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PROLOGUE

Two kindergartners just caught a ladybug in the grass during recess. They rush over excitedly to show their teacher who retrieves the bug cage from the cabinet. After pulling out the child’s encyclopedia containing information on ladybugs, the teacher mediates a whole-class discussion in which many children relate their background experiences with ladybugs. *The Grouchy Ladybug* (Carle, 1986) is then read by the teacher.

The following day, the teacher displayed two new books on the science table: *Ladybug* (Watts, 1987) and *Life of the Ladybug* (Heiderose Fischer-Nagel, 1986). During the choice time, many children studied the close-up photographs in the books while others tackled the text. Several requests from children prompted the teacher’s reading of one of the books during the Shared Book Event that morning. The children then discussed various characteristics of the ladybug as the teacher wrote what they said on a huge chart placed on the bulletin board. An art activity in which the class made ladybugs dangling from stings created a period in which further discussion stimulated these kindergartners’ interests.

Experiences such as these occur on a daily basis in our classrooms. These children are experiencing the enjoyment of a literacy event as it relates to an immediate incident within their lives . . . the discovery of the ladybug. The
learning that develops in this situation did not develop independently; it was structured in the interactions between teacher and children, and among children. The purpose of instruction is the creation, rather than the transmission, of knowledge (Hanssen, 1986). This teacher through her attitude and philosophy left the door open to pique children's curiosity. Knowledge is learned through a co-creation of shared knowledge (Bruner, 1986). The theory that literacy learning is a fundamentally social process (Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Goodman, 1987; Heath, 1983; Scollon & Scollon, 1981; Scribner & Cole, 1981) supports the premise that children acquire an understanding of literacy as a result of their interactions with everyday print.

Perhaps, the single most important literacy event in which children and adults participate is the Shared Book Reading Episode. In such warm, personal times with others, the child can see literacy as a fun, meaningful experience.

As a teacher and a parent, I have always been fascinated with the children's enthusiasm and participation during the Shared Book Events. As a teacher, it seemed to be the one period of the day when I had all of their undivided attention. As a parent, I cherish this special time with my children when one of us reads, as they interact with me, with each other, as well as with the text.
CHAPTER I

DIMENSIONS OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

This morning during breakfast I noticed two books on the kitchen table that my eight-year old son had been reading last evening. The books, which I thought represented two types of genre, were Song and Dance Man (Ackerman, 1989) and Tyrannosaurus (Sheehan, 1981). Then upon opening Tyrannosaurus, I realized that both books were narratives. I then asked my second grader:

"Which do you like better . . . storybooks or books that tell a story like Song and Dance Man or nonfiction books or books that tell facts or tell about something?"

Without pausing, he then responded,

"Both 'cause I like to read about real baseball players or sports' players and I like to learn about things that really happened. I like stories, too, 'cause they're fun and I always wonder what's going to happen."

I then posited the same question to my ten-year old son. He thought for a moment before responding:
"I like the true books more because I know it really happened and that means something."

A narrative-lover myself, I was surprised at both boys' responses. These children liked nonfiction as much if not more than narrative!

I had read many more narratives than nonfiction texts to my children, as well as to my students during the Shared Book Events. I wondered if other people had followed this behavior pattern. One of my children expressed a preference for nonfiction and the other children liked the genres equally. Did other children exhibit this proclivity toward nonfiction, as well?

Rationale for the Study

Of the many experiences involved in young children's literacy encounters, perhaps storybook reading has received more attention than any other (Teale, 1986). This storybook reading period is a session in which the represented genre is usually a narrative rather than an expository text. After conducting an extensive cross-analysis of Shared Book Sessions within the home, the preschool, and the elementary school, I realized that there exists more research on the child's understanding of the narrative than of the expository text. More specifically, since narrative and expository texts serve different purposes (Spiro & Taylor, 1987), and most children who are exposed to books are inundated with stories at the expense of nonfiction being neglected (Kobrin, 1988), I wondered
if children possess a natural proclivity for narrative rather than expository text. Are the strategies employed by children to understand exposition more difficult than the strategies necessary to understand the story genre when the social situation remains constant? I also wondered if the group interaction processes during the Shared Book Events with different genres also varied. How do children perceive the interactions of their peers as well as their teacher during such literacy events?

Significance of the Study

As children interact with family members, classmates, and teachers, they construct a "what literacy means to me" value. The social importance of the "significant other" to the young child's stance has already been established (Cochran-Smith, 1984; Roser & Martinez, 1985; Teale, 1986). Therefore, not only is the teacher's influence an important factor, but there exists a strong possibility that the social relationships within the group also influence the children's interactions with the text. Even as young as preschool, behaviors and activities that children regard as important become an integral part of peer interactive events (Corsaro, 1985).

As children listen to the text within a Shared Book Event, they develop schemas of the organizational schemes within a text, as well as the patterns of
predictability. Narratives are organized in a predictable, similar manner, and the child who is familiar with this known style has a set of expectations upon which to base his predictions, thus enhancing comprehension (Stein & Glenn, 1978; Mandler & Johnson, 1977). Even children of a very young age (between two and five years) have been shown to be capable of using simple narrative conventions (Applebee, 1978), such as "once upon a time," or "they lived happily ever after."

Several researchers suggest that narrative forms a type of thinking platform. For instance, Langer (1953) claims that narrative allows us to symbolize and hence, think and communicate about past experiences. Hardy (1977) alludes that in living, we make up stories about ourselves and others. We live through narrative, whether it's dreaming, remembering, anticipating, planning or believing. Is this because of our exposure to narrative from a very young age or do people exhibit a proclivity to narrative rather than exposition?

As students move through the grades they encounter increasing emphasis upon content area material such as Science, Social Studies, and so forth (Taylor & Beach, 1984). It has been speculated that many children may have difficulty in relating knowledge and in making the transition from narrative to exposition in both reading and writing.

Many researchers have described the nature of reading events as a "storybook" reading process between parents and preschoolers within the home.
(Heath, 1983; Wells, 1986; Bloome, 1985; Panofsky, 1987; Morrow, 1988; Taylor & Strickland, 1986). Much noteworthy research has been explored on the storybooks sessions within the preschool (Cochran-Smith, 1984; Morrow, 1987; 1988). In the elementary school, researchers have focused on teacher strategies during shared book experiences (Hoffman, Roser, & Farest, 1988); the constitutive language of the text becoming increasingly more precise with the child's increased comprehension (Pappas & Brown, 1987); teacher interaction style and focus of talk (Martinez & Teale, 1989); the effects of group size assessed by probed and free recalls as comprehension measures (Morrow & Smith, 1990); repeated storybook readings (Beaver, 1982); the developmental progression of children's reenactment attempts (Sulzby, 1986); and the orchestration of storybook reading sessions by assessing the verbal, nonverbal, and paralinguistic elements of the teachers and students' conversation (Green & Harker, 1982). These studies were based exclusively on narratives as the text.

Recently, several noteworthy studies have examined children's responses to nonfiction and how children process the nonfiction text (Pappas, 1993, 1991a, 1991b). Newkirk has also explored the range of children's non-narrative writing (1989a, 1989b). However, it appears that no studies have dealt exclusively with the Shared Book Events in which the different genres are represented.
Since it has generally been accepted among researchers that response to literature is a transactional process involving the text, the reader, and the poem or meaning (Rosenblatt, 1978), the relationship between the text and the particular reader will vary, dependent on the purpose for reading as well as the reader's background knowledge. It has generally been accepted that we read for different purposes. When reading narrative, the reader assumes an aesthetic stance. When reading an expository text, the stance is of an efferent orientation. The child's literacy experience will have value only when the child feels comfortable with it and when the text is assimilated into the student's experiences with other literary works (Rosenblatt, 1978). How much of the "other literary works" consist of the nonfiction genre?

In contrast to previous research involving Shared Book Events, I present an exploration from many perspectives. Imagine, if you will, that the Shared Book Event is a puzzle, in which the concentric layers surrounding the Event must be peeled away (Cochran-Smith, 1984). However, in this study, (unlike Cochran-Smith's), the layers consist of the teachers' reports of the range and nature of Shared Book Events in nine schools representing 2,330 students, as well as, the more focused layers of two special teachers' beliefs and goals, two classroom environments, curriculums, and groups of children. Forty-three Shared Book Events provide the frame for the wholistic description data
represented in this study. As that overview layer is peeled back, I focus on the moment-to-moment construction within seven Shared Book Events. However, unlike other research, I examine these Events from the unique advantage of three perspectives: the researcher, the teacher, as well as the children. This multilayered approach opens the door for the "voice of the participants" to be resounded throughout the study.

The Present Study

In this study, I explore the range of ways that teachers in kindergarten, first, and second grades are using Shared Book Sessions within their classrooms. I examine the nature of these Shared Book Events in which both fictional narratives and informational books were represented. My interest was in examining how and why children learn within the social context of the event.

My goal was to describe the children's and teachers' responses within a social context. Although I began the study with three broad research questions, my grounded theory emerged from the data as an ongoing process of data collection/data analysis throughout the study. The resulting research yielded an unusual and different way of thinking about how and why children learn within the Shared Book Event.
Questions Guiding the Research

The objective of this study was to examine the nature of the Shared Book Events across classrooms. I wished to explore the commonalities and differences represented in different genres. My concern at the beginning of the study was that as educators and parents, we are not reaching those children who exhibit a propensity toward nonfiction rather than fiction. Specifically, the three broad questions focusing this study were:

1. How are teachers using Shared Book Sessions within their classrooms?
2. How are the different genres represented and treated by teachers?
3. How do children construct meaning during the Shared Book Sessions involving narrative as well as the expository text? What are the possible variations occurring?

These questions provided the guidance during the data collection and data analysis phases of this research. However, throughout the study, new questions and new perspectives on the research did arise.

In Chapter II, I relate these three focus questions to research perspectives related to the present study. In Chapter III, I describe the design and methodological procedures to explore my focus questions. Chapter IV presents
the survey results which examined question 1. In Chapter V, I describe and analyze the data as it relates to question 2 and question 3. Chapter VI consists of the discussion, summary, and implications related to the focus questions, as well as the questions which evolved from the data.

Definitions of Terms

The concept "Shared Book Event" was used in this study as a conceptual tool. It will be used interchangeably throughout the study with "Shared Book Session." This particular type of "literary event" (Heath, 1982) is a session in which a book was integral to the nature of the participants' behavior and their ways of interpreting the text. The participants' interactions, discussion, attitudes, and orientation perspective are examined within the framework of all participants focusing on a shared text within a group context.

Debriefing - a 1:1 situation with a child and the researcher, or a 1:1 situation with a teacher and the researcher. This time provided the theoretical sampling for the study. It was during this time period that another layer was "peeled away" in grappling with the underlying processes within the Shared Book Event. During the Debriefings, the child's perspective, as well as the teachers' perspectives were examined.
Social - the learning process as exhibited within an interaction group context

Cognitive - the mental constructive process in acquiring new knowledge
CHAPTER II

RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES

RELATED TO THE PRESENT STUDY

The Storybook Reading Process

Much recent educational research has focused on children's early literacy development (Bissex, 1980; Chomsky, 1972; Cochran-Smith, 1984; Doake, 1976, 1985, 1987; Dyson, 1981, 1989; Ferreira & Teberosky, 1982; Goodman & Goodman, 1979; Hall, 1987; Harste, Woodward & Burke, 1984; Heath, 1980, 1982, 1983; King, 1989; Mason, 1980; McKenzie, 1986; Snow & Nino, 1987; Strickland & Morrow, 1989; Sulzby & Teale, 1983; Taylor & Strickland, 1986; Teale, 1984; Taylor, 1983; Wells, 1986). The principle underlying all of this research is that children learn about print as they interact with it in context. For example, children are surrounded by language and print. On any given day, they see "Campbell's" on a soup can, "Crest" on a toothpaste tube, "STOP" and "WALK" at the street corners, television show titles, as well as story print when cuddling up with a parent to read a children's book. Children learn language by interacting with it in meaningful contexts and through using it to communicate socially (Halliday, 1975; Goodman & Goodman, 1979). They see the process as meaningful and sociable. Parents and teachers of young children do not take language out of context to teach the child. Perhaps this is why the child acquires language so effortlessly and easily.
It is fun to socialize; the child sees language as a system of meanings (Halliday, 1975).

Literacy events, like oral language events, can be experienced as meaningful and instrumental (Hall, 1987). Therefore, it can be said that literacy and oral language juxtapose for many people and develop in a naturally occurring manner.

It has been found that those children who learn to read early were following a natural process similar to the process of learning language (Chomsky, 1971; Anderson, 1984). They read for meaning in context as they interacted with others. It is an individual's conceptualization of the world that determines meaning in reading. Children "predict" and form a mental image of the expected meaning when learning to read. According to Smith (1982). . . "this ability to predict is both pervasive and profound, because it is the basis of our comprehension of the world" (p. 60). Children must, out of necessity, base their predictions on past experiences.

For many years, educators and parents have realized the value of quality parent-child interactions (Doake, 1986; Health, 1983) and that possibly the single most important activity for building the knowledge required for eventual success in reading is reading aloud to children (Holdaway, 1979).

Storybook reading as a process is enhanced by a cooperative negotiation between adult and child. Positive attitudes and strong feelings toward reading, and reading as a warm, social interaction are developed. As children experience the repetitive, rhyming, easy-flowing, and highly predictable language within the text, they strive for eventual personal control over this experience. In fact, the child's attention
span was found to be a direct correlate of the degree of familiarity with the story, even at age 2;3 (Doake, 1976).

The foundation for literacy should occur in these early formative years of infancy and preschool. The earlier the foundation is provided, the easier and more natural the learning is (Doake, 1987). Learning can occur in a supportive environment where children can build a positive attitude toward themselves and toward language and literacy. By cuddling up to the parent, sharing in the repeated reading of favorite stories, the child enjoys the experience so much that he wants to participate. As oral language develops, the child's ability to reproduce stories in reading-like ways also unfolds (Sulzby, 1985; Pappas & Brown, 1987; Doake, 1976). The child's attention span increases and they want to hear their favorite stories read repeatedly. Children are not only learning to read, but they are participating in a warm, personal human encounter.

Most of the research studies of storybook reading are descriptions of the interaction or social context in which the story is read or descriptions of the child's independent functioning with storybooks. First, I will discuss results of the interaction studies.

Research from an Interaction Perspective

Several researchers have conducted studies documenting the relationship of the storybook reading episode to literacy development. Snow (1983) determined three attributes of language used by parents during a literacy event:
1. Semantic contingency, or the give-and-take characteristic of meaning sharing within a conversation.

2. Scaffolding, or the parent assisting the child, through the use of skillful questioning, in reaching for the next level or "Zone of Proximal Development" (Vygotsky, 1962)

3. Accountability procedures, in which the parent expects the child to finish the task to achieve success.

Studies by Teale (1984), Sulzby (1985), Teale & Sulzby (1989), and Phillips & McNaughton (1990) revealed that by exposure to repeated storybook readings, the child becomes more experienced and able to handle more responsibility as the adult diminishes input. Altwerger et al. (1985) demonstrated that as others read, they adapt, extend, clarify and even disregard print to construct a meaningful, coherent, and relevant text for the child. Even if the parent is reading straight text, strategies such as highlighting unfamiliar vocabulary of concepts, are used during the reading. The social interaction throughout the session is negotiated . . . the child affects the mother as much as the mother affects the child. Panofsky (1986) discovered the same principle when studying paralinguistic functions, such as gazing and pointing during the Shared Book Event. Children used gazing to monitor the adult's reactions to their comments, while the mother's gaze served regulatory or expressive purposes. Therefore, gazing served as a feedback function while pointing appeared to be causally related to cognitive development. Another interesting result of this study was that an interpretive process that is culturally transmitted, rather than spontaneous
or natural, is necessary to "guide" the child to picture comprehension.

Cochran-Smith (1984) in studying nursery school children for 18 months, discovered that the in-school storybook readings were extremely stimulating for the children as they were able to relate their everyday life experiences to the decontextualized storybook languages. The adult acted as the intermediary between children and the print by filling in the gaps. Children at this age are very "print conscious" as they actively construct knowledge during the storybook sessions.

Adult interactive behavior during storybook readings can also influence the children's responses (Roser & Martinez, 1985; Hiebert, 1981). In an interesting study conducted by Roser & Martinez (1985), it was discovered that the children's responses tend to resemble the mediating adult both in the home and in the school context, whether the responses were narrational, interpretive, or predictive. Children at school were asked more questions than those at home and so the school children had more answers. It was also found that when the adult assumed a role of co-responder and informer/monitor, the children's responses tended to be richer and more divergent.

The time that the teachers and parents permitted for responses also had an effect on the social interaction. For example, if parents permit children only minimal time to talk or respond, the range of the children's responses will be constrained (Yaden et al., 1989). It was also discovered that as story readings
continue over time, parents tend to change their interactive style as the child changes responses to the activity (Heath, 1983; Ninio & Bruner, 1979; Taylor, 1983; Teale & Sulzby, 1989). Adult interactive behaviors which may affect the quality of storybook interactions are: scaffolding, questioning, extending information, dialogue and responses, clarifying or restating information, directing discussion, sharing personal reactions, and relating concepts to life experiences (Morrow, 1988). Therefore this same "fine tuning" principle (Bruner, 1985) in oral language development also applies to early literacy experiences. This interactionist perspective, which originates from the Vygotskian theory of learning as a social process (1962), involves both the parent (or teacher) and the child in mutually-supported roles. In fact, the social context in which the literacy event occurs could possibly be the most important factor when eliciting children's responses. Although Morrow (1988) discovered that children tend to ask more questions in a 1:1 situation than in a small group situation, story comprehension increases as the number of students increase from 1 to 3, but decreases as the group size increases from 3 to the entire class (Morrow & Smith, 1990). In respect to comprehension, however, it was discovered that children in small-group storybook readings yielded significantly higher comprehension scores than children in the one-to-one context and the children in the whole class readings. They hypothesize that the small group setting can enhance listening comprehension and permit more verbal interactions as children learn from each
other. In small-group settings within the schools, children can serve as models for each other, as questions and comments can serve as "springboards" for more discussion. Also, teachers can encourage passive children to participate. However, Morrow and Smith (1990) do imply that the 1:1 story reading seems especially important for children who have had no experience with storybook reading at home.

The social context appears to be a powerful influence affecting the quality of the Shared Book Events. In fact, Green and Harker (1982) demonstrated that children's responses as determined by past experiences and teacher cues, depend on how the children perceive the requirements for the situations. Different teachers have different expectations for participation during the story readings. These expectations are determined by the manner in which the teacher orchestrates the lesson. This includes verbal, nonverbal, and paralinguistic elements within the conversation.

Several studies have focused on children's questions as indicating their interest during the storybook reading process, as well as indicating the children's level of understanding of the various aspects of story reading (Yaden, Smolkin, & Conlin, 1989; Morrow, 1988). Preschool children are predominately interested in illustrations, but perhaps after four years of age, their emphasis shifts to the story's meaning (Yaden et al., 1989. It seems as if children are more interested in the meaning than in the story structure or the print (Morrow, 1988).
Storybook reading sessions provide the child an opportunity for a more "in-depth" involvement with the written language genre. For example, when children are exposed to environmental print such as a McDonald's sign next to McDonald's, the word is in a context thereby aiding the child's understanding. To bring in another example with oral language, it is easier for the child to understand language being spoken in context. "Knowing" in oral tradition is achieved through a sense of identification with the speaker. The understanding is subjective with many variables coming into focus (intonation, pragmatics, backgrounds of the speaker and listener) (Ong, 1977).

The strategies associated with oral tradition place emphasis on shared knowledge and the interpersonal relationship between communicator and audience. Bateson (1972) refers to this as the metacommunicative function of language. In other words, the meaning of the words depends on the relationship between communicator and audience.

The groundwork for literacy is laid as the parent or teacher tacitly know how to keep the language focused or the game going, which develops from protoconversation to the linguistic domain, and extending into written language in context to decontextualized language. As Wells (1986) points out, in conversation, words "fit the world." In writing, "words create the world." Stories become the child's means of entering a shared world. By listening to stories, children discover the symbolic potential of language, as the context of the story
is removed from the context in which it occurred.

Wells (1982) also contends that participation in storybook reading is "probably the best way" of helping young children become literate because it provides experience with decontextualized language and the opportunity to learn the characteristics of written language, as well as helping the child to cope with reflective, disembedded thinking, which is necessary for literacy success in school. Wells (1986) also discovered in his fifteen year longitudinal study, that only the frequency of listening to stories significantly predicted the teachers' assessment of the children's oral language ability. Children who had been read to:

1. had acquired a larger vocabulary
2. were better able to narrate an event
3. could describe a scene
4. could follow instructions
5. were better able to understand the teacher's instructions
6. were able to "exploit the symbolic potential of language".

This thinking skill became even more important as children aged, when they were asked to "disembed" their thinking from the original context in order to find solutions.

Snow and Ninio (1987) also stress that storybook reading exposes a child "to more complex, more elaborate, and more decontextualized language than almost any other kind of interaction, and the ability to understand and to produce decontextualized language may be the most difficult and most crucial
prerequisite to literacy" (p. 118-119). The seven tacit "contracts" of literacy which can be established by exposing a child to literature are:

1. Books are for reading, not for manipulating.
2. The book is in control; the reader is led.
3. Pictures are representations of things.
4. Pictures are for naming.
5. Pictures, though static, can represent events.
6. Book events occur outside real time.
7. Books constitute an autonomous fictional world.

As Snow (1983), Donaldson (1978), and Wells (1986) believe, the problem children have with learning to read may be more from the fact that the language is decontextualized rather than from decoding the print.

Perhaps the most extensive ethnographic study of young children to date is that of Heath (1983) in which she examined the uses of language and literacy in three different cultures in the Piedmont Carolinas. She found that the mothers of the "Townspeople" not only read to their children, but in the process, they continually supported and "guided" children in relating book knowledge to the real world. This served as a tremendous advantage when the child "disembedded" language upon beginning to read. Therefore, not only the quantity of storyreading events is important, but the quality of dialogic interaction within the mother-child dyad contributes to literacy success.
Perspectives from Repeat Readings Research

Several researchers have studied the effect of repeated readings with the same storybook. Morrow (1988) demonstrated that children will focus more on story structure and print in repeat readings, but this technique was more effective with lower-ability children. The questions focused on meaning were varied, as the different-book per session group offered more responses on detail, labeling, and background experience. Their number of responses increased as sessions increased. The repeated-book group demonstrated more interpreting, prediction, and narrational behavior. Therefore, with repeated sessions, these children developed more complex, higher-level thinking responses. Beaver (1982) also demonstrated that children analyzed the book, Say It! Over and Over, in greater depth and in various activities stemming from the four readings. Bloome (1985) indicated an increase in the child's interaction with the text and telling of the story. The child also demonstrated a greater diversity in sociolinguistic strategies. Holdaway (1979) and McKenzie (1986) examined individual children's reenactments with repeat readings. It was discovered that the children displayed more comprehension with repeats. They self-corrected on semantic grounds, used more intonation, self-monitored through syntax, and demonstrated more prediction strategies. Also, as stated previously with very young children (age 2; 3), the children's attention spans were found to be a direct correlate of their degree of familiarity with the story (Doake, 1976). Teale (1987) notes that
repeated storybook readings are both repetitive and innovative. For example, a facilitative framework is provided in which the child can operate. Repetition, as in oral language learning, is not mere repetition, but variation with the repeated stories. Construction by the child is a critical element in learning.

Perhaps, one of the best research projects to date indicating the child's ontogenesis of written language as a constructive process rather than rote memory is that of Pappas & Brown (1987). These researchers examined how children learn about the characteristics of the meaning within the text from a cognitive-linguistic perspective. "The ontogenesis of written language appears to be just as much a constructive process as we have seen in other areas of children's cognitive/linguistic development" (p. 175). After analyzing how different syntactic chains interact to form the global text structure, the text's constitutive tendency and register were established. Then, during three reenactments, the use of tokens (syntactic or semantic language elements) were analyzed to determine the case-study child's and 26 other kindergartners' cognitive processing. By analyzing the children's constitutive registers, the researchers discovered that if a child did not understand the global text structure (as represented in the initiating, frequent, or final event, or the optional events of the placement, the finale, or the moral), then the registers of written language would not be used appropriately.
Through increased reenactment episodes, the children increased their approximate token usage which reflected their increased awareness of the constitutive language of the text. The researchers concluded that a decrease in the use of ambiguous tokens across the three reenactments indicates the children's greater reliance on the linguistic message of the text. The child's use of extrapolations reveal how the child is utilizing the resources of the text, rather than merely memorizing the text. Therefore, the implication that reading is merely word decoding is refuted, as these children "extended the functional potential of language" (Pappas & Brown, 1987).

Research from a Developmental Perspective

Now that I have discussed research representing the independent child functioning with stories in a reenactment process (Pappas & Brown, 1987; Holdaway, 1979; McKenzie, 1986), I will proceed by focusing on those researchers within a developmental perspective.

Several theorists believe that as children age and are exposed to more experiences in storybooks, they develop different conceptions regarding reading and will exhibit different behaviors dependent on their present stage (Sulzby, 1985; Doake, 1976, 1985, 1987; Yaden, Smolkin, & Conlon, 1989).
Yaden et al. (1989) discovered that preschoolers are predominantly interested in the illustrations when asking questions during the storybook reading, but as children age, their interests seem to shift to the meaning of the story. These authors hypothesize that home storybook reading has more of an effect on the child's comprehension processes than on their print awareness, corroborating Phillips and McNaughton's research (1990). Although Goodman (1980, 1986), as well as Taylor and Strickland (1986), claim that the talk about the words and pictures in books inevitably turns to questions and comments about print, perhaps there is a possibility children are learning about print from other means, such as environmental print or writing experiences.

Doake (1976, 1985, 1987) felt that all children progress through stages, although background experiences will influence when the progression is initiated. The first stage is the Inner Drive in which attitude is developed within the home setting as the child associates reading with enjoyment and pleasure. The child learns how to handle books, can predict with repeated readings of the same story, responds to the illustrations, and builds prediction strategies. This is the stage which is described by Snow and Ninio (1987).

Then the child progresses to the Inner Drive-Non Visual Cuing System which is dependent on the oral dimensions of written language conventions. During this stage, children learn that written language is different than oral language. They exhibit stages, such as cloze techniques, mumble reading, echo
reading, as well as cooperative reading with the parent. It is at this stage the child learns how to mean. The child also develops more prediction strategy, which is very important when learning to read with semantic and syntactic reasoning. At the Non Visual-Visual Cuing Stage, children learn the graphophonic representations. They will use the strategy of "least resistance" when taking meaning from text, as they learn about written language conventions and select appropriate cues. Then, in the Visual-Non Visual Fluent Stage, the phonics cue system is completed. It is at this stage that the child uses a variety of strategies when taking meaning from text, and the child reads fluently.

Sulzby's stages (1985) take a holistic approach as the child interacts with the storybook in three reenactments. First, children produce no story, and then they proceed to produce an oral-like story in which they are very dependent on illustrations. Children will then exhibit written-like discourse with a mixture of oral-like language as they still rely on illustrations. As the children become more cognizant of the print carrying the message, they will still rely on the pictures, but they now will also consider the print, so visual cue and perhaps some phonics strategies come into play. Later, children rely on the print, as they become text-dependent in disregarding the illustrations. This demonstrates that this early literacy process, in which storybook reading should be an integral process, is extremely important as the child cognitively sorts out clues from the text. Sulzby
concluded that across ages (2-; 3-; 4-; 5) different stages are evident, as cognitive processing interacts with semantic and linguistic functions which are a necessary prerequisite for reading.

Generalizations Regarding the Shared Book Events

Several researchers have described early literacy benefits from children participating in Shared Book Events. Taylor & Strickland (1986) explored language, literacy, and learning in families of different socioeconomic backgrounds. Their generalizations are as follows:

When parents read stories to their children they are creating a safe, warm place for language and literacy learning. These informal discussions that accompany story reading help to establish children’s understanding about the way in which people communicate ideas through print.

Story reading is a fun, shared activity without direct formal language lessons. Perhaps this is why children learn so much.

As children learn how stories are constructed, they understand stories written by others and the ability to create their own.

Storybook reading is one of the richest resources for vocabulary development available to children. Children also enjoy the sound of words and the variety of language patterns that they are exposed to. Children learn the power of language which is a tremendous advantage when learning to read and write.

Thus, children learn that symbols represent meaning. This abstract idea takes time and experience, but children unlock the system on their own rather than being taught formally.

Through storyreading, children foster their ability to listen, as well as to relate new information with what they already know.
Children are active participants in the whole process. They later develop the ability to talk about written language.

Children learn the value of books as they view books as sources of pleasure and information.

Thus, an expanding body of literature has clearly demonstrated the impact of the Shared Book Session in which the represented genre is a narrative. Perhaps, as Holdaway (1979) and Wells (1986) have stated, the child's participation in the storybook process is the most important activity for building the knowledge necessary to begin reading. I will conclude this section by listing Teale's (1984) generalizations regarding the significance of reading to young children.

Factors such as the type of text, the number of times the book has been read, the number of children involved in the reading, the temperamental characteristics and sociocultural backgrounds of the participants, as well as the age or developmental level of the child affect what happens when parents read to their children. The nature of the book-reading event is important in the attempt to understand early literacy.

Cognitive and affective factors influence the child's development of literacy. An "orientation toward literacy" (Scollon & Scollon, 1981) and a "literacy set" (Holdaway, 1979) seem crucial. Such factors influencing a child are:

1. assumption about the functions and uses of written language
2. concepts of print, books and reading, and the forms and structure of written language
3. attitudes toward reading
4. reading strategies ("ways of taking" from text)

There are many effects of reading to children:

1. Children learn that print is meaningful (Smith, 1978; Doake, 1981).
2. Listening to stories permits the child to explore existential or moral issues.
3. In many families, there is a match between school literacy activities and reading at home (Heath, 1982).
4. Children see a trusted adult as a role model who is reading (Hiebert, 1981).
5. Children realize the joy derived from written language and become motivated (Holdaway, 1979).
8. Children learn that written language is different from spoken language (Smith, 1978; Clay, 1976; Doake, 1981; Hoffman, 1982).
9. Preschoolers develop metalinguistic awareness about print (Schickdeanz, 1981), learn about phoneme/grapheme correspondence, and extend letter and word recognition.
10. Children acquire knowledge of a story schema (structure, as well as grammar of stories).
11. Self-monitoring and prediction strategies develop as a result of being read to (Holdaway, 1979; Doake, 1981).
12. Children are provided with a "way of taking" from text. Children are guided "to use the knowledge of the world to make sense of text (Heath, 1982; Cochran-Smith, 1982). Therefore, a higher-thinking reading strategy is promoted.

13. These reading sessions, as a cooperative negotiation between adult and child, show that literacy develops from an interpsychological process structured by the parent to an intrapsychological process whereby the child becomes an independent reader/writer.

The Shared Book Events in which Expository text is the Represented Genre

As I have clearly demonstrated, considerable research attention has been directed to the Shared "Storybook" Reading Session. In the last few years, however, there has been a substantial increase in the volume of research on expository text (Spiro and Taylor, 1987). This is fortunate given that reading content-based books becomes increasingly prominent in grades three through graduate school.

Several studies have demonstrated that children find expository text more difficult than narrative (Freedle & Hale, 1979; Hall, Ribovich & Ramig, 1979). Researchers have hypothesized why children have more difficulty with expository rather than narrative prose (Spiro & Taylor, 1987). Harris & Smith (1976) contend that narrative is easier for children because of their pre-reading experiences in associating linguistic form to narrative structure. Several considerations must be taken into account with this theory, however (Spiro & Taylor, 1987). For example, do children develop a story schema because of
prior experience or do they develop more efficient processing mechanisms to deal with story structure? Or is the content of the story (usually dealing with people and their goals) more familiar than the expository text with a wide variety of topics? If this is the case, then children's stories are easier to comprehend because of familiarity with the content rather than the form. Another possibility that could be attributed to the difference is the ideational density and complexity of expository forms (Freedle & Hall, 1979).

Perhaps, the difficulty can be attributed to specific psychological properties of the texts (as well as the contexts in which they are encountered). Spiro & Taylor (1987) argue that this could be a problem resulting from initial understanding, remembering, the cognitive capacity limitations on the number of difficult dimensions that can be handled within the same text, prior experience with oral or written discourse, or certain kinds of written genre inherently easier to understand. More research is needed in this area, but my primary theory can be expressed as follows. The view of comprehension as a situation-based, context-dependent process comes into play. The linguistic content of the text must be conceivable for the child, however, the text is only one variable contributing to understanding. Prior knowledge as a foundation for material assimilation or material familiarity as well as the natural order of events in the text structure may also enhance understanding in a facilitative and organized manner. The child's expectations, interest, and motivation for reading while
considering the social context in which the reading occurs, all are decisive factors affecting the cognitive dimensions of reading.

It appears that children at a young age are simply not exposed to expository texts. Phillips & McNaughton (1990) demonstrated that three and four year olds in the home almost exclusively chose narratives to be read during the Shared Book Events. This is interesting in light of the fact that my children as well as the kindergarteners, the first, second, and third graders who I taught did enjoy expository texts. As Kobrin (1988) stresses, I also have found that children are fascinated by the real world. They enjoy hearing about real people, places, and things to satisfy their curiosity and inspire even more (p. 4). Recall from the Introduction section how my children responded when asked whether they preferred storybooks or nonfiction . . .

The eight-year old -  
"Both 'cause I like to read about real baseball players or sports' players and I like to learn about things that really happened."

The ten-year old -  
"I like the true books more because I know it really happened and that means something."

Children are not getting enough nonfiction to read. A 1987 Gallup survey revealed that while adults buy an equal number of fiction and nonfiction for themselves, they buy predominantly fiction (70%) for their children (cf Kobrin, 1988). As author Jane Yolen commented, the word nonfiction" sounds as if it
had been in a contest with fiction — and lost.

In an interesting study examining children's structural knowledge, and how this knowledge related to their sense of differing uses of language in reading and writing, Langer (1988) demonstrated that children even as young as age 8, can differentiate clearly between the uses of exposition and storytelling. They were able to describe a story as different from a report, attribute different uses to them, select different topics for use with each, and organize them differently (p. 52). Langer attributes this basic difference between fact presentation and imaginative fiction leading to differences in the structural content which enables children to organize the text when ascertaining the differences.

The children's recall after story reading showed a well-developed sense of story structure even at age 8, with only slight improvement (mostly in detail embellishment) between ages 8 and 14.

Report writing showed tremendous structural improvement between ages 8 and 14, as well as improvement in passage recall. The 8 year olds relied on descriptions about the title, but were consistent in their report structures. Langer hypothesizes that this significant difference in expository text structure between ages 8 and 14 is a result of young children's exposure to the same story-format as they later experience in the schools. Conversely, young children may rarely hear the spoken versions of expository text which they later encounter in school.
Research Focusing on Teachers within the Shared Book Events

Mason, Peterman, & Kerr (1989) examined six kindergarten teachers reading narrative, informational, and picture phrase books. The teachers' strategies, the teacher-student interactions, as well as the question focus before, during, and after the readings were examined. It was found that teachers read stories in ways similar to parents at home, with an interaction technique of negotiating construction. Before the storybook reading, teachers led the discussion about the author, illustrator, and type of book. During the reading, teachers responded to children's responses, elaborated on aspects of the story, and asked for comprehension questions. Following the story, the teachers reviewed the story with the children and often had accompanying activities.

Unlike narrative sessions, the informational book episodes lead-in discussion included more time to develop close connections between the text concepts and the children's background experiences. Demonstrations, such as creating shadows with a flashlight, were often conducted. During the reading, teachers elaborated on the concepts by discussing illustrations or with demonstrations. Vocabulary and concept building were therefore accomplished by eliciting children's responses focusing on visual representations (pictures or illustrations) rather than through verbal representations or discussion about the text.
In the picture phrase book sessions, several teachers relinquished more responsibility to the children since the text was simplistic and the book shorter in length.

This study demonstrates how teachers employ effective comprehension and vocabulary recognition techniques as they mediate the Shared Book Session. It appeared as if the teachers fostered comprehension in three ways:

1. They helped children relate new text information with their own life experiences.

2. They provided opportunities for children to restate text concepts (perhaps as an assessment technique, also?)

3. They assumed more responsibility when the text was difficult and less when the text was easy.

In eliciting children's comments during all three types of book sessions, teachers seemed to take four approaches:

1. Teachers ask questions about text words, phrases, or ideas that needed to be highlighted.

2. Discussions occurred to help children relate new information with old or to comment on new concepts.

3. Demonstrations and stimulating questions were asked.

4. Teachers solicited answers to explain, describe, predict, or infer. More specifically, children had to think and relate information in a different format than in the text.

Therefore, by exposing children to different genres, varied and rich book interactions occurred. Mason et al. (1989) contend that such experiences will
help children to understand different genres, to read independently while monitoring their comprehension, and to relate new information with their own experiences. These implications corroborate Martinez & Teale's research (1989) in that children have a tendency to learn what the teacher focuses on and as Hoffman, Roser, & Farest (1988) demonstrated . . . when teachers successfully incorporate strategies, a significant increase in children participation occurs.

It has been found that how teachers perceive the text influences how they teach (Newell, MacAdams, & Spears-Burton, 1987). In a study representing five junior high school teachers, Zancanella found that how teachers perceive reading influenced their teaching. One teacher believed that the text is a puzzle or problem to be solved by peeling away the "layers" of the text. He valued literary techniques and the elements of the text, which were ascribed to in class.

This text-based belief was in sharp contract to another teacher's belief in that the value of a text is in the readers' vicarious participation with the characters. This orientation which is reader-based focuses on student responses, experiences, and feelings (Beach, 1993).

Individual Reenactments of Expository Texts

Pappas (1990) examined the textual properties of typical information books. Applying Hasan's (1984, 1985) methodology, she identified six global elements: three obligatory -- topic presentation, description of attributes,
characteristic events and three optional ones -- category comparison, final summary, and the afterward. From a cognitive-linguistic perspective, Pappas (1990) then examined the kinds of strategies children employ in approximating the discourse patterns or book language of informational books. Through four kindergarteners repeated reenactments of three different information books, she discovered that even though children were not always consistent in their use of textual features of the information book genre, they all showed an increasing sensitivity to them across repeated reenactments. For example, one child on his last reading, included "you" as the reader, "squirrel" as a class member, and "he might be jumping" as the attribute.

By the third reading, the children seemed to concentrate more on the linguistic message of the text or begin to interpret this in terms of the illustrations. In the earlier reading, illustrations influenced and supported the children's readings.

The strategies the children employed, as well as their extrapolations and self-corrections, demonstrated that learning to use the information book genre is meaning-driven and a constructive process, similar to that which was seen in research on children's sense of story genre (see previous research on the storybook process earlier in this chapter).

In another study, Pappas (1991) examined twenty kindergartners' reenactments after they were read six books -- three storybooks and three
informational books -- at different sessions during the school year. Linguistic features such as co-referentiality in storybooks compared to co-classification in the expository text, past verb tense in stories as opposed to present verb tense in nonfiction, and some rather than a predominance of relational processes in expository texts were examined in the children's "pretend readings."

The results indicated that young children are very successful in learning to sustain the co-classification aspects in the expository text genre and the co-referentiality properties found in storybooks. It was also demonstrated that children are not better at reenacting stories than they are information books. Even more surprising is the fact that performance was not related to the children's preferred book. Twice the number of children preferred the information book! In a study I conducted with four kindergarteners in 1989 in one-to-one readings and group interaction Shared Book Events with four narratives and four expository texts used, the children's preferences were equally represented for genre type.

Pappas' research has far-reaching implications. Perhaps we are over-emphasizing story genre at the expense of neglecting nonfiction. This emphasis on narrative appears to be based on an unexamined ideology about young children's capabilities in learning to use non-story genre (Pappas, 1991). Have we created a barrier to children's full access to literacy? If learning to read is fundamentally an extension of the functional potential of language as Halliday
(1978) has suggested, then children must be exposed to a range of language registers and genres in differing social contexts.

Summary

It is apparent that most of the previous research of Shared Book Events involves the representation of a fictional narrative as the text. In this chapter, my attempt was to present the reasons why this is so. I also hope that I have opened the door to the questions of "Why isn't the expository text equally represented?" and "What is it about the Shared Book Event that narratives are the preferred choice of genre?" For a review of the background research perspectives related to the Shared Book Event, refer to TABLE 1, TABLE 2, and TABLE 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Book/Article</th>
<th>Participants/Size</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Learning Perspective</th>
<th>Focus of Interaction</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cochran-Smith</td>
<td>The Making of a Reader.</td>
<td>15 children (3 to 5 yrs.) Teacher Parent Volunteers Private/ Residential School</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>Ethnographic</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Social Interactionist</td>
<td>Verbal and Nonverbal Type I Readiness Behavior Type II Life-to-text Interactions Type II Text-to-life Interactions Literacy is a cultural and social phenomenon. Adults act as intermediaries between children and print by filling in gaps. Literacy is a constructive process. Child is active learner!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roser &amp; Martinez</td>
<td>&quot;Roles Adults Play In Preschoolers' Response to Literature&quot; Language Arts 62 (5)</td>
<td>Classroom - 4- and 5-year olds 10 stories read 3 times each. Home - 4 children (3 1/2 to 5 yrs.) same book plus more</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Social Interactionist</td>
<td>Types of Story Told Focus of Story Told Role of Adult and the Child Language Interaction Patterns Children construct meaning at a variety of levels. Responses were similar at home &amp; at school. Children tended to respond like the adult. More questions &amp; more responses at school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Book/Article</td>
<td>Participants/Size</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Learning Perspective</td>
<td>Focus of Interaction</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td>&quot;The Effect of One-to-one Story Readings on Children's Questions and Responses&quot; Research in Literature: Mergin Perspectives National Reading Conference</td>
<td>Daycare Centers (2): Lower S.E.S. children, 27 children in experimental group, 27 children in control group, 10 different picture story-books</td>
<td>Once a week for 10 weeks</td>
<td>Experimental Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design</td>
<td>Social Interactionist</td>
<td>Questions/Comments of Children Focus on meaning, structure, print, or illustrations</td>
<td>Children in the 1:1 asked more questions &amp; made more comments than in whole classes. Children were more interested in meanings than in print. Higher level thinking skills were evident with progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdaway</td>
<td>The Foundations of Literacy Chapter 4</td>
<td>One year - Applied model of 1:1 Shared book experiences to classroom</td>
<td>One year - Applied model of 1:1 Shared book experiences to classroom</td>
<td>Descriptive Pre-Experimental Experimental</td>
<td>Developmental Social Interactionist</td>
<td>Focus on children acquiring literacy skills: internalizing written language conventions, phoneme/grapheme correspondence, high expectations of print, disembedding language from context.</td>
<td>Children became self-confident, self-regulating readers while meeting individual needs. Teachers became attendants &amp; facilitators of natural processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Book/ Article</td>
<td>Participants/ Size</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Learning Perspective</td>
<td>Focus of Interaction</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdaway</td>
<td><strong>The Foundations of Literacy</strong> Chapter 3</td>
<td>Examples of 4 children's story reenactments</td>
<td>Single Encounters</td>
<td>Descriptive Case studies' comparison</td>
<td>Developmental Cognitive Constructivist</td>
<td>Language during story reenactments Children displayed deep comprehensions in reenactments. They self-corrected on semantic grounds, used intonations, self-monitored through syntax, and demonstrated prediction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td>&quot;Young Children's Responses to One-to-one Story Readings in School Settings&quot; Reading Research Quarterly, XXIII, (1)</td>
<td>78 children (4 yr. olds) One experimental group - different book each week for 10 weeks. Other experimental group - repeated readings of three different books. Control group - readiness activities</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Social Interactionist</td>
<td>Number, type, and complexity of questions and comments of children in repeated vs. unrepeated books Experimental children made more comments &amp; asked more questions. Responses more on meaning. Repeated readings prompted increased responses from low-ability children. High-ability offered more responses in different books.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Book/Article</td>
<td>Participants/ Size</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Learning Perspective</td>
<td>Focus of Interaction</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pappas &amp; Brown</td>
<td>&quot;Learning to Read by Reading: Learning how to extend the Functional Potential of Language&quot; Research In The Teaching of English 21 (2)</td>
<td>Case study of one child. Then research on 26 Kindergartners.</td>
<td>Three Reenactment encounters</td>
<td>Quasi-Experimental Descriptive</td>
<td>Cognitive Constructivist</td>
<td>Constitutive language of the text with child's increased comprehension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The ontogenesis of written language appears to be a constructive process. As children increase in comprehension, their registers of written language increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman, Roser, &amp; Farest</td>
<td>&quot;Literature-Sharing Strategies in Classrooms Serving Students from Economically Disadvantaged and Language Different Home Environments&quot; Dialogues in Literacy Research</td>
<td>Kindergarten and First Grade teachers working with children. 50 teachers from 8 schools.</td>
<td>Language to Literacy Project 1 1/2 years</td>
<td>Descriptive and Quasi-Experimental Intervention was teacher workshop</td>
<td>Social Interactionist</td>
<td>Teacher Strategies Literature sharing responses.</td>
<td>Time for shared book sessions more than doubled after workshops. Teachers were very successful at incorporating strategies. There was a significant increase in participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez &amp; Teale</td>
<td>&quot;Classroom Storybook Reading: The Creation of Texts and Learning Opportunities: TIP 28 (2)&quot;</td>
<td>3 Kindergarten teachers reading to their respective classes.</td>
<td>4 narratives per 3 teachers</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Interactionist</td>
<td>Teacher Interaction style and focus of talk.</td>
<td>Since different adults mediate stories in different ways, students may be moving along different paths to literacy. Children have a tendency to learn what the teacher focuses on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Book/Article</td>
<td>Participants/Size</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Learning Perspective</td>
<td>Focus of Interaction</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulzby</td>
<td>&quot;Children's Emergent Reading of Favorites Storybooks: A Developmental Study,&quot; Reading Research Quarterly XX (3)</td>
<td>Study 1 - 24 children in Kindergarten. Study 2 - 2-, 3-, &amp; 4-year olds reading 2 books per session for 4 sessions.</td>
<td>Study 1 - beginning and end of Kindergarten year. Study 2 - 4 sessions spaced over a year.</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Developmental Cognitive Constructivist</td>
<td>Developmental Trends were demonstrated. Language progresses to more written discourse-type oral language &amp; intonation patterns. Children's behaviors are conceptual and not dependent on text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow &amp; Smith</td>
<td>&quot;The Effects of Group Size in Interactive Storybook Reading&quot; Reading Research Quarterly 25 (3)</td>
<td>27 Kindergarten and First Grades in 5 school districts.</td>
<td>3 story stories in small-group setting, 3 stories in a 1:1 setting, 3 stories in whole-class setting.</td>
<td>Quasi-Experiment al Non-equivalent Control Group design</td>
<td>Social Interactionist</td>
<td>Probed &amp; free recalls by children. Children's verbal responses.</td>
<td>Children in small groups performed better on comprehension than children in 1:1. Whole class scored lowest. Children in 1:1 responded most. Most comments on meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>&quot;Say Itl Over and Over&quot; Language Arts 59 (2)</td>
<td>First grade class (22 children)</td>
<td>4 readings of Say Itl (Zolotow)</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Social Interactionist</td>
<td>Literacy Activities and language stemming from repeated book readings.</td>
<td>Children analyzed book in greater depth and various activities stemmed from the four readings. Topics: Illustration, Vocabulary, Language phrases, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green &amp; Harker</td>
<td>&quot;Reading to Children: A Communicative Process&quot; Reader Meets Author/Bridging the Gap.</td>
<td>Primary-aged children</td>
<td>One encounter of two different teachers reading to whole classrooms.</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Social Interactionist</td>
<td>The orchestration of the lesson-the verbal/nonverbal &amp; paralinguistic elements of conversation.</td>
<td>How children respond depends on how they &quot;perceive the requirements of the situation.&quot; This is determined by teacher cues &amp; past experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3

**Story Reading in a Comparative Frame in the Home**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Book/Article</th>
<th>Participants/Size</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Learning Perspective</th>
<th>Focus of Interaction</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doake</td>
<td>&quot;A Developmental Model of Learning to Read&quot;</td>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>Single Encounters</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Developmental (stages)</td>
<td>Reading-like Behavior of child</td>
<td>Children develop naturally through a series of stages in becoming literate, if home is literacy-oriented. Because of positive attitudes toward reading, children strive for control over experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Reading-like Behavior: It's role in learning to read,&quot; Observing the Language Learning &quot;Learning to Read: It Starts in the Home&quot;</td>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td>Repeat Readings</td>
<td>Ethnographic</td>
<td>Social Interactionist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath</td>
<td>Ways with Words &quot;What no Bedtime Story means: Narrative skills at home and at school,&quot; Language &amp; Society</td>
<td>Different Communities: Roadville, Trackton, Townspeople</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Social Interactionist</td>
<td>Language, Literacy &amp; Values</td>
<td>The mothers of the Townspeople not only read to their children, but they continually supported and guided children in relating book knowledge to real world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaden, Smolkin &amp; Conlon</td>
<td>&quot;Preschoolers' Questions about Pictures, Print Conventions, and Story Text During Reading Aloud at Home&quot; Reading Research Quarterly</td>
<td>Study 1 - 2 brothers taped twice per week for 2 years Study 2 - 4 boys and 3 girls taped weekly for 1 year</td>
<td>Study 1 - 2 years Study 2 - 1 year</td>
<td>Case Studies Descriptive</td>
<td>Cognitive Constructionist</td>
<td>Unelicited questions by children Parent Style</td>
<td>Study 1 - Illustration questions, then meaning about story, then words, graphic form, finally book convention. Study 2 - 5 out of 9 matched brothers. After age 4 - more questions on meaning. Parents - facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altwerger, Diehl-Faxon &amp; Dockstader-Anderson</td>
<td>&quot;Read Aloud Events as Meaning Construction&quot; Language Arts 62, (5)</td>
<td>2 mother-child dyads Children - 23 months to 29 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Social Interactionist</td>
<td>How mother &quot;fine-tunes&quot; language of text to child's background Developmental sequence</td>
<td>The Interaction is negotiated. The child affects the mother. The mother matched the text to her child's cognitive capability of understanding written language. Mother relinquishes her role as child's comprehension increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Book/Article</td>
<td>Participants/Size</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Learning Perspective</td>
<td>Focus of Interaction</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>The Meaning Makers: Children Learning Language and Using Language to Learn</td>
<td>128 British children of varying social classes at 15 months of age. 32 of these children into elementary education years</td>
<td>10 years at home and then in the schools</td>
<td>Longitudinal Descriptive</td>
<td>Social Interactionist</td>
<td>Language Literacy experiences</td>
<td>Stories become the child's means of entering shared world. In conversation, words &quot;fit the world&quot;. In writing the &quot;words create the world&quot;. By listening to stories, children discover the symbolic potential of language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloome</td>
<td>&quot;Bedtime Story Reading as a Social Process&quot; National Reading Conference Yearbook</td>
<td>A mother and a 2-year old child</td>
<td>Bedtime over a 10-month period</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Developmental Social Interactionist</td>
<td>Micro-analysis of language message units 1. text based 2. mapping 3. patterns</td>
<td>In re-reading of same story, there exists an increase in child-text interaction &amp; telling of story. Also, a greater diversity in sociolinguistic strategies. Readings can be very different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panofsky</td>
<td>&quot;Parent-child reading interactions the importance of nonverbal behavior&quot; Dialogues in Literacy Research</td>
<td>2 mother-child pairs reading the same book for the first time. Children 3;0 &amp; 3;10</td>
<td>Single Encounters</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Developmental Social Interactionist</td>
<td>Gazing &amp; Pointing Allocation of Attention Developmental Sequence?</td>
<td>Pointing appears to be developmental. Children use gaze to monitor the adult's reactions to their responses. Mother uses gaze to determine if child comprehends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips &amp; McNaughton</td>
<td>&quot;The Practice of Storybook Reading to Preschoolers in Mainstream New Zealand Families&quot; Reading Research Quarterly 25, (3)</td>
<td>Study 1 - 3- &amp; 4-year olds in book sessions Study 2 - 3- &amp; 4-year olds</td>
<td>Study 1 - 1 month Study 2 - 8 story-books over 4 to 6 weeks (at least 3 readings each)</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Social Interactionist</td>
<td>The nature, frequency, type of book &amp; participants Developmental changes across 3 readings of same book</td>
<td>Books chosen were almost all imaginative fiction. Insertions during book sessions were almost all book related. Most were narrative related. Developmentally from meaning to anticipation and analyzing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor &amp; Strickland</td>
<td>Family Story Reading</td>
<td>Families representing different socio-economic backgrounds were videotaped</td>
<td>Several encounters</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Social Interactionist</td>
<td>The nature - language, nonverbal, scaffolding by reader, etc. of the story sessions</td>
<td>Children learn written language conventions and the power of language. They learn to disembed language and decontextualize situations. They learn to relate new information with the old.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Learning for a young child is first and foremost a social process. It is at this stage that learning is interpsychological in that it involves the child with others in a social context (Vygotsky, 1962). Research involving the young child must take into account not only the individual's product as a result of thinking, but more importantly, the thinking processes of the child in relation to the peers, the parents, or the teacher. Imagine, if you will, of a family vacation involving parents and children traveling to the seashore. The two-day care ride to the ocean, and the two-day car ride back home comprise the family vacation. In fact, the journey to and form the desired destination required more time and invested energy than the desired goal -- "days at the ocean." However, the children remember this vacation as not only the ocean experience but the journey to and from.

Research of young children must take into account the many diverse avenues children travel as they learn. It is true that as they travel, children may think independently, but many of the avenues are shared with others who are helping the child travel.
I have always been fascinated by the Shared Book Event as a context for naturalistic inquiry. The context of these sessions and the social nature of knowing (Carey, Harste, & Smith, 1981) form the foundation upon which the child's learning occurs. For example, Harste (1985) argues that "reading is an event which entails an ongoing collaborative process of social sense-making. . . Meaning is negotiated among the participants in the setting and evolves over the course of the event itself" (p. 18). Bleich (1978) and Culler (1975) claim that a literacy event can only be understood by looking at the social or cultural context in which the event occurs (as cited by Short, 1986). "Cultures of literacy" is a term used by Bloome and Green (1984) to stress the classroom as a social unit. In fact, Bloome (1985) relates three dimensions of reading as the social process: the social context of reading, reading as a cultural activity, and reading as a socio-cognitive process.

My primary goal of this study was to examine literacy learning during Shared Book Events in which different genres were represented with the aim focused at how children learn during these events and what they take from the experience. Therefore, as a researcher, my goal was to observe the learning process, how it occurred, why things happened in the manner they did, how the children helped each other learn, what role the teacher played, what role the text assumed, and how all these variables entwined when contributing to the child's cognition. Furthermore, the needs of the research precipitated the method. I
realized the value in resolving intrinsic meaning by understanding what wasn't always evident on the surface.

My research project's methodology was a juxtaposition of several methods. Ethnographic techniques were necessary to present a descriptive analysis of the cross-sectional comparison of Shared Book Sessions within the natural context of the classroom. In addition, other research techniques were employed when children were removed from the natural context to assess their understanding of the shared book experiences with narrative and expository text.

This process of learning, therefore, is examined from a cognitive and a social perspective. The research is grounded within a social constructivist theoretical framework. As children make sense of stories, they do not simply memorize the story, but instead activate the mental operations necessary to comprehend the oral language involved - the conversation dialogue, the recognizing and/or reconstructing specific narrative sequences, and the reorganizing of story material by inferring or creating information in addition to what is explicitly stated (Cochran-Smith, 1984, p. 9).

During the Shared Book Event, the child must progress a step beyond the world of contextualized print. Before children listen to stories, they learn the meanings of print in context, such as the "McDonald's" on the restaurant's sign, "Crest" on the toothpaste box, or "STOP" on the street sign. This environmental print is within the situational context and a mental concept that children grasp
easily. However, within the Shared Book Event, children are exposed to decontextualized print, in which the meaning of the words is not within the situational context. The meanings of decontextualized print in adult books, as well as in children's books, extends from the lexical and syntactic features of the printed text and from the conventions of literature (Cochran-Smith, 1984). For example, as readers, we understand not only the decoding, but the literary conventions appropriate for the particular genre we are reading.

As significant as this cognitive process is, I could not study literacy within the frame of the Shared Book Event, without considering the social context. Children become readers, not only by the cognitive processing, but through a socialization process within the environment. The adult-child and child-child interaction during the Shared Book Event creates the context for reading and interpreting the decontextualized print of the text (Cochran-Smith, 1984). This period of socialization is a process with the consensual goal of interpreting the meaning of the text.

I appreciated Cochran-Smith's method of research in that storyreading was examined from the "multiple layers of context." In my research, I also studied the Shared Book Session as not an event apart from the child's everyday world, but as a core event in which all other forces in the child's life contributed. This circuitous path to literacy was examined with the Shared Book Event as my focus, but I found it necessary to examine this process through several lenses:
the community, the home, the school experience in which the curriculum, teacher philosophies, and extension activities contributed. I examined the Shared Book Event as a social process as it contributes to children's literacy acquisition from an ethnographic perspective in which the children's culture and way of living were emphasized.

Negotiating Entry Into the Classrooms
Meeting the Teachers Who Led me to the Children

Harste and Burke (1977) propose that teachers and students operate in classrooms according to distinctive and identifiable underlying theories of language and learning even though these theories are usually not articulated. Therefore, I wanted to study the beliefs of teachers as they related to informational and narrative texts. I also wanted to limit my study to teachers who had well-defined beliefs of Shared Book Events.

I conducted an extensive survey of kindergarten, first, and second grade teachers representing one large school system in the Central Ohio area. Through this survey, I learned how and why teachers use literature in their classrooms, what type of literature they are using, as well as how they interact with their students. The data from the survey also served in refining and validating data analysis categories for my observations within the classrooms. A secondary purpose of the survey was to find teachers who shared similar
beliefs to mine regarding Shared Book Sessions for young children, and to locate classrooms where the children were exposed to exposition as well as narrative.

Therefore, the survey served two purposes: to afford a wide survey of shared book practices and beliefs as a basis in defining the population from which the teachers were selected; in locating the teachers who share beliefs similar to mine (Chapter IV). The survey represents a revision of several drafts resulting from the Pilot Study (see Appendix B).

I also wished to find teachers who would work with me in collaborating data perspectives. To verify and explain observations, member checking was built into the design of this study in that I met with each teacher after I had participated in the Shared Book Sessions in that particular classroom. During the conferences, the teacher was also shown videos of the Shared Book Events to ascertain her understanding of the social and cognitive behaviors depicted in the interactive process.

Grade Selection

Many five and six year old children are not introduced to the expository genre until entering school. The typical text represented in Shared Book Sessions within the home is the narrative (Phillips & McNaughton, 1990). Given this background of narrative exposure, children may respond differently to a
genre that they have only recently interacted with. For example, most five and six year old children have already developed a story schema or a well-developed sense of story (Applebee, 1978).

Therefore, I believed children at this age-level to be the most interesting to study as they interact with both narrative and exposition texts. I wish to explore differences with the types of genre as children are introduced to the expository text.

Site Selections

Siegel (1984) reports the difficulty of gaining entry into a school system near the university which is inundated with requests from college instructors, graduate students, as well as undergraduates wishing to fulfill teaching and research studies in the schools (Short, 1986). The time required in approving a proposal prospectus was considerable in the system located near my university. For these two reasons, and also due to the convenience factor of working in locations closer to my family, I chose to conduct my research in a school system in the outlying area. The classrooms chosen were based on the survey results, and this was accomplished after I met with prospective teachers. My goal was to select one kindergarten classroom and one first grade classroom within this school system as the focus for the study.
My Role in the Study

Because I value working with people, I wished to become a participant and be directly involved in the study. Therefore, as Dewey emphasized (1938), the democratic social arrangement which I maintained with teachers and students, promoted a better experience which was more enjoyable for all of us. Also, by becoming a participant, I will be able to use tools of language, intention, and schema. Experience is a valuable tool that functioned not only how I wrote about what I discovered, but also shaped what I saw (Sapir & Whorf, as cited by Eisner, 1988). I was the instrument of the study, but through my "subjective knowing" of the classroom cultures, this was an advantage in exposing important information that may not have been directly revealed in the data (Malinowski, 1922). However, I also realized that since I was interpreting the data based upon my own theoretical perspectives, my experience, my research methodology, as well as the possibility of my presence affecting the data, reflexivity was necessary throughout the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). It is impossible to keep one's research purely "objective" and unaffected by one's values or presence (Bateson, 1979). For this reason, I kept a daily journal to record such biases which may influence outcomes.

A central feature of ethnographic research is an extended period of participant observation during which the researcher "becomes part of the situation being studied in order to feel what it is like for the people in that
situation" (Sanday, 1979, p. 527 as cited by Rowe, p. 186). In this study, I became a member of kindergarten and first grade culture for approximately six months. I felt this was necessary as I explored Shared Book Events from the children's, as well as the teachers' points-of-view. My research involved learning from people within the culture of the classroom. I was concerned with the meanings of actions and events of the people I was seeking to understand (Spradley, 1979). Some of these meanings were directly expressed in language, some were taken for granted, and some were more difficult to understand. As a member of the classroom, the meanings were easier to understand. During the Shared Book Events within the classroom, my role was that of observer. Not only were these sessions videotaped, but I also took field notes. My role of observer was expanded to that of participant as I worked with individual children after the classroom Shared Book Events. During this 1:1 Debriefing Session, I reviewed the S.B.E. by viewing the videotape with the child. As with a theoretical sample, the children's comments were dependent on the social context which precipitated their formation. Specifically, the purpose of the Debriefing was a direct result of the preceding Shared Book Event. This is a major advantage of qualitative research . . . the theory is generated from the data. As I peered through the windows of the children's minds, my goal was to discover what they were thinking, how the social context influenced their thinking, and how this thinking process was related to different genres. The text
was not used during the videotape review.

Adults have a tendency to use leading questions to get children to expand on an established topic, and often they know intuitively the child's answer (Corsaro, 1979). For example, questions are used for testing children's knowledge and reasoning abilities and as a mechanism for structuring teaching-learning situations. My goal in these one-to-one sessions was to reverse such a tendency by encouraging the child to adopt the facilitator role. I assumed a passive stance during most of the session (Corsaro, 1985) in that I responded to the children's comments with a non-judgmental "I see" type of response. My focus was on understanding the child's thinking process as generated by the Shared Book Event. These sessions were audiotaped and I almost always debriefed two children after each Shared book Session. Because I hoped to define the shared book experience from the child's perspective as well as the teachers's viewpoint, I attempted to get "inside the experience of the actor" (Blumer, 1969). The children's and teachers' voices will be heard throughout the data analysis chapter of this study.

The Narratives and Expository Books

The books used during the Shared Book Events were chosen by the respective teacher. Several narratives with expository texts on the same subject were selected for use in the Shared Book Sessions. Many books, however,
were read without the corresponding narrative or expository text on the same subject accompaniment. My goal regarding the text selection, was to observe the teacher and her choices in a natural context.

I had hoped that the books chosen would demonstrate the following criteria:

The book had illustrations which were large and colorful.

There existed an obvious demarcation between the narrative and the expository text.

All books involved familiar concepts to the 5, 6, and 7 year old child.

The storybooks had a well-developed story structure, characters, a definite setting, a clear theme represented in characters who are faced with problems or goals, plot episodes that lead to the attainment of the main character's goal, and a resolution (Morrow, 1988).

The language of the story was typical storybook genre language, with phrases such as "once upon a time" and "happily ever after."

The written register of the nonfiction books is typical of expository text.

Elements such as topic presentation, a description of attributes, characteristic events, a category comparison, a final summary, and a conclusion are represented in the nonfiction books (Pappas, 1990).

Books were of a length appropriate for young children's attention spans.

The same books were not read by the kindergarten teacher and the first grade teacher during the time I was in each classroom. This was purely by
chance as several books were chosen by both teachers, but were read at times when I was not in that particular classroom. For example, books shared by both teachers were *The Snowy Day* (Keats, 1962), *The Mitten* (Tresselt, 1964), and *A Picture Book of George Washington* (Adler, 1989).

Phases of Research

I divided the research study into three distinct time phases in which these analysis techniques were employed:
### TABLE 4

**PHASES OF RESEARCH STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Cross-analysis of Literature</td>
<td>Peer Debriefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determining Gap in Literature</td>
<td>Triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal for Study</td>
<td>Reflecting on theoretical notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formation of Survey</td>
<td>Organizing data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiated Entry into Schools</td>
<td>Constant Comparative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot Study of Survey</td>
<td>Macro analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot Study of Shared Book Sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Teachers Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Daily review of Field Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considered Hypotheses</td>
<td>Peer Debriefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considered Patterns</td>
<td>Member Check Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflected on Methodology and Theoretical notes as Pertained to Hypotheses</td>
<td>Indefinite Triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Obtrusiveness</td>
<td>Constant-Comparative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catalogued Audiotapes</td>
<td>Cross-referenced Data Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examined Hypotheses</td>
<td>Daily Reviews of Videotapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily Review of Audiotapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transcription of V.T. events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transcription of A.T. events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wholistic Descriptive Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nascent Patterns in Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of Microsociolinguistic Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Categorization of Type and Focus of Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of Individual’s orientation and Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Developed true Hypotheses</td>
<td>Reviewed all techniques employed in Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Checked Credibility of Report</td>
<td>Searched for Negative Cases that May Disprove Hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revised Study to Reflect Committee Members' Comments</td>
<td>Peer Debriefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worked Written Report into final form</td>
<td>Indefinite Triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guided Theoretical Sampling</td>
<td>Member Check Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of Microsociolinguistic Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Categorization of Type and Focus of Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of Individual's orientation and Understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis

I designed a qualitative study in which the analysis was occurring throughout the data collection process. I was able to generate theory out of data with the design of the study changing as I collected more data (Spradley, 1979). Throughout the entire process I reflected on what I had learned in regard to the design of the study, the grounding of the theory, and the data collection phases as they related to my purposes and tentative hypotheses (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Several of the techniques employed by Rowe (1986) helped to guide my analysis in forming hypotheses related to Shared Book Events and children's comprehension of different genres. These data analysis techniques are: organizing and cataloguing the data, using a constant-comparative method to identify possible patterns in the data and to generate hypotheses (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985), reflecting on the theoretical notes to guide theoretical sampling, using indefinite triangulation (Cicourel, 1975) to gain input from the other participants' perceptions of what's happening, using peer debriefing (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) with other graduate students to gain other perspectives on the methodological and theoretical issues, transcribing the events from the videotapes and audiotapes, and analyzing microsociolinguistic data. Therefore, during the Shared Book Events, I categorized the type and focus of discussion as it pertained to the text. In the Debriefing Sessions, I analyzed the child's genre understanding as well as the individual interpretation
as it related to the whole group consensus by categorizing their comments. I will now discuss the data analysis procedures.

Field Notes

During the Shared Book Events, I took notes while I observed the teacher mediating the sessions with the whole class. This method in recording data seemed logical in that I could separate the different types of information as the exchange occurred in a particular context. As Corsaro stresses, the researcher can thus search for patterns within a session or in sessions over time. During the Debriefing episodes with individual children, I also took notes, as many factors weren't revealed in the audiotaping. All field notes were taken during and immediately following events, when everything was fresh in my mind. Each evening I reviewed these notes making necessary renditions to present as accurate a picture as possible. I gathered as much holistic, descriptive data as I felt I was capable: the children's talk, the teacher's talk, as well as an account of all behaviors.

Personal Journal

As stated previously, I kept a daily journal to counteract biases and to maintain reflexivity throughout the data collection period of this study. This was necessary to objectively examine my own processes of interpretation, how my
presence may have affected the setting, how my research methods may have influenced my observations, and how my own theoretical perspectives may have biased my interpretation of the data (Rowe, 1986).

Collection of Artifacts

Many teachers encourage writing, drama, play, music, and art activities in the classroom. As experienced from my own teaching years, during choice time, children will often choose to participate individually or with peers in such activities stemming from discussions and readings during the Shared Book Events. Teachers did collect the children's work for me when I was not present, with a brief annotation of the context in which the artifact was made, the date and the child's name.

If the artifact was a product of the accompanying activity to the Shared Book Event, then I asked various children if I could photocopy their work and later returned the original to the children. These artifacts were then categorized with the corresponding field notes, audiotapes, and videotapes representing the Shared Book Sessions.

Informal Conversations

Corsaro (1985) stresses the necessity in field research of people not viewing the researcher's presence as simply a means to an end, such as a dissertation or research monograph. Becker (1970) has observed that people
can feel threatened if they see the researcher as important or involved in important research. As Corsaro (1985) recommends, I worked hard at playing down my research status. In an atmosphere such as this, the teachers were more likely to "open up" in volunteering background information which proved to be valuable data pertaining to her style of teaching, the children's learning styles, or behavior patterns.

Videotaping

Based upon the pilot study experience, I realized that to capture the entire class and the teacher during the Shared Book Events, I definitely needed to videotape. Moreover, the teacher was also interacting with different children who may not have been included on the videotape, so notes were taken in addition to the video data. During the pilot study, this method of data collection was invaluable as a review resource and a means to reflect on what had happened and a period in which to form tentative hypotheses on what had occurred.

Each evening, after videotaping the Shared Book Events, I viewed the tapes to get a better feel for what had happened, and I used this as an interpreting base.
Minimizing Obtrusiveness

One of my major concerns during my pilot of my observational procedures was the possibility of disruptive influence of the video camera. However, I found that the children paid no attention to it whatsoever. I speculated that most of these children were familiar with a video camera and it simply was not a novelty. I set up all video equipment myself, and the camera was stationed on a tripod. In all likelihood, a person operating a camera would have been far more disruptive than a stationary camera on a tripod.

Several children were influenced by the camera the first time the Shared Book Event was videotaped. However, the teachers and I felt the influence was minimal in that several children looked at the camera for a few seconds. The camera, appeared to not influence behavior and class interaction patterns in any way, as the Shared Book Event seemed to proceed in a normal manner similar to the preceding weeks in which I was a classroom member and did not videotape.

Estimating Obtrusiveness

Before the Shared Book Sessions, the teachers and I discussed the project, the camera, the necessity of not touching the camera, etc. with the
children. As Corsaro (1985) recommends, I was prepared to answer and record all questions the children and teachers asked about the equipment. I was hoping that the discussion with the children and a question/answer period would reduce later comments, questions, and self-consciousness of the children. It appeared to be true, as no one gave the camera a second thought. The frequency, range, and duration of questions are all indicators of the children's sensitivity to the video camera (Corsaro, 1985). Therefore, the children represented in these two classrooms were not sensitive and the data was not compromised.

I was more concerned about the teacher's sensitivity to the equipment, as during the pilot study, one teacher was very nervous during the videotaping. After approximately ten minutes however, she appeared more relaxed. Corsaro (1985) stresses that it is sometimes more of a problem for adults to act normally when being videotaped than for children. I was relieved that both teachers appeared unaffected by the camera's presence.

Obtrusiveness of audiovisual equipment and recording can also be estimated by comparing videotaped events with corresponding activities represented in field notes (Corsaro, 1985). Specifically, I compared the participants' behaviors during the videotaping of the Shared Book Events with the field notes' coverage and with the sessions that were not taped. If disparities had existed, at least I would have attempted to explain their effects when I
interpreted the data. However, this was not the case.

Corsaro (1985) also suggests a form of teacher collaboration to estimate obtrusiveness of the equipment by asking the teachers to review the tapes to confirm correspondence between the children's behavior in the Shared Book Events in this study with typical behavior during such sessions. The teachers did review the tapes during the Debriefing Sessions and felt the children's behavior to be normal.

Organizing and Cataloguing the Data

Based upon an extensive review of the existing literature and the result of my Pilot Study, I concentrated on developing a system for recording field notes, cataloguing artifacts, deciding on the data collection units, and refining my role as a participant in the study. The data was organized and catalogued on a daily basis with the respective class, date, and time in which the data was collected. To enable cross-referencing, all data sources related to a particular Event were filed accordingly.

The Constant Comparative Method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967)

By comparing the field notes, theoretical notes, methodological notes, and personal notes, I hoped to find patterns in the children's social learning within the Shared Book Sessions. I then hoped to generate hypotheses on the individual's
orientation as it related to the group. By comparing all the categories represented within that particular Event, and cross-comparing many Events, patterns did emerge. The videotapes and audiotapes provided valuable links between the patterns in the data.

The constant cross-analysis of methods enabled me to develop tentative hypotheses regarding not just one particular Shared Book Event, but also to compare data across many Shared Book Events. The fact that I was working with individual children as they reflected on what occurred during the session provided a rather unique perspective of constant-comparative analysis built into the design of the study. For example, we focused on the particular happenings within the Shared Book Events. Therefore, I analyzed notes, audiotapes, as well as videotapes of the same literacy event. By using this constant comparative method, I was able to generate hypotheses which were grounded in the data.

Indefinite Triangulation

In a qualitative study such as this, I found it necessary to not only use numerous data sources to validate information of my results, but I also felt it prudent to involve others in the analysis process. Therefore, a blind rater offered assistance with the microanalysis computations. I then compared these interpretations with my own interpretations. The data did not vary dependent of
the interpretations.

Corsaro stresses the importance in estimating the validity of interpretations. Indefinite triangulation is also a valuable tool for the initial testing and refinement of hypotheses, or theory generation.

Member Checking

Feeding data back to the teachers as well as the children provided perspectives of those who participated in the study which was necessary to validate my own interpretations of the data, the usefulness of the analysis categories, as well as my own theory generation. By asking the teachers to respond, they were given a final opportunity to reveal any perceptual discrepancies, as well as to provide a final "approval" on their role in the study and the research credibility.

Analyzing the Microsociolinguistic Data

Transcripts were practical, but also took into account theoretical considerations (Ochs, 1979). Even though verbal and nonverbal acts were integrated, all utterances and contextual information had to be readable, displayed clearly and be systematically organized (as cited by Corsaro, 1985). The primary aim of microsociolinguistics is the description and understanding of how occasions of interactions are organized and maintained (Corsaro, 1985, p. 47). My analysis focused primarily on the linguistic information as it pertained
to the propositional content. However, because contextual cues played a major role in the child's interpretations of the event, I recorded this information, also.

The context of the Shared Book Event, is what created the potentially shareable cognitive construct for the participants. This construct framed the range of possible interpretations both in terms of the relevance of presuppositions and as a guide to further action (Cook-Gumperz & Gumperz, 1976).

Analysis of Shared Book Events

I developed analysis categories appropriate for both the narrative and expository texts. Based upon the Pilot Study and the cross-analysis of the Shared Book Events, I was influenced primarily by the work of Cochran-Smith (1984), Pappas (1990), Roser & Martinez (1985), and Morrow (1988). However, I found it necessary to bring in added social dimensions that other researchers have not employed, which I analyzed under the "Social Influence" category.

Even though I was able to construct the main analysis categories in a chart form to be applied to both the narrative and expository texts' Shared Book Events, the data within these categories were dependent upon the type of text. For example, the analysis of a true expository text did not reflect the "character" category. Therefore, this was coded "not applicable" on the pie graph depicting the microlinguistic data.
Data Sets

Patterns which were revealed in the comments and questions indicated distinct categories. These were similar to the categories established by Roser & Martinez (1985). These sets were classified as:

FOCUS OF QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS
TYPE OF QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Then the data set were delineated and coded by symbols into the following classification scheme:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
<th>FOCUS DATA SET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>content/meaning</td>
<td>responses in which concepts, meaning, category comparisons, descriptions of attributes, or characteristic events were discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure</td>
<td>represented plot, theme, style or writer's craft, symbols/details, tone, point of view, sequence, setting, or topic presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characters</td>
<td>the actions and motives of the characters were discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illustrations</td>
<td>comments pertained to the color, medium, or style of the illustrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book related</td>
<td>features such as title, genre, author, dedication, and extension activities were emphasized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language</td>
<td>comments focusing on vocabulary or the sounds of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intertextual</td>
<td>represented comments comparing other works of genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal experience</td>
<td>when children or teachers referred to life-to-text or text-to-life experiences (Cochran-Smith, 1984) and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background knowledge</td>
<td>comments and responses pertaining to knowledge as it relates to the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social influence</td>
<td>comments in which another person's name was mentioned in reference to what had been said or a comment expressing feelings about another person's comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TYPE DATA SET

The second category of comments and questions were highlighted with a color-coding system by type with the following data code utilized:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE DATA SET</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>personal (P)</td>
<td>statements reflecting background experiences as they relate to the text as well as putting oneself into the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrational (N)</td>
<td>statements that retell literal information about the text or discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpretive (I)</td>
<td>comments or questions that are inferential and involve a higher level of thinking than the narrational category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predictive (PR)</td>
<td>responses that predict what might happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluative (EV)</td>
<td>comments that are judgmental regarding what should have occurred or what did occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explanatory (EX)</td>
<td>responses or questions that clarify information as well as language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative (A)</td>
<td>comments or questions that can be associated or related to other genres, works, or extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaborative (EL)</td>
<td>responses that extend knowledge or information to a greater degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 1:1 Child Debriefings

In the 1:1 Child Debriefings, I also utilized Roser & Martinez's (1985) categories for coding children's responses. I felt it beneficial to adopt the same Focus classification system for the individual Debriefings as I used for the Shared Book Events. Therefore, I could examine the group interpretation compared to the individual's understanding of the text using the same procedure for analysis. My goal in analyzing this phase of the research was to identify what individual children were thinking as they viewed the videotape of the Shared Book Event. These sessions were conducted in a private room immediately following the Shared Book Event. I offered no prompting as the children were instructed to share with me their thoughts, so I could ascertain what they deemed important, as well as their orientation perspective.

Unlike Roser & Martinez, I also superimposed an S on the response if the child's comment referred to another child's response or the teacher's behavior. This additional code was to help me analyze when the child's thinking was so influenced by another in so far as the child even mentioned this fact to me!

I also marked a comment or question about the character's action under the category "meaning" rather than "structure" if the character's behavior was related to the meaning of the story. If a child's comment was unrelated to the text or to the Shared Book Event's discussion, the comment was disregarded for analysis purposes.
Theoretical Sampling

Since one of my goals was to collect data to enable me to form hypotheses about children's understanding of different genres, I needed to be certain that the children I chose form the whole class shared book experience for the Debriefing Session were able to express their thoughts orally. Therefore, the sampling design emerged after the Shared Book Event in which I was able to observe the children in the socially constructed process. Even though I cannot do an "a priori" specification of the sample (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), I did project specific criteria considered when choosing the sample:

1. The child interacted with the other children, with the teacher, and with the text, as demonstrated by body actions or verbal behavior.

2. The children chosen are a representative sampling of the children in the two classrooms. For example, it would be beneficial to collect data on an equal number of boys and girls, and an equal sampling of readers of varying ability.

3. Based upon the teacher's descriptions of the children, as well as my observations of the children, the participants in the 1:1 Debriefing Sessions exhibit a willingness to participate.

4. The child is able to express ideas in a coherent manner.

The Debriefing Sessions in which I examined individual children's comprehension of the different genres, as well as their understanding of social interactions within the Shared Book Event were audiotaped. I questioned the
idea of videotaping these sessions, but felt it would be too obtrusive in moving the camera from the room. These Debriefing Sessions were immediately following the Event and were conducted in a location away from the other children. I also grappled with the idea of these episodes occurring in the classroom, but believed I could better assess the child’s comprehension if the teacher wasn’t explaining the accompanying activity’s directions simultaneously or the children weren’t all busy working throughout the room which may distract the child. With my experience, also, I have found that most children enjoy that one-to-one time in which they receive special attention. I believe that they did "open up" more because of this arrangement.

The obtrusiveness variables described in the preceding videotaping section also apply to the audiotaping. At the beginning of the 1:1 episodes, I explained the tape machine to the child. In my previous research endeavors, children were not affected by the tape recorder and they appeared to be unaffected in this project, as well.

As I continually interacted with the children and constantly interpreted my notes, I had the advantage in choosing the children for the 1:1 Debriefing Sessions based upon the conditions within the Shared Book Events. As discussed in the Data Collection Techniques’ Section of this chapter, a judgment call was necessarily involved (Lincoln & Guba, l985). Since data collection and analysis during the Shared Book Sessions focused on the role of social
interaction, this one-to-one theoretical sampling permitted an in-depth analysis of the students' thought processes as they understood the text. Therefore, the social interaction provided the necessary foundation for the subsequent analysis of the individual's perspective. I truly believed that I could not have studied comprehension of the individual at this young an age level unless I examined the learning strategies that were embedded within the larger domain of the social context.

The Teacher Debriefings

The purpose of this phase of the research was to examine the teacher's perspectives when analyzing their role and the children's actions during the Shared Book Sessions. Other concerns such as the text or the follow-up lesson also became evident.

In the final phase of data collection, after all the Shared Book Sessions had been taped and all the 1:1 Debriefings with the children had been conducted, I met with the kindergarten teacher individually on three occasions to review three of the sessions on video. I met with the first grade teacher twice to review two of the events. I did no prompting, except to ask for a further explanation of the previous comment on three occasions. The teachers were asked to express their thoughts at any time during the video. I needed to know what they felt was important, why it was important, and how they perceived their interactive role
during the sessions. This was a review session for the teacher to reflect on her understanding of the children’s comprehension of the different genres, as well as her understanding of social interactions within the Shared Book Events. The teachers also were able to offer input regarding issues I may have missed.

These Teacher Debriefings were very interesting for me to analyze and I will interweave these comments throughout the description of the Shared Book Event, to relate why these teachers conducted the Shared Reading Session a certain way, why such topics were approached, or why thinking was guided in a particular manner.

Estimating Trustworthiness

I was concerned that the results of my study would not be internally valid or credible. However, by observing and participating in so many Shared Book Events, I was able to compare extensive data collected in two classrooms. By participating in so many literacy events, I determined patterns from a cross-sectional perspective.

Lincoln & Guba (1985) suggest that triangulation and peer debriefing increase the internal validity (credibility) of the study. I did triangulate my methods as well as my sources (as previously discussed). Peer debriefing provided fresh perspectives from people not participating in the study. These viewpoints and the diary helped to maintain my reflexivity in respect to
theoretical orientation which could have influenced the interpretation of data.

As Rowe (1986) stresses in her research, the constant comparative method of data analysis, the videotape, audiotape, and artifacts' collection, as well as member checks all serve to safeguard a study's validity. I was able to change hypotheses and refine data analysis categories based on previous data. By being able to repeatedly examine the tapes, I was not as reliant on my "immediate interpretations" of field notes (Rowe, 1986). The member checking process with the teacher participants also established further credibility.

By using extensive data triangulation, as well as the same techniques in both classrooms, the data analysis proved to be reliable as well as externally valid. I was able to provide a detailed description of all characteristics within the Shared Book Events, including an exhaustive description of all data collection methods I used. By providing as much information as possible in addition to intrinsic data analyses categorization, readers may form their own judgments as to the generalizability of the results.

Summary

In analyzing the S.B.E., I utilized the data collection techniques of several leading early literacy researchers. I adopted a wholistic, descriptive approach exemplified by the work of Cochran-Smith (1984), Dickinson & Smith (1994), and
Heath (1982, 1983). These researchers, while focusing on the entire book reading event, discovered recurrent interaction patterns.


Of all the studies, my research methodology is linked to the wholistic approach of Cochran-Smith (1984) and the descriptive approaches of Roser & Martinez (1985) and Morrow (1988). The study is grounded within a Vygotskian framework (1978) in that the child must be an active participant with significant others in the learning process. Literacy, like oral language, is acquired through social interaction, and only later becomes internalized. The interpersonal (social) processes later become intrapersonal (mental) processes.

Similar to Rowe's procedures when analyzing preschool interaction (1989), I describe the Shared Book Event in wholistic terms during Phase II of this study.
For purposes of analyses, I found it necessary to transcribe 43 Shared Book Events, 77 (I:I) Child Debriefings, and 5 Teacher Debriefings. Then, in Phase III, I categorized the responses and comments during seven Shared Book Events. This analysis of the tapes revealed several types and foci of children's and teachers' responses. By using these categories as an organizational framework, I attempted to make sense of the participants' thinking during the Events as well as the children's diverse paths when constructing meaning during the I:I Debriefings.
CHAPTER IV

A DESCRIPTION OF HOW TEACHERS PERCEIVE THEIR SHARED BOOK EVENTS TO BE IN GRADES K-2 AND ACROSS SCHOOLS IN ONE SUBURBAN DISTRICT

The Survey Results

The purpose of the survey (Appendix B) was to explore the nature of Shared Book Sessions and related activities in kindergarten, first, and second grade classrooms. The first question of my study is, "How are teachers using Shared Book Sessions within their classrooms?" The teachers answered questions describing their professional background, aspects of the classroom environments, as well as a description of the Shared Book Events.

From the response and input of teachers during the pilot study, several questions were changed. For example, several questions needed available choices for teachers to circle rather than descriptive explanations. A time concern was expressed by two teachers, as they felt I would have a better response rate if teacher input time was one-half hour or less.

Nineteen teachers comprising twenty percent of the 91 teachers of grades K, 1, and 2 in this midwest suburban district responded to the survey. This represented 2,330 students. The teacher respondents of the pilot study were excluded from the data analysis.
My second purpose of the survey was to select a kindergarten teacher and a first grade teacher. After several phone conversations and interviews, I located two teachers who shared my pedagogical beliefs with respect to Shared Book Sessions.

My Beliefs About Literacy Learning during the Shared Book Event

1. Teachers and children participate in at least one S.B.S. a day.

2. Books or selections of books representing several types of genre are read.

3. Children are encouraged to comment and/or question at several different times during the session. Literacy learning is a social event.

4. Teachers question the children or make comments at several different times during the session.

5. Many book-related features are highlighted during the S.B.S., such as:
   - author/illustrator
   - title
   - genre
   - Caldecott Medal winner
   - plot
   - characters
   - word phases
   - predictions
   - visual images
   - personal background experiences as they relate to the text
   - intertextual ties
   - book-handling skills
6. Classrooms activities accompany the reading sessions often. Literacy is learned in an environment where print, music, art, etc. are meaningful and functional (Rowe, 1986).

7. A collaborative relationship between the teacher and the children is developed.

8. Teachers realize the benefits and values to be gained in Shared Book Sessions. Teachers act as examples by exhibiting enthusiasm and a love for literature. Children experience the sessions as a fun, meaningful activity as they learn about literacy.

Of the nineteen teachers, who responded to the survey, sixteen of them shared many of these beliefs. Four of the respondents shared all of the beliefs, but one did not wish to have a visitor in her classroom on a daily basis, and one was a second grade teacher, rather than a kindergarten or first grade teacher. The first grade teacher, who I selected, had filled out the survey in extensive detail and the kindergarten teacher responded in such a way that I felt she loved the Shared Book Events and teaching in general.

Background of the Teachers Who Responded to the Survey

Of the respondents, fifty percent had a master's degree while one-third were presently working in graduate courses. The average number of years as a teacher was ten years with the range from two to twenty-one years. Most of the respondents has been in their current grade level at least four years. Therefore, most of the teachers responding to the survey were well educated, as well as experienced teachers.
The Community

The students' cultures represented in these classrooms were African-American, Oriental, and Indian, with the majority culture being Caucasian.

This study was conducted at the elementary schools located in a predominantly Caucasian suburban area. According to the Mt. Auburn Associates Survey of economic development (March 11, 1994), several factors should be cited to give the reader the over-all perspective of the community. In terms of population, the city jumped from 3,855 residents in 1980 to approximately 19,500 at present. This rate of growth (405 percent) is much larger than the city of Columbus (27.5 percent) and the state (2.1 percent).

This community's residents are relatively wealthy. In 1989, 72 percent of the households earned over $50,000 in income compared to just 23 percent of households in Columbus. Nearly 12 percent had incomes exceeding $150,000, compared to 1% for Columbus.

Highly educated professionals comprise the adult community. In 1989, almost all of this area's adult residents had a high school diploma and 58% had a bachelor's degree or higher. Consistent with this education background, most residents are primarily employed in white-collar professional occupations. In 1990, 56 percent of employed adults were in executive, managerial, or professional occupations (Mt. Auburn Economic Development Survey, 1994). Therefore, as one might expect, there exists a definite emphasis on education
in this area. Over 60 percent of property tax revenue paid by the residents go to the schools. The children represented in these classrooms were not only expected to achieve success in school, but teachers and parents just naturally assumed it. The children enjoyed school, and parent volunteers participated in school activities on a daily basis.

General Description by Teachers When Describing Their Shared Book Events

Descriptions by the teachers of a typical Shared Book Session stressed active participation by the children in the form of questions/answers or discussion involving prediction/anticipation, empathy with characters, and personal experiences.

Books are typically introduced with a poem, song, or even an object related to the text. Most teachers discuss the cover of the book, the title, author, as well as dedication. Most books are chosen for a particular theme or author unit being studied. Repeat readings were common with many extension activities listed. Several of these included art projects in the form of murals, puppets, salt paintings, etc., buddy reading, recreational reading, the listening center, word studies, learning center activities, or writing related to the reading. Several teachers accompany the shared reading with big comparison charts relating three or more books with similar themes. It is apparent that these respondents shared many similar characteristics of a typical Shared Book Event.
Frequency of Shared Book Sessions

Ninety percent of these teachers read to their students two or three times a day. The other ten percent read once a day. The important factor here is that 100% of the survey respondents read to the students on a daily basis! This contrasts sharply with Hall (1971) who reported that only 48% of teachers read to their children on a daily basis. In this survey, 120 student teachers answered questionnaires regarding their cooperating teachers' patterns of teaching. Specifically, Hall wished to ascertain the extent and types of experiences with children's literature as well as recreational reading provided by these cooperating teachers.

In another study by Langer et al. (1990), it was found that only 57% of fourth-grade teachers read daily to their students. The fact that teachers are not reading to children across the grades also extends to the preschool and kindergarten classes. Even children as young as pre-kindergarten and kindergarten were only read 12 stories in a 4-week period (Morrow, 1982). These results are very different from the present survey conclusions.

Times of Shared Book Events

No discernible pattern was found in the scheduled times the Shared Book Sessions were conducted across classrooms. Teachers commonly selected more than one time to read to the children, with most choosing to read either first
thing in the morning (70%), or in the afternoon (70%). The Shared Book Event was least likely to occur just prior to dismissal (26%), while reading after lunch occurred more often (42%) (Figure 1).
FIGURE 1

Times of Shared Book Events
Repeat readings of the same story were sometimes conducted by 60% of the teachers. Thirty-seven percent of the teachers reported that they read the same story repeatedly on a frequent basis. One of the two teachers who rarely repeats reading the same story commented that it depends on the book and that for many books, she would never conduct a repeat reading. One teacher responded that the same story was always re-read.

Type of Material

When asked to identify the different genres they chose to read during a Shared Book Event, poetry, narrative, informational, and holiday books were chosen by 100% of the teachers. Fantasy books were also popular and chosen by 95% of the teachers. Biographical and fairy tale selections were read by 90% of the teachers in shared book sessions. Eighty percent of the respondents read historical fiction and 68% read animated books (Figure 2).
FIGURE 2

Chosen Genre
Children's interests and links to thematic units were determining factors for 100% of these teachers when choosing books. Ninety percent of them listed children's needs as important. Curriculum requirements and other teachers' or parents' suggestions influenced 74% of the teachers while 68% were inspired to choose Caldecott winners. Every teacher respondent uses Big Books for some of the Shared Book Sessions frequently or some of the time (equal percentages).

The preferred authors of these teachers are highly recognized. In comparing the list of the 31 authors listed by the teachers with the index of a recently published children's literature text (Huck, Hepler, and Hickman, 1993), I found that over 93% of the authors whose books were being read during Shared Book Sessions were also cited by the authors of the children's literature textbook (Figure 3).
Books that were listed by the teachers were:

- The Indian in the Cupboard, Lynne Reid-Banks
- Chicka, Chicka, Boom, Boom, Bill Martin Jr.
- Polar Bear, Polar Bear, What Do You Hear?, Bill Martin, Jr.
- The Snowy Day, Eyrat Jack Keats
- The Mixed-Up Chameleon, Eric Carle
- The Very Busy Spider, Eric Carle
- Swimmny, Leo Lionni
- Pumpkin, Pumpkin, Jeanne Titherington
- Which Which Is Which, Pat Hutchins
- It's Groundhog Day, Steven Kroll
- The Clifford books, Norman Bridwell
Organization of Sessions

When reading books during a Shared Book Session, 100% of the teacher respondents sit in a chair or rocker. Twenty-one percent responded that they sometimes stand in front of the class or sit on the floor with the children.

The children, on the other hand, sit on the floor during the S.B.S. in 95% of these classrooms. Sometimes, the children sit on the floor in a circle in 16% of the classrooms, and one teacher reported that children sit at assigned seats or at a table.

Description of the Activity

Ninety-five percent of these teachers responded that they question the children at several different times during the S.B.S. Sixteen percent question once or twice while reading. Of the respondents, 84% comment at several different times while reading. Sixteen percent comment once or twice during the S.B.S. and one teacher reported that she rarely comments while reading.

The times that the children were encouraged to comment or ask questions varied from: anytime, 53%; at several different times, 47%; to one or two times, 10%.

A whole range of types of comments and questions are encouraged by these teachers:
FIGURE 4

Range of Responses
The survey respondents were also asked to circle the number of times various features of the book were highlighted during the Shared Book Session:

**TABLE 7**

Highlighted Features

Percentage of Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author/Illustrator</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Selection</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldecott Winner</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characters</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Phrases</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Images</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Experiences</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Books</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Skills</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonics Skills</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These data seem to suggest that the survey respondents discuss many literary conventions pertinent to the S.B.S. Classroom activities (extension activities) accompany the reading on a frequent basis in 63% of these classrooms. The extensions always occur in 26% and they sometimes take place in 11%. No teacher responded that extension activities rarely or never occur. The children in these classrooms participate in several types of extension activities when used in conjunction with the Shared Book Events.
FIGURE 5

Extension Activities
The writing activities consisted of journals, point-of-view papers, and spin-off stories. Sequence strips and comparison charts would be two examples of the comprehension recall activities. Whole class discussions and author studies were used as extensions in 95% of these teachers' classrooms. The skills worksheets were used least with only 16% of classrooms adopting this form of extension activity.

Child as Facilitator

Children are permitted to read during a Shared Book Event "sometimes" in 47% of these classrooms. Twenty-six percent of the respondents always permit a child to read and in 21% of the classrooms, a child reads frequently. Only in one classroom, were the children never permitted to read during the S.B.S.

Teachers listed several circumstances when children read during this time (See FIGURE 6):
FIGURE 6
When Children Read
However, each child rarely has a book in 58% of the responding teachers' classrooms. Sometimes, all the children have copies in 26% of the classrooms, and in 16%, the children never have a copy of the shared books during the session.

Children are given the opportunity to choose the book some of the time in 58% of these classrooms. They frequently choose the book in 16% of the classrooms and rarely choose the book in 32% of the rooms. Several teachers commented that they chose books according to their thematic units and one teacher commented that the children may request repeated readings.

After the book has been read during the S.B.S., the children always have access to the book in 90% of these classrooms. Children frequently have access to the book in 10% of the rooms.

Instructional Outcomes of Shared Reading Sessions

Of these respondents, 100% felt that children have fun, gain an appreciation for literature, and gain information as outcomes of the S.B.S. Ninety percent of the teachers stressed that children learn the language of books, while 84% believe that children learn written language conventions as Shared Book Event benefits. Forty-two percent of these respondents believe a moral is learned during the sessions, with one teacher believing a moral is sometimes learned.
Several teachers stressed varied benefits of the Shared Book Event with each of the following outcomes mentioned once:

**TABLE 8**

Benefits of the Shared Book Event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listening/Speaking Skills</th>
<th>Read for Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Learning</td>
<td>Read Words in Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of Illustrations</td>
<td>Skill Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Knowledge</td>
<td>Cognitive Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling for Oral Fluency/Expression</td>
<td>Strategy Modeling for Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers were asked their three most important goals of a Shared Book Session. Enjoyment and love of books were listed by 68%. One teacher did not respond (TABLE 9):
**TABLE 9**

Three Most Important Goals of S.B.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>% of classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment/Love of Books</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge/Concept Development</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation of Literature</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Books/Written Conventions</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling of Good Strategies</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Learning/Sense of Community</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Participation</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Experiential Backgrounds</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success for Child</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage Imagination/Creative Thinking</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springboard for Other Activities</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight Word Vocabulary</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Skills</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Vocabulary</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain Different Perspectives</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diagnostic Outcomes

The teachers also enumerated diagnostic information which they were able to obtain from the Shared Book Session. The most listed was "concepts of print/print carries a message" (FIGURE 7).
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FIGURE 7

Diagnostic Outcomes
These data suggest that teachers do indeed assess diagnostic information regarding their students throughout the Shared Book Sessions. Even though this is a whole class activity, this time period seems to be an invaluable source in assessing children’s needs.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Shared Reading Sessions

I asked the teachers to list the evident strengths in their shared reading procedures. Many teachers stated enjoyment and excitement as an obvious strength (52%), with one teacher going so far as stating this was the favorite time of day for her students. Twenty-one percent of the respondents felt the Shared Book Events helped children become readers, while 16% felt the time afforded children the opportunity to choose books they are comfortable with.

Several strengths were listed by 11% of these teachers:

- children become listeners
- comprehension is enhanced
- cooperative learning occurs in which strong students help weaker ones
- participation and involvement
- interest and varied literature selection
- vocabulary development is enhanced
- theme related and a springboard for extension activities
- the S.B.S. leads to independent learning for the children

Many answers were represented one time by the different teachers:

- children can ask for repeated readings
- the S.B.S. is a good teaching tool for specific skills and objectives
- audiovisual materials enhance interest
- children learn to identify the parts of a book
- prediction strategies are learned
decoding or word attack skills are learned.

The survey respondents expressed varied and many strengths in evidence at this time. However, several weaknesses were also cited, with 16% of the teachers wishing for multiple copies of the book so all children could see. Several teachers lamented that there are not enough Big Books. Other teachers listed one weakness associated with the Shared Book Event. Some of these expressed weaknesses are:

- not meeting all children’s needs
- are the curriculum guidelines being met?
- improvement of questioning strategies
- more repeat readings needed
- some children can’t focus
- stronger students overshadow the weaker students
- more preparation time is needed
- more time in the school day is needed

However, even though teachers did express these concerns, 100% of them felt the Shared Sessions are meeting the children’s needs.

When asked how they usually improve upon the shared reading experiences, 21% of these responding teachers provide better extension activities, 16% go to workshops or read professional literature, and 16% share ideas with a colleague. More repeat readings, practice, reading with smaller groups based on needs, pulling out more skills, changing the format, and more observation of children’s responses were also expressed improvement techniques.

Teachers learned about the Shared Book Sessions in several ways:
Teachers learned about the Shared Book Sessions in several ways:

- Colleagues (16.1%)
- Journals/Literature (19.4%)
- Whole Language District (6.5%)
- Student Teaching (3.2%)
- Workshops (19.4%)
- Personal Experiences (16.1%)
- College Courses (19.4%)

**FIGURE 8**

How Teachers Learned About S.B.S.
All of these teachers have been reading literature to their students since they began teaching. Several teachers expressed, however, that in the last couple of years, they have been reading more.

When asked if they had any questions about shared reading, two teachers replied that they ask questions all the time, one of whom receives advice from colleagues. Another teacher expressed concern that her goals may not be "on target" and one person felt children may not be picking up basic skill work since reading test scores are down. She was concerned that teachers are being held accountable. Eight-four percent of the respondents had no questions.

Summary

Respondents are committed to a well-planned, quality Shared Book Session for their students. Children are actively involved throughout the reading by asking questions and discussing the plot, theme, or characters. They are given the opportunity to predict events, relate personal experiences and talk about language. Books are often presented as an integral part of a unit of study, as different books are analyzed and different genres compared. These teachers also select quality literature for their shared book sessions while offering many varieties of extension activities. In other words, the literature "leans on" other literature (Yolen, 1977) and children are given the opportunity to express their understanding of the shared book in new ways (Hickman, 1981).
Rereading selections was also stressed by the teachers. This extends children's participation as new perspectives are discovered and new issues explored which weren't evident at the initial reading (Martinez & Roser, 1985; Morrow, 1988; Yaden, 1988).

New teaching techniques are shared among these colleagues as they attend professional education courses and workshops. Several teachers stressed how fortunate they were to be teaching in a whole-language district. How very encouraging for us as educators to see these children learning to read as they participate in quality Shared Book Sessions. Unlike the children represented in the Hall (1971), Langer et al. (1990), and Morrow (1982) studies, who were not experiencing quality Shared Book Events, the children represented in this survey across three grade levels, are engaged in whole class instruction during the reading in 95% of the classrooms. Small group discussions are conducted in 42% of the rooms. Through this survey, I was able to examine how teachers in this suburban district are using Shared Book Sessions. From their descriptions of the quantity and quality of these events, it seems that teachers in this area are teaching literacy through whole group instruction as the children interact with each other with the consensual goal of interpreting the text. From the teachers' responses, the discussion appears to be as important as the reading. Based upon the previous studies cited, these teachers seem to be atypical of teachers nationally.
The survey also provided the means in which I was able to select the teachers and classes in which I would work for the next six months. Exactly how children are benefitting from the Shared Book experiences which these teachers described will be discussed in the next section.
CHAPTER V

AN EXPLORATION OF LEARNING WITHIN THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF SHARED BOOK EVENTS IN TWO CLASSROOMS

In the last chapter, I described how teachers are using Shared Book Events within their classrooms. This represented Phase I of my study. In this chapter, I focus in on Shared Book Events within two of these classrooms. I have organized this research into Phase II and III of my study.

The Phase II consists of a wholistic description as an overview of all the Shared Book Events conducted over a 3 month period in a first grade classroom and a 2 1/2 month period in a Kindergarten classroom. During this stage of the research, I examined the teachers' goals and beliefs, the classroom environments, the curriculums, and the children. I proceeded with a wholistic descriptive overview of 43 transcribed Shared Book Events in which different genres were represented. The data revealed distinct stages within the Events with a further delineation of various styles within these stages.

In Phase III of the study, I examine the moment by moment social construction within seven of the Shared Book Events in which different genres were represented. This Chapter focuses on my second and third research questions:
How are the different genres represented and treated by teachers?

How do children construct meaning during the Shared Book Events involving narrative as well as expository text? What are the possible variations occurring?

During this research, I also explored the many avenues which children travel as they strive for meaning. During the 1:1 Child Debriefings, the children revealed the important details or happenings that they wished to share. What did they gain from the Shared Book Events, which I can share with you, and from the unique advantage of being told from their perspective?

Finally, the teachers' thinking processes are analyzed as they view themselves from the outside looking in. Why did they choose a certain book? Why was that point emphasized? How do they take knowledge and help children apply it to their own lives?

All of these questions could not be answered, however, unless I examined the outer context of community and family culture, the classroom environment and curriculum, as well as the teachers' goals and beliefs.
The First Grade Classroom: Physical Description

The front of the room was designated the whole group area. The floor had carpeting which provided comfortable seating for the children. Mrs. L.'s chair was located between two bulletin boards and shelves (FIGURE 9). Whole Group Time provided the instructional format for almost all activities and subjects. These periods during the day were academic sessions in which knowledge was discussed, shared, and created through social interactions. The "T" in front of the chalkboard represents Mrs. L.'s location and the "C's" depict the children’s location during the whole group events. The inverted "V's" represent the location of the children as they worked during the extension activities to the Shared Book Event. Small group work or buddy work occurred at various seat clusters or on the floor throughout the room. The small group work consisted of math activities or different Language Arts' activities emanating from the Shared Book Event.

The Learning Stations were located to the left upon entering the classroom, which was essentially in the back. These centers were rotated with new activities every two weeks to correlate with the shared book unit of study (see Appendix D for examples of Learning Center activities).
First Grade Classroom

Figure 9
Bulletin boards were located throughout the room and samples of the children's writing, which were a normal extension activity to a shared book were always displayed. The children's projects in the form of comparison charts of the shared books, poetry, writing, or art work with writing examples were also displayed in the outside hall for the rest of the school to observe (see Appendix C for samples of children's writing which were displayed on the bulletin boards).

The Listening Center with a text of the shared book or a related book was located in the back of the room. The reading center with bookshelves filled with books and comfortable, isolated reading space was along the windowed wall. Often, multiple copies of the shared book were placed on the shelves. The Reading Recovery books, which were used by the teacher during 1:1 instruction time while small group activities were occurring, were located along this wall, also.

The Kindergarten Classroom: Physical Description

The front of this room was also the designated "whole group area" and was located to the right of the room upon entering (FIGURE 10).
This section of the room was carpeted, as children sat on the floor during the Shared Book Events while Mrs. U. sat on the rocker. A chalkboard, bulletin boards, book shelves, and the experience chart easel were all within Mrs. U's reach. This was the location of whole group instruction for all subjects-reading, language arts, math, and science (see the "C's" which represent the children in FIGURE 10).

Most of the small group work occurred at the tables as the extension activities to the shared book in the forms of writing, art and bookmaking. Children also performed math problems and worksheets at the tables (see inverted "V's" in FIGURE 10.)

Choice time centers were located around the room. These centers consisted of the block and toy shelves, the housekeeping corner, the painting easels and art cabinets, the science center, the rabbit cage, the math games, the drama center, and the book shelves in the reading center.

Bulletin boards and wall displays were located around the room, as well as in the adjoining hall. The children's work was always related to the shared books of the particular unit of study. For example, one display represented, "The Jackets We Wear in the Snow" as an extension to "The Snowy Day" by Keats. Another display was Keep Looking by Millicent Selsen and Joyce Hunt, in which children's art work illustrating animals above and below were depicted.
The Curriculum: First Grade Classroom

The Children wrote in their journals for one-half hour every morning upon entering the classroom. This literacy activity was socially constructed as the teacher and I responded to what the children had written, and we walked from child to child. Often, we presented questions to the children in writing which they then expounded on in the journal. After this initial writing period, we then divided the children into groups for 15 to 20 minutes in which children read their writing aloud to others. Writing time preceded the Shared Book Event on a daily basis. This session usually was 40 to 50 minutes in length and was followed by the special (gym, art, music, or library). The period before lunch was small group time or individual work time, depending on the extension activity of the shared book or the learning center assignments.

Lunch and recess were followed by math, in which children worked in pairs. Upon completion of math lessons, children finished language arts' activities and participated in 1:1 reading/decoding with Mrs. L. Portfolios were kept on each child's progress and level in the primers, Reading Recovery books, or children's books, along with work examples.

Children also participated in an afternoon recess. Upon returning to the classroom, if time permitted, another shorter Shared Book Event was conducted. Before going home, Kids' News" was written during whole group time in which children contributed while Mrs. L wrote the experience chart describing the day's
activities. Every Monday, the children took home a typed copy of Kids’ News of the previous week.

The Curriculum: Kindergarten Classroom

Reading and language arts’ activities comprised most of this kindergarten classroom’s half-day. Even science lessons emanated from the book which was read and discussed during the Shared Book Event. For example, the children studied fruits and vegetables after reading *Eating the Alphabet: Fruits and Vegetables from A to Z* (Ehlert, 1989). The five senses were studied in conjunction with books such as Bill Martin Jr.’s *Brown Bear, Brown Bear, What Do You See?* and *Polar Bear, Polar Bear, What Do You Hear?*

Math concept books and labeling books were also shared. *1 to 100 Busy Counting Book* (Rosenberg, 1988) and *Eating Fractions* (B. McMillan, 1991) were two such books. So, essentially all lessons in this classroom were extensions of a primary literature lesson in which a book was read and discussed within a social context.

Therefore, both the first-grade classroom and the kindergarten classroom were alive with print and vivid displays of literacy activities associated with extension activities of the Shared Book Events. Actually, most of the curriculum revolved around these sessions in which books were read.
TEACHER GOALS AND BELIEFS

First Grade Teacher

Mrs. L. had been teaching for 21 years. When asked to describe a typical Shared Book Event in her classroom, Mrs. L. relates:

"A typical Shared Reading Session in our room is almost always related to our thematic units or author studies. The book choices are those written by highly acclaimed children's authors, rich in natural, predictive language, with stories of high interest to the children.

The children sit in a group on the floor. I sit on a low chair. There is an easel and a pointer for the Big Books.

The book is introduced by mention/discussion of the theme or author study of the day. We discuss to build experiential background before the reading begins. We think of things to look for in the reading.

As I read, the children are encouraged to interject questions/ideas as long as we do not impede the flow of the story.

After the initial reading, if it’s a Big Book, we will reread it together. We may frame known/unknown words, compound words, plurals, etc. We also discuss interpretations, illustrations, etc.

We discuss what we can do to extend the reading experience. It may be a comparison chart with another book, making of a Big Book (replica or innovation), or put the poems in our poetry notebook with choral and/or buddy reading.

The children often will extend the book with art projects, buddy reading, recreational reading, listening center, activities in learning centers -- and ALMOST ALWAYS will write the Shared Reading Experience in some way. We are constantly interrelating our reading/writing experience."
From Mrs. L.'s description of the Shared Book Event, it is apparent how the children are active participants of the session. The students are encouraged to comment or ask questions at several different times during the session. All types of questions are encouraged and prediction, pattern, characters, or plot comments are encouraged.

The sessions are conducted in an informal, comfortable manner in which the children sit in a group on the floor. The readings occur 2 or 3 times a day, with the longest session occurring the second period of the day.

The type of book varies, as the selection depends on Caldecott winners, the children’s interests and needs, or a link to thematic units. Fantasy, poetry, narrative, informational, biographical, holiday books, and fairy tales are all represented. Big Books are used, often as a result of the children's publications.

Authors are chosen based on the text comprehension level and illustration appeal to the children. These authors are chosen for author studies or topic of the book as it assimilates within a particular limit of study. Mrs. L. reads the works of many authors, but when asked to list four books and authors she preferred, her choices were:
Pat Hutchins - (author study): Which Which is Which?

Eric Carle: all of his books

What Do You See? 
Polar Bear, Polar Bear.. 
What Do You Hear?

Ezra Jack Keats: The Snowy Day

Reflecting Mrs. L.'s belief that children are active participants in the learning process, discussion occurs throughout the Events. Topics consisting of the author and illustrator, the title, the genre, Caldecott medal winners, the plot, the characters, predictions, word phrases, library skills, and some phonics skills are deliberated on a daily basis. Mrs. L. believes in not only teaching children how to read, but also guides them about reading attitudes to appreciate books. The children's background experiences as they relate to the plot or the characters' experiences are compared throughout the session. Books or selections related to the present reading are also compared and contrasted, often in the form of written comparison charts. Decontextualizing the information is not left to chance; Mrs. L. deliberately guides the children's thinking process of relating book knowledge to the life around them or to the information in other books.

Reflecting Mrs. L.'s belief that the Shared Book Event represents a topic within a unit of study, the classroom activities promote reflection of the book
throughout the day. Comprehension recall activities, such as comparison charts, drama, or sequence strips are common. Art activities are also frequent with some form of writing as a spin-off to the story occurring almost every day.

Mrs. L. always offers the children access to the shared book after it has been read. For example, the book will be placed in the reading corner or the listening center with a tape of the text. Several times throughout the year, smaller versions are read after the Big Book is shared. In fact, the only weakness of the Shared Reading Event that Mrs. L. cited was the fact that she did not own more Big Books. She feels it is a tremendous advantage if the children can see the print while the book is being read. Then, children not only learn the language of books, but they can learn to decode during a fun, interactive, whole-class style.

Fun, an appreciation and a love for literature, information gain, knowledge of written language conventions and the language of books, modelling of fluency and expression, as well as strategy modelling for the students are all benefits which Mrs L. feels are instructional outcomes of the Shared Book Event. Children gain in the affective, as well as the cognitive domain. She listed her three most important goals as:

1. "To instill within the children a love and excitement about literature/sense of story/authors.
2. To model fluent reading with the use of appropriate problem solving strategies.
3. To teach the children knowledge and the ability to gain knowledge through reading good literature -- to expand experiential background."

Mrs. L. also responded that she gained much diagnostic information on her students during the Shared Book Event. This consists of: listening skills/focus, comprehension (listening), strategy usage (with Big Books), oral and verbal skills, as well as language usage, and experiential background knowledge.

It was evident to me that Mrs. L's beliefs regarding the Shared Book Event were carried over into other areas of the school day. This was not a self-contained period, but a way of life in developing the class curriculum.

Kindergarten Teacher

Mrs. U. was located at another suburban school and had been teaching for 8 years, all on the kindergarten level. When asked to describe a typical Shared Book Event, Mrs. U. stressed active participation by the children. Children share experiences and ask questions throughout the story, as well as answer Mrs. U.'s questions throughout the Shared Book Event. Mrs. U. also emphasized the wide variety of books read . . . narrative, informational, poetry, fantasy, biographical, holiday books, historical fiction, fairy tales, animated books, as well as her love of Big Books.
Mrs. U. reads to the children 2 or 3 times a day and shows a proclivity toward frequent repeat readings. Like Mrs. L., she chooses her selections based on the children's needs and interests, the Caldecott winners, a link to thematic units and curriculum requirements, as well as other teachers' or parents' suggestions. Her preferred authors are Tana Hoban, Bill Martin, Jr., Gail Gibbons and Ezra Jack Keats.

Mrs. U. believes that the children regard this Shared Book Session as a fun, interactive time when everyone can participate in the reading and discussion. Therefore, these Shared Book Events are quite informal with the children sitting on the floor in a group, and the teacher sitting in a rocker or on the floor with the children. Many book-related features (title, author, illustrator, genre, Caldecott winners, plot, characters, word phrases, predictions, visual images, library skills, phonics skills) are discussed during the Shared Book Event. The children's background experiences as they relate to the reading and other books or selections are also brought up during the session.

Reflecting Mrs. U.'s belief that the topic of the Shared Book is part of a unit of study or a current relevance, many classroom extension activities in the form of music, art, drama, author studies, writing and comprehension recall activities, and whole group or small group discussion are used in conjunction with Shared Book Sessions. Children are always permitted to read or read-along when they wish and they always have access to the book. Active
participation is an integral part of the Shared Book Event.

Mrs. U.'s three most important goals of the Shared Book Event are:

1. "All children can participate and feel success.
2. Increase comprehension by including and welcoming all responses.
3. Provide a role model for developing a sense of story and concepts of print."

From the Shared Book Session, Mrs. U. ascertains which children are: enthusiastic about reading, willing to take risks, developing a sense of story, and learning about the concepts of print. Like Mrs. L., Mrs. U. feels the children benefit from the fun, the information, develop an appreciation for literature, and learn written language conventions, as well as the language of books. In her opinion, the biggest strength of the Shared Book Event, is the excitement that it generates within the children in developing a love for reading.

In many ways, these teachers have definite goals and beliefs, which are similar, regarding the Shared Book Event. They feel that children's interpretations of text should be conveyed through a variety of extension activities. To promote active participation by all students, a high degree of talk is encouraged. This talk involves relating the text to the students' lives, as well as intertextual linking. Problem solving and critical thinking questions by the teachers guide children to higher thinking levels. Both teachers stress the importance of the Shared Book Event as an integral part of the reading program.
Through the social context, children not only learn from the teacher, but from each other. Idea sheathing, as one thought leads to another, fosters a sense of community within the Shared Book Event. Learning is not left to chance, it is developed through questions or comment strategy promoting active involvement of all students. The Shared Book Sessions as they extend into all areas of the curriculum, are becoming a way of life within the classroom.

THE CHILDREN

Children in the First Grade Classroom

Twenty-three children participated in this first-grade study during two settings: the Shared Book Events of which whole group time was the format and the 1:1 Child Debriefings which were conducted in a separate room immediately following the Shared Book Event.

The majority culture represented was Caucasian, with two Japanese children involved as E.S.L. students. Twelve boys and eleven girls were included in the study. After conferring with Mrs. L. and participating as a class member for eleven weeks, I observed children of all different ability levels in this classroom. Even though no standardized test results were available for this young an age, the third graders in this district consistently score at least 10 stanine points above the national average in math and reading. Several of the
schools had scores in the eighth and ninth percentile.

Most of these first graders were from traditional family homes where the father represented the main bread winner. Eight of the mothers worked part-time and two mothers worked full-time. Of all the couples, at least one parent was college-educated. Many of the mothers volunteered to help in the classroom or in the school with the publishing shop or in the library.

Therefore, these first graders were from homes where education was valued. As literacy is important to their parents, the children have been read books since early childhood.

The Kindergarten Children

Six girls and seventeen boys comprised this class of twenty-three children. The format for the study was exactly like that in the first grade classroom with the whole group participating in the Shared Book Events and the 1:1 Debriefings conducted in another room immediately following the Shared Book Event. The majority culture represented was Caucasian, with African-American, Japanese, and Indian children also represented. As in the first grade classroom, no standardized test results were available, but a wide range of abilities was evident. All of the children were participants in the Shared Book Events, but one child was not included in the 1:1 Debriefings because he would not cooperate.
Most of these children were also from homes where the father was the main breadwinner. However, one father was unemployed and the mother was working as a babysitter within the home to help out financially. Several of the other mothers worked in part-time positions, as well. Most of the parents had at least some college education, with many parents earning college degrees.

Therefore, most of these children had also arrived at school with a background of literacy within the home. A knowledge base had already been formed based on shared experiences of reading and talking about books.

The Events Within the Context of the Classroom

The Shared Book Event was an integral part of the reading program with the book subject represented within a unit which was extended across the curriculum. These topics were reflected in not only the Shared Book Event, but also in the writing, extension activities, learning center activities, art, cooking, science, and occasionally in math lessons. For example, the Kids’ News, which was written by the children at the end of each school day, detailed what the class had done on that particular day. Children took home copies each Monday of the Kids’ News of the previous week. November 4th through November 8th was the time period for the Native American unit, which was the first unit of study for Thanksgiving. The Kids’ News for Friday, November 8th read:
Today is Friday, November 8th.

We read *The Girl Who Loved Wild Horses* by Paul Goble.

We wrote an Indian Big Book.

We made a cover for our Indian legend book.

We visited our buddies.

We wrote Native American poetry with them.

We painted an illustration.

Mr. Carroll made us some Indian bread.

We finished our chart about Native Americans.

We had a good week.

Different activities pertaining to Native Americans were also at the individual learning stations. These activities consisted of: a Kachina doll art activity, finding a pattern in the Indian necklaces, weaving a mat, and Q-tip Indian paintings. The children participated in these activities during their free time after their assignments were completed.

Paul Goble's, *Buffalo Woman*, was placed with several head-sets and copies of the book, at the listening center, so children could read along as they listened to the book. There were many activities emanating from the Shared Book Events. The children wrote legends which they then illustrated; they wrote a story in pictures on "hide" (simulated hide from crinkle paper); constructed a
comparison chart of life today compared to life at the time of the first Thanksgiving; created Native American poetry about animals and legends which were then compiled into a Poetry Notebook for each child to take home; did choral reading of poetry with their fifth-grade buddies; and cooked Indian bread. The children participated in all of these activities within a social context in which talk, laughter, and the sharing of ideas occurred.

Of the 40 books chosen by the first grade teacher during my participation time in the classroom, six books were nonfiction, three were poetry, and the rest were narrative. All books were selected as part of a unit of study or for a holiday theme (see TABLE 10). In the kindergarten, Mrs. U. chose 33 books, representing unit studies, curriculum topics, holidays, experiential in the children’s lives or for enjoyment (see TABLE 11). Seventeen of these books were concept books, six of these were nonfiction, and ten of the books read by Mrs. U. were picture narratives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Chosen By</th>
<th>Basis for Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Legend of the Indian Paintbrush Retold by T. de Paola</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>11/06/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Girl Who Loved Wild Horses by P. Goble</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>11/08/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain Player by D. Wisnewski</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>11/11/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn is Maize by Alki</td>
<td>Picture/Nonfiction</td>
<td>11/12/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bunny Teacher by a child in classroom</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>11/13/91</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Fun/example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Popcorn Dragon by J. Thayer Illus. by L. McCue</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>11/13/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Who Rides Horses by children in class (Big Book)</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>11/14/91</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Popcorn Book by T. de Paola</td>
<td>Picture/Nonfiction</td>
<td>11/14/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tick Tock The Popcorn Clock by J. Moncrue Illus. by H. Endref</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>11/15/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Thanksgiving Story by A. Dalgliesh Illus. by H. Sewell</td>
<td>Nonfiction</td>
<td>11/18/91</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squanto and the First Thanksgiving by J. Kessel Illus. by L. Donze</td>
<td>Nonfiction/Narrative</td>
<td>11/19/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, What a Thanksgiving by S. Kroll Illus. by S. Schindler</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>11/20/91</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, What a Thanksgiving (Repeat reading)</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>11/21/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes It's Turkey, Sometimes It's Feathers by L. Balian</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>11/22/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Many Days to America? by E. Bunting Illus. by B. Peck</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>11/25/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly's Pilgrim by B. Cohen Illus. by M. Deraney</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>11/26/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's Thanksgiving by J. Prelutsky Illus. by M. Hafner</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>11/27/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the River and Through the Woods by L. Child Illus. by B. Turkle</td>
<td>Picture/Poetry</td>
<td>11/27/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Chosen By</td>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gingerbread Boy</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/02/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Introduction to Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illus. by E. Amo</td>
<td>Folktale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gingerbread Boy</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/03/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retold by P. Galdone</td>
<td>Folktale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gingerbread Man (Big Book)</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/03/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retold by B. Parkes &amp; J. Smith</td>
<td>Folktale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gingerbread Boy</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/05/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illus. by S. Cook</td>
<td>Folktale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Runaway Pancake</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/05/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by P. Asbjornsen and J. Moe</td>
<td>Folktale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Picture Book of Hanukkah</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/09/91</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retold by D. Adler Illus. by L. Heller</td>
<td>Nonfiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chanukkah Guest</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/10/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by E. Kimmel Illus. by G. Cami</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hershel and the Hanukkah Goblins</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/11/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by E. Kimmel Illus. by T. Hyman</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's Christmas</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>12/12/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by J. Prelutsky Illus. by M. Hafner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Night before Christmas</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/12/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by C. Moore Illus. by J. Gurney</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Christmas Pageant</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/13/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by J. Rogers</td>
<td>Narrative/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Friendly Beast</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/16/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illus. by T. de Paola</td>
<td>Folktale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Early American Christmas</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/15/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by T. de Paola</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Holiday Handwriting School</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/17/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by R. Puliver Illus. by G. Karas</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Letter to Santa Claus</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/17/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by R. Impey Illus. by S. Porter</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wild Christmas Reindeer</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/18/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by J. Brett</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wild Christmas Reindeer</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/19/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ending)</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Twelve Days of Christmas</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>12/19/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illus. by Jan Brett</td>
<td>Fiction/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Chosen By</td>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudolph the Red-Nosed Reindeer</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>12/20/91</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retold by R. May Illus. by D. Gillen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let's Find Out About Winter</td>
<td>Picture/Nonfiction</td>
<td>01/06/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Introduction to Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by M. &amp; C. Shapp Illus. by L. Roth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mitten</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>01/07/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by A. Tresselt Illus. by Yaroslava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mitten</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>01/07/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illus. by J. Brett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 11

### BOOKS READ BY KINDERGARTEN TEACHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Chosen By</th>
<th>Basis for Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Jacket I Wear in the Snow by S. Neitzel Illus. by N. Parker (Big Book)</td>
<td>Picture/ Fiction</td>
<td>01/10/92</td>
<td>Teacher Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Z was Zapped by C. Van Allsburg</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>01/15/92</td>
<td>Teacher Reading Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Snowy Day by Erza Jack Keats</td>
<td>Picture/ Fiction</td>
<td>01/23/92</td>
<td>Teacher Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caps, Hats, Socks, and Mittens by Borden, Illus. by L. Hoban</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>01/24/92</td>
<td>Teacher Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clap Your Hands: Finger Rhymes by S. Hayes Illus. by T. Goffe</td>
<td>Picture/ Nonfiction</td>
<td>01/30/92</td>
<td>Teacher Introduction to Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here Are My Hands by B. Martin, Jr. &amp; J. Archambeault</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>01/30/92</td>
<td>Teacher Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polar Bear, Polar Bear, What Do You Hear? by B. Martin, Jr. Illus. by E. Carle</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>01/31/92</td>
<td>Teacher Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Bear, Brown Bear, What Do You See? by B. Martin, Illus. by E. Carle</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>01/31/92</td>
<td>Teacher Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's Groundhog Day by S. Kroll Illus. by J. Bassett</td>
<td>Picture/ Fiction</td>
<td>02/03/92</td>
<td>Teacher Holiday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating the Alphabet: Fruits and Vegetables from A to Z by L. Ehlert</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>02/04/92</td>
<td>Teacher Unit/Reading Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion Dancer: Ernie Wan's Chinese New Year by K. Waters and M. Slovenz-Low</td>
<td>Picture/ Nonfiction</td>
<td>02/04/92</td>
<td>Teacher Holiday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If At First You Do Not See by Ruth Brown</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>02/05/92</td>
<td>Teacher Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 100 Busy Counting Book by A. Rosenberg</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>02/07/92</td>
<td>Teacher Math Curriculum (Children Voted)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The More We Get Together by A. Daniel (Big Book)</td>
<td>Song/ Picture/ Fiction</td>
<td>02/11/92</td>
<td>Teacher Enjoyment/ Didactic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freckles and Willie by M. Cuyler Illus. by M. Winborn</td>
<td>Picture/ Fiction</td>
<td>02/12/92</td>
<td>Teacher Experiential/ Enjoyment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farm Concert by J. Cowley Illus. by I. Lowe (Big Book)</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>02/12/92</td>
<td>Teacher Unit/Enjoyment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Chosen By</td>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Picture Book of Abraham Lincoln by D. Adler Illus. by J. &amp; A. Wallner</td>
<td>Picture/Nonfiction/Biography</td>
<td>02/18/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champions by R. Williams Illus. by G. Ford</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>02/19/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snakes by R. Williams Illus. by Y. Miyaki</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>02/19/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moccasins by M. Frost Illus. by Y. Miyaki</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>02/19/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circus by M. Frost Illus. by J. Veno</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>02/19/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Picture Book of George Washington by D. Adler Illus. by J. &amp; A. Wallner</td>
<td>Picture/Nonfiction/Biography</td>
<td>02/20/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thump, Thump, Rat-a-Tat-Tat by G. Baer Illus. by L. Ehlert</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>02/24/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooth Fairy by A. Wood</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>02/25/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Eyes, Brown Skin by C. Hudson &amp; B. Ford</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>02/27/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Black History Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben's Trumpet by Rachel Isadora</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>02/27/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Black History Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rabbit's Loose Tooth by L. Bate Illus. by D. DeGroat</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>02/28/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodnight Moon by M.W. Brown Illus. by C. Hurd</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>02/28/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Mean, Nasty, Dirty, Downright Disgusting, but Invisible Germs by J. Rice Illus. by R. Merrill</td>
<td>Picture/Nonfiction/Narrative</td>
<td>03/03/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Look Book by children in the room</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>03/03/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germs Make Me Sick by M. Berger Illus. by M. Hafner</td>
<td>Picture/Nonfiction</td>
<td>03/04/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating Fractions by B. McMillan</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>03/05/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Math Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Chosen By</td>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If You Give a Mouse a Cookie by L. Numeroff Illus. by F. Bond (Big Book)</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>03/06/92</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Overview of all the Shared Book Events

The children looked forward to the Shared Book Events. In fact, this time appeared to be a favorite period during the day. The books were entertaining and everyone was encouraged to participate in the discussion.

I videotaped 23 Shared Book Events while I was a participant in the first grade classroom and 20 Shared Book Events during my months in the kindergarten classroom. All of these tapes were transcribed. I then analyzed the Shared Book Events utilizing the following criteria: Basis for Selection, Book Genre, Lead-in, Reading, Discussion, and Extension Activity (refer to Tables 12 and 13).
## TABLE 12

**FIRST GRADE SHARED BOOK EVENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis for Selection</th>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Lead-In</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Extension Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holiday</strong></td>
<td>Squanto and the First Thanksgiving</td>
<td>Picture/Biography</td>
<td>The discussion was a review of yesterday's book which also contained much information on Squanto. Mrs. L. explained that yesterday's book was from the Pilgrim's perspective and today's book was from Squanto's perspective.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text while the children looked at the illustrations. Discussion and questions occurred throughout the reading.</td>
<td>Discussion of Co-construction Interactive style, with topics ranging from vocabulary meaning, personal feelings, predictions, background knowledge, and content.</td>
<td>None--had an assembly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holiday</strong></td>
<td>Oh, What a Thanksgiving</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>Children talked about the times they have used their imaginations.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text as the children looked at the pictures. Discussion and questions asked by Mrs. L. occurred throughout the reading.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. asked the children about vocabulary meaning, background knowledge, prediction of character's actions and illustrations. Personal experiences were also discussed. Co-construction Interactive style.</td>
<td>Children wrote papers on the first Thanksgiving from the perspective of the Native Americans or the Pilgrims. They also illustrate this writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holiday</strong></td>
<td>Oh, What a Thanksgiving</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>Mrs. L. shared with the children her experiences as a little girl when she and a girlfriend used their imaginations.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text as the children looked at the illustrations. Toward the end of the book, they talked as they only looked at the illustrations, rather than reading.</td>
<td>Children discussed using their imaginations. Mrs. L. asked about vocabulary meaning and background knowledge. Co-construction Interactive style was evident, but not as much discussion in this repeat reading.</td>
<td>None, however, children worked at centers on Thanksgiving-oriented activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-In</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>Some-times It's Turkey, Sometimes It's Feathers</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>The children were asked why an author would name a book this title. They also discussed the illustrations.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text while the children looked at the illustrations. Mrs. L. asked questions and discussion occurred throughout the reading.</td>
<td>Much of the discussion was how the children would feel if they were in the protagonist's shoes. They also enjoyed the &quot;joining in&quot; and &quot;What a fine Thanksgiving dinner we will have&quot;.</td>
<td>Children worked in pairs on a big Thanksgiving book depicting the life of the Pilgrims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>How Many Days to America?</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>Mrs. L. illustrated time with giant time line to aid children's comprehension of when Christopher Columbus, the Pilgrims, and the introduced book's characters came to America.</td>
<td>Children looked at the illustrations while Mrs. L. read the text. Much discussion and questions.</td>
<td>Questions exemplified differrent reading. Children were also asked to empathize with these Modern-Day Pilgrims.</td>
<td>Children worked on Math problems (puzzle) on a Native American. They also colored and cut a Tom Turkey paper according to clues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>Molly's Pilgrim</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>The class reviewed the time line to introduce another book of Modern-Day Pilgrims. The children then predicted what the book was about based on the title.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text as the children looked at the illustrations. Much discussion and questions throughout reading.</td>
<td>Most of Mrs. L.'s questions involved feelings (children empathizing with the protagonist). Children discussed how they would resolve the dilemmas in the book.</td>
<td>Children worked at Thanksgiving centers and on reading activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-In</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>Over the River and Through the Woods</td>
<td>Picture/Poetry</td>
<td>Mrs. L. shared a newspaper article on Modern-Day Pilgrims (last two days' stories). They reviewed what a &quot;Pilgrim&quot; is. The new book of today was introduced by children judging from illustrations when the story occurred. Mrs. L. commented that this is one of her favorite books.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text as the children looked at the illustrations. Much discussion and questions throughout reading.</td>
<td>Much of the discussion involved the illustrations and interpreting the language of the poetry. Co-construction Interactive style.</td>
<td>Children wrote about what they would be doing for Thanksgiving Day. They were also to add what they are thankful for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertextual Unit</td>
<td>The Gingerbread Man</td>
<td>Picture/Folktales</td>
<td>The Lead-In consisted of Mrs. L. holding an attribute box while the children played &quot;20 Questions&quot; to guess what was inside. They also discussed what a &quot;folktales&quot; is.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text as the children looked at the illustrations. They all read the &quot;Run, run as fast as you can, you can't catch me, I'm the Gingerbread Man,&quot; and the &quot;I have run away from . . .&quot;</td>
<td>Children were asked to interpret the illustrations, to predict what might come next, and to relate their life experiences to the events in the story. A Co-construction Interactive style.</td>
<td>The class composed a chart describing the book (see comparison chart). The children then worked on Gingerbread Man centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertextual Unit</td>
<td>The Gingerbread Boy</td>
<td>Picture/Folktales</td>
<td>The substitute teacher read two other versions of The Gingerbread Man which were discussed. Then the class studied the illustrations of today's version and discussed them.</td>
<td>Much discussion and questions throughout the reading. Mrs. L. read the text as the children looked at the illustrations. The class joined in on verse and common parts.</td>
<td>Discussion involved much talk about the illustrations, prediction of what might come next, and identifying with the characters. Co-construction Interactive style.</td>
<td>Children put pictures of The Gingerbread Boy in proper sequence telling about each picture. They also worked on the comparison chart. Children made Gingerbread ornaments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-in</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertextual Unit</td>
<td>The Runaway Pancake</td>
<td>Picture/Folktale</td>
<td>Children were asked to guess the name of the book and why Mrs. L. would be reading a book about a pancake when the unit was on &quot;Gingerbread Men&quot;.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text as children looked at the illustrations. Children tried to finish sentences, but this text had a more difficult prediction sequence.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. discussed the word pattern, asked the children the previous Gingerbread books with this book and asked the children to predict. A Construction Interactive style with much laughter and enjoyment.</td>
<td>The children chose their favorite Gingerbread book and wrote the reasons why they preferred this one. The comparison chart was also completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>The Picture Book of Hanukkah</td>
<td>Picture/Nonfiction</td>
<td>A poster board with Hanukkah items was viewed as the class discussed Hanukkah and also viewed a Menorah with an emphasis on the eight candles representing the eight days of Hanukkah.</td>
<td>The children viewed the illustrations as Mrs. L. read the text. There was discussion throughout the reading, but it pertained to the text.</td>
<td>The questions and discussion were related to the information in the text (content-based) and vocabulary, with an efferent orientation. A Construction Interactive style. Children also discussed their &quot;miracle&quot; experiences as they related to the text.</td>
<td>The class reviewed the information in the text by writing key words on the chalkboard and by reviewing the poster board with Hanukkah items on it. The children also wrote about Hanukkah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>The Chanukkah Guest</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>A review discussion of the poster board with Hanukkah items on it was the lead-in. Mrs. L. also introduced a new Hanukkah book for the book corner. She pointed out that Hanukkah is spelled in different ways.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text as the children viewed the illustrations. Much discussion occurred throughout the reading.</td>
<td>The children's personal experiences as they related to the text were discussed. The class also talked about what they would do and how they would feel if they were the main character. A Construction Interactive style.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. gave each child a copy of a song about a dreidel. First, the class read the song and then they sang it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-In</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>Hershel and the Hanukkah Goblins</td>
<td>Picture/ Fiction</td>
<td>The class reviewed the signs on the dreidel and played the dreidel game. Mrs. L. announced that today’s book is her favorite Hanukkah book.</td>
<td>Much laughter and discussion occurred throughout the reading. Mrs. L. read the text as the children observed the illustrations.</td>
<td>The class described the protagonist, predicted what might happen, explained how they would handle the situations if they were the protagonist, and discussed vocabulary. A Co-construction Interactive Style.</td>
<td>The class reviewed the ways the main character had fooled the goblin. The children then chose one of the days of Hanukkah and wrote about what the protagonist would do. They also painted the goblin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>&quot;It’s Christmas&quot; The Night Before Christmas</td>
<td>Picture/ Poetry</td>
<td>A review discussion occurred on Hanukkah before Mrs. L. introduced the Christian holiday of Christmas. She then read a couple of Christmas poems.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text as the children viewed the illustrations. Much discussion occurred throughout the reading.</td>
<td>The children discussed the theory that the joy of Christmas is giving rather than receiving. They also interpreted the language of the poem and discussed how they would feel if Santa came down their chimney. A Co-construction Interactive Style.</td>
<td>Children read (choral reading) a poem and then put it in their poetry notebooks. They then wrote about their holiday wish for all their school friends and the papers were to be displayed in the hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>The Christmas Pageant</td>
<td>Picture/ Fiction</td>
<td>Hanukkah and Christmas were reviewed, as well as the facts about each holiday. Mrs. L. then discussed the new book as it was told from the perspective of children performing in a pageant.</td>
<td>The text was read by Mrs. L. as the children looked at the illustrations. Mrs. L. compared the children’s practice for the Christmas program to this book’s plot of the play.</td>
<td>Much of the discussion involved the language of the text, as well as a discussion of the illustrations. A Co-construction Interactive Style.</td>
<td>The class created a huge graph of real vs. artificial tress as they are used in the children’s homes. They also wrote on a paper stocking what they love to display.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-In</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>The Friendly Beast</td>
<td>Picture/Folk tale</td>
<td>The class reviewed the first Christmas—the setting, the birth, the visitors, etc. The new book was introduced by guessing this favorite author and discussing the dedication.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text as the children viewed the illustrations. Much discussion and review occurred throughout the reading.</td>
<td>The children discussed why the story is like a poem, compared this book to others, contrasted this long-ago setting to the times of today, and interpreted the vocabulary of the text. A Co-construction Interactive Style was evident.</td>
<td>Children wrote about all the preparation that is occurring in their homes to prepare for Christmas. They also did a math paper on a Christmas tree and worked at the centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>The Holiday Handwriting School</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>One of the children read a letter he had written to Santa Claus. Then, Mrs. L. explained the difficult time she had choosing the book for today, so she decided to read both. She related how a child wrote about losing a tooth in their journal and that reminded her of this book.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text as the children examined the illustrations. Much discussion took place throughout the reading.</td>
<td>Children discussed their personal lives as they related to the text, identified problems the characters might be having and ways to resolve these dilemmas. A Co-construction Interactive Style.</td>
<td>Led to another book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>A Letter to Santa Claus</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>A short lead-in in which Mrs. L. stated who the author and illustrator were.</td>
<td>The children observed the illustrations as Mrs. L. read the text. Discussion was concurrent with the reading.</td>
<td>Vocabulary words were interpreted, prediction of what might happen, and ways to solve the characters' problems were all discussed. A Co-construction Interactive Style.</td>
<td>Children learned how to set up a letter and then wrote letters to Santa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-In</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holiday</strong></td>
<td><em>The Wild Christmas</em></td>
<td>Picture/ Fiction</td>
<td>The class discussed the letters they wrote to Santa Claus and mailing them. Today's book was introduced with the author and by Mrs. L. asking the children to pay special attention to the illustrations.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text as the children viewed the illustrations. Much discussion throughout the reading.</td>
<td>The children related their personal experiences to the text, discussed the illustrations, interpreted vocabulary, and discussed how they would feel if they were the protagonist. Co-construction Interactive Style.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. did not quite finish the story, as the children wrote how they would solve the protagonist's problem. They also illustrated the borders like in the book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Reindeer</em></td>
<td><strong>Holiday</strong></td>
<td>Picture/ Fiction</td>
<td>A review of the part of the book that was read yesterday. This discussion was efferent-based on plot and content. Then, several children read their endings to the story. They then discussed these endings with the actual ending by Jan Brett.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the ending of <em>The Wild Christmas Reindeer</em> as the children examined the illustrations. The children read <em>The Twelve Days of Christmas</em> with Mrs. L. as they looked at the text and pictures.</td>
<td>A discussion occurred relating human behavior to the reindeer's behavior in the text. Co-construction Interactive style. During the second book, the class discussed the illustrations and the characters. A Co-narrational style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Twelve Days of Christmas</em></td>
<td>Lyrical Folk Poem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holiday</strong></td>
<td><em>“When Santa Claus Comes”</em></td>
<td>Picture/ Fiction</td>
<td>One of the children read the book he had just published to the class. The poem was read aloud together as each child had a copy. The book was introduced as another poem with rhyme in it. The author was also cited.</td>
<td>The short poem was read aloud in unison. The children pointed to each line with a finger. The book was read by Mrs. L. as the children looked at the illustrations.</td>
<td>The class discussion consisted of the children interpreting the language, the feelings of the characters, the illustrations, and an integration of their experiences to the experiences of characters. A Co-construction Interactive Style.</td>
<td>The children each made a Rudolph book by decorating his nose on the cover and then writing a story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Rudolph the Red-Nosed Reindeer</em></td>
<td>Picture/ Fiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-In</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Let's Find Out About Winter</td>
<td>Picture/Nonfiction</td>
<td>Mrs. L. stressed how great it was to be back in school after the holiday break. She reviewed what had happened to several children during the break. Then, the class conducted an extensive review and discussion of the four seasons and various activities associated with the seasons.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text as the children examined the illustrations. Much discussion occurred throughout the reading.</td>
<td>This efferent-based discussion involved facts pertaining to winter and the children's explanation of facts within the text. Many of the children's personal experiences as they related to the text were also discussed. A Co-construction Interactive Style.</td>
<td>The children wrote papers on winter... what happens in the winter, what they do in the winter, and if they like winter. The class also read a winter poem together and worked at the winter centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>The Mitten</td>
<td>Picture/Folktale</td>
<td>The class had a review of the four season with an emphasis on winter. They discussed winter clothing and recited a poem on mittens. Mrs. L. introduced the comparison chart as the children explained &quot;setting&quot;, &quot;plot&quot;, &quot;characters&quot;, and &quot;conclusion&quot;.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. asked many questions to aid the children's comprehension throughout the reading. She read the text as the children observed the illustrations.</td>
<td>Much discussion accompanied this reading, as children predicted what would happen next and discussed the animals, the illustrations, and the pattern throughout the book. A Co-construction Interactive Style.</td>
<td>The class worked on the comparison chart. The children then wrote stories about mittens on paper inside of drawn mittens. They also made animals to pop out of the mittens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>The Mitten</td>
<td>Picture/Folktale</td>
<td>Mrs. L. explained where the Ukraine is (since this is a Ukrainian folktale) and its relationship to Russia. She then questioned the children on previous Jan Brett books and they admired the illustrations.</td>
<td>Mrs. L. read the text as the children viewed the illustrations. Much discussion occurred throughout the reading.</td>
<td>The children compared this version to yesterday's, discussed what they would do if they were one of the animals, discussed the illustrations and the characters. A Co-construction Interactive Style.</td>
<td>The class completed the comparison chart and discussed the two different versions of The Mitten.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13

#### Kindergarten Shared Book Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis for Selection</th>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Lead-In</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Extension Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit on &quot;Winter&quot;</td>
<td>The Jacket I Wear in the Snow</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>Children got jackets from coat hooks. Went to seats with jackets. They watched as Mrs. U. drew jacket on chalkboard and labeled characteristics such as zipper, hood, snaps, button, etc.</td>
<td>This book was read by Mrs. U. as children listened. Illustrations were always visible as Mrs. U. read while she pointed at words of text. The text was a big book.</td>
<td>Co-Construction Interactive style with children discussing jacket characteristics and winter experiences throughout reading. Mrs. U. guided conversation through questions and scaffolding.</td>
<td>Children made drawings of their jackets and labeled the parts. These drawings went up in the hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Unit</td>
<td>The Snowy Day</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>An introductory discussion occurred by looking at footprints, buildings, the character, the Caldecott medal in the illustrations.</td>
<td>Mrs. U. read the text as children looked at illustrations. Often, she hesitated at words so children can fit the missing word in context.</td>
<td>Co-Construction Interactive style with discussion occurring throughout the reading. Mrs. U. questioned on background knowledge and discussed illustrations. Compared this book to The Snowy Day.</td>
<td>(Cut and paste activity) Children were asked to put snowman pictures in sequence and then to tell the story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Unit</td>
<td>Caps, Hats, Socks, and Mittens</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>Discussion of winter clothing, winter weather. Children talked about clothing, snow experiences, etc.</td>
<td>Mrs. U. read text. Illustrations were always visible while she read.</td>
<td>Co-Construction Interactive style with Mrs. U. bringing in children's experiences with book.</td>
<td>(Cut, paste, color activity) Children decorate mittens. Also, draw snowman and write in picture. Penguins and snowflakes are stamped on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-In</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Unit on &quot;The Five Senses&quot;</td>
<td>Clap Your Hands, Here Are My Hands</td>
<td>Poetry–as Intro. Picture/Nonfiction</td>
<td>Children talk about what they like to feel with their hands. They did echo-poetry to practice before the book (teacher says a line, the children repeat).</td>
<td>Collaborative Reading—Mrs. U. read a line, then children read (repeated) the line throughout the text.</td>
<td>Co-Construction Interactive style. Children discuss the text throughout the reading as the parts of the body and experiences in text relate to their experiences in real lives. Illustrations are also a focus for discussion.</td>
<td>Worksheet on body parts. Children work at tables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Five Senses Unit</td>
<td>Brown Bear, Brown Bear, What Do You See?</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>No Lead-In. This was a repeat reading.</td>
<td>Mrs. U. and the children read simultaneously while they looked at the illustrations. This was a repeat reading.</td>
<td>Style was continued co-narration with discussion following. Background information and personal feelings pertaining to the animals were discussed.</td>
<td>Led to another book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Five Senses Unit</td>
<td>Polar Bear, Polar Bear, What Do You Hear?</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>The author was discussed, the time period between the two books' publication, and the two books were compared.</td>
<td>Children attempted to read simultaneously while they looked at the illustrations. One child commented that there should be a small square to the animal on the following page.</td>
<td>Co-Construction Interactive style in which background information, animal sounds, and personal experiences were discussed.</td>
<td>The children played a game in which they acted out the animals in the book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-in</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>It's Groundhog Day</td>
<td>Picture/ Fiction</td>
<td>A short discussion occurred in which the author, the title page, the illustrator, and the dedication were discussed.</td>
<td>Mrs. U. read the text as the children looked at the illustrations.</td>
<td>Co-Construction interactive style with Mrs. U. leading the discussion in the form of questions. Background information, personal experiences, and characters were discussed.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>Eating the Alphabet: Fruits and Vegetables from A to Z</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>A short discussion of the title and author of the book.</td>
<td>Children repeated the vegetables labeled after Mrs. U. read it. The illustrations were always visible. Letters and letter sounds were also pronounced on each page.</td>
<td>Not as much co-construction interaction. Comments were made during the reading, but most of them were by the teacher. There was discussion following the reading and during the graphing.</td>
<td>Neat activity! Children graphed the vegetables they brought from home according to type and number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>Lion Dancer: Emile Wan’s Chinese New Year</td>
<td>Picture/ Fiction</td>
<td>Mrs. U. showed the class the red envelope that the Chinese hand out on the Chinese New Year. The children practiced saying &quot;Double Happiness&quot; in Chinese. Children were asked to predict what book was about.</td>
<td>Mrs. U. read the text while exhibiting illustrations at all times.</td>
<td>Co-Construction interactive style as children discussed personal experiences and compared things in the illustrations of China to the way things are in their lives.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-In</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Five Senses Unit</td>
<td>If At First You Do Not See</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>Mrs. U. talked about the unusual book, in that as she turns the book in different ways, different things can be seen. Children were instructed to use their eyes.</td>
<td>The text was read by Mrs. U. as the illustrations were always shown.</td>
<td>A tremendous amount of Co-Construction interactive style as children and teacher discussed on each page the different things they observed in the illustrations.</td>
<td>Mrs. U. had made huge eyes of various colors. The children then made their eyes and glued them on the representative big eye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Curriculum</td>
<td>1 to 100 Busy Counting Book</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>Children voted on the book they wanted to hear. The title and author were discussed. Mrs. U. also told the children who gave her the book.</td>
<td>Mrs. U. read a line and then the children repeated this line throughout the book. (Collaborative Reading). They continually looked at the illustrations.</td>
<td>A combination of Co-Construction interactive style with continual co-narration. Children discussed illustrations and counted periodically.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment/Didactic</td>
<td>The More We Get Together</td>
<td>Song/Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>Everyone sang the song together. One child demonstrated sign language for “happier”.</td>
<td>The children sang the text as Mrs. U. used her pointer.</td>
<td>A Co-Construction interactive style as the entire conversation was about the illustrations (example, what characters were doing, the setting of the picture).</td>
<td>Led to another book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential/Enjoyment</td>
<td>Freckles and Willie</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>The children echoed a poem which mixed-up words (fun activity).</td>
<td>Mrs. U. read the text as the children looked at the illustrations.</td>
<td>A Co-Construction interactive style as children answered Mrs. U.'s questions. More continual narration was in evidence in this event.</td>
<td>Children colored Valentine hearts. Each child received candy hearts in a cup which they graphed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-in</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Enjoyment</td>
<td>The Farm Concert</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>Mrs. U. answered one child's comment that this was a B book. Another child commented that the man on the cover was mad which led to further discussion.</td>
<td>The story was first &quot;told&quot; by the children as they looked at the illustrations. then Mrs. U. read the text as she pointed to the words. (Big Book) Last, the children sang.</td>
<td>A distinctive Co-Construction interactive approach as the children talked freely and often &quot;led&quot; the course of the conversation.</td>
<td>Children sang the text in normal voices and then in soft voices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Reading Unit</td>
<td>The Farm Concert</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>The children read the title and author on inside cover in lines as Mrs. U. pointed. One child commented on &quot;the&quot; being seen often. Emergent reading was explained by Mrs. U.</td>
<td>During this reading, the emphasis was on the text (words), punctuation, voice accent, and modulation. Animal sounds were also imitated. Children imitated the protagonist through actions. The class also sang the text.</td>
<td>Children talked about the characters feelings by looking at illustrations. Quotations marks were discussed as well as other books compared to this one. The style was co-narrational and interactive.</td>
<td>Led to another story on the same day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>A Picture Book of Abraham Lincoln</td>
<td>Picture/Nonfiction/Biography</td>
<td>The class discussed history in terms in Martin Luther King and Christopher Columbus. They then discussed background information regarding Abraham Lincoln.</td>
<td>The text was read by Mrs. U. as the children listened and looked at the illustrations.</td>
<td>A Co-Construction Interactive style was obvious as children discussed the meaning of the text, Abraham Lincoln, and the Civil war. (efferent focus)</td>
<td>Children drew pictures which were put on bulletin board in which they drew Lincoln how he looked better—with a beard or without.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Event–Olympics</td>
<td>Champions</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>Discussion of the Olympics.</td>
<td>The children and Mrs. U. read the text in unison. Mrs. U. pointed to the words.</td>
<td>Punctuation and illustration were discussed. Style was continual co-narrational with little discussion.</td>
<td>Led to another book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-In</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>Snakes</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>Discussion of the author's name, &quot;Rebel&quot; as to what sex. Discussion of Japanese names and letter &quot;S&quot;.</td>
<td>The children and Mrs. U. read the text as she pointed to the words.</td>
<td>A Co-narrational style with not a lot of discussion. Children were instructed to look at the illustrations for a clue in decoding. Snake's venom and poisonous was discussed.</td>
<td>Led to another book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>Moccasins</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>Discussion of author and illustrator led to the reading.</td>
<td>Mrs. U. pointed to the words as the children and teacher read in unison.</td>
<td>The exclamation mark was stressed by Mrs. U. The colors of the beads were also discussed. However, a distinct co-narrational style.</td>
<td>Led to another story on the same day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>Circus</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>The author and illustrator were stressed by Mrs. U.</td>
<td>The children and Mrs. U. read in unison as Mrs. U. pointed to the text.</td>
<td>The unison reading lends itself to a co-narrational style. (Less of a discussion).</td>
<td>A poem was recited &quot;I Love You&quot;. Children repeated each line after Mrs. U. read the line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>A Picture Book of George Washington</td>
<td>Picture/ Nonfiction/ Biography</td>
<td>The cover illustration was discussed. This book's cover was then compared to the Lincoln book in respect to authors, words, colors, styles.</td>
<td>The text was read by Mrs. U. as children looked at the illustrations.</td>
<td>A Co-Construction interactive style led by Mrs. U. George Washington was often compared to Abraham Lincoln. History and the illustrations were discussed, vocabulary words, also.</td>
<td>A page of the presidents' pictures was discussed as each child gets a copy soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-In</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Thump, Thump, Rat-A-Tat-Tat</td>
<td>Picture/Concept</td>
<td>The children discussed the picture clues that revealed the book was about a marching band. The author, illustrator, and dedication were cited.</td>
<td>Mrs. U. read the text as she and the children patted their legs with the rhythmic beat of the text. Children joined in with &quot;Rat-A-Tat-Tat&quot;.</td>
<td>Between readings, the class discussed rhythm, beat, loud and soft. A narrational leading to co-narrational style was evident. Marching bands and parades were discussed after reading. A Co-construction interactive style occurred after the reading.</td>
<td>Children marched in a circle while text was read. Children then stated why they would like to be in a marching band.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Tooth Fairy</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>Mrs. U. stressed the things that the children learn in February on being Dental Health Month, which led to the book.</td>
<td>Mrs. U. read the text as the children listened and looked at the illustrations.</td>
<td>A Co-Construction interactive style was obvious as the discussion involved the characters and the personal experiences of the children.</td>
<td>The children learned about the parts of a tooth with diagrams at their seats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black History Month</td>
<td>Bright Eyes, Brown Skin</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>Black History Month and famous Black Americans were discussed.</td>
<td>The text was read by Mrs. U. as children looked at illustrations.</td>
<td>Illustrations and language were discussed. Personal experiences were also brought in, as well as a comparison of hair. A definite Co-Construction interactive style.</td>
<td>Led to another book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black History Month</td>
<td>Ben's Trumpet</td>
<td>Picture/Fiction</td>
<td>The class discussed the author and the Caldecott Honor Medal.</td>
<td>Mrs. U. read the text as the children looked at the illustrations and pretended to play the trumpet.</td>
<td>Instruments were compared to another book's instruments. Vocabulary and the character were also discussed. The style was Co-Construction interactive.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-In</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Little Rabbit’s Loose Tooth</td>
<td>Picture/ Fiction</td>
<td>The title, the author, and the illustrator were discussed. Letters in the words of the title were also observed.</td>
<td>The text was read by Mrs. U. as the children looked at the illustrations.</td>
<td>The discussion occurred throughout the reading with a Co-Construction interactive style. Words in the text, personal experiences, illustrations, and money were discussed.</td>
<td>A Finger Play about rabbits was recited. Led to another book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>Goodnight Moon</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>The children studied the words in the title and learned about compound words.</td>
<td>The big book led to children trying to read the text while Mrs. U. read and pointed to the words.</td>
<td>The big book afforded the children much opportunity for discussion of illustrations and personal experiences. A definite Co-Construction interactive style.</td>
<td>A discussion about the mouse occurred. Then, the class sang some songs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Those Mean, Nasty, Downright Disgusting, but Invisible Germs</td>
<td>Picture/ Nonfiction/ Narrative</td>
<td>A poem about colds was recited and dramatized. The character of the book was related to the children’s experiences. Title, author, and dedication were also discussed.</td>
<td>Mrs. U. read the text while the children looked at the illustrations.</td>
<td>The children discussed their personal experiences with germs. The illustrations were also discussed and how to get rid of germs.</td>
<td>Children chose to play where the characters were playing in the illustrations of the book. They later drew pictures of germs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Our Look Book</td>
<td>Picture/ Concept</td>
<td>A discussion of margins when making books was the lead-in discussion to this class-made book (last year’s kindergartners).</td>
<td>The children and Mrs. U. read the text together as they looked at the illustrations. Mrs. U. pointed to the text.</td>
<td>A co-narrational style was evident. Mrs. U. reviewed the names of the last year’s kindergartners by looking at their photos at the end of the book they had made.</td>
<td>Led to another book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Selection</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Lead-In</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Extension Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Germs: Make Me Sick</td>
<td>Picture/</td>
<td>Mrs. U. talked about the title, the author, the illustrator and the fact that this was a Reading</td>
<td>Mrs. U. read the text as the children looked at the illustrations.</td>
<td>A main part of the discussion was about the manner in which germs enter our bodies. Questions related</td>
<td>Children drew picture of germs and they then wrote about</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extension Activities

In the first grade classroom, the children participated in several types of extension activities. The most prevalent type was writing, and these papers consisted of:

- Thanksgiving as a Pilgrim or Native American child
- Thanksgiving day and what children are thankful for
- The life of the Pilgrims as the children compiled a Big Book
- Several comparison charts
- Story completions or differences
- Letters to Santa
- Hanukkah events
- The protagonists' dilemmas
- How their families prepare for the holidays.

The kindergarteners participated in many art extension activities as extensions to the Shared Book. These activities consisted of:

- Drawings of their winter jackets
- Snowman pictures
- Mittens and decorating them
- Drawing germs and labeling them
- Drew Abraham Lincoln with or without his beard
- Valentine hearts
- Toothbrushes
- Fraction/food papers

The children also participated in physical extension activities, such as finger plays, poetry, marching, singing and acting out animals.

The lead-ins for both classrooms were similar. Background information, personal experiences, current events pertaining to the book's topic, poetry, the title, the illustrator, and the dedication were all typical lead-in discussions. One
notable difference in the two classrooms was the kindergarten teacher's use of concrete objects during the lead-in. For example, as the lead-in to The Jacket I Wear in the Snow (Neitzel, 1989), the children got their jackets off the coat hooks, brought them to their places, and studied the jackets as Mrs. U. drew her jacket on the chalkboard. A red envelope which the Chinese hand out for the New Year was shown to the children before the Shared Book Event of Lion Dancer: Ernie Wan's Chinese New Year (Waters & Slovenz-Low, 1990). Mrs. L. in the first grade classroom, had the children guess with "Twenty Questions" what was inside her attribute box. This was the lead-in to The Gingerbread Man folktale comparison unit.

Most of the discussions in both classrooms revealed a co-construction interactive style in which the teacher and children contributed to the discussion which correlated with the reading. In several of the concept books during the kindergarten Shared Book Events, a co-narrational style was adopted. During these events, the children and Mrs. U. read the book together, and less interactive discussion occurred (See Table 12 and Table 13). This also was the adopted style during lyrical books or poetry books.

Perhaps, the discerning information revealed in this data was the limited representation of nonfiction for the Shared Book Events. Since there are two primary ways of looking at the world (Rosenblatt, 1991), and as you'll recall from my Introduction, some children prefer expository text to narrative, are these
children participating in enough Expository text Events? Young children can process nonfiction quite well -- if given the chance (Pappas, 1991). I will discuss children's preferences in these classrooms in Chapter VI.

INTERTEXTUAL EVENTS

Several of the first grade Shared Book Events involved the comparison of the same theme, but different versions. For example, during the first week in December, Mrs. L. felt it was still too early to begin Hanukkah and Christmas books, so the children had a one-week unit on different versions of The Gingerbread Man. Not only were these books represented during the Shared Book Events, but children were able to listen to these books at the listening center or they were able to read or look at them during their free time. The five books that were compared are:


The lead-in discussion for this unit involved a game in which children played "Twenty Questions" to guess what was inside the attribute box. All five versions of The Gingerbread Man were in the box. Mrs. L. proceeded with a discussion of what a folktale is. As was the case with many discussions, the children were "guided" in the thinking process.

T: Can someone tell me what a folktale is, Dan?

C: It's like a made-up story.

T: O.K., and when a story is made up, what do we call that category?

C: fiction?

T: Fiction. O.K., it's a made-up story. It's fiction, and when you say it's made-up, could you tell me a little more about that? Anyone else?

C: Someone's thought of it.

C: Someone tries to put the words in their head and writes them down.

T: Folktales, Boys and Girls, are stories that happened many years ago, and what would happen is a mother would think of a story or hear about a story and she would tell her child, and then when that child would grow up and become a mother or a father, they would tell their child, and so it was handed down over the years, kind of like a story that we read. Think about our Indian stories, Katie?

C: The Legend of the Indian Paintbrush?
The Legend of the Indian Paintbrush and legends are passed down in the same way. Well, folktales, if you think about it, think about passing a story down just by way of mouth and not writing it down. Do you think it'd be the same, Dan?

C: no

T: What might happen?

C: Well, it might like change the words a little.

T: In other words, it would be the same basic idea, but some of the little things might be changed, some of the characters might be changed, the order of things that happened in the story might be changed, the place might be changed. What I'm going to do this week, I found five versions of The Gingerbread Man and I just love The Gingerbread Man, and I'd like to share this with you. I'm going to read one of them to you this morning and we're going to chart it on our graph and each day we read one, we're going to chart The Gingerbread Man and compare the stories. So settle back.

The children in Mrs. L.'s classroom were exposed to all different types of genres, with the folktale being introduced at this time of The Gingerbread Man unit. The characteristics of the folktale were discussed and compared with the legend, which the class was introduced to during the November unit on Native
Americans (see TABLE 14 for the comparison of *The Gingerbread Man*).

Now that I have discussed all of the Shared Book Sessions in a wholistic descriptive overview, I will focus in on four first grade Events and three kindergarten Events to provide a moment-by-moment analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Main Characters</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Saying</th>
<th>Order of Chase</th>
<th>Ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Gingerbread Man</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>The people and animals could not catch the Gingerbread Man.</td>
<td>Run, run as fast as you can, you can’t catch me, I'm the Gingerbread Man.</td>
<td>Boy, Man, Lady, Bear, Wolf, Fox</td>
<td>The fox ate the Gingerbread Man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illus. by Ed Amo</td>
<td>Old Woman, Three farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Gingerbread Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gingerbread Boy</td>
<td>*Gingerbread Boy</td>
<td>The people and animals could not catch the Gingerbread Boy.</td>
<td>Run, run as fast as you can, you can’t catch me, I'm the Gingerbread Man.</td>
<td>Old man, Old woman, Cow, Horse, Threshers, Mowers, Fox</td>
<td>The fox ate the Gingerbread Boy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illus. by Scott Cook</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threshers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mowers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Runaway Pancake</td>
<td>Grandfather</td>
<td>The people and animals could not catch the Runaway Pancake.</td>
<td>As I’ve managed to escape from ____ , ____ , and from ____, then I might as well escape from you.</td>
<td>Mother, 7 Kids, Grandfather, Manny-Panny, Henny-Penny, Rooster-Pooster, Ducky-Lucky, Goosey-Poosey, Piggly-Wiggly, Gander-Pander</td>
<td>The pig ate the Runaway Pancake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Pancake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manny-Panny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rooster-Pooster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ducky-Lucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goosey-Poosey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piggly-Wiggly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gander-Pander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE FIRST GRADE EVENTS
THE FIRST SHARED BOOK EVENT
NARRATIVE

OH, WHAT A THANKSGIVING

I chose the narrative, *Oh, What a Thanksgiving* (Kroll, 1988), for analysis because I could also examine an expository text, *Squanto and the First Thanksgiving* (Kessel, 1983) on the same topic. Also, purely by chance, Mrs. L. chose these two books to analyze during the Teacher Debriefing process. I felt this would enrich the data with the teacher perspective throughout the analysis. The children really appeared to enjoy the narrative, *Oh, What a Thanksgiving* by Steven Kroll. All of them were very focused and truly involved in the discussion and the text. In this Blue Ribbon book, the protagonist, a young boy named David, oscillates from the reality of celebrating Thanksgiving today to the imaginative of celebrating Thanksgiving as a Pilgrim Boy. Schindler's large, watercolor illustrations juxtapose well with the different eras and are an effective accompaniment to the text in aiding children with the concept of reality versus imaginative.

Mrs. L. conducted a large amount of time for the lead-in to this particular book. During the Teacher Debriefing, she expressed her reason for doing this: "I'm helping children bring into consciousness what imagination is because it's
such a big part of that book. They have to realize that the child is changing back
and forth from reality to imagination, reality to imagination."

Many children cited examples of when they have used their imaginations:

- c: I play dress up with my dolls.
- c: When I played soccer and I imagined there was another team, but there wasn’t.
- c: When I was playing school, I pretended to teach real children.
- c: I imagine that I’m in a different place.

These personal comments were so numerous and discussed so much throughout the Shared Book Event that 27.5% (44 out of 160) of all codings reflected personal experiences of the children or Mrs. L. (see FIGURE 12).

Not only does Mrs. L. establish the difference between reality and imaginative, but she states the purpose for reading the story. "This person has a wonderful, a strong imagination" (referring to the protagonist). "As I’m reading this book, I’d like you to notice his strong imagination." Many comments during the I:1 Child Debriefings also emphasized this imaginative perspective versus reality:

- c: He doesn’t really live there.
- c: He wanted to be like the Pilgrims.
- c: He was thinking he met these Indians.
c: He was imagining that he was a Pilgrim with Pilgrim clothes on and he was on the ship.

c: He was imagining that he was meeting Squanto and Samoset, but they were really his next door neighbors.

c: He was pretending that he was in the old days with clay houses.

c: David is not imagining when he cleared the table.

However, as Mrs. L. analyzed the Event during the Teacher Debriefing, she commented that if she were to do this lesson over again, she'd have been more verbal about clarifying David's imagination versus reality. She felt that the children would have understood this abstract concept more if she had asked, "What has happened?" especially with respect to the imagination events in the text. Regardless, a high percentage (24.4% or 39 out of 160) of the number of codings were categorized "character" in the Focus Data Set.

Predictions also appear to pull the child in and pique the interest level. Mrs. L. uses this technique throughout the story . . . "From the picture on the cover, does it give you an idea what the child's imagination might be about? Here's another clue, the picture on the back."

c: I think he is a grown-up in another outfit.

c: I think he is growing up in a different time and it is Thanksgiving.

The preschool class in Cochran-Smith's study (1984), which focused on
storytime as a structured literacy event, stressed these life-to-text or text-to-life discussions as the most important type of interaction during a storyreading event. In the present study, both teachers embraced this form of questioning as a key in helping children understand the text. Like the preschool teacher in the Cochran-Smith study (I984), many of the responses consist of text-to-life or life-to-text experiences. The protagonist, David, hated wearing his uncomfortable sweater and shoes for Thanksgiving. Mrs. L. asks, "Have you ever felt that way?"

c: When I go to church and we have to sit for so long.

c: I felt like that when I went to a birthday party and my mom made me wear a dress.

c: When I wear my dress shoes 'cause they're tight.

During the teacher debriefing, as Mrs. L. analyzed the Shared Book Event, she explains, "I'm asking the children what has happened to them. They're internalizing it and when they think of their own experiences, then it really belongs to them. It is a practical application of the concept."

Many times throughout the Shared Book Events, the teachers guided the discussion around the illustrations rather than the text. As the teachers read, the children are able to observe the illustrations. During the reading of Oh, What a Thanksgiving, Mrs. L. and the children discuss the illustration:

T: How do you think our author made this picture?
C: his imagination
T: Yes, but what materials do you think he used to paint this picture?
C: acrylics?
T: What do you think, Elizabeth?
C: paint
T: What kind of paints?
C: brown, yellow, orange
T: Do you think they had a lot of different paints? (referring to the Pilgrims)
C: no
C: They used berries and squashed them up.
T: Yes, and they also used something called whitewash.

The meanings of new words were discussed, as the words "musket" (c: a weapon), "bountiful" (c: It means that there was plenty of food) "harvested" (c: Ones that were just picked). Mrs. L. when analyzing the Shared Book Event on video, states:

"I do that a lot. I don't know if many people do, but when you come to a word that they may not know, you ask for clarification. Sometimes, I ask for synonyms."

During the 1:1 Child Debriefings, several comments exemplified these new
vocabulary words:

C: A "musket" is a long rifle. I saw one before.

C: The next "harvest" time, they had a lot of corn and everyone wasn't sick.

C: The corn is already "harvested."

This demonstrates a child's retention of new vocabulary words learned in the context of the narrative. I did no prompting during the LLI, and these children used the words in the appropriate context of their own volition. From the Focus Data Set, 3.8% (6 out of 160) of the codings reflected the "language" category. The effects of reading books to children are indirect, but as I have demonstrated, children can learn new word meanings through exposure to these "vocabulary words" in the context of the reading. "This incidental learning can measurably improve children's vocabulary knowledge" (Meyer, Stahl, Wardrop, & Linn, 1992, p. 27).

Mrs. L., throughout the Shared Book Event, encourages student talk and participation. She puts herself into the story, by identifying with the characters and relating life-to-text experiences to the children. She also encourages the children to relate experiences and to empathize with the characters. It's as if they all want to jump into the book and become a part of the action. Children are not born with this attitude . . . they acquire it through the support and guidance of adults (Heath, 1983; Bloome, 1985). What a good example for these
T: How many of you have cranberry sauce for Thanksgiving?

T: Do any of you make it fresh from the real berries like I do? It is so good when it is made that way.

T: Do you know that adults feel uncomfortable, too, sometimes? When I have to wear my good shoes, my feet hurt, and they're tight. I think we all feel that way from time to time.

During the Teacher Debriefing, Mrs. L. realized she relates her own life to the experiences in the text:

T: There was a personal comment from me.

T: I make a personal comment again.

T: A little personal note there again.

These text-to-life and life-to-text comments were also observed in the 1:1 Child Debriefings following the Shared Book Event:

C: I only see Playdough come out like that, like cranberries, in the shape of a can.

C: My real name is Katherine (referring to the character in the book).

C: You can imagine like there's this big, huge thing and you have a fake water gun and then you shoot the big thing with a water gun and it turns into a small
crumb.

Not only were the real-life experiences as related to the text discussed, but comments relating information from other books or genres were also apparent, as the children related this information in the debriefings:

C: The Indians taught the Pilgrims how to plant the corn 'cause they didn't know how to do it that well. First, you dig the hole. Then you put the fish in and then you cover it back up.

C: Squanto learned how to talk English when he lived in England.

C: When they were coming over to where the Indians were, they had three ships. Two went back. Some of the people on the other two went on the Mayflower. There were 201 people on the Mayflower.

These intertextual comparisons and related background knowledge were regularly discussed throughout many of the Shared Book Events. In the reading of, Oh, What a Thanksgiving, information pertaining to the Pilgrims and Indians was discussed:

T: We're thankful for the same things the Pilgrims were thankful for: our friends, our family, and the most
important reason the Pilgrims came to American for

... what, Jessie?

C: freedom

T: What kind of freedom?

C: Where the king made them go to his church.

T: What kind of freedom do we call that?

All: Religious

T: How does Squanto know English, Allison?

C: He learned it while he was in England.

This transfer of knowledge from one text to another helps children relate background knowledge to new situations. They not only retain factual information, but the children relate book knowledge to the real world and the more abstract world of another text. Background knowledge represented a share of 17.5% (28 out of 160) of the codings during the Shared Book Event of Oh, What a Thanksgiving. The "intertextual comparisons" category reflected 1.3% (2 out of 160) of the codings (refer to FIGURE 12).

Not only did the children utilize background knowledge and transfer knowledge from one text to another, but they also transferred knowledge from one medium to another. The extension activities, as they emanated from the Shared Book Event, occurred every day in the first-grade classroom and most days (an average of 3 out of 5) in the kindergarten classroom. The children
seemed to enjoy these activities, as this social period afforded children the opportunity to discuss the book, share their interpretations with others, and to reflect upon the meaning from different perspectives. By participating in conversations within a small group context, they talked about books and about their work.

These extension activities took the form of art, writing, drama, mathematics, or music. Knowledge was expressed not only in its verbocentric form (language as the path to literacy) but in multiple ways of knowing. Children had the opportunity to express their work in multiple ways and through multiple interpretations. The children were given the opportunity to create marbleized snow pictures, to sing the text, to dramatize the animals in the text, and so on.

For the extension activity to *Oh, What a Thanksgiving*, the children were asked to use their imaginations, as David did throughout the story. They were to write about all the things that could happen to them from the beginning of the day as a Pilgrim or Native American boy or girl. They were also instructed to draw a picture to accompany the writing and then the children would share their work with each other (see FIGURE 11).
On Thanksgiving day. On Thanksgiving day I went on a sleigh to see my friend Bonny. Wenn we got there we had to share the toys and spere. Wenn it was time to eat. We gave a present. But when it was time to go I said No No for I did not want to go.

Happy Thanksgiving.

I love having Thanksgiving with My Timmy and My Gram and Grandpa's and My Cousin's And Aet. And it is fun At My Grandpa is Wen The or a lateing Wen The or Get Back I Get See The train we bat lotis Of Story in it is too! I am thinking of more tiges!

FIGURE 11
Children's Writing
Oh what a Thanksgiving! There was a girl. The hawk is white and the wolf peek. It is coming to eat in the field. We said, 'We will eat the dog with fun.'

It is Thanksgiving. I am alander and went to the first Thanksgiving. We landed. Hayot, the family had the first Thanksgiving.
The children were always encouraged to use invented spellings in which they wrote the word as it sounded. As demonstrated from this work, Mrs. L. felt the children could write more freely if they weren't preoccupied with correct spellings.

These extension activities were as varied (see TABLE 12) as the teacher's imagination. They provided an extension to the literature, thereby embracing the experience of the Shared Book Event. As Rosenblatt states, "We should help the young reader to return to, relive, savor the experience" (Rosenblatt, 1982, p. 275). In both of my research classrooms, the extensions to the event were an integral part of the literacy program. This enabled the children to "linger under the spell of a good book a bit longer" (Yolan, 1977).

THE FOCUS AND TYPE OF COMMENTS

For the Shared Book Event in which the represented narrative was Oh, What a Thanksgiving, 160 codings emerged in the focus data set. Of these coded symbols, the largest amount were categorized as "personal experiences" with a represented percentage of 27.5% (44 out of 160). Much of the discussion also pertained to characters (24.4% or 39 out of 160) and background knowledge (17.5% or 28 out of 160) (see FIGURE 12).
In the type of statements data set, representing the narrative, the majority of questions and comments were personal (36% or 39 out of 108) and interpretive (31% or 34 out of 108). In review, the personal statements reflect the teachers and children’s background experiences as they relate to the text, as well as putting oneself into the text. The interpretive comments and questions are responses that are inferential and involve a higher level of thinking than the narrational category, which are statements that tell literal information about the text. (See FIGURE 13 for an analysis on the type of statements).
Oh, What a Thanksgiving
Narrative
Focus of Statements

Personal Experiences - 27.5% (44 of 160)
Characters - 24.4% (39 of 160)
Background Knowledge - 17.5% (28 of 160)
Content Meaning - 15.6% (25 of 160)
Illustrations - 8.1% (13 of 160)
Language - 3.8% (6 of 160)
Structure - 1.3% (2 of 160)
Intertextual Comparisons - 1.3% (2 of 160)
Book-Related - 0.6% (1 of 160)
Shared book Event - 0% (0 of 160)

FIGURE 12
Oh, What a Thanksgiving
Narrative
Type of Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Statement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39 of 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34 of 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictive</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18 of 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborative</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7 of 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7 of 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associative</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3 of 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 of 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrational</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 of 108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 13
Oh, What a Thanksgiving
Three children were debriefed during the 1:1 Sessions following the Shared Book Session. From these children, 46 comments reflecting 63 codings were elicited. One comment was disregarded as the child was influenced by the video, "That's what I said." Five of the comments applied to the illustrations, and two of the comments referred to the Social "S" category in that a reference was made to another child:

C: Keith said that when the Indians squashed berries, that's how they made paint.

C: It was in Barbara's imagination.

This is interesting in that Mrs. L., as she analyzed the tape during her Debriefing Session, expressed concern about integrating more social interactions among the children:

T: I wonder if bringing children into your lesson more would help and I've thought about this because I can't seem to do it that well. If someone gives an answer and you said, "What do you think about that, Jean?" you would be encouraging more social interactions among the children. In other words, you're not just asking them what you're saying about the book, but you're asking them to comment on what another child has said.
T: I would be promoting social togetherness rather than independence and teacher dependence.

Social interaction was promoted, however, within the context of the Shared Book Event, with Mrs. L. playing the role of mediator. Children were taught to listen to each other and respect what another child contributes. These children seemed to be acquiring social skills. For example, only one child talked at a time, but they all had an opportunity to participate in the discussion.

The amazing fact about the three Child Debriefings is that an abundance of the comments were coded "character" in the Focus Data Set (refer to FIGURE 14). This possibly was a reflection of the narrative's unusual theme, as the protagonist's dilemma was reflected on every page. Because of this unusual theme, if a child recalled the oscillation between imaginative and reality, and specified this, a comment was coded both "character" and "content/meaning."

Again, Mrs. L. expressed her concern in clarifying David's (protagonist) imagination versus reality.

T: I'm helping children bring into consciousness what imagination is because it's such a big part of that book. They have to realize that the child is changing back and forth from reality to imagination, reality to imagination.

Not only is it apparent that these three children who were debriefed understood the concept quite well, but it appeared as if this underlying theme
regarding the character's imagination, was so important to them that it
overpowered the true meaning of the narrative . . . "Thanksgiving today wasn't
so different from the very first one. It will always be a time for appreciating your
friends and family, your home, and your teacher. And we will always be thankful
for being together" (last pg.).

All three children, also maintained the group's interpretation of the story,
rather than an individual interpretation. The role of discussion was the direct
impetus in shaping their responses. Mrs. L.'s questions regarding David's
actions and how they related to reality or imaginative guided the children's
responses to the text. During the Individual Debriefings, their comments
reflected exactly what David was thinking.

This text lends itself to the comments being categorized in the character
category, as well as the "content/meaning" category, as the entire book is the
story of David and how he wishes he were a Pilgrim during the first
Thanksgiving. Recall that a comment was coded both "character" and
"content/meaning" if it reflected David's oscillation. This was such an
overpowering message throughout the book that I felt it was directly related to
meaning. The true meaning of the book is not revealed until the last page of the
text. Consequently, children empathize with the character throughout the book,
as the discussion and reading involve David imagining himself as a Pilgrim and
then returning to reality. This finding corroborates the research results of
Morrow (1988), in which most of the children's comments during the Shared Book Sessions were related to the meaning of the story.

Now that I have analyzed this narrative, I will proceed with a corresponding expository text.
THE SECOND SHARED BOOK EVENT

EXPOSITORY TEXT

SQUANTO AND THE FIRST THANKSGIVING

This book was chosen for analysis because it was one of three expository texts chosen by Mrs. L. As in Oh, What a Thanksgiving, the holiday theme was Thanksgiving, and both books offer one protagonist. The books were also read on successive days.

Squanto and the First Thanksgiving was written by Joyce Kessel and is illustrated by Lisa Donze. It is a biography of Squanto written in narrative form, and therefore, not an expository text exhibiting patterns of texture and global structure (Pappas, 1991). The pictures represented as brown and white sketches, are not as colorful as in most picture books. The text describes how Squanto as an English-speaking Indian, taught the Pilgrims the necessary survival skills in the New World. While Squanto was taken as a slave back to England, his tribe was wiped out from smallpox.

The lead-in for this Shared Book Session was very different than the narrative's lead-in. The children reviewed the information pertaining to Squanto from yesterday's book . . . how Squanto thought the Pilgrims to plant corn and why did Squanto speak such good English. Several ideas were expressed by the children:

C: 'Cause he could have been spying on 'em to try and learn English.
C: He may have been practicing.
C: The Pilgrims taught the Indians how to talk that way.
C: The Indians kept watching and watching and watching.

Mrs. L. commented that these were "wonderful ideas" and after listening to the children’s predictions, as when reading the narrative, she stated the purpose in reading:

"I found a book about Squanto and I thought maybe if I read this book, I would find out how Squanto could speak such good English, and the name of my book is Squanto and the First Thanksgiving. The story we read yesterday talks about Thanksgiving from where the Pilgrims were coming from. This tells about the first Thanksgiving as far as Squanto is concerned."

The children's attention is focused on information to be acquired and on information that will be retained after the reading (Rosenblatt, 1978). The lead-in appears to be of an efferent orientation. This is in sharp contrast to the lead-in of Oh, What a Thanksgiving, in which the children, when relating how they used their imaginations, immediately put themselves into the reading and transacted with the author. The children were emphasizing "associations, attitudes, or feelings that centered on the experience of living through their relationship with the story" (Rosenblatt, 1978, p. 25). Therefore, not only is the purpose for reading stated differently in both Shared Book Events, but the entire setting is different. As the precursor to the Event, children innately realize what seems to
be expected of them . . . fact retention. As Mrs. L. states during the Teacher Debriefing of *Squanto and the First Thanksgiving*:

T: I felt like I had to set the stage for the children. I needed to clarify why Squanto spoke better English than other Indians.

T: I’m questioning them on prior knowledge and relating it to what we are reading now. It’s a review session.

T: We are relating slavery to the king not allowing people to go to church. We’re relating two kinds of oppression.

T: I am re-emphasizing to make sure everyone has that point.

T: What you are looking for in this lesson is general concepts. Background knowledge in the form of facts seemed to be discussed more during this Shared Book Session, compared to the narrative event:

T: What did these men come to our country for? Andrea?

C: to have a free life

C: Because the king wouldn’t let them eat as much.

T: What else wouldn’t the king let them do? Vicki?

C: He said, "Go to my church."
T: Yes, that was one of the main reasons they came to our country - to worship as they wished.

In fact, background knowledge was so significant that 23.3% of the comments during the Shared Book Event of *Squanto and the First Thanksgiving* were coded as background knowledge in the Focus of Statements Data Set. During the narrative session in which *Oh, What a Thanksgiving* was the represented text, 17.5% of the coded Focus Statements were background knowledge. (FIGURE 14).
Squanto and the First Thanksgiving
Expository Text
Focus of Statements

Personal Experiences - 31.7% (38 of 120)
Background Knowledge - 23.3% (28 of 120)
Content / Meaning - 15.8% (19 of 120)
Characters - 15% (18 of 120)
Language - 5.8% (7 of 120)
Intertextual Comparisons - 5% (6 of 120)
Illustrations - 1.7% (2 of 120)
Structure - 0.8% (1 of 120)
Book - Related - 0.8% (1 of 120)
Social Influence - 0% (0 of 120)

FIGURE 14

Squanto and the First Thanksgiving
Background knowledge and facts were also related during the I:I Child Debriefing, which I thought was very interesting.

C: You put the fish in the ground and then the seeds on top of it.

C: The king says you have to go to my church and they wanted to go to another church. So, what they did is they came over and they landed right there (points to the globe). The Indians were right here.

C: The king wouldn't let them do anything and when they were on the Mayflower, they had worms in their bread, and dirty, dirty water that wasn't good and, when they reached the new place, they were so hungry, so, so hungry and the Indians saved their life.

When the children's comments during the I:I Debriefings were coded in the Focus Data Set, similar findings to the Shared Book Event were discovered. However, for the Squanto and the First Thanksgiving Debriefings, (refer to FIGURE 16), 21.6% of the statements were coded "background knowledge" compared to 15.9% in the Oh, What a Thanksgiving Debriefings (See FIGURE 15).
Oh, What a Thanksgiving

Narrative

Focus of Statements

FIGURE 15

63 Codings
1:1 Child Debriefing

Characters - 36.5% (23 of 63)
Content / Meaning - 22.2% (14 of 63)
Background Knowledge - 15.9 % (10 of 63)
Illustrations - 7.9% (5 of 63)
Personal Experiences - 7.9% (5 of 63)
Structure - 3.2% (2 of 63)
Social Influence - 3.2% (2 of 63)
Intertextual Comparisons -1.6% (1 of 63)
Language - 1.6% (1 of 63)
Book-Related - 0% (0 of 63)
FIGURE 16

**Squanto and the First Thanksgiving**

Expository Text

Focus of Statements

Content / Meaning - 24.3% (9 of 37)
Background Knowledge - 21.6% (8 of 37)
Characters - 21.6% (8 of 37)
Intertextual Comparisons - 13.5% (5 of 37)
Personal Experience - 8.1% (3 of 37)
Social Influence - 8.1% (3 of 37)
Language - 2.7% (1 of 37)
Book - Related - 0% (0 of 37)
Structure - 0% (0 of 37)
Illustrations - 0% (0 of 37)

37 Codings
1:1 Child Debriefing

**Squanto and the First Thanksgiving**
Regardless of the emphasis on background knowledge and fact retention, Mrs. L. pulls the children into this expository text through several means. She asks the children how they would feel if they were a servant like Squanto had been:

C: I'd feel bad
C: bad
T: Why is that?
C: 'Cause they had you to do all their work and you’d never get a rest.

Mrs. L. asks the children if anything like this has ever happened to them? Have they ever "longed for their home" like Squanto longed for his home:

C: Yes, when we moved.
C: Yes, when we went back and I missed all my friends and I wanted to stay there.

When Squanto arrived back home, he realized he had no home, as smallpox had killed his whole tribe. Mrs. L. asks the children what they would do if this had happened to them:

C: I would go back to England.
C: I would try to find some other Indians.
C: I would go to labor.
T: In other words, you would work.
C: I would build a house.
These children, in sharing their ideas with each other and with Mrs. L., express individual thoughts. However, often within the Shared Book Event, one child's idea precipitates another's thought as demonstrated in the "I would go to labor" as one child's solution to another child's thought, "I would build a house." This cognitive sheathing was evident in several of the Shared Book Sessions, but it does not seem to be as prevalent as the divergent and individual thinking by the children.

This method of pulling children into the expository text proved so prevalent, that 31.7% of the coded statements in the Focus Data Set and 35.1% of the Type of Statements were coded "personal" (See FIGURE 14 and FIGURE 17). This compares to 27.5% of the coded statements represented as personal experiences during the reading of Oh, What a Thanksgiving in the Focus Data Set and 36% in the Type of Statement Data Set. In review, the coding of "personal experience" (color-coded brown) in the Focus Data Set represent comments when children or teachers referred to life-to-text or text-to-life experiences (Cochran-Smith, 1984) and feelings. The "personal" category (P) in the Type Data Set refers to statements reflecting background experiences as they relate to the text as well as putting oneself into the text.

During the Teacher Debriefing, Mrs. L. states her reasons for bringing children into the expository text, as she did during the narrative event:

T: I'm asking them how they would feel so they
can put themselves in Squanto's shoes.

T: You're trying to take knowledge and help the children apply it to their lives, to situations that they are familiar with because as they internalize it, they're going to remember it and understand it better.

T: When you are reading a book like this, too, so much of it is cognitive, so I do try to bring in the affective.

As my analysis suggests, Mrs. L. wants the children to feel a part of the text, even though this is an expository text by asking them to identify with Squanto, to imagine how they would feel if what had happened to Squanto had happened to them.

Child Debriefing comments were also along this same line of thinking.

C: I would make friends with some more Indians and find some new friends and stuff and get married again.

C: If all of the Indians and all of the tribes died of smallpox, I'd just go be a slave again. What is that called? I'm not sure.

C: I'd find other Indians if the Indians were alive.

The findings were similar during the I:I Child Debriefings for both the expository text (Squanto and the First Thanksgiving) in which 8.1% of the
comments were personal and the narrative (Oh, What a Thanksgiving in which 7.9% of the coded comments were of personal experiences. (see FIGURES 15 and 16).

Not only was this the same across both the expository text and the narrative, but Mrs. L. during this Debriefing again expressed the desire to discuss with the children her own experiences during the Shared Book Event:

T: I guess if we didn't have a time element, a constriction of time, they tire and you can't have them sit for longer periods of time. I would bring in much more of my experiences into my teaching. A lot of times, things that have happened to my family or to me. I enjoy doing that. I enjoy sharing with them. I think the children enjoy this and learn. But, time constriction . . . you would only be able to do this so often.

However, there were notable differences in the two Shared Book Events. More intertextual comments were elicited during the Child Debriefing after Squanto and the First Thanksgiving, as references to other texts were commented on by the child:

C: Slaves are like when you sell a person to somebody else and the person says, "Well, you have to do all this work," like in Cinderella. She had to sweep the chimney and do all this and make the house look so beautiful.
C: From the book yesterday -- *The First Thanksgiving* that Dan brought in, the water was so yucky that they didn't know what to do, and so, one day when they got there, the Indians helped them out. What they did -- they fed them corn. They saved their life. I think it was fall. Yes, it was fall. They saved their life 'cause if they had gotten there and the Indians were mean and stuff, the Pilgrims would have died. But the Indians were nice.

Intertextual comments represented a 13.5% of the total comments compared to only 1.6% of the total comments of the three children in the narrative Debriefings. In fact, the only mention of another text was a reference to Squanto in the previous day's event:

C: Squanto learned how to talk English when he lived in England.

Another discernible difference in the expository Shared Book Event compared to the Narrative Shared Book Event, was Mrs. L.'s strategy of paraphrasing the text during the reading of Squanto. The expository text was more difficult for the children to understand than the narrative, *Oh What a Thanksgiving*. During the Teacher Debriefing, Mrs. L. expresses this:

T: I am paraphrasing this again because of the time constraint and I probably would anyway because it is a long book and a bit over their heads.

You really need to explain as you go along.
T: I'm reading it in conversation form because this is really tough stuff for children of this young age.

R: Do you think it is difficult because it is expository rather than narrative?

T: No, well I think this is a lot of information the children do not have prior knowledge of, so I think it is the information itself that the children find difficult. I am trying to make it more of a narrative, actually.

Therefore, Mrs. L. was rewording the expository text so the children would better understand the concepts.

This corroborates the findings of Altwerger, et al., 1985 and Taylor & Strickland (1986) in that the reader or parents in these examined situations, "fine-tune" the language of the text depending on the capability of the children. Mrs. L. believed the expository text was more difficult for the children than the narrative. The text of Oh, What a Thanksgiving was read word for word.

As in the narrative, the meanings of new vocabulary words were discussed as the words were read in context:

T: What are slaves?

C: It's kind of like when there's a king and there are
people, and they have to do all your work.

T: That’s right. They have to do all your work. Megan, what do you think?

C: and they bring you water.

T: Sometimes. Servants are people who are not free, Boys and Girls. Servants are people who are owned by other people.

T: What does that mean, "he longed for his home?" Ralph?

C: That means he wanted to go back to his home.

Statements focusing on "language/vocabulary" represented 5.8% of the Focus Data Set comments elicited during the Shared Book Event of the expository genre. The percentage of language/vocabulary statements in which the narrative was read and discussed was 3.8% (see FIGURE 12 and FIGURE 14). Even though Mrs. L. considered the expository text more difficult and paraphrased the language of the text, she still introduced the children to new vocabulary words in context.

However, during the 1:1 Child Debriefings, only one comment was made in each of the genres:

(Expository) C: Slaves are like when you sell a person to somebody else and the person says, "Well, you have to do all
(Narrative)  C: A musket is a long rifle. I saw one before.

No discernible difference was discovered in the structure nor the book-related categories within the Focus Data Set for the genres. For the narrative, book-related comments represented .6% and structure represented 1.3% of the total comments. In the expository Shared Book Event, these two categories each represented .8% of the statements or questions. These statements involved Mrs. L. telling the children the title and author of the books during the lead-in period.

The text of both genres contributed to a large number of comments and questions categorized as "character." In the narrative, Oh, What a Thanksgiving, David, as the protagonist, oscillated between the reality of Thanksgiving today and the imaginative of celebrating Thanksgiving as a Pilgrim boy:

T: What do you think he's going to imagine next, Genene?

C: He's going to walk to the store as a Pilgrim.

C: I think he is growing up in a different time, and it is Thanksgiving.

C: I think he's imagining that that's his friend.

This type of comment was coded for "character" as well as for "content/meaning" if it contributed to the content of the story. During this Shared Book Event, 24.4% (39 of 160) codings were in the "character" category (see...
FIGURE 12). However, the structure of this narrative possibly accounted for the large number of character comments. Moreover, David was illustrated in vivid, large pictures on every page and the text was structured around David's imagination.

The astonishing number of character comments by the children in the 1:1 Child Debriefings leads further credence to this theory. Of the coded responses to the video, a surprising 36.5% of these were coded "character." The following comments are typical of the children's thoughts during these 1:1 Sessions:

C: He's pretending all his neighbors are together and that they are real Indians and Pilgrims.

C: David is not imagining when he cleared the table. He didn't like his fancy shoes.

C: He met a friend right here. He didn't know him and then at the end, he liked him.

Conversely, for the expository text, in which Squanto was represented in a biographic frame, only 21.6% of the coded comments from the 1:1 Session were coded "character." Several of these comments reflected Squanto learning English:
C: Probably, he like, every day would go down and look and try to figure out what the words were, like "hi" and he knew what "hi" would be and finally, he learned all these words except like "dragon" and stuff.

C: There's Indians in the woods and Squanto could be spying on them (hiding in the woods and watching them). That's how he learned English so well before the Pilgrims came.

An even lower percentage of questions and responses represented "character" during the Shared Book Event of the expository text. Only 15% (18 out of 120) of the total codings represented "character" compared to 31.7 (38 out of 120) representing "personal experiences" during this Event (see FIGURE 14). Recall that Mrs. L. pulled the children's personal experiences into this session:

T: You're trying to take knowledge and help the children apply it to their lives, to situations that they are familiar with because as they internalize it, they're going to remember it and understand it better.

T: I'm asking them how they would feel so they can put themselves in Squanto's shoes.

Therefore, even though this was a biographic expository text, a higher percentage of comments represented the "character" category during the narrative Shared Book Event, as well as during the narrative 1:1 Child
Debriefings than during the expository Event and Debriefings.

Perhaps, when examining all of this data representing the narrative and Expository Shared Book Events, as well as the 1:1 Child Debriefings, what surprised me most was the content/meaning category represented in both genres. Recall that a statement was coded simultaneously "content" and "character" for the narrative events if the statement reflected David, as well as his imaginative versus reality thoughts.

It seemed as if the children were empathizing with David, which is part of his thinking process in ascertaining the true meaning of the story . . . "Thanksgiving today wasn't so different than the very first one. The imagining was even tied in to what David had learned by the end of the narrative.

During the Teacher Debriefing, Mrs. L. expressed that she wished for the children to think about the "content/meaning" while she read the story:

T: I don't know if I do it in all my lessons, but in this lesson, it looks as if I'm breaking up cognitive and affective learning. At the beginning of the lesson, I asked children how they felt about things. During the story, I'm more cognitive.

During this Shared Book Session in which the narrative was read, 15.6% of the codings for the Focus Data Set were "content/meaning" comments (25 out of 160 total) (see FIGURE 12).
The children during the 1:1 Child Debriefings had an even greater percentage of "content/meaning" statements. Of the 63 codings, 14 of these or 22.2% were coded content/meaning. Examples of comments with this focus are:

C: He was imagining that he was meeting Squanto and Samoset, but they were really his next door neighbors.

C: He was imagining that he was a guy up on top of the deck looking for enemies with his cannon, but it was really his teacher.

The interesting fact emerging from this data is that even more responses pertaining to the content/meaning category were evident during the 1:1 Child Debriefings than were evident during the Shared Book Event of the narrative.

This also was consistent with the data from the expository text sessions. During the Child Debriefings, 24.3% (9 out of 37) of the codings reflected content/meaning compared to 15.8% (19 out of 120) of the codings during the Shared Book Event in which Squanto and the First Thanksgiving was read and discussed. Typical statements during the Child Debriefings which demonstrated the "content/meaning" category were:

C: So, they decided to make Thanksgiving a different day, and all those three days, the women cooked and they finally had a Thanksgiving and everybody was stuffed. They ate turkey, geese,
light peas and stuff like that.

C: They had Thanksgiving 'cause the Pilgrim's were just so thankful and Squanto helped.

C: Squanto, he's in England. He wants to go back to America and he says, "Oh, I want to go back to America."

It was obvious to me that this child was thinking of facts and retained much of the knowledge that she learned from the Squanto text.

During the Shared Book Event of this expository text, the efferent-based questioning by Mrs. L. seemed to guide children to fact retention:

T: Where did Squanto learn how to speak English?

C: England

T: What do you think happened?

C: He took Squanto.

However, recall that this line of questioning was obscured by the large number of personal comments (31.7% of 38 out of 120) and background knowledge statements (23.3% or 28 out of 120). During the teacher debriefing, Mrs. L. expresses this:

T: I'm questioning them on prior knowledge and what we're reading now. It's a review session.

T: You're trying to take knowledge and help the children
apply it to their lives, to situations that they are familiar with because as they internalize it, they're going to remember it and understand it better.

Interestingly, during the 1:1 Child Debriefings, the children exhibited a higher percentage of content/meaning statements than during the Shared Book Events representing both the expository text, as well as the narrative. It appeared as if the children, regardless of the genre, read for content/meaning, even as young as this first-grade age.

Several distinct patterns also emerged from the data to form "type" categories (see FIGURE 17).
Squanto and the First Thanksgiving
Expository Text
Type of Statement

Personal - 35.1% (31 of 88)
Interpretive - 22.8% (20 of 88)
Elaborative - 11.4% (10 of 88)
Explanatory - 10.2% (9 of 88)
Narrational - 9% (8 of 88)
Associative - 7.9% (7 of 88)
Predictive - 3.4% (3 of 88)
Evaluative - 0% (0 of 88)

FIGURE 17

Squanto and the First Thanksgiving
These comments were color-coded by type. When analyzing this data representing the type of statements, the findings suggest similar discrepancies between the genres as in the Focus Data Set. For example, in the Shared Book Event of *Oh, What a Thanksgiving*, 17% (18 out of 108 statements) were categorized "predictive." Examples of such questions and responses would be:

T: What do you think he might imagine now?

C: That he is going sailing.

C: I think he is going to imagine himself back in Plymouth again.

Conversely, during the Shared Book Event of *Squanto and the First Thanksgiving*, only 3.4% (3 out of 88 statements) were categorized "predictive."

A question and comment depicting this were:

T: What do you think happened?

C: He took Squanto

This difference in the "predictive" category, however, could be attributed to the structure of these two different texts, rather than the different genres. Perhaps, this narrative was more conducive for teacher questions asking for predictions from the children. Mrs. L. commented on this type of question during the Teacher Debriefing:

T: When you ask a group question like that, it brings them into focus, too, if you are losing someone.
Another interesting discovery was the difference in the category "narrational." In review, this category represents questions or comments that are a literal interpretation of the text. During the Shared Book Session of *Squanto and the First Thanksgiving*, 9% (8 out of 88 statements) were coded "narrational." Examples of this type of comment are:

T: Again, he was captured.

T: He shows them how to plant corn. Who knows how to do that?

C: Put fish down in the ground and then the seeds.

During the Shared Book Event of *Oh, What a Thanksgiving*, there were no narrational questions or comments. Mrs. L. considered this an easier text for the children to understand. Perhaps, this is why she did not feel it necessary to question children on what the text stated. Recall that in the Teacher Debriefing on *Squanto*, Mrs. L. expresses the difficulty of the text:

T: This is really tough stuff for children of this young age.

T: I am re-emphasizing to make sure everyone has that point.

This could also explain why there were more elaborative statements during the Shared Book Event of *Squanto* and the First Thanksgiving (11.4% or 10 out of 88 statements) compared to the Shared Book Event of *Oh, What a*
Thanksgiving (6.5% or 7 out of 108 statements). Along this same line of thinking, perhaps the difficulty of the text Squanto, contributed to less "interpretive" statements (22.8% or 20 out of 88) compared to the text of Oh, What a Thanksgiving (31% or 34 out of 108 statements). Recall that interpretive statements are inferential and require a higher level of thinking than the category type "narrational." Examples of interpretive statements are:

T: How could Squanto speak such good English?
C: 'Cause he could have been spying on 'em to try and learn English.
C: He may have been practicing.
T: How do you think they look different than what he's imagining in his mind?
C: They would wear clothes like David does.
C: The Indians have feathers on their headbands.

Although comparable differences existed in the amount of "explanatory" type talk and the "associative" type talk (with more statements for each in the expository S.B.E.), the "personal" type category percentages were similar across both genres. During the reading of Squanto and the First Thanksgiving, 35.1% (31 out of 88 statements) were coded "personal" compared to a 36% (39 out of 108 statements) in the Oh, What a Thanksgiving reading. I attribute this fact of similar percentages representing the "personal" type category to Mrs. L.'s
excellent ability of drawing children into the text, regardless of genre. She expressed this strategy during the Teacher Debriefing:

T: Now, I'm asking them for the affective view . . . how would they feel if they were a slave or purchased by someone else, because I guess I believe that they internalize it because they are really understanding it.

T: So, what I try to do is relate it to more of their own experiences.

Therefore, as I have described and demonstrated, similarities, as well as differences existed across both genres during the social interactions of these two Shared Book Events. The highest percentages for both genres were categorized "personal experiences." It seems as if these first graders were guided by Mrs. L. to feel a part of the text, as this was also expressed by Mrs. L. during the Teacher Debriefing. Her belief was that if children internalize what is happening in the text and if the children relate these happenings to their own life experiences, they will understand the text. As in the Cochran-Smith study, these children's culture (home as well as community) was an integral part of the literacy process in learning to read. An interesting fact was that during the 1:1 Child Debriefings, the comments coded "personal experiences" were less consequential. This focus comment only represented a 7.9% (5 out of 63) for Oh, What a Thanksgiving and an 8.1% (3 out of 37) for Squanto and the First
Thanksgiving.

There existed very few comments representing "book-related" and "structure" categories across both genres. The lead-in discussion accounted for this percentage in which the title of the book or topic were presented. Perhaps, with older students, this focus would be more prevalent, but it was not expressed often during the first grade Shared Book Event. This focus was also expressed less by the children during the l:1 Child Debriefings for both genres. "Structure" represented a 3.2% (2 out of 63) of codings during the Oh, What a Thanksgiving Debriefing, but a 0% during the Debriefing of Squanto and the First Thanksgiving.

Another similarity across both genres, which perhaps surprised me most, was the same percentage of comments categorized as "content/meaning." For both Shared Book Events, a 15.6% (narrative) and a 15.8% (expository) of the codings were demonstrated. As I explained, this fact could be related to the particular text representing each genre, rather than a generalization regarding all genres. But, during the Child Debriefings, the "content-meaning" focus comments were more significant than during the Shared Book Events. During the narrative Debriefings, 22.2% (14 out of 63) of the codings were related to meaning compared to 24.3% (9 out of 37) of the codings during the expository text. It appears as if the individual interpretation of these particular children (the "what I feel is important") represents the "content/meaning" focus for not only the
expository text, as one might expect, but for the narrative, as well. Also surprising was the fact that the children, without the guidance of Mrs. L., represented a larger percentage of this focus comment, than with Mrs. L.'s guidance during the Shared Book Event.

There were also obvious differences between the two types of genre. Even though many comments were focused on "characters", more of these were represented during the narrative (24.4% or 39 out of 160) compared to the expository text (15% or 18 out of 120). This group interpretation under Mrs. L.'s support also carried over to the I:I Child Debriefings. A "whopping" 36.5% (23 of 63) of the comments during Oh, What a Thanksgiving were coded "character" compared to 21.6% (8 out of 37) of the comments during Squanto and the First Thanksgiving. Recall that the entire narrative represented the protagonist, David, oscillated between the reality of Thanksgiving today and the imaginative of Thanksgiving as a Pilgrim boy. This text truly lends itself to thinking with David throughout the reading.

Background knowledge was more represented during the expository Shared Book Event (23.3% or 28 out of 120), as well as the Child Debriefing (21.6% or 8 out of 37) compared to the narrative Shared Book Event (17.5% or 28 out of 160) and the Child Debriefing (15.9% or 10 out of 63). Mrs. L. expressed the importance of "setting the stage" and relating prior knowledge to the expository text during the Teacher Debriefing. I also found it interesting that
the children related background knowledge during the l:l Child Debriefings. It appeared as if the group interactive behavior had carried over to an individual interpretation of each text.

The illustrations in *Oh, What a Thanksgiving* were large, vivid watercolors which could be a reason for more "illustration" coded comments during the narrative Shared Book Event (8.1% or 13 out of 160) compared to the expository Shared Book Event (1.7% or 2 out of 120). Similarly, this finding was demonstrated during the l:l Child Debriefings. During the narrative Debriefing, 7.9% (5 out of 63) of the comments referred to illustrations compared to no comments for the Squanto text.

More questions and responses were related to vocabulary and language during the Shared Book Event of *Squanto and the First Thanksgiving* (5.8% or 18 out of 120) compared to a 3.8% (6 out of 160) of language comments during the narrative session. Interestingly, this finding also carried over to the Child Debriefings in which 2.7% (1 out of 37) of the comments for the expository text compared to 1.6% (1 out of 63) of the comments for the narrative. Recall that Mrs. L. expressed concern of the "tough stuff" when referring to the Squanto text.

Therefore, these children, as they are becoming readers, strive within the interactive Shared Book Event, to reach the consensual goal of interpreting a shared text. This group interpretation often carried over to the individual child's
interpretation as demonstrated during the 1:1 Debriefings. There are times, however, when the individual interpretation achieves a different perspective than was represented during the Shared Book Event, as demonstrated in the high percentage of meaning/content coded statements in both represented genres.
I chose the expository text *Let's Find Out About Winter* (M. & C. Shapp, 1963) to analyze and then to compare with the fiction folktale narrative, *The Mitten* (Tresselt, 1964). Both books involved the topic "winter" and each Shared Book Event occurred on successive days. The "textural" properties of each book typify that genre. For example, the co-referentiality involving a protagonist, as well as a past verb tense (Pappas, 1990) are implicit in the narrative. In contrast, the expository text represents co-classification and a present verb tense. The books were also chosen as an integral part of the unit of study on winter.

When choosing this book for analysis, I also considered the fact that many teachers select *The Mitten* to read during the winter season. One teacher read this book to her class during the pilot study of this project and several other teachers have had activities related to this book when I have been in their classrooms. Also, this was a favorite book of mine when reading to my classes, as well as to my own children at home.

*Let's Find Out About Winter* lists many winter activities with which children can identify. Blue, white, and black illustrations (by Laszlo Roth) accompany the text of 100 words. Some of winter's happenings which are depicted are:
The Event

This was the first day back after the holiday break, so the lead-in to *Let's Find Out about Winter* was slightly different than other Shared Book Events' lead-ins. Mrs. L. discussed how nice it was to be back in school and named those children who had experienced birthdays; who had lost teeth during the two-week break from school; who had sprained an ankle; and who had received a black eye in an ice-hockey accident.

The discussion then proceeded to the topic of snow and how they were all anticipating snow soon. A review of all the seasons and what occurs during these seasons was the main discussion topic leading into the book's introduction. Specifically, background knowledge questions/comments were numerous and the over-all orientation of the discussion was of an efferent perspective:

T: We talked about all the things you did in the summertime and then after summer, what season came along?

C: the fall
T: The fall, what's another name for fall?
C: autumn
T: The autumn. Remember we learned all about autumn and the different things that happen in the fall and the autumn. Who can tell me some of the things we saw happening and changing around us? What are some of the signs of fall?
C: Leaves were falling off the trees.
C: It was getting colder.
C: And, the animals were hibernating and the squirrels were collecting their acorns.
C: The leaves were turning.
C: Birds were flying south.

The background knowledge responses were not only evident in the initial introduction, but were also apparent throughout the Shared Book Event. Mrs. L. guided a rather lengthy discussion about birds in the winter season:

T: We have some birds who cannot live here in the wintertime because there isn't any food, so they do something special. What do some birds do that are unable to find food in the wintertime?
C: They fly south.
T: They migrate. Some birds don't need to do that. They can find food here. Does anyone have any idea why they can do that? Think about what they look like.

C: Because people put out their food.

T: O.K., but that isn't the reason the cardinals are able to stay up here because if that was the reason, then all the birds would be able to stay here because they would eat from bird feeders. There is another reason why cardinals and blue jays are able to stay here even when it's cold and frozen.

C: Because they have beaks?

T: Well, think about their beaks. Did you ever notice cardinal beaks? And blue jay beaks?

C: They eat through ice?

T: They have very strong beaks and they are able to eat through the seeds and able to store the nuts and eat through those things so they are able to eat the food during the winter. And, like you said, through the ice, they can get things. Whereas, the birds who have the beaks that aren't as strong, they need to go to a warmer climate because they can only eat the soft things, such as berries and worms.

This focus type of comment was so numerous and discussed so much
that 36% (67 out of 186 codings) of the questions and comments were categorized background knowledge (see FIGURE 18).
Let's Find Out About Winter
Expository Text
Focus of Statements

Background Knowledge - 36.2% (67 of 185)
Personal - 36.2% (67 of 185)
Content / Meaning - 12% (22 of 185)
Illustrations - 8.6% (16 of 185)
Language - 3.24% (6 of 185)
Book - Related - 3.24% (6 of 185)
Social Influence - .5% (1 of 185)
Structure - 0% (0 of 185)

Intertextual Comparisons - 0% (0 of 185)
Characters - not applicable

FIGURE 18

Let's Find Out About Winter
Not only were a high percentage of background knowledge comments evident during the Shared Book Event of this expository text, but an analysis of the 1:1 Child Debriefing comments demonstrated this group emphasis carried over to the individual interpretation. Of these codings, 50% (10 of 20) were categorized "background knowledge." Several examples of this type of comments are:

C: There are two-bladed ice skates, but for people who are talented, they get to use one blade.

C: When they make, when it snows, sometimes it doesn't just snow really light, sometimes it doesn't just snow really hard. If it's really light, it's called frost. If it is really hard, it's called a blizzard. Whenever you get to the North Pole or to Antarctica, I don't really know, but there should be a lot of snow there 'cause the penguins need it cold.

One child's comment was a direct carry-over from the Shared Book Event discussion in which Mrs. L. told the children about the cardinal's and the blue jay's strong beak:

C: When a cardinal or a bluejay dig into ice or dig into something for their food, they don't just use their beaks or their feet and go . . . (child stomps feet). They can dig in because they have strong beaks.
I thought it was interesting how this knowledge seemed to have made an impression upon this child. I found the discussion impressive from my own learning perspective and even after participating in an extensive bird unit in third grade, I had not learned this fact.

Not only was much of the discussion during the Shared Book Event related to background knowledge, but Mrs. L, as in the last expository text of *Squanto and the First Thanksgiving*, focuses on many text-to-life and life-to-text experiences. Mrs. L. embraced this form of questioning throughout the event:

**T:** How many of you remember when it was so cold, we couldn't go out on the playground to play? Remember how cold it was? That was during the winter time. Right now, we are having a little bit of what we call a thaw. It's a little bit warmer out right now.

**C:** It's like when you have chocolate. When you take it out of the refrigerator for a while, you wait five minutes, it's thawed.

**T:** Yes, it starts to defrost or thaw. But, I'm sure within the next few days, it will start to get colder again, and we will watch for the snow. I'm sure we will have some.

Mrs. L. also asked the children to discuss their experiences with the group during this Shared Book Event:

**T:** What are some other things you do in the snow that are fun?

**C:** You can make a snowman.
C: Bury yourself. Bury yourself in the snow until you turn to ice.
C: have snowball fights
C: igloos
C: snow angels

The children then proceeded to explain to Mrs. L. how they make snow angels. In fact, comments such as these were so numerous throughout the Event that 36% (67 out of 186 codings) were categorized as personal. This abundance was equal to the background knowledge percentage and this was an expository text. As you'll recall, Mrs. L. stressed the importance of pulling children's personal experiences into the Event during the Teacher Debriefing:

T: You're trying to take knowledge and help the children apply it to their lives, to situations that they are familiar with because as they internalize it, they're going to remember it and understand it better.

It is during this social discussion of personal experiences that Mrs. L. often takes advantage of that "teachable moment." For example, after one child related his enjoyment from snowball fights, Mrs. L. brought up the safety issue:

T: Let's remember when we talk about having snowball fights and throwing snow at other people, we need to be very careful because we could hurt them. If you make a snowball and want to throw it, find a tree somewhere that you can throw it at so you don't hurt someone . . . but if you make a really hard snowball and throw it
at someone, that could hurt them, so we need to be very careful about that.

C: Don't make an iceball and throw it at someone. If it were really hard and rough enough, it could turn into ice.

C: My friend got hit in the eye. Her brother threw it at her on purpose and she got hit in the eye with a snowball.

T: And that hurts, doesn't it? So, when people think it is fun to have snowball fights, we have to be very careful about that because we could hurt other people. If you want to throw snowballs, choose a target like a tree or a bush, but not a house. Why not a house?

C: If you hit a house and you are in front of a window, you could break it.

C: I have a wall in front of my house and it has flowers on it, and I throw snowballs at it.

T: That's a good target.

Even though the children share lots of personal experiences, they seem to focus on the topic. As demonstrated in the snow activities related by the children, even as young as first grade, these children follow the social norms of turn-taking and topic focus. They are using literacy to reflect upon their personal and social lives (Kantor, et. al, 1992).
The emphasis on the child's personal experiences also carried over to the 1:1 Debriefing comments (refer to FIGURE 19):

C: I like winter the most.

C: When I said, "Me and my friends split the berries on my deck," it was like hockey. We took the brooms and used them like in hockey. We pushed leaves and berries.

C: If you make a snow angel, you don't exactly make a snow angel 'cause there isn't a halo. You just lay down in the snow and move your arms back and forth like wings. And then, you form an angel.

This latter comment was coded in both the personal and background knowledge categories. The child knew angels had a halo and explained, from her perspective and personal experience how to make snow angels.

Of twenty comments during the 1:1 Debriefing, six were coded "personal" which represented 30% of the codings. This was in sharp contrast to an 8.1% in the other expository text of *Squanto and the First Thanksgiving*. During this Debriefing, as you'll recall, the majority of comments were categorized as "content/meaning," "background knowledge," and "character" (in reference to Squanto). Several reasons could account for this difference in the two expository text Debriefings. The text itself could be a factor, as *Squanto* represented an expository text written in biographic narrative. Therefore, children recalled many statements pertaining to the life of Squanto, rather than
Let's Find Out About Winter
Expository Text
Focus of Statements

- Background Knowledge - 50% (10 of 20)
- Personal - 30% (6 of 20)
- Content / Meaning - 20% (4 of 20)
- Illustrations 0% (0 of 20)
- Structure - 0% (0 of 20)
- Language - 0% (0 of 20)
- Intertextual Comparisons - 0% (0 of 20)
- Book Related - 0% (0 of 20)
- Social Influence - 0% (0 of 20)
- Characters - 0% (0 of 20)

20 Codings
1:1 Child Debriefings

FIGURE 19

Let's Find Out About Winter
focusing on their own experiences. In the book, *Let’s Find Out About Winter*, people were illustrated participating in winter activities, but there was not character identification. One plausible theory is that the children, since they have participated in these winter activities, recalled vicariously such experiences as they listened to the text, and then related some of these experiences during the 1:1 Debriefings.

This expository text on winter was easy reading and comprehension in which only 100 words were used. The text of *Squanto* was quite difficult for first grade level and, in review, Mrs. L. did quite a bit of paraphrasing and questioning to ascertain comprehension. Perhaps, the children "sensed" a seriousness to the book, as this is what the 1:1 data revealed.

What was surprising, however, was the fact that across both types of expository texts during the Shared Books Events, the percentages representing the personal category were 31.7% (*Squanto and the First Thanksgiving*) compared to 36% (*Let’s Find Out About Winter*). Therefore, the data was similar for both expository texts in the "personal" category comments. The individual orientation seems to have deviated from the group emphasis for the winter book. This reason could be attributed to Mrs. L.’s question focus, however, and as you’ll recall, I did no prompting during the 1:1 Debriefings.

The discussion during the Shared Book Event of *Let’s Find Out About Winter* also pertained to the content or facts in the text. Most of these comments
were teacher initiated, as demonstrated in the following examples:

T: Sometimes, the oak tree leaves stay on all winter long and they fall off a little at a time. Tell us about evergreens.

C: When summer comes, evergreens are all green. In the wintertime, the evergreens are still green, so the pines don't come off unless you pick them.

T: These are the trees that we use for Christmas trees. They are called evergreen and the reason they are called evergreen is because they are always green. They don't lose their leaves the way the other trees do.

T: Some animals sleep under the ground during the winter. That is called _____?

C: hibernation

The data revealed 11.8% (22 out of 186) of the codings to be categorized as content/meaning. Therefore, this focus of comment was represented 1/3 as much as both the personal and the background knowledge categories within the Focus Data Set. Interestingly, this finding corroborated the other expository text of Squanto and the First Thanksgiving in that 15.8% of the codings (19 out of 120) were categorized "content/meaning." Consistent with the Squanto expository text and the narrative, Oh, What a Thanksgiving, the children during the 1:1 Debriefings again had a larger percentage of comment/meaning
comments than were represented during the Shared Book Events. Of the comments, 20% (4 out of 20) were categorized in this manner during the 1:1 Child Debriefings compared to the 11.8% (during the Shared Book Event).

Typical comments by the children representing this category were:

C: The evergreen tree is called that because the pines stay on all year. We use them as Christmas trees.

C: When it is winter, the thermometer is blue. In summer, it is hot and it is red. In winter, it is cold and it is blue.

C: On trees in the winter, there is ice. Very close to the spring, there are little buds on the trees. They have baby leaves inside, but you shouldn't open them up because if you don't, the tree will have more leaves and more life.

Even though these "content" comments were expressed by the children during the Debriefings, several other categories within the Focus Data Set were not represented. These were: Illustration, Structure, Intertextual Comparisons, Book-related, and Character. Of course, the character category does not apply to this expository text, but there were some similarities and differences when this data is compared to the other first grade expository text.

The analysis of the 1:1 Debriefings were similar across texts in that several categories within the Focus of Statements Data Set represented a zero percentage of the children's comments. Specifically, for both expository texts,
there existed no comments in the "book-related", "structure", or "illustrations" categories.

However, several differences were also noted across texts. During the Squanto Debriefings, the "Intertextual Comparisons" category represented a 13.5% of the codings. There were no intertextual comments during the Debriefings representing Let's Find Out About Winter. One explanation for this finding could be the order of the books within the unit of study. For example, the Shared Book Event of Let's Find Out About Winter was the introduction lesson for the unit on winter. Squanto and the First Thanksgiving was read and discussed after another Thanksgiving book.

Another difference between the two Shared Book Events representing expository texts was that more of the discussion involved background knowledge for the Let's Find Out About Winter Event (36.2%) compared to the Squanto and the First Thanksgiving Event (23.3%). This discrepancy could also be attributed to the order of the books within the particular unit of study. Specifically, the introductory lesson for the winter unit represented the text Let's Find Out About Winter. Therefore, perhaps Mrs. L. found it necessary to review what the children knew when shaping the discussion.

Illustration emphasis was more evident in the Let's Find Out About Winter Event. Although these pictures only depicted three colors (blue, black and white), several comments, representing 8.6% of the coding, pertained to them.
One child even got up, walked to the book and pointed to her reference with the
comment:

C: It looks like the illustrations are penciled first and then he erased
something.

Mrs. L. also initiated the discussion while guiding the children to look at
the illustrations:

T: Everything looks nice in the snow.

C: Everything looks white, like black and white movies.

C: It's not a black light, it's a white view like when you are wearing
black . . .

Even though the children appeared to enjoy the illustrations, I got the
impression that they were more into the discussion than into this text. For
example, during the reading several children were looking around the room,
looking at each other, and moving their bodies around more than the "normal"
amount. This also became more noticeable as I viewed the videotape. Based
upon my subjective observation, the children were not as involved with the text
so much, but they were still involved within the social dynamics of the group
discussion.

Even fewer comments pertained to the book-related and language topics
(each represented a 3.24% or 6 out of 185 codings). The language topics
involved the terms "migration" and "hibernation," and the book-related discussion
pertained to the extension activity and the learning centers.

The extension activity accompanying this book was a writing exercise (see Appendix C):

T: Then I would like you to write down all the things you like to do in the winter. And, you can also tell what it looks like in the winter and what happens to our earth in the winter. Maybe, you don't like the winter. Then, you can write about that, too. But, write about the winter and tell us all that you know about it.

In summary, this Shared Book Event involved a discussion in which background knowledge and personal experiences that pertained to the text were related. These two categories represented a combined 72.4% (or 134 out of 185) of the codings. This fact, alone, differentiated this event from the Thanksgiving analyses where the discussion topics for both the narrative and the expository biographic text were more evenly represented.

The children during this Shared Book Event were also not interacting with the text, as evidenced by the lack of attention and excess movement. However, they were involved in the group discussion. It appeared that this social interaction with each other and with Mrs. L. was the context for learning with the text serving a secondary role.
THE FOURTH SHARED BOOK EVENT

NARRATIVE

THE MITTEN

This Ukrainian folktale, by Tresselt, is the story of a boy who lost his mitten one cold, snowy day, as he was gathering firewood. The mitten magically shelters the forest animals until the cricket comes along. Then the mitten "pops" and animals fly all over. The illustrations combine colors with detailed lines on a green background every other page.

The class was involved in a winter unit at this time. Children participated in science experiments with snow, learning centers with "winter" as the writing or art topic, and many other extension activities consisting of art projects of "marbleized" snow or writing exercises.

The lead-in to this story consisted of a lengthy discussion in which facts and background knowledge were reviewed pertaining to the winter season. This discussion was of an efferent orientation in which children were asked to recall facts:

T: What were some of the things that we said we noticed in the wintertime?

C: Birds that fly south

T: What did we call that? We said that when birds fly south, it is _____________?
O.K., they move, and another word for that is _______?

migrated

Migration! Remember, they migrate or they are migrating . . . migration. What is another sign of wintertime?

All the leaves fall off the trees . . .

They change colors.

snow

What about animals? We talked about animals yesterday.

Animals hibernate and the squirrels gather food.

What does Diane mean when she says animals "hibernate"?

There are holes down under the ground, under the snow. They just stay there in their hole where it is warm.

And what do they do down there?

hibernating

Yes, but what's another thing that they are doing? What's part of the hibernating? Corey?
C: sleeping

T: They are sleeping and bears find caves and other animals find holes in the ground.

This lead-in discussion, was therefore, very similar to the lead-in discussion for the Shared Book Event in which the expository text was *Let's Find Out About Winter*. Conversely, the discussion focus was very different from the other narrative Shared Book Event in which the represented text was *Oh, What a Thanksgiving*. In review, that lead-in discussion topic involved the children relating how they use their imaginations.

Although the lead-in discussion pertained to a background knowledge focus for *The Mitten* event, there were relatively few other background knowledge comments during the rest of the Shared Book Event. However, there were still 47 out of 433 (or 10.9%) comments that were categorized "background knowledge" (See FIGURE 20). This compares to a 17.5% (or 28 out of 160 codings) representing "background knowledge" for the other first grade narrative, *Oh, What a Thanksgiving*. However, compared to the expository text, *Let's Find Out About Winter*, there existed not nearly as much discussion pertaining to background knowledge. During the Shared Book Event of that expository text, a "whopping" 36.2% (67 of 185) of the codings were categorized "background knowledge."
During the 1:1 Child Debriefings (refer to FIGURE 21), the results were comparable -- a 13.3% (14 out of 105) coded "background knowledge" in The Mitten Debriefings compared to a 15.9% (10 out of 63) coded in this manner for the Oh, What a Thanksgiving Debriefings. During the 1:1 Child Debriefings representing the expository text, Let's Find Out About Winter, 50% (10 out of 20) of the codings were categorized "background knowledge." Therefore, for both the Shared Book Events and the 1:1 Child Debriefings, a much higher percentage of background knowledge comments were elicited during the expository text experiences than the narrative experiences.
FIGURE 20

The Mitten
Narrative
Focus of Statements

- **Characters**: 26.6% (115 of 433)
- **Content / Meaning**: 12.7% (55 of 433)
- **Structure**: 12% (52 of 433)
- **Illustrations**: 10.9% (47 of 433)
- **Background Knowledge**: 10.9% (47 of 433)
- **Personal**: 8.3% (36 of 433)
- **Language**: 8.1% (35 of 433)
- **Book - Related**: 4.6% (20 of 433)
- **Intertextual**: 4.4% (10 of 433)
- **Social Influence**: 1.6% (7 of 433)

433 Codings
Shared Book Event
The Mitten
Narrative
Focus of Statements

FIGURE 21

105 Codings
1:1 Child Debriefings

Personal - 21% (22 of 105)
Content / Meaning - 20% (21 of 105)
Character - 17.1% (18 of 105)
Background Knowledge - 13.3% (14 of 105)
Intertextual Comparison - 6.7% (7 of 105)
Book - Related - 5.7% (6 of 105)
Language - 5.7% (6 of 105)
Illustrations - 5.7% (6 of 105)
Social Influence - 3.8% (4 of 105)
Structure - 0.95% (1 of 105)
Of the three children interviewed for *The Mitten* 1:1 Child Debriefings, one child associated the animals in the story with facts about other animals. Typical examples of this type of comment are:

C: There's a lot of animals I wouldn't want in the mitten, like a snake. The only way you can release his venom is to hold his head back and that releases it.

C: The raccoons are dangerous. They could be as dangerous as tarantulas. The can scratch at you.

C: We don't know about spiders around here. There may be no more Black Widows. They may all be dead.

The other two children had one and two comments coded in this category, respectively. These comments were about the weather and the fact that animals could not actually fit in a mitten.

Therefore, "background knowledge" discussion during the Shared Book Events in which the narratives were read, represented a share of the discussion. Interestingly, the discussion pertaining to the seasons during the Shared Book Event were not the topic of the "background knowledge" comments elicited by the children. As demonstrated, these typically pertained to animals and this was
one child's thinking process, rather than all three children who were debriefed.

After the Shared Book Event's lead-in, Mrs. L. presents to the children the purpose for reading:

T: Well, that just leads right into my book, The Mitten, by Alvin Tresselt. Before we start reading the book, I would like for you to look at the charts that I put up on the board. They are comparison charts and this book is called The Mitten by Alvin Tresselt and down here we are going to have another mitten book.

These are the things I'd like you to look at as I'm reading The Mitten to you. I'd like you to think about the setting. What does the "setting" mean?

C: It means where it took place.

T: I'd like you to look for the story plot. What's the story plot?

C: How they made up the story.

T: O.K., the story plot is the things that happen, Boys and Girls, in the story. In other words, the beginning, the middle, and the end. It tells you what problems the characters have and how those problems are solved. Then, the order of the characters. We not only want to remember the names of the characters,
but we want to remember the sequence in which they occur in our story, the first one in the story, the second one, the third one. Then, I put a big word up there. I was going to write another word and then I thought, "No, these boys and girls have learned so much this year, they are going to be able to handle this word. The word is "conclusion." What is "conclusion"? What’s another word I can put up here?

C: How you end the story.

T: So, what’s another word I can put up there instead of "conclusion"? I could put "The ___?"

C: End

T: Ending, couldn’t I?

T: Let’s enjoy this wonderful book, The Mitten. I’m going to ask you to look for something else in the book. I’m going to ask you to look for a pattern, but let’s not tell what the pattern is until the book has been finished.

Therefore, the purposes for reading were explicitly stated. After the reading, the class filled out the experience chart labeled: "Book/Author", "Setting", "Story Plot", "Order of Characters", and "Conclusion" (See Table 15).
This lengthy discussion justified the abnormally high percentage of comments categorized "structure," 12% (or 52 out of 433 codings). In review, in the last analyzed narrative, only 1.3% (or 2 out of 160) were categorized "structure." There existed no "structure" comments during the expository text Shared Book Event.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book/Author</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Story Plot</th>
<th>Order of Characters</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Mitten</td>
<td>in the winter outside in the woods</td>
<td>A boy lost his mitten. He couldn't find it. Many animals crawled inside the mitten. The mitten popped. The boy looked for it. He said, &quot;It's all right&quot;.</td>
<td>Boy Grandmother Mouse Frog Owl Rabbit Fox Wolf Boar Bear Cricket</td>
<td>The mitten exploded. The little boy got a new mitten with reindeer on them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Alvin</td>
<td>cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tresselt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mitten</td>
<td>in the woods in the snow outside</td>
<td>Grandmother knit the boy some mittens. The boy lost one mitten. Many animals crawled inside it. The mitten was stretched. One of the animals got on the bear's nose. The bear sneezed. The mitten flew into the air.</td>
<td>Boy Grandmother Mole Rabbit Hedgehog Owl Badger Fox Bear Mouse</td>
<td>When the mitten flew into the air, the boy found it. The grandmother was confused, bewildered, and puzzled at the stretched mitten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Jan Brett</td>
<td>cold in the winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 15

COMPARISON CHART OF THE MITTEN
What surprised me, however, was the fact that this high percentage during *The Mitten* Shared Book Event did not carry over to the individual interpretation. Only a 0.95% (1 out of 105) of the three children's comments pertained to "structure" (See FIGURE 21). Interestingly, this comment referred to the discussion of what "conclusion" means:

C: I thought it was solution.

Therefore, one might infer from this data, that even after the considerable discussion time devoted to the purpose and then to the experience chart, the children recalled comments of every other coded category more than "structure."

Another noted discrepancy between the Shared Book Event and the 1:1 Child Debriefings was in the category "personal" within the Focus Data Set. Even though Mrs. L. discusses her own personal experiences . . ."When I was a little girl, my teacher read this book to me and I loved it," and pulls the children's experiences into the discussion, only 8.3% (36 out of 433) of the codings were categorized "personal" in the Focus Data Set. Many of these comments consisted of clothing opinions:

T: What are some special clothing that we wear in the wintertime to help us and protect us from the cold?

C: warm coats

C: mittens

C: snowshoes
At the mention of gloves, Mrs. L. took advantage of that teachable moment, asked the difference between gloves and mittens, and then they all recited a poem on mittens, which led into the reading.

In reference, the above comments regarding winter clothing were coded "personal" as well as "background knowledge." Mrs. L. phrased her question "that we wear . . . to help us and protect us," which brought in the "personal" category. However, the background knowledge of winter weather is what was necessary to answer the question.

During the Child Debriefings representing The Mitten, 21% (22 out of 105) of the children’s comments were coded "personal." Therefore, again, the group discussion did not carry over to the individual interpretation. A much higher percentage of personal comments was demonstrated in the Debriefings. All three children related personal comments:
C: If I were in the winter and it was snowing
and it was as cold as it could get, if I were
in my short-sleeved pajamas, I'd be frozen.
I'd be like ice.

C: I'd be scared of all those animals. I'd just run
out. If all those animals came up against me,
the only way I could beat them was with a football
helmet and charge them.

C: I'd be scared in the mitten with all those animals.
I could stick my head out. I wouldn't climb in
head first, either.

These children exemplified several text-to-life and life-to-text experiences.
However, a higher percentage of "personal" comments was demonstrated in the
expository text Debriefings (30%), as well as the expository Shared Book Event
(36.2%). Perhaps, the text played a role in this outcome, however, as the
expository text Let's Find Out about Winter consisted of only 100 vocabulary
words. The discussion seemed to generate more interaction than the text, as
I stated previously. During the reading of The Mitten, the children were attentive,
focused, with all eyes on the text. It seemed as if suspense played a major role
in piquing their interest level.
Again, with this Shared Book Event, as with all the analyzed Events thus far, regardless of genre, the children's comments during the 1:1 Debriefings represented a larger proportion of the "content/meaning" category than during the preceding Shared Book Event. The children's comments during the Debriefings represented 20% (21 out of 105) coded in this manner contrasted with a share of 12.7% (55 out of 433) during the Shared Book Event.

Comments typifying a characteristic event represented the "content/meaning" category during the Shared Book Event:

C: The mitten exploded.
T: He lost his mitten in the snow. He went on his way.
C: He didn't know he had lost his mitten?
T: When the mouse sees the mitten lying in the snow, she was very cold. What do you think she did?
C: moved in
C: went inside
T: She popped right in to get warm. Wouldn't you?

These comments were not only coded for content, but also for "character". The last comment was given a third category "personal." Similar comments were related during the 1:1 Child Debriefings in which both categories of "character" and "content/meaning" were given:

C: It doesn't matter at all (referring to his lost mitten).
C: In this story, the boy who lost his mitten didn't mind and said, "Oh well" because his grandmother was making him some new ones.

C: The animals in that book made interesting houses out of old things that they find.

As demonstrated in these examples, often a character's behavior in a narrative was tied in to a characteristic event. This code was established as a comparison correlate to the expository text "content/meaning" category.

Although this category's findings in the Focus Data Set remained similar throughout the events, one noted difference in The Mitten Shared Book Event compared to the expository text Let's Find Out about Winter was in the category of "intertextual comparison." Although there existed no such comments in the expository Shared Book Event (which occurred the preceding day) several children initiated the discussion relating other books to this one.

C: I know a story about the old man and a mitten.

T: The Old Man's Mitten, isn't it?

C: Yes, The Old Man and the Mitten

T: You can tell us about that afterwards and compare it with this book and see if it is like this book.

C: I wanted to read another thing (about winter).

C: long underwear
This "intertextual comparison" focused comment was also exhibited by children during the 1:1 Child Debriefings: (6.7% or 7 out of 105 codings).

C: In all the books we read, they have happy endings.

C: Some books we read have pictures.

One child also compared the incident of the mitten popping and animals flying all over to a Steve Urkai comment, "I've fallen and I can't get up" in "Family Matters" which is a T.V. show.

Not unexpected, the largest number of comments were coded "characters" in the Focus Data Set for the Shared Book Event in which The Mitten was represented. A less percentage was carried over to the individual interpretation during the 1:1 Child Debriefings, however (17.1% or 18 out of 105 compared to the 26.6% or 115 out of 433 for the S.B.E.).

Much of this discussion during the Shared Book Event involved character identification and the children empathizing with the characters:

T: But, wouldn't you think this boy out in the cold would feel the cold on his hands?

C: yes

T: Why do you think he just didn't think about it?

C: Because he was too busy picking up the firewood.

C: Because his grandmother is making him a new pair anyway.
T: How do you think the boy accepted the fact that he actually lost his mitten and it was no more? How did he accept that? How did he act?

C: not even angry. . . He just said, "Oh well."

C: He knew he was going to get new mittens, so he said, "no big deal."

This line of thinking was carried over to the individual interpretation, even though represented at a less percentage:

C: That's very generous to let them inside the mitten.

C: Doesn't he notice that his mitten is off? Was his hand so used to being like this? (she imitates hand position) How could he not notice?

C: In this story, the boy who lost his mitten didn't mind and said, "Oh well", because his grandmother was making him some new ones.

The structure of this text in which the plot consists of distinct character actions lends itself to the array of talk about characters.

Language comments were more prevalent in the Shared Book Event of *The Mitten* as well as the 1:1 Child Debriefings than in the other experiences, regardless of genre. Specifically, an 8.1% (35 out of 433) of the codings were
categorized as such for the S.B.E. compared to no comments during the winter expository text.

Several of these comments pertained to migration and hibernation during the background knowledge lead-in discussion, but as demonstrated in the Thanksgiving genres, vocabulary words in context were also discussed:

T: Does anyone know what a boar is? It sounds like a bear, but it's not a bear.

C: A hog

T: A wild pig, isn't it? Or, a wild hog.

During the 1:1 Child Debriefings, 5.7% (6 out of 105) of the codings were categorized "language" in the Focus Data Set. These comments did not exemplify one type:

C: I know how to spell house. It's just like mouse, except you spell it with an "h" (referring to another child's comment during the Shared Book Event).

C: I thought it was solution (referring to the discussion of what conclusion is).

Not only were "language" comments represented, but much of the discussion pertained to the illustrations during the Shared Book Event (10.9% or 47 out of 433). Twice during the reading of "The Mitten," children came up to the book and pointed to the picture to illustrate their point.
C: She has a bridge.

C: She has a little bridge by her house and I think she is pretending these are flowers so she makes sort of a nice house. So, this bridge, she can sort of walk up it, so she doesn’t have to jump high.

C: I just wanted to show you something on this page.

T: Oh, back here?

C: Yes, the bridge is breaking.

T: ... Joe noticed that some of the landscaping from the strain of the weight of the people is breaking.

Much of the illustration discussion pertained to the illustration’s pattern:

T: Mike, did you want to say something?

C: The pattern is blue colors, white colors, blue colors, white colors.

T: You’re sharp. Do you know another teacher told me that there was a pattern in this book this morning and I had to think because I couldn’t remember what the pattern was and you picked it up.

C: a color pattern

T: And, what did Mr. Tresselt do with snowflakes? Did you notice?

C: He went a lot and a little bit.
T: What about the colors?

T: So, when he has a white page, what color of snowflakes did he make?

C: blue

T: And when he had a blue page, what color of snowflakes did he make?

C: white

T: That was a very attractive way to illustrate the book.

Therefore, the illustrations did play a significant role in this Shared Book Event. Children were free to come point to the book and were "guided" in analyzing the patterns.

Similar findings when comparing The Mitten narrative to the expository text Let's Find Out about Winter, were found in the book-related category. The narrative's book-related category represented 4.6% (20 out of 433) compared to the expository text statistic of 3.24% (6 out of 185). However, the discrepancy existed in the l:l Child Debriefings in which 5.7% (6 out of 105) of the codings in the Focus Data Set were categorized "book-related" compared to no comments during the expository l:l Debriefings.

Several of the comments during the Shared Book Event of The Mitten involved genre discussion and comparisons:

T: This is called an old Ukrainian folktale. I
know that Mrs. Smith in the library is beginning
to read folktales to you, so this is another
folk tale that you can tell her about, an old
Ukrainian folktale. This happened in Europe.

C: What is it?
T: It's a folktale. A folktale is a story that,
remember, that has been handed down over the
years.
C: like a legend
T: like a legend. And it could be based on a true
story, but remember, when this folktale is passed
down over the years, one person tells another
person and another person tells another person.
C: It changes.
T: It kind of changes. It could be based on a true
story.

During the 1:1 Child Debriefings, these salient points during the group
discussion were carried over to the individual interpretation:

C: Passed on and passed on and passed on and passed on.
C: It changes.
C: An owl would not be able to fit in the mitten, but it is a folktale.
C: fiction (in reference to the fact that the animals could not fit in the mitten)

Therefore, it appears that this Book-Related discussion did leave an impression upon the three children who were debriefed, unlike the data revealed in the expository text debriefings.

Several "Social Influence" comments were noted in the Focus Data Set for both the Shared Book Event (1.6% or 7 out of 433) and for the 1:1 Child Debriefings (3.8% or 4 out of 105). It was interesting that more children referred to other children's comments during the Debriefings than Mrs. L. or the children did during the Shared Book Event.

In summary, the Focus Data Set findings reveal that for this narrative, The Mitten, the comments categorized "character" represented over one-fourth of the codings. Content/ Meaning comments, especially typifying characteristic events associated with characters, and structure comments pertaining to the discussion of setting, plot, sequence, and conclusion each represented approximately half of this amount, (12.7% and 12% respectively). Illustrations and background knowledge during the lead-in played a significant role, as well. Perhaps, the unexpected finding was related to the low number of "personal" comments during this Shared Book Event (8.3% or 36 out of 433 codings) compared to the expository text data in which 36.2% (67 out of 185) were categorized "personal." The background knowledge comments were also much more numerous during
the expository text Shared Book Event (36.2% compared to 10.9%). However, no comments applied to the "structure" and "intertextual comparisons" categories during the expository Event compared to a 12% applied to "structure and a 4.4% applied to "intertextual comparisons" during the narrative Shared Book Event.

Another interesting finding was related to a comparison of the 1:1 Child Debriefings to the Shared Book Events. Across both genres, a higher percentage of "content/meaning" comments were represented during the Debriefings than during the Events:

- **Narrative Event=12.7% Debriefing=20%**
- **Expository Event=12% Debriefing=20%**

Note the similarities, as well, across Events and across Debriefings of the represented genres. The possible implications of this data analyses will be discussed further in Chapter VI.

**Type of Statements**

A comparison across genres in the Type Data Set reveals several differences in the winter Shared Book Events (refer to FIGURE 22 and FIGURE 23). As in the Focus Data Set, more "personal" experiences were related in the expository text discussion (40.1%) than in the narrative discussion (9.5%). In review, these statements reflect background experiences as they relate to the text, as well as putting oneself into the text. The children recalled many
wintertime experiences, winter clothing, etc. during the expository reading.

More "elaborative" comments were represented in the expository Shared Book Event (20.9% or 38 out of 182). During the narrative, 13.2% or 49 out of 370, were categorized in this manner. These responses extend knowledge to a greater degree. As stated previously, the expository text was elementary in that only 100 words comprised the text.

Another difference, which I expected, was in the narrational category. These are statements that retell literal information about the text. For the expository text Event, only 12.1% (22 out of 182) were categorized in this manner compared to the narrative Event in which 22.7% (84 out of 370) were coded "narrational." The fact that the expository text had only 100 words could have contributed to this difference. This relatively simplistic text could have alleviated the teachers' check or concern for comprehension-related comments.

Correlating with this premise, there were also more "explanatory" comments during the Shared Book Event in which the narrative was read (24.3% or 90 out of 370). During the Shared Book Event in which Let's find Out about Winter was represented, 12.1% (22 out of 182) were categorized in this way. Explanatory responses or questions clarify information, as well as language.

As one might expect, more discussion related to "prediction" in the narrative Event (10.5% or 39 out of 370) than in the expository Event (0.5% or 1 out of 182). More "associative" comments were also found in the narrative
Shared Book Session (6.5%) than in the expository Shared Book Session (1.6%).

However, two findings were similar across genres in the Type Data Set. Only 1 comment categorized "evaluative" was related in both Shared Book Events. This was a judgmental response regarding what did occur or should have occurred. Another similarity was in the "interpretive" category. These are questions or comments that are inferential and involve a higher level of thinking than the narrational category. In the expository Event, 12.1% (22 out of 182) were categorized "interpretive" compared to 13% (48 out of 370) coded in this manner during the narrative Event. Even though this category across genres remained similar, in the Thanksgiving books, many more comments were categorized "interpretive" and they were different:

Narrative-Oh, What a Thanksgiving-31% (34 out of 108)
Expository-Squanto and the First Thanksgiving-22.8% (20 out of 88)

Perhaps, one can surmise that the difficulty level of the represented texts was a contributing factor to the different data results. For a review of the Type Data Set delineations, refer to TABLE 6. To examine the Type Data Set results for the winter topic genres, refer to FIGURE 22 and FIGURE 23.
Let's Find Out About Winter

Expository Text

Type of Statement

- Evaluative
- Elaborative
- Associative
- Personal
- Interpretive
- Predictive
- Explanatory

182 Codings
Shared Book Event

Personal - 40.1% (73 of 182)
Elaborative - 20.9% (38 of 182)
Explanatory - 12.1% (22 of 182)
Interpretive - 12.1% (22 of 182)
Narrational - 12.1% (22 of 182)
Associative - 1.6% (3 of 182)
Predictive - 0.5% (1 of 182)
Evaluative - 0.5% (1 of 182)

FIGURE 22

Let's Find Out About Winter
The Mitten
Narrative
Type of Statements

Explanatory - 24.3% (90 of 370)
Narrational - 22.7% (84 of 370)
Elaborative - 13.2% (49 of 370)
Interpretive - 13% (48 of 370)
Predictive - 10.5% (39 of 370)
Personal - 9.5% (35 of 370)
Associative - 6.5% (24 of 370)
Evaluative - .3% (1 of 370)

FIGURE 23

The Mitten
THE KINDERGARTEN EVENTS

THE FIFTH SHARED BOOK EVENT

NARRATIVE

IT'S GROUNDHOG DAY

I chose this book to analyze for several reasons. Although Groundhog's Day is not an actual holiday, the outcome of the groundhog seeing his shadow and whether or not we'll experience six more weeks of winter is discussed in many elementary classrooms. The topic of holidays often are a unit study (see TABLE 10). The book exhibits the typical narrative elements of story plot, sequence of action, protagonist dilemma and character delineation, as well as resolution. I also wished to see if the animated (cartoon-like) illustrations would influence children's responses and attitudes.

Many of the children attending this school have had a snow skiing experience. Therefore, the characters' experiences would correlate with the children's life-to-text experiences.

The plot involves Godfrey Groundhog telling his friends at the end of summer that he had a hunch he would not see his shadow this year. Roland Raccoon, who was hiding behind a tree, was very distressed at hearing this news. He owns a ski lodge and from a financial position, the longer the winter, the better. He, therefore,kidnaps Godfrey, who escapes in time for Groundhog's Day. Everyone was able to ski for free, as a result of Roland's punishment.
During the Teacher Debriefing, as Mrs. U. viewed this Shared Book Event, she stated her reasons in choosing this book:

T: I chose this book because Groundhog's Day is a fun day for children and it's a good book for introducing the seasons.

T: I try to follow the curriculum guidelines and we study the holidays, animals, and the seasons. The guidelines are written with the children's interest levels in mind.

However, later, Mrs. U. explained:

T: Holidays seem to be a hot topic right now. Is it okay to celebrate them in school?

The lead-in for the narrative Shared Book Event involved a discussion of the author, illustrator, title page, and dedication. Mrs. U. pulls in a personal note . . . the librarian is one of her favorite people and this is whom the book is dedicated to. There also was a discussion with a language emphasis:

T: His first name is Steven, but he spells it differently than Stephen Z. (a child in the classroom).

T: What do you think this says?

C: the same thing as the title page
Therefore, in contrast to Mrs. L.'s lead-ins which were a discussion of the children's personal experiences or of background knowledge, this lead-in was more book-related. Several comments of background knowledge were expressed, however, pertaining to the seasons, but the emphasis was on book-related facts.

These comments throughout the narrative Shared Book Event represented 5.4% (9 out of 168) of the codings (refer to FIGURE 24). None of this information was carried over to the individual interpretation, as neither child in the 1:1 Child Debriefings cited a book-related comment (refer to FIGURE 25).
It's Groundhog Day
Narrative
Focus of Statements

Characters - 26.2% (44 of 168)
Personal - 22.6% (38 of 168)
Background Knowledge - 14.3% (24 of 168)
Content / Meaning - 13.7% (23 of 168)
Language - 9.5% (16 of 168)
Illustrations - 6.5% (11 of 168)
Book - Related - 5.4% (9 of 168)
Intertextual Comparisons - 1.8% (3 of 168)
Structure - 0% (0 of 168)
Social Influence - 0% (0 of 168)

FIGURE 24
It's Groundhog Day
Narrative
Focus of Statements

FIGURE 25

Characters - 34.5% (10 of 29)
Content / Meaning - 31% (9 of 29)
Personal - 24.1% (7 of 29)
Background Knowledge - 10.4% (3 of 29)
Book - Related - 0% (0 of 29)
Language - 0% (0 of 29)
Illustrations - 0% (0 of 29)
Structure - 0% (0 of 29)
Social Influence - 0% (0 of 29)

29 Codings
1:1 Child Debriefings
The "background knowledge" comments were interspersed throughout the Shared Book Event. Several of these statements involved the topic of seasons:

T: What season comes after summer?
C: fall

T: What are the things that happen in the fall?
C: Leaves change colors.
C: Leaves fall down.
C: He is asleep (referring to Godfrey Groundhog).

T: What do we call that?
C: hibernating

Although this Shared Book Event represented a narrative, 14.3% (24 out of 168) of the codings were categorized "background knowledge." During the I:I Child Debriefings, this focus comment played less of a role -- 10.4% (3 out of 29 codings). These statements reflected the groundhog:

C: About the groundhog digging underground for winter, he hibernated.
C: Yesterday, the groundhog saw its shadow.

However, this child did not understand the concept:

C: We'll have six more days, now it's five more, then four more, then three more, then two.
Mrs. U. during the Teacher Debriefing expresses the emphasis on background knowledge:

T: I'm bringing in the concept of seasons.

The children had studied autumn earlier in the school year and had a week-long unit on winter before I became a member of the class. Math was brought into the Shared Book Event, as well. The children added the number of friends at Godfrey Groundhog's picnic.

As one might expect, the largest number of comments represented the category "character" within the Focus Data Set for both the Shared Book Event and the 1:1 Child Debriefings. During the Shared Book Event, 26.2% (44 out of 168) of the codings were categorized in this manner compared to an even greater percentage, 34.5% (10 out of 29) during the Debriefings. Much of the discussion pertained to the characters:

C: What's wrong with him?

T: this little guy?

C: yes

T: He's the one who owns the ski lodge. Why is the ski lodger (raccoon) upset?

C: because it's not snowing

T: Why is he kidnapping Godfrey?

C: So he wouldn't see his shadow.
T: Do you think the groundhog was pretty clever the way he was getting away?

C: Yes, groundhogs are really escape artists.

This character discussion during the Shared Book Event was carried over to the individual interpretation during the 1:1 Child Debriefings:

C: He had to shove him in. He had to grab on to him and very fast, shove him in the back 'cause groundhogs can dig really fast.

C: That squirrel kidnapped him. The groundhog escaped.

C: That squirrel got the groundhog again. It tied it up to a chair. The groundhog escaped. It dug underground. The squirrel saw it was digging underground. It came up where its home was. The squirrel came up and had to have a punishment. He didn't have much money. He has to let them ski for free.

This large amount of discussion relating to the characters can be attributed to the text structure. During the Teacher Debriefing, Mrs. U. states why she likes this book for the kindergartners:
Also, this setting and the characters are good for the developmental level of these children. There is a dilemma or problem and a solution. I like the happy ending.

Mrs. U. also expressed what a nice job the children were doing with the longer length of this story. As she viewed the videotape, Mrs. U. also pointed out what a good listener one particular child was.

Although a large amount of time was devoted to talk about the characters, considerable discussion also occurred in two other categories, the "content/meaning" and the "personal." First, I will discuss the "personal" talk.

Mrs. U., like Mrs. L., believes the children should be given the opportunity to relate their lives to the text. During the Debriefing, she expressed this concern:

I try to let the children talk about the experiences they have had and relate their own lives to the story.

It's neat to have an animal introduce the new season. Animals are all around the children's lives. Their behavior is important. Animals get along, but not always. It shows children that situations happen like in their lives.
These text-to-life and life-to-text experiences were discussed throughout the Shared Book Event. Topics pertaining to New Year's Eve, getting up early, and ski experiences were addressed:

T: Stand up if you have been skiing before.
T: Sit down if you have trouble stopping on the slopes.
C: Yes, but I use poles. Do you see that? (referring to poles in the illustration). Put them down in the grass and you go like that.
T: Tell me about your ski adventures.
C: I bumped somebody.
C: I never went skiing.
C: You can jump off if you want to stop.
C: Once, I went down real fast and I wanted to stop. I flipped my poles back.
C: I went to where we paid the money.
C: I hit my head . . . that hurt.

This type of discussion pertaining to personal experiences represented 22.6% (38 out of 168) of the codings. The experiences of Godfrey Groundhog and Roland Raccoon (the characters) were related to the experiences in the children's lives. In fact, Mrs. U. commented during the Teacher Debriefing that "even though this book was fiction, there was a lot of truth to be found." These personal experiences represented an even greater percentage during the l:l
Child Debriefings. In the Focus Data Set, 24.1% (7 out of 29) of the codings were categorized "personal." Typical comments relating to the text were:

C: The book reminds me of my brother because on Halloween, my brother was a groundhog.

C: When I was skiing, there was a rock -- no, it was a groundhog hole and I went over it.

C: We have a big hill and we can go sledding. The groundhogs were there. I slid backwards.

Further analysis of this data revealed the unique interpretations or "orientation perspectives" (Carol Lyons, 1994) of each child. An emphasis on the life-to-text experiences was characteristic of one child's orientation while the other child stressed the characters' experiences and characteristic events. The whole group discussion represented comments coded in eight different categories compared to the individual interpretation of only four categories (see FIGURE 24 and FIGURE 25).

One of these four categories and the last to be discussed, is "content/meaning." As in the first grade Shared Book Analyses, this category represented more of the discussion during the 1:1 Child Debriefings than during the Shared Book Events. During the Debriefings, 31% (9 out of 29) of the codings were categorized "content/meaning" compared to only 13.7% (23 out of 168) for the actual Event.
Many of these comments reflected a characteristic event as it pertained to the plot or the characters' actions. Other responses were strictly a fact:

C: One house was underground and the other one was on top.

C: I think I remember something. They put up their Christmas tree and it was Christmas and they got presents.

C: His friends had a picnic. He invited three friends. After that, it became summer. They all went to the beach.

The latter two comments elicited during the Debriefings also were coded "character" as well as "content/meaning." Both involved a child thinking about a characteristic event involving a character.

Facts or characteristic events were also typical of the "content/meaning" category during the Shared Book Event representing this narrative:

C: The groundhog home is below the ground, the others are above the ground.

C: Do they really dig holes like that?

T: Yes, and they really do have rooms in their holes. Did you know that? It's true.

C: They don't have beds.

T: They are sort of like prairie dogs in that way.
Mrs. U., during the Teacher Debriefing also stresses the efferent perspective:

T: Maybe I should have used a map. The geography involved is good-like pointing out the beach or snow in the mountains.

T: That whole idea of hibernation is why I chose this book. We study what happens to animals, their behavior, their homes.

Therefore, it appears that some discussion pertaining to facts, content, meaning, or characteristic events does occur in the narrative Shared Book Event. However, this category within the Focus Data Set of the 1:1 Child Debriefings appears to be more heavily represented. The individual stresses this focus when interpreting literature more than the group does in a social context (refer to FIGURE 24 and FIGURE 25).

Other categories which were represented during this narrative's Shared Book Event, but were not discussed by the children during the Debriefings were "language," "illustrations," and intertextual comparisons." No comments pertaining to "structure" and no comments referring to another person's comment ("social influence") were coded for either the Shared Book Event or the child Debriefings.

Typical comments categorized "illustrations" during the Shared Book Event (6.5% or 11 out of 168) were as follows:

T: Look at these pictures and tell me some of his friends.

C: porcupine
C:  squirrel

C:  bunny

T:  Who is bigger, Roland or Godfrey?

C:  He is chubby.

T:  Roland is bigger and he has a harder time.

T:  Look at this page! I love this. It kind of reminds me of the book we read *Keep Looking* where we termed the "under" ground and the "above" ground. Remember that?

The last comment was also categorized "intertextual comparison" since Mrs. U. compared this text with another. This focus of comment represented 1.8% (3 out of 168) of the codings during the Shared Book Event. Mrs. U. also commented during the Teacher Debriefing:

T:  Again, I'm comparing this information to a book that we have read before.

Discussion associated with an emphasis on language represented a larger portion of time within the group than did the "intertextual comparisons" and the "illustrations." This "language" category within the Focus Data Set represented 9.5% (16 out of 168) of the codings. The following statements or questions exemplify this category:

T:  Did you notice anything about the characters' names?

C:  All their both names start with the same letter.
T: Yes, but they are totally different sounds. One is a "sh" and the other is "squ" (referring to Sherwood Squirrel). But, Penelope Porcupine works, doesn't it?

C: Yes, is that what it says for them?

T: It's called "personification." This animal character is becoming like a human.

T: What is it called when you take someone? It's against the law.

C: stealing

C: kidnapping

Not only are comments referring to the print discussed, but vocabulary meaning with the words in context are discussed. Mrs. U. commented on this during the Teacher Debriefings:

T: Basically, why I stop so much is because I want the children to get involved and to see the print.

T: I also bring in phonics . . . their names and other words that begin with the same sounds.

Therefore, these children were learning vocabulary words, learning about print, and learning sound while reading words in context within the social structure of a whole group.
Type of Statement Data Set

The largest category of comments represented within the Type of statements' Data Set was the "explanatory." These were the comments or questions when Mrs. U. clarified information that was stated in the text or discussed within the Shared Book Event. Of all the codings, 26.8% (44 out of 164) were categorized "explanatory" (see FIGURE 26). Some examples of this type of comment or question are:

C: What's wrong with him?
T: He's the one who owns the ski lodge. Why is the ski lodger (Raccoon) upset?
C: Because it is not snowing.
T: Right...you can't go skiing if it is not snowing.
It's Groundhog Day
Narrative
Type of Statements

Explanatory - 26.8% (44 of 164)
Personal - 25.6% (42 of 164)
Narrational - 16.5% (27 of 164)
Interpretive - 11.6% (19 of 164)
Elaborative - 9.8% (16 of 164)
Predictive - 7.3% (12 of 164)
Associative - 2.4% (4 of 164)
Evaluative - 0% (0 of 164)

FIGURE 26

It's Groundhog Day
The "personal" category also represented a large amount of the discussion time (25.6% or 42 out of 164 codings). These comments involved the text-to-life and life-to-text experiences as related by the children and referred to various topics:

- how the children would like to live in a burrow
- what they would do to get away like Godfrey Groundhog
- their ski experiences (as cited in the Focus Data Set examples)

Narrational statements in which literal information within the text was discussed represented 16.5% (27 out of 164). Many of the book-related comments (as represented in the Focus Data Set) and questions the children could easily ascertain by looking at the illustrations were categorized in this manner.

Children as young as kindergarten ask higher-level thinking questions or Mrs. U. may ask this type of question for the children to answer. A question or comment such as this was categorized "interpretive." Examples of this type were:

T: Why is he kidnapping Godfrey?

C: So he wouldn't see his shadow.

T: Did you notice lines here? What does that mean?

C: Moving?

In the Type of Statement Data Set, 11.6% (19 out of 164) were categorized "interpretive." This was comparable to the first grade "winter" genres, but far
less than during the first grade Thanksgiving books, in which "interpretive" represented 31% during the narrative event and 22.8% during the expository session.

The "elaborative" responses extended knowledge to a greater degree. These questions and comments represented 9.8% (16 out of 164) of the codings within the Type Data Set. Typical examples of this type of comment were:

T: What are the things that happen in the fall?
C: Leaves change colors.
C: Leaves fall down.
C: The groundhog home is below the ground, the others are above the ground
C: They are neighbors.
C: Sure, they might be neighbors.
T: Yes, but they might live in different places . . . one above and the other below.

Comments within the category "predictive" represented 7.3% (12 out of 164). This type of response usually occurred when Mrs. U. asked the children what they thought might happen:

T: What do you think happened on February 2nd?
C: The groundhog is waking up.
T: Do you think he saw his shadow?
T: Who do you think will come to help him?

T: What do you think the punishment will be for the raccoon?

As with several of the first-grade Events, comments categorized "associative" were less numerous than most of the other types. These questions or statements relating the text to other genres, works, or extension activities only represented 2.4% (4 out of 164) of the codings during the narrative Event of It's Groundhog Day.

There were no comments categorized "evaluative" during this narrative Session. This data finding correlates with both the narrative and the expository text with the Thanksgiving theme in which no comments during the Events were coded "evaluative." This category was also the least represented during both genres of the winter topic . . . 1 out of 370 (The Mitten) and 1 out of 182 (Let's Find Out About Winter). Therefore, judgmental comments regarding what should have occurred or what did occur rarely are discussed during Shared Book Events of children within these two classrooms.

In summary, this kindergarten, narrative Shared Book Event representing It's Groundhog Day was conducted in a manner very similar to the first-grade Events. Children interacted with Mrs. U., with each other, and with the text to construct a consensual meaning of the text.

Like Mrs. L's narrative events, this Session involved as much talk about the text, as the actual reading of the text. Children were asked to empathize
with the characters—"How do you think Godfrey felt? How would you feel if someone stuffed you in a burlap bag?"
They also discussed personal experiences as they related to the happenings within the plot, predicted what might happen next, and noticed phonics similarities and new vocabulary words.

The animated illustrations seemed every bit as effective as realistic illustrations and Mrs. U. pointed out the illustrations on several occasions: comparing the animals' homes and locations, counting friends at the picnic, the ski lodge and its sign, and the lines denoting movement of the skis. It was obvious that the children and the teacher used the illustrations in constructing meaning.

The discussion about the characters occurred throughout the Event, and this data finding corroborated the first grade Events in which narratives were represented. Talk about the characters was even more abundant during the 1:1 Child Debriefings than during the Shared Book Events for this kindergarten narrative, It's Groundhog Day, as well as one of the first grade narratives, Oh, What a Thanksgiving.

Perhaps what surprised me most when analyzing this kindergarten data, was the emphasis variation representing the "content/meaning" category in the 1:1 Debriefings compared to the whole class Event. Children throughout all the Events have consistently stressed facts and characteristic events more in the 1:1 situation than during the whole group Events. The individual interpretation leans
toward an efferent orientation, but not without emphasizing the aesthetic, as well.

This will be discussed in greater detail, in Chapter VI, the summary chapter.
THE SIXTH SHARED BOOK EVENT

EXPOSITORY TEXT

THOSE MEAN NASTY DIRTY DOWNRIGHT DISGUSTING

BUT... INVISIBLE GERMS

This expository text is told in narrative form. The nonfiction topics involve health and hygiene, bacteria, and viruses. A kindergartener accumulated several kinds of germs on her hands while participating in various activities in the course of a school day. She then washes the germs away before eating her lunch. The contrasting illustrations depict Beth, the protagonist in real-life photographs with the different types of germs with human-like characteristics in colorful paintings.

The lead-in for this text was the recitation of a poem about colds. The children repeated each line after Mrs. U. as they dramatized the actions (sneezing, hoarse voices, and relief). Mrs. U. mentioned this poem during the Teacher Debriefing:

T: The reason we did the poem about colds...colds are caused by germs. This was the set-up before I read the book.

Many of the children had colds at this time of the year and Mrs. U. stated her reasons for choosing this book:
T: One of the reasons I chose this book was the relevance. First of all, children get sick in real life. Germs are important to learn about and relevant to the five-year old in school. Real pictures contrasted with drawn pictures were neat. The book shows things they do in kindergarten... relevant topics, such as the house corner, spaceships, and cooperative play. Extension activity with food is always fun.

Although germs and hygiene were not the typical one-to-three week unit topic, two books on germs were read on successive days. Books chosen for the purpose of helping children with real-life experiences were termed "experiential" under "Basis for Selection" (refer to TABLE 13).

The lead-in was of a more personal perspective, with several book-related facts discussed, as well. The children were informed of the purposes for reading the book:

T: This book is one of my favorite books in the whole wide world. While I am reading this book, I want you to think about whether you have ever had one of these germs that are mentioned in this book and if you can draw your own germ.

Therefore, even the stated purposes for reading were on a personal, life-to-text level. The facts related throughout this book were continually tied-in to the children's everyday experiences, so much so that a whopping 43.8% (46 out
of 105) of the codings were categorized "personal" in the Focus Data Set (refer to FIGURE 27). Much of this discussion involved the children relating which germs they had contacted in the past and how to get rid of germs:

C: I have already had the chicken pox.

C: I have, too.

C: I had the chicken pox when I was five.

T: Have you ever had any of these germs, like an earache, headache, or sore throat?

C: yes

T: How did you feel?

C: I didn't feel good at all. I even had to go to the doctor.

C: I had it when I went to a party.

T: What did you do to get rid of the germ?

C: I ate 55 popsicles.

C: I have tubes in my ears right now.

C: What about your hands?

T: And wash your hands. And, what about every night when you take your bath? And your mom and dad say, "It is time for your bath," and you sometimes don't want to. But, some people say, "Oh, I want to take a bath because I love baths." It depends. I had a brother who hated to take baths, but do you know what? He had
to take a bath. You need to take a bath to get rid of germs.
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C: I take showers.

C: I love showers.

C: I hate showers. I love baths.

C: I like both.

Note above that Mrs. U. relates her own personal experiences to the children as Mrs. L. liked to do. The children were really into the discussion involving this expository text. At various times, they became so excited that several children talked at once. Perhaps by pulling-in the children’s personal experiences into a social interaction time, Mrs. U. created an easy-to-understand concept from what could have been very abstract and difficult for children this age to comprehend. She commented on the relevancy of children’s experiences during the Teacher Debriefing:

T: I mentioned the chicken pox because that germ isn’t discussed and introduced. A lot of kindergartners get chicken pox.

Perhaps what shocked me, when analyzing the 1:1 Child Debriefings in the Focus Data Set, was the low number of personal comments. Perhaps, the social interaction within the group setting promoted this discussion of text-to-life experiences, but in the 1:1 settings, the emphasis shifted to comments in the “content/meaning’ and “characters” categories. The personal comments represented only 13.7% (7 out of 51) compared to the 43.8% during the Shared Book Event. The individual interpretation and orientation perspective were far
different than the consensual meaning when interacting with this text. One child elicited personal comments. The other child's comments referred to the discussion:

C: I have that... I do (referring to Mrs. U.'s question of tubes in the ears).

C: There was one part I did not like.

C: They (referring to the children) all started yelling at the same time, "I had it. I had it."

C: I couldn't understand them.

The relevance of this personal perspective was obscured by the large number of comments that were categorized "content/meaning." A whopping 35.3% (18 out of 51) of the codings during the 1:1 Child Debriefings were categorized in this manner. Examples of these comments are:

C: So, she got the germ when she was painting the picture and it can give you an earache.

C: So, it was an invisible germ and she didn't see it. You don't know when you get germs. You can't feel them and you can't see them.

C: She washed her hands with so much soap and water that four different germs go off and the reason why the throw-up germ didn't get off is because it was hiding on her thumb.

C: Germs live in dark places and warm places.
The ironic part about these children's emphasis on content and characteristic events was that Mrs. U. during the Teacher Debriefing expressed concern that she did not spend enough time on facts:

T: Should I have given them more time to discuss that? Maybe brought in more?

T: I knew I should have addressed that, but I did it on the next page. I really needed to go back where the germs are, like Hammerhead, and name the germ.

T: I wish I would have done that at every page, taken time, and really talked about it.

Moreover, this category of "content/meaning" was represented approximately only half as much during the Shared Book Event (18.1% or 19 out of 105) as during the 1:1 Child Debriefings (refer to FIGURE 28).
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Another category within the Focus Data Set that the children discussed often was "characters." Recall that this expository text in which facts and concepts were related was in narrative form. The protagonist was a five-year old named Beth. During the 1:1 Child Debriefings, the children referred to Beth, but only in reference with a comment which was also categorized "content/meaning." There were several comments elicited by the children when the "content/meaning" category was coded independently of other categories. No "character" comments were coded independently. Specifically, typical comments coded "character" as well as "content/meaning" were:

C: I like this one last part where she grabs the napkins, wipes her hands, and throws the throw-up germ in the garbage can.

C: So, the germs, all the germs in the book, got on her hand.

C: I remember one part of the story. Beth washed her hands and Beth got the headache, the earache, and two other germs off her hands, but not the throw-up germ.

Another interesting revelation pertaining to the "character" category within the Focus Data Set was the small number of these comments during the Shared Book Event in which the expository text was read. Only 6.7% (7 out of 105) of the comments were coded in this manner, and three of these comments involved the character's location of play at the end of the book. The children then chose places to play in their classroom that were represented in the book's
photographs.

This paucity of comments coded "character" is the least "character" representation in any of the Shared Book Events, regardless of genre (with the exception of Let's Find Out About Winter which was the first grade expository text, in which the "character" category was non-applicable). Perhaps, an explanation for this low representation was the text structure. The information on germs definitely obscured the character's actions. However, the individual interpretation and orientation perspectives again deviated from the group discussion. Children in the 1:1 Child Debriefings did discuss characters (23.5% or 12 out of 51). Therefore, the data revealed two categories ("character and "content/meaning") discussed with much greater frequency when the individuals interpreted literacy in their own style.

As in the lead-in to the narrative, It's Groundhog Day, Mrs. U. stressed several book-related comments during the lead-in to this expository text, Those Mean Nasty Dirty Downright Disgusting But . . . Invisible Germs. The author, illustrator, dedication, etc. are the characteristic lead-in comments categorized "book-related". Mrs. U. also mentioned comments relating to this during the Teacher Debriefing:

T: I probably should have discussed dedication but I've done that in the past.

C: They pick up on the author and illustrations.
Consistent with the 1:1 data, regardless of the genre, the children in this Debriefing of the book on germs also had a lower incidence of book-related comments representing the individual interpretation than during the Shared Book Event. It appears that this information is not as important to the individual. In fact, the only comment issued by either child in this category related to the book's title:

C: It's a long title, isn't it?

Conversely, comments in the "language" category were more represented during the individual interpretations. During the Shared Book Event, only one comment out of 105 codings related to "language..." That's what the word says, Ben -- "this" and "this" (as Mrs. U. pointed to the germs). During the 1:1 Debriefings, the children stated:

C: I like the part where they all said "Hammerhead" (referring to the children naming the sore-throat germ "Hammerhead" and calling it out when they saw its picture).

C: I didn't even know what it said. It was interesting to me because it was her other name (referring to Mrs. U. telling the children her maiden name when her previous initials matched initials in the book).

During the Teacher Debriefing, Mrs. U. also referred to language-related issues:
T: Now Ben mentioned some word he wanted to know.

T: Ben picked up on the fact that his name was in the text.

T: That was when Patrick interpreted the throw-up germ as the puke germ.

T: I hope it's not a put-down that I let them fill in the word at the end of the sentence.

It seems as if these kindergarteners are becoming aware of print and how language can work for them. And as the teachers responded in the survey, Big Books are wonderful so the children can see the print.

Along the same line, these children seemed to have been socially influenced during the Shared Book Event, at least in so far as comments were stated referring to others. Although there were no "social influence" coded comments during the Shared Book Event, several were expressed during the individual interpretation:

C: That was the funniest thing. He had to eat lots of boxes (laughing and referring to Patrick's comment, "I had to eat 55 popsicles").

C: I like it when people say, "What does that say?"

C: There was one part I did not like. They all started yelling at the same time, "I had it. I had it" (referring
to the children calling out that they had had the chicken-pox germ).

I thought this data was interesting, as it appears the "social influence" comments often aren't known until the individual interpretation AFTER the social context situation. This appears consistently throughout data representing several of the Shared Book Events. Although the Shared Book Event represents a social interaction process, some children don't participate for various reasons. At this young age, much of the conversation is guided by the teacher, but not always. It was exciting for me to see when children were influenced by each other, not only within the socially-constructed context, but during a cognitive assessment of the Shared Book Event.

There were no comments categorized "intertextual comparison" nor "structure" during the Shared Book Event representing this expository text in the kindergarten. This carried over to the individual interpretation with no comments representing "intertextual comparisons" and only one statement relating to "structure." However, this was the first Shared Book Event representing a book about germs. As with the first grade data, it appeared that the order in which books were presented possibly influenced intertextual comparisons. This text was followed by another on germs, and as Mrs. U. commented: "Tomorrow we'll read another story, more scientific on germs, too."
Type of Statement Data Set

Those text-to-life and life-to-text experiences represented a whopping 50% (50 out of 100 codings) of the comments categorized "personal" (refer to FIGURE 29). This corroborates the other expository text data (Let's Find Out about Winter and Squanto and the First Thanksgiving) in which the highest incidence categories were also "personal."

During the present Shared Book Event, comments coded in this manner represented a discussion of the various germs the children had contacted and how to get rid of germs (as in the Focus Data Set).

Another high percentage category, was that of "narrational" in which literal, easily-comprehended knowledge was related by the children (26% or 26 out of 100). These statements typically referred to information about the illustrations, which differed from the other Shared Book Events in which comments reflecting this coding were usually representing the text rather than the illustrations.

Several comments reflecting the "narrational" categories and referring to the illustrations were:

T: Notice the color the temperature germ.

C: It is yellow.

T: This is what the germ looks like that gives you a headache.

C: It's a long throat.
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Personal - 50% (50 of 100)
Narrational - 26% (26 of 100)
Interpretive - 17% (17 of 100)
Explanatory - 6% (6 of 100)
Associative - 1% (1 of 100)
Elaborative - 0% (0 of 100)
Evaluative - 0% (0 of 100)
Predictive - 0% (0 of 100)

100 Codings
Shared Book Event
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C: It's a fly.
C: a bunny rabbit
C: a hammerhead
T: Who remembers this germ?
C: heat
C: temperature

Several narrational comments reflected the text, as well:

T: That's what the word says, Ben -- "this" and "this."
T: Germs like wet places. And they like warm places, too.
C: wash your hands.

More "narrational" comments were represented in this Shared Book Event than were represented in the others, regardless of genre. This fact could possibly be attributed to the emphasis on illustrations.

Those comments which reflected a higher level thinking process than the narrational were coded "interpretive." The data revealed that 17% (17 out of 100) of the codings for this expository text, Those Mean Nasty Dirty Downright Disgusting But... Invisible germs, were coded in this manner. Some examples of this type of question or comment are:

C: How will the germs come back?
T: Where do you think germs live?
C: They live in junk.
C: Yea, like in trash cans in the dump.
C: in your mouth
T: They do. That is why you have to brush your teeth to get rid of germs.

The interpretive comments of this expository text corroborated the 16.5% of interpretive comments during the kindergarten Shared Book Event in which the narrative was read and discussed.

However, in contrast to the explanatory category of the narrative in which 26.8% (44 out of 164) of the codings were categorized in this manner, only 6% (6 out of 100) of the comments were coded "explanatory" representing the expository text. At this point of analysis, I cannot state this difference is genre-dependent. The data of the first-grade genres of the same topic revealed conflicting findings. ... the expository winter text represented fewer explanatory comments than the narrative text, but the reverse was true for the Thanksgiving texts.

Two book-related comments (from the Focus Data Set) reveal this explanatory-type comment in which information is explained or clarified:

C: Why is it so long in this book?
T: It is dedicated to all those people because the author has a lot of friends.
In this kindergarten Shared Book Event, only one comment was categorized "associative," and there were no comments in the following three categories: elaborative, evaluative, and predictive (refer to FIGURE 29). This corroborates with the other Shared Book Events, regardless of genre, in which 0% or a very low incidence were represented for the evaluative category. However, the "predictive" category appears to increase in number of comments dependent on the genre. Specifically, the narratives had a higher incidence of prediction questions or comments:

- **It's Groundhog Day** - 7.3% (12 out of 164)
- **Oh, What a Thanksgiving** - 17% (18 out of 108)
- **The Mitten** - 10.5% (39 out of 370)

Surprisingly, the present Shared Book Event of Those Mean Nasty Dirty Downright Disgusting But... Invisible Germs had less comments representing the "elaborative" category than the kindergarten fictional narrative did. This was in direct collation to the first grade narrative-expository texts' comparisons. In these Events both expository texts reflected more elaborative comments in which the discussion extended information to a greater degree than during the narrative Events. This was truly not the case in the kindergarten narrative and expository text Events' comparison.

In summary, the personal categories in both the Type Data Set and the Focus Data Set were by far the largest percentage of represented questions and
comments (43.8% and 50% respectively). This type or focus of statement proved less evident for this expository text analysis, however, when the individual interpretation and orientation perspective were considered. During the 1:1 Child Debriefings, only 7 out of 51 codings (13.7%) represented the personal category. It was during these sessions that the children related what was on their minds -- a "content/meaning" emphasis as in all previous Debriefing sessions. Comments reflecting the characters also seemed to be on the children's minds, and this data finding is consistent with the other 1:1 Child Debriefings' results.

Another interesting revelation was in the number of categories. Specifically, the children's talk individually revealed more category differentiation than did the Shared Book Event discussion. The only category not represented during the Debriefings was that of "intertextual comparisons". During the Shared Book Event which represented *Those Mean Nasty Dirty Downright Disgusting But . . . Invisible Germs*, there were no comments representing several categories: intertextual comparisons, structure, and social influence (in which the teacher or a child referred by name to what another person had said). Extending the analysis to the Type Data Set, three other categories were not represented: elaborative, predictive, and evaluative. This data set did not apply to the individual interpretations, however, or perhaps a similar finding to the Focus Data Set would have been revealed.
However, during this Shared Book Event, much of the discussion pertained to comments coded in the content/meaning (18.1%), background knowledge (13.3%) and illustration-emphasis (10.5%) categories. This data was consistent with nearly all the other analyzed Shared Book Events. The first grade expository text event of *Squanto and the First Thanksgiving* represented only a 1.7% (2 out of 120) focus on illustrations. As explained in the Second Shared Book Event, this fact could be attributed to the less colorful and less demanding illustrations.
EATING FRACTIONS

This book introduces the very basic mathematical concept of fractions: from a whole to halves, from a whole to quarters, from a whole to thirds. Bruce McMillan accomplishes this through giant mouth-watering photographs of food, thus appealing to the reader's sense of taste, as well. The photographs of food consist of: bananas, muffins, pizza, corn-on-the-cob, pear salad, and strawberry pie. The characters eating this food are a happy boy, a playful girl, and a shaggy dog. The only text represented in the book are the words denoting a whole and its fractional parts in big print. However, at the end of the book, the author has his recipes for the various foods illustrated in the book.

I chose this book to analyze for several reasons. I wished to examine learning when the interaction of the children involved a concept book. Mrs. U. chose many concept books to read during the Shared Book Events. Of the thirty-three events which I observed, seventeen of these represented concept books. The children seemed to enjoy Eating Fractions as evidenced by their high amount of participation and acute attention spans. I also liked the huge, colorful photographs and I had not yet examined the learning process when a limited number of words were represented in the text.
During the Teacher Debriefing, Mrs. U. expressed her reasons for choosing this concept book:

T: The reasons why I chose *Eating Fractions* was because I like his work. It's very primary. His pictures are relevant to the children. The book, *Eating Fractions*, is wonderful because I always have a tough time teaching fractions to kindergartners.

The book made it more real for them.

T: Fractions are in our curriculum guidelines. That's why I bought the book and it's great.

The lead-in to this book was similar to all of Mrs. U.'s lead-in discussions. There was talk about the author, the book, the dedication, the illustrations, and the cover:

C: That matches the thing on the book. It shows the pizza thing.

T: Well, where do you think I got this?

C: on the copy machine

T: on the copying machine? I put this book on the copying machine and I copied the cover of this book. Boys and Girls, this is a brand new book. I bought it at a Literature Conference and let me tell you when
it was published -- published in 1991. That means it is only one-year old. It's a brand new book.

T: The title of this book is Eating Fractions.

T: The author is Bruce McMillan. I like him because he took the pictures instead of drawing the illustrations. There are real people and real dogs and real food.

T: The book was written for Chris.

Book-related comments such as these represented 10.3% (12 out of 116) of the codings. The comments pertaining to the extension activity which would normally have been categorized "book-related" were not included in this analysis, as the extension activity occurred later in the morning and not at the end of the Shared Book Event. During the 1:1 Child Debriefing, only one comment in this category (out of 36) was stated:


Mrs. U., during the Teacher Debriefing also expressed her lead-in strategy:

T: The reason why I pointed out the cover was because when you are getting children ready for the story, I always show them the front cover and the back cover. I point out the title, the author, so if they
wanted to do a project on it, they'd remember who it was. When they wanted to take the books home, they could explain it to their parents. It's also a new book.

She also referred to her evaluation of the "book-related" talk:

T: I thought it went well. The extension activity was good. The extension we did was developmentally appropriate. They were using their fine motor skills.

T: The cover and then the extension activity were fun.

Some children had trouble folding on the lines.

Not surprising to me, the illustrations represented a large category during the Shared Book Event. Comments coded in this manner maintained a record 15.5% (18 out of 116) of all codings and this amount was highest in the illustration category of all the Shared Book Events which were analyzed (refer to FIGURE 30). Recall that these photographs are bold, vivid, and huge. There is a limited amount of text in this concept book. It is no wonder that much of the talk pertained to the illustrations! The discussion of the photos with the concept of fractions unified this Shared Book Event. Examples of these comments are:

T: This is a whole. I'm not sure what this is. What is this? It looks like lime jello to me with maybe some cheese inside of it. It could have some cottage
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Content / Meaning - 30.2% (35 of 116)
Illustrations - 15.5% (18 of 116)
Background Knowledge - 14.7% (17 of 116)
Characters - 12.9% (15 of 116)
Book - Related - 10.3% (12 of 116)
Personal - 10.3% (12 of 116)
Language - 4.3% (5 of 116)
Social Influence - 0.9% (1 of 116)
Structure - 0.9% (1 of 116)
Intertextual Comparisons - 0% (0 of 116)

116 Codings
Shared Book Event
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cheese or sour cream in it.

C: It looks like cheese.

T: Look at this. Oh, this looks good. One whole strawberry pie.

T: Do you think these two people are good friends?

C: Yes.

C: They're eating pizza.

T: What is this? Oh, look what we have here, one whole corn-on-the-cob.

This "shared" group talk about the illustrations carried over to the individual interpretation and orientation perspective. During the 1:1 Child Debriefing, the category "illustrations" were represented with the largest number of comments (22.2% or 8 out of 36) (refer to FIGURE 31).
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Illustrations - 22.2% (8 of 36)
Content / Meaning - 19.4% (7 of 36)
Personal - 13.9% (5 of 36)
Characters - 11.1% (4 of 36)
Structure - 11.1% (4 of 36)
Social Influence - 8.3% (3 of 36)
Background Knowledge - 5.6% (2 of 36)
Language - 5.6% (2 of 36)
Book - Related - 2.8% (1 of 36)
Intertextual Comparisons - 0% (0 of 36)

36 Codings
1:1 Child Debriefings
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These were the only Debriefings in which the illustrations played such a prominent role. Typical comments representing this category during the Child Debriefings were:

C: I like all the pictures a lot 'cause they were colorful.

C: I like it because they said it was a whole strawberry cake. It looked really good. I like it because they had crust on top and that makes it even better.

C: There was a whole big piece of the banana.

During the Teacher Debriefing, Mrs. U. also expressed thoughts regarding the illustrations:

T: To do this again, I probably would say "How are the illustrations different from some of the other books that we have read?" -to explain the photographs as being different from illustrations.

T: I had the pointer there so I could show another way of pointing out fractions. I was disappointed it didn't have a whole on it to show halves, fourths, and eighths. I'll put it up in the room and then the children can study it to help them remember the book (referring to a chart of illustrations depicting fractions).

Therefore, as I have demonstrated the photographs definitely dwarf the text in denoting the concept of fractions. More emphasis was on the illustrations in this Shared Book Event, than in the preceding Shared Book Events, which
were examined. The individual interpretation also maintained the group's emphasis on illustrations.

Although illustration prominence was obvious, the largest amount of talk during this concept Shared Book Event pertained to "comment/meaning." A whopping 30.2% (35 out of 116) of all the codings represented this category. This is the largest amount of talk in this category during any of the examined Shared Book Events, regardless of genre. Perhaps this makes sense, as the concept is just that . . . a book of facts and information. Examples of comments categorized "content/meaning" are as follows:

T: Why do you think they cut the banana in half?
C: 'Cause there was only one banana left.
C: Then, they could both eat some.
T: What are they doing here?
C: eating pizza
T: They are cutting the pizza into four pieces. One-fourth plus one-fourth plus one-fourth and one-fourth is equal to one whole pizza.

Mrs. U. also expresses a "content/meaning" perspective during the Teacher Debriefing:

T: So, I was pointing out a phrase there and really, I could have stretched it even more and had a whole separate description of the banana. Carolyn added those words to her picture. Hard concept,
the text showed more than I thought it would.

T: That's dividing!

T: He gives such good information. He adds so much to the lesson (referring to one child's comment about fractions).

Compared to the kindergarten fictional narrative, this Shared Book Event representing the concept book had more than double the amount of talk devoted to "content/meaning" (30.2% compared to 13.7%). Although there were still abundant comments categorized "content/meaning" during the 1:1 Child Debriefings (19.4% or 7 out of 36 codings), this was the only Event where the individual interpretation revealed less "content/meaning" talk than during the Shared Book Events. Some of these comments were:

C: They keep cutting things in half. First, they had one whole, then they cut it into twos and then threes, then four.

C: Then, I was surprised that we knew what the green stuff was. It was a pear salad.

C: I like it because they make two for each of the kids and we all thought there was only one apple and they had to share it. I like it because they cut it in half so they each got some.

Much of the discussions during the Shared Book Event representing the concept book also involved background knowledge (14.7% or 17 out of 116). In contrast to Mrs. L.'s lead-ins in which a large discussion involving background
knowledge occurred, the comments within this Shared Book Event were interspersed throughout the session. Some of these comments are as follows:

C: It's called sharing. Maybe there was only one banana left.

C: I know what they could do with four pizzas.

C: They could each have two pieces.

C: Corn-on-the-cob . . . it's dangerous for kids.

T: Why is this dangerous for kids?

C: because they could burn their finger.

T: Who should boil the water for the corn?

C: your parents.

The amount of "background knowledge" talk during this concept book Event corroborated the data during the kindergarten fictional narrative Event in which 14.3% of the coding represented "background knowledge" in the Focus Data Set. Moreover, this represented category was comparable to the incidence of "background knowledge" during the other kindergarten Shared Book Event in which the other expository text was read and discussed (13.3%).

However, this amount differed during the 1:1 Child Debriefings, in which the number of codings representing the category "background knowledge" fell to 5.6% (2 out of 36). During the other kindergarten 1:1 Child Debriefings, this category representing "background knowledge" was both higher for the narrative, It's Groundhog Day (10.4%) and lower for the expository text told in narrative
style, Those Mean Nasty Dirty Downright Disgusting But . . . Invisible Germs (2.7%). Therefore, one can surmise that the category of "background knowledge" was represented with relative consistency across all three kindergarten Shared Book Events. However, this focus of talk within the Focus Data Set fluctuated during the individual interpretations.

The role of protagonist was played down in this concept book. However, there were characters eating the various foods in the photos on every page. The children during this Shared Book Event did refer to the boy, the girl, or the dog on several occasions. The amount of talk representing the category "characters" was 12.9% (15 out of 116 codings). Examples of comments coded in this manner are as follows:

T: What are these children doing?
C: eating a banana
C: It's a girl.
C: That was a boy.
T: What are they doing here?
C: eating pizza
T: Michael says he thinks they are eating too much. Do you think this boy and girl are eating too much? What are they doing with the leftovers?
C: They are feeding it to their dog.
This amount of talk pertaining to characters was what I would expect as dependent on the text structure. Specifically, during the Shared Book Event in which the narrative, *It's Groundhog Day*, was read and discussed, 26.2% (44 out of 168) of the codings were categorized "characters." This was a text in which the structure was totally dependent on the characters' actions. However, during the Shared Book Event in which the expository text on germs was represented, only 6.7% (7 out of 105 codings) referred to "character" comments. The structure of this text was of a more efferent perspective, in that facts and information on germs were related to the reader. The role of Beth as the five-year old was less significant than the content of the book, during the Shared Book Event.

However, during the individual Debriefings, this character emphasis increased for both the narrative and the expository text from the Shared Book Events (34.5% during the 1:1 Child Debriefings for the narrative and a 23.5% for the expository Debriefings). During the 1:1 Debriefings for the present concept book analysis, this amount of talk pertaining to the "characters" corroborated the Shared Book Event (11.1% compared to 12.9%). The children expressed "character" comments in the following examples:

C; I think they're eating too much when they eat that much. I think he did the rest the other day and I think he only did dinner. I think he didn't do the other ones (referring to the child eating the food in
other photos).

C: I like the characters in the book.

C: It surprised me when it wasn’t only the two kids. It was a dog, too.

During the Teacher Debriefing, Mrs. U. also referred to the characters:

T: There was a question as to what one character was. The haircut didn’t let us know. It was like a boy or a girl’s... it was a unisex haircut. We went with a girl. It was the children’s decision.

Although the data finding related to the "character" category was not surprising when examining this concept book Event, I was very surprised at the findings related to the "personal" category in the Focus Data Set. Only 10.3% (12 out of 116) of the talk pertained to the children’s or to Mrs. U.’s life-to text or text-to-life experiences. Examples of this focus of talk are as follows:

C: This is making me hungry. I could eat the pizza. I could eat the whole book.

C: Ugh... I hate cottage cheese.

T: Do you ever do that at home? (referring to the characters giving leftovers to their dog).

C: I give them to the cats.

T: I know some people who will give leftovers to their dogs and some are finicky about what they give to their dog and they only feed their dog, dog food. And, sometimes, they get really mad at you if you
This scarcity of talk about personal experiences during the Shared Book Event contrasts sharply with the expository narrative text on germs (43.8% or 46 out of 105). Moreover, this category was well represented during the fictional narrative Shared Book Event (22.6% or 38 out of 168).

However, during the 1:1 Child Debriefings, this amount of talk pertaining to personal experiences increased slightly to 13.9% (5 out of 36). Therefore, the individuals related more personal experiences to the information within the text during the 1:1 Child Debriefings, than the class did during the social context of the group. The data revealed an almost exact finding for the "personal" category in the Focus Data Set during the 1:1 Debriefings (13.7%) for the expository narrative of *Those Mean Nasty Dirty Downright Disgusting But . . . Invisible Germs*. A much larger percentage (24.1%) was revealed for the fictional narrative, *It's Groundhog Day*.

Mrs. U. also expressed personal experiences within the classroom as they related to the text during the Teacher Debriefing:

T: I pointed that out because whenever we do anything with math in kindergarten, they eat it up. Whenever I say "math" or "science," they really love it, first or second grade math.

She elaborated on the category pertaining to language, as it related to the text and the discussion:
T: This was a good time for them to talk about the different vocabulary in the book. They were using fractions so it was a good book.

T: So, I was pointing out a phrase there and really, I could have stretched it even more and had a whole description of the banana. Suzanne added those words to her picture. Hard concept, the text showed more than I thought it would.

There were more comments coded "language" (4.3% or 5 out of 116) for this concept Shared Book Event than for the other kindergarten Shared Book Events. The 1:1 Child Debriefings, representing the concept book, revealed a similar finding of 5.6% (2 out of 36). This corroborated a 5.9% for the Debriefings representing the kindergarten expository text, but contrasted with the 1:1 Child Debriefings representing the kindergarten fictional narrative in which there were no vocabulary nor language comments elicited by the children.

During the concept book Debriefings, the two comments were:

C: I like to hear what they say (referring to the characters).

C: I like the words because they went with the pictures.

Similar comments referring to language were discussed during the Shared Book Event:

T: That's what we call table scraps (referring to leftovers fed to the dog).

T: This word says "halves."
T: Interesting . . . Look at this! This word says "whole" and so does this word.

This text lent itself to a discussion about the words. The giant print on each page referred to the fraction illustrated in the photo. The children joined in and read whenever they could. The extension activity also was a language-related activity as the children labelled their diagrams of food with the equivalent fraction part.

There were very few comments related to the categories of "structure" and "social influence" within the Focus Data Set of this Shared Book Event representing a concept book. Only one comment (0.9% or 1 out of 116) was expressed in each category. Mrs. U. referred to what another child had said...

. . "Mike, Angie says she thinks they are eating too much. Do you think this boy and girl are eating too much?" The structure comment referred to the recipes at the end of the book:

T: Look at this. This is not only a math book, or a fraction book, it is also a recipe book!

There were no comments categorized "structure" nor "social influence" during the other kindergarten Shared Book Events. This dearth of comments coded in this manner carried over to the individual interpretation for only one group of the 1:1 Child Debriefings, It's Groundhog Day (the fictional narrative). In contrast, the individual Sessions representing the text of Those Mean Nasty Dirty
Downright Disgusting But . . . Invisible Germs revealed a 7.8% (4 out of 51) categorized "social influence" comments and a 2% (1 out of 51) denoting the "structure" category. In the present analysis representing the concept book Debriefings, the individual interpretation varied from the consensual whole group discussion. The "structure" category represented 11.1% (4 out of 36) of the codings within the Focus Data Set and an 8.3% (3 out of 36) represented comments coded "social influence." This data finding was quite interesting in that again, the individuals expressed comments spread across more categories during the Debriefings than the whole group did during the Events, as revealed in the data representing the other expository narrative text.

There were no comments coded "intertextual comparisons" for both the Concept Book Event and the Debriefings. This finding corroborated the other kindergarten Debriefings and the other expository book Event. It seems as if this category is the least represented in these kindergarten analyses within the Focus Data Set.

Type of Statement Data Set

There were many variations within this Data Set compared to the other two kindergarten Events. The "narrational" category in which information was restated from the text represented a huge amount of the discussion time-49% (49 out of 100 codings). In contrast, the other expository text reflecting this
category represented 26% (26 out of 100) of the codings and only 16.5% (27 out of 164) represented "narrational" for the narrative Shared Book Event (refer to FIGURE 32).

The explanatory category in which questions or responses clarified information or language represented 16% (16 out of 100) of the discussion time during the Shared Book Event of Eating Fractions. Typical comments of this type are:

T: I like him (referring to the author) because he took the pictures instead of drawing the illustrations. There are real people and real dogs and real food.

T: Do you know what they are going to do with four pieces of pizza? Each have one.

This explanatory category was less represented in the other kindergarten expository text Shared Book Event (6%) but more represented during the fictional narrative Shared Book Event (26.8% or 44 out of 164).

During the present analysis of the concept Shared Book Event, each of the interpretive and the personal categories represented 15% (15 out of 100) of the codings. The "interpretive" category reflects questions or comments that are inferential and involve a higher level of thinking. This 15% data finding corroborates both the other expository narrative text (17%) and the fictional narrative, in which the discussion talk was slightly less (11.6%). However, the
Eating Fractions
Expository Text / Concept Book
Type of Statement

Narrational - 49% (49 of 100)
Explanatory - 16% (16 of 100)
Interpretive - 15% (15 of 100)
Personal - 15% (15 of 100)
Evaluative - 3% (3 of 100)
Elaborative - 2% (2 of 100)
Associative - 0% (0 of 100)
Predictive - 0% (0 of 100)

FIGURE 32

Eating Fractions
time devoted to "personal" text-to-life and life-to-text experiences was much less during the concept Shared Book Event than during the narrative (25.6% or 42 out of 164) and during the other expository text Event (50% or 50 out of 100).

Some of the comments which were categorized "interpretive" are as follows;

T: Why do you think they cut the banana in half?
C: 'cause there was only one banana left.
C: Then, they could both eat some.
T: So, how did they solve their problem? There were two people.
C: It's called "sharing." Maybe there was only one banana left.

Although most of the discussion talk was categorized "narrational," "explanatory," "interpretive," and "personal," there were three comments coded "elaborative." This finding contrasted with the other kindergarten Events in which there were no comments categorized in this manner. During the Teacher Debriefing, Mrs. U. explained:

T: I thought it was interesting when they said, "They're eating too much!"

Only two comments from this Shared Book Event were categorized "elaborative" in which information was extended to a greater degree. There were no comments coded in this manner during the other expository Shared Book Event. However, during the fictional narrative Shared Book Event, the
discussion extending knowledge represented 9.8% (16 out of 164) of the talk.

There were no comments categorized "predictive" or "associative," representing the concept Shared Book Event. During the narrative Shared Book Event, 7.3% (12 out of 164) of the comments were categorized "predictive" as children were given the opportunity to guess what would happen next within the story plot.

In summary, the kindergarten Shared Book Event in which the concept book, Eating Fractions, was read and discussed had twice as much discussion time devoted to "content/meaning" talk than any other category within the Focus Data Set. This efferent orientation carried over to the individual interpretation. Comments which were categorized "illustrations" and "content/meaning" represented the most talk, with a 22.2% (illustrations) and a 19.4% (content/meaning) during the 1:1 Child Debriefings. The large number of illustration comments by the children could probably be attributed to the large, vivid photos in the text.

In contrast, during the other kindergarten nonfiction narrative text, most of the talk represented the personal category. During the fictional narrative Shared Book Event, the heavily represented category was "characters" (26.2%) with comments categorized "personal" also abundant (22.6% or 38 out of 168).

The ironic finding revealed in the 1:1 Child Debriefings analyses pertained to a comparison of the individual orientation to the consensual meaning within
the group. Although the "content/meaning" category was a much higher percentage during this concept Shared Book Event than the other kindergarten Shared Book Events, this same category was not nearly as abundant during the 1:1 Child Debriefings representing the concept book (19.4%) as during the fictional narrative (31%) or the other expository narrative text (35.3%). The "illustration" category had a much higher incidence of comments during the concept book Debriefings than the other two represented genres.

The data analysis in the Type of Statement Data Set revealed similar inconsistencies between the genres. Specifically, during the concept Shared Book Event, almost half of the discussion pertained to comments categorized "narrational" compared to exactly half of the comments during the Shared Book Event representing the expository narrative book on germs being categorized "personal." Most of the comments during the fictional narrative Shared Book Event were categorized "explanatory" (26.8%) and "personal" (25.6%).

Summary of Chapter V

In this section, I examined seven Shared Book Events consisting of four Events representing a first-grade classroom and three Events representing a kindergarten classroom. During these Shared Book Events, several types of genre were analyzed: three narratives (Oh, What a Thanksgiving, The Mitten, and It's Groundhog Day), one "classic" expository text (Let's Find Out About

My attempt was to explore the child’s path to literacy by looking across all the layers. The process of learning was examined through several lenses. The macroanalysis involved the community, the home, the classrooms, the teachers’ goals and beliefs, and the curriculum. The wholistic description presented an overview of all the Shared Book Events. The microanalysis of the actual Shared Book Events identified the moment by moment social interaction. Through the cultural lens, I discovered how and why children come to school prepared to learn to read as a way of life. Through the social lens, I learned what happens socially within the child’s immediate environment that influences reading within the social context of the Shared Book Event. Through the cognitive lens, I studied the children’s orientation perspectives as related to taking meaning from the text within a socially constructed, fun event.

These seven Shared Book Events were chosen for the microanalysis from an array of over seventy Shared Book Events, which I experienced as a participant-observer in a first grade classroom and a kindergarten classroom. By becoming a member of each of these classrooms, I was able to adopt an ethnographic stance in which to examine the child’s social processes, as well as
the individual orientation, on the path to literacy.

In Chapter VI, I will summarize my interpretations while discussing all this research with possible implications.
The purpose of this study was to explore the social and cognitive dimensions within Shared Book Events in which narrative and expository texts were represented. My motivation to understand this process stems from my years as a teacher of primary-aged children, my years as a parent of two children, and my time in helping pre-service and classroom teachers. Children do not learn to read overnight . . . the path they follow to literacy takes years. This path is embedded within the social world of their culture.

The Shared Book Event appears to be a favored method to becoming literate and this viewpoint is shared by teachers and parents alike. Snow and Ninio stress that storybook reading exposes a child "to more complex, more elaborate, and more decontextualized language than almost any other kind of interaction, and the ability to understand and to produce decontextualized language may be the most difficult and most crucial prerequisite to literacy (p. 118-119). As Snow stated earlier (1983), the problems children have with learning to read may be more from the fact that the language is decontextualized rather than from decoding the print. If parents and teachers read to their children, perhaps this problem could be solved and as Holdaway stated (1979), "Possibly the single most important activity for building the knowledge required
for eventual success in reading is reading aloud to children."

This read-aloud time was a favorite period of the day for me as well as for my students at school and my children at home. As an educational researcher interested in this process, I embarked on a journey myself. I needed to discover exactly what occurred during the Shared Book Event, how the social process contributed to this learning, and how the child’s orientation to the text differed from the whole group’s interpretation.

The results of this research have been a description of a particular suburban culture in the Midwest. The survey results described in Chapter IV provide the range of ways that teachers in this district are participating in Shared Book Events within their classrooms. Through an analysis of the survey results, I answered the first research question of my study:

How are teachers using Shared Book Sessions within their classrooms?

The results of the survey not only served as a means to answer this question, but it provided the frame and created the context for the study. The teachers with whom I worked and the classrooms in which I became a member were drawn from the survey. In the first part of this summary chapter, I will provide a "profile of the most typical way" (Kantor, 1994) that teachers and children are participating in Shared Book Events.
The macroanalysis of this community of teachers and their classrooms led me further along my journey and warranted the microanalysis of the Shared Book Events. At the time the design of this study was created, there truly was a dearth of information on Shared Book Events in which the expository text was the represented genre. Noteworthy research now, however, has helped fill this void (Pappas & Brown, 1987; Pappas, 1993, 1991a, 1991b, 1990; Kobrin, 1987). I wished to study Shared Book Events in a different way, however, in answering my second and third research questions:

How are the different genres represented and treated by teachers?
How do children construct meaning during the Shared Book Events involving narrative as well as the expository text? What are the possible variations occurring?

Unlike the previous research, I examined these questions from three different perspectives: the researcher's, the teachers', and the children's. The Shared Book Event, in which different genres were represented, was investigated. The Shared Book Event was also examined as a core literacy event with many variables contributing to the social construction of literacy within this Event.

In Chapter V, I described the patterns generated from my data, while providing transcript excerpts demonstrating these patterns. In the present
chapter, I will present an overview of these patterns. I will discuss my research findings with implications for instruction, as well.

The Journey Through the Data

The Shared Book Event, was examined in three distinct phases. The macroanalysis, consisting of the community, and the range of ways that teachers are using Shared Book Events within their classrooms was examined as Phase I. It was during this phase that I conducted the district-wide survey representing ninety-one teachers to discover the nature of Shared Book Events and related activities in kindergarten, first, and second grade classrooms.

The macroanalysis conducted during the Phase I of this study led to a wholistic overview analysis of all the Shared Book Events within a 5 1/2 month period in one first grade and one Kindergarten classroom. Data analysis procedures consisted of a systematic search for the commonalities and differences within 43 Shared Book Events. These videotapes of the Events were transcribed and field notes were reviewed. The procedures or routines within these Events were then described in wholistic terms.

From the data findings of Phase II, I proceeded with the microanalysis of Phase III. In this phase, seven Shared Book Events served as the frame for an in-depth study of dialogue patterns. The commonalities and differences within
these transcribed Events produced distinct patterns. Two data sets consisting of the Focus of Statements and Type of Statements emerged from this data. Unlike Phase I and Phase II, in which literacy events were examined within the context of the community and the classrooms as a way of life (Cochran Smith, 1984; Kantor, Miller, & Fernie, 1992), this situated event within Phase III provided the frame in which to examine the moment-to-moment social construction. The culture of the Shared Book Event was examined as a social process in helping children become literate. The children's individual orientation perspective, as well as the teachers' reflections of the Shared Book Events were also studied.

Phase I
The Community

The cultural and ethnic backgrounds of people within this community include Caucasion of European heritage, Jewish, African-American, Indian, and Oriental. Although there were differences among these groups of people, there were also many similarities. Of these similarities, perhaps the most salient was the overriding emphasis on education, marked by the adults' educational attainment and value of literacy as a way of life which was passed on to their children. Consistent with this educational background, most of the adults are employed in white-collar professional occupations.
Therefore, within this community, literacy is a way of life. Children see their parents using literacy throughout the day. Parents just naturally assume that children will become literate, but this process is not laissez-faire. Parents and teachers work at guiding these children in acquiring a "what literacy means to me" attitude.

Shared Book Events Throughout the Classrooms
The Survey Results

By conducting this district-wide survey of all ninety-one teachers, I was able to examine the nature of Shared Book Events used by teachers in kindergarten through second grade classrooms. Although the data revealed a range of ways the teachers within this district conducted their Shared Book Events (refer to Chapter IV for the analysis of these results), for this summary chapter, I will present a profile of the typical Shared Book Event within the classrooms, as reported by the teachers.

The books are chosen by the teacher for a particular theme (holidays, seasons, the five senses, safety, health, etc.), an author (Hutchins, Keats, Carle, Martin) unit of study, or children's needs and interests.

One longer Shared Book Event (reading and much discussion) is conducted daily with a shorter Shared Book Event later in the school day, as
The sessions occur first thing in the morning, later in the morning before lunch, or in the afternoon, depending on the special (gym, music, art, or library) or other scheduled activities for that day. When reading the book, the teacher sits on a chair in front of the children and the children sit in a group on the floor.

The book is often introduced with a poem, an object related to the text, or a discussion of background knowledge as it relates to the text. This lead-in time is followed by a book-related discussion in which the title, author, illustrator, or dedication are stated.

Throughout the Shared Book Event, the teacher asks the children questions or makes comments and the children are encouraged to ask questions or comment. Active participation by the children is always welcome. The discussion pertains to life-to-text and text-to-life experiences, background experiences as they relate to the text, prediction/anticipation comments, the characters, vocabulary explanation, the illustrations, and meaning clarification.

Many literary conventions are also discussed throughout the Shared Book Event. These consist of the previously-mentioned book-related features, as well as genre, medal winners, plot, word phrases, visual images, related books, phonics skills, and library skills.

Extension activities in the form of comparison charts, writing activities, drama, art, music, whole class discussions, and meaning recall activities often
follow the Shared Book Event. The writing activities consist of journals, point-of-
view papers, and spin-off stories. Sequence strips and comparison charts would
be two examples of the comprehension recall activities.

The favorite genres read by this "profile" teacher are narrative, poetry, and
information books. Carle, Martin, Keats, Hutchins, Lionni, Kellogg, dePaolo,
Mayer, Rylant, Cleary, Sendak, Gibbons, and Burningham are several of the
favored authors. Several of the favorite books consist of:


Polar Bear, Polar, What Do You Hear?, Bill Martin, Jr.

Chicka Chicka Boom Boom, Bill Martin, Jr.

The Snowy Day, Ezra Jack Keats

The Mixed-Up Chameleon, Eric Carle

The Very Busy Spider, Eric Carle

Swimmy, Leo Lionni

Pumpkin, Pumpkin, Pat Hutchins

It's Groundhog Day, Steven Kroll

The Indian in the Cupboard, Lynn Reid-Banks

The children are permitted to read or "join-in" reading during many Shared
Book Events. The circumstances in which this occurs are when a Big Book is
represented, when several copies of the book are available, when the text is
predictable, when the book is a repeat reading, or when children share a book they can already read. Almost always, children have access to the book after it has been read and discussed during the Shared Book Event.

Several instructional outcomes were expressed by this "profile" teacher. These were that the children gain an appreciation for literature, they have fun, they gain much information, they learn the language of books, and the children learn written language conventions. Other mentioned outcomes were that the children develop listening and speaking skills, learn to cooperate within a group situation, gain affective and cognitive knowledge, become aware of illustrations, and that the children develop oral fluency, expression, and strategies from the teacher as model.

Several goals which this teacher deems important are that the children develop:

- an enjoyment and love of books
- knowledge
- appreciation of literature
- good strategies
- cooperative learning and a sense of community
- active participation
- experiential backgrounds
- success
- imagination and creative thinking
- sight word vocabulary
- listening skills
- vocabulary
- gain different perspectives
The Shared Book Event can also serve as a setting for other outcomes. Diagnostic information is also obtained by the teacher during the Shared Book Event. These outcomes are: concepts of print, comprehension, listening focus, reading strategies, participation, plot, theme, and character analysis, experiential background, phonetic skills, vocabulary development, critical thinking and questioning, language usage, book knowledge, risk-taking, and fluency. Even though the Shared Book Event is a whole class activity, this time period seems to be an invaluable source is assessing children's needs.

The most evident strength in the Shared Book Event is enjoyment and excitement. This seems to be the favorite time of the day for some of the students. Other related strengths are: children become listeners, enhanced comprehension, cooperative learning, participation and involvement, varied literature selection, enhanced vocabulary development, theme related and a springboard for extension activities, as well as leading to independent learning for the children.

Although these obvious strengths are inherent within the Shared Book Event, several weaknesses were also expressed. There are not enough Big Books and not enough multiple copies of the books so all the children can see the print. However, it was felt that the Shared Sessions are meeting the children's needs.
Various improvement techniques, such as better extension activities, more repeat readings, reading with smaller groups based on needs, pulling out more skills, sharing with a colleague, and more observation of children's responses, were expressed as ways to improve the Shared Book experience.

Therefore, I have provided a "profile" of the nature of the typical Shared Book Event, its strengths, weaknesses, diagnostic outcomes, as well as the favored genres, authors, and books. From the teachers' descriptions of the quantity and quality of the Shared Book Events, it seems that teachers in this area are teaching literacy through whole group instruction as the children interact with each other with the consensual goal of interpreting the text. From the teachers' responses, the discussion appears to be as important as the reading. However, based upon the previous studies cited (Hall, 1971; Langer et al. 1990), these teachers seem to be atypical of teachers nationally. These teachers who responded to this survey relate that their goals and objectives through the Shared Book Events are being met. It appears that they are using all types of genre within their classrooms. Nonfiction, fiction, poetry, as well as holiday books were represented by 100% of the teachers who responded to the survey. Additional genres of fantasy, biography, and fairy tale were represented by 95%, 90%, and 90% (respectively) of these respondents. Historical fiction was represented by 80% of the teachers during their Shared Book Events.
The major findings of Phase I of the journey through the data can be summarized as follows:

1. The kindergarten, first, and second grade teachers within this community have established goals and beliefs with respect to the Shared Book Events and literacy within their classrooms. At the present time, these goals and beliefs are being met.

2. Unlike previous studies (Hall, 1971; Langer et al. 1990), teachers in this district are conducting Shared Book Events on a daily basis, and often more than once a day. No discernible pattern was found in the scheduled times the Shared Book Events were conducted across classrooms.

3. Repeat readings of the same story were sometimes conducted by 60% of the responding teachers.

4. Many different types of genre are chosen by these teachers. The favored genres are: poetry, narrative, and informational, followed by fantasy, biographical, and fairy tale selections.

5. When choosing books, children's interests and links to thematic units are determining factors. Other considerations are: children's
needs, curriculum guidelines, other teachers' or parents' suggestions, and Caldecott winners.

6. All the responding teachers love Big Books.

7. Teachers have favorite authors as well as favorite books (refer to Figure 3).

8. During the Shared Book Event, the usual organizational format is for the children to sit on the floor as the teacher sits in a chair or a rocker.

9. Children are active participants in this social context. In the majority of the classrooms, children may question or comment at anytime during the Shared Book Event. A whole range of type of comments and questions are encouraged by the teachers.

10. The talk during the Shared Book Event is about many things. These consist of comments pertaining to structure such as theme, plot, setting, discussions of text-to-life and life-to-text experiences (Cochran-Smith, 1984), background experiences, related books, predictions, book-handling ability, and phonics skills.

11. Extension activities accompany the reading on a frequent basis in 63% of these classrooms. The extensions always occur in 26%.
12. All of the responding teachers felt that children have fun, gain an appreciation for literature, and gain information as instructional outcomes of the Shared Reading Sessions. Other favored outcomes were that children learn the language of books and written language conventions.

13. The teachers listed as their most important goals:

- enjoyment/love of books
- knowledge/concept development
- appreciation of literature
- language of books/written conventions
- modelling of good strategies
- cooperative learning/sense of community

14. Teachers do assess diagnostic information regarding their students during the Shared Book Events. Even though this is a whole class activity, this time period seems to be an invaluable source in assessing children's needs.

15. Enjoyment and excitement were the most-listed strengths in the shared reading procedures. Responding teachers also expressed that the Shared Book Event helped children become readers and felt the time afforded children the opportunity to choose books they were comfortable with.
16. All of the responding teachers felt the Shared Book Events were meeting their needs at this time, but 16% stated they would like to have multiple copies of the book so all children could see. Several teachers lamented that there are not enough Big Books.

17. To improve upon these sessions, teachers felt they could provide better extension activities, go to workshops, read professional literature, or share ideas with a colleague. They learned about the Shared Book Events through journals, workshops, college courses, colleagues, or personal experiences.

18. In the two classrooms in which I became a member, the Shared Book Events were a "way-of-life" as their emphasis extended into other areas of the curriculum. These sessions reflected the unit of study and were an integral context for learning.

In summary, the survey results provided a systematic way of looking at the nature of Shared Book Events throughout the classrooms representing 2,330 students within this district. The survey provided the frame and context in which I was able to examine the children by peering through the cultural lens. By being a member of this community myself, I assumed an ethnographic perspective in ascertaining the values and beliefs that underlie and organize the activities and literacies of the children and adults who comprise this community.
(Schiefflin & Cochran-Smith, 1984). I examined the "what literacy means to me" value and the variety of ways that children acquire this attitude. These beliefs and attitudes not only create the context for the Shared Book Event, but they affect the social processes within the event.

During the Phase I macroanalysis, I have described the range of ways that teachers within this district are using the Shared Book Events. I have specified the characteristics of the Shared Book Events, as reported by the teachers who responded to the survey. It appears that these teachers are representing different genres within their Shared Book Events. How these genres are represented and treated by the teachers and how the children construct meaning during the Shared Book Events will now be discussed as I proceed with data findings from Phase II.

The Journey Through the Data
Phase II

I will now focus on data findings related to question two and question three:

2. How are the different genres represented and treated by teachers?

3. How do children construct meaning during the Shared Book Events involving narrative as well as the expository text? What are the possible variations occurring?
I had already examined the community and the range of ways that teachers were using Shared Book Events within their community. By peering through the cultural lens, I had already peeled back the layers of the community and the homes. It was now time to peer through the social lens as well as the cognitive lens. How are the social dynamics within the group contributing to the children's thinking processes as they reach a consensual goal of taking meaning from the text? What contributes to this process and what changes are evident in the different genres?

When I began this research study, I had only had four research studies under my belt and they had all been conducted as partial requirements for upper-level seminar classes during my graduate training:

- The Unique Learning Styles of Two Children when Learning to Read
- Literacy Within a Family
- The Writing Process from a Developmental Perspective
- The Focus of Four Children During Read Aloud Times

The methodologies were distinct for each of these studies. The data collection techniques differed, as well. However, with all of these studies, as well as the present one, my data collection and data analysis were intertwined throughout the study. These naturalistic studies were examined by a method of constant comparison analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). As Lincoln and Guba
(1985, p. 335) cite Goetz and LeCompte:

"this strategy combines inductive category coding with a simultaneous comparison of all social incidents observed. As social phenomena are recorded and classified, they also are compared across categories. Thus, the discovery of relationships, that is, hypothesis generation, begins with the analysis of initial observations, undergoes continuous refinement throughout the data collection and analysis process, and continuously feeds back into the process of category coding. As events are constantly compared with previous events, new typological dimensions, as well as new relationships, may be discovered."

At no point did this continuous and simultaneous collection of data intertwine with the processing of the data apply more than the present study. This learning experience was a tremendous undertaking in which the frame of the study (the survey within the community) led to a more situated-specific analysis and the necessity to transfer frames. It is this second frame, all of the Shared Book Events, that comprise the Phase II Data collection. The frame of Phase II was the context of all the videotaped Shared Book Events, which represented 23 events in the first grade classroom and 20 in the kindergarten classroom. New data collection techniques were used for this Phase. These consisted of field notes, videotapes, transcripts and artifacts. The patterns that emerged from this data consisted of commonalities and differences within the procedures of the Shared Book Events. The procedures or routines within the context of the Shared Book Event (refer to TABLE 12 and TABLE 13) were then analyzed by
reviewing all videotapes, reviewing the transcripts, as well as the field notes. These routines were then characterized in terms of broad patterns exemplified by the work of Heath (1983, 1982) and Cochran-Smith (1984) (as cited by Dickinson & Smith, 1994). Interaction patterns were generated from this data revealing lead-in differences, reading style variations, as well as discussion techniques. I will now summarize this wholistic description of all the Shared Book Events, which occurred in two very special classrooms.

Following the Data Path
The Two Classrooms

The survey, additionally, provided the context in which I was able to select the teachers and classes in which I would become a member for the next six months.

Both the kindergarten and the first grade classroom were alive with print. Extension activities to the Shared Book Events were in evidence throughout the rooms as well as out in the halls. This work took many forms:

"marbleized" snow pictures accompanied the childrens stories patterned after The Snowy Day (Keats)

art work illustrating animals above and below (Keep Looking, Selsun & Hunt)

stories of the children’s legends patterned after dePaola’s Native
American legends for children
stories describing Thanksgiving as a Pilgrim or Native American child
comparison charts depicting different versions of the same story
papers describing what the children are thankful for and how they will spend Thanksgiving Day
descriptions of Hanukkah events
letters to Santa
drawing of germs with attached labels (*Those Mean Nasty Dirty Downright Disgusting . . . But Invisible Germs*, Rice)
fraction food papers (*Eating Fractions*, Macmillan)
decorated mittens (*The Mitten*, Tresselt)
mittens with stories written inside them patterned after *The Mitten*, Brett
pictures with sentences of how the children prefer Abraham Lincoln—with a beard or without a beard (*A picture Book of Abraham Lincoln*, Adler)

These various extension activities as I looked around the rooms demonstrated the significance of these Shared Book Events to these children. Other extension activities which weren't as obvious since they could not be hung on a wall were:

cooking Native American bread
dramatizing Bill Martin, Jr.'s depicted animals
buddy reading a reenacted story
poetry notebooks
Interest centers and learning stations were situated throughout the classrooms, which also reflected the Shared Book Events. For example, during the Native American unit in the first grade classroom, these activities consisted of: a Kachina doll art activity, finding a pattern in the Indian necklaces, weaving a mat, and Q-Tip Indian paintings. The listening center located in the first grade classroom also had a book with several copies so children could listen and read a book related to the one represented in the shared Book Event or the actual book.

Therefore, the classrooms illustrate the relevance of the Shared Book Events. These sessions extend throughout the curriculum and into other activities throughout the day. The Shared Book Events represent an integral activity around which the classroom revolves. A cultural context or way of life within these classrooms was already firmly established before I entered the picture.

The Teachers' Goals and Beliefs

Mrs. L. (the first grade teacher) listed her three most important goals of the Shared Book Event as;

1. To instill within the children a love and excitement about literature/sense of story/authors.
2. To model fluent reading with the use of appropriate problem solving strategies.

3. To teach the children knowledge and the ability to gain knowledge through reading good literature-to expand experiential background.

It is her belief that as children participate in the Shared Book Event, they gain many benefits, affectively, as well as cognitively. Some of these benefits are fun, an appreciation and a love for literature, information gain, knowledge of written language conventions and the language of books, strategy modelling, as well as modelling of fluency and expression.

The one weakness of the Shared Book Event expressed by Mrs. L. was the fact that she did not own more Big books. She feels it is a tremendous advantage if the children can see the print while the book is represented. Then, the children not only learn the language of books, but they can learn to decode during a social, interactive whole-class event.

Like Mrs. L. (the first grade teacher), Mrs. U. also feels the children benefit from the fun, the information, develop an appreciation for literature, and learn written language conventions as well as the language of books. In her opinion, the biggest advantage of the Shared Book Event is the excitement that it generates within the children in developing a love for reading. Mrs. U's three most important goals are:
1. "All children can participate and feel success.

2. Increase comprehension by including and welcoming all responses.

3. Provide a role model for developing a sense of story and concepts of print.

In many ways, these two whole language teachers have definite goals and beliefs, which are similar, regarding the Shared Book Event. They feel that children's interpretations of text should be conveyed through a variety of extension activities. To promote active participation by all students, a high degree of talk is encouraged. This talk involves relating the text to the students' lives, bringing in background knowledge, as well as intertextual linking. Problem solving and critical thinking questions posited by the teachers guide children to higher thinking levels. Moreover, both teachers stress the importance of the Shared Book Event as an integral part of the reading program.

Through the social context, children not only learn from the teacher, but from each other. Idea sheathing, as one thought leads to another, fosters a sense of community within the Shared Book Event. Learning is not left to chance . . . it is structured through questions or comment strategies promoting active involvement of all students. The Shared Book Events as they extend into all areas of the curriculum are becoming a way of life within the classrooms.
Along the Path
The Curriculum

As previously stated, many subject areas reflected the topic or unit of study represented in the Shared Book Event. For example, a science experiment of making snow accompanied the books on the winter topic. Baking Indian bread was an extension activity to the Native American books. Work with foods and fractions went along with *Eating Fractions* (Macmillan).

The extension activities, as they emanated from the Shared Book Event, occurred every day in the first grade classroom and most days (an average of 3 out of 5) in the kindergarten classroom. The children seemed to enjoy these activities, as the social period afforded children the opportunity to discuss the book, share their interpretations with others, and to reflect upon the meaning from different perspectives. By participating in conversations within a small group context, they talked about books and about what the books mean to them.

These extension activities took the form of art, writing, drama, mathematics, or music. Knowledge was expressed not only in its verbocentric form (language as the path to literacy) but in multiple ways of knowing. Researchers who have examined the semiotic theory or sign systems to learning are: Harste, Short & Burke, 1988; Leland & Harste, 1994; and Gardner, 1990. These researchers contend that all learners should have the opportunity to
express their work in multiple ways and through multiple interpretations. The children, therefore, gain new perspectives. "The movement between and among sign systems is known as transmediation. Transmediation occurs when meanings formed in one communication system are recast in the context and expression planes of a new sign system (for example, we take something we know verbally and recast it in art)." (Leland & Harste, 1994, p. 340).

Therefore, literacy as stemming from the Shared Book Event, is integrated throughout the curriculum. Children were given the opportunity to express their knowledge and share their interpretations with each other as they worked in small groups throughout the day. The social dimensions of the whole group learning during the Events were extended over to other activities in which the frame was the small group context. Children at this time had less teacher supervision and more social interaction with peers. Cooperation without teacher intervention was more obvious during this period of the day than during the Shared Book Event when the teacher guided children as they interacted with the text directly.

A Wholistic Description and Overview of all the Shared Book Events

The children looked forward to the Shared Book Events. In fact, this time appeared to be a favorite period during the day. The books were entertaining
and everyone was encouraged to participate in the discussion.

To examine how the children and the teacher interact during the social context of Shared Book Events in two classrooms, I videotaped 23 events in the first grade classroom and 20 in the kindergarten classroom. All of these sessions were transcribed. These tapes were then analyzed according to the following criteria within each event: Basis for Selection, Book Genre, Lead-in, Reading, Discussion, and Extension Activity (refer to TABLE 12 and TABLE 13 in Chapter V).

All of the first grade events were an integral part of a particular unit of study. These units consisted of holidays, seasons, and an intertextual comparison unit. The kindergarten books were chosen based on units for only some of the Events. The units represented were the seasons and the five senses. Books were also read depicting one-day holidays such as Valentine’s Day, the Chinese New Year, Groundhog’s Day, George Washington’s and Abraham Lincoln’s birthday. Books representing current happenings such as Black History Month or the Olympics were chosen, as well as books chosen with the curriculum guidelines considered. Mrs. U. also read many books that I termed "experiential" in that these specific books were about the children's day-to-day experiences. Examples of this type of book were topics on losing a tooth and germs. Several Big Books were represented for enjoyment and decoding
purposes.

Therefore, books chosen by these two teachers were usually within a particular unit of study or were chosen for a one day fun holiday. Mrs. U. also chose several others for different reasons.

The genre of the books varied. Of the 24 transcribed events of the first grade classroom (2 books were within one Shared Book Event), 18 of the 24 were fictional narrative. One of these books was a repeat reading (Oh, What a Thanksgiving). However, within this narrative genre, there were 6 folktales. Three books would be classified as poetry, one as a biography, and only two were expository books in the "classic" sense. Specifically, these two books had expository text characteristics included as: patterns of texture, such as present verb tense, co-classification, and an abundant amount of descriptions; and, patterns of global structure, such as topic presentation, description of attributes, characteristic events, and final summary (Pappas, 1991).

Mrs. U., on the other hand, chose many concept books. Of her 33 represented books, almost half of these (17) were concept books. Eleven books were classified as fictional narrative, one as poetry, two as biography, and two as nonfiction narratives. Therefore, Mrs. U's favored book, during the weeks that I was a member in her classroom, was the concept book followed by the fictional narrative. It was true that many different genres were represented in their
Shared Book Events (as the teachers reported on the survey), but there were a limited number of "classic" expository text Shared Book Events.

In analyzing the lead-in, the reading and the discussion for all of the Shared Book Events in both grades, I adopted a wholistic characterization approach similar to that described by Dickinson & Smith, 1994. In their study examining Book Reading Events of low-income children, three distinct approaches to reading were identified:

1. Co-Construction Approach which was characterized by much talk as books are read.
2. Didactic Interactional Approach which was characterized by little talk and literal recall of the text.
3. Performance-Oriented Style which was characterized by talk before and after the reading, but no talk during the "performance" of the reading.

The lead-in strategies used by these teachers were different across teachers but the same, regardless of genre for each teacher. Specifically, Mrs. L.'s (first grade teacher) were efferent-oriented in that background knowledge was consistently discussed during events when the represented genre was expository, but there were also events when the narrative was represented in which background knowledge was discussed. However, this was dependent on the context: the previous day's event, the order of books within the unit, and the children's needs. During the three videotaped Events in which nonfiction was the genre, the lead-in was always from an efferent perspective.
Other lead-in discussions during the first grade events were intertextual comparisons, text-to-life and life-to-text (Cochran-Smith, 1984) experiences, the game of "Twenty Questions" pertaining to an attribute box, and book-related discussions, involving the author, book, or illustrations.

Conversely, Mrs. U's favored lead-in discussion was book-related. The author, title, and illustrator were stated. Often, the children discussed the illustrations or the book's cover. Several times, poetry was recited as part of the lead-in, background knowledge was discussed, text-to-life or life-to-text experiences were related, or objects related to the text were examined (examples of this were footprints, winter jackets, or the red envelope the Chinese people pass out to celebrate the New Year).

Therefore, the lead-ins for the Shared Book Events in these two classrooms were similar in that many types were evident. However, the degree in which these types were represented varied across the classrooms. Mrs. L's favored lead-in was of an efferent perspective in which background knowledge was discussed. Mrs. U's adopted style was as a discussion of book-related information. The duration of the lead-in also differed greatly between the two classrooms and I attribute this to the children's developmental levels. Mrs. L.'s lead-in time was often of five-to-ten minutes in length. Mrs. U.'s was rarely over three minutes long.
The reading styles during all of the Events were similar for both teachers. Specifically, the text was read by the teacher, as she held it up so the children could examine the illustrations. This style was consistent across genres by both teachers. However, more collaborative reading occurred in the kindergarten classroom, as the Big Books and easy-text concept books were conducive for the children to read along. In the first grade Shared Book Events, the text was more difficult. However, children were able to join-in on The Gingerbread Man refrain and the sequence of characters' line, as well as during the lyrical poem of The Twelve Days of Christmas. One child read his recently published book (from the school publishing shop) as part of the lead-in for one of the Shared Book Events.

Therefore, the data finding representing the readings of all the Shared Book Events did not corroborate one of the survey results. The children were rarely facilitators or readers of the text. Collaborative reading did occur during several Events in the kindergarten classroom, but only for a couple of the Events during the first grade Sessions.

For the wholistic characterization patterns describing the discussions of all the shared Book Events, Mrs. L. adopted the Co-Construction Interactive Style (Dickinson & Smith, 1994). This discussion approach exemplified a large degree of conversation during the reading of the text. However, unlike the
Dickinson & Smith (1994) classification criteria, this talk was also present before and after the reading for the purposes of my discussion description. The children and Mrs. L. contributed to the discussion during the Shared Book Events. Mrs. L. asked more questions during this interactive process, but the questions were asked with definite purposes. However, this discussion was much more than a teacher-directed question child-answer period. The children were encouraged to participate at anytime during the Shared Book Event. For example, Barbara got up during the event, walked to the book, pointed to an illustration to prove her point, and commented: (from The Mitten Shared Book Event)

C: She has a little bridge by her house and I think she is pretending these are flowers so she makes sort of a nice house. So, this bridge, she can sort of walk up it, so she doesn't have to jump high (referring to the illustration).

This comment led to a discussion on landscaping.

At two other points during this same event children initiated topic changes:

C: They are all beside the windows.

T: Oh, so they have windows.

C: I just wanted to show you something.

T: Oh, back here?
C: Yes, the bridge is breaking.

T: Oh, the bridge is breading. Gina noticed that some of the landscaping from the strain of the weight of the people is breaking. Well, let's see.

Similar to the "tacit" rules of group interactive styles which were examined in other studies (Cochran-Smith, 1984; Roser & Martinez, 1985), the children participated in the discussion as their thoughts or experiences related to the text. The children at this point in time already knew the socially-accepted rules within the group . . . Mrs. L. expected the conversation to relate to the text. This tacit understanding is consonant to the findings of Martinez and Teale (1989) in that children have a tendency to learn what the teacher focuses on, and children respond how they perceive the teacher wants them to respond (Green & Harker, 1982).

All of the Shared book discussions in Mrs. L.'s first grade classroom followed this Co-Construction Interactive style within the broad wholistic Data Category, except one. In this Shared Book Event, the text represented was The Twelve Days of Christmas (Brett, 1986). It was during this discussion that a Co-narrational style was characterized. Specifically, this text is a lyrical poem and lended itself to Mrs. L. and the children singing the words as they examined the illustrations. This provided a context in which much less discussion occurred.
If discussion had occurred, the flow of the song would have been impeded.

In Mrs. U.'s kindergarten class, I also found the discussion style to be directly related to the text. For example, during the Shared Book Events in which the represented text was one that the children could read along because of the easy language, the wholistic style was categorized Co-narrational. The children and Mrs. U. "read" (or memorized) the text in unison. A discussion would have impeded the flow of the language. In fact, during the first reading of The Farm Concert (Cowley, 1983), a distinctive Co-construction style was evident. However, during the repeat reading, the style shifted to that of Co-narrational. The children, during the successive reading, were familiar enough with the text to "read" along.

The interesting thing about these two distinct discussion styles evident during the various Shared Book Events, is that Mrs. U. may have subconsciously chosen these concept books so the children could participate more in the reading, with the inverse proportion of participating less in the discussion. At no time during the Teacher Debriefings and during my weeks in this kindergarten classroom did Mrs. U. discuss the different approaches. Perhaps she was not aware of this shift herself. It was obvious the children benefitted from both experiences.
Therefore, in Mrs. U.'s kindergarten classroom during the Shared Book Event in which a narrative was represented, the style of discussion was always of a Co-construction category, which is consistent with Mrs. L.'s narrative discussion style. However, during the Shared Book Events in which a limited text easy-to-follow-along concept book was read, this style shifted to co-narrational with both teacher and children "reading" the text. Therefore, the discussion style within these classrooms could be classified as genre-specific, but only when the concept book is considered a class of its own. Moreover, all Shared Book Events in which the narratives were represented across both classrooms were categorized Co-construction. Teachers and children participated in the talk before the text was read, during the reading at intervals, and following the reading. This style of talk is somewhat different, however, to the findings of several studies in which home literacy events were examined (Bloome, 1985; Taylor & Strickland, 1986; Altwerger, et al., 1985; and Teale, 1986). In these home literacy events, a collaborative interaction or a negotiation process is at work, in which parent and child work together to reach a shared meaning of the text. The child affects the parent as much as the parent affects the child, as the meaning is jointly constructed. Therefore, the cognitive processing is affected by the social interactional exchanges between parent and child. The literacy learning in these homes occurs with child and parent on
equal footing.

The Shared Book Events in the present study, although there did exist a high incidence of child-initiated talk, still represented a teacher-controlled social interaction within teacher expectations. However, it appears to me that the literacy learning within these events were not as teacher-dominated as the events described by Wells (1986) in his seminal research on the contrast between home and school literacy events. In this study, Wells concludes that children in the British schools were not given the same negotiation privileges as in the homes, with less talk affecting not only the process, but the knowledge. However, the teachers in this study did have the primary role in conducting these Shared Book Events, but the children also exhibited many instances when they influenced the course of conversation. "Negotiation privileges" did occur.

Based upon the findings generated from the wholistic descriptive data within Phase II, I needed to focus in on the similarities and differences of the discussion within the Shared Book Events in which different genres were represented. In order to systematically describe this data, I felt it necessary to explicitly categorize the conversation patterns as to type and focus. The data findings revealed several distinct patterns which led to an analysis using a detailed coding system similar to that of Roser & Martinez (1985) and Morrow (1988). The frame of all Shared Book Events within two classrooms has now
been further refined to seven Shared Book Events constituting the frame of Phase III. The microanalysis of conversation patterns representing the "moment to moment" social interaction is examined at this time.

Phase III
Microanalysis of Seven Shared Book Events

The design of Phase III led to the microanalysis of two delineated Data Set: Focus of Statement Data Set and Type of Statement Data Set.

Within the final phase of this study, are also interwoven two subsections. The primary focus of one subsection is the use of theoretical sampling (also referred to as purposeful sampling by Lincoln & Guba, 1985) to maximize information depending on particular "ebb and flow of information" as the study was being carried out. It was during this subsection that children were debriefed immediately following the Shared Book Event. This interview process, as defined by Dexter (1970) in Lincoln & Guba (1985) is a conversation with a purpose. Two of the purposes applied to the present study were "obtaining the here-and-now constructions of persons, events, activities, organizations, feelings, motivations, claims, concerns, and other entities or reconstructions of such entities as experienced in the past" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 268). I found during the data collection/analysis procedures of the Shared Book Events that I was unable to assess the child's individual orientation perspectives within the
social context. Therefore, I pulled children from this context with a definite purpose. This purposeful sampling enabled me to come to grips with the children's thinking process and preferred orientation perspective as they related to the previous Shared Book Events.

The other subsection of Phase III Data Analysis was the theoretical sampling of the teachers as the final perspective of the Shared Book Events. It was during this period that teachers discussed how they felt about the events: why they chose the book, how the lesson went, were their goals met?, etc. I will now continue with a discussion of this Phase III.

The data presented in Chapter V indicate that children and their teacher are engaged in meaningful literacy learning processes within the social context of the Shared Book Events. Data analysis procedures aimed at understanding the link between these processes and social interaction focused on identifying the patterns within the dialogue and the role of social influence within these patterns. The patterns suggested ten categories within the conversation (refer to TABLE 5):

Across all seven of the analyzed Shared Book Events, more of the discussion talk represented the personal category than any other categories. This was largely because personal comments were made nearly 40% more often during the expository readings than any other focus of comments. While not the
most commonly observed category in the narrative genre, personal comments occurred often enough (19.5%) to suggest that much talk relating to personal experiences, as well as to feelings, did extend across genres. As you will recall, both Mrs. L. and Mrs. U. related the book information to the children's experiences. Both teachers expressed the fact during the Teacher Debriefings that if children internalize the information and apply it to situations within their own lives, they are more likely to remember it and understand it better. They also asked the children often for the affective perspective – how would they feel in that situation. Perhaps this occurred more often in the expository Shared Book Events than in the narrative events because of the teachers perceptions that children would likely experience greater difficulty in comprehending the expository text if they were not to focus on personal experiences. In fact, the percent of personal comments observed in the expository Shared Book Events were 56% more than the percent of personal comments elicited during the fictional narrative events. This was generally true regardless of whether the expository book was written in narrative form (*Squanto and the First Thanksgiving*) or in expository form (*Let's Find Out About Winter*).

Conversely, the Shared Book Event in which the concept book, *Eating Fractions* was represented, generated the fewest personal comments of any expository event. In review, this concept book event was categorized "co-
narrational" during the wholistic description analysis of Phase II. It was hypothesized that this style may have limited the children's opportunity to make personal comments.

The smallest percentage of talk pertaining to personal experiences was observed during the reading of *The Mitten* (8.3% or 36 out of 433 codings) compared to the largest percentage observed during the Event of *Those Mean Nasty Dirty Downright Disgusting But ... Invisible Germs* (43.8% or 46 out of 105 codings). Although there were substantial numbers of personal comments made during the Event of *The Mitten*, they were dwarfed by the many other types of comments made by the children who appeared much more into the characters' actions and dilemmas. A smaller percent of alternative categories of talk were observed during the germs book representation possibly because the children recalled their many illnesses and how to avoid catching these germs on a personal basis.

Perhaps, what did surprise me was the comparison of the children's comments during the I:1 Child Debriefings to the Shared Book Events. Far fewer comments were coded "personal" for the individual interpretation. In fact, although this was by far the most represented focus of talk in the Focus Data Set during the Shared Book Events, this category dropped down to a much less represented category during the Debriefings. I do not attribute this difference to
me as the instrument of the research, as I was a member in these classrooms for several weeks before I videotaped the Shared Book Events and audiotaped the Debriefings. In fact, children throughout the day related personal experiences to me. As a participant/observer, but a member of the classroom I feel the children perceived me as a second teacher.

It appears as if the children did not sense these personal comments as significant as the talk pertaining to three other categories during the 1:1 Child Debriefings. This difference could be attributed to the teacher's influence in bringing in the children's experiences and feelings as a major emphasis during the Shared Book Events. It appears that the children when interpreting the Event, as well as the literature were more topic-oriented and "got seriously involved in the business at hand."

Therefore, the comments which were coded "personal" represented a similar percentage across the fictional narratives and the expository texts during the 1:1 Child Debriefings. This was not a carry-over from the Shared Book Events, where the percent of personal comments observed during the expository readings represented 56% more than the percent of personal comments during the fictional narrative Shared Book Events.

Across all genres, during the Shared Book Events, background knowledge was interspersed throughout the discussions. And, as you'll recall, Mrs. L.'s
lead-ins, regardless of genre, related to an efferently-oriented discussion involving background knowledge. Although prevalent throughout all the Shared Book Events, there were 28% fewer background knowledge comments observed than personal comments during the Shared Book Events. As with the personal comments, the percent of background knowledge comments were greater in the expository text readings (21.9%) than in the fictional narrative Events (14.2%). Unlike the personal comments, though, which were essentially the same across genres during the 1:1 Debriefings, the talk categorized "background knowledge" occurred 50% more often in the expository Debriefings (19.8%) than in the narrative Debriefings (13.2%). These data findings reveal that children during the 1:1 Debriefings, in which no prompting was provided, do not always reflect the same emphasis or orientation perspective when interacting with the text as the consensual goal of the group in a social context when interacting with the text. Specifically, the greater emphasis representing background knowledge during the expository texts' Events was carried over to the individual interpretation. However, this was not the case when the represented category was "personal." Although the larger percentage of "personal" talk during the Shared Book Events occurred during the expository texts' Events, this occurrence did not carry over to the individual interpretation. It was during these Debriefings that the comments coded "personal" remained constant across
genres. One hypothesis related to this finding is that the children during the Event interact with the text the way the teacher guides them (as in the Martinez & Teale study, 1986). As you'll recall, Mrs. L. felt it necessary to "set the stage" for the book by reviewing knowledge and information.

During the Shared Book Events representing all genres, slightly less amount of talk pertained to "content/meaning" than to "background knowledge." Moreover, as in the data revealed for the last two categories discussed, there was again more representation of talk within this category during the expository Events than during the Events in which a narrative was read and discussed. This was largely due to the lone concept book Eating Fractions, which had double the percent of comments categorized as "content/meaning" (30.2%) than the average of the remaining three expository books (15.3%), as well as the narrative books (14%). During the Debriefings, however, compared to the S.B.E., the percent of talk coded "content/meaning" decreased for the text Eating Fractions while they increased for every other book, yielding identical percentages of "content/meaning" talk during the fictional narratives' Debriefings (24.4%) and during the expository books' Debriefings (24.4%). Therefore, "content/meaning" comments are not likely to be genre specific except perhaps with particular concept books. During the Shared Book Event in which Eating Fractions was represented, more talk pertaining to "content/meaning" occurred
possibly because the children had less personal and background experience with fractions which probably reduced the number of "personal" and "background knowledge" comments relative to "content/meaning" comments during the Shared Book Event. Future studies of concept Shared Book Events may shed some light on this theory.

"Characters" was the other category which was well-represented during the Shared Book Events, with a representation of slightly less talk coded in this category than in the "content/meaning" category. Initially, when these categories emerged from the data, I had planned to code all character comments as "structure" as Morrow did in a study of one-to-one story readings (1987). However, when so many comments evolved pertaining to the characters' actions and behaviors, I found it necessary to identify "characters" as a separate category although it could be classified within the "structure" category.

Although, only one Shared Book Event occurred in which the characters' category could not apply (Let's Find Out About Winter), I can hypothesize that this category was genre-specific. Two of the expository texts represented characters in a well-defined plot (Those Mean Nasty Dirty Downright Disgusting But . . . Invisible Germs and Squanto and the First Thanksgiving. The other expository text, which was figured in the computations, was the concept book Eating Fractions, in which the same two children were depicted on every page
in the huge photos. The percent of talk pertaining to the category "characters" during the fictional narrative Events was more than twice that of the expository text Events. This comparison of "character" comments between genres was carried over to the individual interpretations. The children during the 1:1 Child Debriefings also discussed the characters more than twice as often in the fictional narratives than during the expository text Debriefings. During both genres representing the Debriefings, the children discussed the characters' actions 19% less than they related "content/meaning" information.

However, I found it interesting that children this young empathized with the characters and referred to their behaviors so often. Galda (1982) hypothesized that a reader must assume a spectator stance and be able to identify with characters to become a mature reader. It was also discovered that the reader who reads for more than just the plot is more likely to exhibit a favorable response to the text. Being involved with the character's action and empathizing with feelings is one way that children as young as these in this study are learning to assume the spectator stance. They are on their way to becoming mature readers, through the guidance of these teachers. "What a child can do in cooperation today, he can do alone tomorrow" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86-89).

Therefore, the categories of talk which were represented across genres in order from the most to the least during the Shared Book Events were:
personal experiences, background knowledge, content/meaning, characters. During the 1:1 Child Debriefings, the order from the most represented category to the least were: content/meaning, characters, background knowledge, personal experiences. Only a slight amount of less "personal" talk occurred than the talk related to "background knowledge" during the Debriefings. I will now discuss the remaining categories.

The comments related to the illustrations seemed to be more text-dependent than genre-specific. For example, during the Shared Book Event in which Eating Fractions was represented, 15.5% (18 out of 116) of the comments were categorized "illustrations" compared to only 1.7% (2 out of 120) coded in this manner during the Squanto event. In review, the photos in the concept text were huge and vivid compared to the small ones with little color in the Squanto book.

The data also addressed how students related to the illustrations. Although the first graders were a year older and developmentally, one might speculate that they would be less engrossed in talk about the pictures, this truly was not the case. The first graders were very illustration-dependent and much of the talk did pertain to the illustrations (refer to all of the pie-graph figures representing each Shared Book Event throughout Chapter V). The results of this study corroborate the hypothesis of Yaden, et al., 1989, in that after age 4,
children begin to pay more attention to the story rather than the illustrations. Although, the illustrations were noted frequently, in the present study, the "content/meaning" talk was always more abundant.

As expected, during the 1:1 Child Debriefings the comments pertaining to illustrations were much less represented. In review, the children were not given the text to examine at this time. An interesting observation was made comparing the percent of "illustration" talk between the Shared Book Events and the Debriefings. During the Shared Book Event in which the concept book Eating Fractions was read, the amount of "illustration" talk during the Event was 15.5% (18 out of 116). This illustration focus increased for the individual interpretation, even without the text, to a 22.2% (8 out of 36). One can surmise from this conflicting data that the photos definitely left an impression on the children who were debriefed.

Comments coded "language" comprised half as much talk as the "illustration" category. The language talk was twice as abundant during the Shared Book Events in which fictional narratives were represented than during the expository text Events. It can be suggested that teacher prompting caused this difference, as the individual interpretations represented more "language" comments during the expository text Debriefings than during the fictional narrative Debriefings.
Book-related comments do not appear to be genre-specific nor text-specific. This focus remained fairly consistent across genres during both the Shared Book Events as well as during the Child Debriefings. However, there was slightly less than half the percentage of time within the Debriefings focused on talk pertaining to book-related features than there was during the Shared Book Events. I attribute this difference to the comments made by the teacher during the lead-in referring to the book's title, author, illustrator, or dedication.

Conversely, the "intertextual comparison" comments were more abundant during the Child Debriefings than during the Shared Book Events. This surprised me . . . children related the text to other works more during the individual interpretations than the group did when interacting with the text. Also, at several times during the Events, these comparisons were child-initiated. This data does not appear to be genre-specific, but is class-specific. Much more of the talk pertaining to intertextual comparisons occurred during the first grade Shared Book Events, as well as the first grade Debriefings compared to the kindergarten data. My hypothesis regarding this data is that children within the social context of a literacy event do not always reveal or make obvious the cognitive processing linked to the group's shared goal of taking meaning from the text. This finding emerged from the data only because the child was removed from the group and was free to express thoughts, in this particular instance without
group influence. How interesting that children as young as first grade, relate genres on their own. Perhaps, we have underestimated young children's capabilities.

During the Shared Book Event, it was very difficult to ascertain the cognitive sheathing, or the idea stepping stones began by one child and followed by another. Many times, it appeared obvious to me that one child's comment precipitated another's thought, but this was such precarious research for the inexperienced researcher, that I felt insecure about categorizing the focus of talk within this Data Set as social influence unless I could be positive. Therefore, only those comments in which someone's name was identified with the thought were categorized "social influence." Also, because of the set-up context consisting of a present to past time frame (1:1 Child Debriefing after the Shared Book Event), one could deduce that more comments would be coded in this category during the Debriefings than during the Events. The data revealed this to be the case with more comments coded in this manner during the expository Debriefings than during the fictional narratives. It is possible this has much less to do with the type of book than with the personality of the child being debriefed. For example, if the child being debriefed tended to be significantly influenced by another child speaking on tape (possibly due to individual personality, friendship, or relative leadership positions in the class), the percent of "social influence" talk
would likely be greater than observed by chance, regardless of genre.

Summary of the Focus of Statement Data Set

Within the Focus Data Set, the findings indicate that teachers and children employ a range of foci when interacting with a text to realize a shared meaning within a social frame. Several assumptions about the interaction process can be made at this time:

1. Of the ten categories emerging from the data, in all probability, only three are genre-specific. The percent of background knowledge comments and personal comments are greater during the expository Shared Book Events than during the fictional narrative Events. Although the percent of background knowledge comments remains greater for the expository 1:1 Child Debriefings than during the fictional narrative Debriefings, this did not prove true for personal comments. Therefore, one cannot rule out the potential influence of teacher perceptions prompting personal comments during the expository Shared Book Events, which, when no longer present (during the Debriefings), yields no genre difference. Conversely, the talk involving the "characters" was represented twice as much during the fictional narrative Events than during the
Shared Book Events in which the expository text was represented. The expository texts which were included in this analysis all had character representation. This data finding carried over to the 1:1 Child Debriefings.

2. The percent of comments identified as content/meaning" was generally the same regardless of genre. Only the concept Book Event elicited a percentage of "content/meaning" discussion significantly greater than the other books during the Shared Book Event.

3. The amount of talk pertaining to the illustrations is text-specific rather than genre-specific.

4. More of the children's and the teachers' personal experiences were shared during the Shared Book Events than during the 1:1 Child Debriefings. The amount of talk pertaining to life-to-text and text-to-life experiences was much greater during the Events.

5. During the 1:1 Debriefings, the category of "content/meaning" was nearly always more abundant than during the preceding Event. The individual interpretation or orientation perspective varies from the consensual group orientation when interacting with the text. Children seem to think along an efferent stance. They approach
literature, regardless of genre, with a purpose, even as young as the kindergartener. The only analyzed Event where this data did not apply was the concept book. In that Event, as well as the Debriefings, the content/meaning category was well-represented. This finding corroborates the discovery of Phillips & McNaughton (1990) in that children focus almost exclusively on meaning within the narrative. In this study, they focused on meaning across genres.

6. Of the most represented focus of talk, those comments categorized as personal experiences, background knowledge, characters and content/meaning represented the order of occurrence from most to least during the Shared Book Events.

7. This order varied during the individual interpretations . . . content/meaning, characters, background knowledge, and personal experiences were the represented categories from most represented to least.

8. The talk coded in the remaining categories was much less represented than talk coded in the aforementioned categories. Of these categories, the order of "amount of talk" occurring from the most abundant to the least was: illustrations, language, book-
related, structure, intertextual comparisons, and social influence.

9. The order again varied from the Shared Book Events to the 1:1 Child Debriefings: illustrations, social influence, intertextual comparisons, language, structure, and book-related categories were represented from the most abundant to the least.

10. It can be assumed from this data that even when peering through the cognitive lens, the "social influence" comments were indicated as affecting a child’s thinking. Specifically, children referred to another child by name and expressed their thought or stated how they felt about what another child had said during the Shared Book Event during the Debriefings. It appeared as if the child was able to switch stances from the cognitive to the social and back to the cognitive construction, even in an individual setting. The social interaction within the group Event was linked to the cognitive processing as indicated in the 1:1 Debriefings.

11. There were times when the individual orientation varied tremendously from the group’s orientation when interacting with the text. For example, the talk pertaining to "content/meaning" was nearly always greater during the individual interpretation. Intertextual comparisons were also more abundant during the 1:1
Debriefings than during the events.

Now that I have discussed the findings within the Focus Data Set, I will continue with a discussion of the findings within the Type Data Set.

Along the Path
The Type Data Set
Microanalysis

In addition to a data set representing the focus of the conversation, I felt it necessary to further refine the questions and comments by type as in the Roser & Martinez study (1985). This data set is not "topic oriented" as in the Focus Data set, but represents the nature or form of the response (refer to TABLE 6).

Overall, data collected within this Type Data Set revealed a consonant link to the Focus Data Set in that the largest amount of talk, as to both the focus and the nature was categorized as "personal." In review, background knowledge only as it related to personal experiences was categorized in this manner. Often, within this Data Set, the type of comment was dependent on the context in which it was used. For example, all of the comments referring to the illustrations within the Focus Data Set were now coded as to the level of thinking involved or the nature of the comment about the illustration within this Type Data Set.
The personal category within this Type Data Set was represented approximately 56% more than the second leading category. The ironic twist in this revelation is that within this Data Set there occurred much more personal talk (compared with other forms of talk) within the narrative Events than within the expository Events. Within this Type Data Set background knowledge comments were often coded "personal" if the comment related to the text (almost 100% difference). In contrast, there existed 60% more personal comments during the expository Events within the Focus Data Set (background knowledge had its own separated category within this set). Although the expository text lends itself to an efferent orientation, these teachers still involved the children on a personal level. Thus, the efferent and the aesthetic were juxtaposed within these Shared Book Experiences representing both the fictional narrative and the expository text.

I must interject a word of caution when interpreting this data. Two classrooms are represented and during the wholistic descriptive analysis of Phase II, it was obvious that these teachers do conduct their Shared Book Events by expressing a sense of purpose to the children. Rosenblatt (1991) cautions that teachers should guide students in adopting the appropriate stance when transacting with the text. She also espouses that the efferent and the aesthetic perspectives fall within a continuum and are not necessarily
contradictory. It appears that these teachers are doing just that. These children did sense the different reading orientations. However, as you'll recall, both teachers, during the Teacher Debriefings, stressed their beliefs in relating the children's text-to-life experiences, not only for the narratives which are read with an aesthetic orientation, but for the expository text which are read efferently. The teachers felt that children would understand the expository text better if personal experiences were related to the text. Often, these experiences were related before the actual reading of the text transpired (recall Mrs. L.'s lead-ins). This data relationship illustrates the importance of ethnographic, wholistic research in the field of education. The statistical coding within the Data Sets representing the personal category could not possibly tell the whole picture. At this young an age, the teachers felt it necessary to juxtapose the stances, but not at the expense of neglecting the primary focus.

This discovery corroborates the work of Holland & Shaw (1993) in which they examined a teacher conducting Shared Book Events on the topic of bugs. The children clearly demonstrated the ability to "shift in and out of the efferent stance, where they focus on acquiring information, and the aesthetic stance, where they focus on what they are experiencing, thinking, and feeling" (p. 114). This ability was evident throughout this study, as well.
Within this Type Data Set, there also occurred an abundant amount of talk categorized as "narrational" which consisted of a literal retelling about the text. Across all seven Shared Book Events representing both genres, 33% less talk was coded "narrational" than "personal." The percent of "narrational" talk observed in the expository genre Events was 64% more than observed in the fictional narrative genre Events. However, this does not appear to be a genre-specific reason, as the concept book threw the statistic off, so to speak, with 49% (49 out of 100) of the comments coded "narrational." This was an extremely large amount of text recall. In contrast, there was no dialogue categorized "narrational" during the Shared Book in which the fictional narrative, "Oh, What a Thanksgiving" was represented.

I was also quite surprised at the high percentage of comments categorized "interpretive" during Shared Book Events of children this young an age. This higher level thinking was evident in questions asked by the teachers as well as comments initiated by children. These Shared Book Events were similar to the events of the Townspeople in the seminal ethnographic study of Heath (1983). The quantity of Read-aloud Events were not an indication of the child's future literacy abilities. It was more a style or manner how parents conducted the Events. The quality of the parents' guidance in structuring the Event was a direct correlate to the child's future literacy attainment in school.
This interpretive skill did not appear to be genre specific, but there did occur slightly more (per book average) in the fictional narratives than in the expository texts. It appears that these teachers and children were involved in conversation exhibiting higher level thinking in all genre types. There also occurred a higher incidence of interpretive discussion in the first grade Events than in the kindergarten Events.

On a continuum from most to least representation within the Type of Statement Data Set, the category "explanatory" was in the middle. An assumption can be made from the data finding related to the explanatory category. The teachers or children clarified information or language to a greater degree (per book average) in the fictional narratives' Shared Book Events than in the expository texts' Events. The percent of explanatory talk observed during the fictional narrative Events was approximately 73% more than that observed during the expository genre Events. These data could lead to the hypothesis that during the narratives these two teachers found it necessary to assess children's understanding or to clarify the plot, theme, characters' actions, etc. to aid the children in comprehension. This category seems to be genre specific for these seven analyzed Shared Book Events.

Much less talk occurred in the last four categories within this Type of Statement Data Set of Phase III. The elaborative category represented 70%
less time (by percentage) than the personal talk (greatest amount within this Data Set) category. Moreover, within this elaborative category, the talk was not genre-specific. There occurred almost equal representations across genres, but this category did appear to be grade-specific with more elaborative talk associated with the first grade Shared Book Events than with the kindergarten Events.

Responses that predict what might happen (predictive category) appear to be genre-specific with a larger amount of talk represented during the fictional narrative Shared Book Events than during the expository Shared Book Events. The percent of comments categorized "predictive" during the fictional narrative events was nearly 12 times the percent of "predictive" comments during the expository Shared Book Events.

Comments or questions that can be associated or related to other genres, works, or extension activities were termed "associative." The percent of talk categorized in this manner and represented during the fictional narrative Events was approximately 40% more than that observed during the expository text Shared Book Events. There also occurred more of this type of talk across the first grade Events than across the kindergarten Events. However, at this time, I cannot hypothesize that the associative category within the Focus Data Set was genre-specific. In review, the order of the book within the unit of study often
reflected the number of associative comments. For example, several readings of Thanksgiving books preceded the Shared Book Event of *Squanto and the First Thanksgiving*. Therefore, several comments during this Event reflected information from previous readings.

Across all seven of these Shared Book Events, there occurred a very small incidence of talk which was categorized "evaluative." It seems that the teachers and children rarely expressed judgmental comments regarding what should have occurred or what did occur.

Summary of the Type of Statement Data Set

Within the Type Data Set, the findings indicate that teachers and children during the Shared Book Events elicit a range of responses varying in nature and type. Several assumptions can be made pertaining to this range when teachers and children within these two classrooms interact with a text to realize a shared orientation within a social context:

1. There occurred much more personal talk (56% more) than the second leading category.
2. Within this Data Set, 100% more of the conversation was coded "personal" during the narrative Events than during the expository Shared Book Events.
3. It appears that children, even at this young an age, possess the ability to oscillate between the efferent and the aesthetic stance when interacting with a text.

4. Children seem to realize the purpose of the reading.

5. Much talk occurred in which the information within the text was literally restated. I cannot hypothesize that this is genre-specific within these two classrooms, due to an disproportionately large amount of "narrational" talk when interacting with the concept book, Eating Fractions.

6. There was an abundance of talk categorized "interpretive" during these seven Shared Book Events. Although there was a higher percentage of this type of comment represented during the fictional narratives than during the expository text Events, I cannot hypothesize that this occurrence was genre-specific. It is commendable that teachers in these two primary classrooms are "guiding" the children to higher level thinking processes when interacting with a text.

7. The focus "explanatory" within this Data Set did seem to be genre-specific. Specifically, the percent of explanatory talk observed during the fictional narrative Events was approximately 73% more
than that observed during the expository text genre Events. One explanation for this large amount of talk during the fictional narrative Events could be that teachers find it necessary to assess children's comprehension of the characteristic events or to clarify the happenings within the story.

8. Comments within the Type Data Set which represented the predictive category appear to be genre-specific with nearly 12 times the percentage represented during the fictional narrative Events than during the expository text Events.

9. Comments within the associative category appear to be text-situational and class-situational, rather than genre-specific.

10. Elaborative comments do not appear to be genre-specific.

11. These two teachers and children rarely discuss what should have occurred or were judgmental toward what did occur.

Summary of the Teacher Debriefings

This subsection of data analysis within Phase III of this research provided an added perspective by the teachers of the Shared Book Events. These interviews were carried out at the end of the data collection in Phase III. At this time, teachers reviewed videotapes of the Shared Book Events in which different
genres were represented. The patterns of the teachers’ comments emerged into several categories as they conducted the Shared Book Events:

- making concepts understandable
- challenging children to think
- relating personal experiences to the book
- affective orientation/feelings
- questioning what is happening
- interactions with children
- how lesson is progressing

It appeared from analyzing the teachers’ comments that they made during the Debriefings, that they both exhibited purposes and rationales for the manner in which they conducted the Events. It also appeared to be a time of reflection for the teachers in which both expressed a desire to grow . . . "If I had this to do over again."

Summary of the 1:1 Child Debriefings

The children seemed to enjoy this 1:1 time immediately following the Shared Book Events. Case studies, within this subsection of the Phase III Data Analysis, were not conducted for a reason. I wanted as broad a range of purposeful sampling as possible. All of the children within these two classrooms
(except for one child who would not cooperate) were given at least one opportunity to talk about a Shared Book Event. Most children were debriefed at least twice with many children talking about the Shared Book Events from an individual perspective on three different occasions.

At the beginning or the end of several of the 1:1 Debriefing Sessions, I asked the child to tell me which of two books she/he preferred. Those two books always included two recently read books represented during the Shared Book Events, one of which was a fictional narrative and the other which was an expository text.

Of the ten first graders I asked, eight children responded more favorably toward the fictional narrative (8 to 2) than toward the expository text. Recall that only three expository texts were represented in first grade during the videotaping data collection phase of the study. The reasons these first graders chose fictional narratives were numerous:

- I liked the illustrations.
- I like happy endings.
- It was funny.
- It keeps going on and on.
- I liked the character, Molly.
- I like stories about animals.
The reasons the two children gave in preferring the expository text were:

Because it was a true story.

It had a happy ending and they got their country back.

On twenty-five occasions, kindergarteners were asked if they preferred a particular fictional narrative or a particular expository text. Recall, that many concept books were represented during the Shared Book Events and for this purpose, they were categorized "expository." Within these Debriefings, thirteen expository texts were chosen over eleven fictional narratives as being the favorite. Various reasons cited by the kindergarteners in preferring the expository text consisted of:

It was longer and he was President and he got money (compared to when he was poor)

It really happened and the illustrations were good.

I liked the beat.

It was more fun because of all the movement.

'Cause it's a true story.

I liked seeing what all the germs looked like.

'Cause I like to count.

It's fun to learn (referring to a counting book).

'Cause it had their names (referring to germs) and showed the way germs looked.
The kindergarteners cited reasons for preferring the fictional narratives were:

Because they were colorful and I like little books.

Because it was funnier.

Because my sister had already told me about it.

Because they got back together and they loved each other a little more at the end.

'Cause the dog was lonesome and he went over to her house and then he came home to look for him. Then he found him. Then, he jumped right on him. And, he took a nice nap by his slippers.

Because he got kidnapped and saved.

I liked it because the raccoon had a fat stomach and he couldn't catch up.

These excerpts indicate that children do have preferences in literature. Although not always able to articulate why they preferred one book to another, these children tried to describe what the chosen book possessed that they liked. As you'll recall from the wholistic analysis in Phase II, Mrs. U., the kindergarten teacher, chose many more expository texts to be represented during the Shared Book Events than did Mrs. L., the first grade teacher. Although the kindergarteners chose the expository text as the preferred book to the narrative more often (13-11) and the first graders chose the fictional narrative over the expository text (8-2), I feel the children's decisions in both classrooms were text-specific rather than genre-specific. However, it was obvious from the
kindergarteners' choices that narrative is not the preferred choice for many children.

It seems as if educators have promoted this "narrative as primary" theory. Egan (1988) espouses that children learn to think and make sense of things by interacting with stories. It is through this story interaction process that children learn the means of remembering. Gordon Wells (1986) also suggests that "storying" or the process of constructing stories in the mind, pervades all aspects of learning.

The data findings emerging from this study indicate that different genres would provide a wide range of experiences for children. If many children prefer the expository text, why is it being neglected during the Shared Reading Events? The microanalysis of the Focus and Type of statements reveal many characteristics to be similar across genres. However, three categories represented within the Focus Data Set appear to be genre-specific. The background knowledge talk and the talk of personal text-to-life and life-to-text experiences seem to generate more discussion time during the expository Events than during the narrative events. (However, this may be attributed to teacher influence). The "character" talk was represented more during the fictional narrative Events than during the expository text Events, even when these texts had character representation.
During the 1:1 Child Debriefings, the individual orientation perspective nearly always (the concept book as the exception) varied from the amount of group talk within the category of "content-meaning." It appeared that children as young as kindergarten read for meaning, regardless of genre. This does not mean that the child did not oscillate between the stances. The data finding indicated children, during the construction of meaning, do have the ability to switch from the efferent perspective to the aesthetic and back to the efferent (Rosenblatt, 1978).

As I peered through the cognitive lens, it also appeared that some children possess a proclivity to a certain orientation perspective when interacting to a text. This theory corroborates the findings of Bussis et al. (1985) in that "the children's styles were manifest as preferred ways of expressing (interpreting and representing) meaning, of working, of deploying attention, and of thinking. Such preferences necessarily play a guiding role in the way people make sense of the world, and they are not of an ephemeral nature (p. 196)."

In the present study, Dax, a first grader, during his Debriefings, related many of his personal experiences in all three of his Debriefing experiences. Kim, a kindergartener, stressed no personal experiences during her two Debriefings but did represent comments within several other categories. John, another kindergartener, during his Debriefings, related much of the plot and
characters' actions in contrast to Jean, a first grader, who emphasized the social influence when citing the other children's comments or the teacher's and how she felt about what others' had stressed. These individual orientation patterns, however, were not the norm, as most of the children's comments were dispersed within the range of categories.

Theoretical Implications

Several hypotheses regarding the process of literacy learning within a Shared Book Event can be postulated at this time:

As children interact with each other, with the teacher, and with the text, a constructive social process is evident in which active participation is the key. The group interaction process progressed in a consonant manner in Shared Book Events during which a fictional narrative or an expository text was represented.

Although this hypothesis was formed by looking through the social lens at a whole class experience of interacting with a text, it corroborates the work of Pappas in that:

Children are able to acquire lexical knowledge through the written texts of the two respective genres. Thus, they are just as successful in reenacting or taking on the discourse properties of the information books as they are of stories (1993, p. 125).
It appears that children develop similar strategies when interacting with different genres. However, this does not mean that they do not realize the varying purposes of different genres. It seems that the genre can be a potential source of influence in the orientation emphasis within the group, as well as for the individual orientation perspective.

Children possess the ability to oscillate between the efferent orientation and the aesthetic perspective. This was apparent in Shared Book Events which were mediated by the teacher, as well as during the 1:1 Child Debriefings in which no prompting occurred. The purpose in reading during the different genre representations was obvious through the teacher’s procedural display, her scaffolding guidance, and her use of different language perspectives.

Hollard and Shaw (1993), as well as Rosenblatt (1991) suggest similar ideas:

Children in transacting with a text, develop the ability to adopt the stance appropriate to the particular purpose and situation (Rosenblatt, 1991, p. 448). Through the crucial guidance of the teacher, children can develop the ability to clarify purposes and read for different purposes (Holland & Shaw, 1993).

In the present study, children, when transacting with the text, exhibited a propensity toward a “content/meaning” emphasis. Regardless of genre, and regardless of the focus of talk emphasis during the Shared Book Event, the children, when interpreting the text individually, stress the content/meaning and
the characteristic events.

Morrow, as well as Phillips & McNaughton stressed similar findings:

The child and the parent focused almost exclusively on identifying the meaning within the narrative (Phillips & McNaughton, 1990). Children are more interested in story meanings (Morrow, 1987).

Although the teachers in the present study stressed meaning during the Shared Book Event, this focus was emphasized more in every group of individual Debriefings, except when the concept book was represented. Children exhibit a proclivity toward meaning when transacting with a text, regardless of genre. Is this the way it should be? Although, children possess the ability to oscillate between the stances, is the aesthetic orientation assumed by children? In this study, the "personal" talk was the largest represented category during the social interaction process of the group. Therefore, the aesthetic stance was the dominant orientation during this period. It was only when the voices of the individual children were heard that I realized the orientation perspective had pendulated to the efferent. Why is this? Only future research can answer why children as young as kindergarten assume an efferent orientation regardless of genre. This, of course, was not a carry-over from the Shared Book Event.

Children are also dependent on illustrations during the social process of taking meaning from the text. However, their dependence was directly related
to the illustration appeal. This finding related to both children and teacher.

There were differences in the ways that the teacher and children interact with the text during the Shared Book Events in which different genres were represented. Specifically, during the expository Events, more of the talk involved "background knowledge" and "content/meaning" than during the Events when a fictional narrative was represented. This group interpretation carried over to the individual interpretation when the category "background knowledge" was represented. The children assumed an efferent stance during the expository text Debriefings. However, this was not the case for the "content/meaning" category during individual Debriefings. This category was not genre-specific during the 1:1 Child Debriefings.

Conversely, the amount of talk pertaining to the characters' actions and behavior was definitely genre-specific. Twice as much character talk occurred during the fictional narrative Events than during the expository text Events. Characters were also represented in the expository texts which were analyzed. Therefore, several inferences regarding the way the genres are represented and treated by the teachers can be formed based on this study's findings. I have also described the resulting hypotheses involving processes related to children during text transactions. There appear to be consistencies as well as differences during the Shared Book Events. This generality carries over to the individual
interpretation, as well.

Instructional Implications

This investigation of Shared Book Events in which different genres are represented is only the beginning to answering important questions involving children's processes when interacting with a text. However, several tentative hypotheses can be postulated at this time.

First, teachers need to be aware of the types of genre they are representing within their Shared Book Events. They approach this event with positive feelings but are they constraining themselves? Although, teachers report using an equal amount of nonfiction to fiction, in actuality, this may not be the case. Since children do read for different purposes, if teachers are not representing enough nonfiction, there exists a strong possibility, the children will have a more difficult time during school when the content areas become dominate in the curriculum. Learning to read is fundamentally an extension of the functional potential of language (Halliday, 1928; Pappas, 1991) and children should be exposed to a range of language registers and genres.

Secondly, teachers must realize the crucial role they play in guiding the children during the shared Book Events. The more participation on the part of the children and the more involved they are within the conversation, the more
they will gain from the experience. Within this discussion, all types and foci of responses should be encouraged to lead to a better understanding of the text. Teachers can help the process along by encouraging social interaction among children, permit children to make comparisons with each other and carry the role of facilitator. As Mrs. L. summed this concept up during a moment of reflection:

T: I wonder if bringing children into your lesson more would help and I've thought about this because I can't seem to do it that well. If someone gives an answer and you said, "What do you think about that, Jean?" you would be encouraging more social interactions among children. In other words, you're not just asking them what you're saying about the book, but you're asking them to comment on what another child has said. I would be promoting social togetherness rather than independence and teacher dependence. When teachers successfully incorporate strategies, a significant increase in children participation occurs (Hoffman, Roser, & Farest; 1988).

Third, individual interpretations must be respected. Individual children, when no prompting is provided, will think along varying lines. Specifically, children transact with a text in different ways. The talk during a group interaction
process can modify an individual's interpretation or the child may maintain this interpretation. What the teacher stresses is not necessarily what the child emphasizes during an individual interpretation.

Teachers must be aware of children's interests in choosing the books for the thematic units of study. Children do not exhibit a proclivity toward narrative unless this is the typical Shared book genre to which they are exposed. Many children prefer the nonfiction (Pappas, 1991). However, within the present study, these choices appear to be text-specific, rather than genre-specific.

The teachers in this study emphasized personal experiences as a way of transacting with the text, regardless of genre. In fact, personal experiences were emphasized even more during Events in which the expository text was represented rather than the narrative. These teachers perceived the expository text to be more difficult for the children to understand. Personal experiences' discussion was viewed as a method which was necessary for comparison.

This finding corroborates Cochran-Smith's (1984) conclusion in that literacy is a constructive process in which the child is an active learner. Literacy is a social and cultural phenomenon in which adults act as intermediaries between children and print.

In the present study, the adult did act as the mediator of the Shared Book Event, but children were empowered to change topics within the conversation,
as long as it pertained to the book. Children and teachers maintained a negotiation process during the interactions with the text.

Throughout this study, I have examined through a social and a cognitive lens, the many juxtaposed complexities that link the cognitive (as demonstrated in the 1:1 Child Debriefings) with the social interactions within the Shared Book Events. As indicated, by viewing the same phenomenon through different lenses, many of the data findings were similar across genres. However, it appears that some processes are different within Shared Book Events in which different genres are represented.

My attempt was to examine the Shared Book Event through a sociocultural perspective with a link to the orientation perspectives of individual children. The Shared Book Event is not an entity, but an on-going process that must be examined from a multi-layered perspective. By peeling back the layer of the community of teachers, the layers of the homes, the children, the two classrooms, the curriculums, and the two teachers' goals and beliefs, I explored Shared Book Events as woven through these children's lives. In those two situated classrooms, the core literacy Event which served as a springboard for many other literacy activities, was the Shared Book Event. The literacy within this Event was transformative and multi-faceted as its effect extended throughout the curriculum and these children's lives.
I examined this literacy Event from four perspectives: the community of teachers and the range of ways they are using Shared Book Events, the researchers' perspective by viewing class-situated Shared Book Events, the children's orientation emphasis to the text and their opinions of the Shared Book Event in which they served as the participants, and the teacher's perspectives and reflections of the Events which she had structured. Interesting conclusions were reached based on these triangulated data sources.

Transferability

What I can offer to you, as the researcher, is my way of looking at Shared Book Events within two particular classrooms within a suburban community. Within these Shared Book Events, different genres are represented. To my knowledge, no one has used these frames, as represented in the three phases of this study, in combination with each other. I also attempted to juxtapose the individual child's perspective, the teacher's perspective, and the group's orientation in examining how the social process within the Shared Book Event contributes to a shared understanding of the text. I further examined the individual interpretation as it differed or remained consistent with the overall emphasis of the class.
Emphasizing my belief in the interpretive research paradigm, I focused on how knowledge was reached within the events. How were the children making meaning within this process? My inherent understanding and descriptions of this process can only be interpreted within the social context. The way I perceive this reality is affected by my beliefs about the education process. These beliefs provide a conceptual framework for seeing and making sense of my research.

However, this hermeneutic philosophy (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of meaning was constructed on the basis of the children's interpretations of the Shared Book Events and actual excerpts from the transcripts are provided throughout this study. The teachers also provided data with their insightful reflections of the Shared Book Events.

As the "human instrument" conducting the research, I possibly had an effect on the children and the teachers in this study. However, this degree of reactivity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was undermined by the fact that I became a member of the classrooms. I was in the classroom for 3-4 weeks before I videotaped.

Conversely, my "verstehen" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and tacit knowledge were useful tools in conducting this study. And the "voice of the participants" were heard throughout the study. Member checking was inherently built into the design of the study as teachers and I reflected on the Shared Book Events when
the study was in the final phase. Peer debriefing occurred periodically throughout the study, as outsiders offered insights and recommendations. My advisor offered suggestions and guidance on a regular basis. I also spent a considerable amount of time in each classroom as I observed and participated daily. A pilot study was conducted in which several kinks were ironed out in the survey, as well as in the observation procedures, before the real study began.

I kept a reflexive journal to keep track of biases which could influence the study’s outcomes. This tracking was especially necessary because of the high degree of data analysis involving language. The works of Vygotsky, Bruner, and Cazden (to name just a few researchers) implicate the importance of language as the all-encompassing factor in shaping the individual’s perspective as well as the researchers’ values as the study is conducted. There exists an inextricable overlap between experience and research. Method influences how we think and what we are permitted to feel (Eisner, 1988).

However, as one considers all the possible variables contributing to the degree of transferability of this study, perhaps the extensive triangulation of data sources intensifies credibility. Numerous data sources consisting of 43 transcribed Shared Book Events, 43 videotapes of these events, 77 transcribed 1:1 Debriefing Sessions, 77 audiotapes of these sessions, the survey, the teacher interviews and these transcribed sessions, the field notes, and reflexive journal
enabled me to cross-check information and results.

What I can offer to you is an explanation of how teachers perceive their Shared Book Events to be within a progressive suburban district. I also have provided an overview in wholistic descriptive terms of 43 Shared Book Events. Within these descriptions, the reading and discussion styles were categorized as to genres.

In Phase III of this study, I have provided an in-depth microanalysis of seven Shared Book Events. It is during this stage of the research that the social interactions revealing the type of talk and focus of talk were examined as they contributed to the child’s individual interpretation of the text.

Implications for instruction were suggested based on these Shared Book Events as they contributed to children’s knowledge within a social context on their paths to literacy.

Limitations of this Study

Studies in other classrooms of different age groups and among different cultural groups would add dimension to this research. Shared Book Events not only are distinct in different classrooms but they differ with respect to varying texts and even with respect to a different time. The interaction within a social
context is a shifting, dynamic process that can never be replicated with the exact results. This research was conducted within two classrooms situated in one suburban area.

A more in-depth study of the group's interaction with different genres would also generate more extensive knowledge on children's ability to interact with different genres. Only one concept book was analyzed in this study and, as pointed out on several occasions, these data findings were inconsistent with other represented expository texts. Further analysis on the concept book would be interesting.

Studies in which repeat readings of the same text or different texts offering the same story within an intertextual unit, would also yield interesting results. The intertextual unit represented during the Shared Book Events within the first grade class was discussed during a brief overview in Chapter V, but the repeat readings were not examined because of the study's focus limitations.

Although a period of "extended participation" was conducted within each classroom, the study was conducted over the course of six months rather than two years. A longitudinal study of Shared Book Events with one class of children may have yielded different results. The changes over time were not assessed. Third, by the nature of the design of this study, I exerted no control over the variables. My goal was to examine human phenomena within the
natural context. Although, a purposeful sampling was conducted, this process occurred after the Shared Book Event. There is a possibility also that I had an impact on the teachers' and children's behavior.

I also speculate that the patterns of categories which I identified from the data are found in all Shared Book Events in first grade and kindergarten classrooms. The dynamics within a social group exhibit change not only with different participants but also with the same participants for different Events or conducted at different times.

The nature of cognitive processing was barely touched upon in this study. I was only able to examine individual children's comments after the Shared Book Events and, as stated during the research, different factors may have contributed to the various thoughts of the children immediately following the Event rather than during the Event.

I hope that the readers of this study will be able to examine the research, relate it to their own experiences and perhaps look at this process of learning within the Shared Book Events from a different perspective. I can offer my method of examining this process, my results, my implications with the hope that readers will be able to construct their own comprehension based on past experiences. If the information within this study can be "transferred" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) to new situations within classrooms or add knowledge to help future
researchers regarding the learning process, then my goal has been accomplished.

Epilogue

When I began this study, I felt overwhelmed. Although I started with three broad questions to help guide me, I truly didn't realize how much I didn't know. Then, at some point during the data collection/data analysis process, I began to focus on what I really didn't know (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This focus became more and more evident as the study progressed. This progressive focusing alleviated my anxiety. My journey through this research study was an invaluable experience. "It is good to have an end to journey towards; but it is the journey that matters in the end" (Ursula K. LeGuin, American author). I view the world from a different perspective . . . more open-minded, more questioning, more understanding, but stronger and hopefully, able to give more back.
APPENDIX A

PERMISSION LETTER TO PARENTS
November 12, 1991

Dear Parents:

I am a Ph.D. candidate working on a dissertation at The Ohio State University. For my research project, I am exploring the many avenues which children travel as they learn from each other and from the teacher during the shared book sessions.

My advisor, Dr. Robert Tierney, a professor at The Ohio State University, is the chief investigator of this project. Even though he will not be in the classroom working with children and observing, he will be meeting with me many times throughout the course of the study.

I will become a daily member of your child’s classroom for several weeks. My goal is to learn about nonfiction as well as the storybook genre to help teachers realize the importance of shared book sessions within their classrooms.

I would like permission for your child to participate in this study which will be conducted as a part of the regularly scheduled class. Several of the shared book sessions will be videotaped. These tapes will be destroyed five years after the study is completed.

Please sign and return this form to your child’s teacher as soon as possible. If you have an objection to your child being videotaped during the whole class shared book session, please state this on the form. Participation or non-participation by your child will have no negative consequences.

Thank you for your understanding.

Sincerely yours,

Tamara Schaeper-Levy

Child’s name __________________________________________

Parent’s Approval (Signature) ____________________________

Date ________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

SURVEY
Purpose: Currently, I am involved in a dissertation study describing the nature of storybook reading and related activities in elementary classrooms in central Ohio. As part of my study, I am conducting a general survey of kindergarten through third grade teachers who might take the time to complete this survey. Questions on the survey include a description of your background as a teacher, aspects of the classroom environment, as well as a description of the shared reading sessions. Your name is required only in case I need to follow up these questions. Your answers to the survey in respect to my study will be anonymous. I truly appreciate your time and your help.

Name ______________________________
Grade ______________________________
School ______________________________
District ______________________________
Number in case I wish to contact you ______________

Educational Background:
Undergraduate degree? _____ Institution? _____ Year?____
Graduate degree? _____ Institution? ___________ Year?____
Years teaching? _____ At current grade level? ________

Please circle the answer that best describes your teaching methods.

Background of Classroom and Students:
Students' cultures represented within your classroom?
Nature of Shared Reading in the Classroom:

Please describe a typical shared book session in your classroom. (Use the back of this page)

Frequency:

How often do you read to your students:

- once a day
- 2 or 3 time a day
- once every other day
- rarely

At what time(s) during the day do you have these sessions?

- first thing in the morning
- late morning
- after lunch
- afternoon
- dismissal

How often do you read the same story repeatedly?

- always
- frequently
- sometimes
- rarely
- never

Type of Material:

What type of books or selections do you read?

- fantasy
- poetry
- narrative or story
- biographical
- books on holidays
- historical fiction
- animated
- informational
- fairy tale

How do you decide on the selection you choose?

- Caldecott winners
- children's interests
children's needs link to thematic units
other teachers' or parents' suggestions
curriculum requirements

Will you please list four books/authors which you prefer?

Do you use big books?
Always Frequently Sometimes Rarely Never

Organization of Sessions:
When you read books, where do the children sit?
on floor in group on floor in circle at a table
at assigned seats on chairs in group

Where do you sit?
on floor in chair or rocker stand in front of class

Description of the Activity:
When do you question the children?
at several different times at one or two times
rarely never

When do you comment during the selection?
at several different times at one or two times
rarely never
How frequently do you highlight the following?

Author/illustrator?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Title of book or selection?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Genre?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Caldecott Medal Winners?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Plot?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Characters?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Word Phrases?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Making Predictions?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Visual Images?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Related background of experiences similar to the readings?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Other books or selections related to the present reading?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Library skills, such as book handling, turning pages, etc.?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Phonics skills?
Always Frequently Sometimes Rarely Never
Comment?

When are the students encouraged to comment or ask questions during the session?
Anytime At several different times At one or two times Rarely Never

What types of comments and questions do you encourage?

Do classroom activities accompany the reading sessions?
Always Frequently Sometimes Rarely Never
Comment?

What activities might you use with your students in conjunction with shared book sessions?
whole class discussion music skills worksheets
small group discussion art skills activities
author studies drama
writing (journals, points of view papers, spin-off stories, etc.)
comprehension recall activities (sequence strips, in-order pictures, charts, etc.)

Child as facilitator:

Are children ever permitted to read during a shared book session?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Under what circumstances?

Do the children each have the book while you read?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Do the children choose the book for the S.B.S.?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Do the children have access to the book after it has been read?
Always  Frequently  Sometimes  Rarely  Never
Comment?

Diagnostic and Instructional Outcomes of Shared Reading Sessions:
What do children gain or how do they benefit from a shared reading session? an appreciation for literature fun information
What are your three most important goals of a S.B.S.?

What diagnostic information on your students do you obtain from a S.B.S.?

**Strengths and Weaknesses of Shared Reading Sessions:**

What strengths in your shared reading procedures are evident?

What weaknesses are evident?

Do you feel the shared reading sessions are meeting the children's needs at this time?

How do you usually improve upon these shared reading experiences?

How did you learn about shared reading with children?
How long have you been reading literature to your students?

Do you have any questions about shared reading?
APPENDIX C

SAMPLES OF CHILDREN'S WRITING

DURING EXTENSION ACTIVITIES
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The mitten was big
in the barn.
He was its size.

The mitten he had left

So he went back to

He hit it by
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Once upon a time there was a boy who went out in the woods to get some wood for the fireplace a little later. When he was coming home his mitten fell off then a moose found it. Alan came a frog, the frog acid may I come in yes said the moose. So the frog came in then Alan came a fox he acid may I come in yes said the moose then Alan came a bear he acid may I come in the moes did not say any thing then the bear jumped in the mittin hit pop.
A little girl was chasing a rabbit for her grammar. When her pacifier one of her mother came off. Then a mouse got in it. A critter got in too. An owl got in a rabbit got in too. A bear got in too. A wolf got in too. A fox got in too.

The mating popped. The Groll came back. The mating was torn up. But it didn't matter. Bekes, he's got no ones.
One is a very cold day
Peter woke up
and saw a lot of snow
He wanted to the vet
Fill battle wotr Fil
For some reason Peter wants
ise skating but the ice
Milted Peter slid down
The fill wane he got home
He told his mom the
idvanchors and want
skeing
Wns tar was a boy
named pyr fr. he was
sad becazz he had nowon
to pla wth. So he
cid his lost find we
ta pjd for howrs an
howrs ta writing
fird. ta rstd tin ta
pld ot sid a gn theand
I like winter snow and ice.
I like making a snowman.
In Christmas, I buy in Santa Claus to brings us gifts.
I play in Santa, I like to built snow men. I like to play in the snow. I like to make snow snow angels in the snow.

I like the snow here. It is fun you can play in it. You can build snowball forts. You can make a snowman. I like January. I like winter because the is snow is in the ground.
I Hate Grmz.
I like winter

BEKSTU CAN DRNK CHOKLET

I like winter

Snow Man

Penguin

Tree
These are my favorite things to touch.

These are my favorite things to see.

These are my favorite things to taste.

These are my favorite things to hear.
APPENDIX D

EXAMPLES OF LEARNING CENTER ACTIVITIES

AS THEY RELATE TO SHARED BOOKS
LEARNING CENTERS ON POPCORN

1. Popcorn Popper Math: How many popcorn?
2. Popcorn Fun: Stringing it
3. Write a Popcorn Story.
4. Make a Picture with Popcorn.

LEARNING CENTERS ON NATIVE AMERICANS

1. Weaving a Mat.
2. Kachina Doll Art Activity.
3. Necklaces: Finding the pattern
4. Q-Tip Native American Paintings

Listening Center-Buffalo Woman (Paul Goble)
Thanksgiving Unit
Interst Centers

Use some of the words on the pumpkin pie to write a Thanksgiving story.

- Turkey
- Pie
- Bib
- Fork
- Smell
- Hat
- Feast
- Chicken
- Fat
- Flavor
- Tasty
- Knife
- Hide
- Thanksgiving
- Corn
- Napkin
- Stuffing
- Food
- Pilgrim
- Dripping
- Feathers
- Tough
- Colorful
We are thankful.

Write a list of all the things you are thankful for. Make sure each sentence starts with the same letter at the beginning of each line.

Another Activity: Connect the dots turkey.

Another Activity: Cut-out turkeys. Each one has a little story with pictures and words.
Thanksgiving Things To Do

1. Draw a Circle
2. Add a neck and head
3. Add Details
4. Make your own here.

Word Hunt

These words were located in a fun activity paper.

corn
friends
Pilgrims
peace
love
sharing
pumpkin
pie
Indian
eat
turkey
squash
Make Pilgrim Bookmarks.
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