "a replication logic" and as "analogous to multiple experiments." In terms of this study, the experiences of two "case authors" compliment each other in ways which, when combined, present compelling images.

From practical considerations, the decision to examine more than one case was based, in part, in concern about the kinds and amounts of documents available in each case. Multiple cases were intended to allow for a more detailed description. However, because each case constituted a complex system in itself, the examination of more than two cases seemed beyond the resources and scope of the present investigation.

**Selection of Cases**

The criteria used to guide the selection of author-participants go quickly to the heart of the issue. With approximately 75 authors to choose from, it was critical that the selection criteria enable me to identify the particular type of informants most appropriate for this study. Journalistic accounts (Bowler, 1978) claim that publishers "cast about for a
writing committee that is well-balanced geographically (to cover as many central adoption or central listing states as possible) and that includes schoolteachers and university professors." However, I decided against geographic location as one of my selection criteria.

I did not share the opinion that educational publishers used geographic location as a basis for engaging literacy scholars. At the outset of this study, I followed selection criteria which I believe were more aligned with the criteria publishers use.

Pikulski (1991) suggests that author selection is guided by a set of specific criteria including professional prominence, practical experience in teaching, research background, creativity in the approach to reading instruction, expertise in a specific area of reading, and effectiveness as a professional speaker. These characteristics formed the start of my own list. Other criteria were added, based on the nature of this inquiry.

The criteria employed to select case study participants were as follows:

1. **Authors should have a long-standing relationship with their present publishers.** This seemed essential for several reasons. First, it was assumed that veteran authors would be knowledgeable about the publishing process and consequently, more likely to be able to manipulate the system. Second, it was assumed that veteran authors were more likely to be given wider authority over specific aspects of the program. Third, it was assumed that veteran authors would bring the perspective of experience with multiple editions, which would make it possible to view trends over time.

2. **Authors should have played an active role in the process of developing a recent basal reading program.** To understand how scholars and publishers collaborate, I wanted to select authors who exemplified the maximal role in this collaboration. And given the retrospective nature of the data sources, I felt restricted to programs published within the past five years.
3. Authors should be willing and available to participate in the study. This inquiry rests upon the level of candor and access authors felt able to extend. Authors needed not only to be outspoken individuals but also to agree to share their personal perspectives, impressions, and documents.

I also used the publication dates of the reform documents *A Nation At Risk* (1983) and *Becoming a Nation of Readers* (1985) as a general reference criterion. I assumed that reading programs published after these documents were more likely to be open to innovation. I then identified authors who had contributed to basal reading programs published after 1988.

Using these criteria still left a broad range of potential author-informants. Before I could proceed with the study, I had to develop a strategy for refining my selection criteria. This procedure is described next.

**Procedures**

Yin suggests that a fourth design component, linking the data to the propositions, may be accomplished through a procedure known as pattern-matching, or relating information from the case study to the study propositions. The following procedures were employed for the purpose of collecting and subsequently identifying and matching patterns to the theoretical propositions stated above.

**Data Collection**

The data collection procedures are divided into three phases — a preliminary search, a pilot study, and an extended study.
Preliminary Search

Prior to conducting a pilot study, I compiled a list of authors of basal reading programs, drawing names from seven basal reading programs having copyright dates from 1989-1993. These programs were:

1. *World of Reading* (Silver Burdett Ginn, 1989)
2. *Celebrate Reading* (Scott Foresman, 1993)
4. *Reading and Writing* (Open Court, 1992)

I then searched the database provided by the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) for entries under each basal author listed. I used the descriptive categories the database service assigns to specific entries as standard terms. These terms were then used to code the key ideas and interests of each author's cumulative work. As a general procedure, even if an author's work contained only one incidence in which a particular ERIC descriptor was listed, this descriptor was added to the author's composite description. Some descriptors were used more than once. The intention here was to begin to form an impression of the range of an author's interest in general rather than to provide an account of the depth of an author's involvement in any particular area.
Results of Author Characterization Strategy

A review of database descriptors and article abstracts confirmed that authors tend to focus their interests in specific areas and that these can be grouped into more comprehensive clusters. For example, authors can be characterized in terms of their scholarly work in one or more of the following literacy areas:

* Children's Literature
* Beginning Reading
* Vocabulary Development
* Reading Comprehension
* Thinking Skills
* Reading in the Content Area
* Assessment
* Teacher Preparation
* Second Language Acquisition

This categorization was based largely on an impressionistic reading of the ERIC descriptors. A simple tally method was used to list and note the incidences in which specific ERIC labels were given and which of these were repeated throughout the author's corpus. It is possible to develop an informative history of an individual's professional perspectives from detailed examination and analysis of his or her work.

For example, arranging the descriptors into cluster maps displays the author's beliefs, expertise, and values with respect to various aspects of literacy. Sample cluster maps describing the two case study authors are presented in Tables 2 and 3. Cluster headings summarize a variety of related entries. Examples of actual descriptors are listed in each cluster.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Name</th>
<th>Relevant Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING</strong></td>
<td>teacher effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>training programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reading instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teaching skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teacher response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>questioning techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT</strong></td>
<td>multiple-choice tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miscue analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>faculty evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reading achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reading tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>informal assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISABILITY</strong></td>
<td>visual perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reading ability/difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>word recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grouping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAMS &amp; POLICIES</strong></td>
<td>reading programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>remedial reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>compensatory education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>program effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>educational policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>program improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>special education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>READING STRATEGIES</strong></td>
<td>context clues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>study skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reading skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>time factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>whole language approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Cluster Map of Scholarly Expertise of Author #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>INSTRUCTION</th>
<th>READING COMPREHENSION</th>
<th>LEARNING THEORIES</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>EDUCATIONAL CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>language acquisition</td>
<td>reading instruction</td>
<td>reading comprehension</td>
<td>schemata</td>
<td>questioning techniques</td>
<td>educational change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second language learning</td>
<td>primary education</td>
<td>reading improvement</td>
<td>prior experience</td>
<td>informal reading inventories</td>
<td>systems analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linguistic performance</td>
<td>teaching methods</td>
<td>reading strategies</td>
<td>metacognition</td>
<td>reading diagnoses</td>
<td>trend analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psycholinguistics</td>
<td>group discussions</td>
<td>content area reading</td>
<td>mastery learning</td>
<td>student evaluation</td>
<td>politics of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole language approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>context clues</td>
<td>cognitive processes</td>
<td>test validity</td>
<td>curriculum development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>standardized tests</td>
<td>program improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


I decided to select two literacy scholars who had expressed activist positions in the areas of the nature of reading comprehension, reading instruction, and the assessment of students' literacy development. By "activist position" I mean to say authors who have in their professional or scholarly work expressed an interest in affecting some aspect of the status quo of classroom instruction. In other words, I was interested in looking at authors who were naturally inclined toward bringing innovation into the classroom via the procedures or philosophies they intended to imbed in the instructional materials they helped develop. My rationale for selecting these areas is largely a reflection of an interest in how literacy scholars bring innovation from research into innovation in classroom practice, in the spirit of reform similar to that called for by Anderson.

These areas — the nature of reading comprehension, reading instruction, and assessment — can be seen as representing important ways of describing the literacy curriculum. For innovations to be meaningful they would be expected to have an impact in these areas. In this sense, these areas are appropriate litmus tests of the potential for innovation.

Also these areas — the nature of reading comprehension, reading instruction, and the assessment of students' literacy development — were assumed to be pivotal issues. They represent some of the critical topics in current professional discussions. That is, literacy scholars who are motivated by the intention to bring innovation to the literacy curriculum might attempt to leverage those efforts through one of these areas.

Moreover, innovation in any one of these areas would be expected to have far-reaching effects on other aspects of the literacy program and on schooling in general. For example, issues in reading comprehension can be linked to vocabulary development (Smith, 1988; Beck & McKeown, 1987). Issues in instruction are closely connected to
literature selections (McGee, 1992). And assessment has been shown to be important for both students' and teachers' performance (Wixson, 1991; Lipson 1990).

Finally, the literacy scholars selected for this study were veteran authors who had active, senior roles in the development of previous programs. In total, the selection of these authors and the issues they advocated seemed to represent the most favorable conditions for innovative ideas to become accepted into the curricula.

**Pilot Study**

Two important procedural questions stood at the head of this inquiry. First, given both the retrospective nature of the study and the collaborative nature of team publishing there was some doubt whether authors could articulate specific innovative ideas they intended to contribute to the process. Second, even if they could articulate their prior experiences, there was additional doubt whether any author would be willing to make those experiences accessible to the public.

A pilot study was conducted to test the feasibility of the inquiry and to narrow the goals and refine the procedures of the study. I began with a "cold" telephone call to an individual who met the key criteria for participating as an author-informant. During the initial call, I introduced myself, briefly explained the purpose of the study and stated that I would forward additional information, confirmed that individual's interest in participating, and scheduled a one-hour interview. I then sent the participant a copy of an open-ended interview plan, which I intended to follow as the basis for the scheduled telephone conversation, and a set of cover instructions.
The interview schedule was developed from the general questions which framed this study. The overall aims were to bring to light the respondent's intentions and to get some sense, from the respondent's perspective, of how these intentions were played out during the process of developing a basal reading program.

An initial set of questions was developed and then reviewed by members of this dissertation committee. The interview questions were arranged around several topics. One aspect of the interview focussed on the process of developing a basal reading program. These questions were arranged by chronological order — (e.g., pre-development activities, development activities). Other questions were aimed at refining various aspects of the investigation itself — (e.g., data collection/analysis procedures, confidentiality, trustworthiness).

The initial interview schedule that was sent to the participant appears below.
I. Predevelopment: First, can you tell me how you came to enter into a collaborative relationship with this publisher?

Please comment on this question.

Can you recall an aim you wished to bring to this particular program?

Please comment on this question.

II. Development: Can you tell me something about the way that aim got played out over the course of the program's development? For example, how did you bring this idea to the team? What happened next, and so on?

Please comment on these questions.

III. Effects: If I were to look at the final version of this program, where would I be most likely to see the effects of this idea?

Please comment on this question.

In your opinion, how closely does the final version of this program reflect the aims you had at the outset of the developmental process?

Please comment on these questions.

In your opinion, what factors would explain the differences between your original aims and the final outcomes?

Please comment on these questions.

Can you think of other individuals — either people [at the publishing company] or other authors — who were instrumental in the area you had expressed interest?

Please comment on these questions.

IV. Data Collection: One thing I'm very interested in is documenting the sequence of decision making, the negotiation of ideas you are describing. Do you have any suggestions regarding how I might document the sequence of events you described?

Please comment on these questions.

Would you be able to walk me through these documents?

Please comment on these questions.

Would you be willing to allow me to photocopy these items?

Please comment on these questions.

V. Confidentiality: What are your thoughts about how I might report this information in terms of confidentiality and anonymity?

VI. Trustworthiness: Do you have any thoughts about how I might insure that my report and analysis is an accurate representation of your viewpoint?

Figure 1
Interview Questions
In a cover letter which I sent to accompany this schedule, I confirmed the information I had presented during the initial call, regarding the purpose of the study and the nature of the participant's expected involvement. The letter also confirmed the date and time of our scheduled interview appointment.

The cover letter also contained instructions regarding how the interviewee should approach the questions I was proposing. My instructions included the following requests:

1. Please comment on the appropriateness/meaningfulness of each question; and
2. Please be prepared to discuss your response to each question.

After the interview schedule had been mailed, I constructed a telephone script and experimented with role-playing the interview. These activities provided important opportunities for mental rehearsal. They also enabled me to look critically at the questions themselves and to make adjustments in wording.

Approximately one week later, I conducted a three-hour telephone interview with the author. With the author's permission, the interview was tape recorded and transcribed. Within another week, I contacted the executive editor (Reading) of the educational publishing company with whom the author had collaborated to produce a recent basal reading program. Again, I followed the "cold call" by mailing a detailed description of the pilot study, and a set of open-ended interview questions. By scheduled appointment, I conducted a telephone interview with the executive editor. The interview lasted less than one hour.

The results of those telephone interviews provided important information about the feasibility of the study. They also offered an initial insight into the different agenda of educational publishers and literacy scholars. The results of the pilot study are summarized as follows:
1. Pilot Issue #1: *Can authors and publishers articulate key ideas they attempted to bring to the process of developing a basal reading program?* It was possible for this author to articulate specific innovations or pervasive ideas s/he contributed. Author and editor agreed that in many cases, however, the collaborative nature of the process would make it difficult to attribute responsibility or "authorship" of an idea to a single individual. Both editor and author agreed the amount of contribution was likely to vary among individuals and different publishing companies.

2. Pilot Issue #2: *Do documents exist to support and extend the recollections of literacy scholars and publishers regarding their experiences as basal authors?* An enormous cocoon of documentation is apparently created surrounding the development of a basal reading program. However, actual access to this documentation is subject to several conditions. Neither authors nor publishers follow systematic procedures for routinely archiving these documents. Authors and editors often dispose of working documents. Document retrieval is thus based on conditions of good fortune.

3. Pilot Issue #3: *Are authors and publishers of basal reading programs willing to participate fully in this inquiry by making themselves and their documents accessible?* Response to this issue divided the author and editor in this pilot study noticeably. For example, the author was immediately prepared to make available all documents except those originating from the publisher or other members of the author's team. The author also offered to waive anonymity and volunteered to be identified by name. In contrast, the editor was skeptical that documentation was available and if it were, doubted it would be useful or of interest. The editor also expressed lack of support for the project:

> I'm hesitant for a couple of reasons. One is just the time involved. I just am not too interested in going back and digging through files for a study that quite frankly — I'm not sure what the benefits are to anybody.
The results from the pilot study were at the same time encouraging and forbidding. They suggested that authors might be willing to speak extensively about their experiences, that documentation would be fortuitous, and that educational publishers might be expected to approach the inquiry with less than enthusiastic participation. Although the publisher's response was not encouraging, the author's experiences were compelling.

The decision to develop the study further was made on the basis of the rich data source provided by the author. That is, the study was developed because the author in the pilot study was available as a participant and possessed a rich source of unique information. The decision was, in part, influenced by the publisher's permission to allow corporate documents to be used in the study. In other words, although the publisher expressed misgivings about the project and was reluctant to participate directly, he was not opposed to the use of materials intended to present the publishing company's intentions and actions in the decision-making process.

At this time, it was confirmed that the extended case study should involve the experiences of two authors. This decision was based on several considerations. As explained above, the decision to study more than one case was based on the aim of enriching the overall design of the investigation. On a practical note, the plan to study more than one case was based on the decision to include the author from the pilot study in the extended study. That is, the author's contributions during the formative period of this study helped refine the procedures and goals of this investigation. These needed to be tested with a second author.
Extended Case Study

The results of the pilot inquiry were heartening in terms of the author's ability and willingness to provide substantive documentation. The author from the pilot study was invited to participate in the extended study. The author had agreed to make available documents stored on computer diskette. This author also agreed to allow opportunities for follow-up interviews, and expressed a willingness to review working drafts of this study. The author accepted the invitation to participate and became designated Author #1 in the extended study.

Author #1 sent a diskette containing original documents. The author described these as a random selection of documents written during the development of a recent basal reading program. The diskette included only documents generated by the author.

After arranging these documents in chronological order, I then catalogued them. I identified subjects and intended recipients. After reading all the documents, I then assigned each one to a topical category. These categories emerged from a careful reading of the documents, from the interview tape recorded during the pilot portion of the study, and from the propositions which framed the study. A portion of the catalogue is shown below.
Table 4
Catalogue of Documents Sample Entries — Author #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOC #</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TO:</th>
<th>RE:</th>
<th>THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>5/18/91</td>
<td>Exec. VPs - MKTG &amp; EDIT</td>
<td>Children - at - risk</td>
<td>Advocates Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>7/7/91</td>
<td>Exec. VP - MKTG</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Market Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3/23/92</td>
<td>Exec. VP - EDIT &amp; Sr EDITOR</td>
<td>Supplement Product</td>
<td>Critiques and Clarifies Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>6/7/92</td>
<td>Exec. VP - EDIT, SR EDITOR, BOOK EDITOR</td>
<td>Supplement Product</td>
<td>Drafting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking for Author #2

While organizing and analyzing the documents I received from Author #1, I began the process of selecting a scholar to be Author #2. Following the selection criteria and procedures described above I attempted to contact a second scholar. After a brief series of phone calls and e-mail communiques, this scholar declined to participate in the study. This author felt that the part s/he played in the process of developing a reading program was confined to a specific component of the overall design. With expressions of general interest and support, the author suggested I contact a different author on the team, an author whom s/he felt had more general control and influence on the program's development.

The recommended author also met the selection criteria I had established. I contacted this scholar by telephone. After a series of conversations, this author, too, declined to participate in the study. Although expressing interest in the project, this author felt participation in the study would jeopardize working relationships s/he had with other members of the publishing team. This scholar agreed to discuss the project with another author on the team and with an executive editor for the publishing company. Both co-author and editor subsequently advised this author against participation.
Selecting from a different publishing company, I made a "cold call" to another scholar in which I explained the aim and procedure of this study. This scholar agreed to full and active participation. We immediately scheduled a series of telephone interviews.

As in the pilot study, I sent Author #2 a set of open-ended questions, modified after the pilot study, which I intended to use during subsequent interviews. The interview was completed over three sessions, each session ranging from approximately 30 to 60 minutes.

During the course of the interviews with Author #2 it became clear that no in-process documents would be available. Author #2 explained that these files had been destroyed after work on the program was completed. However, Author #2 was able to share a packet of documents which might be best described as philosophical frameworks and proposals. These were written several years in advance of the actual process of developing the publisher's most recent basal reading program. While they do not provide information regarding the process by which ideas are negotiated, these documents do point to the way ideas which originate in the research community become transferred into teacher and student texts.

Combining information from the interviews and from the documents the authors shared, and from my own experiences with the process of assembling instructional materials, I began to weave together a narrative, highlighting various aspects of each author's experience. These narratives were then submitted to the authors as a member check. The authors verified that the presentation accurately depicted their experiences.
Desperately Seeking Editors

The editors for the educational publishers of the reading programs under discussion were, ultimately, unavailable for direct participation in this study. Repeated efforts to contact the executive vice president in charge of reading included phone calls, faxes, postal and express deliveries. The publisher was simply unavailable for comment. After finally making contact, the publisher not only declined personal involvement in the study, he also discouraged contact with other members of the staff to solicit their participation. The publisher expressed concern over the amount of time participation in the study would entail, as well as concern over anonymity, and repeated his previous contention that the study did not merit attention.

Lacking full participation from publisher #1, the plan to incorporate publisher #2 was re-evaluated. This uneven representation of authors and publishers placed important limitations on this study’s aim to provide multiple perspectives on the process. These limitations are discussed more fully in Chapter V of this report.

The publisher’s voice did, however, penetrate this discussion in several ways. First, Author #1 was able to provide a second set of documents — in-coming items received from others involved in the development of the reading program. These were original memos, minutes of meetings, prototypes, and letters generated by the executive vice presidents and editors associated with the development of this program. With the publisher’s permission, these have been excerpted and incorporated into this study.
Data Analysis

The fifth component of the case study design, criteria for interpreting a study's findings, requires the researcher to establish guidelines for the appropriateness of assigning data to one set of theoretical propositions over another. Each author's narrative was subjected to analysis. The aim of this analysis was to elaborate on the following:

* the relationship between author's background experience and the area of responsibility he or she assumes;
* the relationship between author's background experience and innovative contributions;
* the relationship between innovative contributions and related ideas contained in previous editions;
* the roles an author plays during the process of developing a basal reading program;
* how ideas are negotiated during the process of developing a basal reading program; and, relatedly
* who controls the negotiations that take place during the process of developing a basal reading program.

Preliminary coding schemes were submitted to peer testing and debriefing. This took place during a series of doctoral seminars. Peers were given copies of sample documents and a preliminary coding scheme devised by this investigator. Peers were asked to apply the coding scheme and to comment on its utility. Additional coding schemes emerged from these trials and discussions. These schemes generally analyzed the data in terms of the author's roles and apparent motivations. Coding schemes were critiqued and subsequently amended as the study progressed.
Data for individual authors and innovations were then analyzed in three phases. These phases are summarized as follows:

1. First, data were sorted according to general "belief" categories (e.g., beliefs about teachers, beliefs about students, beliefs about literacy instruction, etc.). Items within these were subsequently coded in terms of factors contributing to these beliefs (author's prior experience), and according to the implications of these beliefs for the development of the specific reading program.

2. Data were reviewed a second time, during which codes were assigned to describe the various roles literacy scholars play in their collaboration with educational publishers. These roles were coded to reflect the nature of the task being performed, who originated the task, and the approximate point in the process where the tasks occurred. Tasks directly related to the author's beliefs were given special note.

3. Case samples were then analyzed to describe the effects of process on outcomes. Specific innovations were coded according to their relationship to pre-existing iterations in previous editions and traced through the process of developing a new program. Comparisons were made between the author's original intentions and the final disposition of the issue. Particular attention was given to identifying critical events (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p.122) which moved the process forward into a new phase or direction.

Further analysis was made by comparing relevant experiences across the two authors and their respective programs.
Validity/Trustworthiness

Patton (1990) states that the credibility of qualitative inquiry depends on "rigorous methods", "the credibility of the researcher", and the "paradigm assumptions which undergird" the study.

In terms of the present investigation, methodological rigor was maintained in several ways. First, the integrity of the findings is grounded in the data from which those findings emerged. In the process of analysis, a variety of possible interpretations were considered. Rival or negative possibilities were entertained and matched against available data.

Validity was further supported by these methods: triangulation of multiple data sources, member checking, and peer debriefing. The retrospective reconstructions of authors' intended and actual contributions were compared to a chain of evidence contained in the documents that predated and/or accompanied the developmental process.

Researcher's credibility was established in several ways. First, an effort was made to allow the participants' voices to speak for themselves, thus minimizing the influence of the researcher's bias. The data sources were, typically, primary documents — first-hand reports written by the participants or their associates. Other data were collected during interviews. In this case, authors' voices, not the researcher's, were used to describe events and explain intentions. Finally, the stature and credibility of the authors themselves provide a level of trustworthiness to the collection and analysis of the data.

To minimize the effect of any personal bias, I submitted my drafts and analyses to each participant (authors and publishers) for their review. I was also able to check assumptions and interpretations through frequent discussions with colleagues throughout the period of data collection and analysis. These discussions helped to point out alternative interpretations, as well as to suggest ways of identifying bias, and of generally refining the
study. Intellectual rigor was maintained by returning to the data repeatedly throughout the collection, coding and sorting, and analysis phases of this study. Lengthy engagement with this data not only insured familiarity, it also allowed an opportunity for checking analyses and interpretations against any shifts in the researcher's perspective across the time of this study.

In the end, the credibility of the findings reported here conform to the fundamental assumptions of naturalistic inquiry. This paradigm assumes multiple realities, encourages an adversarial nature in which all sides are presented fairly, and acknowledges the influence of the researcher in the collection and interpretation of experience (Guba, 1981 in Patton, 1990). The implications of these assumptions have been attended to in the design and the operating procedures of this study.

**Reliability**

The development of operational techniques detailed in a case study protocol are included in this presentation. This protocol is intended to make clear the procedures employed in the conduct of this case study and to minimize the possibility of error and bias. Included are telephone logs, inventory of data sources, data collection timeline, interview questions, memos, and analytic procedures.

**Generalizability**

As Yin points out, case studies are best thought of as analytical generalization (generalization to theories). The case study data and analysis in this study are presented as individual experiences. Undeniably, conditions which surround the process of developing basal reading programs are certain to vary across situations and within author/publisher teams. Outside of the selection criteria used to identify informants, this naturalistic study
made no effort to control for differences. Generalization to other authors and other publishers and programs seems unreasonable.

Cronbach (in Patton, 1990) suggests that the term "extrapolation" might be better suited as a research objective. Patton explains:

...an extrapolation clearly connotes that one has gone beyond the narrow confines of the data to think about other applications of the findings. Extrapolations are modest speculations on the likely applicability of findings to other situations under similar, but not identical, conditions. (p.487)

In this sense, it is suggested that the patterns which emerge from these analyses might well be applied to the development of other programs where activist notions are at least entertained. Such extrapolations, however, would need to be carefully considered in terms of publishers' histories, aims, and the nature of their relationships with authors.

Summary

The purpose of this research was to describe the relationship between an author's beliefs and the contributions he or she brings to the process of developing a basal reading program. A second aim was to describe how these ideas are negotiated during that process.

The data was collected from retrospective interviews and documents generated prior to, during, and after the process of collaborating on two recently published programs. These data were described in rich narrative, analyzed by individual cases, and summarized in various matrices.

In Chapter IV, the results of data analysis are presented. Chapter V includes a summary of the findings, a discussion of the findings, implications of the study, and ongoing concerns.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents an explanation of the categories and the coding schemes employed in the analysis of data pertaining to authors' experiences in the process of the development of basal reading programs, a summary of the analyses of individual case data, and a discussion of cross-case comparisons.

Data were collected from two literacy scholars each of whom had participated in the development of separate basal reading programs. Data were collected retrospectively through extended, reflective telephone interviews and through primary source documents, that is, first-hand records generated during the process of constructing recently published programs.

Information from interviews and document analyses was interwoven to create individual narratives. These narratives described each author's background experiences, beliefs, and intentions, as well as reflections on how intentions fared during the process of text development. In addition, these narratives were used to illustrate the roles literacy scholars played during this process. The authors' experiences were presented as reflections of the negotiating process of constructing a reading program and of the forces of culture, economy, literacy, and key individuals that control the negotiation of ideas.

Data were analyzed in three ways. First, the data were examined to identify dominant beliefs or themes authors expressed prior to and during the process of constructing a recent basal reading program. Second, data were analyzed to identify the
various roles literacy scholars played during this process. A third analysis investigated the relationship among authors' intentions, the development processes, and actual outcomes. Patterns emerging from case data were compared across cases.

This general organizational framework for analyzing an author's experience is depicted in Figure 2: Process and Relationship in Developing a Basal Reading Program. The figure represents the way the innovative contributions an author made were linked to beliefs about instruction, teachers, students, and educational publishing. These beliefs were, in turn, grounded in the author's research and personal experience.

As innovative contributions entered the dialogue that shaped the development of the new reading curriculum, the author took on various roles to navigate these ideas through the influences of traditional culture, economy, literacy. These factors determined whether innovations were incorporated into the program's design. For ideas accepted into the program design, these factors determined the components or structures into which they would be incorporated.
Figure 2
Process and Relationship in Developing a Basal Reader
Corpus of Data

Data were collected from several sources: two authors and one publisher. These sources yielded the following corpus of data.

* Approximately eight hours of tape-recorded author interviews
* Approximately sixty author-generated documents addressed to specific publishing executives, senior editors, and project editors. These documents ranged in length from one to twenty-two pages (typed, single-spaced).
* Approximately one hour of tape-recorded interview with publishing vice president
* Approximately fifty documents (letters, memoranda, prototypes) generated by publishing company executives, senior editors, project editors, and outside developers. These documents range in length from one to twenty-three pages in a variety of type styles and formats.
* Pertinent published basal products (teacher editions, pupil editions, promotional literature, catalogues) were also available for analysis.
* One letter of personal correspondence received from author

Data received via interview refers to reflective comments which were made after the participant had completed involvement in the development of a particular basal reading series. Data received via document analysis were based on comments that were generated prior to and during the development of two specific basal reading programs.

The nature of the data collection procedures employed in this inquiry operated under two important conditions, both of which needed to be kept in mind as the data were analyzed. One condition may be termed "controlling the data." That is, because the data was not collected through the researcher's firsthand observations, participants controlled the quantity and range of data available for analysis. A second issue refers to "filtering the data." That is, if the participants were responsible for (i.e., controlled) the data collection process, there existed the possibility that the individuals were, in a sense, filtering the data
by selecting documents which represented their own image of the events which transpired or which illustrated their actions and intentions in some particular way.

A more complete discussion of these issues is presented in Chapter V of this report (see limitations). However, without meaning to imply that participants manipulated the data available for scrutiny, it would appear reasonable to regard the data as a sampling of the sorts of communications and exchanges which may have occurred across time and in no way constitute the entirety of such communication. Furthermore, it seems wholly consistent with the tenets of qualitative inquiry to look at the way individuals construct their own meanings regarding their experiences. In this sense, the data upon which this inquiry was based may be regarded as the participants' best attempts to do just that. Again, the implications of these issues are discussed in Chapter V of this report, as are the measures taken to insure the trustworthiness of the data. Finally, and relatedly, it should be pointed out that while all of the data contributed to the formation of categories and coding schemes described in this section, the researcher has added a second "filtering" stage by determining which documents (and which portions of those documents) were ultimately reproduced in this report. The decisions regarding which documents to reproduce were guided by the general aim of this investigation to illustrate how authors and publishers negotiate critical points of collaboration and resistance.

**Analysis One: Author's Critical Beliefs**

This investigation explored the connection between an author's beliefs and innovative contributions. Interview data and documents were read and sorted by the technique of constant comparison (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) according to primary themes. In other words, the data were scrutinized to determine the main ideas they purportedly presented. Typically, this process was grounded in the participants' own rhetorical devices
or as responses to specific questions or as specified by document titles or memoranda headings. For example, an author may create a position paper titled "New Directions for Instruction", or a memorandum may be generated describing the needs of a particular group of students or teachers. After reworking and refining codes, four main themes were selected for focus. These were beliefs about 1) teachers, 2) students, 3) literacy instruction, and 4) educational publishing companies. Representative "sub"-themes included the following:

* beliefs about teachers — teacher competence, teacher preparation, and individual interests and needs
* beliefs about students — reading ability, literacy experiences, individual interests and needs
* beliefs about literacy instruction — teacher roles, literacy skills and strategies, methods of instruction and assessment
* beliefs about educational publishing companies — political and pedagogical motivations, market constraints, influence on instruction

It should be noted that a coding category was assigned even if the author made only one reference to such a belief. Again, the aim of the coding scheme was to represent the range of key topics rather than to characterize particular levels of depth or intensity regarding such beliefs.

Each theme was combined with a descriptive or relational phrase. For example, phrases might describe attributes (that is, the author's attributions) of teachers, students, instruction, and educational publishing. An author might attribute to instruction the condition of "requiring maintenance" or that opportunities for applying reading skills are "pervasive" or "occur naturally."

Finally, themes were related to the specific aspect(s) of the basal reading program which the author intended to operationalize the belief.
Summary of Authors' Critical Beliefs

Author #1

An interpretation of Author #1's critical beliefs about instruction, teachers, students, and educational publishing is summarized below. These interpretations are elaborated in the following excerpts from interviews and documents.

Table 5
Author #1: Key Beliefs About Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Lack expertise in reading and language arts</td>
<td>Instruction and modelling in TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials make them better at what they're supposed to be doing</td>
<td>Explicit background instructions in TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drive the publishing industry</td>
<td>Teacher as audience, innovation bounded by tradition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author #1 expressed concern about teachers who lack expertise or interest in literacy instruction and developed the program with these teachers as the intended consumers of the instructional materials. The author implied that for such teachers, the value of basal reading programs is to help them better perform "what they are supposed to be doing — helping children learn to read." This author believes that basal reading programs direct teachers and their students toward more meaningful instruction, while at the same time acknowledging that teachers' needs, values, and buying habits direct the nature of the basal program.
So it has forced me to sort of move out of the ivory tower and begin to think about the real world of teachers and the problems of 28 kids in a classroom and not much background or expertise in the reading/language arts process. Often folks who wouldn't be considered very literary at least themselves who don't read and write much personally, how do you create instructional materials that makes that person better at what they're supposed to be doing?"

The author's comment points to two critical perceptions of teachers. First, the author emphasizes that the teacher is at the center of effective instruction. Second, that an important task of the basal reading program is to help teachers more effective. This aim might have been intended to help "good" teachers become "better" teachers by providing a support system to direct them through new models of instruction. It seems more likely, however, that Author #1 viewed the basal reading program as a form of compensatory training for teachers — teachers "who don't have much expertise."

For example, excerpts such as the following illustrated Author #1's belief that teachers lacked sufficient expertise to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of a range of students while integrating instruction among the whole group of diverse readers.

To: [Editor]
From: XXXXXXXXXX
Re: [Program] questions
15 February 1992

The basic question for this series is not how to group kids but how to reorganize instruction so all kids can be successful in the common curriculum. Teachers need to think about how to "group" their services so all children have access to sufficient amounts of instruction to learn to read on schedule. We need to make clear that "ability groups" and "whole class" instruction are not the only options. We can have a single curriculum and distribute instructional effort differently across different students. Some students simply need to be taught more and better. They don't need a different curriculum....
Students. Author #1's beliefs about students are summarized in Table 6. As noted above, Author #1's research background focused on students often labelled "disabled" or "disadvantaged" readers. The theme of "unlucky kids," or students who did not have school-like literary early childhood experiences, is found throughout this author's comments and documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>All can keep a similar pace of learning</td>
<td>Unified program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some require special instruction</td>
<td>Differentiated instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on pronouncing, not understanding</td>
<td>Emphasis on comprehension/ cognitive skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author expressed the belief that individual differences in reading ability are often attributable to the variation in the amount and kind of literacy experiences children receive before they ever enter school.

Some kids need to be taught, particularly the kids that I spend a lot of my time worrying about.... a lot of those kids seem to be sort of lost in a fog because of the way we taught them.

Author #1 believes "unlucky kids" should receive more instruction and more opportunities for reading to help them catch up with students who had more school-like literacy experiences in early childhood. This belief provided the perspective and mission of the innovations s/he intended to contribute to the program.
The following memo, written by Author #1 and directed to the entire editorial/author team at the conceptualization stage of the publishing company's 1993 edition, illustrates these beliefs about "unlucky kids" and about the appropriate goals of an instructional program.

To: [editors and authors]
From: XXXXXXXXXX
Date: 4/10/90
re: children who find learning to read difficult

I've been thinking about the issue of poor readers and the new [publisher's series]. Let me briefly set the issues I see and then suggest some ideas we can pursue.

First, children find learning to read difficult for one, or more, of the following reasons:

1. They begin school behind their peers in terms of experiences relevant to the demands of the curriculum we design, and then given the same instruction as everyone else they confront failure.

2. They present a lesser proclivity for reading and other language processes, so with the same instruction as everyone else they fall behind steadily.

3. They receive substantially less or lower quality instruction (or slower paced) than most everyone else and lower achievement follows.

Historically, educators have proposed a 'slow-it-down-and-make-it-more-concrete' curriculum with resultant differential goals (and hence outcomes) for such children. We need to decide how we might actually create a curriculum that does not require different goals for children that vary on the three features noted above.

Author #1 becomes an advocate for a specific population of students — "unlucky kids." In comparison, Author #1 did not comment on the relationship between basal reading programs and "lucky kids," or students who had been engaged in school-like literacy activities throughout early childhood. Instead, the author expresses beliefs that the targets of the basal reading program are both teachers and students who lack expertise.
Instruction. The author expresses several critical beliefs regarding literacy instruction. These beliefs are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7
Author #1: Beliefs About Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Shifted from skills-based to integrated LA framework</td>
<td>Strategies in context, literacy connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction by definition, &quot;practice makes perfect&quot; model</td>
<td>Explicit instruction, construction of meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers &quot;explicit instructions&quot;</td>
<td>Explicit instruction in TE and SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Point out aspects of literacy</td>
<td>Identify specific aspects / provide instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can occur naturally</td>
<td>Open-ended, holistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should be based on material, not scope / sequence plan</td>
<td>Authentic instruction / assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literature drives instruction</td>
<td>Emphasis on literary issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State agencies constrain instructional design</td>
<td>Assessment and accountability features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should be scaffolded</td>
<td>TE provides well - defined teacher roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author #1's comments reflected support for an integrated language arts approach to literacy instruction. Author #1 emphasized the belief that previous editions of most basal had been constrained by scope and sequence schemes and by state and local agencies aimed at maximizing skills coverage. S/He favored an instructional approach which was determined by a body of high-quality literature.

One main theme which emerged from Author #1's comments about instruction. This was the commitment to what s/he termed "explicit teaching." Explicit teaching, the author explained, contrasted with what s/he described as a practice-makes-perfect model of instruction. In keeping with the author's dual concerns for both students and teachers, s/he
is careful that teacher guides offer teachers explicit information through modelling and directed think-alouds.

The following memo illustrates Author #1's beliefs about instruction. In this outline of an instructional plan, the author advocates what teachers ought to teach and the procedures they ought to use. The themes of "unlucky kids" and "inexpert teaching" can be seen as having shaped this outline.

To: [Editors & Authors]
From: XXXXXXXXXXX
Date: 18 May 1991
re: [New Series and children we place at risk; Supplemental Program]

As I mentioned last week I am worried about [the new series] and the 'unlucky' kid.... The more I've thought, the more worried I've become...so let me make a few broad arguments about where to focus attention right now.

We need to offer a K program tightly linked to grade 1 entry demands of our program. A curriculum that accelerates the learning of children who will arrive at school with few home literacy lessons. We need an immersion curriculum, not a few big books. The K program also needs to be virtually flawless in developing phonemic awareness and do this through listening, language play, and invented writing. We have mountains of evidence that kids who do not develop PA [phonemic awareness] do not learn to read. There is no debate on that - the debate has been on how to foster it and there are enough good ideas that that should not pose a problem either.

Basically, our K curriculum needs to develop concepts about print, books, and story language and patterns. It needs to develop the sense of an alphabetic writing system and the phonemic awareness and segmentation skills to acquire efficient decoding strategies. It needs to include story playing, story boards, flannel boards, enactments, retelling, and repeated experiences with a single story. In other words, we need to cover the ground from print detail to response. ...I worry whether our freelancers can write TE lessons for story playing or readers theater. We cannot just suggest a story play. Teachers are not yet familiar enough with these activities to pull them off without substantial support.

We need to ensure that our spelling plan supports the phonemic awareness and decoding skills development plan, beginning in K. We need to use spelling time to add pattern words to the repertoire.
Grades 2-3 share some similarity with K-1. We will still need lots of books kids can read but because their reading has developed we can provide fewer but longer books here. Writing, spelling, and decoding still need attention, especially compounds, 2-3 syllable words and so on. From here on we will also have to be concerned with the problem that poor readers have getting into stories - taking a stance, getting involved ... poor readers are far more likely to be able to recount story events than take a stance or identify a voice... Our TE will have to have clear supportive lessons on use of activities like those in the story playing articles I sent this winter.

...we also need a strong Informational text instructional plan for all kids, but especially for at risk kids. I've suggested narrative and informational text distribution guidelines previously, with a 50-50 balance achieved about grade 5. I will note that we will be lucky if we have 25% in any grade level. Given the problems kids have on the Michigan and Illinois informational reading test component (about half as many achieve the minimum standard as compared to narrative) and on the NAEP informational reading items, we need to immediately move to strengthen this element of our PE... While I understand the marketing argument that teachers are currently looking more for renowned children's literature, they also expect informational texts and will even more so shortly.

The author's contribution to the instructional design is seen here to operate on two levels — general and specific. That is, the author provides broad philosophical commentary concerning "immersion" and "phonemic awareness." S/He also includes specific instructional aims (e.g., "segmentation" and "decoding"). The author also enters into discussions of the specific composition of the student's anthology (fiction and informational texts), and specific teaching strategies (e.g., story playing, story boards, flannel boards, enactments, retelling).

Educational Publishers. Author #1's beliefs about educational publishers are summarized in Table 8. These beliefs focus on the mission of educational publishing and the way educational publishers carry out their mission.
Table 8
Author #1: Beliefs About Educational Publishing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Publishing</td>
<td>Development is vulnerable to disruption</td>
<td>Time works against consistent implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior staff may have conflicting visions</td>
<td>Final reading program will reflect best compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authors may win conflicts with publishing executives</td>
<td>Authors may take active roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author teams are compatible, philosophically</td>
<td>Final reading program will reflect uniform broad view of literacy and instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This author believed that one function of the educational publisher was to provide a properly organized basal reading program to compensate "unlucky kids" and their teachers or enable them to meet up with their more successful peers. In contrast, the author did not express interest in the relationship between educational publishing and successful students and teachers. Author #1 believed the publisher engages a team of authors whose individual members are, for the most part, philosophically compatible. Differences among authors were expected to be minimal, and compromise solutions were expected to be tolerable. Believing that the team was composed of like-minded members — within broad boundaries — also helped to identify and define the boundaries of reasonable innovation. For example, the author might suspect that similar notions of direct instruction would be shared among team members. Reasonable innovation in instructional formats might be expected to be limited to variations within this boundary.
The author also noted educational publishing is sensitive to corporate shifts in management and finance. Changes in corporate ownership, for example, were believed to cause disruption, delay, and redirection of the development of a basal reading program.

The author expressed the belief that educational publishers controlled the decision-making process during the development of the basal program. Acknowledging that innovations required the publisher's approval, Author #1 expressed the belief that despite this power of final decision, authors can successfully negotiate innovative ideas into the program. The author believed that publishers began the process of developing a basal reading program with only broad intentions and looked to the contributions of authors and editors to develop specific goals and formats.

In these beliefs about teachers, students, instruction, and educational publishing certain themes can be seen accompanying Author #1's participation in the dialogue out of which a reading program will emerge. These themes: explicit instruction, differentiated instruction, and support of poor readers run through the author's experience regardless if s/he is proposing innovations or responding to the contributions of others.

**Author #2**

A set of Author #2's key beliefs about teachers, students, instruction, and educational publishing are summarized in Tables 9-11. These ideas are further elaborated in the following excerpts from interviews with the author and documents written by the author prior to the development of a recent basal reading program.

**Teachers.** Author #2 expressed key beliefs about teachers and their role in instruction. These beliefs are summarized in Table 9.
Table 9
Author #2: Key Beliefs About Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Must assume active role in leading students in skill learning</td>
<td>Teacher - directed format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ought to be didactic: tell, guide through examples, provide correction and feedback</td>
<td>Scripting, modelling, sample responses, background content info for teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guide exploration and discovery</td>
<td>TE to provide opportunities for building background and instructional devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use vocabulary instruction to help students develop appropriate and critical schemata to understand a selection</td>
<td>TE to focus on word meanings rather than word recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrange conditions which facilitate practice and learning</td>
<td>TE provides open-ended, thoughtful questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author #2 expressed the belief that teachers must play an active role in helping students develop reading skills. The teacher's responsibilities include providing information, guiding through examples, and providing correction and feedback. This idea about teachers' roles can be seen as contributing to the design of a basal reading series. As the author proposed in a framework for teaching reading comprehension (1978):

From time to time teacher's guides should suggest direct instructional guidelines for introducing, discussing, and explaining particular skills. The lesson plans might look more like the lesson plans for teaching decoding skills than the present types of plans, which typically do little more than direct a teacher to distribute a ditto sheet or workbook page.
Author #2 advocated that teachers take a direct and explanatory approach to literacy instruction. The framework continues with the examples of the ways a teacher should direct instruction.

Author #2 expected the activities and formats of the basal reading program to support teachers in instruction, and that these activities and formats might also be used to instruct teachers. The author described how a basal reading program might model the author's notion of proper teacher behavior.

General and specific guidelines should be offered to help teachers guide a discussion of a skill after students have completed the independent seatwork portion of a skill lesson. Such guidelines would need to address issues like how to provide useful feedback to students, how to probe for reasons behind seemingly deviant responses, how to develop a set for flexibility in evaluating responses, and the like. (1978)

One theme which characterized Author #2's comments and experiences was the importance of schema theories of reading comprehension, and in particular, the notion that comprehension is related to prior experience. For example, Author #2 expressed a strong belief that one role teachers had was to help students develop appropriate schemata for making meaning from what they read. In this excerpt from a "comprehension rationale" (1979), the author describes dual purposes teachers ought to concern themselves with.

Not all activities within the conduct of teaching a specific selection are designed to increase competence in various skills; some are designed to develop schemata. Clearly, introducing new vocabulary, building background, and setting purposes for reading help to build and/or focus upon those schemata that will be essential for understanding a story, an article, or a poem. And the questions that are posed before, during, or after reading — while they may provide the opportunity to apply a previously taught skill — also allow a teacher to sharpen or expand upon schemata that are presented in a selection.
**Students.** Author #2 expressed key beliefs about teachers and their role in instruction. These beliefs are summarized in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Learn comprehension skills through direct instruction and practice</td>
<td>TE units organized to introduce, maintain, and review skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students' ability to understand text is a function of concept familiarity not inherent skill difficulty</td>
<td>TE provides activities for building background knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted above, Author #2's beliefs about students focused on ways readers' prior experiences influence their ability to comprehend what they read. Author #2 commented that a student's ability to understand a selection may turn on the degree of familiarity with the selection content. Thus, while teachers stand at the center of instruction, students control the construction of meaning (based on their prior experiences). Author #2's perspective that varying world experiences explain differences in students' ability to understand reading contrasts with Author #1, who believed limited school-like literacy events during early childhood accounted for reading frustration and failure.

The author's beliefs about students have important implications for the reading program design. It might have been expected, for example, that the author's focus would have been to develop a reading program which aimed to help students build background and develop appropriate metacognitive strategies.
The author also expressed the belief that students require frequent opportunities for relearning and practicing comprehension skills. The position on repeated direct instruction and guided and independent practice can be seen as consonant with (or contributing to) the broad scope and sequence plan. The author's emphasis on developing comprehension skills suggests that materials contain frequent and patterned exercises to introduce, maintain, and review skills.

**Instruction.** The author expressed several key beliefs regarding approaches to literacy instruction. These beliefs and their implications are summarized below.

Table 11
**Author #2: Beliefs About Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Should be direct — skills ought not to be left to chance</td>
<td>TE &amp; PE specific skills lessons and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflects idea that strategies and skills change across levels</td>
<td>Spiral curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involves both &quot;necessary&quot; and &quot;desirable&quot; skills</td>
<td>Introduce and assess skills in different degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relies on massed practice in workbook and worksheets</td>
<td>TE lessons relate to practice activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses examples highly similar to those used in practice</td>
<td>Emphasis on discernable forms and patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requires maintenance</td>
<td>Spiral curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finds application in all written discourse</td>
<td>Relate instruction to PE anthology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has two outcomes: <strong>mastery</strong>, (e.g., phonics) and <strong>growth</strong> (comprehension)</td>
<td>Apply different assessment schemes to phonics and comprehension instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ought to occur prior to and during reading</td>
<td>Units are front-loaded, post reading activities for extension and application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The author's beliefs about instruction appear to have had pervasive implications for the design of the basal reading program. The author's contention that skills transfer is the hallmark of "solid" or "quality" instruction has already been discussed. Quality instruction is characterized by opportunities for identification, introduction, practice, assessment, and the maintenance of a set of specific skills.

Also as noted above, the author recommended fewer labels to describe the various skills in the instructional program and a more elaborate and complex exploration of each skill across the grades.

The author's beliefs about the increasingly complex nature of comprehension skills across the grade levels find familiar ground in the spiralled scope and sequence which outlines the program. However, Author #2 questioned the traditional organization of instruction according to a scope and sequence of skills, as evidenced in the following excerpt taken from a position paper (1978):

There is no rational basis for establishing what skills or activities ought to be prerequisite to others. Our intuition may tell us that finding details is prerequisite to (or at least easier than) finding the main idea. And we might even require mastery of the one skill before introduction of the other. But if we do, we will make a serious error in our judgment of children's mental capacities, for there will be some passages for which even novice readers will be able to determine a main idea while there will be others for which the same children will have difficulty in locating details. Concept familiarity — not inherent skill difficulty — is the over-riding factor.

Author #2 reflected on the practice of labeling skills and arranging them on a skills instruction chart. The author considered the concern over the identification of skills as a marketing concern rather than having any basis in literacy research. For example, Author #2 described the impact of assigning skills to specific strands.
The strand notion is a double-edged sword. If you have a strand, people tend to think of it as something you do at a particular point in time in a lesson. I think that's one of the dilemmas, that "Now it's time to focus on comprehension" or "Now it's time to focus on word recognition" or "Now it's time to focus on response to literature." As opposed to taking a point of view that you can look at a reading lesson from all these different perspectives.

What you want, what you hope happens is that, in the course of reading selections, kids get a chance to engage in activities that if someone were looking at them from outside would say, "Ah ha, there's a comprehension thing" or "Ah ha, there is a response thing" and "Ah ha, there's a word identification thing."

You really prefer that they all happen because you are focusing on a single goal and that is to construct a meaning for a text that you're engaged with. And in the process of constructing that meaning, you had to do all these things to sort of make sense of the text....

Author #2 expressed the belief that basal reading programs must present (or be made to appear to present) teachers and students with a model of reading comprehension fragmented into specific skills, at the same time the program needs to reinforce the notion of literacy and comprehension as a holistic endeavor.

So then you're stuck with this compromise. I'll label these things and I'll put them down here and what I'll do is somewhere I'll say that things aren't as simple and neatly packaged as we say they are. These really don't always happen in this nice predictable, compartmentalized way.

Then what happens is you take your lumps for implying that you have a time for comprehension and a time for response and a time for all this. But then your response back is to say at least I'm sending out a model of what I think the range of good activities ought to be for any particular engagement with print.

Above all, Author #2's comments about instruction pointed out the tension between open-ended approaches to skill development and a basal reading program which directs instruction. For example, the author expressed the belief that direct instruction and practice exercises were fundamental to becoming proficient. Or as
the author wrote (1979), "Skill learning cannot be left in the hands of students and workbook pages."

**Educational Publishers.** The author's comments and observations reflected important beliefs about educational publishers and their role in facilitating instruction. These beliefs are summarized in Table 12.

**Table 12**
**Author #2: Beliefs About Educational Publishing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Publishing</td>
<td>Ought to provide scope without sequence instruction</td>
<td>Differentiate levels of difficulty/ minimize number of skills introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodate dominant themes and interests</td>
<td>Reflect popular approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide guidelines for feedback, probing responses, flexibly evaluating responses</td>
<td>Clearly define appropriate teacher and student behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List different names for same skill: relating general ideas to specific ideas</td>
<td>Reduce number of skills introduced use &quot;relating general ideas to specific ideas&quot; as program theme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author #2 also shared certain beliefs about publishers and the way they collaborate with authors. Author #2 expressed the belief that educational publishers generally seek to reflect the current themes and interests dominating the marketplace. In other words, publishers are careful to maintain links to traditional literacy instruction in their programs. As the author explained,
I've always thought it was silly to have all the different categories and subcategories for comprehension we do. But one of the reasons that we have them is that you want to be sure that people in different places see what a colleague of mine refers to as "old friends" when they look in the teacher's edition...

Author #2 also believed that labels identifying familiar skills (or "old friends") play a powerful role in reassuring teachers about a new reading program. In other words, teachers' expectations about basal reading programs can be seen as helping to define the boundaries of innovation. Innovations might add to the canon, but at least according to this author's perspective they must be careful not displace familiar skills or "old friends" (e.g., finding the main idea). The use of labelling, Author #2 expressed, can lead to situations in which terms might be "conceptually incoherent", yet politically or economically relevant.

This author believed that innovative ideas must combine persuasive, solid market research with support from literacy research and publication if they are to find a place in the basal reading program. The author offered an example of the effect of market research combined with scholarly research — the way thinking skills entered the reading program:

I think we worked real hard to incorporate what we saw emerging in the thinking skills research. That's an interesting one because that represents both an appeal to an emerging research tradition as well as something that was "hot" from a market perspective. If you look back to '89 you realize that was really when the thinking skills movement was at it's apex. So that was one where the marketplace of basal readers both meshed.

The author's belief that the marketplace controls the development of the reading program is again reflected in observations about the need for innovation to forge an alliance between fiscal and pedagogical economy.

You see any time you can get the marketing arguments aligned with your conceptual arguments you're really in a great position to change things.
The author also believes that individuals have the power to introduce innovation. Even without alliances between marketing and editorial groups, the author believed that "political capital" can be used to leverage new approaches into a program. The author explains the use of "political capital" with the example of an aim to introduce an alternative assessment package into a recent reading program.

It's like any negotiation. If you have political capital in one arena you use it in other areas. I mean they could have said "no" on assessment but then I could come back and said "You want me for comprehension you've got to take assessment too. That's what I mean by political capital. They couldn't do without me on comprehension. They could have done it without me on assessment, so I could use my strategic advantage in the comprehension area to drag assessment along.

Author #2 expressed the belief that publishers are more willing to enter innovative instructional terrain if they are reasonably certain to maintain existing territory. For this reason, innovation was believed to be more easily-accommodated into the program when positioned as an alternative, an option, or an extension and not as a replacement of some part of the publishing company's existing program. For example, the author described the rationale of publishing a program with two assessment plans:

They knew they had the other (criterion test) in the bag and they could pull it out... They would do whatever good sales people did — they would haul it out [the open-ended assessment package] where they think it will sell and where they don't think it will sell they sell the other stuff.

Author #2 considered the process of developing a basal reading program a negotiation between authors and editors, each group lobbying from its own vision of the product and the marketplace. Despite a lack of parity among factions, the author expressed the belief that the process is open-ended, and allows multiple voices to be heard. The result of this negotiation process is a product woven from careful, political threads. With characteristic pragmatism, Author #2 concluded:
It's political in the worst and the best senses of the notion of politics. It's political in the worst sense, in the fact that people compromise with their basic values in order to get in what it is they want to get in. But it's political in the best sense in that if you have a good idea you can find a way to get it into the mix.

Author #2 also observed that publishers are under pressure to introduce new programs if only to maintain an appearance of modernity.

People perceive the market to be changing so fast that the life of a reading series has gone from a decade down to about four or five years.

The author believes that not all new programs contain novel ideas. Furthermore, Author #2 suggested that when publishers do move to incorporate new ideas they may do so with varying degrees of rapidity.

I think they're very confused right now. I think they want to get their share of the market and they do what they have to, to do that. Sometimes that means taking a risk and going off and doing something totally new and different but for every success story for risk-taking there's three failures. They tend to be real conservative about some things and not about others. I think the changes in literature have been incredible. But the change in the assessment component in basals has moved like a snail.

Further, Author #2 observed that as publishers moved to incorporate innovation, several outcomes were possible. First the publisher might move gradually, making a transition over successive editions. As an example, the author described the transition made by the idea of "prior experience" from a position of marginal concern to the status of an organizing theme.

I think it's a difference between having sort of a hope and a pretty explicit plan for how to do it. I think we made some overtures to it in the '82 and the 85-86 but we really pulled it off in the '89. I think it was a grander vision of how important that was. The difference? It's really simple. Between '82 and '89 the notion of reading as a constructive process gained
a lot more momentum. There was a general feeling on their part that they could risk more… In '82 they were very worried about it… In '89 it was not a big risk. As a matter of fact, I think in '89 they felt that it was minimally necessary to look modern.

The author also pointed out the problem educational publishers may confront when innovations are caught in transition. For example, the author commented on the process by which the publisher — responding to shifts in the marketplace — made a transition from a traditional student workbook (skill-like) to a reader's notebook (response-like).

It fills two needs. One is to keep up with the times and the market and the other is to recognize the fact that we're moving away from sort of a multiple choice mentality in responding to things. More toward a constructive response… I think when we first did the reader's journal it was exactly that. And the interesting thing is that it was supplementary and we still had the workbook. But in the 1993 edition we tried to meld the two ideas of what used to be a workbook with something that had more of this kind of constructive, extended response feel to it. I think trying to serve two masters necessarily compromised both.

**Critical Analysis of Author Beliefs**

Both authors share strong beliefs about the central role teachers play in literacy instruction. Both authors have a commitment to direct instruction. They also believe teacher manuals, student texts, and practice books provide valuable resources both to model "appropriate" or "quality" instruction and to organize opportunities for explicit instruction of reading comprehension. Both authors believed that teachers could become more effective by following the models of instruction they developed.

The authors seem to differ in their beliefs about students. While Author #1 focussed attention on the needs of poor readers (explicit instruction, a unified but differentiated curriculum, and concentrated massed opportunities for reading), Author #2 placed greater emphasis on students' prior experiences (not skill knowledge) as the key for
success in reading. Neither author expressed beliefs about the relationship between able students and the basal reading program.

The authors both expressed ideas about the aims and format of instruction. Both authors concentrated interests on skills believed to have an impact on improving students' ability to comprehend what they read. Both authors advocated traditional comprehension skills (finding main ideas, inference, sequence, etc.) although Author #1 used innovative labels. Both authors gave minimal explanation to the way skills are incorporated into a holistic approach. Although Author #1 gave some examples of how genre selections affected the content of skill lessons and provided a ratio for literature selection, neither author offered details on the "working" relationship between the literature selections and learning to read.

In terms of educational publishing, both authors also believed market forces dominated the process of developing a basal reading program, but that literacy scholars were able to play a number of important roles in that process, thereby affecting its outcome. The next section describes an analysis of some of those roles.

**Analysis Two: Author's Roles**

The data were sorted according to the roles authors played in the context of collaborating on the development of a basal reading program. Generally, codes were assigned based on an author's explicit comments. For example, the code "reviewer" would be used to describe an author's role based on the statement: "The first draft of the program philosophy is quite good. Of course, I like some parts better than others so below is my review." Other codes were assigned based on inferences drawn from the author's statements. For example, the code "teacher trainer" was used to describe an author's
perceived role, based on the statement "I'm at least sending out a model of what I think the range of good activities ought to be for any particular engagement with print."

After the role or function had been coded, references were described along three characteristics: task, direction, and occurrence. "Task" refers to the author's actual contribution. For example, in the role of "market analyst," an author might contribute a comparative analysis of product competition or use a personal/professional network to cull insights about market trends. Such insights might reflect classroom and statehouse concerns.

"Direction" refers to who initiated the task. That is, each task was coded to reflect whether the author acted as the "originator" or "reactor" in performing a particular task. Examples of "originator" include writing proposals and guidelines. "Reactor" typically was used to describe reviewing activities. This code was intended to explore the effect of control of the direction of the dialogue as the development process continued.

Finally, "occurrence" refers to the location in the process in which a particular task occurred. Tasks were analyzed to determine a chronology. Tasks described as "prior" occurred before the development of a final prototype. Tasks labelled "during" occurred after the prototype was distributed to program developers and before publication. Tasks termed "after" relate to post-publication activities. A few tasks, referring to general functions, were labelled "ongoing." Tasks spanning two or more phases received multiple codes.
Summary of Author Roles

Author #1

Author #1's comments and documents illustrated a number of roles or functions performed in the process of developing a recent basal reading program. These roles are summarized in Table 13.

Table 13
Author #1: Roles in the Development of a Reading Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>DIRECTION</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>staff developer</td>
<td>upgrade skills and orientation of edit and sales staff</td>
<td>originator</td>
<td>prior, during, after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consultant</td>
<td>develop prototype, create sample formats and organizing themes</td>
<td>originator</td>
<td>prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reviewer</td>
<td>comment on drafts by in-house staff and subcontractors</td>
<td>reactor</td>
<td>prior, during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>market analyst</td>
<td>critique competitors' products</td>
<td>reactor</td>
<td>prior, during, after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teammate</td>
<td>facilitate other authors in the aim of articulating ideas</td>
<td>reactor</td>
<td>prior, during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student</td>
<td>learn from other members of the author-editorial team</td>
<td>reactor</td>
<td>prior, during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lobbyist</td>
<td>write position papers</td>
<td>originator</td>
<td>prior, during</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these roles, Author #1 had occasion to initiate action as well as to react to the ideas or the work of other members of the editorial team or outside developers. Regardless of whether the topic at hand was author-generated or other-generated, Author #1 focused the dialogue on beliefs about students (supporting poor readers) and framed discussions
according to specific beliefs about instruction (direct, explicit instruction; differentiated instruction; whole class instruction).

Although not responsible for actually writing the teacher and student texts, Author #1 did function as a writer, drafting a model (actually, a series of models) intended to guide the development and the marketing of the program. As a writer, Author #1 prepared outlines and sketches which circulated as discussion starters.

In the sample sketch below, Author #1 began to organize a framework to guide a strategic reading philosophy. In this instance, the author outlined the program's instructional content, identifying specific reading strategies:

* Getting involved
* Keeping tabs/monitoring
* Repair
* Summarizing
* Determining importance
* Pulling things together
* Comparing
* Reflecting and responding

Author #1 drafted a format (set of procedures) for literacy instruction.

To develop strategic readers:

* Model the situation
* Model thinking
* Shift to students
* Present alternatives
* Interact responsively
* Real reading use

With this instructional format taking shape, so also does the process of negotiation among other members of the author/editor team — for next-step decisions regarding lesson design, skill coverage, for terms and labels, and for placement within the various components of the program.

Prototype development occurred when scholars, working independently or in teams, drew up model teaching plans. These conceptual drafts were an important phase in the dialogue, becoming the means for focusing, extending, and modifying the discussion.
During the development of these models authors can serve as leaders. Author #1, for example, explained how the group developed an instructional prototype organized around informational text. The sample represented shows one model lesson developed by the author. It can be seen that the model incorporates the main ideas presented in the previous sketches.
Keeping Tabs

SAMPLE STRATEGY #1: Recognizing and using chronology

Focus
Authors often organize biographical and historical information chronologically, or in a sequence by days, ages, or years. Ex: History books, a vacation story, your own biography.

Model
Skim "the remarkable Pele" and point out it begins with his early childhood (age 4, p.x), then his elementary school years (pp.x), continues to his teen years (age 15, p.x), and ends at adulthood.

Keys: Dates (pp.x) and ages (pp.x)

Guide
Construct a timeline (put Fig. 1 on board)
"I often create a timeline to organize chronological information. A timeline helps me keep tabs on the main ideas the author presents. I put the age or dates below the line and the event above it. You can see how I began this timeline at age 4 with Pele playing soccer in the streets."

Have Ss complete the timeline in pairs.

Independent
Options: Use the WB, Ss create another timeline. Create timeline for previously read "story" pp.
Create timeline for personal story
Create timeline for section of social studies text

Summarize
Discuss author use of chronology. Note other sequences similar to timeline (Step 1, Step 2...; First, then, finally...)

Figure 3
Author #1: Sample Lesson Design
Here the author gives shape to "explicit instruction" using "think-alouds" (for example, "A timeline helps me keep tabs on the main ideas the author presents"), teacher modelling, ("You can see how I began this timeline..."), and providing operational information ("I often create a timeline to organize chronological information").

The sequence above reveals what happens when beliefs about instruction become set in hard copy. Sample lessons included attention to what was highlighted and what was not, how various typographic devices (plain, bold, and italic) were employed, and how content and design were used to direct the reader's attention and the basal's use.

After contributing to the design of a conceptual model of the new program — writing proposals, outlining instruction, creating instructional formats, and forming organizing themes — Author #1 adopts the "reviewer" role, critiquing sample units developed by in-house editors and editorial assistants as well as materials developed by outside sources. In Figure 4, Author #1's response to a developer's interpretation of the conceptual model and the resulting prototype plan illustrates the way the author uses this opportunity to express beliefs about explicit instruction and concern for supporting poor readers — two of the dominant themes.
To: [executive editor]
From: XXXXXXXXX
re: TE lesson plan- 4/8/91 version
13 April 1991

I think the highlight boxes are a coup, of sorts. They do the focus that we need without being obtrusive. I'd like to try a version, though, that includes specific text related information rather than just the general strategy steps. I think we might be able to solve the skills lesson and reteach issue with this. What if we construct the highlight boxes so that the teacher can draw attention to text features instructionally?

I'd like to try and figure out a way to have the Supportive Reading strategy boxes actually be our strategy instruction and then offer a more traditional skill/strategy lesson under the strategy lesson heading later (pp. 41-42) and have that serve as our reteach phase. I'd put a graphic, at the opening of the story, under the supportive reading heading, to simply cue teachers as to strategy and components. If we actually had a module in which we could emphasize one strategy, I'd put a "Note on strategies" feature at the beginning of the mod. Provide some quick background and a graphic like the ones I sent in from Cambourne's book (Altho that graphic format would also work really well in the strategy box on p. 7, say).

---

**Figure 4**

Author #1: Reviewer
In the following memo, written just three months after s/he commented that the model was "getting closer to a TE that will be helpful, useable, and salable", it appears that the model has shifted direction. The author uses the "reviewer" role to try to shift the focus back to a perspective that reflects her/his themes — explicit direction, and differentiated instruction to support poor readers.

To: [Executive editor]
From: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
re: TE strategy lessons
Date: 23 July 1991

These lessons just don't seem to reflect any of the directions or formats I've discussed and presented for the past several years. The scripts are didactic, wordy, and still unfocused and too often unhelpful to the teacher. We still say,"Discuss X with students....." and offer no good direction for the critical elements of the strategy to be taught. We get lost in words when the flowchart format I sent from Cambourne and Turbill's book is so much clearer, easier to follow, and focused. That one little flowchart communicated more than these three page lessons. Likewise, the Duffy and Roehler transcript excerpts (one teacher's think-aloud) also provides more useful direction than these. It almost seems that the editors who developed these lesson scripts had never read the memos I sent, never reviewed the alternative formats culled, and simply went and looked at the old TE. I hate to sound so shrill but I just think these are so far off the mark and I've been saying that for two years and recommending these various alternatives be developed. But, one more time I will try to make a few critical points....

Offering specific suggestions for revising the model lessons, Author #1 concludes:

Perhaps the problem, I just divined, is that these "model lessons" look suspiciously more like the Texas Hunter model than anything that we authors have ever mentioned as a model for TE strategy lesson. The Hunter model simply will not work with strategy instruction and if [the publisher] is going to develop TE for Texas on that model there is no need to ask me any more questions about TE. That model and the author model are simply philosophically and pedagogically incompatible. Can we ever get marketing to agree to develop a program for the 1990s????

As these examples illustrate, the author attempted to shape the program through a variety of roles. These include the role of "staff developer" as the author addresses the skills and/or the orientation of the publisher's editorial team and marketing managers.
Functioning as a "consultant" —providing research articles, suggesting lists of professional books, writing position papers, and participating in training presentations for sales and marketing employees — the author attempts to influence the language and the focus of the dialogue surrounding the development of this product. In this capacity the author also acts as a "lobbyist," attempting to shift the project to a groundwork which supports her/his research-based beliefs.

**Author #2**

Author #2 also described a number of different functions performed as a program author. These evidence the author's participation prior to, during, and after the production of the reading program. The author operated as both "originator" and "reactor" in these various roles. A summary of the roles Author #2 played is presented in Table 14.
### Table 14
**Author #2: Roles in the Development of a Reading Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>DIRECTION</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>writer</td>
<td>compose instructional frameworks for proposed programs</td>
<td>originator</td>
<td>prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scholar</td>
<td>read widely regarding key topics (metacognition and reader response)</td>
<td></td>
<td>prior during after ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translator</td>
<td>operationalize theoretical constructs as teaching / learning phenomena</td>
<td>originator</td>
<td>prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marketer</td>
<td>labelling parts of the instructional program &quot;just so people see it's there&quot;</td>
<td>reactor</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher trainer</td>
<td>sending a model of the range of good activities for any particular engagement with print</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor</td>
<td>responsible for looking over all of the instructional design to see &quot;if we're on the right track&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>prior during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advisor</td>
<td>set goals, introduced open-ended assessment</td>
<td>originator</td>
<td>prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politician</td>
<td>expends political capital to achieve innovation</td>
<td>originator</td>
<td>prior during after</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author #2 described her/his principal responsibility in the process as "looking after" the program's overall design and "making sure we were on the right track." In addition to this "supervisor's" or "reviewer's" role, Author #2 recounted instances, such as the development of an alternative assessment plan, which called for "originator" contributions.

I went to them. I said, you may not think we need it (open-ended assessment) now, but when this thing is in its heyday there will be places where we can't sell this unless you have this kind of assessment option. I said the people I've talked to, the cutting edge districts are already moving into this. And so they went along with that.
Author #2 was also involved in the development of a plan for comprehension skill instruction. Operating as "consultant" and "writer," s/he composed position papers which outlined instructional frameworks. The author summarized the process:

I'd prepare a draft, a philosophy statement and a scope and sequence. I'd usually have one or two people on the staff who worked with me on it. Then we'd make a presentation on that and get responses. People would either say "Yes" or else they'd say, "Here's how I think it needs to be changed."

These philosophy statements reflected a sensitivity to classroom applications. The following excerpt from a position paper (1978) offers a sample of the way this author used a consultant's role to influence the program at the level of lesson design.

**Task 3: Main Idea**

If all main ideas were alike, they might be easier to teach. Instead, what we have is a variety of different kinds of activities that typically fall under the main idea label:

**Introduction.** Introduce topic or title activities through a classification task in which the students are asked to classify common objects or words, such as faults, clothes, and tools. Introduce the term main idea to the students. Tell them that the main idea of a story is what the story is about, just like all the objects in the fruit category are "about" fruits, etc. Then put the following paragraph on the chalkboard.

Author #2 also acted as a "translator" (of ideas originating from other sources) in which the task was to operationalize theoretical constructs as teaching/learning procedures. For example, the author's description of her/his role in bringing ideas about "reader response" into the program illustrates this role.
I think it was simply a matter of my own personal awareness of just how important that tradition was and then sort of coming to terms with it on a kind of personal understanding level. What I read about response to literature in the 70's and early 80's didn't always leave me with a sense of what it is I could do as an author to incorporate it — other than to just exhort people. But I think some people in the last five or six years have started writing about how to incorporate response to literature constructs into discussions and instruction and the like. [They] have really helped the field come to terms with operationalizing response to literature as a teaching/learning phenomenon as opposed to something that literary theorists talk about.

The author operated as an educational marketer, too, advising the publisher on market (classroom) trends and new perspectives. Author #2 also considered part of the development role as that of a teacher trainer, sending a model of "the range of good activities for any particular engagement with print."

Throughout the development process, whether reacting to the ideas of others or originating new development, the author's pragmatic nature made her/him an effective "dealmaker."

**Critical Analysis of Author Roles**

The authors were similar in the roles they played in the development of their respective reading programs. Both authors maintained active engagement in the process before, during, and after publication of the program. In addition, regardless of whether they were contributing original proposals, or reacting to the ideas of others, both authors used every role as an occasion to move the dialogue in a direction which reflected their own themes and personal beliefs.
Analysis of the roles authors play suggest that authors' control of the process (or their autonomy) is greatest at the earlier, developmental stages. For example, once the prototype model has been finalized and sent to a development company, the authors were mainly utilized as reviewers and as consultants to marketing. And although authors used these roles to advance their perspectives or present their themes, they were less likely to control operating decisions unless — as one author explained — there was something s/he "just couldn't live with."

**Analysis Three: Process-Outcomes Relationships**

After identifying specific innovations arising from an author's beliefs, and then describing the roles an author plays in the process of bringing those innovations into a new reading program, I analyzed the relationship between the author's intentions and the final outcomes of those issues. The comparison of intentions and outcomes made possible an analysis of the decision-making mechanisms of the process and allowed for inferences about possible pathways innovative ideas travel.

I began by analyzing the innovations which related to each author's principal themes (e.g., Author #1 — explicit teaching, supporting poor readers, unified curricula; Author #2 — the influence of prior experience on comprehension, response to literature, and open-ended assessment). Each idea (innovation) was analyzed in terms of its relationship to existing traditions vis a vis prior editions of a publisher's reading programs. Ideas were characterized as "*evolutionary*" if aspects of the idea had already been introduced into prior editions of a program. In this sense, the "innovation" is more appropriately considered an elaboration, extension, or intensification of an existing practice, perspective, or philosophy.
Innovations characterized as "revolutionary" were those ideas that represented some sort of breakthrough. While the idea might relate in a general way to aspects addressed in earlier editions (e.g., vocabulary/language development, comprehension/study skills), no specific procedure having this name or this form was ever advanced by this publisher.

To further refine this analysis, I characterized each idea in terms of its relation to components of the existing program, or how a particular proposed innovation compared with other categorical aspects of existing programs. For example, even radically innovative procedure such as open-ended assessment has some sort of assessment counterpart in an existing program. This category was intended to shed light on the way the author intended the innovation to be used. These are characterized as:

* **Parallel** — The idea is an alternative or optional technique. In this sense innovations can be either evolutionary or revolutionary and still be considered primarily "add-ons" if they do not directly challenge existing structures. In parallel usage, the author intended Practice X to be used in conjunction with (possibly in a supportive role) or as an equal option to Practice Y.

* **Replacement** — The idea is perceived as a challenge to an existing idea, and tries to dislodge the existing idea. In this case, the author intended Practice X to replace Practice Y. In general, the two ideas are pedagogically or philosophically incompatible.

Third, innovations were analyzed according to their intended placement in the program. Specific placement options include Teacher Edition Anthology (TEA), Pupil Edition Anthology (PEA), Teacher Edition Practice Book (TEP), Pupil Edition Practice Book (PEP), Supplemental Ancillary Materials (SAM), or Program Assessment (PA). Some ideas are more pervasive than others, thus having an impact on more than one component.

Analyses of the authors' intentions are summarized in Tables 15 and 16. Intentions were compared to actual outcomes as published in the author's basal reading program. The outcome of each negotiation is characterized in one of the following ways:
* **Accept in total** — The author's innovative ideas were accepted into the program (that is, the basic concept and its placement) the way the author intended.

* **Accept in part** — The publisher (or other members of the author team) adapted/usurped the author's innovation. The innovation found its way into the program, but in an abbreviated or modified form.

* **Reject** — The author's proposed innovation was disregarded and failed to be incorporated into any component of the program.

While almost any innovative idea might have some impact on the discussions and processes which guide the development of a complex reading program — if only to strengthen the opposition's case — the disposition codes were assigned to indicate outcomes which were direct and overt rather than philosophical nuances or subtleties.

**The Data Summary**

The categories described above represent a simplified expression of complex personal interactions. Conversations with authors, review of developmental documents, and personal experiences suggested that the course of innovation rested on important, fluid cross-currents. The intricacies which support these outcomes must be inferred; some important trends emerge.

The following section reports descriptions of the development and disposition of several illustrative examples presented by the authors. A more complete and in-depth description of the ways these cross-currents affect innovative ideas can be found in the full narrative sequence presented later in this study.

**Critical Analysis of Intentions-Outcomes Analysis: Author #1**

Three key themes frame the intentions Author #1 brought to the development of this reading program. These are summarized in Table 11.
Table 15
Author #1: Intentions Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>INNOVATION</th>
<th>RELATION</th>
<th>PLACEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unified Curricula</td>
<td>Revolutionary</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Instruction</td>
<td>Evolutionary</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>TE/SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Poor Readers</td>
<td>Evolutionary</td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>TE/PEA/SAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author's background interest in supporting poor readers contributed to an intention to help teachers provide explicit instruction. The author also advocated that the program be organized around a single, unified curriculum with differentiated instruction to meet the needs of "unlucky kids" or students having difficulty learning to read.

The concept of a unified curriculum challenged the industry and company tradition of providing differentiated instruction through separate programs and ancillary materials. A single curriculum which supported able and less-able students alike was considered "revolutionary" in the way it challenged certain basal program traditions and traditional classroom practice. The author's intention — to develop a single program, and one which reflected her/his themes — was expressed in statements such as the following excerpt from a memorandum:
I'm quite sure we can design a program that basically provides whole-class instruction and whole-class pacing through a curriculum. I think we can design a literature-based program to accomplish this (and hope we do). But we cannot design such a program without substantial shifts in how teachers allocate their classroom time - very simply, we will have to convince teachers that some children will require 50% more of their instructional efforts and time than other children in the room.

There is no easy answer here. I truly believe that we can create a program that allows all children to develop on schedule and I think we can even convince folks to buy it. But we need to worry a lot about Kindergarten and grade 1 and those unlucky kids. We need to reconceptualize how teachers will spend their 90-120 minute reading/language arts block each day. Once we have a clearer view of what it is we want teachers to be doing, the design of the lesson and the texts will become much easier.

Within an approach that differentiates instruction through a single common curriculum, the author also intended to shift the instructional content of the program to reflect a more explicit stance and to cast the program according to these themes. As Author #1 explained "explicit instruction":

In terms of primary grades, explicit instruction in the alphabetic principle per se. With a focus on developing fluency. In developing self-monitoring strategies. As children mature and the text grew more difficult, more idea-filled. Then explicit instruction in summarization. I'd teach them about gist. I'd teach them about point of view. I'd teach them about synthesizing across different sources of information, additional background knowledge and text sources and so on. Now I think that stuff has to be done fairly explicitly for most kids.

Author #1's set of instructional outlines and model lessons suggested these ideas were intended to enter the program mainly through an elaborated teacher edition. Repeatedly, the author's observations concerned the need to have teachers re-examine their approaches to instruction. This was intended to be facilitated by a teacher's edition which would be designed to identify, explain, and model effective procedures. This innovation challenged the content and format of previous programs.
Outcomes — Author #1

The outcomes of the major innovations which Author #1 intended to bring to the program are summarized in Table 16.

Table 16
Author #1: Outcomes Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>INNOVATION</th>
<th>RELATION</th>
<th>PLACEMENT</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unified Curricula</td>
<td>Revolutionary</td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>Acc in Prt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Instruction</td>
<td>Evolutionary</td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>TE / SAM</td>
<td>Acc in Prt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Poor</td>
<td>Evolutionary</td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>TE / PEA / SAM</td>
<td>Acc in Prt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The themes of differentiated instruction and explicit instruction did enter into the reading program, but they were accepted only in part. According to the author, although model units aimed at guiding a range of student abilities through a lesson had been proposed, the innovation was shifted. The idea of a unified curriculum was rejected while the notion of explicit instruction was applied mainly to a supplementary product for "poor readers." As the author interpreted the experience:

There was an initial issue of whether [the publisher] would publish an "improved" [co-basal series] for at-risk students or modify the mainline basal in ways to make it more attractive and useable with those at-risk kids. For a variety of reasons, budget with new corporate ownership, positive/negative market features of two programs, my argument that we could produce one strong series that would serve such kids well and so on, [the publisher] ultimately decided to develop one series but, in my view, then forgot to worry enough about at-risk students in the development. [The supplementary product] evolved from a concern that putting all those teaching activities in the mainline TE would make it look and feel too cumbersome to teachers.
The theme of explicit instruction was incorporated into the supplemental program aimed at supporting poor readers. Here literacy lessons were explicit but unrelated to the content and lessons of the mainline program. The author's intention of differentiating instruction was transformed to mean different parallel instruction.

**Critical Analysis of Intentions-Outcome Analysis: Author #2**

Author #2 saw her/himself in a generalist role, mainly "keeping sure the program was on track." However, Author #2 did approach the new program with some specific intentions. These are summarized in Table 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>INNOVATION</th>
<th>RELATION</th>
<th>PLACEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>Evolutionary</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>TEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Assessment</td>
<td>Revolutionary</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>TEP / PEP / PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader Response</td>
<td>Revolutionary</td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>TEA / PEA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author #2 expressed intentions related to three themes — (1) the relationship between prior experience and reading comprehension, (2) engagement and reader response to literature, and (3) open-ended assessment.

Author #2 intended to bring the relationship between comprehension and prior experience to greater prominence in the program's overall instructional design. This theme was intended as an evolution or extension of the direction of the comprehension strategy presented in the publisher's previous editions. The author had intended this theme to dominate the reading comprehension and vocabulary components of the program.
The author intended to introduce a plan for open-ended assessment of comprehension. This package was intended to replace the publishing company's traditional, criterion-referenced assessment package, and was thus analyzed as a "challenge" to tradition.

Although the author expressed the intention to "do something more" with reader response, it was not clear how s/he intended it to be incorporated into the overall program design. The author had intended response-type activities to be placed in the teacher editions, as well as the student anthology, and the student notebook. Activities which emphasize reader response to literature were already a part of the publisher's previous program, mainly as extension activities.

**Outcomes—Author #2**

These themes — prior knowledge, response to literature, and open-ended assessment — traversed the development process in three different paths, arriving at different outcomes. The outcomes of the major ideas which Author #2 intended to bring to the program are summarized in Table 18.

**Table 18**
**Author #2: Outcomes Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>INNOVATION</th>
<th>RELATION</th>
<th>PLACEMENT</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>Evolutionary</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>TEA / PEA</td>
<td>Acc in Tot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Assessment</td>
<td>Revolutionary</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Acc in Prt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader Response</td>
<td>Revolutionary</td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>TEA / PEA</td>
<td>Acc in Tot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Author #2's intention to organize the comprehension approach around the theme of "prior experience" came to dominate the program's instructional design. Author #2 interpreted the impact this intention had on the program:

I would say that concept is pervasive in the following ways: if you look at the TE you'll find that not only is vocabulary presented with that theme in mind, the whole introduction to the selection is really built upon that bridging metaphor. If you look at how stories are introduced, what sort of conceptual frame you try to set is pretty transparent in the lesson introductions. In the questions, it's a little less transparent. The questions that go along with these stories permit kids to bring their knowledge to bear on understanding the selections. And then the next phase of questions is intended to help kids integrate the events and activities and ideas in the selection and then finally it's moving out again from the selection into their own experience.

The graphic design elements in the teacher and student editions serve to reinforce this theme of "linking the new and the known." A banner at the head of each (pre-reading) section identifies the instructional approach of "Using the known selection to prepare for the new." The theme of "prior experience" is applied to comprehension strategies and story vocabulary in every unit. This theme carried through to accompanying teaching charts, practice masters, and workbook activities.

The power of this theme as an organizing framework of the program can be seen in the way "other interests" fared in the program. Author #2 described the "other interests":

There was a last minute attempt to imbed two other goals on the questioning strands. If you look at the story questions there's a Highlighting Literature and there's a Strategic Question strand and they're suggested as options to the more mainline questions and the reason that they're there is because at the 11th hour someone said "We don't have enough of the literary look here." One way to do it is by asking questions to focus on issues of literary themes, literary devices, things like that. So if you look through the questioning strand it has Guided Reading as one strand and then there's this Focus on Literature and Focus on Strategic Reading and they are sort of overlays. But they weren't part of the original design.
As overlays, these themes were not an integral part of the instructional program. In other words, teachers might expand, diminish, or omit entirely the emphasis they choose to give to the study of "literary topics". By comparison, teachers who chose to omit segments involving the "prior experience" theme would be disregarding virtually all pre- and postreading activities in the teacher's manual and the student text.

The author's intention to advance an "open-ended assessment" plan ended as an alternative to the publisher's established criterion-referenced assessment package. The author describes the way negotiations over these competing approaches to assessment played out over the course of developing successive editions.

The '82/85 edition was very much imbedded within the prevailing zeitgeist of criterion-referenced assessment for each and every skill. In '89 two things happened. Number one, we created an alternative assessment strand which had open-ended assessments. Not very interesting, but nonetheless open-ended responses. And a rationale was developed for it. For example, one of the questions should focus on the experience-text relationship. One of the questions should focus on the importance of comprehension strategy - taught in that unit. One of the questions should focus on getting to the author. One should be sort of evaluative. We put that in an alternative strand but that was really something to placate a few people.

As the author pushed an innovative assessment plan, the publisher reacted in two ways. First, the open-ended assessment was incorporated into the program as an optional or alternative component. The author's challenge failed to unseat criterion-reference tests. The primacy of the traditional assessment package (another of the program's "old friends") was considered necessary to reinforce the product's image against the publisher's background tradition of strong, skills-based programs.
A second outcome was an attempt to adapt the holistic aspect of the open-ended assessment to the existing assessment model. In this case, the criterion-referenced tests were made to appear holistic by redesigning questions aimed at multiple skills within a single testing frame. As the author interpreted them, these adaptations were mostly superficial:

the attempt was to be more integrative so that instead of having one sub-test for every skill we tried to have longer passages and then assess more of the skills that had been independent tests before around a single passage. The truth of the matter is that they still were criterion/objective reference examinations.

In this example, the response to innovation illustrates how ideas with the potential to challenge tradition are introduced. Here, innovations are launched and permitted to expand or contract without necessitating a redesign of the overall instructional framework.

The outcome of the author's intention to advance the theme "response to literature" is another example of the way innovations can become transformed as they are negotiated. One outcome was "effective labelling." That is, by prominently labeling activities (even traditional activities) as response-type activities, teachers interested in this theme can easily identify it. However, having identified these activities, teachers would find minimal detail and minimal direction. For example, activities could be interpreted as oral or written. Typical directions to the teacher called for them to "assign" rather than "instruct." In general these responses were not presented as essential aspects of the unit.

I think what we've done is wave a flag at it in the core instruction and then, if you will, marginalize by putting it out as activities which teachers may or may not ever get to.
Response activities (generally postreading activities and language arts connections) are embedded in the teacher edition under the heading "Teaching Option." Response activities, labelled "Reader's Response" are located in the student anthology at the conclusion of each story. Teachers are not advised or assisted in providing (or modelling) instruction. Teachers are not instructed in ways to help students become engaged in reading or to organize meaningful responses. The teacher's edition offers little guidance in terms of evaluating (or helping children evaluate) responses.

The author observed the way this theme fared and interpreted its outcome:

I just think that we started to get into it and we made a few advances in subsequent editions but I think we could have worked a lot harder at engaging kids in a fuller range of response to literature activities that I started to see come out in some textbooks and some publications. I think our response to literature tend to be single shot things... I think that we still tend to wave the flag at response to literature. I think that if we had focussed our collective energy, both authorship and staff, on it then I think we could have made more progress on it.

In this example, the issue of reader engagement and response is a potential challenge to existing structures. The literary quality of this approach to reading can be seen as an alternative to cognitive skills approach. In other words, a response to literature theme might have been made to dominate the instructional strategies and instructional time. Instead, it remains a highly visible, but less than critical feature of the program. Whether it ever moves beyond accommodation (or "overlay") seems to be dependent upon the disposition of the author and the publisher, and the prevailing sense of the market.
An Illustrative Example

The preceding analyses suggest that an author’s intended contributions to a basal reading program might be rooted in his or her research background and be shaped by pertinent beliefs about teachers, students, instruction, and educational publishers. The analysis also suggests that not all intentions receive equal support, and that an innovative idea may be adopted in whole, in part, or rejected completely.

The analyses described above, based on interviews with authors and an examination of their documents, reveal the process from the authors' perspectives. Clearly, given the data presented by the outcomes described above, other decision-making factors influence and control to an extent the adoption of innovative ideas. The following example is offered as an illustration of the way these factors operate in the development of a basal reading program. The example follows product development from conceptualization to publication. This series of events is summarized in Table 19.
Table 19
Author #1: Critical Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988 June</td>
<td>Mtg: Pub. IDs mainline + supp-prod</td>
<td>10 November</td>
<td>Pub. sets research agenda AR-rv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 27 February</td>
<td>Mtg: Providing manageable multiple possibilities B-dl/AR-c, m/R</td>
<td>10 April</td>
<td>Auth #1 memo &quot;create program that allows all children to develop.&quot; B-pr, dl/AR-c/O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991 21 August</td>
<td><em>Pub guidelines to dvlpr. Texas market driving this product.</em></td>
<td>4 March</td>
<td>Auth sends sen. ed note; concern over lit selections. B-pr/AR-c/O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991 3 August</td>
<td>Auth reviews sample lesson by developer. Labels these &quot;disastrous&quot; B-pr/AR-rv/R</td>
<td>10 September</td>
<td>Philosophy authed by development house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991 28 September</td>
<td>Ed sends scope of instruction for mainline program B-dl/AR-c/O</td>
<td>20 October</td>
<td>*Auth revus frmwk by Texas scholar B-pr, ex/AR-rv/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991 25 August</td>
<td>*Pub. guideline to auth. re: framework proposed by Texas scholar B-pr, ex/AR-rv/R</td>
<td>1 October</td>
<td>*Pub. note to auth. re: framework proposed by Texas scholar B-pr, ex/AR-rv/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 October</td>
<td>Prototypes and writing guidelines for supp-prod due.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 October</td>
<td>Prototype of supp-prod due for testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 October</td>
<td>Pub sends draft of philosophy for mainline program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 October</td>
<td>Auth revus philosophy B-pr/AR-rv/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 November</td>
<td>Wrtg sched to begin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 November</td>
<td>Pub in charge of supp-prod sends proto lessons to Author #1 and Texas-based author.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 November</td>
<td>Auth revus mainline proto TE copy B-dl/AR-rv/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1 January Auth memo revus TE mod grade 1. B-ex/AR-rv/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 January</td>
<td>Auth memo to pub. Supp prod needs to extend mainline activities B-dl/AR-c/O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 February</td>
<td>Sampler due from dvlp+r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 February</td>
<td>Pub to Auth sample Supp-prod. States ESL focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 February</td>
<td>Auth memo to pubs. revus sample supp-prod. Wonties conceptualized as separate product B-di/AR-rv/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 March</td>
<td>Ed sends &quot;pretty-final&quot; proto of supp TE with guide for freelancers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 March</td>
<td>Auth memo to mtg re: promotion of mainline program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 March</td>
<td>Pub responds to Author 3/11 memo; reiterates ESL focus of the suppl-prod.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 March</td>
<td>Auth memo to pub &amp; ed revus proto lessons for suppl-prod. &quot;too ESL focused.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 March</td>
<td>Auth ans pub's 3/20 letter &quot;First anyone told me [ESL] was focus. B-pr/AR-c/O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 April</td>
<td>Ed to Auth and Texas-based author copy of book map for the development of suppl prod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 May</td>
<td>Auth memo on current approaches to ESL instruction, and on credibility of Texas-based co-author B-pr/AR-m/O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 June</td>
<td>Auth drafts front matter for suppl-prod B-dl/AR-c/O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 July</td>
<td>Grade 2 due from dvlp+r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16/20 July Ed sends front matter of suppl-prod IDs target students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**

B - Belief  
AR - Author Role  
O - Originating  
R - Responding  

**Author Roles**

1 - lobbyist  
C - consultant  
M - marketer  
Rv - reviewer  

**Intentions**

Di - differentiated instruction  
Pr - poor readers  
Ex - explicit instructions
During his career as a literacy scholar and researcher, Author #1 focussed on students generally considered to be poor readers. It was the author's expertise in this area that initially attracted the publisher. The author's previous contributions to the publisher's catalogue centered on a successful co-basal reading program, designed to meet the needs of students "who were having difficulty learning to read", or students whom teachers believed were not capable of successfully completing the publisher's mainline program.

During the initial round of discussions during the conceptualization of the new series, one critical issue turned upon whether the publisher's tradition of developing separate literacy programs — for mainstream, poor readers, and Spanish-speaking students — should be continued. According to Author #1, the discussion explored the options of whether to develop an improved (co-basal) series for at-risk students or to try and prepare an improved series for all students that would better meet the needs of at-risk students.

Traditionally, publishers develop three programs simultaneously: a mainline product for students of general ability; a co-basal (skills-oriented) program for low-achievement or disadvantaged students; and a program for Spanish-speaking students in ESL, bilingual, or mainstreamed classrooms.

However, as the publisher approached the development of this program, the intention was not to develop three separate programs but one unified curriculum, a single product which could be marketed to and utilized by teachers from each of the traditional groups. Although the publisher approached the initial stages with only general conceptions of the product, it seems clear that the publisher was committed to a single pupil anthology with support in the teacher's edition to help the teacher differentiate instruction according to students' needs.
For Author #1 — a vocal supporter of a unified curriculum — such an approach would appear a fitting match. Author #1's expertise with developing instruction for at-risk students was already proven in a successful, previous product. The task at hand was actually an invitation for the author to fold the same expertise into the mainline product. So while publisher and author shared similar intentions at the start of the process of developing the new program, the eventual product was the result of critical events and key decisions.

What follows is an analytical narrative of what took place.

**The Birth of a Supplemental Product**

Early meetings (June 1988) between the publisher, editors, and authors explored the question of what to do with the company's previous products — a traditional mainline program and a successful, skill-oriented co-basal program.

By August 1989, the agenda for staff meetings included these questions: "Can a mainline basal program meet the needs of at-risk children?" "Do they need a separate set of materials?" Acting in the role of consultant or lobbyist, Author #1 describes the tension in the task of meeting the needs of poor readers in a unified curriculum:

It seemed to me that one of the things that [the publisher] was worried about was as we moved to this kind of program how do we take care of kids who are having difficulty learning to read? How do we address those children? Particularly given that the conventional wisdom has also sort of moved to the elimination of ability groups. The whole market behind [the old co-basal series], the whole reason was the conventional wisdom that dominated the market place - that there were kids who were slow and who couldn't keep up with the normal pace of things.

The question for the 90's was can we design a mainline program that will work for all kids?
The difficulty of creating a single program of value to mainline teachers, remedial teachers, and ESL teachers placed a great strain on the strategies and options suggested in the teacher edition. This tension was explored during a February 1990 meeting of publishers, editors, and authors during the program's conceptual phase. The development of a workable solution to the problem of providing differentiated instruction was raised in two issues: "How do we take advantage of the opportunistic and still provide structure?" and "How do we provide multiple possibilities and make it look manageable?"

Acting as a consultant and a lobbyist, Author #1 prepared a memo addressing the issue of a unified curriculum and the needs of "children who find learning to read difficult." Excerpts from that memo illustrate the author's beliefs about poor readers and the role of literacy instruction.

I suggest that there is good evidence that common curriculum goals can be met on a common schedule by 98% of the children who walk into any kindergarten in the U.S. but only if we vary the quantity and quality of the instruction we make available to different children... Part of the quality issue involves the quality of the teacher explanations and interventions. Part of the quantity issue involves more time to read and write more texts... I'm quite sure that we can design a program that basically provides whole-class instruction and whole-class pacing through a [single] curriculum. I think we can design a literature-based program to accomplish this. But we cannot design such a system without substantial shifts in how teachers allocate their classroom time - very simply, we will have to convince teachers that some children will require 50% more of their instructional efforts and time than other children in the room."

As the development of the program continued, Author #1 contributed further as a reviewer, analyzing the programs produced by the publisher's competition and reviewing the format and scope of instruction of the new program. By October 1990, a tentative model had been developed. In a planning meeting held to evaluate that model, the author led a discussion titled, "How are we helping the student 'at-risk'?"
At that time the author produced a Grade 3 sample lesson based on the publisher's model. The sample lesson ("How do authors let readers know what characters are thinking and feeling") is referenced to the Texas skill element 5.3. The author's orientation toward explicit instruction is illustrated in the sample text which contains scripted think-alouds and model lessons headed "One teacher's lesson":

As I read this I could almost feel Lucas getting upset - I could hear it in his voice. I thought about how I'd feel if someone accused me of being a jabbermouth. I thought how I would say, "Want to bet?" I have to think about the words and how they might feel by comparing the situation to my experiences....

One interesting outcome of the activity of preparing a model lesson involved the author's reaction to the literature selection. Author #1 had contended that the literature selection was not only tied to strategy instruction but also affected the motivation of reluctant readers. Excerpts from a memo to the publisher express the author's concerns:

After going through the grade 3 mod I wondered what happened to authors reviewing tentatively selected texts? It seems to me that we are being presented a 'done deal' with the texts for the new series, at least I've not seen these choices before. I raise this because of the fundamental inadequacies in these choices....

As additional samples were developed from the model, a preliminary lesson design took form. By January 1991, a draft of the design was complete. The draft shows the elements of the program and their placement on mock pages of a teacher's edition. In support of poor readers, the design includes the traditional feature of Guided Reading ("an option for students who need your support") and Reteaching ("emphasizes different modalities"). The design also provides a feature called "Helping Students with Trouble Spots," which attempts to insure strategic reading by pointing out to the teacher places where students may have trouble comprehending. In addition, the teacher's text provides
other "micro-level information" to deal with language issues such as idioms and unusual pronunciations. These features reflect the publisher's and the author's aim to adapt instruction to accommodate poor readers as well as general-ability students.

By February 1991, prototype lessons based on the model are being developed. Using actual pieces of literature, features specified in the earlier version of the model now appear as instructional guidance for the teacher. Attention to the needs of poor readers and the theme of explicit instruction is reflected in section headings such as "Modeling the Strategy by Thinking Aloud" and in scripted "thinking." This sample lesson also includes a reteaching section "for students who have had difficulty ..."

As the prototype lesson is reworked, the author (as reviewer) begins to raise doubts about the amount of skill instruction contained in one lesson. S/he expresses concern over the ability of poor readers to maintain this pace without being overwhelmed. In a memo to the publisher (April 1991), the author suggests that the pace of instruction is "simply too much too fast to be useful for kids experiencing difficulty."

As the framework of the new program becomes fleshed out as sample lessons, Author #1's concern for at-risk readers continues to grow. In an extended memo (May 1991) to the publisher and to other senior authors, the author criticizes the lack of attention the teacher's edition gives to the needs of these students. The author concludes:

We may be producing a series that will work in the suburbs but I cannot see the old plan working for at-risk kids. I understand the timeframe problem and that there is much we cannot undo that has already been done, unfortunately....I hope we can do what needs to be done but the issues of levelling, informational text, and the unknown talents of freelancers make me worry.
The author continued to lobby for greater attention to the needs of poor readers in another memo written a few days later. Here the author cited a recently-completed federally-funded longitudinal study of effective schooling for disadvantaged students. Arguing as a scholarly research consultant, the author suggests:

I think we should consider the findings as evidence of what the market looks like and what folks will be willing/eager to accept in our program....Practice is advancing and we need a basal that teachers see as useful and moving them in the direction that they are already headed.

In a related role, the author provides marketing information on new developments in the Texas marketplace. Through a network of acquaintances, the author is familiar with the new state commissioner. The author's memo to the publisher aims to guide the development of the publisher's new assessment program, but more generally, to support the image of the author's connection to the marketplace.

As work on the prototype lessons for the teacher edition continued to develop, the author (as reviewer) expresses concern about the lack of explicit direction. In a July 1991 memo, the author complains: "We still say 'Discuss X with students ...' and offer no good direction for the critical elements of the strategy to be taught."

As prototype development neared completion, emphasis was given to the task of providing additional support materials for teachers with students who have difficulty reading. In order to maintain a unified curriculum wherein all students read the same literature anthology, differentiated instruction was necessary to support diverse needs. An additional consideration was the publisher's decision to enter the Texas market without a complete Spanish-language program. From an editorial standpoint, the problem was how to accommodate these diverse needs without making the teacher's edition a cumbersome and foreboding text.
The publisher's solution was to develop independent modules to accompany the main text. These would augment instruction for students having difficulty reading the selections and assist them in acquiring and utilizing the strategies and skills presented in the course of instruction. This supplementary product was prepared under contract by an outside text development company. Author #1 collaborated on the development of this product, primarily as a reviewer of sample materials produced by the developer. Overall responsibility for the supplemental product was assigned to an editorial vice president who normally supervised social studies and foreign language products.

The publisher's perception of this supplemental product was expressed in a document (August 1991) to the developer. In this excerpt, the editorial vice president outlines the scope and intent of the project, and the relationship of the supplemental product to the main program:

This letter is to describe our project to you and indicate what we are looking for from [you]. The [Supplemental product] is an adaptation of our new basal reading program for students in need of language development help. It was originally conceived to help teachers mainstream Spanish-language students who are transitioning into reading in English. The [supplemental product] components provide a way to use the [main product] with these students, keep these students in the same place as their classmates, let them participate in the sharing time when selections are discussed, and let them move forward with their classmates as they gain proficiency in English. As we discussed the kinds of learning activities ESL and LEP students need to learn to read successfully in English, we realize that we were describing a program that could be used with students other than Spanish-speaking students; students who for whatever reason need more time on task, need language development, need comprehensible input, need instructional strategies that involve different modalities, need material structured for success. Thus we have expanded our target student population, but we don't want to lose sight of the fact that the market need driving this product development is the classroom teacher with Spanish-speaking students who are "transitioning" into English. [The main program] is being developed to submit in the 1992-93 reading adoption in Texas. The Texas market is the market driving this product.
The publisher's guidelines to the developer refer to the need to support all students who are experiencing difficulty, but the product is clearly presented as a language support system. To some extent this orientation can be attributed to the publisher's background in foreign language learning. However, the economic factors attributed to the adoption by the state of Texas with its large number of Spanish-speaking students can be seen to have an even more powerful influence on the orientation of the supplemental product. As a program rationale (August 1991) explains, the goal of this product was:

> to add value to [the main program] for those Texas teachers who have limited-English proficient students — particularly Spanish-speaking students — in their classrooms. This added value must be sufficient to offset the lack of a Spanish edition of the reading program.

The publisher's aim — to create support modules which will augment the main program — can be seen as an attempt to accommodate a specific target population without straining the main program and the publisher's investment. While publishers might promote the flexibility of a reading program as a bonus feature for teachers, flexibility usually means that the same product can be sold in different markets. The tension, in this case, is to provide a Spanish supplement which makes the adoption list in Texas, while still providing support for students whose reading difficulties are not language-related. This issue is further addressed in the proposal sent to the developer:

> While the [supplemental product] is designed to address a specific marketing issue in Texas — that of bilingual teachers with Spanish-speaking LEP students — it will also meet the needs of teachers whose students lack the language and concept background to succeed in a regular basal program for other reasons. Students who speak other non-English languages than Spanish, children who are in various Federally supported programs such as Title 1, children who are not as developmentally ready as their peers to learn to read, and so forth, will be well served by [the supplemental product]. Thus, a component designed to meet one market need can, if properly promoted, expand the market for [the main program] throughout the country, and within Texas itself.
This aim to expand the market with a supplemental or ancillary product places enormous pressures on these modest (forty-eight page) instructional guides. Not only does the publisher aim to address the needs of a range of diverse students in these booklets, these products’ ability to provide such broad support should be immediately obvious to even casual (“thumbtest”) examination. The appearance of the supplemental product reflects the compromise between these two concerns.

The proposal and the guidelines for the supplemental product were produced by the publisher and elaborated through discussions with the developer. Author #1 served mainly as a reviewer and consultant. In these roles, the author can be seen attempting, if not to redirect the product away from a language deficit model toward strategic instruction at least to maintain a support component for students other than those in ESL or bilingual programs. In a 1991 memo to the publisher, the author commented on guidelines sent to the developer. In this excerpt, the author argues against the amount of time allocated to vocabulary development at the expense of actual reading. (The supplemental product proposed to offer students support for one-third of the selections in the mainline program.)

To: [Executive editors]
From: XXXXXXXXXXXXX
Date: 25 August 1991
re: [Supplemental Product]

... We simply cannot offer a program that provides more vocabulary study, more skill work, and more preparation for reading at the expense of actual reading and writing. If there is one thing we know for sure it is that nothing beats actually reading for improving reading. We cannot foist upon these children a program that reduces their reading by two-thirds compared to their peers! That simply guarantees their permanent status as underachievers. Basically, we are confronted with the same problem we had in the development of [Previous supplemental product] - either we admit that these kids need more time, more instruction, and more opportunity to read or we design a program that actually slows acquisition. These kids do not need slower instruction and less reading - they need accelerated instruction and lots of supported reading and writing.

I enclose, by way of examples, an article "on Storyplaying" which I sent earlier and a big book article. Earlier I sent the phonemic segmentation curriculum demonstrated enormously effective by [researcher] and it should be available in
the [publisher's] offices somewhere. Each of these pieces could represent components of a K-1 intensive instructional expansion of [publisher's new program].

I am worried that [the supplemental product] sounds like a slow track and simply will not sell for the same reasons we had difficulty with [publisher's previous product] in urban markets - those in charge know that the design sounds a lot like a slow track. In that Texas survey I mentioned above, principals were far less enthusiastic than teachers about 'developmental' approaches that did not accelerate low-achieving kids progress. We need to ask ourselves, "Is this program one I'd like my kid in?" Is this such a rich effort that the gifted folks will borrow from it? Or are we designing a very traditional "slow it down and make more concrete" program that is designed to keep low-achieving kids on the bottom?

This said, let me note that there are some features of the [proposed supplementary product] proposal that I like very much but I will continue to suggest that the basic framework is misguided and that the market has changed since 1980. Everyone is much more attuned to the notion of acceleration now (even Chapter 1 has as its slogan 'Acceleration, not remediation'). We need [supplemental product] to be an add-on that, when used, will ensure that more low-achieving children are successful in [mainline product] don't need a program that severely limits their participation in [new product] and reduces the chances that they will acquire reading proficiency. We just know too much about vocabulary development now to suggest taking kids out of reading for work with vocabulary cards.

The conceptual framework for the supplemental product was then translated into a "statement of philosophy," a document that was actually authored by the text developer and submitted to the publisher and author for review. In the statement, the aim of the supplemental product is identified as providing activities to:

- extend and build upon the strategies in the [main program] by adding pictures, pantomimes, manipulatives, work with words and sentences, semantic maps — ESL methods and Sheltered English techniques to ready the LEP student for success in reading.

The author's response (in the form of comments written directly on a copy of the statement) were succinct. S/he expressed concern that the statement was "too heavily weighted towards LEP" students. In one place, the author amended the text from "proficient in English" to read "proficient in reading and writing."
Within weeks, the developer had produced sample lessons and activities for the supplemental product. These were submitted to the publisher, who then relayed them to the author for review. The author, with characteristic plain-speaking, delivered a highly critical response to the developer's materials. In this excerpt from a memo to the publisher, the author uses the "reviewer" role to move the product away from the ESL focus and back into providing support for poor readers:

To: [Executive editors]
From: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
re: [Grade 3 [Supplemental Program] selections & [Outside Developer's sample] lesson
September 29, 1991

I think the sample lesson is generally a disaster. Like the selection criteria, the lesson draws from a 1960s mentality about assistance. We have worked hard to get this sort of thing out of the regular program and now it appears here. I was worried when I saw all those workbooks on the shelves at [outside developer] and when I heard the ideas for components but they seemed to talk a better game while I was there but this betrays their firm footing in the slow it down and break it up mentality.

This is a front-loaded lesson where the teacher dumps out information to fill the empty heads of these kids. I see no emphasis on children sharing what they know, none on speaking, writing, reading, sharing! I expect it will occupy 2-3 days of a teachers time to do all this stuff before the Ss are allowed to read the story themselves. I see no contextual instruction and no real strategy instruction at all in here. Instead, we get dance v. danced lesson in isolation. We have kids listening for verb tense instead of character development, plot line, or literary language. We have an idiot's vocabulary lesson before Ss read and no contextual strategy focus on vocabulary learning after Ss have read. We want these Ss to acquire strategies for learning new vocabulary meanings as they read not long drawn out definitional vocabulary lessons before they read.

The supported reading suggestions are the old 'interrupt them a lot and ensure all comprehension is destroyed' pattern. This is not support, it is interruptive of the story line and emerging reader understandings. This is the old lessons originally created for retarded Ss and it didn't work well with them either! Again, we have spent 10 years getting this sort of thing out of the regular TE and now it appears here! I am about ready to give up! Honestly, this lesson is worse than the old program we worked to replace. We have made so many strides that I cannot simply let this stuff float by. Either [outside developer] needs to demonstrate some understanding of the basic program philosophy and the developments in understanding language learning acquired in the past 30 years or we should dump them now before anymore damage is done. We will be better off with no [Supplemental product] than to offer one of this sort.
If [the developer] can sell this stuff to someone, fine, but don't contradict virtually everything the author team has worked to achieve with this program. Maybe we should send them copies of Experiences with literature: A thematic model for the bilingual classroom (Navarez & Ramirez), Writing in a bilingual program (Edelsky), Reading in the bilingual classroom (Goodman & Flores), The input hypothesis (Krashen), or even Toward a reading-writing classroom (Butler & Turbill). They don't seem to have a clue.

If [the developer] is the only choice then we need to get them up to speed before they do anything else. I don't know how we can compress lessons on 30 years of literacy learning research and 10 years of [the publishing company's] development work into the timeframe. They have such a long way to come before they can produce anything that I would think [the publishing company] would want their logo on and having them produce more at this point seems to be a case of throwing good money after bad.

The publisher's response to this criticism is bewildering. Days later (October 1, 1991), the editorial vice president in charge faxed a letter of acknowledgement to the author, adding, "Obviously we need to make some changes — we're not getting the kind of expertise in ESL that I had expected." The publisher's commitment to positioning the product to support both ESL students and low-achieving students, however, remained intact. The publisher concludes, "If we could marry ESL methodology to reading, we would further reduce fragmentation of instruction in the classroom, wouldn't we?"

Also at this juncture, the publisher introduces an instructional framework proposed by a Texas-based scholar whose background is associated with ESL instruction. The publisher presents this framework to Author #1 for comment adding, "These describe a language/reading instructional approach and provide some examples of the kinds of activities we would find in our TEs were we to adopt it."

This framework is characterized by attention to language and vocabulary development. Activities focus on letter sounds, idioms, and syntax. In the following excerpts from a memo to the publisher, Author #1 supports what s/he believes are ideas compatible with her/his own. In this memo the author also comments on the progress of the sample lessons being revised by the developer.
To: [editorial v.p.]
From:
re: [supplemental product proposal]
12 October 1991

I think most of what [Texas-based scholar] has proposed as a framework for supporting students reading is right on the mark. His ideas about oral presentation of the text by the teacher fits well with I know about supporting poor readers and developing language competence generally. I particularly like his notion that;

"As the students listen to the selection, the teacher models the important sentences by saying, repeating, reciting, chanting, and singing these special sentences.

I think the framework is doable and worthwhile. I do have a few concerns about some of the proposed lessons offered in his memo but I'll describe them and hope that you or [the Texas-based scholar] might respond to them.

The first lesson in my packet is on the SH digraph and perhaps it was just unfortunate positioning because I reacted negatively to this focus for such a powerful story. After completing the whole packet I felt more at ease but would hope we didn't create a program that generally suggested that such lessons were needed.

Along those same lines, I would like to see WORD level activities contextualized and focused on after the initial listening/reading of the story. Wide reading/listening is the most powerful activity for developing vocabulary and syntactic competence. The link between language competence and reading performance is bi-directional with involvement in reading/listening fostering language competence. For too long we've held the view that language competence limits reading competence and ignored the role of reading in developing language competence.

I appreciate the sentence focus but would not restrict lesson focus just to sentences (or would create another category between sentence and story comprehension). A primary focus of [the main program] is the development of literary understanding. We want teachers and children to focus their attention on how authors create settings, moods, characters, plots, and so on. I don't see that focus in this sample lesson but do believe that we need it to keep [the supplemental product] on track with thrust of core plan. At times we can focus on sentences and accomplish this, at other times we'll need to focus on several sentences where a character is described, for instance.

In short, I support the notion of 'bathing' children in language experiences and I think the proposal is headed in that direction. As long as we keep the notion that these kids need more opportunities to read, write, and respond and a more supportive environment for doing those things I think we will be all right. We just have to remember that what takes up the most space is what teachers are most likely to select to do. We have to ensure there is a balance in favor of holistic support activities with response as the focus.
Here, as "reviewer," the author attempts to keep the supplemental product philosophically integrated with the instructional approach of the main program. Although this philosophy is not aligned with the proposed ESL-oriented framework, the author works to position specific skill lessons within the context of supported reading.

By mid-November, the Texas-based scholar has been placed as co-author of the supplemental product. As materials begin to arrive from the developer, the program reflects the shift toward an ESL orientation. Sample heads and text make clear the product's aim to help students "Achieve English Proficiency" and "Build Cultural Understandings." Specific strategies refer to illustrations as "visual clues to build vocabulary" and "the barriers" of dialogue.

Author #1 maintains the point of view that poor readers need more instruction in the same strategies as able readers receive. In other words, Author #1's vision of the supplemental product provides more instruction, elaborating on the activities presented in the teacher's edition to the main program. To strengthen this connection to the main program — by offering poor readers instruction which is differentiated but not different — the author negotiates this point in the following memo:
To: [Executive Editor]  
From: XXXXXXXXXXXX  
re: [Supplemental Product]  
Date: 9 January 1992

It seems to me that we don't have to always create new activities for [Supplemental Product]- in many cases we might simply clarify, extend, simplify a TE activity. For example, the TE has Word Watch comments on words that editors thought might pose problems for kids, especially meaning problems. However, in many cases the words also present pronunciation problems but usually the TE doesn't address that, especially above grade 2. Since pronouncing 'big words' is one of many problems that at-risk readers present we might key the [Supplemental Product] to develop word structure knowledge for word watch words. For example, the teacher could show the Ss the syllable structure, model breaking down big words by trimming affixes, contrasting words with known words with similar structure, etc. Much of the design of such activities is already available in [Publisher's Previous Supplementary Product] (that was the stuff the Ts loved about [Publisher's Previous Supplementary Product]).

I guess my worry is that as [the Supplemental Product] is developed we will reinvent the wheel and in doing so create a product that Ts see as a lot of additional work (and not too well linked to TE).

The justification for the author's "worries" about the supplemental product were borne out when the first sample lessons for the product arrived. Forwarding a copy from the developer, a senior editor from the publishing company asked for the author's review, noting:

As you know, these activities/lessons for second-language learners who have been placed in mainstream classrooms are to be used in tandem with the lessons provided in the teacher's editions. They will even use the colors that the TE use to signal various parts of the lesson.

As this cover letter suggests, not only has the focus of the product moved further into a second-language orientation, but despite appearances, the supplemental product will have its own set of support materials. As the editor further explains:

They are supported by their own ancillaries: audiotapes (of all the selections!) BLMs (including, among other things, the 10 important sentences for every main selection); a sounds boardgame (one for each grade level), picture dictionaries, sets of "idiom cards" (humorous illustrations of English idioms, and possibly a Spanish/English glossary based on the glossaries at the end of each pupil book (one for each grade level).
What is remarkable about this description of the product is the way the original idea of "booklets inserted in vinyl pockets that precede each module in the main teacher edition" has blossomed into a set of "books and support materials available together in a custom box." This substantial expansion of the scope of this product can be seen to reflect the concern to provide Texas adoption committee members with an unmistakable impression of the publisher's concern for second-language students.

Not altogether surprisingly, Author #1 (as reviewer) responded that the materials and the plan were in danger of being conceptualized as a separate product. More importantly, as work on the product moves along, last year's concepts are solidifying rapidly into instructional formats. In the process, responsibility for actual lesson construction moves further out of the author's control. The author's "reviewer" role aims to maintain program coherence. As excerpts from the following memo point out, the author uses this role to steer development.

To: [Executive & Senior Editors]
From: XXXXXXXXXX
re: [Supplemental Product]
10 February 1992

It was my view the [supplemental product] needed closer links to [the main product] lessons. The developer needs to think of the [supplemental product] as an extension of [the Main Product] lessons rather than a collection of additional activities. The framework needs to be focused on expanding shared/supportive reading and writing activity rather than adding isolated skill activity.

The workshops in [the main product] are virtually ignored in the sample lessons but should be a second focus of [the supplemental product]. There is no link to [the main product] BLM or Activity Books in the sample lessons although these would be third focus of my [supplemental product]. We do not need more BLM, nor more drill, nor more skills. What we need from [the supplemental product] are activities to foster development of the [the main product] strategies and understandings. We need activities that have taken the [main product] activity and reworked it so that children who are having problems can still get it.
Much of the [main product] word activity focuses on developing meanings but avoids developing sensitivity to structure - that is, lessons often have no component that illustrates why a word is pronounced the way it is or how to use what you already know about other words to help figure out the new word. Most kids seem to discover these things but we have a mass of evidence that many kids do not without clear and careful instruction that draws their attention to these features of words. This is true not only in the primary grades but through grade 8. Thus, I would make creating an integrated word structure activity strand a central focus of [the supplemental product] also.

The current sample lessons of the [supplemental product] are vast improvements over the previous draft versions. However, I do think we are still a ways from prime time versions. I worry that [the supplemental product] is still conceptualized primarily as a separate product built from an isolated skills perspective rather than a support product that extends the constructivist framework of [the main product]. If we want to deliver a product that will make [the main product] work better for a wider range of children then we need to ensure we have developers who understand [the main product] and its underlying philosophy.

As can be seen from the example so far, the working arrangements of authors, editors and developers have an effect on the ways texts evolve. Not only is the author isolated from contractors and subcontractors, he may not work directly with other authors. In this case, communication of ideas can easily become circuitous. And, as "ideas" become "text", collaborators who may have been in (at least partial) agreement at the conceptual level may find themselves at odds with each other when the product begins to reach an operational stage.

This situation is illustrated in the memo Author #1 sent to the editorial director concerning the development of the supplementary product. Here the author, reviewing sample lessons, responds with research perspectives intended to shift the product back to the orientation of supporting poor readers.
Enclosed is a table from an article I just reviewed for publication. The article is entitled "How well do classroom materials assist teachers of mainstreamed LD students?" The analysis is of TE copy and attempts to determine whether TEs provide explicit suggestions for teachers about how lessons might be adapted for mainstreamed mildly handicapped children. Jean Schumm did another similar article recently on TE manual suggestions for LEP students. I think we should at least review the general categories of assistance the analysis framework offers. It is too late to do anything along this line explicitly for the [the main product] TE but we do need to seriously consider how to integrate some such framework into [the supplemental product].

I fear that [the supplemental product] is once again becoming an ESL support product and the majority of kids who might have trouble are being ignored in the design. The latest lesson is heavily weighted towards [co-author's] ESL framework and largely ignores much of what we offered even in [previous supplemental program]. There is a market beyond Latino audiences and we need to acknowledge that in our philosophy and pedagogy. I worry that we are losing our initial broader focus and our notion of rich supportive lessons to a gamut of games and word/sentence level activities. The goal is to help teachers use literature to develop readers. To immerse these children in language and literature (not in words, phrases, and sentences). Children need to understand and appreciate stories before they are bothered with words and sentences.

Let me shift subjects and note that Texas seems a mess. I thought it was only schools that didn't have plans.

While control over the actual development of specific lessons is clearly out of this author's hands, control over general organizing frameworks also appears limited. In this example, the perspectives of two authors resonate where compatible (intensive instruction and teacher support) but clash disharmoniously at the level of application. How are conflicts such as these resolved?

Issues which find conflict may not be necessarily framed in terms of "appropriate" or "inappropriate" per se. Ultimately, decisions are guided in terms of which approach best fits the publisher's concept of the market. In this example, Author #1's holistic and literary approach conflicts with his co-author's language orientation. As the development of the supplemental product moves into its final phase, the author's ability to influence the process (functioning in any role) appears minimal.
An exchange of faxes illustrates where authority resides in this process. Responding to the author's last review of the supplemental product, the executive vice president in charge of development for this product sent the author a note to clarify the focus of the project.

The focus of the [supplemental product] is as a support system for second language students. It has been so from the beginning. However, we believe firmly that the [supplemental product] will help many other children who need language development and support beyond what can be given in the main line teacher's guides. The tension between the needs of the second language learner and those of the [poor readers] has contributed to much delay in our development of the [supplemental product]. We have felt it necessary to clarify that the target audience is the second language learner. This clarification helps us keep in the [supplemental product] lesson elements of vocabulary and concept development and pronunciation assistance that would not be present if we did not make this audience a primary one. Nonetheless, the vast majority of assistance provided by the [supplemental product] is of the kind you want....

Despite such reassurance, the author again voiced a protest as seen in the excerpts from the following memo. However, by now the prototype for the project had become what the editor considered "pretty final copy" and the author had little power to redirect it.

To: [Executive and Senior Editors]  
From: XXXXXXXXXX  
Re: [Supplemental Product] proto  
22 March 1992

Attached to this memo is a marked copy of the [supplemental product] prototype I received on Friday. Here I'll try to discuss general reactions to the format rather than selection specific features. However, I don't have the TE copy for the selection so I may miss the mark a bit. Please note that this proto is very much improved and has a lot more right with it than earlier versions (but it isn't perfect yet).

I worry that the activities are light on response to literature and focused more on recall instead....The several activities here all focus primarily on simple recall of events (personally, I can't imagine finding 10 sentences that would adequately reflect the story line here much less the literary line). We have kids retell, recall, predict, remember, and so on but we hardly ever touch on 'getting into' characters or plot. I just worry that this focus makes using wonderful literature irrelevant. This approach does not reflect much of what we have tried to do in the regular program nor much of what we have learned about teaching literature.
I'd like to see more 'enactment' activity - dramatizations, readers theater, skits, role play, voice, etc. Too much of this seems workbook-like rather than response-like. I'd like to see more writing activity or more suggestions about how to support Ss when they do TE writing activity.

Finally, it seems this proto is still too ESL focused and largely ignores other at-risk populations. We are real light on the type of support activities (from Jean Schum and friends) suggested for remedial and LD kids (see the information I sent in last week)...

While from a marketing standpoint, the publisher might prefer to produce a single text with multiple markets, eventually the product takes on characteristics which conform to traditional notions supplied by the publisher's product catalogue. As the struggle to define the target audience draws to a close, the development of the supplemental product is wrested away from Author #1's influence. Not surprisingly, given her/his longstanding convictions, Author #1 continues the debate in this memo, even as this critical issue goes down to defeat.

To: Please copy to all
From: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Re: [Supplemental Product] product
23 March 1992

I received [Senior Editor's] letter of 3/20/92 just after I faxed in my comments on the 3/18/92 prototype that Julie had faxed me late last week. I am beginning to bumble onto the source of the problems I've been having with [the Supplemental Product], I think.

[Editor] refers to my brief 3/11/92 memo where I worried that the "[Supplemental Product] is once again becoming an ESL support product and the majority of the kids who might need help are being ignored in the design." Her response is that the [Supplemental Product] is focused "as a support system for second language students." This is the first anyone told me that this was to be the focus. As two years of memos will attest, I think this is a very wrong focus but if that is the final decision I can offer future commentary from that product view.

When I wrote the 3/11/92 memo I had not seen the 3/18/92 version of [the supplemental product]. Thus, my evaluation of that recent prototype (faxed 3/23/92) was based on my assumption that LEP students were but one of three groups of at-risk children that [the supplemental product] would focus on (disadvantaged, learning disabled/ADD, LEP). Had I been working from the assumption that the product was to be focused on LEP student needs, my comments might have differed.
Let me reiterate my longstanding concerns. I think it is a mistake to ignore the other two groups as focal groups. I think it is a mistake to focus this product on any single at-risk population. But more to the point, I think we are often applying an ESL/LEP support framework that is a bit out of step with the whole orienting framework of [the main product]. Basically, the activities that focus on vocabulary before reading, pictures for cued recall, ten important sentences, and articulation activities fall at the perimeter of the language framework from which we developed [the main product].

Such an emphasis was more in vogue when we created the original [co-basal series] (see LEP suggestions there) but it seems out of step with current views. The notion of games, blackline masters, visuals, and workbooks appear dated in the current era of language immersion, language play, and an emphasis on language as communicative activity and literature as a rich source of learning about language and humankind.

Ideally, I think we need a product that somehow reflects the varying circumstances that we place at-risk children in. We need a product that can be used by ESL/LEP teachers, by reading and resource room teachers, and by classroom teachers who are stuck out there alone. Perhaps we can offer suggestions along this line in the front matter but I'd like to see if the design folks can come up with a design format that reflect the varying conditions better.

I think there are teachers and kids who will need more support than our TE gives them to be successful in [main product]. I think we need a [supplemental product] that offers that support for teachers of at-risk children. I think that [the supplemental product] needs to target at-risk children generally, regardless of the factors that put the children at risk. Much of what the LD kid needs, the ESL/LEP kid needs, and the disadvantaged kid from the Adironacks or South Bronx needs it as well. At-risk readers need immersion in literature and language. These kids need access to the stories and the responses to those stories, not just recalling the events in sequence. These kids need the reading and writing processes explained to them, modeled for them.

I guess my frustration in all this is that we have been at this effort for several years and I still see a product that is not well-defined and lacking a consistent relationship to the [main product] philosophy or pedagogy. I keep hearing sales reps tell me what they need the [supplemental product] to do and I don't think we are quite there yet. The most recent prototype represents enormous steps forward. The linkage with the TE is far better than in previous versions. The DLTA works wonderfully here and the dramatization and interpretation activities are on the mark. It looks easy to use and reasonably coherent. In short, I am cheered by the progress. Nonetheless, I hope we can continue to perfect the design and create BB formats that reflect the central features of the [main product] philosophy and support kids' learning. Perhaps we should also poll [co-authors] on their notions about this product.
After conceding the conceptual battle as a lost cause, Author #1 has little room to navigate. Neither invocation of research literature, nor reiteration of personal belief and experience prove effective in terms of redirecting the mission of the new product. Accepting the publisher's perspective, Author #1 appears to have little recourse other than to couch her/his opinions in terms of her/his perception of "the market," an argument employing a language to which s/he seems to hope the publisher will be sensitive.

To: [Executive and Se or Editors]
From: XXXXXXXXXXXX
Re: [Supplemental Product]
Date: 26 May 1992

I had the opportunity to have a long conversation with an ESL teacher on Long Island last week and the topic of reading support materials just happened to arise. I'm writing about this because I often feel that the ESL advice/ideas we seem to be getting are just several years out of date in terms of where programs on the East Coast are today. My long conversation seemed to confirm much of my earlier criticism of [the Supplemental Product] activities and ideas. I am not aware of what folks do in Texas but I do feel reasonably comfortable with ESL program structure and philosophy here and in California and I think we would do well to run some sample [Supplemental Product] lessons past ESL practitioners on both coasts (we need the product in Eastern cities and all over California).

I'd like you to consider sending prototype lessons to [XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX]. She is willing, perhaps eager, to review stuff for us. If you are interested, I can provide a West Coast name or two and an ESL program administrator or two.

I guess I am more worried now than before, perhaps because of what [a colleague] had to say about why [co-author] isn't working on the [competitor's] program.

As the development of the product concludes, one last event further illustrates the decision-making process which directs new product development. The "front matter" — informational text for the teacher, placed at the beginning of the materials — helps explain the key features and utility of the supplemental product. Here the publisher answers the question: WHO needs the support of the [supplemental product?] Teachers are recommended to:
Use the [product] with children whose language development has not reached its full potential:

* students whose native language is not English
* English-speaking students whose exposure to vocabulary and concepts has been limited
* students in Chapter 1 programs
* students who have not been read to at home
* students who need more time and more experiences with literature—children who need extra support in the classroom.

Summary of Illustrative Example

As can be seen from this example, the author is an active participant in the process of developing instructional materials. It should be noted that the events highlighted in this example occurred while the author participated in a number of other discussions and collaborations.

What is also evident from this example is that the author operated in a variety of functions. And that, regardless of the role s/he played, s/he used each event as an opportunity to advance a conception of the product which reflected her/his longstanding beliefs about poor readers and their need for differentiated and explicit instruction. Finally, this example illustrates that the author was not entirely successful in controlling the development of the product. While the program eventually met the author's general concern (of providing all students with a unified curriculum), in this case, traditional ideas (about literacy instruction and poor readers), as well as critical market factors (going into the Texas adoption without a Spanish-language program) proved overwhelming in determining the way even this general concern was operationalized.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the ways in which two literacy scholars contributed to the process of the development of basal reading programs. This study explored critical aspects of this process which in turn determined whether the authors' ideas were accepted, adapted, or rejected.

Procedures

After a pilot study had been conducted, criteria were developed to guide the selection of case study participants. Two key informants were selected. These were literacy scholars who had actively collaborated in the development of separate basal reading programs.

Because the aim was to capture the process which guides the construction of reading programs, this study relied mainly upon analyses of documents created in and around the development of two basal reading programs. Document analyses were augmented through retrospective interviews in which authors who participated in the development of these programs reflected on their experiences.
Data were analyzed and coded to describe authors' key beliefs. Data were re-coded to identify the roles authors played during their collaborations with publishers. Additional analyses compared authors' intentions with published outcomes. Finally, data were used to develop an illustrative analytical narrative which reconstructed the experiences of one author.

Inferences were drawn to show how the authors contributed to the development of the reading programs at general thematic (macro-organizational) levels as well as at levels of specific goals and formats (micro-organizational). Analyses and inferences were subsequently reviewed by key informants. Their comments were addressed and incorporated in the final data analysis.

Findings

The major findings of this study contribute to the understanding of the way innovative ideas are advocated and negotiated through the process of developing a basal reading program. These findings are summarized in this section.

1. The innovative ideas which the authors intended to contribute to their programs had clear connections to their respective research careers. As veteran authors, they appeared to have attempted to use the basal reading program as a delivery vehicle for their own research-based beliefs about instruction and assessment. Specific beliefs described in this study included support for poor readers through an explicit and unified curriculum, prior experience as a basis for comprehension, response to literature, and open-ended assessments.
2. In this study, each author was shown to be an active participant in the process of developing their respective reading programs. Both authors assumed a variety of roles before, during, and after the publication of the reading programs. Through these roles, the two authors originated ideas or responded to the ideas of others. Regardless of the nature of the task or when it was performed, the authors used these occasions as opportunities to refocus issues, shifting them to align with their own intentions and perspectives regarding the programs' instructional or assessment designs.

3. The specific innovative ideas of the two authors were considered (by publishers) in relation to the overall program. That is, an author's proposed innovation was analyzed for its connection with the program's general philosophical orientation. Relatedly, innovative ideas were evaluated (by publishers) on the basis of their compatibility or fit with other components of the reading program. In other words, because basal reading programs are composed of inter-related core components and ancillary support materials, innovations were also examined for their impact on these components and their inter-relationships. For example, Author #1's intention of supporting poor readers while maintaining a unified curriculum was not well connected to the publishing company's tradition of providing for individual differences through different curricula. By comparison, Author #2's intention to use the theme of "prior experience" as the program's organizing strategy was closely linked to the company's tradition. This theme was interpreted as an evolution of the company's traditional strong skills approach to comprehension instruction.

4. The authors' intentions (of introducing innovative approaches to reading comprehension instruction, of providing an innovative unified approach to support for poor readers, of introducing an alternative assessment format, etc.) resulted in different outcomes. Innovative ideas were accepted in total, accepted in part, adapted, or rejected in
total. For example, the theme of "prior experience" as reflected by its prominence in the Teacher Edition, Student Edition, and practice book dominated the reading program. The theme was also incorporated as the central part of the lesson format used to provide instruction in comprehension strategies and vocabulary development. Innovative intentions such as an alternative assessment plan were accepted only in part. In this case, the plan was accepted as an optional strategy. As with reader response activities, these contributions were not interpreted as central to the design of the program. Author #1's intention to develop a single curriculum was adapted by the publishing company. In this case, all students did read from a common core of literature selections, but students received different kinds (not amounts) of instruction through the utilization of specialized teacher manuals.

5. The authors seldom exercised absolute control over the decision-making processes. More typically, authors and other members of the publishing group engaged in a process in which ideas were negotiated over prolonged periods of time. In this study, the two authors appeared to have less decision-making authority than did editors and publishing executives. The authors appeared to have more control over the process during the conceptualization phase. At that time, authors were introducing new ideas, training staff members, writing position papers and proposals. The value of negotiations among authors and editors in these preliminary stages seemed based on the expectations that such negotiations would lead to the refinement of some ideas, and eliminate others. The expertise of literacy scholars was valued (they led groups which developed prototypical models, they analyzed competitors' products, they wrote and presented statements about the program's philosophy, etc.), but the authors did not have the final say on contentious decisions. As ideas were consolidated into prototypes and sent to development companies, authors shifted to a "reviewer" function. An illustrative example was used to show how
one author lost control over the conceptualization of the approach to teaching poor readers. In this case, the author's expertise — developing effective programs for students who were experiencing difficulty learning to read — dominated the negotiation of the development of an acceptable prototype. However, when the program became more focused — "differentiating instruction" was redefined to mean meeting the needs of primarily Spanish-language students — the author appeared helpless to redirect the publisher's approach. Also, authors in this study believed there were decision-making processes at work which did not include them.

If the authors in this inquiry did not maintain control of the development of innovative ideas during this process, it seems reasonable to ask, "Who was in control?" At a basic level, the obvious answer points to the publisher (executives and their representative employees — senior and project level editors) as the final decision-maker. Ultimately, the publisher sets the budget and has the responsibility for developing products which not only justify expenses but which return sizeable profits. However, this perception is simplistic. This inquiry suggests that the publishers involved in the two basal reading programs described in this report were guided by outside factors and considerations. A more profitable question, it seems to me, is to ask, "What are the factors which influence the decision-making processes of the publishers described in this study, particularly with respect to the innovative ideas advanced by the case study authors?"

The findings which emerged from the analyses pointed to three themes which appeared to influence the extent and the direction the authors' contributions affected the process of developing their respective basal reading programs. These themes were "the market" (or economic influences), "literacy research" (or scholarly influences), and "tradition" (or historical influences).
Economic Influences

Both basal reading programs described in this study were assembled with attention to "the market." Notions of "the market" were reflected in the outcomes of innovative ideas the two case authors described as their intentions. These innovations were intended to have an impact on the overall instructional framework ("prior experience" or "differentiated instruction") or assessment ("open-ended formats"). Market factors were most noticeable in decisions about where these innovations should be located (in teacher editions, in student anthologies, or in ancillary materials such as kits, cards, and charts.)

Foremost among economic factors, in this study at least, was the targeting of specific regional markets. With regard to such point-of-sale factors, one author's contributions were evaluated in light of the values perceived to be associated with the target markets. For example, while the case example was seen to be second-language orientation, these values might also have been characterized as a literary orientation or a skills orientation.

A second economic factor pertained to notions of point-of-use. The basal reading programs described in this study were developed according to particular sets of beliefs about the teachers who utilize these materials. These sets of beliefs (publishers' perceptions and/or authors' perceptions) included appraisals of teachers' general level of expertise, teachers' interest in literacy instruction, as well as the realities and logistics of classroom teaching.

A third economic factor involves issues of cost-effectiveness. Educational publishing involves high stakes investments. In this study, innovations were accommodated through an alternation strategy characterized by a hierarchy of least-risk options. In other words, when the publishing executives in this study perceived an innovative idea to be fulfilling a significant market demand, their response was swift and
loud. For example, the incorporation of schema theory as an organizing theme was viewed as one publisher's (low-risk) response to an idea which appeared to have a large and growing base among classroom teachers. In contrast, ideas such as reader response or open-ended assessment, which publishers apparently believed enjoyed only marginal familiarity among classroom teachers, were incorporated marginally (mainly as labels, or as optional alternatives).

**Literacy Influences**

In this study, literacy research was shown to have been called upon to influence or advance innovative ideas in several ways. For example, literacy research contributed to the conceptual phase as the case study authors proposed innovative ideas (about instruction, reading skills, assessment, through position papers, meetings, and memoranda, supported by research-based rationales. These rationales either originated with the author's own body of research or were translations of research from other literacy scholars.

Literacy scholarship also affected the process during the actual development of the program. Both authors functioned as "staff developers" providing professional books, articles, and research reports to management, editors, and sales representatives. Acting as lobbyists in this way, authors intended to influence the way innovative ideas were applied to instructional formats or assessment designs. For example, Author #1 referred to literacy research in several arguments to broaden the application of the idea of providing differentiated, explicit instruction.

However, in this study, scholarship generally appeared to count for far more as a reactive influence rather than a creative influence. In other words, scholarship was most important during tasks such as product reviews and competitive analyses. That is, the case study authors believed they were called upon to evaluate aspects of the program according
to the products' relationship with contemporary research views. However, in instances which put the findings of scholarly research in conflict with the market (such as supporting poor readers versus the need to offset a lack of a Spanish-language edition), negotiations were controlled by the publishers' notions of "the market."

Scholarship was given courteous respect by the educational publishers. Both authors believed their personal stature (or "political capital") as scholars contributed to the educational publishers' willingness to accommodate their interests when conflicts arose. However, this outcome was reserved to areas which were considered of marginal importance ("reader response") or which presented low risk ("open-ended assessment"). In such cases they were incorporated as ancillary products or alternative options.

Finally, both authors believed that publishers responded slowly to most scholarly influences, but both authors commented on the "long view" of their collaboration. That is, in the long run such response was both incremental and inevitable. The response was inevitable in the sense that research-based ideas were believed to have powerful influences by stimulating the demand among the general education market. Two examples (prior knowledge and holistic assessment) were given to illustrate a publisher's changing response to persistent issues. It was pointed out that such changes took place over a period of nearly ten years. It was further suggested that the authors had worked on multiple editions of the publishers' basal programs, and that they were able to apply this long view across extensive careers rather than passing instances of collaboration.
**Historical Influences**

The authors' contributions to the development of their respective basal reading programs were subject to historical influences. Two general types of historical influences were observed — corporate and classroom.

Corporate traditions were seen to have had a powerful effect on the way the authors' ideas were perceived. On one level, corporate traditions refer to the previous programs the publisher has produced. Over time, the publishers believed their products had established corporate images characterized through generations and generations of reading programs. Successive innovations were thus viewed from the perspective of these traditions and evaluated according to their alignment with these traditions.

The influence of corporate traditions was also reflected in the author teams which the publishers described in this study assembled to develop basal reading programs. For example, in this study, both basal reading programs involved key participants — authors and editors — who had worked together on previous reading programs for their respective publishing companies. To a large extent, both authors framed their intentions in terms of their prior experiences as authors. And, as authors intending to introduce innovative ideas to new programs, they were reminded to retain "old friends", that is, the instructional formats, skill labels, and program components that had appeared in previous editions. These familiar features were believed to be of importance to prospective consumers whose expectations helped define the boundaries of innovation.

Classroom traditions also acted as powerful influences in determining the outcomes of particular innovative ideas. Because the basal reading programs described in this study were shown to follow rather than lead classroom trends, innovations appeared constrained by the prevailing view of innovations in the classroom. Whether such perceptions were based on actual data and analysis or mere speculation, the notion that entrenched traditions
such as ability grouping affected the disposition of proposed innovations. For example, Author #1 had intended to develop a curriculum in which all students would participate. The whole class approach advocated by the author challenged the traditional practices of segregating students on the basis of ability. In this instance, the tradition among publishers to develop different programs for able readers, poor readers, and students for whom English is a second language also worked against the author's proposed innovation. Specifically, the tradition of entering the Texas marketplace with a strong Spanish-language component influenced the author's proposal to the extent that it was repositioned as a language supplement.

Finally, basal reading programs have their own historic traditions as cultural artifacts. Programs have traditional components, and each component has traditional formats and functions. Innovations in student workbooks or assessment packages, for example, were considered in terms of their relationship to their more traditional counterparts. The merits of new assessment programs were weighed against existing assessment packages. Innovations perceived as evolutionary links were more likely to become incorporated than those which were perceived as revolutionary challenges to tradition.

**Discussion**

This study was undertaken to explore the ways literacy scholars contribute to the process which leads to the development of basal reading programs. Of particular interest was the identification of aspects of the process which determined how authors' ideas become incorporated, adapted, or rejected during the phases of development.
By the same token, it should be pointed out that there were several aspects pertaining to the collaborative relationship between literacy scholars and educational publishers which might have been explored but which were not the focus of this inquiry. Briefly, three important issues which might have been looked into were (1) the influence of purportedly lucrative remuneration contracts which specify the legal relationships between authors and publishers, (2) the ethical issues surrounding scholars who operate in multiple leadership roles and the possibility of conflicts of interests, and (3) the validity of the research base which underlies the practices advocated in basal readers.

While these issues were not addressed directly in this investigation, it might be appropriate to assume that these do contribute to the complexity of the author-publisher relationship and that they have implications for the ways innovation entered the basal reading programs described here. However, neither personal experience in educational publishing nor analysis of the documents available to me suggested that these factors dominated the relationships and experiences described in this report. That is not to say that such influences might have operated in covert ways or manners which were not amenable to the data collection procedures used in this inquiry. In this sense, these issues may warrant future investigation.

The temptation to evaluate authors and publishers as gatekeepers of innovation is ever present in a study such as this. Socio-political, economic, and ethical issues pertaining to the sort of active collaboration between literacy scholars and educational publishers similar to those described in this study are sensitive and important (Smith; Shannon; Goodman, et al.).

A more important contribution of a study such as this, it seems to me, is not what the data reveal about the authors and editors whose voices are heard in these negotiations but what the outcomes of these dialogues say about the authors' and publishers' perception
of literacy and their perception of literacy instruction. That is, insofar as these products reflect what the authors and publishers estimated a significant number of teachers, students, and others will "buy" as valuable instruction, the basal reading programs underscore contemporary values about reading instruction and assessment. In this way, the present exploration reflects the beliefs of two authors and several editors, and their perceptions of the larger community which directly or indirectly supports their intentions and efforts.

And, while the beliefs of the authors and editors described in this study may have been grounded on nothing more substantial than perception or intuition, these participants were seen to have been operating from inconsistent positions. That is, analysis of the data pointed to important tensions among these beliefs. In this way, the basal reading programs discussed here and the decision-making processes out of which they emerged can be viewed as compromises negotiated among these several tensions. The critical tensions are summarized in this section.

**Critical Tensions in the Development Process**

* These basal reading programs attempted to negotiate between innovation and tradition — dynamic versus static perspectives. Market pressures required the publishers to continually provide their sales representatives with new products to sell. These products need to appear innovative even to casual, superficial examination. At the same time, the publishers and authors expressed concern to maintain ties with tradition. The result maximizes strategic labelling and minimizes actual innovation.

* The basal reading programs described in this report attempted to negotiate between contemporary realities and future possibilities — leading versus following. On the one hand, instructional materials were developed to support the publishers' and the authors' beliefs about teachers' perceptions of literacy and instructional practice. At the
same time, the case study authors attempted to model approaches which would cause teachers to modify those perceptions and practices. The result is a voice which is simultaneously patronizing and confirming.

* The basal reading programs described in this study attempted to negotiate between audiences — teachers versus students. On the one hand, basal reading materials were aimed to help students learn about literacy. On the other hand, the basal reading programs appeared constructed with the aim of helping teachers learn to teach literacy. The results were materials which assumed that learning to read is difficult and that literacy instruction requires specific kinds of expertise.

* The basal reading programs described in this investigation attempted to negotiate between competing assumptions about the foundations of proficiency — atomism versus holism. For example, the instructional programs in this study presented lessons which highlighted specific comprehension strategies. Although these were introduced and practiced as independent strategies, the authors expressed the belief that skillful reading is accomplished through the holistic, integrated employment of a range of cue systems, subroutines, and effective self-monitoring. Unfortunately, neither author in this study was able to account for the way skillful readers invoke, blend, and utilize these strategies into holistic procedures. The result is an instructional format which presents skills as a linear progression of discrete features but suggests that the reading process is holistic and interactive.

* The basal reading programs described in this investigation attempted to negotiate between competing models of literacy learning — as a result of direct instruction versus indirect acquisition. Both products can be seen as attempts to be simultaneously explicit and allusive in the language used to direct teachers and students. For example, lessons or activities which were expected to be instances of direct instruction were well defined and
prescriptive. Other activities, such as reading response activities which were viewed as extension activities, were written with minimal direction, and may only allude to possible responses or suggest ways teachers might customize the activity if they choose.

* The basal reading programs described in this investigation attempted to negotiate between competing conceptions of teaching — art versus science. As the progeny of educational science, they represented guidebooks to literacy. Yet, like the very best works of art, they enable us to re-examine the way we think about literacy. The result is an attempt to be both didactic and impressionistic.

These tensions are not surprising. They reflect the ambiguities and contradictions that comprise our current state of understanding, in terms of literacy acquisition and instruction. Given the complex context described in this study, how reasonable is the challenge that literacy scholars form collaborative partnerships with publishers (and other interested parties) for the purposes of bringing literacy research into practice? In light of the experiences of the two authors who participated in this investigation, the strategy appears to be questionable, at least in terms of efforts and effects.

It might be more realistic, perhaps, for literacy scholars to re-emphasize their areas of expertise, namely conducting and reporting literacy research. In this way, scholarship naturally has an indirect influence on classroom practice. Employing scholars to prepare or advise in the preparation of instructional materials, by contrast, can be seen as an attempt to short-cut this indirect approach. Unfortunately, it may not be appropriate to expect literacy scholars to have a direct influence on classroom practice. It may also be questionable to assume that literacy scholars have the same level of expertise in the areas of classroom practice or writing instructional materials as they do in conducting literacy research. Furthermore, it may be the case that without significant teacher input in the development of these programs, whatever innovations do become incorporated might be expected to be
viewed by teachers as merely another set of didactic routines imposed from outside the classroom. It is noteworthy, for example, that the investigation of the development of two basal reading programs in this study did not reveal significant and ongoing incidences of teacher participation or direct teacher-scholar-publisher interactions. In light of the data presented in this study, literacy scholars intending to translate their research directly into classroom practice through the medium of basal reading programs ought to expect minimal success. Ultimately, it may be the case that if literacy scholars intend to contribute to instructional practice, they must seek to form direct partnerships with classroom teachers as co-researchers and co-developers of instructional materials.

Resolution of these issues is not likely to come about through the employment of more skillful authors or more enlightened publishers. So long as there continues to be a fundamental assumption that the collaboration involved in the development of basal reading programs excludes teachers and students, and so long as scholars and publishers develop materials according to their own estimations and perceptions about literacy, teachers, and students, we ought to expect basal reading materials and classroom practices to resist important innovation and remain much the same as they are.

Limitations of the Study

This investigation attempted to describe and analyze the process in and by which literacy scholars contributed to the development of two basal reading programs. This aim differs from other investigations pertaining to instructional materials, which, until now, have mainly scrutinized the finished products of such contributions. Keeping the focus of this investigation on process, rather than product, proved to be an exciting and rewarding approach. However, the effort to capture this process "live" also entailed some formidable limitations.
One limitation was the inability to observe first-hand the behind-the-scenes interactions between authors and editors. The shortcomings of historical and retrospective data can be seen in the distance at which this placed the researcher from the event. In some cases, events were up to five years past at the time of this study. Moreover, the contexts in which events occurred were in some cases irretrievable. Political currents (vis a vis the educational reform movement) have certainly shifted. Economic conditions (vis a vis specific publishing companies) have similarly experienced change. And, of course, the key participants would be expected to have moved on from the philosophical and pedagogical positions they took up years ago. The nuances of these and other factors can not be accounted for in any reconstruction. In this sense, while the events presented in this study were reconstructed as ordered sets, a reconstructed history might not reflect the same interpretations authors would have attributed to their experiences as they were occurring.

A second limitation pertains to the method of data collection. Lacking an opportunity to add my own eyewitness account of the process, I relied mainly on the accounts of the key participants — the authors. Other data was collected from documents authors had received. This information must then be considered secondary source material. Furthermore, access to the data was controlled by others. For example, informants were able to provide or withhold documents as they chose. As mentioned previously, the data collection process created situations in which participants might have willingly or unwillingly acted to control the flow of information regarding their experiences.

Third, this study was limited by the documents which were not available for examination and analysis. In addition to documents which the participants might have misplaced or simply discarded, other data might never have been available in written form. Both authors, for example, alluded to the fact that a great number of pertinent discussions took place as conversations, casual comments, phone calls, and electronic mail. Moreover,
the images that did emerge from this process passed through several "filters" — first by the participants themselves and second by the investigator who organized and analyzed the data.

Fourth, an investigation of basal reading programs seems fraught with political overtones. Of particular consequence is the suggestion that authors and editors chose to participate (or elected not to participate) out of political motivation. The differences between the way the case study authors and publishers viewed this study were dramatic. That is, while some authors were reluctant to participate, the case study authors were enthusiastic in their participation — to the extent that they were both willing and desiring to waive their rights to confidentiality and anonymity. In contrast, the publishers contacted in this study were reluctant participants and expressed concern over what was perceived as a lack of anonymity and confidentiality. The first condition suggests that in a study such as this, the motivation to participate may need greater exploration. The second condition obviously posed a problem in terms of the desire to include multiple voices in this discussion. The lack of complete and equal cooperation from publishers reduces the clarity of the images presented in this study.

In conducting this investigation, these considerations were addressed in several ways. First, the images presented in this study should be recognized for what they are, namely, the reconstructions of experiences or the meanings which the participants ascribed to their own experiences. The implicit power of this approach is realized when it becomes clear that the participants are presently engaged in the ongoing development of new programs with their same publishing companies and are, thus, likely to be guided today by the meanings which they associate with previous experiences. In other words, these reconstructions are likely to affect the way these scholars approach their current collaborations.
Second, because the participants certainly controlled the flow of data, it cannot be assumed that the images presented in this study represent a complete depiction of the entirety of events which transpired. At best, they can be seen as examples of reasonably well-integrated instances of negotiations between scholars and publishers. In this regard, care was taken to look for patterns in which similar negotiations (that is, negotiations involving similar topics) occurred repeatedly over a period of several years. In this case, documents (from diverse sources) often revealed remarkable consistency. In this sense, the data do illustrate certain aspects of the collaboration between the authors in this study and agents of their respective publishing companies. It would be hoped that further investigations will reveal not only similar (i.e., corroborating) data but might extend our understanding through additional (i.e., complimentary) data.

Third, as mentioned previously, the data presented in this investigation must be considered in light of the several "filters" through which they passed. While there is no substitute for direct observation and collection, I believe great care was given to acknowledge and account for bias in both the data offered by participants and the analysis offered by the researcher.

Finally, the lack of complete and equal participation by all parties in the collaboration is lamentable. Although attention was given to documents prepared by agents of the publishing companies, intentions and values explicitly expressed in these documents were made to represent the publishers' perspectives. Hopefully, further research in this area will add to our understanding of the meanings publishers ascribe to these experiences.
Implications for Further Research

This investigation was an attempt to explore the collaborative relationship between literacy scholars and educational publishers. It was undertaken with the assumption that a collaboration between scholars and publishers would be expected to have important contributions to the development of basal reading programs. While analysis of authors' reconstructed experiences did help to clarify the way this process worked, other, related investigations seem appropriate.

First, a study which presents the publishers' intentions in these negotiations would add greatly to the images presented here. By the same token, it would be helpful to know how publishers' beliefs affect the way they view basal reading programs. It would also be interesting to learn how publishers interpret their roles in this process. In short, Apple's call for a full ethnographic study of the development of a basal reading series — from start to finish — remains a valuable goal.

Second, in setting out to do this study, I drafted a set of criteria to select participants. Among these criteria, I mentioned that participants would represent dominant and active voices which contributed to the negotiation process. I further focused attention on authors who seemed involved in shaping the reading comprehension features of their programs. One theme which quickly became apparent was the relationship between the literature selection process and the instructional strategies which authors built up around those selections.

Third, it would be helpful to explore the interplay between authors. For example, how do instructional theories and literary theories affect the way materials are selected for students' anthologies, or the way assessment programs are developed?

Fourth, this study suggested that market factors played an important role in shaping the contributions of these literacy scholars, and indeed, in determining the direction of the
programs which they helped develop. This aspect of educational publishing is largely unexplored territory. Our understanding of much of the mechanism underlying this relationship are presently limited to speculation. It would be helpful to know how products are built from the marketing side of the publishing company. Such information may illuminate the extent to which market decisions are grounded in actual research among active classroom teachers.

Fifth, the present study and those suggested here are in large part based on the assumption that basal reading programs influence teachers' decision-making processes. The need to revisit these issues seems particularly worthwhile in light of the trend to provide even greater numbers of menus from which publishers expect teachers to develop instructional plans.

Sixth, the influences of teachers on this process needs to be explored. Future research might be designed to reveal how teachers affect the development of instructional materials either in a direct or indirect manner. Related research might be used to learn how innovation actually does enter the classroom.

Ideally, a continued exploration of the way instructional materials are developed and utilized will enable us to better understand and appreciate the complex relationships between teachers and texts, scholars and students.
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