The Dissertation Committee for Annamary L. Consalvo Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

WRITING CONFERENCES AND RELATIONSHIPS: TALKING, TEACHING, AND LEARNING IN HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH CLASSROOMS

Committee:

Randy Bomer, Supervisor

Anna E. Maloch

Allison Skerrett

Melissa Mosley

Diane L. Schallert

WRITING CONFERENCES AND RELATIONSHIPS: TALKING, TEACHING, AND LEARNING IN HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH CLASSROOMS

by

Annamary L. Consalvo, B.A.; M.Ed.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2011

Dedication

For my husband, Carmine and for our son, Alex. Both of you supported me beyond measure with your love and confidence.

For "John O'Brien" and "Kathy Hampshire" – you inspire me.

For my mother, Mary Edgar Listman, whose heart was as wide as the ocean.

WRITING CONFERENCES AND RELATIONSHIPS: TALKING, TEACHING, AND LEARNING IN HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH CLASSROOMS

Annamary L. Consalvo, Ph.D

The University of Texas at Austin, 2011

Supervisor: Randy Bomer

This qualitative classroom study follows two high school English teachers, in one class apiece, and their students across a school year in a diversely populated urban high school in the south central United States. Using case study, ethnographic, and microanalytic methods, the research focuses on writing instruction and ways in which talk and relational dimensions inside one-to-one, teacher-student writing conferences interact and influence subsequent student writing and reflect larger classroom patterns established by the teacher. Data sources include fieldnotes; video recordings of writing conferences; audio recordings of student and teacher interviews across the year; transcriptions; student writing, and other documents. The approaches to analysis include constant comparison, discourse analysis, and microanalysis (Bogdan & Bicklen, 1992; Erickson, 1992; Bloome et al., 2005; Charmaz, 2006). Informing the analytic process are sociocultural theories of learning, language, literacy, and relationships (Gee, 1996;

Wertsch, 1991; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, 1991; Lave and Wenger, 1991; Bahktin, 1981, 1986, 1994; Wells, 2007; Noddings, 1988, 2005). Central to the theoretical foundation for examining evidence of teaching and learning in this study are Erickson's (2006) sedimentation, Burbules and Rice's (1991) communicative virtues, and van Manen's (1991, 1995) pedagogical tact.

Findings include, 1) *structures* that make writing conferences dialogic encounters including openings and closings, internal structures, and duration; 2) *relational moves*, or interpersonal efforts by teachers inside writing conferences, that serve to bring the curriculum and the student closer include particular kinds of verbal and non verbal communications; and, 3) *instructional moves*, or how the teachers used talk for specific instructional purposes, including teaching of writing rules, drafting, and modeling the role of the reader. Findings suggest that teaching and learning occur in the context of relationships, and in recursive and non-linear patterns; moreover, brief encounters between teacher and student that are both instructional and relational may build over the arc of the life of the classroom. This investigation may contribute to the limited literature on high school writing conferences and help educators consider their potential as particular kinds of instructional conversations and relational platforms to encourage dialogic classroom environments hospitable to students from diverse backgrounds.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

xv

Chapter One: Contextualizing The Study

And Theoretical Frameworks

Context for this Research

English classrooms are places where writing, reading and talking about personal experiences, concerns and priorities can be directly connected with meeting the standards of the content area (NCTE, 2009). English classes can also be places where none of this happens; places where students fill out comprehension-level worksheets about texts read, and where the focus of writing instruction is procedural (Lipson, Mosenthal, Daniels, & Woodside-Jiron, 2000). English class environments can be built to consistently encourage honest and thoughtful conversations, and be places where students' expressions of their ideas, experiences, feelings and selves/histories/cultures are valued (Beach & Friedrich, 2006). It is in such classrooms where teaching is arranged in a way that recognizes that feeling and affect are linked to learning (Wood, Bruner, and Ross, 1976; Vygotsky, 1978). Writing is taught in classrooms; the primary currency of classrooms is talk (Johnston, 2004; Mercer, 1995; Cazden, 2001); and, it is inside teaching and learning relationships that talk occurs. Therefore, it makes sense to study how learning to write connects with talk and the nature of the relationships connected with that writing.

Encounters with Writing Conferences

Writing conferences as a master's student and as a teacher. I first learned about and experienced writing conferences as a master's student enrolled in a methods course for teaching writing. I found that writing conferences propelled my writing

forward in unexpected and welcome ways. The opportunity to talk through my thinking

with someone who knew what to listen for, and who knew how to help me transition

from thoughts to words on a page, was unlike any other experiences up to that point in

my writing life. A few years later, during my year as contract faculty at the same college,

I was in the midst of planning to teach Freshman Composition and had sought out my

mentor for some advice. During our conversation, in sharing her own experiences and

priorities, she made a strong case for holding weekly writing conferences outside of class,

sharing that it made a noticeable difference in the quality of the course for her as a

teacher, and for the students. She talked about how the writing conferences were a

vehicle for her to get to know her students, and to help them engage more fully in their

writing, which ended up, ultimately, in better teaching and learning in that class. While

the cost was a substantial extra time commitment, I followed her example and found what

she had said to be true. Unlike in two sections of Composition that I had taught during

my master's degree work, and in which I had not made regular writing conferences a

priority, students substantially revised their work, sought out advice from me, their peers,

and the campus writing center; and, in sharing their work, came to know and support

each other as writers.

Both before and after that contract faculty year, I taught high school English and

during periods of time when students were working on writing assignments, conducted

writing conferences. At the time, I didn't think they were bona fide writing conferences

because, by necessity, they were very brief – thirty seconds to three minutes long – and

because I went around to my students, they didn't get up to come to me. There, as in the

Composition classes, I found that as a result of both choice of topic and the one-to-one attention given to students' ideas, students were more willing to revise, and their writing was better developed. Furthermore, the process over time, began to normalize these conversations, and nudged my classroom's atmosphere toward being more collaborative and more dialogic. I found that conducting the writing conferences helped to shape my practice as a teacher as well, by building in opportunities for me better to appreciate my students *as* individuals, as interesting and literate people, and as people who appreciated my interest in them as well.

Writing conferences as a dissertation topic. As I continued to engage with teachers and students in classrooms through my graduate studies, the potential of writing conferences was never far from my mind and led me to propose this research for my dissertation study. The goals of this study, from its inception throughout the writing of this report, have been to examine, identify, and describe elements of the conversational, relational, and instructional work inside one-to-one, teacher-student writing conferences and how those elements change across a school year.

Need for the Study

One-to-one, teacher-student writing conferences are moments when teacher and student can come together in a unique social space for the distinct and expressed purpose of furthering the thinking, reflecting, and communication ability of the student (Walker & Elias, 1987; Fitzgerald & Stamm, 1992; Jacobs & Karliner, 1977; Freedman, Greenleaf, & Sperling, 1987; Kaufman. 2000). The conferences are embedded in the concentric ring-contexts of the moment, the teacher-student relationship, the class, the school, the

3

community, and the culture. According to a recent Pew Research Center report, one of the social realities of that outer ring is that the United States is in the midst of a major demographic shift toward a far more populous and diverse population (Passel & Cohn, 2008) which calls for revised ways of thinking about teaching and learning. This study attempts to answer Grossman and McDonald's (2008) call for research that steps back from a narrow view of teaching to one that embraces the contexts that students and teachers bring with them:

> We argue that in the future, researchers need to move their attention beyond the cognitive demands of teaching, which have dominated the field for the past 20 years, to an expanded view of teaching that focuses on teaching as a practice that encompasses cognition, craft, and affect; the field of teacher education, in turn, must attend to preparing novices for the relational as well as the intellectual demands of teaching. (p. 185)

This research explores the notion that the writing conference, as a dialogic classroom practice, has the potential to be a particularly focused site of agency-building in students (Strauss & Xiang, 2006) and of relationship-building and dynamic encounters between teacher and student. When the multiple literate practices that adolescents do possess are not valued, they can become resistant to school literacies (NCTE, 2007, p. 3), including various forms of in-school writing. In the following pages, I endeavor to show, through the various data collected and analyzed, how embodied, non-verbal, as well as verbally expressed elements of the interactions between teacher and student inside writing conferences may lead to an enhanced understanding of how these encounters can

promote student learning. Moreover, to help adolescents find connecting threads between their lives and writing and reading enhances motivation (NCTE, 2007, p. 4). "Writing conferences between teachers and individual students are the central vehicle for altering traditional classroom norms by getting teachers to interact on a daily basis with students about writing" (McCarthey, 1992, p. 53). Furthermore, writing conferences are suitable teaching formats for beginning and developing writers (Kaufman, 2000; McCarthey, 1992; Sperling, 1990) because students are likely to be interested in learning as the topic of conversation is *their* own writing. Because the writing process is a highly individualized, recursive, and non-linear process (Emig, 1971; Flower & Hayes, 1981), it makes sense to examine ways to meet this teaching challenge.

It is my hope that this study may contribute to the limited literature available on teacher-student writing conferences with high school students (Freedman, Greenleaf, & Sperling, 1987; Sperling, 1990), as more of the existing literature explores writing conferences with elementary school students (Fitzgerald & Stamm, 1992; Lipson, et al. 2000; Larson & Maier, 2000) and college students (Perl, 1979; Jacobs & Karliner, 1977; Freedman & Sperling, 1985; Walker & Elais, 1987; Strauss & Xiang, 2006) than with either middle school students (Kaufman, 2000) or secondary school students.

Research Questions

1) What are the features of instructional conversations between teachers and students about writing, what do students do after these conversations, and how do those features change across a school year?

2) What are the relational dimensions of those instructional conversations between teachers and students about writing and how do those dimensions change across a school year?

3) How can those relational dimensions be traced to larger patterns in the classroom that the teacher establishes across time?

Theoretical Frameworks

Introduction

In this section I discuss first, the dialogicality of language in use in the Bakhtinian sense in order to locate the daily interactions and those over time that this study addresses inside a larger frame of discursive human interactions. Then, narrowing the lens, I focus on dialogicality as predictable talk structures in place inside classrooms which invite (or not) co-construction of understanding and learning. I turn, as well, to an explanation and short discussion of related concepts including intertextuality, sedimentation, as well as revoicing and positioning as lenses more sensitive to viewing moment-by-moment interactions to help me fasten particular findings to a dialogical framework. Finally, I address teaching as a democratic endeavor, and two constructs that in the real world of students and teachers in classrooms, can help to support that endeavor -- communicative virtues and pedagogical tact.

Dialogicality and Bakhtin

Teaching and learning as socially constructed. Talk as a tool helps the learner organize his or her thoughts and problem-solve and is a social process through which we *"grow into the intellectual life around [us]"* and, grow into the intellectual life *within* us

(Vygotsky, 1978, p.88, italics original). Language is the tool of communication. With enough opportunity and reciprocity -- the learner internalizes that talk – to inner speech – which marks the point that "it comes to organize the child's thought, that is, becomes an internal mental function" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 89). The research presented here assumes a view of teaching and learning as social practices in what Wertsch (1991) called a "sociocultural approach to mind" the basic tenet of which "is that human mental functioning is inherently situated in social interactional, cultural, institutional and historical context" (p. 86). In these kinds of contexts, learning can be seen as a form of apprenticeship. Novices are brought into discourse communities through sponsorship from insiders, receive support as they strive to engage in the activities of the group. They are treated as newcomers and engage with the community in a sanctioned process of *legitimate peripheral participation* (Lavé & Wenger, 1991). Central to this study as one that examines talk in classrooms as enculturated, situated social practices is a view of language use as dialogical processes, and of particular ways of using language in a classroom as dialogically oriented.

d/Discourse. In the manner of Gee (1996), I adopt his use of big "D" *Discourse* to stand for various ways of performing one's self in the world, and, I use small "d" *discourse* to represent daily interactions within and across various life worlds. A "Discourse…" is the "language plus being the 'right' *who* and saying the 'right' *what*….What is important is not [just] language, and surely not grammar; but *saying (writing)-doing-being-valuing-believing combinations*" (Gee, 1996, p.127 italics original). People belong to any number of social worlds, each of which has its own

7

Discourse. Beginning with home or primary Discourses, people acquire membership in other social worlds each of which is represented by its own Discourse and each of which is taken up as secondary to the home Discourse. The Discourse of school is a secondary Discourse although for some students, primarily those from homes with middle class values, their home and school Discourses and experiences are more congruent than for other students (e.g., English language learners, ethnic and racial minorities, people from low socioeconomic homes) whose backgrounds and experiences may not include the dominant culture values represented in the dominant Discourse of school (Anyon, 1980, 1981; Gee, 1996; Valenzuela, 1999). Useful as a way to think about how students in classrooms may or may not have access to the dominant culture, yet I draw on Bakhtin's (1994) idea of *heteroglossia* to enrich and amplify the core idea of multiplicity of languages beyond a linear primary-secondary view.

The utterance. "[S]peech can exist in reality only in the form of concrete utterances of individuals speaking people, speech subjects" therefore the "*real unit* of speech communication: the utterance" (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 71) is situated and in use as speech, not atomized and divorced from actual words people combine and use to communicate their thoughts and feelings, bound up as they are in histories and ideologies. He explains that through "the change of speaking subjects" the distinctive qualities of the utterance become appreciable vis-à-vis the great variety in "heterogenous sphere of human activity and life" (1986, p. 72). Moreover, he valorizes *dialogue* as "a classic form of speech communication" which is visible in the exchange of utterances where the partners take turns; each turn he calls a *rejoinder* (1986, p. 72). It is in this

8

exchange between speakers where *finalization* of utterance is possible – one utterance, to the next (1986, p. 76).

Bakhtin steps back from the local, situatedness of utterances (in face-to-face conversation) and also locates them in dialogue with all other utterances; the utterance stands as an answer to prior utterances and a call to future utterances:

The living utterance, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogic threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousness around the given object of an utterance, it cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue. After all, the utterance arises out the dialogue as a continuation of it and as a rejoinder to it – it does not approach the object from the sidelines. (Bakhtin, 1994, p. 76)

Heteroglossia, social languages, ventriloquation. Moreover, these "living utterances," in use and in situated in specific environments, combine as a centrifugal force within a "unitary" language structure or a "system of linguistic norms" (Bakhtin, 1994, p. 74), to form what Bakhtin refers to as multi-languagedness or *heteroglossia* (Bakhtin, 1994, pp. 74-76). Students bring their own "ways with words" (Heath, 1983) and ways of enacting their parts in the discursive worlds in which they live. Within today's classrooms, filled with students from different linguistic and social backgrounds (Passell & Cohn, 2008) who bring their own *social languages*, heteroglossia is at play in the layering over time of the pull and push of daily interactions around working to create understanding with one another and is always in process, or "unfinalizable" (Morris [ed]

9

in Bakhtin, 1994, p.74). A *social language* (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 356) is akin to Gee's notion

of "Discourse…" being "language plus being the 'right' *who* and saying the 'right'

what…." (Gee, 1996, p. 127). In consideration of how speakers negotiate understanding

using and in spite of their social languages or memberships in various discourse

communities, in a face to face setting, one speaker might *ventriloquate*, or speak through

another Discourse or social language to accomplish his or her purpose of being

understood. *Ventriloquation* (Bakhtin, 1981) is a kind of dialogicality "whereby one

voice speaks *through* another voice or voice type in a social language" (Wertsch, 1991a,

p. 59). Centralization or centripetal forces are essential in the process of people working

toward understanding one another as "it is the struggle with another's word that a new

word is generated" (Morris [ed.] in Bakhtin, 1994, p. 74). Bakhtin addresses the social

nature of acquiring ways to express new understandings, new meanings – new languages

-- to do so:

> The word in language is half someone else's. It becomes 'one's own' only when
>
> the speaker populates it with his own intentions, his own accent, when he
>
> appropriates the work, adapting it to his own semiotic and expressive intention.
>
> Prior to this moment of appropriation the word does not exist in a neutral and
>
> impersonal language…but rather it exists in other people's mouths, in other
>
> people's contexts, serving other people's intentions: it is from there that one must
>
> take the word, and make it one's own. (Bakhtin, 1994, p. 77)

Whether part of the sense-making process of inner-speech (Vygotsky, 1978) or in

interaction with other people or artifacts, all utterances are, in a sense, in continuous past

and future dialogue with all others. In explicating the dialogical relationship between person to person utterances, Voloshinov writes that each "word is oriented toward an addressee" and (including those printed, not only spoken) is "precisely *the product of the reciprocal relationship between speaker and listener, addresser and addressee*" (Voloshinov in Bakhtin, 1994, p. 58, italics original). Each utterance gets but a moment in the "continuous, all-inclusive, generative process of a given social collective" (Voloshinov in Bakhtin, 1994, p. 59). Moreover, it is understood that the layering of utterances in the shared "social collective," or in the case of the research presented here, schooling, creates certain kinds of understandings.

In the next section, I leave the discussion the dialogicality of language in use, and focus on dialogicality as talk structures in classrooms that invite (or not) co-construction of understanding based on what actually helps students to learn.

Dialogicality and the Classroom

For the purposes of this study, I draw on Wells's (2007a) idea of the *monologic to dialogic continuum* (p. 271) as a way to look at how two teachers work between two points of tension inherent in classroom settings. Monologicality in the classroom refers to an "assumption that there is only one valid perspective, which is put forward with no expectation that there is more to be said" (Wells, 2007a, p. 261). It comes from a stance toward education as akin to that of banking where "students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor" (Friere, 1993, p. 72). This model of education views people as manipulatable things to be shaped and fashioned; to be acted upon; to be told what to do, say, and think. The consequences of this epistemology serve a system that seeks to

11

control people since "[t]he more students work at storing the deposits entrusted to them, the less they develop the critical consciousness which would result from their intervention in the world as transformers of the world" (p. 73). Moreover, Shields and Edward (2005) reflect that monologicality "is unidirectional, when it is either describing relations among objects or between a persona and an object or when we 'depersonify' the other, while dialogism is the creative interaction that generates meaning reciprocally" (p. 58).

For this study, dialogicality in a classroom setting means that the assumption is made that "there is frequently more than one perspective on a topic and that it is worthwhile to present and discuss them" (Wells, 2007a, p. 261). It is not to say that there is no place for lecture, but as Wells (2007a) points out, each succeeding generation needs to engage in questioning underlying assumptions and engage in dialogue with the world in order to construct its own understanding of what is valid and why (pp. 262-263). In looking at differences between monologic and dialogic classrooms, Christoph and Nystrand (2001) found that in monologically organized English classrooms, 85% of talk was a combination of recitation, lecture and seatwork, and an average of only *one minute* per class was spent in discussion. Monologically organized classrooms follow a transmission of knowledge model, one that values knowledge as coming from teacher and textbook (Nystrand, 1997). By contrast, in a dialogically organized classroom, a transformation of knowledge communication model is followed, and sources of knowledge sources are broader and include student voices, understandings, and experiences (Nystrand, 1997). "Monologic discourse is usually associated with fixed

12

transmission of unchanging ideas and status inequalities. Dialogic discourse connotes social relationships of equal status, intellectual openness, and possibilities for critique and creative thought" (O'Connor & Michaels, 2007, p. 277). Moreover, whether a classroom is organized monologically or dialogically is reflective of the worldview of the teacher. And especially relevant to this study, whether a teacher has adopted a "dialogic stance" (Wells, 2007a, p. 269), more so than the frequency of talk, is a better indicator to his or her approach to teaching. This stance becomes evident over time, as "it is the teacher's overall dialogic stance that allows the class to move between the two modes so smoothly as, through inquiry-oriented talk and action, they engage in knowledge building that enhances both collective and individual understanding" (Wells, 2007a, p. 271).

Intertextuality. Kristeva (1980) is credited with bringing the term *intertextuality* to the attention of scholars as she strove to further Bakhtin's theory of intersubjectivity and wrote that "Bakhtinian dialogism identifies writing as both subjectivity and communication, or better, as intertextuality" (p. 68). Intersubjectivity, or communicative understanding, is often described as being on the same page with someone. Wertsch (1998) described social interaction as on a continuum with one end intersubjectivity, or the "degree to which interlocutors in a communicative situation share a perspective" (p. 111), and on the other end, alterity, or the sense of the "distinction between self and other" (Wertsch, 1998, p. 116). If one regards intersubjectivity as a continuum, it necessarily is a process of movement toward sharing a perspective and one that is replete with hiccups and stumblings that call for repair – rather than a stasis that one either attains or does not – which would cast intersubjectivity as a binary. In Kristeva's (1980)

view, intertextuality encompasses more than individual speakers looking for points of shared understanding but also that texts have points of mutually shared contact and commensurability as well. She posited that texts inhabited two axes – the horizontal, or how texts build on each other; and the vertical, or how texts draw on each other's conventions (Johnstone, 2008, p. 164). Kristeva's (1980) relatively generous view of what counts as a text and how various texts relate to one another is apparent as she further explained that "any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the transformation and absorption of another" (p. 66). For this investigation, I draw further from Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, and Shuart-Faris's (2005) conception of intertextuality as "the juxtapostion of texts" (pp. 40-41) of all sorts (e.g., written, conversational, electronic, graphic, and nonverbal texts) and as intertextuality pertains to classroom life:

> In a classroom the students may simultaneously have their textbooks open on their desks, be engaged in a conversation with the teacher, and have maps hanging on the wall while the teacher is writing on the whiteboard….intertextuality is socially constructed rather than given in a text. (Bloome et al., 2005, pp. 40-41)

Moreover, the authors establish criteria for whether or not the "inter" part of intertextuality actually has been constructed, "[I]t must have been proposed, acknowledged, recognized, and have social consequence" (p. 41). That is, to have "social consequence" intertextuality requires reciprocity, and, whatever is proposed, must be taken up (p. 41). Intertextuality as a theoretical tool will help me to identify the continual and connected nature of classroom norms, conversations, and morés over time.

Sedimentation. Linked to intertextuality through repetition of patterns, interactions in a social setting become predictable. Predictability of talk, actions, morés, physical environment and expectations in particular social settings is accomplished through the laying down of micro-layer after micro-layer of lived, daily instances of talk, behaviors, values and more. In discussing how features of a language become commonplace over daily use across generations, Erickson (2006) explains that some properties evolve and not others: "The activity of use has *sedimented* as a distinctive set of features of language"… (p. 14). For this investigation, I propose that the idea of sedimentation be applied as well to the being-doing-saying d/Discourse norms inside classrooms. Moreover, I move from Erickson's generational timescale, and toward a shorter one (Lemke, 2001) that represents the arc of classroom life -- moment by moment, day by day, and week by week.

Revoicing, positioning. *Revoicing* in a classroom setting, is a form of ventriloquation, and thus, a kind of dialogicality (Bakhtin, 1981; Wertsch, 1991a, p. 59). Revoicing can be strategically used by a teacher in order to make space for students' ideas and contributions as well as being a form of scaffolding of those ideas. Revoicing, according to O'Connor and Michaels (1996), is "a particular kind of reuttering (oral or written) of a student's contribution – by another participant in the discussion" (p. 71). It can be used to 1) relocate a student's contribution in relation to the academic agenda at hand; 2) align a student's contribution with prior conversations on the topic; and, 3) create a space for the teacher to credit a student with a relevant re-formulation or revised and enriched perspective on the subject at hand. Moreover, because revoicing comes

15

from the teacher, "who has a privileged status" it necessarily transforms the student's

utterance as "it can be uttered more succinctly, loudly, completely, or in a

different…social language" (O'Connor & Michaels, 1996, p. 71). Moreover, revoicing

can be a way to position students differently within the ongoing construction of the

classroom community.

Often accomplished through revoicing, *positioning* is "the discursive process

whereby selves are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent

participants in jointly produced story lines" (Davies & Harré, 2001, p. 264). The authors'

dual expansion of the notion into "interactive positioning" or how one person's

contribution can change or re-position another's; and, "reflexive positioning" as the

discursive process of a person positioning himself (p. 264) are what I draw from for this

research in order to identify dialogical classroom structures though selected interactions.

Democratic Aims, Communicative Virtues, and Pedagogical Tactfulness

Democratic aims. The preceding constructs do not presupposed intention, for

good or ill, of speakers or of composers of texts. In this portion of the framework, I aim

to make clear that the goals of this study are to determine how teachers construct and

enact democratic values in their classrooms and specifically, in the writing conferences

that they conduct with their students. Literacy taught for empowerment of students rather

than their subjugation and disempowerment is emancipatory teaching, and one might

venture, a political act on the part of teachers who have decided to enact their work in this

way (Friere & Macedo, 1987, p. 98). Dewey asks the fundamental question which points

back to the need for encouraging thoughtful and dedicated educators: "Who, then shall

16

conduct education so that humanity may improve? We must depend upon the efforts of enlightened men in their private capacity" (Dewey, 1966, p. 95)**.** Moreover, Dewey describes a conception of education as social, and in the quote that follows, also as respectful of the individual, and life-affirming:

> Since life means growth, a living creature lives as truly and positively at one stage as at another with the same intrinsic fullness and the same absolute claims. Hence education means the enterprise of supplying the conditions which insure growth, or adequacy of life, irrespective of age. (Dewey, 1966, p. 51)

One reason I elected to study writing conferences is to examine their affordances for a teacher-student encounter that is both respectful of the individual and particularly educative for that student, in that moment.

Communicative virtues. In their discussion on the value and importance of maintaining dialogue in educational settings with others because of differences – not just in spite of them, Burbules and Rice (1991) point out that even raising the issue implies that we are more alike, than not. They acknowledge that "effort and good will alone are not guarantees; dialogue is fallible" (p. 405), yet in the *persistence of effort* lies the possibility of positive change and better understanding. They suggest that understanding in dialogical exchange is a continuum: 1) agreement and consensus; 2) common understandings established where discussion remains possible; 3) disagreement with positions but respect for conversational partners' thoughtful positions; and 4) irreconcilable differences (p. 409). Moreover, Burbules and Rice (1991) developed what they call *communicative virtues,* the practice of which reflects "an affective and

17

intellectual stance toward partners in conversation; they promote a generous and sympathetic regard for the perspectives and self-expression of others" (p. 411).

> These virtues include tolerance, patience, respect for differences, a willingness to listen, the inclination to admit that one may be mistaken, the ability to reinterpret or translate one's own concerns in a way that makes them comprehensible to others, the self imposition of restraint in order that others may "have a turn" to speak, and the disposition to express one's self honestly and sincerely. (p. 411)

These communicative virtues are part of the criteria I employ when examining the interactions of the two teachers in the study presented here: they are at once, relational and intellectual, affective and instructional attitudes that an educator can choose to value and develop in his or her life and practice.

Pedagogical tactfulness. Related to thinking on one's feet or reflection-in-action, (Schön, 1984), and caring (Noddings, 1984) *pedagogical tact* is an ability of particularly effective teachers to make just-right teaching decisions governed by genuine caring about a child in their charge amid the ebb and flow of a busy teaching day, life, or year. Noddings (1984) urges the teacher to treat each student with respect and caring, giving each her full attention, so that when the student later remembers the learning, a feeling or affect that comes up will be positive, reflective, and confidence imbued – something the student will want to hold on to and even continue in dialogic engagement with through inner speech. This kind of teaching involves "sharing and reflecting aloud. It involves the kind of close contact that makes personal history valuable...A relationship is required" (Noddings, 1984, pp.121-122). For the research presented here, I frame *pedagogical tact*

in terms of a teacher's practice with his or her students. "Pedagogical tact does what is right or good for the child….[including] preserve a child's space, protect what is vulnerable, prevent hurt, make whole what is broken, strengthen what is good, enhance what is unique, and sponsor personal growth" (van Manen, 1991, p. 161). Moreover, "A tactful teacher seems to have the ability of instantly sensing what is the appropriate, right or good thing to do on the basis of perceptive pedagogical understanding of children's individual nature and circumstances" (van Manen, 1995, p. 44-45). As a construct, in concert with Burbules and Rice's (1991) communicative virtues, caring, and reflection-in-action, pedagogical tact will serve as a magnification lens through which selected interactions presented in this study can be described and considered in light of contributing to the literature that explores ways in which teachers can create dialogic, democratic, and humane classrooms.

Based on the evidence gathered and displayed in the pages that follow, I aim to use these theoretical frameworks to examine whether the classroom practices in this study are dialogic, and ways in which classroom structures put into place might reflect a dialogic stance on the part of those teachers. In addition, this study will explore whether and how those classroom structures influence the talk and relational elements of writing conferences and subsequent student writing across time.

Chapter Two: Review of Literature

In this study, I explore the interplay and overlap of talk, writing, and relational aspects of classroom life. In particular, I center my attention on the features of writing conferences and the relational dimensions between student and teacher inside those structures. Additionally, I look at how those instructional and relational interactions influence student writing, and how they point to overall classroom norms established by the teacher. In the following pages, within a perspective of teaching and learning as socially situated, I review broad areas of professional literature including conversations as instruction including listening, and high quality teaching; writing instruction and within that, writing conferences; response to writing, including written, verbal, and non-verbal feedback; teacher beliefs about writing conferences; and, the role of relational aspects of teaching and learning including what students see as caring classroom environments. Taken together, these literatures will help me to identify areas of related interest as they are presented in the findings and discussion chapters.

Literature Review

Conversations in the ZPD

Teaching as "assisted performance": Instructional conversations. Talk as dialogue is central to Tharp and Gallimore's (1991) definition of teaching as "assisting performances through a child's zone of proximal development (ZPD). *Teaching must be redefined as assisted performance; teaching occurs when performance is achieved with assistance*" (p. 5, italics original). This assistance is accomplished through "*dialogue –*

the questioning and sharing of ideas and knowledge that happen in conversation" (p. 6, italics original). They coined the term "instructional conversations" (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) to reflect a teaching agenda that is systematic, deliberate, and which comes out of a sociocultural epistemic stance. Seven criteria inscribe the territory of the instructional conversation: modeling, feeding back, contingency managing, directing, questioning, explaining, and task structuring (Tharp & Gallimore, 1991, pp. 5-6).

The scaffolding process (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976, p. 98), not surprisingly, is very similar to instructional conversations with its six criteria: demonstration, marking critical features, direction maintenance, recruiting the child's interest; narrowing the task, and frustration control. Tharp and Gallimore (1991) address interest recruitment through "activity settings…[as the]… social furniture" (p. 7) necessary to create interest and provide structure for learning to take place. Activity settings must "allow for a maximum of assistance in the performance of the tasks at hand. They must be designed to allow teachers to assist children through the zone of proximal development toward the goal of developing higher order mental processes" (Tharp & Gallimore, 1991, p. 7). Both notions – instructional conversations and scaffolding – come out of an understanding of learning as a situated social process (e.g., *this* or *these* student(s), *this* task, *this* point in task mastery).

From his examination of the kinds of talk that moved scientific discovery forward, Bereiter (1994, p. 6) identified the aim of "progressive discourse" as the result of collaboration, conversations, and finally, consensus among people who agree that, together, they've reached a better understand than the one with which they began. Wells

and Haneda (2005) propose that progressive discourse's outcome of superior understanding applies as well to instructional conversations (p. 155). Furthermore, instructional conversations, progressive discourse and scaffolding are consistent with ways that experts in *communities of practice* (Wenger, 1998) work with novices "in solving what the novice experiences as a problem and typically they do so in a manner that enables the newcomers to achieve mastery of the relevant knowledgeable skills to that they are eventually able to participate in the activity autonomously" (Wells & Haneda, 2005, p. 5). The kinds of conversations or patterns of interaction available in a classroom may reflect structures put into place by the teacher that may exhibit themselves inside a writing conference.

Listening. Reciprocal conversations, such as well-conducted instructional conversations including writing conferences, where teachers are working to create situations of assisted performance for learners, require careful listening in order to achieve a degree of mutual understanding or intersubjectivity (Wertsch, 1998) between participants. The kinds, value, and dimensions of listening are much more nuanced than a listening-not-listening binary.

Situating listening inside a framework of interacting virtues where living well and virtuously is connected to both to individual and social happiness, Burbules and Rice, in their piece "On Pretending to Listen" (2010) view context as critical for deciding what is virtuous listening behavior in a given situation and locate it on a continuum of listening action with disregard at one extreme, and deeply exclusive listening on the other. The authors point to the realities of listening as being on a continuum and decry the laundry

22

list of virtues that many schools today adopt with an either-or atomization of virtues inside a zero-tolerance, rule-following emphasis on controlling student behavior (p. 3) and question whether such a focus in schools is healthy. With increasing pressure from standardized testing, increased use of pre-packaged curricula afford students fewer opportunities to listen to that which is worthwhile including content as well as learning conversations with other students. "Learning to listen well is educationally generative. The better one can listen, the more educated one can become, and the more educated one becomes, the better one can listen" (p. 6). Applying it to the lives of teachers, they unpack the notion of pretending to listen -- taking it out of an either-or frame -- and locate it on a continuum of where one may be *trying* to listen or *learning* to listen (p. 2). They push back against the pressure to exemplify the "virtues of perpetual selflessness" (p. 7) of service occupations, and instead, count as both necessary and desirable the ability to navigate listening demands and carefully select moments for thoughtful engagement.

Discussing public schools as the best suited arena to develop democratic discussion habits *because* of the diversity and differences encountered, Parker (2010) examines the practice of one teacher who has spent considerable effort in teaching her high school students the skills and preparedness necessary for productive civic and civil discussions. He concludes that teaching and learning democratic habits of listening is a complex and worthwhile undertaking. Those habits include reciprocity, humility, and caution while investing oneself in dialogue with others. Writing conferences can be a safe space for students to both learn and practice such habits. Moreover, focusing on the

23

silence of students in classroom settings, Shultz (2010) concludes from her research that silence may be a part of careful listening and warrants inclusion in what counts as classroom participation in consideration of students who come from cultures that value silence as respectful participation, those who are English learners and thus have heavy linguistic processing demands placed on them, or students whose dispositions or propensities cause them to *appear* reluctant to engage verbally. Shultz's (2010) piece is a useful reminder that students in writing conferences as well as in classroom discussion may be reluctant to speak, not from lack of interest or engagement, and it points to the necessity for teachers to figure out hospitable ways to persist in their efforts with quieter students.

Burbules and Rice (1991) explore the necessity of "dialogue across differences" as a way educators can enact a stance of hopefulness by making the efforts required to reach points of respectful understanding through adhering to practice of communicative virtues (p. 411). Although but a fraction of the work on listening is represented here, these pieces are important to this study to better conceptualize dimensions of listening in what happens between student and teacher during an instructional conversation or writing conference.

High quality teaching. Literature on high quality teachers highlights those teachers' abilities to support the autonomy of their students, create positive relationships with their students, create a cooperative and collaborative classroom culture that values classroom talk, and provide learning experiences that are both engaging and sufficiently challenging. High quality teachers significantly influence improving students' learning

and achievement (Darling-Hammond, 1997) and this is especially true in schools that serve students from predominantly low socioeconomic homes (Nye, Konstantopolous, & Hedges, 2004). Moreover, high quality teachers understand and develop relational aspects of their practices and classroom environments. Developing profiles of classroom quality, Stuhlman and Pianta (2009) conducted an observational study of 820 first grade classrooms of which 23% were labeled "high overall quality." In these well-managed classrooms, teachers were "constantly aware of and responsive to students' needs" and built "warm, friendly" classroom atmospheres, and maintained "genuinely positive relationship with their students" (p. 332). The teachers respected students' need for autonomy and choice, provided "effective literacy instruction", and consistently engaged with students in "conversations about their ideas, their work, and the process of learning" (p. 332). These findings closely reflect those of Blair, Rupley, and Nichols's (2007) research review which showed clear connections between confident, effective teachers and student achievement in reading and writing.

In their study of masterful fourth grade literacy teachers (Allington & Johnston, 2001) as well as in their first grade study (Pressley, Allington, Wharton-McDonald, Block, & Morrow, 2001), the researchers found that teachers drew upon their content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and understanding of each child in order to make expert and personalized instructional decisions. The exemplary fourth grade teachers used longer term projects, curricular integration, collaborative structures, personalized and small group instruction, encouraged effort and self-evaluation, valued classroom talk including the trying out of ideas or "tentative talk" and treated language as something to

be studied (pp. 214-215). Moreover, Mercer 's (2007) findings from his work on how effective teachers use talk (Rojas-Drummond, Mercer, & Dabroski, 2001 in Mercer, 2007) show that such teachers use open-ended questioning to guide students' understandings, teach students principles and procedures for solving problems, and treat "learning as a social, communicative process" (p. 144). Using data from his 2001 study with Allington, Johnston's (2004) book *Choice Words* echoes the respectful, inquiring tone of those classrooms and shows all educators ways that language can be employed to help construct positive learning environments.

Writing Instruction

Addressing writing for educational purposes, Vygotsky (1978) explains that important connections exist between the self-expressions of gesturing and speech, speech and drawing, drawing and writing, and how for the student, writing is an expression of himself and a way of meeting his own needs. He underscores that writing is a "complex cultural activity" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 117-118), and that a student needs authentic purposes for writing relevant to his or her life, without which writing becomes merely mechanical and ultimately, boring (p. 117). "Reading and writing should become necessary for her in her play" (p. 118). If we think of play as the expression of imagination and the trying on of possibilities and identities, then, although he was referring to younger children in this passage, Vygotsky's ideas are clearly relevant for adolescents, as well.

In much writing instruction, the act of writing is seen as a tool for thinking (NCTE, 2004/2008) which involves making authorial choices, planning, drafting, and

revising. Writing, as such, is a recursive process in which any stage can be visited or revisited at any time along the way (Flower & Hayes, 1981). Sondra Perl (1979) found, in addition to writing being a form of meaning-making or thinking, that internalization of the composing process – prewriting, writing, editing – display themselves in recognizable patterns across writers (p. 331). Perl (1979) used Goodman's (1969) notion of miscue analysis – originally developed for readers to observe themselves in the meaning-making process of reading – and applied it as a tool in her analysis of writers writing. Using it, she focused on students' "encoding processes or what students spoke while writing and decoding processes or what students 'read' after they had finish writing" (Perl, 1979, p. 324). Using a think-aloud protocol, Perl (1979) studied the writing processes of five unskilled college writer-participants. Moreover, she followed up with more in-depth case studies of which one was "Tony" whom she found had a deeply embedded and recursive writing process. He would, however, get stuck on overcorrecting himself. Perl (1979) deduced that Tony did not need more rules to learn, more practice sheets, or more discrete instruction; what he needed was teachers who could help him understand his own processes, help him understand, as Murray (1982) put it, his "other self."

The emphasis in process writing is on the student's *process* of writing, more so than the end *product* so that the student can emerge as more thoughtful, more metacognitively aware, more able to be his or her own first reader (Murray, 1982), and more able to interact with and affect change in the world. According to Ray and Laminack (2001), indispensable elements of process writing instruction for classrooms of students from kindergarten through college and beyond include "choices about content,

27

time for writing, teaching, talking, periods of focused study, publication rituals, high expectations and safety, [and] structured management" (p.15), all of which point to balance between procedural and process elements of writing instruction. The National Writing Project, a non-profit organization that provides national and local professional development process writing instruction for teachers of writing, combined data from 16 studies in seven states and found that teachers who had undertaken National Writing Project professional development and their students out-performed those who did not, both in terms of quality of thought and quality of writing (National Writing Project, 2010, p. 2).

      Writing conferences. Teaching and talking inside the classroom can be, in turn, whole group, small group, in conferences between peers, or between teacher and student or students. Teaching and talking about writing can take the form of relatively brief meetings, or "writing conferences", with and between students about their writing, as well as between teacher and student (Murray, 1982; Calkins 1994; Atwell, 1998). This study's main focus is on the talk that goes on in the teaching of writing, and particularly, the talk between student and teacher. The one-to-one, teacher-student conference is an instructional conversation (Tharp & Gallimore, 1991) the purpose of which is to help the student with his or her writing. It occurs inside a set-aside island of time that may last anywhere from less than one to fifteen minutes (Sperling, 1991, p. 135). It is a hybrid kind of conversation that is both curricular and interpersonal (Jacobs & Karliner, 1977). Writing conferences, as conversations, are dialogic *participation structures* (Goffman, 1981) which can normalize thinking out-loud-together kinds of

28

encounters, can accustom students to think about their own thinking, and can provide "conditions of entry…into speech activities associated with complex thinking and problem solving" (O'Connor & Michaels, 1996, p. 64).

The conference provides a unique space for both parties to address any aspect of the student's writing process, including talk, that might appear to be only tertiarily related to writing instruction (Freedman & Sperling, 1985) such as in-school or out-of-school interests and/or concerns that may or may not lead to writing topics and ideas. Containing both the power-differential constraints of school-based learning events as well as such conversational affordances such as the ability of either partner to choose to switch topics, elaborate, or interject, the writing conference can open or close learning opportunities as both parties interpret responses and negotiate their way through the interchange (Freedman & Sperling, 1985; Cazden, 2001).

Flexibly and depending on the individual student's needs, the teacher's role in a writing conference is to use a repertoire of conversation strategies (McCarthey, 1992, p. 53), to support the student's writing, stimulate reflection through authentic response, ask questions, and make suggestions for improvement. Calkins (1994, pp. 226-228) advocates three consistent patterns of interactions or internal structures as the architecture of a writing conference. The teacher begins with the *research* step in which she reads what the child has so far and talks to him to better understand his intentions and concerns. Second, based on her research, the teacher *decides* what is most important for this child, this writer to focus upon. Third, following the decision, the teacher then *teaches* in the context of the child's current project. Moreover, both Calkins, Hartman and White (2005)

and Bomer (2010) add *naming* what the student is already doing well as an author to conference architecture: Calkins, Hartman and White (2005) advocate finding and using an honest, substantive and specific "lasting complement" (p. 64) in order to help the student build self-confidence; whereas, Bomer (2010) foregrounds this *naming* as "the key to teaching students something they may not have consciously realized they are doing so that they can build on it and do it again" (p. 9). Such naming also helps to establish a discourse of appreciation that the student can later draw upon when considering his own or another's writing.

Encouraging a writer's independence, Murray (1982) wrote that the foundational, three-way dialogue between the student, his "other self", and the teacher, happens best in an in-person, one-to-one conference – and that opportunities for conferencing should be plentiful and brief (p. 146). He ties his discussion of effective conferencing to careful and authentic listening. To teach this way, he asserts, "is a demanding teaching; it is nothing less than the teaching of critical thinking…. Listening, after all, is an aggressive act" (p. 145). Inside Murray's vision of a writing conference, the teacher helps the student figure out what, exactly, is working and how it can be made to work better. The teacher models this process, and helps the student learn to hear his own "other self". Central to Murray's claim is the idea that the writer, as his own first reader, is capable of becoming the metacognitively-aware reader who comes to know this knowledgeable "other self".

These one-to-one conversations not only address instructional needs of students but also afford students and teachers personalized opportunities, outside of classroom discussions, to come into contact with each other in dialogic encounters (Intrator &

Kunzman, 2009, p. 43), and to build "the relationships that make learning possible" (Cushman, 2003, p. xii). Among the affordances of writing conferences is the ability for a teacher to differentiate instruction for each student based on frequent instruction and interpersonal interactions centered on the student's writing.

Response to Writers and their Writing

Written feedback. Teachers of English language arts tend to spend a great deal of time reading and commenting on student work. Most of this is done by written comments, which can be very time-consuming at 20 or more minutes per paper. The intent of feedback, ideally, is "to dramatize the presence of a reader, to help our students to become that questioning reader themselves, because, ultimately, we believe that becoming such a reader will help them to evaluate what they have written and develop control over their writing" (Sommers, 1982, p.148). Even with the best intentions, in their written comments, Peterson and Kennedy (2006) found that sixth grade teachers tended to praise narrative writing more than persuasive writing, and, tended to position female students as more capable writers, while offering more criticisms, suggestions, and commands to boys (pp. 54-55).

Evaluative feedback, or diagnostic comments connected with a grade is often disregarded by students (Underwood, 2008; Dinen & Collopy, 2009). On the other hand, students found helpful clear and directive feedback that came from a content expert, was oriented toward helping the student improve his or her writing, and praised specifics in their writing (Cho, Schunn, & Charney, 2006, p. 276). Liu (2009) found that native Chinese ESL college students in her study were unfamiliar with the expectation of

dynamic interchange in a writing conference and, while they readily answered questions, seldom initiated any, and felt that a successful exchange occurred when they received directive feedback.

In their study of written feedback on drafts of third grade students Matsumura, Patthey-Chavez, Valdéz, and Garnier (2002) found that teachers attended most to surface features of writing and far less to content and ideas contained therein – despite evidence that students readily embraced and used teachers' content-based feedback. The researchers note that both standardization of language use might be an overriding concern at this grade level, and, that the mounting pressure of high-stakes testing might incline teachers to attend most closely to that which is graded on the exams despite the fact that this stance mis-educates students by overfocusing on correctness rather than exploration of ideas. To counter this, they advocate for "collaborative assisted professional development" (p. 22) that aims to help teachers improve their practice.   Moreover, for students to maximally benefit from teacher comments intended to help them improve their writing the students need to notice, accept, and understand the feedback, and how to implement it (Underwood, 2008, p. 415).

Investigating how response to writing was accomplished in the nation's best public school classrooms, Freedman, Greenleaf, and Sperling (1987) wondered how response could support the teaching and learning of writing. In their national study conducted in two main phases, they first surveyed 560 "successful" K-12 teachers, and 715 secondary students of the teachers in this group who taught grades 7 through 12. The second phase was an ethnographic study of "how response is accomplished" (p. 3) in two

successful 9th grade English classes in San Francisco. In addition, they looked for *what kinds* of responses both teachers and students felt were most helpful and why. Of their findings, teachers consistently considered conferences to be the most helpful mode of response (p. 72). Students considered written responses on final drafts most helpful and believed that writing conferences with the teacher were far more conducive to their growth as writers than conferencing with self or peers (p. 94). The literature reviewed indicates that teacher feedback on late drafts that is both clear and improvement-oriented is considered by students to be much more helpful than teacher comments on graded work. Moreover, with the variety of cultural backgrounds represented today in schools, it appears that there is a place for both written and spoken feedback on student work in progress.

The writing conference: the instructional agenda. One of the characteristics of a successful conference is that the teacher carries into it an *agenda* or a list – physical or not -- of things to be accomplished inside the meeting or conference, the purpose of which is to help the student learn principles of good writing, and/or help the student learn universal features of writing that make for an effective composition (Walker & Elias, 1987; Fitzgerald & Stamm 1992), through the use of well-elaborated comments and explanations specifically construed to the writing of each student (Beach & Friedrich, 2006). Teacher Linda Reif's writing conference agenda, as part of her overall teaching of writing agenda, included using questioning to help the student clarify his or her ideas, the student initiating the conference, the student engaging in a discussion about the writing,

33

and the student doing most of the talking once inside a conference (Kaufman, 2000, p. 93).

Lee and Schallert (2008) found that most of the English-learning Korean students in their study believed that the teacher's robust instructional agenda – which included a great deal of written feedback on drafts, as well as verbal writing conferences conducted in Korean, for clarity's sake -- was not only good writing instruction, but was also evidence of teacher caring and commitment. In their study of speaking turns, and of linguistic markers that pointed to agentive or non-agentive stances taken up by the students in a basic composition course composed of international students, Strauss and Xiang's (2006) findings point to a robust instructional agenda as essential in the teaching of writing. They describe their observation of an instructor's class where "students and teacher collaborate in the discursive negotiation and construction of the detailed planning, translation, and early composition stages of students' writing… [the result of which is that]…agency emerges among novice writers as they grapple with the writing tasks at hand and engage in purposeful goal-directed dialogue with their instructor about reading, writing and the fulfillment of their writing assignments" (p. 356).

The literature indicates that a productive writing conference agenda includes teachers' adoption of a collaborative stance toward the student and his or her writing, combined with both the ability and intent to help the student make his or her writing more precise, more vivid, and more aligned with his own purposes as well as with the academic goals of a particular composition.

Body language as feedback in writing conferences. Exploring how participants in writing conferences draw upon non-verbal elements of communication in order to get on the same page with their conversational partners is useful in considering how non-verbal communication can enhance or block effective encounters between teachers and students. Tickle-Degnen and Rosenthal (1990) conceptualized non-verbal elements of rapport, attention, positivity and coordination as they related to teacher-student interactions, and Fox (1999) called for more study in prosodic and gestural moves related to syntax in turn taking and turn completion as she posited that the three may be mutually constitutive. Hanks (1996) offered that people don't even have to share the same grammar but for effective communication to occur,

> What they must share to a variable degree, is the ability to orient themselves
>
> verbally, perceptually, physically, to their social world. That is, the basis of
>
> linguistic practices is not a common set of categories (whether viewed as verbal
>
> or cognitive) but rather a commensurate set of categories, plus commensurate
>
> ways of locating oneself in relation to them. (Hanks, 1996, p. 235)

Studies examining the interplay between gaze, body orientation, and other non-verbally communicated elements in context of writing instruction include those between a tutor and tutee in a college writing center (Belhiah, 2009; Thompson, 2009; Artman, 2005; Thonus, 2008) and one in a secondary setting (Martin & Mottet, 2011). Artman (2005) noted that the college instructors' nonverbal elements of a writing conference were used to either emphasize a directive, or take the edge off of one. Belhiah (2009) examined verbal and non-verbal openings and closings of one-to-one, ESL writing

35

conferences between a college instructor or tutor, and her tutee. Findings indicate that

substantial mutual negotiation takes place in which each aspect of the tutoring agenda

does not proceed unless and until the tutee ratifies it. Moreover, body orientation and

gaze were employed economically in the communicative endeavors of each participant.

Thonus (2008) investigated sequences of laughter in one-to-one writing

conferences in a university's writing center and found that laughter, overall, increased

familiarity and the sense of acquaintanceship between tutors and their tutees. Thompson's

(2009) microanalysis of a tutor-tutee writing conference led her to conclude that

nonverbal gestures partnered with talk to enhance the message, and, that to relegate that

which is communicated but not spoken to a "non" status, undermines its importance in

lived encounters (p. 445). Moreover, she found that a complex combination of direct

instruction, cognitive scaffolding and motivational scaffolding was highly situation

specific. The tutor is this study drew heavily upon cognitive scaffolding, providing his

tutee with IRE-type questions in order to limit the likelihood of error, and to increase her

motivation – ultimately, permitting tutor and tutee to achieve a helpful degree of

intersubjectivity (p. 445-447). Investigating non-verbal immediacy behaviors, or those

behaviors that teachers exhibit "that reduce perceived distance between teachers and

students" (Immediacy Behaviors, 2008), Martin and Mottet (2011) looked at

effectiveness of writing conferences with ninth grade Latino/a students. They found that

non-verbal immediacy behaviors (e.g., gaze, smiling, leaning forward while conversing

with a student), when combined with clear and direct instruction worked well for the

students to both understand what they needed to accomplish in their writing and

increased their motivation to do so through higher affect toward the teacher and the writing.

Teacher beliefs and attitudes about writing instruction and writing conferences. How a teacher conducts a writing conference reflects his/her beliefs about teaching and learning. Jacobs and Karliner's (1977) early study of two student and teacher pairs' verbal interactions inside writing conferences showed that for one pair, the amount of talk was roughly equal; and for the other pair, the teacher did most of the talking. The researchers surmised that too much teacher talk might point to that teacher's underlying banking model philosophy of education. Their recommendations are reflected in those of Calkins (1994) and others (e.g., Ray & Cleaveland, 2004; Moher, 2007; Fletcher & Portalupi, 2001) in that their findings pointed to a need for instructors to develop greater sensitivity to know when it is the right time to talk with a student about structural and procedural concerns, and when it is better to talk with that student about his or her ideas. Moreover, some of Jacobs and Karliner's (1977) recommendations include using conversational mirroring techniques (e.g., "I hear you saying that…"); positioning the student as agent in the speaker, initiator, and framer roles; listening closely, making genuine comments, and asking genuine questions can all help make the conference a more effective learning experience for the student (p. 504-505).

Teacher beliefs and practices align. An example of a teacher whose beliefs and practices align along a constructivist axis, the focal teacher in Kaufman's (2000) study calls a writing conference "a good healthy chat". The purpose of the "chat" is to work on

forming a relationship with the student that will nurture his or her writing. While

studying this teacher's practice, Kaufman observed that

> Working in a relationship of camaraderie, she [the teacher in his study] is better
>
> able to elicit and recognize the things that interest them. Then she can say to the
>
> writer, 'Look at what you just said. Get it down on paper!'. (Kaufman, 2000, p.
>
> 77)

Kaufman (2000) found that the teacher, forming a relationship with her students in a

context where attention is focused on producing something together, will nurture writing

not unlike friendships that get built in a quilting circle. When the teacher believes the

purpose of conversing with a student to be more than information imparting or correction,

a writing conference can be a time when the student discovers his own ideas as he talks.

Another example of teacher beliefs and practices in alignment is Larson and

Maier's (2000) study, where Larson investigated Maier's exemplary and dialogic

classroom in a year-long ethnography where writing conferences were conducted with

students. The teacher embedded the workshop approach to writing in her classroom

ecology and believed that children benefited from seamless immersion in a literacy-rich

environment where everyone was a writer/reader: "[S]he did not simply model writing as

discrete technique or set of skills but modeled authorship as a meaningful writing process

constructed in interaction" (p. 477). There was not a specifically set-aside writing

conference period but "interaction around text occurred consistently" as Maier circulated

among the students, crouched down to talk to one at time, and asked things like, "'What

do you got so far?'" (p. 487); and, honoring the child's choice of topic, "'Tell me more

about Street Sharks'" (p. 489). The overhearer role was planned in as students continued composing and benefited from proximal instruction. This teacher's classroom is an example, as was the classroom in Kaufman's (2000) study, of one in which talk, sharing, and student making/composing is a constant, unified, and shared process. The degree to which the teachers in my study also facilitated their students' composing processes as interactive elements of teaching, talking, making, and sharing may be reflected in how student writing is or is not traceable to their writing conferences as well as to other classroom interactions which are set up by the teacher as learning structures.

Teacher beliefs and practices at odds. McCarthey (1992) wanted to find out whether teachers' beliefs about and actions during writing conferences changed as a result of professional development. She conducted case study research of two teachers who participated in the Teachers College Writing Project, a summer intensive with follow-up classes, conferences, and seminars, connected to the National Writing Project. She found that both teachers did change. One started the program conflicted about the tensions between "teaching" and hurting a child's feelings, and over time, came to understand that she could both teach *and* converse with the student-author. Interestingly, this first teacher exemplifies the inherent paradox between instruction and conversation. Perhaps she felt "the former implying authority and planning, the latter equality and responsiveness. The task of teaching is to resolve this paradox. To truly teach, one must converse; to truly converse is to teach" (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, p. 6). When she started the professional development, the second teacher (McCarthey, 1992) was overly concerned with procedural elements and paid little attention to what the writer was

saying. Eventually, after engaging with the program's professional development opportunities, she was able to shift away from having such a narrow focus on procedural elements of writing and, subsequently, learned to listen more closely to the writer and focus her attention more broadly. The results indicate that with the right combination of support and professional development, teachers *can* learn to have authentic exchanges with students and how learning to confer with students is a continual process that takes effort and reflection, and which may change and develop over time.

Looking at how students took up the writing conference discourse of their teacher, McCarthey (1994) conducted a case study in a New York City mixed 5th & 6th grade classroom. Her purpose was to look at how intersubjectivity between class members and student internalization of classroom discourse was achieved. Her evidence showed that the students did, in fact, use the words of the teacher (McCarthey, 1994, p. 226); however, intersubjectivity and movement of discourse from external speech or internal speech, or internalization, is complicated by power relations. Her findings indicate that teacher beliefs, social values, and norms are transmitted to students right along with any content; and, that everyday practices of the teacher in her study did not appear to be in line with her stated beliefs about teaching.

Similarly, Freedman and Sperling (1985) investigated the impact of writing conference talk on students with a teacher whose intentions did not align with practice when they conducted a study in which they looked at one college writing teacher's initial meetings with each of four students. She was chosen because of consistently positive student evaluations and she was experienced in conducting writing conferences. Findings

indicate that the teacher engaged the lower achieving students in surface level talk, only. Conversely, writing conferences were animated and extended with the higher achieving students with whom she used praise, and both academic and conversational registers. Although she had *intended* to treat students equally, the evidence presented to her by the researchers suggested otherwise and indicated that her praxis was fueled by biases, not a robust and egalitarian teaching agenda. Based on their findings, the researchers recommended that teachers conduct action research on their interactions with students in order to study their own practices, to conduct their own professional development, and to better align their beliefs with classroom practices. The findings of McCarthey (1994) and Freedman and Sperling (1985) concur with those of Wells (2007a) that, whether knowingly or not, the use of language by adults in children's lives serves to bring those young people into the adults' discourse practices – for better or for worse -- expanding or limiting students' views of their agency in the world.

Teacher beliefs, and attitudes about process writing instruction was the subject of an inquiry conducted by Lipson, Mosenthal, Daniels, and Woodside-Jiron (2000). Conducting case studies and using cross case analysis to look at how teachers' commitment to process writing, as well as their beliefs and their attitudes about learning and writing instruction, aligned with their classroom practices, they selected data from a much larger, longitudinal study on Vermont portfolio assessment in Grade 5. From 177 survey respondents whom they sorted according to four categories of pedagogical beliefs, the researchers selected eleven 5th grade teachers whose practices included teaching students to use the planning, drafting, revising, publishing steps recursively. Five of the

eleven did, in fact, focus instruction on helping students to develop ideas and taught using a workshop approach. However, the other six teachers followed a procedural approach to writing instruction. Regarding conferences, the researchers saw that some teachers did none at all; others circulated and only made brief remarks like, "'Good job' or 'nice start'" (p. 220). Three used conferences solely to correct student errors.

Lipson et al. (2000) concluded that there is a lot of variation in how teachers understood process writing, and acknowledged that while all the students were engaged in writing, for those teachers who adhere to a procedural approach to writing instruction "[the] writing process is less meaningful than it is formulaic for the majority of the teachers. Change and reform in instructional practices…. have been primarily structural and superficial…" (p. 227). Yet, even the procedurally-oriented teachers worked to create space for students write about topics important to them.

The recommendation that teachers need high quality professional development that can help them better understand the processes of teaching and learning and make the most of their writing programs, is shared by Lipson et al. (2000) and Matsumura et al. (2002). Even in Freedman, Greenleaf and Sperling's (1987) study, where teachers reported that they believed the writing conferences were worthwhile, the teachers whom one might have thought would be most able to implement them, did not. The researchers found that the experienced teachers (average 14 years), and the half of those who were teaching less than a full load had a hard time creating the structure in their classrooms for regular, one-on-one conferences (pp. 163-165) and pointed to the intensely scheduled nature of secondary schools as being the disincentive to conferencing (p. 168).

Certainly, implementing writing conferences for 120 to 150 students in a daily teaching load is no small accomplishment. Kaufman's (2000) two major findings -- the clearly prioritized and highly organized nature of a well-running site of conferencing, and the necessity of building of relationships with students -- points to the essential ongoing commitment and long-range foresight it takes to include writing conferences in the regular curriculum. Moreover, he shows that a prerequisite is orderliness of a classroom because it is those positive and intentional routines that permit teachers to be able to carve out other curricular and temporal spaces for inclusion of writing conferences as feedback and relational structures.

Teaching and Learning: Relationships Between Teachers and Their Students

  ZPD as a system with affective and intellectual aspects. Conditions for having productive conversations about writing may be created from having a friendly conversation (Kaufman, 2000). It may well be in this friendly exchange where the teacher and student enter and shape their shared interrelational zone which then serves as the gateway to the zone of proximal development where the work of learning unfolds (Goldstein, 1999). Endeavoring to further map out Vygostky's (1978) zone of proximal development, and drawing from their individual research (Mahn, 1997; John-Steiner, 2000), Mahn and John-Steiner (2007) drew upon "*perezhivanie*" a concept of Vygotksy's that "describes the ways in which the participants perceive, experience and process the emotional aspects of social interaction" (p. 49), and which refers to how "children perceive, experience, appropriate, and internalize interactions in their environment" (Mahn, 2003, p. 129). Examining affective factors in learning, Mahn and John-Steiner

(2007) grounded their thinking in Vygotsky's conception of the symbiosis of emotion and thought:

> [Thought] is not born of other thoughts. Thought has its origins in the motivating sphere of consciousness, a sphere that includes our inclination and needs, our interests and impulses, and our affect and emotions. The affective and volitional tendency stands behind thought. Only here do we find the answer to the final 'why' in the analysis of thinking. (Vygotsky, 1934/1987, p. 282, in Mahn & John-Steiner, 2007, p. 47)

The zone of proximal development is a "system of systems in which the interrelated and interdependent elements include the participants, artifacts, and environment/context, and the participants' experience of their interactions within it" (p. 49). Furthermore, if learning is a cooperative endeavor -- an outcome of sociocultural systems -- then those interwoven systems may well comprise a "collective" zone of proximal development (Moll & Whitmore, 1996, p. 20), or a multiparty zone of proximal development (Erickson, 1996). Stretching the edges of students' learning can be dyadic or multiparty. If the zone of proximal development is "a system of systems" (Mahn & John-Steiner, 2007), then, an effective learning environment requires sensitive orchestrations of invitations, activities, and relationships.

Student connectedness: positive and reciprocal relationships with their teachers. Adolescent students' positive and reciprocal relationships with their teachers were strongly associated with student connectedness and engagement with school (Libbey, 2004; Shochet, Dadds, Ham, & Montague, 2006; Anderman & Freeman, 2004;

44

Klem & Connell, 2004; Roeser, Eccles & Sameroff, 2000). Moreover, other studies highlight the importance of teachers building relationships with their diverse students which can help teachers to develop instruction that aligns closely with their students' learning needs and which helps to mitigate negative effects of crowded classrooms and schedules (Bosworth, 1995; Ferreira & Bosworth, 2001; Alder, 2002; Garza, 2009; Camangian, 2009; Jimenez & Rose, 2010; Martin & Mottet, 2011). Still, other research points to the tensions teachers encounter when attempting to both cover content and build relationships with students in secondary teaching (Hargreaves, 2000, 2001), which is exacerbated by today's high-stakes testing environment (Assaf, 2008).

Elements of a caring environment: Modeling, confirmation, dialogue, and practice. Modeling, confirmation, dialogue, and practice are the four components indicative of a caring environment within a school community identified by Noddings (1984, 2005). A teacher's *modeling* (Noddings, 1984, 2005) through words and actions of a caring and altruistic attitude, are more likely to encourage her students to adopt those ways than if she simply talks about caring without making her commitment visible (Compton-Hall, 2004; Alder, 2002; Noblit & Rogers, 1995). *Confirmation* (Noddings, 1984, 2005) combines genuine concern for the individual child with high expectations situated in the life of the classroom and "depends upon and interacts with dialogue and practice. I cannot confirm a child unless I talk with him and engage in cooperative practice with him" (Noddings, 1984, p. 196). Moreover, to confirm a student is a decision to consciously reject a deficit perspective (Nieto, 1999; Zembylas & Isenbarger, 2002) and to see the child in the best possible light. Furthermore, confirmation in action

45

is helping the child to envision and move toward his or her best self. *Dialogue* (Noddings,1984, 2005) in a classroom helps establish community and connection (Cazden, 2001; Christoph & Nystrand, 2001; Erickson, 2006; Johnston, 2004; Wells, 2001, 2007b). *Practice* (Noddings,1984, 2005) offers a student the opportunity to engage in the life of the classroom in meaningful ways. Part of practice is "guided practice" (Pearson & Gallagher, 1983) which is the process of a student taking on more responsibility as the learning continues to be scaffolded by the teacher which may include interpersonal classroom structures which ask that classroom members listen and respond to others respectfully and offer assistance when needed. As constructs, *modeling, confirmation, dialogue*, and *practice* offer ways for me to consider caring classroom relational patterns across this data set both for this report and future analyses.

     Relational patterns: teachable moments. The "teachable moment" also called "just-right moments" are explained by Glasswell and Parr (2009) as opportunities of teaching and learning that come together at just the right moment for a student with a teacher whose practice includes actively looking for and responding to these moments in ways that expand students' zones of proximal development. Glasswell and Parr (2009) conducted case study research in which they investigated five exemplary teachers' practices. They investigated how first grade children's writing over time related to characteristics of effective and less effective interactions that took place within writing conferences. Their main focus was on a teacher who used the interactions in her classroom as "interactive formative assessment" (Cowie & Bell, 1999 in Glasswell & Parr, 2009, p. 353) which, they suggest is "social and collaborative activity aligned firmly

46

with future learning and teaching….” Moreover, “…it takes account of the goals and actions of both teacher and learner as they work in partnership…” (Glasswell & Parr, 2009, p. 353). Echoing Vygotsky (1978), Noddings (1985, 2005) and Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976), the authors identify three essential qualities of successful teachable moments:

> A teachable moment develops from and through a meeting of minds… A teachable moment requires a view from the present that extends to possible futures…[and] a teachable moment requires scaffolding – an interactive, responsive teaching approach that makes the most of each moment” (Glasswell & Parr, 2009, pp. 355-356)

These three hallmarks, and Noddings’ (1984/2005) four -- modeling, confirmation, dialogue, and practice -- combine to offer ways to notice how pedagogical tactfulness (van Manen, 1991, 1995) and dialogicality (Wells, 2001, 2007a) can be manifested in classroom interactions in general and in writing conferences in particular.

    Student perceptions of connectedness with teachers. Studies of orderly and nurturing classroom environments (Kaufman, 2000; Larson & Maier, 2000; Zembylas & Isenbarger, 2002) show that teachers influence students by both modeling relationally positive and community-enhancing behaviors and by creating caring environments that encourage and expect academic and personal growth from all students. These studies point to ways to invite children toward academic and social successes that may include reclaiming students whose negative labeling and/or reputations were reinscribed daily in school (Noblit & Rogers, 1995; Zembylas & Isenbarger, 2002; Compton-Hall, 2004;

47

Worthy, Consalvo, Russell, & Bogard, *in press*). Yet, it is instructive to review the literature that invites students to voice their perceptions of teacher caring and supportiveness.

When Wentzel (2002) asked hundreds of sixth graders how they knew whether teachers were caring and supportive toward them, male and female students from varied racial backgrounds identified many of the same characteristics. Most of the students highly rated those teachers who "promote democratic and respectful interactions," hold high expectations based on their personal knowledge of students, and demonstrate parent-like supportive behavior in providing "constructive, nurturing feedback" (p. 288). Bosworth (1995) called teachers "the brokers of caring in schools" (p. 687) and discussed how students think about their own caring as well as what being cared for by teachers means to them. Over the course of a year she and her team went into one urban middle school and one rural middle school in order to observe approximately 300 classrooms and to interview over 100 students in sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. The domains of students' comments included *helping*, *feeling*, *relationships*, *values*, and *activities*. "[H]elping" (p. 689), or teachers' provision of consistent guidance and reliable assistance was how they operationalized their receiving of teacher caring; "feelings" (p. 690) described when students were empathic or were on the receiving end of empathy; "relationships" (p. 690) expressed how students' relationships with friends, family and others were part of their definition of caring; "values" (p. 690) described instances when students foregrounded their own or teachers' kindness, respect, and faithfulness as related to caring; and, "activities" (p. 691) expressed students' experience of how being together

on a consistent basis constituted caring, like an adult who "'takes you places'" (p. 691). Describing what an ordinary moment looked like in the classroom of teachers whom students believed cared about them, one student shared that "'everyone would be in their seats, doing work. The teacher would go around the room talking to everybody to see how they were doing…'" (p. 693). Across grades, gender and race students believed that a caring teacher, first, gives students real help when they need it; second, values the individuality of students; third, shows students respect; fourth, is tolerant; fifth, explains what it is they want students to accomplish; and, finally, is encouraging.

Ferreira and Bosworth (2001) collected data from 101 racially diverse students in two middle schools schools – one suburban and one urban, about their perceptions of teacher caring and support. Two broad themes are described: in one arena are curricular and pedagogical teacher behaviors such as giving explanations, monitoring understanding and progress by walking around and asking questions, making learning fun, and good classroom management. In the other arena are teacher behaviors that reflected relationship between teacher and student: treating their students as individual persons; taking an interest in the student as a unique person; being respectful of students; and being a good listener if a student is upset. Also, teachers can exhibit -- as social brokers of caring and through modeling a confirming, non-deficit perspective of a student or students (Valencia, 1997, 2010) -- "personalized leadership" (Alder & Moulton, 1998) as a kind of social education customized for the benefit of an individual student in which the teacher makes space for a "fresh start" (Alder, 2002, p. 244) in which the teacher holds for both of them, the vision of the student as his or her best self.

49

Alder (2002) investigated middle school student perceptions of caring. To do so, she surveyed 12 students in two schools serving largely African American urban neighborhoods. One area was economically challenged although the school had recently been renovated and restored to its wood paneled glory; the other served a middle class population with some European Americans. Both teachers were experienced, African American, female, and considered strict. One taught 8th grade science and the other, 7th grade language arts. Using focus groups and interviews, Alder found that the most robust finding was that "[s]tudents almost unanimously agreed that teachers who pressured students to complete assignments and study were caring teachers" (pp. 250-252). "Good teaching", or, carefully explaining concepts to students, monitoring progress and understanding, being fair, making learning interesting and "fun", and maintaining a carefully managed classroom were all indicative to students of caring teacher behaviors (p. 258). Secondly, she found that students believed that if teachers involved their parents that, too, indicated caring to the students (pp. 253-253). Thirdly, many students agreed that caring was shown when a teacher spent time with a student and engaged with him or her in conversation (p. 254).

Adding to the conversation about what middle school students view as caring Ferreira and Bosworth (2001) address that while a busy teacher with well over one hundred students might really *be* showing caring by stopping to think of, select, and send a card to a homebound student, that student might perceive the action as *not* caring (Garza, 2009) because it is not a face to face or phone call visit. Troubling the idea that caring is unitary Garza (2009) argues that caring is a social construction, and found that

50

teachers may believe they are caring, but that students – especially students who are from a different culture than that of the teacher – may not perceive a teacher's actions *as* caring (p. 298). The moral, reciprocal, and personal nature of caring is connected to the appreciation of each person encountered. He sought to compare White and Latino/a students' perceptions of teacher caring. Data included teacher interviews, field notes from observations, and student questionnaires. Results show similarities to studies already discussed in that scaffolding during teaching figured prominently (p. 310), that a teacher's "actions reflect a kind disposition" (p. 312), that teachers are readily available to students as well as show interest in students' lives outside of school (p. 313), and, that caring teachers are flexible, understanding, and provide "affective academic support" in class (p. 314).

Interestingly, Latino/a students most frequently mention academic help as evidence of caring, whereas White students value a teacher's kind disposition (p. 317). A study such as Garza's (2009) may be helpful to educators in determining how to best approach the development of rapport with White or Latino/a students. In addition, Carmangian's (2009) action research study suggests that African American students, like Latino students, tend to appreciate specific assistance with learning as evidence of caring on the part of teachers.

The studies presented here that deal with student perceptions of what constitutes teacher caring point to engaging in friendly and interested conversations with students, being helpful when students need help, and holding a strong, positive, and hopeful view

of each student. Moreover, these studies illustrate ways that students receive positive relations behaviors on the part of teachers.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I reviewed professional literature that included conversations as instruction, aspects of listening, and high quality teaching; writing instruction and within that, writing conferences; response to writing, including written, verbal, and non-verbal feedback; teacher beliefs about writing conferences; and, the role of relational aspects of teaching and learning including what students see as caring classroom environments. The wide scope of the literature has helped me to consider some of the specific ways that two teachers in this study managed to navigate the tensions of a tightly scheduled, crowded, and demanding environment in order to offer students an educative experience in which they believe. Research has shown that better learning does happen in contexts where students have positive and warm relationships with teachers who have clear instructional agendas. Moreover, research indicates that writing conferences may be a significant site of the expression of those relationships and of the kinds of talk that move students' thinking forward. The literature I was able to find came more from studies in elementary and middle school, however, than from those in high schools. This study offers to further expand the somewhat limited literature on relational aspects of teaching writing and writing conferences in high school English classrooms by looking at the similarities and differences of how two high school English teachers of different ages, genders, and backgrounds communicate with their students in both personal and curricular ways – and whether and how those ways are durable for the students. Zooming in on one aspect of

classroom life and the curriculum, I focus on the conversations between students with their teachers inside writing conferences and whether and how evidence of those conversations appear in subsequent student writing or in students' thinking about themselves as writers.

Chapter Three: Methods

One-to-one, teacher-student writing conferences are a fertile site for study because they are moments when teacher and student can come together in a space that is both instructional and relational as well as private and public, for the distinct and expressed purpose of furthering the thinking, reflecting, and communication ability of the student (Walker & Elias, 1987; Fitzgerald & Stamm, 1992; Jacobs & Karliner, 1977; Freedman, Greenleaf, & Sperling, 1987; Kaufman, 2000). This inquiry is intended to explore how teachers of adolescents use one-to-one talk with students to teach writing inside contexts of the moment, the teacher-student relationship, the class, the school, the community, and the culture. I conducted this qualitative/naturalistic research by examining naturally occurring discourse in two classrooms across the duration of those classroom's lives -- a school year. The conferences are embedded in the contexts; In order to explore my research questions, I used ethnographic and case-study methods.

In this chapter, I begin by displaying my research questions and provide justification for the methodological design I have chosen. Secondly, I contextualize the study's design with a discussion of the site and participants and how they were selected. Thirdly, I explain the phases of the study, as well as provide a detailed discussion of data sources and the collection techniques I employed. Fourth, I endeavor to provide a thorough account of my analyses of the collected data. Lastly, I address both issues of trustworthiness and of researcher reflexivity.

My research questions are:

- o What are the features of instructional conversations between teachers and

students about writing, what do students do after these conversations, and how

do those features change across a school year?

- o What are the relational dimensions of those instructional conversations

   between teachers and students about writing and how do those features change

   across a school year?

- o How can those relational dimensions be traced to larger patterns in the

   classroom that the teacher establishes across time?

Research Design

I employed ethnographic methods including prolonged fieldwork, taking

fieldnotes, and conducting interviews (Patton, 1990; Heath & Street, 2008; Emerson,

Fretz & Shaw, 1995). I entered this research with a premise that the classroom norms and

ways of being that are established from the beginning of the school year shape the

interactions between all members of that social space – including the interactions

between one student and his or her teacher – for the entirety of their time together. My

research spanned the 2009-2010 school year: the classes came together in August and

remained relatively intact until June and "like every human group that is together for a

period of time…evolve[d] a culture" (Patton, 1990, p. 67-68). Thus, the ethnographic

task I undertook was to describe the cultural features of the classrooms I entered by

discovering and describing "(a) the parts of a culture, (b) the relationship among those

parts, and (c) the relationship of the part to the whole" (Spradley, 1979, p. 189). I took

fieldnotes in the classes for several weeks in order better to understand the contexts out

of which the writing conferences arose. Moreover, because capturing the classroom talk

as it occurred in situ was my first concern in data collection, I used video and audio recording equipment to record one-to-one teacher-student writing conferences because it enabled me to collect "more live data – immediate, natural, detailed behavior… [using] …cameras, audiotapes, videotapes…" (Spindler & Spindler, 1987, p. 20), and later, as a form of ethnographic note-taking (Pink, 2001). I also conducted and audio recorded interviews with writing conference participants to help me understand from an emic perspective, what I observed from an etic point of view (Heath & Street, 2008, p. 44). The prolonged ethnographic fieldwork helped me to build a foundational understanding of the two classrooms from which I then was able to select and study particular cases of writing conferences.

I was interested in understanding a range of writing conference experiences in high school English classrooms. In order to be able to make comparisons between teachers and their instructional conversations with students around their writing, I used a case study approach with two English teachers who conduct writing conferences -- one class per teacher, and several focal students per class and their interactions inside of writing conferences -- in order to study the features and relational dimensions of writing conferences, and what students do in their writing afterward. The cases are nested inside the larger case of the classroom, the English department, the school, the community, and on into the wider world. Such nesting is congruent with observational case study where "the major data-gathering technique is participant observation and the focus of the study is on a particular organization…or some aspect of the organization" (Bogdan & Bicklen, 1992, p. 63). In this research, I sought to study the phenomenon (Dyson & Ganeshi,

2005, p. 4) of the high school writing conferences; the writing conferences inside each of the classrooms stood as cases of that phenomenon. Methodologically, using both ethnographic and case study methods are not at odds: "For single-case and multicase studies, the most common methods of case study are observation, interview, coding, data management and interpretation" (Stake, 2006, p. 29).

The Research Setting and Participants

The School

I chose to look for a site in Crest School District (CSD) because as a former teacher in the same district I am familiar with its people, places, and priorities; and, because I am known, I reasoned that my ability to obtain access would meet with little in the way of complication, which turned out to be true. All names of cities, school, and persons are pseudonyms; furthermore, students chose their own monikers. Getting to know the school in which I would eventually conduct my study occurred naturally. During the school year leading up to the study, I served as a university facilitator for an English Education student who was placed with a teacher at Governor High School (GHS) in CSD. As I became familiar with the school, I came to see it as an ideal research site because the diverse population it served reflected demographic trends and projections in the United States (Passel & Cohn, 2008), whereas the teachers were mostly White which also reflected demographic trends projected for the profession (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005). Students at GHS come from different ethnic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds with Hispanic, Black, White, and Asian backgrounds represented here in order of percentage of the student body (see Table 3.1 *Governor High*

School 2009-2010 Campus Demographic Data). When I first considered the school,

roughly 40% of GHS students at that time qualified for Free and Reduced Lunch; by the

time I completed the study, that number had risen to 56%. Located less than a thousand

feet from the interstate highway that bisects the state, one school boundary extended into

a densely settled area of the abutting major city and another boundary encompassed

moderate-income, suburban neighborhoods (Porter, 2008). Furthermore, in 2008, GHS

was a middling school based on an intra-state ranking of 52%, which is a "weighted

overall 2006 test average as compared to other schools in [the state]" The website's

school ratings are based on the state's educational data that includes various categories of

grades, attendance, voluntary taking of SATs and other achievement tests across

demographic groups (City-Data.com, 2009). However, GHS's ranking for 2009-2010

dropped to 36% (City-Data.com, 2010). GHS met the state accountability ratings for both

2007-2008 and 2009-2010 of "academically acceptable" (TEA, 2008, 2010); at the same

time, however, the school missed the first year's federally imposed, No Child Left

Behind's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) because of low reading and mathematics

scores; yet achieved AYP for 2009-2010 (TEA, 2010). In addition, the state's educational

oversight bureau considered the 60% of GHS students "at-risk" by virtue of enrollment,

academic, and disciplinary data collected about them (TEA, 2010).

Table 3.1 Governor High School 2009-2010 Campus Demographic Data

Demographic Category	Number of Individuals	Overall percentage of school population
African American	578	27.8%
Hispanic	841	40.4%
White	338	16.2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	319	15.3%
Native American	5	0.2%
Limited English Proficient	258	12.4%
Economically Disadvantaged	1,137	54.6%
At-Risk	1, 195	57.4%
Mobility (2008-09)	481	20.9%
		(TEA, 2010)

The Participants

Selection of the teachers.   Because experienced teachers have built a bank of case knowledge from which to draw, their cumulative knowledge becomes tacit, or what Schön (1984) calls "knowing-in-action" or simply, know-how. What Schön (1984) called "reflection-in-action" refers to when experienced teachers who value reflective teaching come to be able think about something as they are doing it by asking themselves focusing questions. This asking is not divorced from the doing – but part of the flow of it – which is one of the differences between an experienced teacher and a new teacher. My criteria for the consideration of teachers was that they were experienced high school English teachers with a minimum of three years in the classroom, and not new to the school in which they were teaching. Furthermore, I was interested in teachers who conducted writing conferences and who, in general, took opportunities to talk with their students one-to-one. I considered seven teachers in all – four from one district and three from another -- from whom I invited two to participate. Out of the seven, five demonstrated a

commitment to process writing as an approach to teaching writing by having gone through the National Writing Project's local summer writing institute. The institute privileges process writing pedagogy: its fellows are required to apply for admission months in advance; to attend classes daily for five weeks; and, to fulfill the significant reading and writing requirements of the program. Because I belonged to the local writing institute as well, I had access to a pool of potential teacher-participants through informal conversations during free time at local site meetings; and, in fact, four of my potential participants were site members.

As part of my decision-making process, I visited the classes of five teachers. Out of the seven, five either had their master's degrees or were working on them. I eliminated one teacher because she was a Reading teacher, not an English teacher, and thus, did not face the same class size or pressure from standardized testing as did English teachers. Two teachers withdrew themselves from consideration, and one more I declined because of logistical issues. One last teacher, I eliminated because she had not been through the writing institute, and decided instead to invite two teachers from one high school who had completed the local summer writing institute – John O'Brien and Kathy Hampshire (see Table 3.2: *Selected feature of teachers invited to participate in the study*), because I was most interested in cases of writing conferences, not cases of individual teachers' disparate practices; the congruent backgrounds of John and Kathy made relevant comparisons possible.

Table 3.2 Selected feature of teachers invited to participate in the study

Name School & District	Gender, age, race, rank	Teaching history	Degrees	National Writing Project (NWP)
John O'Brien Governor High School Crest School District	Male, 50+/-, White, teacher	20, middle school and high school, 12th grade	B.A. English Master's degree	Yes
Kathy Hampshire Governor High School Crest School District	Female, 30+/-, White, teacher	3, high school, 11th grade	B.A. English Education Master's degree in process	Yes

John and Kathy. During a visit to a student teacher at GHS, in the fall of 2008, I bumped into John O'Brien, a 20 year veteran English teacher, a former fellow grad student, and a fellow NWP institute member. He was in his conference period and invited me into his classroom. In our conversation, John talked about his teaching priorities which centered on students leaving school both loving and knowing how to write and read well, and for their own purposes. Around that time, I had begun to consider studying the practices of two or even three teachers of writing who valued process writing (and used writing conferences) for my dissertation research – a fact that I shared with John. We arranged to meet at a professional convention that we both planned to attend, a few weeks later, for dinner to talk more about the study. He recommended another teacher at GHS, Kathy Hampshire whom he felt was an excellent teacher. He explained that she built a classroom culture of respectful interaction in which literature circles and writing workshop figured prominently. She was planning to attend the convention as well, so I suggested, and he concurred, that she join us for dinner. The result of that later meeting was that John reaffirmed his interest, and Kathy indicated that she would welcome

61

participation in my study as she felt it would give her a chance to reflect on her practice and think in new ways about her own teaching.

Both teachers invited me to observe their classrooms, which I did on January 27, 2009. I visited Kathy's eleventh grade English classroom during first period of that rainy day. Students were subdued, and quite a few were absent. She thought that they were sleeping in at home. She showed a short segment of a documentary film in order to teach literature circle roles (Daniels, 2001) and practice them with her students. Using a combination of whole class instruction and small group work, Kathy moved around continuously to small groups of four students. The following excerpt from my notes shows a representative moment of Kathy's classroom on that day:

> She is attentive and conversive with her students. From looking through a stack of student work, I concluded that Kathy works to make assignments relevant to her students' lives through permitting her students a wide range of choice in how they approach an assignment, and that she sees her students as thoughtful, smart people with voices that need to be heard through classroom talk. While this class did not have *writing conferences,* strictly speaking, it had *thinking conferences* in that students had to make something of what they saw in the video, compose a response, and write it down. One girl calls her over – Kathy kneels down at head of pod right next to girl – talks back and forth – explaining task – It all seems very relaxed -- stays there for about 5 minutes. Moves around to other groups
>
> Sits down at one table where they're quiet [asks] Who's the Connector? What do you think….. (Fieldnotes January 27, 2009)

That same day, I also visited one of John's classes of seniors, where John was conducting both reading and writing conferences; he said that he did the same in all his classes. The following excerpt comes from my observation notes and contains my paraphrase of his curricular priorities which he spoke to me about in between visits with students:

Quick move into computer lab to continue to work on writing started earlier - John goes around to one kid at a time and sits cross-legged on the floor and talks 1-on-1 with each for a few minutes (like 10)

Says (to me) that the most important thing is that kids leave school loving to read and write – not about test scores – even in this – an AP class.

While he talks with each student about his or her writing, he makes notes about their free choice reading. He keeps track of what each is reading via a system of one page per kid – wants kid to *talk* to him about the book – not write about it – that way he gets to interact reader to reader as well.

John is very clear that he wants the kids to leave school as confident writers and as people who love to read – neither of which is "tested" – he's very focused on writing and reading – not pre-scripted activities etc. (Fieldnotes January 27, 2009)

After visiting with Kathy and John, I was impressed at the centrality of one-to-one instruction and of the high regard for classroom talk. At that point, I knew that their classrooms would be hospitable to my study but, because I was in the midst of my teacher selection plan, continued to talk with and observe a few other teachers. In the end, I decided to follow John and Kathy, who, while both White, like the projections for the next decades of teachers (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005), and similar in outlook and

education about teaching and teaching writing in particular, were different enough from one another by virtue of gender, age, and years of teaching, to be compared and contrasted in their practices as teachers of writing inside writing conferences. For the school year 2009-2010, John continued to teach 12th grade, and Kathy, 11th grade. Furthermore, that they were both in the same school, serving diverse students, in regular classes, also similar in demographic to projected data for the next few decades (Passel & Cohn, 2008), concentrated my focus, served to prolong my fieldwork in both classes, and helped me better understand GHS as a curricular, cultural, and social space that teachers and students, alike, lived in day after day.

Selection of the students. The students were assigned to their classes by the school's guidance department; thus, I did not recruit particular students from across the school. Instead, I decided to invite students in one class period of John's and one of Kathy's. The two periods were determined by convenience sampling (Merriam, 2009); that is, the class periods with the highest return rate of informed consent forms were invited to participate in this study. All of Kathy's and John's students (approximately 150 students per teacher in five periods) were given consent forms on the first day of school. After three weeks, I tabulated the returns and decided on Kathy's first period class of juniors with 26 students, 24 of whom gave informed consent; and, John's, seventh period class of seniors with 11 students, of whom eight gave informed consent. Later during the school year, one more of Kathy's students' gave informed consent, making the consent rate 96%, as well as two more of John's, raising that class's consent-return rate to 90%. The age span of the students was approximately 15-19 years old.

Sampling decisions concerning students. In consultation with each teacher, I

selected which students' conferences to record based on typical sampling. The first

sampling was undertaken to see which students represent the typical range of points of

writing proficiency in that class (Merriam, 2009, p. 78). As with any group of students,

variation in skill is expected. In order to ascertain the overall writing accomplishment of

students, I asked John and Kathy to rate each of their students, who had given informed

consent, according to a continuum with novice and/or reluctant writers on one end and

accomplished writers/composers/makers on the other. To accomplish this, early in the fall

semester, I gave each teacher a roster of the study participants, and asked the teacher to

locate his/her overall impression of that student's writing, up to that point, along a Likert

scale (see Table 3.3 *Sampling tool; approximate writing proficiency*).

Table 3.3 Sampling tool; approximate writing proficiency

1	2	3	4	5
Novice and/or Reluctant writer		Developing writer		Accomplished writers/Composers/Maker

My goal was to select five focal students for each class based on my thinking that

five was a large enough number of students to ensure dynamic diversity in range of

ability, background, and the kinds of writing conferences they engaged in with their

teacher; moreover, five was a small enough number so that I could direct my attention in

a more focused way as I looked at writing conferences across the year, as opposed to

studying every student participant. I then looked at the demographics of the students in

each class along gender and racial lines and sought through typical sampling (Merriam,

2009) to arrive at representation of the students that cut across demographics and

approximate writing achievement (see Table 3.4 *John O'Brien's class: Student demographics* and Table 3.5 *Kathy Hampshire's class: Student demographics).*

Table 3.4 John O'Brien's class: Student demographics

	Gender:		4 Hispanics	5 AA	2 Asian
N=11			1 male	4 male	1 male
	M=6=54.5%	0 White	2 female (the 3rd is unavailable)	1 female	1 female
	F=5=45.5%	0%		45.4%	18.1%
			36.3%		
	3M 2F	0	1.5	2	1.5

Table 3.5 Kathy Hampshire's class: Student demographics

	Gender:	3 White	16 Hispanics	6 AA	4 Asian
		2 female	4 female	3 female	1 female
		1 male	12 male	3 male	3 male
	M=19=65.5%				
N=29	F=10= 34.4%%	10.3%	55%	20.5%	13.7%
	3M & 2 F	1	2	1	1

Then, I sought to identify which individual students I would focus on. Data set completeness was an ongoing consideration as well as I determined which students to pay closer attention to. For example, student attendance was a factor because it affected data collection on any given student. Because student mobility was an issue at GHS, I decided to select five backup students as well, for each class. The identification of which students to focus on was less of a concern in John's class where everyone (but one) was either a focal or a backup student across the year; but I still had to make the decision whether any given student in his class was of primary (focal) or secondary (back-up) interest. Because Kathy's class had so many more students, I felt I had to make some early decisions based on limited observation (see Table 3.6 *John O'Brien's class: Writing scores,*

demographics, focal student status and Table 3.7 *Kathy Hampshire's class: Writing*

scores, demographics, early focal student status).

Table 3.6 John O'Brien's class: All students by writing scores with demographics, and focal student status

1	2	3	4	5
none	none	FS: Tupac Williams (AAM) FS: Tommy Oliver (AM) FS: Lydia Sun (AF) FS: Boo Zoo (AAM)	BU: Sabrina Miller (AAF)	BU: Reggie Guy (AAM)
			FS: Margarita Limon (4-5) (HF)	
Key: 1= Novice writer 3= Developing writer 5=Accomplished writer FS=Focal Student BU=Back up focal student	Scores (1-5) assigned by John O'Brien, October 2009	BU: Joshua Martinez (HM) *N/A: Jane Doe (HF)* BU: Benjamin Doolittle (3-4) (AAM)	BU: Christina Barbie (4-5) (HF)	

Table 3.7 Kathy Hampshire's class: All students by writing scores with demographics and early focal student status

1	2	3	4	5
EFS: Matthew Reyes (HM)	EBU: Lake later (AF) *"John Doe" (HM) not in study*	EFS: Julien (HM) EFS: Pedro (HM) EBU: Sha'Nequa later (AAF) EBU: Fake (AM) *Luke (HM) *Jacinto (HM) *Sarah (HF)	EFS: Mac Daddy (AAM) EBU: Jake (AM) *Diamond (AAF) *Anthony Williams (AAM)	EFS: JC Candy (HM) EFS: Brooke (WF) EFS: Angela (HF) EBU: Mark (AAM) *Dahvie (HM) *Don Corleone (HM) *Billy Bob (HM) *Joseph (HM) *Alexander (WM) *Averry (WF) *Jane Doe" (HF) not in study*
Key: 1= Novice writer 3= Developing writer 5=Accomplished writer EFS=Early Focal Student EBU= Early Back up focal student *=non-focal	Scores (1-5) assigned by Kathy Hampshire, October 2009			

I made initial, tentative decisions for five focal and five back up students per

class. Then, I revised those decisions based on the quality and quantity of writing

conferences, interviews, and writing samples. All along, I decided to err on the side of

collecting data on more rather than fewer students. In January, I made some revisions to

my focal and backup student list based on newly reviewed and inventoried data and ongoing early analysis (Appendix A *Kathy's focal students* and Appendix B *John's focal students*). These decisions were informed by my classroom observations, reviewing and preliminary analysis of writing conferences, conducting interviews, and collecting student work samples as well as data set completeness.

My final selections for focal and back up students were made during summer, 2010, after exiting the site, and after further review, organization, and preliminary analysis of data sources. Final results for John's students are shown immediately below (Table 3.8 *John O'Brien's class: Final sampling decisions…*); in addition, I provide a short description of the students (Table 3.9 *John O'Brien's class…Short descriptions)*. Following a similar format, I show final results for Kathy's students in Table 3.10.

Table 3.8 John O'Brien's class: Final sampling decisions, all students by writing scores, and by demographics

	Approximate writing proficiency*	Demographic characteristics**	Focal or Back up Student***	Comment
Tommy Oliver	3	AM	FS	Rich data set
Margarita Limon	4-5	HF	FS	Rich data set
Reggie Guy	5	AAM	BU	Thin data set
Benjamin Doolittle	3-4	AAM	BU	Very thin data set
Boo Zoo	3	AAM	FS	Solid data set
Sabrina Miller	4	AAF	BU	Solid data set
Tupac Williams	3	AAM	FS	Rich data set
Lydia Sun	3	AF	FS	Solid data set; her WCs provide negative case examples.
Christina Barbie	4-5	HF	BU	Solid data set
Joshua	3	HM	BU	Very uneven data set

68

Martinez

| ("Jane Doe" not in study) | 3 | HF | N/A | N/A |

Key
*Approximate writing proficiency with "1" =Novice and "5" =Accomplished. Scores assigned by John O'Brien, October 2009.
**Demographic characteristics: Race: AA=African American; A = Asian; W= White; H= Hispanic
Gender: M=Male; F = Female
*** FS=Focal student; BU=Back up focal student

Table 3.9 John O'Brien's class: Focal and backup students: Short descriptions

↓ Focal Students	↓ Backup Students
Margarita Limon FS/HF/4-5 Bi-lingual, Mexican immigrant, attentive student, popular, quiet, frequently sits with Lydia Sun.	Christina Barbie BU/HF/4-5 Attentive student, frequently sits with Tommy Oliver. Reggie Guy BU/AAM/5 Very quiet, almost shy young man.
Tommy Oliver FS/AM/3 Bi-lingual, from Viet-Nam, attentive student, very conversive with Christina Barbie. Makes many bids for teacher's attention.	Benjamin Doolittle BU/AAM/3-4 Pleasant, frequently absent.
Tupac Williams FS/AAM/3 Sits often with Sabrina Miller who takes on a tutoring role with him, unasked. Multiple conferences with John. Boo Zoo FS/AAM/3 Attentive student; frequently absent. Cross-room conversations with teacher.	Sabrina Miller BU/AAF/4 Sits most often with Tupac, enjoys writing.
Lydia Sun FS/AF/3 Very quiet. Originally from Viet-Nam. Sits with Margarita Limon. Diligent student. Infrequent contact with teacher.	Joshua Martinez BU/HM/3 Gregarious student. Repeating 12th grade. Interested in film. Makes many bids for teacher attention when he is in attendance. Very frequent absences.

Key
FS=Focal Student; BU=Back up focal student
Demographic characteristics: Race: AA=African American; A = Asian; W= White; H= Hispanic
Gender: M=Male; F = Female
Approximate writing proficiency with "1" =Novice and "5" = Accomplished. Scores assigned by John O'Brien, October 2009.

Lastly, the final decisions for focal and backup students for Kathy Hampshire's

class appear below (Table 3.10 *Kathy Hampshire's class: Final selection and short*

descriptions). Included is focal student status, the student's demographic, my justification

for his or her inclusion as a focal or a backup student, and a short description.

Additionally, I comment briefly on the completeness of each student's data set.

Table 3.10 Kathy Hampshire's class: Final selection and short description of five focal and five backup students, June 2010

↓ Focal Students	↓ Backup Students
Brooke Layne FS/WF/4-5 Interesting WCs. Thoughtful answers, material instances (pen, food etc), dropped AP English. Friendly but not part of a group. Solid data set.	Mark BU/AAM/4-5 Quiet student. Reticent in WCs and interviews. Data set is present but thin across all three collections.
Fake FS/AM/3-4 Revealing and interesting WCs about process, mechanics, engagement, writing as therapeutic. Began year as reluctant student, became more involved as a student and as a writer. Often sat with the other two Asian students. From China, No longer receiving ESL services. Solid data set.	Jake BU/AM/4 Active participant in class. Often sat with the other two Asian students. From Viet Nam. No longer receiving ESL services. Complete data set.
Sha'Nequa Arnold FS/AAF/3 Several interesting conferences. Friendly, thoughtful student. She frequently sat with two other African American students. Complete data set.	Mac Daddy BU/AAM/3 Somewhat shy, good WCs, disinclined toward elaboration. Had several friends in class across racial and gender lines. Complete data set.
Pedro Gonzales FS/HM/2 Several very interesting writing conferences. Persistent behavioral issues. Reminders from teacher to student, visible in data, for him to pay attention to what he says. Possible gender-identity issues. Father passed away recently. SRI #2 missing Solid data set.	Lake BU/AF/2 From China. Working to gain control over standard English spoken and written conventions. Very quiet in fall; voice actually got louder toward end of the year. Most WCs were about content. Attentive student. Sat with Jake and Fake. Good data set.
Julien Jackson FS/HM/1-2 Attitude of unselfishness; concern with correctness. At beginning of year his writing was closer to "1", improvement noted by the end of year. Friendship with other Latino young men from Mexico with whom he frequently sat. SRI #2 missing. Solid data set.	Matthew Reyes BU/HM/1 Interesting and bright but very little data due to frequent absences. Friendship with other Latino young men from Mexico with whom he frequently sat when he attended school. Thin, irregular data set. One interview at end of SY. One WC.

Key
FS=Focal Student; BU=Back Up focal student
Demographic characteristics: Race: AA=African American; A = Asian; W= White; H= Hispanic
Gender: M=Male; F = Female
Approximate writing proficiency with "1" =Novice and "5" = Accomplished.
Scores assigned by Kathy Hampshire, October 2009.

I attempted to video and audio record a minimum of three writing conferences across the year with all of the students I considered as focal or backup students. In addition, I followed up with stimulated recall interviews with each as well as collected writing samples. I made these recordings in October – November, 2009, January - February, 2010, and again, in March-April, 2010 in order to permit me to examine differences across time in the instructional and relational features and dimensions of writing conference.

Phases of the Study, Positionality, Data Sources, and Data Collection

Overview of Phases of the Study

The study was conducted in three main and sometimes overlapping phases – entry, data gathering, and closing (Patton, 1990). In Phase One, the focus was on establishing my presence, making observations, and taking field notes; in Phase Two the emphases were on making video recordings of writing conferences, conducting stimulated recall interviews with writing conference participants, conducting interviews with the teachers, and collecting student writing samples and other documents. Phase Two, as the main data collection phase, was segmented into three collection periods that coincided with Fall, Winter, and Spring: October – November, 2009; January - February, 2010; and, March-April, 2010. Phase Three's focus was on finalizing collection of data, exiting the research site, and turning my attention toward full time analysis. In this section, I address researcher positionality; data sources and their justification as well as issues of positionality that are particular to those sources; and, data collection including

71

my procedures for gathering these data as well as including tables showing what data I did collect.

Researcher Positionality

The participant-observer continuum (Bogdan & Bicklen, 1992) permitted me the flexibility to interact with participants at some times, and more closely attend to data collection at other times. However, as I contemplated the focus of my inquiry, I had to ask myself to what degree I would engage in "…repeated, genuine social interaction on the scene with the subjects themselves as a part of the data-gathering process" (McCall & Simmons, 1969, p. 3). I realized that this inquiry warranted a very limited researcher role in the classrooms so as better to observe the classrooms as natural in situ settings. Thus, my position in both classrooms was on the *observer* end of the continuum. The observer role permitted me to focus my attention more closely on data collection responsibilities.

Data Sources

The main sources of data include *field notes* that narrate the life of the classroom and that record aspects of classroom activity; *video recordings* of student-teacher writing conferences; *audio recordings* of periodic teacher interviews; audio recordings of teachers' stimulated recall interviews of writing conferences; audio recordings of students' stimulated recall interviews of writing conferences; and, audio recordings of students' end-of-year retrospective interviews; *transcripts* of selected writing conferences and interviews. Another supplementary source of data includes *documents* such as student writing, and teacher handouts, lesson plans, and district guidelines;

72

Fieldnotes. Most of my taking of fieldnotes was accomplished during Phase One of this study which spanned the first six to eight weeks of school. In the first two to three weeks, I went to GHS twice a week, in the observer role, and using convenience sampling (Merriam, 1998), took fieldnotes in the periods that showed the highest return of consent forms, which included those periods I ended up deciding to study. As discussed earlier in the section about selection of the teachers, by the end of week three, I determined to confine my attention for the rest of the year in two classes: Kathy's first period and John's seventh period. Bearing in mind that "the evaluator-observer is also being observed and evaluated" (Patton, 1990, p. 273), I observed both classes once a week for weeks four through six in order to help students and teachers to acclimate to my year-long presence and establish a degree of trust (Patton, 1990, p. 254). When I began videorecording regularly, I replaced the typed fieldnotes with video data as a form of fieldnote-taking (Pink, 2001).

Collecting the fieldnotes. Fieldnotes are the written account of what "the researcher hears, sees, experiences, and thinks in the course of collecting and reflecting on the data" (Bogdan & Bicklen, 1992, p. 107). I took fieldnotes on my laptop which, at first, accentuated my presence, but after a couple of weeks, I barely drew a glance from any of the students. Fieldnote expansion occurred following observations of Kathy's first period class, usually on campus. Following John's seventh period class, fieldnote expansion took place at home. In my fieldnotes, I described what classroom activities were going on and environmental factors that contributed to those activities (e.g., lighting, displays, interruptions). The underlying focus of my fieldnote-taking was on

73

describing interactions between the teacher and individuals and small groups. I recorded my early perceptions of the relational elements of the encounters in which I included, to the best of my ability depending on earshot and eyeshot range, who said what and how including features such as prosody, volume, facial expression, proxemics, gesture and more (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw,1995). Moreover, to lay analytic groundwork, I included personal, methodological, and theoretical notes in the manner of Corsaro (1981).

In John O'Brien's classroom, I collected eleven sets of fieldnotes between August 26 and November 5, 2009. In Kathy Hampshire's classroom, I collected seventeen sets of fieldnotes between August 26 and January 12, 2010; three of the earliest were data collected during other class periods while waiting for the process of students' return of their consent forms to be completed. Fieldnotes were filed by teacher and by week on my computer. Especially helpful in my acclimation to the sites during Phase One, my reading, re-reading, and expansion of field notes helped me to notice patterns, wonder aloud, make connections across time, and consider some preliminary directions.

Videorecording writing conferences. My primary work in Phase Two of the study was to make videorecordings of writing conferences in order to capture communicative and relational aspects of the materiality of face-to-face interactions between teacher and student. Face-to-face conversations involve speaking and its attendants, prosody, pitch, and volume. Moreover, these conversations are mediated by facial expression, gaze, and body language including posture, and proxemics (Goffman, 1981; Schegeloff, 1998). Social action and discourse are intimately interwoven (Scollon, 2001); to look at one without the other would not address my research questions. People

74

communicate their intentions in the world through discourses that "are forms of life which integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes, and social identities, as well as gestures, glances, body positions, and clothes" (Gee, 1996, p. 127). Furthermore Scollon (1999) argued for the primacy of the "face-to-face, real-time social interactions that bring the textural artifacts into being…" (p. 152). Luke (1992), too, discussed part of the process of schooling children as physical, with "[p]articular posture, silences, gestures, and visible signs of 'being in' the lesson… on display" (p. 123) which were present in video data I collected. Using video data, Belhiah (2009) and Thompson (2009) recently found that tutors and their tutees commonly use their gaze and body orientations in their sessions together to communicate their engagement, disinterest, absorption, confusion, and more. As earlier researchers of writing conferences have utilized video data (including but not limited to Sperling, 1990, 1991; McCarthey, 1994; Larson & Maier, 2000; Christoph & Nystrand, 2001), so too, I collected video recordings to enable me to revisit and analyze the voices, facial expressions, gaze, gesture, posture, and proxemics of both parties -- all of which are central to understanding communicative intent in a face-to-face interaction, whether instructional, relational, or both.

I was often conscious during this study that my presence as researcher changed what I researched as I was observing in the site, by the very fact of my presence in what Labov (1972) described as the Observer's Paradox. Moreover, the added presence of recording devices almost certainly increased the participants' feelings of self-consciousness of their words and actions to a higher level than they would have without the recording (and my presence). It is possible that such self-consciousness may have

75

motivated the participants to alter their own portrayal or performance of themselves for the camera; thus, "such video materials should be treated as *representations* rather than visual facts and their analysis should take note of the collaborations and strategies of self-representation that were part of their making" (Pink, 2001, p. 88). In order to help mitigate the effect on the data of performance of self dilemmas that participants may have portrayed in the recordings, *and* to get the participants' perspective of what occurred during the writing conferences, I made every effort to conduct stimulated recall interviews (DiPardo, 1994; Christoph & Nystrand, 2001), within 48 hours (Gass & Mackey, 2000, p. 18) of the recording of the writing conference, or as soon as possible afterward, in order to give participants the opportunity to clarify their actions captured on the video recording. In each of these interviews, the participant and I viewed the recorded writing conference, and I asked the participant about what he or she was thinking, doing, saying, acting, and writing.

Collecting the videorecordings. I recorded writing conferences during Phase Two of the study, the main data collection phase, that I broke up into three segments of time corresponding with Fall, Winter, and Spring: October – November, 2009; January – February, 2010; and, March –April (see Table 3.11 *Video data by teacher*…). My primary interest in this study was the writing conferences that occur one-to-one between student and teacher. These events were face-to-face encounters and a form of instructional conversation, embedded in a relational context that was built between the teacher and students from the beginning of the school year. In order to collect videorecordings of writing conferences, I stationed myself with the camera along the

periphery of the classroom and moved along the room's edges in such a way to minimize the intrusion of my presence with the camera, and to maximize what I was able to catch on film. I found that I had more flexibility if I held the camera in hand rather than used a tripod – although I surely sacrificed visual quality in some recordings of conferences as a result of this decision. As my presence lost its newness, I was able to get up closer to teachers and students with minimal intrusiveness. Each teacher wore a wireless microphone that was clipped onto his or her belt, and that had a tiny microphone that clipped onto his or her shirt. The sound captured by the microphone fed directly into the video camera, and through an earbud connected to the receiver, I was able to monitor conversations from across the room.

Each video session also had a backup digital audio recording made possible by John and Kathy's ongoing willingness to hand carry a small digital recorder as a precaution against video equipment failure or human error. The teacher placed the digital recorder on the desk between him/herself and the student during a conference. The placement of the device insured a high quality backup recording of both participants. Additionally, for example, a video file and its companion audio file were put together in the same folder on my computer. It did happen that portions of some audio tracks of video recordings were inaudible for a number of reasons and in those instances, when preparing for and conducting interviews, I used the audio file, whole or in part. If I gleaned something interesting from the backup audio data, I included it in my table of video contents.

Table 3.11 Video data by teacher, date and N of writing conferences of all consenting students

Periods of data collection in Phase Two of the study	Teacher: John O'Brien	Sub Total	Teacher: Kathy Hampshire	Sub Total
	Date (N=writing conferences)	Videos of class	Date (N=writing conferences)	Videos of class
		WCs of all consenting students		WCs of all consenting students
Fall	Nov. 5 (N=4)	3 videos	Oct. 22 (N=14)	3 videos
	Nov. 10 (N=8)		Nov. 4 (N=7)	
→	Nov.12 (N=9)	21 WCs	Nov. 5 (N=8)	29 WCs
Winter	Feb. 4 (N=19)	4 videos	Feb. 17 (N=13)	3 videos
	Feb. 5 (N=9)		Feb. 19 (N=13)	
→	Feb. 8 (N=4)	39 WCs	Feb. 23 (N=9)	35 WCs
	Feb. 9 (N=7)			
Spring	Mar. 2 (N=10)	4 videos	April 6 (N=9)	4 videos
	Mar. 4 (N=4)		April 8 (N=15)	
→	Mar. 10 (N=10)	32 WCs	April 13 (N=13)	
	Mar. 11 (N=8)		April 16 (N=14)	51 WCs
Totals, by teacher →		Total: 12 videos		Total: 10 videos
		Total: 92 Writing Conferences		Total: 115 Writing Conferences

Audio recordings of interviews. After I had videotaped one-to-one, teacher-student writing conferences, I conducted stimulated recall interviews (DiPardo, 1994; Smagorinsky, 1997) with the participants, also called prompted recall (Merry & Moyles, 2003), or retrospective account (Greene & Higgins, 1994). The purpose of these interviews was to elicit participants' recall of what they were doing and thinking during the writing conferences. Researchers have emphasized the importance of interviewing each participant within 24 hours of the writing conference (Green & Higgins, 1994; Smagorinsky, 1997) in order that the participants' memory of the event is as clear as possible. DiPardo (1994, p. 170) called on Rose's (1985, p. 250) consideration that researchers are not bound to replicate strictly an older method but instead encouraged

researchers to consider flexible and innovative reconceptualizations of such methods. In that vein, DiPardo (1994) explained that since her interest was in "inviting informants to construct a narrative of their semester-long relationships, retrospective impressions proved more valuable than immediate ones" (p. 170) she found that using the stimulated recall interviews at the *end* of her data collection period yielded rich insights on their relationships. I, too, was interested in the vividness of short-term recall of the writing conferences and instructional and relational elements inside them, but was also interested in how participants thought about themselves and their development as writers in writing conferences over time. Thus, I conducted both *stimulated recall interviews* and what I am calling *year-end, retrospective interviews* in the manner of DiPardo (1994). In addition, I conducted *loosely structured interviews* with both teachers inside each of the data collection segments (October – November, 2009; January - February, 2010, and March-April, 2010) of Phase Two of the study. In these interviews, John and Kathy were invited to reflect on their practices, to consider how the school year was going so far, to look back on what they had recently taught their students, and, to look forward from the point of the interview (see Table 3.12 *Interview questions*).

Although interactions and interviews may have been friendly encounters, it was important for me to remember that the researcher and informant positionalities are neither mutual nor equitable as our roles and purposes for being in the classes were different. Because interviews were important data sources for me as researcher, I felt, as Goldstein (2007) cautioned, some pressure to make every interview "count." I strove to remain sensitive to participants, and one way I attended to that was to remind myself that the

79

participant may have experienced ambivalence in that he or she agreed to participate and probably wished to be of help, but he or she may have felt some degree of discomfort. The engagement between researcher and informant is complex both relationally and ethically (Goldstein, 2007). At the beginning of interviews, I explained the connection of the interviews to the project, the rationale for use of recording devices and how I used them both during and after the interviews, and, the rationale for the kinds of questions I posed (Spradley, 1979). I used loosely structured questions (see Table 3.12 *Interview questions*) based on both my core areas of interest and what I witnessed in the classroom (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 160). To self-monitor my conducting of the interviews, I referred periodically to Spradley's (1979, p. 67) checklist for interviewers, "Elements in the Ethnographic Interview." Although interviews shared features of conversation, as Schiffrin (1994) noted, I worked to balance "asking questions, listening instead of talking, taking a passive rather than as assertive role, expressing verbal interest in the other person, and showing interest by eye contact and other nonverbal means" (p. 46) in order to build and maintain productive relationships with the participants.

     Collecting the audio recordings of interviews. Because the class periods were short (55 minutes) and I had several stimulated recall interviews to conduct at any one time, I conducted the interviews as soon as I could after the videorecorded writing conferences and usually within 48 hours, but sometimes longer due to student absences or other scheduling concerns (see Table 3.13 *All interview data*). Because the writing conferences were generally brief -- often no more than two minutes long -- I showed each student his or her entire videorecorded conference and opened the stimulated recall

interview with one or more of three open-ended recall questions (see Table 3.12

Interview questions) in order to assist him or her in the recall effort: "Comments?; What

do you have to say about this?; What's your sense of what was going on here?" (DiPardo,

1994, p. 170). In the year-end retrospective interview, I asked students "What has it been

like for you being a student in this class?" and, "How have you grown as a writer, or as a

reader?" and "What learning or skills of your work as a writer in this class will you be

able to take with you into your future life" (Table 3.12 *Interview questions*).

Table 3.12 Interview questions

Stimulated Recall: Open-ended questions for students and teacher participants in writing conferences (DiPardo, 1994, p. 170)	*Year-end retrospective interview questions for students*
o Comments? o What do you have to say about this? o What's your sense of what was going on here?	o What has it been like for you being a student in this class? o How have you grown as a writer, or as a reader? o What learning or skills of your work as a writer in this class will you be able to take with you into your future life?

Loosely structured interview questions for teachers
- o What is your sense of how your year is going with your students?
- o Are you where you want to be, or had planned to be with your students concerning writing instruction?
- o Where do you see yourself and your class in the continuum of the year at this point?
- o What are some thoughts about where you might go from here concerning writing instruction?

When I conducted interviews with students, I planned for about eight to ten

minutes from start to finish. I first asked the student if he or she would do an interview

with me. I then moved with the student to a place out of the range of other people; in

most cases, I conducted interviews right outside the classroom or lab door. Prior to the

student coming out, I cued up the video data, then, when the student had joined me, I

played the video recording for the student on my laptop, and kept the volume low. At the

outset of the interview, I re-explained the purpose of the interview and turned on a digital audio recorder in order to record the interview.

In addition to conducting stimulated recall interviews with the students, I did so as well with Kathy and with John, usually during a conference period, as they were also participants in the writing conferences. Moreover, I used the same questions as I did with the students. I also conducted loosely structured interviews with Kathy and John and did so once each during the three segments of data collection inside Phase Two of the study – Fall, Winter, and Spring. These interviews were held in an empty classroom during a conference period on a day when no videotaping, observations, or stimulated recall interviews were taking place in order to afford the teacher a bit of distance from the events being studied. The loosely structured interviews focused on the teacher's increasing knowledge and understanding of writing instruction, classroom talk, and his or her curricular goals (see Table 3.12 *Interview questions*).

All interviews of students and teachers were recorded only on the digital voice recorder (see Table 3.13 *All interview data*). Each file was uploaded to an external hard drive, renamed, and filed by teacher, phase, date and category (e.g., "KH Student Interviews Round 2") and within that, by student. Interview data were later reviewed and transcribed. Furthermore, I used interviews as an opportunity for member checking, recalling Lincoln and Guba's advice concerning its important function being one of making sure that "data, analytic categories, interpretations, and conclusions are tested with members of those stakeholding groups from whom the data were originally

collected, [and] is the most crucial technique for establishing credibility [and can be] both

informal and formal….[occurring] continuously" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 374).

Table 3.13 All interview data by teacher, students, N, kind, and date

Periods of data collection in Phase Two of the study	Teacher: John O'Brien	Sub Total	Teacher: Kathy Hampshire	Sub Total
Fall (Oct.-Nov.) → Stimulated Recall Interviews (SRI)	Margarita Limon Nov. 19 Sabrina Miller Nov. 19 Joshua Martinez Nov. 19 Christina Barbie Nov. 23 Lydia Sun Nov. 23 Boo Zoo Nov. 23 Tupac Williams Nov. 23 Benjamin Doolittle Nov. 25 Reggie Guy Nov. 25 Tommy Oliver Dec. 15	10	Sha'Nequa Arnold Nov. 19 Angela Nov. 19 Brooke Layne Nov.20, Jan 12 Fake Nov. 20 Dahvie Nov. 24 Mac Daddy Nov. 24 Julien Jackson Jan. 11 J. C. Candy Jan. 11 Pedro Gonzales Jan. 11 Lake Jan. 12 Jake Jan. 12 Mark Jan 12	12
Teacher SRIs	John O'Brien Nov. 23 & 24	2	Kathy Hampshire Nov. 20 & 24; and Jan. 12	3
Teacher, loosely structured	John O'Brien Nov. 16	1	Kathy Hampshire Nov. 3	1
Winter (Jan.-Feb.) → Stimulated Recall Interviews (SRI)	Margarita Limon Feb. 22 Christina Barbie Feb. 22 Benjamin Doolittle Feb. 22 Reggie Guy Feb. 25 Lydia Sun Feb. 26 Sabrina Miller Feb. 26 Tupac Williams Feb. 26 Tommy Oliver Feb. 26 Boo Zoo Mar. 2	9	Brooke Layne Feb. 18, 23 J.C. Candy Feb. 18 Mark Feb. 18 Fake Feb. 22 Jake Feb. 22 Lake Feb. 22 Mac Daddy Feb. 22 Sha'Nequa Feb. 26	8
Teacher SRIs	John O'Brien Feb. 22, 23, 25	3	Kathy Hampshire Feb. 16, 19, 26	3
Teacher, loosely structured	John O'Brien (loosely structured) Feb. 26	1	Kathy Hampshire Feb. 23	1

Table 3.13 (continued)

	John O'Brien		Kathy Hampshire	
Spring (Mar.-Apr.) → Stimulated Recall Interviews (SRI)	Christina Barbie Mar. 5, 29 Tommy Oliver Mar. 5, Apr. 1 Sabrina Miller Mar. 4, 29 Joshua Martinez Mar. 25, Apr.1 Lydia Sun Apr. 1 Margarita Limon Mar. 25, 29 Boo Zoo Mar. 25 Reggie Guy Mar. 25 Tupac Williams Mar. 25	10	Brooke Layne Apr. 23 Fake May 7 Julien Jackson Apr. 23 Pedro Gonzalez May 10 Sha'Nequa May 5 Mac Daddy Apr. 23 Mark May 5 Lake May 7 Angela May 7 Jake May 7 J. C. Candy May 7 Rudolfo May 7 Jacinto Perez May 7	13
Teacher SRI	John O'Brien Mar. 10, 11, 29, 30	4	Kathy Hampshire Apr. 20, 22, May 5, 7	4
Teacher, loosely structured	John O'Brien Mar. 10; Apr. 1	2	Kathy Hampshire May 7	1
End of Year Retrospective Interview (RI) →	Lydia Sun May 18 Christina Barbie May 18 Reggie Guy May 19 Sabrina Miller May 19 Benjamin Doolittle May 20 Margarita Limon May 21 Tupac Williams May 21 Tommy Oliver May 25 Boo Zoo May 21	9	Sha'Nequa May 10 Lake May 17 Angela May 19 Brooke Layne May 19 Pedro Gonzalez May 19 Fake May 20 Julien Jackson May 20 Dahvie May 20 Matthew Reyes May 20 J. C. Candy May 20 Jake May 20 Mark May 20 Mac Daddy May 20	13
Totals of teacher and student interviews in data set →	John O'Brien Total: 37 student interviews Total: 13 teacher interviews		Kathy Hampshire Total: 46 student interviews Total: 13 teacher interviews	

Combined total interviews in data set →   Teachers – 26   Students -- 83

Transcriptions. Taking the advice of Bogdan and Bicklen (1992), my transcripts follow the spoken interview in that remarks by a speaker are prefaced along the left side of the document by that person's name. Because I was working with transcription software, I was able to make notes during subsequent analysis, usually above the text of

the transcript, and save them easily without printing them out. Drawing from Ochs (1993), I minimized the use of punctuation so as not to construct artificially a complete thought by independently declaring it a sentence. I did not transcribe the accents of the participants as it is not their accents that were investigated; to have done so may have drawn undue attention to regional or cultural differences and may have awoken biases in me of which I am unaware. Additionally, because analysis and transcription were occurring simultaneously, the time I spent in transcription was far greater than the three hours of transcription for every hour of recording (Powers, 2005, pp. 25-26) that I had planned for at the outset of this study.

Transcriptions of writing conference and interview data for teachers and focal and backup students were essential to my subsequent analysis. In order to catch participants words, I used a digital voice recorder for all interviews and as a backup for all writing conferences. About mid-way through data collection, I purchased InqScribe, a transcription program that is compatible with audio and video data files. I began transcription during data collection. However, intensive transcription occurred after I exited the research site, during July, August and September, and was accomplished by myself with the paid help of a former student teacher acquaintance in a local library branch.

In order to protect the data, I brought along two laptop computers, one for her and one for me; that way, no files were transferred to her computer or email. Moreover, she and I sat side by side so that I could both see what she was doing as well as answer any questions she might have. Her role was to do as accurate-as-possible first drafts of the

transcript. I then could focus more attention on re-listening to the recorded event, make edits, and include notes. After transcription, I filed the electronic transcripts by teacher, phase, date, and speaker. Moreover, because videos of classes often had multiple writing conferences, I used a heading on each transcription that identified the speakers, times and date, and context, so that I could easily locate individual students' conferences. Transcripts are discussed in greater depth in the section on analysis, which follows.

Student writing and other documents. According to Patton (1990), "written documents", along with "direct observation", and "in-depth, open-ended interviews" comprise the three arenas of data collections. "Document analysis in qualitative inquiry yields excerpts, quotation, or entire passages" from personal, organizational, professional, or other written material (Patton, 1990, p. 10). When I visited a class, I collected copies of handouts that the teachers gave their students. In addition, I collected lesson plans when they were available as well as district and department guidelines. I focused my attention on making copies of student writing samples which included memoirs, essays, poetry, genre explorations, journal entries and quickwrites and more (Merriam, 1998, p. 120-121). Of particular interest was student writing, of any kind, about which teachers had conferenced with students. In order to keep track of what writing went with what conferences, I created a data sheet for each student and made note of conference-to-writing evidence on those sheets (see example, Appendix C *Cover Sheet, Margarita*). In addition, the documents I collected are paper. In order to accommodate paper files, I purchased several plastic file bins and created a folder for each student into which I placed his or her data sheet, and student work samples, by date.

I made copies of student work periodically when I visited the two classes. Both teachers kept some student work organized in folders within crates designated by periods. Other documents were on the school's server, and others were occasionally available either before or after having been graded. I made it a point not to take student work out of the building, to make my copies, and to return them as soon as possible to cause the least disruption to instruction. To accomplish this, I would use the copy room in periods other than Kathy's first or John's seventh, where I was conducting the study. Because I am known to personnel in the school and in the district, I was loaned a key that fits both the copy room and the teacher lounge both near the two classrooms, so that I could make copies when I needed and expand my field notes in a relatively quiet place. I worked out an informal arrangement concerning making copies with the chair of the English department to use my own copy paper and, donate a few reams to the English department.

Exiting the Research Site

As the school year and my time in the school drew to a close, I became more concerned with verification of data in order to confirm or disconfirm themes (Patton, 1990, pp. 265-267). It was during this phase that I member-checked both formally by conducting retrospective interviews with students and by having frequent informal conversations with both John and Kathy. In addition, I made copies of student work and other documents that I still needed. Having been with the two classes from the beginning of the school year, I arranged with each class, a time during which I showed students a slide show of themselves across the year using screenshots culled from the videos,

87

provided refreshments, expressed my appreciation for their friendly and consistent cooperation, and, reiterated the importance of the contribution of their experiences and perspectives toward a better understanding of teaching of writing.

Analysis

Using a constant-comparative perspective (Bogdan & Bicklen, 1992; Merriam, 2009; Charmaz, 2006), analysis was ongoing, recursive, and inductive from the beginning of data collection throughout the writing process. Data analysis was conducted in three, sometimes overlapping main stages, the first two of which overlapped with data collection as well, whereas the third occurred after I had exited the research site. The first stage of data analysis consisted of expanding fieldnotes as well as of reviewing, making notes about, and organizing video data in order to conduct follow up interviews. The second stage consisted mainly of transcription of video and audio data and expansion and memo writing about those transcripts. In the third stage, I solidified my coding and categorization of conference and interview data and used qualitative software to help me in this analytic process.

Stages of Analysis

First stage. During the first stage, I refined and expanded fieldnotes, viewed conference videos, and wrote memos as suggested by Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995) in preparation for conducting stimulated recall interviews with students and teachers and in order to help me identify patterns in the data as well as formulate emerging themes. These notes and memos also served as a form of data reduction and display (Miles &

Huberman, 1984) that made it easier to notice patterns between incidents and across data. Taken together, these helped me to formulate initial interpretations of what I saw in the research site, and later, to draw and verify conclusions.

 I collected fieldnotes on days when I was not videotaping; I reread and expanded them that day, or shortly thereafter, with the addition of personal, methodological, and theoretical memos as in the manner of Corsaro (1981) (for example, see Appendix D *Excerpt from fieldnotes…).* Organizing my fieldnotes by teacher and by week on my computer made it easier for me to revisit them. Especially helpful in my acclimation to the sites during the early moments of data collection, my reading, re-reading, and expansion of field notes helped me to notice patterns, wonder aloud, make connections across time, students, and classrooms, and consider some preliminary directions. When I began videorecording regularly, I replaced the typed fieldnotes with video data as a form of fieldnote-taking (Pink, 2001).

Early analysis occurred as I organized video data. My first classroom video recordings were made in late October and early November; the second group in January and February; and, the third group, March and April. For the first and subsequent groups of video recordings, I watched the video as I uploaded it into iMovie. I then converted the video into QuickTime and filed it on an external hard drive, by teacher, by phase, and by date.

After I filed the video data, I watched it again, this time making note of classroom events, using my computer's word processing program, so as to have a sort of table of contents as a record of who appears when on the video and what was happening (for

example, see Appendix E *Example - excerpt video notes*). Filed by teacher, under "video notes", these tables of video contents permitted me quickly to find and play video clips for students and teachers during stimulated recall interviews. In my preparation for the stimulated recall interviews, I would again view the video data and further expand the corresponding notes. These preparatory viewings constituted early analysis as they helped me decide how to focus my questions to students during the interview and prioritize salient features both that I wanted to discuss in the interview as well as to guide my research. In addition, I used the preparatory viewings to prioritize which video segments were more and less important to share with a participant given the time constraints of the school day. This iterative process also helped me refine my selection of focal students, which, as discussed earlier in this chapter, changed somewhat from the beginning, to mid year, to after exiting the site. Moreover, the notes I made throughout fieldnote collection, and initial viewing of the writing conference video data helped me to direct my subsequent observations, to better formulate teacher interview questions, and continue to assist me in creating thick description during the process of analysis (Geertz, 1973; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000) and subsequent writing of this and other research reports.

Second stage. The second stage of analysis included transcription of video and audio data using InqScribe and the refinement of those transcripts by multiple reviewings as well as the addition of notes and open codings inside the transcripts where I noted specific teacher and student relational and instructional moves, body language, classroom tone, and more (for example, see Appendix F *Excerpt, writing conference transcript – Pedro, April 13, 2010)*. To create the transcripts for the writing conferences, I uploaded

90

the video data into the transcription program, slowed down the playback, and watched

and listed to a videorecording several times. I used a similar process for transcription of

the interview data on audio files. If my transcription helper (discussed earlier in this

chapter) created the first draft of the transcript, I would review it at least twice as I

reviewed, corrected, and expanded these transcripts with noticings, wonderings, and

personal, theoretical, and methodological notes (Corsaro, 1981) and began the process of

open coding.

During this second stage of analysis, I further inventoried writing conferences by

creating one document per teacher, by data collection period (e.g., Fall, Winter, Spring)

by date, and, within the date, by student (for example, see Appendix G *Excerpt, all John

O'Brien's WCs for March 4, 2010 in table of contents format*). In addition, I made a table

for each student of all data collected regarding that student (see example, Appendix C

Cover Sheet, Margarita). These continued organizational efforts contributed to my

attempt to develop a categorization system that both accounted for the data and helped

me to revisit data recursively, undertake preliminary analysis throughout the data

gathering stages, and search for disconfirming evidence (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). As the

volume of the data collected continued to increase, my simultaneous efforts to group,

categorize, and inventory these data continued to serve as both data reduction and display

(Miles & Huberman, 1984) that helped me to identify both emergent patterns as well as

negative cases. My continual looking for evidence of negative cases and subsequent re-

examination of them helped me to re-conceptualize the events and patterns of interactions

inside those negative cases (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 119). For example, it was in this

process that I identified John's need for a student to make a bid for his attention (Lydia, Nov. 10, 2009).

Stage three. In the third stage of analysis, conducted after exiting the site, I used coding software in order to better manage open coding and my subsequent collapsing of categories into themes. The software aided me to generate noticings that up to then, I might have overlooked, and as a way to quickly be able to retrieve data examples in the writing process. I used the numeric results only as a guide (Bogdan & Bicklen, 2003) in determining which findings to focus upon.

Coding using HyperResearch. In order to better identify thematic patterns across the data, and to supplement my observations, I used HyperResearch, a Mac friendly coding software by which I created a coded, hyperlinked transcript of a transcript. So that I could locate enough instances of various features across classes, for each teacher, I chose six class video transcripts: two from the first data collection period in the fall, two from the winter, and two from the spring. Altogether, I used HyperResearch to code twelve class periods in which writing conferences took place (see Table 3.14 *HyperReseach coding: Twelve classes*).

Table 3.14 HyperReseach coding: Twelve classes

InqScribe writing conference class transcription files converted for coding to HyperResearch	Round One (Oct-Nov) Video data transcripts	Round Two (Jan-Feb) Video data transcripts	Round Three (Mar-Apr) Video data transcripts
John O'Brien →	Nov. 10, 2009 Nov. 12, 2009	Feb. 4, 2010 Feb. 5, 2010	Mar. 3, 2010 Mar. 4, 2010
Kathy Hampshire →	Oct. 22, 2009 Nov. 2, 2009	Feb. 19, 2010 Feb. 23, 2010	Apr. 6, 2010 Apr. 8, 2010

To accomplish this, I converted the InqScribe writing conference class transcription files to text then uploaded them into HyperResearch. I then went through each file, and anytime I noted a feature of the writing conference, an instructional conversation, or an interaction that pointed to relational dimensions, I created a coded descriptor, and highlighted that place in the text.

For example:

Code: Closing – "Get something written"

Example from data: JOB: (as he is taking his leave) "Okay words on paper, or words on screen not in the air" [00:00:15.19]

Notes: 11.12.10 -- this might be also directing the verbal prewriting toward making sure something gets written - this is a point of Writing Apprehension (see Reeves, 1997).

The highlighted text section is marked along the left-hand margin with the name of the code. Already in the transcript, information such as the identity of the speaker and time of occurrence with, at minimum, the time stamps for the beginning and ending of

93

the writing conference were part of the uploaded original transcript, and thus were available to me as I coded the writing conference transcript data using HyperResearch (for example, see Appendix H *Excerpt, HyperResearch transcript coding – John, Feb. 4 & 5, 2010*).

Consolidating codes into themes. After going through the data using HyperResearch several times, coding anew and revising prior codes, I ended up with a list of 245 open codes (Appendix I *Master code list*). Then, I looked for exemplars as I defined categories and consolidated codings into those categories, through writing exploratory descriptions that helped me to create themed groupings that pointed to findings. The use of counts of instances in my observational data was helpful in order to "supplement, validate, explain, [or] illuminate" thematic directions and findings of this research (Bogdan & Bicken, 2003, p. 37). Expert and peer debriefing were part of all stages but were most helpful during this third stage of data analysis. I met my advisor several times from summer 2010 through the spring 2011. In each meeting we discussed emergent themes and next steps. Moreover, I met with a peer debriefing group made up of several dissertating graduate students from Language and Literacy Studies. Together, we examined several writing conference transcripts and, through their input, I was able to attend more productively to negative case analysis such as IRE/F patterns in one of Kathy's writing conferences (e.g., Julien, Oct. 22, 2009, discussed further in Chapter Four); and, subtle forms of student distancing and/or resistance (e.g., Pedro WC, Oct. 22, 2009).

As categories emerged, discussions with my advisor helped me to narrow my focus to three main arenas of findings: structures, instructional moves, and relational dimensions. Several categories were subsumed into these three arenas and through this process, 203 of the original 245 codes were consolidated into twelve thematic groups or categories (Table 3.15 *Category name...*). The remaining codes were repetitions of those already present and were subsumed. For example, the first categories – opening, closings, duration, talk in composition, talk from reading compositions, and gap-closing -- are addressed directly and unpacked as areas of findings in Chapter Four.

Table 3.15 Category names, number of codes subsumed, and brief descriptions

Category names and number of subsumed codes	Brief description and examples
Openings a & b (see Ch. 4)	Openings are a two-part process that creates a space for the writing conference.
Physical approach signaling the onset of a writing conference (12 codes)	(Example: T scoots on knees over to S)
Opening words of a writing conference (11 codes)	(Example: How are you doing?)
Closings a & b (see Ch. 4)	Closings are a two-part processes that closes the space for the writing conference.
Closing or giving the student a task (7 codes)	(Examples: 1) T says, "Just keep writing"; 2) "Good", "Fine", or "Okay")
Closing or Leave-taking (8 codes)	(Examples: 1) T promises to come back; 2) T walks off)
Duration (7 codes) (see Ch. 4)	The length of WCs (Examples: 1) 1 to 15 seconds; 2) 16 to 30 seconds)
Using talk to help student compose (16 codes) (see Ch. 4)	Examples: 1) T modeling out loud composing; 2) T explains how to elaborate; 3) Brainstorming out loud)
Using talk to comment on student work that teacher has just read (19 codes) (see Ch. 4)	Teacher commenting on student work; Student commenting on his or her own work (Examples: 1) Takes pleasure S lang choice; 2) T reads S work out loud; 3) S comments on S writing process)
Gap-closing or teachers' efforts to reduce distance between a student	Often relational but with curricular goals in mind. (Examples: 1) T offers encouragement; 2) T uses self-deprecating humor)

and curriculum
(27 codes) (see Ch. 4)

Classroom management for writing (14 codes)	Teacher works to maintain environment conducive to writing (Examples: 1) T insists on keeping writing time sacred; 2) High expectations)
Objects as mediators in an exchange (3 codes)	Examples: 1) Scarf –used to play with like doodling in the midst of writing; 2) Feather – used to infuse humor into an exchange,; 3) Food, Pen – used as a medium of sharing between teacher and student.
Student names (38 codes/names)	Individual names of students
Class Context (5 codes)	Refers to something out of the ordinary taking place in class. (Examples: 1) Standardized testing; 2) in computer lab)
Intertextual (1 codes)	Someone points to a prior conversation inside a writing conference.
Technology (3 codes)	Conversations about technology.

The consolidation of the groups of codes under thematic headings was an iterative

process in which I revisited data instances (an affordance of HyperResearch) in order to

better determine a code's place within a category. Taken together with specific transcript

analysis (Table 3.16 *Example analyzed transcript: Pedro)* both combined to inform my

analysis and strengthen my conviction over which findings to focus on concerning

instructional and relational moves.

Table 3.16 Example analyzed transcript: (KH) Pedro Gonzales Oct. 22, 2009

Line #	Speaker	Transcript	Social Interaction (Relational)	Building Knowledge (Instructional)	Comments
		Duration 37 seconds			
1.		*"Pedro Gonzales" and "Luke" sitting in pair desks facing each other -- [00:11:28.29] KH walks up to them, then kneels in between them, hands close to her body, head turned to Pedro.*	T reduces vertical distance by kneeling;	Approach – (A)	
2.	KH	How are you guys doing?	Opening – sub text = how is the writing going?	Opening (B)	
3.	KH	*(reads Pedro's work by looking on – his writing is entirely in front of him – he owns it – she is not touching his work at all)*	T keeps arms to her side and does not enter student desk space at all		
4.	KH	That's intense "Pedro"	Uses S first name	Responds as a	

96

			– direct statement to student	reader	
5.	Pedro	Huh? *(laughs)* [11:35 audio]	Questions validity of what T said		Distancing move
6.	KH	Your opening -- it's a big deal		T responds again as a reader	

Table 3.16 (continued)

7.	Pedro	How do you spell loss....	S quickly changes subject		Distancing move – keep T away from personal life – keep her in her prescribed role (e.g., she who can spell)
8.	Pedro	Is it L-O-S-E or –		Spelling	
9.	Pedro	Oh no that's "lose" [11:45 AUDIO]		Spelling	
10.	KH	Right!	Validate/Evaluate		T's responses all appear to be designed to validate S – she does not try to get him to talk more
11.	Pedro	Lost is L-O-S-T		Spelling	
12.	KH	You're right	Validate		
13.	KH	You know the answer (11:59 audio)	Validate		
14.	Pedro	Loses - L-O-S-E so "losses" L-O-S-S		Spelling	
15.	KH	You knew that answer	Validate		Three sets of S spelling and T validation
16.	Pedro	Yah I just wanted to make sure [AUDIO 12:04] end on video [00:12:07.01]	S gets validated for what he knows and chooses to share	S can think through what he wants to say with teacher and she'll listen	What did S want to be sure of?

In addition, when considering my findings concerning the theme of duration, I

noticed that even in the shortest encounters, there seemed to be much going on. I

questioned whether these were, in fact, writing conferences. I conscripted Calkins (1994) and Bomer's (2010) discussion of the internal elements of a writing conference into service as an analytical tool (for example, see Table 3.17 *Elements of a writing conference: Brooke*) to address my question; the results of which I discuss in detail in the next chapter.

Table 3.17 Elements of a writing conference: Brooke, Oct. 22, 2009, 1-15 seconds.

Elements of a writing conference (Calkins, 1994; Bomer, 2010)	Explicit, Implicit, or Missing	What's going on here?	Student's take on encounter
Research	√	Reads Brooke's work	
Name	√	Your connection is "perfect"	
Decide	√	Decides to encourage Brooke to go for her idea	
Teach	implicit	Teaching takes the form of reassurance.	Brooke perceives Kathy's response *as* teaching based on her subsequent writing and her response in the SRI (Nov. 20, 2009)

Discourse analysis. Because I am examining the transcripts of conversations, I draw from discourse analysis to examine key incidents. The task of discourse analysis is to describe, interpret, and explain the discursive event in question and to do so in a systematic way. My transcripts are written in a manner that is both consistent and serves the purposes of this study (see Appendix J *Transcription conventions*). Consideration is given to who gets to talk, issues of power relations between speakers, positionality of participants, and literal and metaphoric location or context of a speech act or event (Wood & Kroger, 2000; Davies & Harre, 1990). In order to do a focused analysis on a transcript, I copied it from the InqScribe transcription document and pasted it into a Word document. Drawing from Bloome et al. (2005, p. 195), each utterance had its own

numbered line, and, I included three columns that helped me focus on my research questions having to do with "Social Interaction" or *Relational* noticings, "Building Knowledge" or *Instructional* noticings, and one for "Comments" (see Table 3.16 *Example analyzed transcript: Pedro).*

Moreover, analyzing my transcript data, I continued to find ethnography of speaking's nested approach to context relevant in that its three levels are relevant to my research questions: the speech situation (e.g., English class or the environment), speech event (e.g., writing conference), and speech acts (e.g., consulting, asking and answering a question) (Cameron, 2001; Hymes, 1974). The heuristic acrostic, SPEAKING (Hymes, 1974), has been especially helpful throughout all three stages, and remains so. In the manner of Schiffrin (1994), I have used it more as a guide for considering any given event from a number of perspectives than as an analytic tool for any particular finding. In Table 3.18 I give examples of how I engaged with each piece of the acrostic during data analysis. Any combination of the SPEAKING keys have been useful -- Setting or where is the event in time and space, Participants or who it is that is involved in the communication and their roles, Ends, or purposes of the communication, Acts or in what order are the speech acts in that combine to make the speech event, Key or the tone of the encounter (e.g., joking, angry), Instrumentalities, or what medium of communication is used which can include gesture, gaze, and other non-verbal means, Norms or rules governing who speaks when and rules governing how that speech is interpreted, and Genres or what kind of family does the speech belong to. The model offers flexibility enough so that I have been able to investigate not only what gets said, and by whom, but

how it is said, and how it is received. Furthermore, the instrumentalities ("I") category offers a way to consider not only non-verbal aspects of communication such as gaze, gesture, vocalizations, and expression, but also other "instruments" such as paper and computer. The genres ("G") category serves to remind me to keep considering and reconsidering how writing conferences in their variety may be newly defined speech genres in and of themselves, or more broadly, be examples of particular kinds of instructional conversations, or that they may share features with other, established speech genres.

Figure 3.18 Ethnography of communication: Application of SPEAKING heuristic

SPEAKING (Hymes, 1974) elements	How the heuristic has helped me consider aspects of my research
Setting or where is the event in time and space	Time can mean more than time of day, but also amount of time spent, frequency of events; time can refer to timing as well (e.g., interruption, sensitivity to others). Space is not only physical space (e.g., nearness, farness of bodies, glances, voices) but shifting relational spaces too (e.g., register).
Participants or who it is that is involved in the communication and their roles	I've foregrounded teacher-student interactions but have also remained aware of overhearing of WCs by other students; sometimes three-way WCs when another student might jump in. Participants sometimes shift roles inside a WC (e.g., Interested Reader; poet; resisting student, etc).
Ends, or purposes of the communication	Seems like in the WCs I've observed, that a continuum exists with instructional on one side and relational on the other. However, even in a seemingly wholly instructional moment, I try to be aware of the occasional sliver of relational purpose (and vice versa).
Acts or in what order are the speech acts in that combine to make the speech event	The order of speech acts opens and closes WCs; a greeting sets a tone; the reminder to notice "acts" has helped me note mirroring speech that teachers use and other ways they build toward a productive encounter with a student.
Key or the tone of the encounter	Much of the work in WCs seems to be about setting, maintaining, a positive tone. Teachers will back off their instructional agendas at times when the "key" is off.
Instrumentalities, or what medium of communication is used which can include gesture, gaze, and other non-verbal means	This element has helpful in reminding me to look at a whole range of non-verbal communications as well as how being in a computer lab changes an interaction.
Norms or rules governing who speaks when and rules governing how that speech is interpreted	I thought of this element when I saw John O'Brien give out heart stickers to his students for bravery for speaking into a discussion that first day of class. Has to do, too, with how both teachers disrupt traditional rules of classroom discourse.
Genres or what kind of family	The questioning of "genre" has been noticeable to me when it is

does the speech belong to	surprising; I've learned to ask what genre is a student or a teacher using when I sense a shift in the communication or when I am surprised. For me, "genres" points to registers too as they are tonal containers of sub-genres (e.g., parent-like; friendly; least-teacherly).

Ethnographic microanalysis of interaction. Lastly, I have drawn from ethnographic microanalysis of interaction (Erickson, 1992) as a tool through which to better understand face-to-face key moments in learning environments and contextualize what it means to shape instruction to the needs of one's students. I undertook the detailed analysis of two writing conferences in Chapter Five by examining the video footage and reviewing the transcripts numerous times. The transcripts reflect the progression in time, as well as verbal and non-verbal elements of the exchanges. In order to accomplish this detailed analysis, each utterance has its own line on the table of its transcript. Moreover, I included three columns into which I identified, first, social interactional or relational moves; second, building knowledge or instructional moves; and third, comments, or questions (Bloome et al., 2005). Erickson makes his case for ethnographic microanalysis of interaction as it shows interactional patterns in detail which, he argues, helps the reader to better grasp the educational context:

 In attempting to change interaction patterns, it is often important to see their

 social ecology as richly and precisely as possible – to see, for example, how

 listeners influence speakers while the speakers are talking, how the timing of

 speech and nonverbal action can make intellectual points more or less salient and

 coherent in group discussions, or how reinvoking something said earlier in a

 conversation can make clear to participants where their thinking together has been

heading and how it has been developing. Advice to teachers such as "state goals first" or "clarify when students are confused" is not of much use unless the giver of advice can specify and illustrate the processes or oral discourse that are being recommended. (Erickson, 1992, p. 205)

Drawing from microanalysis of interaction, I have attempted to identify the *"full range of variation"* in my data set, by the purposive selection of the two conferences examined in Chapter Five (Erickson, 1992, p. 206, italics original) through which I explore the second-by-second unfoldment of teacher-student interactions in order to study how the language, registers, gestures, and other forms of communication shaped the teaching and learning interactions of the individuals in those two writing conferences.

Trustworthiness

Elements of building trustworthiness include prolonged and persistent observation, triangulation of data, peer debriefing, negative case analysis, referential adequacy, member checks along the way and at the end of the engagement with participants, thick description, the audit trail, and documentation of reflexivity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 328). Engaging with the two classes as a researcher for a whole school year permitted me an adequate degree of both prolonged and persistent observation. Triangulation of data was achieved as my varied sources of data (e.g., interviews, video and audio recordings, field notes, documents, and transcripts) have helped to ensure that multiple points of view are represented including opportunities for disconfirming evidence to have been collected and discussed to varying degrees in Chapters Four and Five. My theoretical framework is broad and draws from a range of constructivist

theoretical perspectives which I have sought to weave together with my findings in the chapters that follow. I have employed purposive sampling, case study, and ethnographic methods. I valued various perspectives and sought the input and advice of expert and peer debriefers such as my advisor, and a few fellow graduate students with whom I have entered into a mutual arrangement where we consult with one another about our research (Hubbard & Power, 1999) both in group settings and one-to-one. The expert and peer debriefing conversations have been illuminating in identifying areas to examine for disconfirming evidence leading to negative case analysis. Lincoln and Guba (1985) indicate the importance of referential adequacy, or the ability to go back to archived data to retest one's findings. I have not done this though I have enough archived data to do so in the future. In addition, member checking with teachers and students to be sure that I did not misrepresent their actions or intentions was ongoing in the first and second stages of analysis. Moreover, member checking occurred naturally as part of the overall design of the study with regular points of interview contact with students and teachers, alike. In this process of member checking, I shared thoughts, hunches, and questions with the teachers; and, for both the teachers and the students, the stimulated recall interviews permitted them to clarify their own actions and intentions, as did the year-end retrospective interviews. In the explanations of my findings that follow, I have sought to provide an account of social and cultural contexts to provide the reader with thick description (Geertz, 1973) in order that the reader may be able to draw his or her own conclusions. In addition, I kept records in such a way that documents my decision-

103

making and concerns along the way, and can provide a retrospective trail of evidence of how I reached my conclusions.

Moreover, I have remained aware during this entire process of designing the study, collecting of data, and analyzing of data that I, as the researcher, am an instrument of the very research I conduct (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 368; Marshall & Rossman, 1995, pp. 59-65). Identification of what is important, communication, and interpretation all flow through the researcher creating who alters the very reality he or she is observing *by* observing Labov (1972). As a White woman, I am privileged in the United States (McIntosh, 1988). In addition, I carried the cultural capital of association with the district as a former teacher, and as an adult who, through this study, was connected to a large, local, prestigious university. The procedures that I used such as memo writing, member checking, and peer and expert debriefing have aided me to remember to question my impressions, inclinations, and decisions in order to disrupt the degree to which the dominant culture values that shaped me, influenced, and continue to influence my research.

Chapter Four: Writing Conferences:

Structures, Relational Moves, And Instructional Moves

In my appraisal of John and Kathy's writing conferences, I realized that they exhibited certain structures that fell into two main arrangements of moves the teachers made within them – relational and instructional. By *relational moves* I mean how these teachers made interpersonal efforts to bring the curriculum and the student closer inside writing conferences. These teacher-initiated relational moves are not about pursuit of personal liking, but more about opening a space for the student to better engage with the curriculum. By *instructional moves*, I refer to how John and Kathy used talk inside writing conferences for specific instructional purposes. In this chapter, I discuss three main findings concerning *structures*, *relational moves,* and *instructional moves* that feature in John and Kathy's writing conferences.

In her work to expand discussion of the shapes of teaching and learning inside writing conferences, Sperling (1991) used the work of Sacks, Schegeloff, and Jefferson (1974) in structures of conversation (e.g., turn taking, beginnings and endings) to consider how the conversations inside writing conferences of widely differing lengths can be construed as dialogic structures. In this research, I, too, examine *structures* that make writing conferences possible including openings and closings as structures that appear to function as boundary markers of conversations particular to John and Kathy's classrooms. I then discuss internal structures that the teachers draw upon in order to make writing conferences an event that is recognizable in its unfoldment. Then, I examine duration of writing conferences and how varying lengths of writing conferences

contribute to a teaching and learning conversation about writing, as well as how they contribute to classroom climate. In the second main finding area, I point out *relational moves* that John and Kathy deployed inside writing conferences, including particular kinds of teacher talk, as well as body positionings inside those encounters. The third finding section on *instructional moves* centers on how Kathy and John used talk inside writing conferences for explaining conventions of writing; for brainstorming, drafting, and revising; and for reading student work to both respond as a reader and to comment on the draft-in-progress.

Inside the classrooms

In order to situate the findings that are presented in this chapter and the next, I provide a glimpse into the physical classrooms of John and Kathy as well as an overview of the ongoing, daily instructional rhythms they established for their students.

Before entering John's classroom, one was greeted with an array of posters on and around the exterior of the door with messages like "Yes, we're open," and "Warning, due dates are closer than they appear!" and "Oh no! Not another learning experience!" as well images of Shakespeare, an AVID decal, a poster warning against plagiarism, and more. Inside, posters were everywhere, as were racks of paperback books, Christmas lights, an area rug, a rocking chair, and a sofa up along a wall that is mostly windows. One dry erase board was covered in writing outlining a day-by-day plan for the week. Personalized circular, card stock picture frames with current students' photos inside dangled from the ceiling. Seating was a matter of choice with desks in rows; and, in the front of the room, the projection screen was down and ready.

Kathy's room had posters and student work up on the walls. Picture books, made by current students in the first week of school, dangled from the ceiling with titles like "Jesus, the Generous Guy" and "Nancy, the Little Chicken." On one of the two dry erase boards, was an array of tile poetry compositions that students changed almost daily. Over another were hung at odd angles several empty, engraved wooden frames, painted silver. One wall section, floor to ceiling, was covered with antique-looking postcards with faces from the past that appeared to be looking out. Another wall section held a curvy wooden computer desk with a lamp on top, and rice paper screen nearby; another area hosted several wooden bookcases filled with paperbacks to loan the students. Near her desk was an aquarium up on top of a tall file cabinet with a single goldfish-type fish that always looked like it was swimming upside down. The desks were arranged in rows and students sat where they wanted.

Students in John's room are taught a short lesson every day based on a published poem or on a model essay. On Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, students were likely to read, annotate, discuss, chorally recite, and later, memorize a sonnet and recite it for a grade. On those days, they had time to read books of their own choosing as John made the rounds, asked them questions, and noted their answers. John took his students for regular visits to the campus library, and twice in a six-week grading period, students engaged with John in a conversation about their self-chosen book in which they were assessed on what they thought about it, and whether and to whom they might recommend it. On Tuesdays and Thursdays, students were likely to look together at a professionally written essay that John felt was a worthy model depending on the current long-term

107

writing assignment. For example, during the essay-writing assignment on portraiture in the early fall, John and his students read, and discussed for meaning and for writerly craft, Marion Winik's (1994) "16 Pictures of My Father" (FN Sept. 29, 2009). Then, they moved quickly into the computer lab, which John booked frequently throughout the school year; and, for most of the period, students worked on their essays with their self-chosen topics. It was in here that John conducted his writing conferences.

Kathy divvied her class time into writing, reading of a shared text followed by a discussion based on that text, and work, usually in groups, on ongoing projects. Students in Kathy's class might have started with a journal write, or a sticky note jotting answering a broad question like "What makes you feel alive?" or "What did you learn on spring break?" or for the end of the class study of *The Crucible* (Miller, 1953), "If you were an alien and you came to earth and you landed in Salem, what would you think about [*sic*] human beings are like?" (Field Notes, Sept. 18, 2009). They wrote longer responses in their journals, and shorter ones that were displayed on a white board in the room. Often Kathy showed students a short video, or a video clip from a documentary, or a portion of a film version of a book they were reading in order to stimulate a class discussion. On other days, she sometimes read a chapter aloud to them from a class book (e.g., Alexie's, 2007, *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian)*. Students used the remaining 30 minutes or so to work on a longer project of which they typically were given choice in topic (e.g., thematic essay with roots in shared class text, lines from a play that they later performed, positive advertisement project, etc.) on their own, but most often in small

groups. It was in this project block of the class period that Kathy got around and conferred with students several times a week about the work at hand.

According to students in both classes, choice in reading and writing, a stimulating and fun class, and regular one-to-one teacher help were among the outstanding and reliable features that they felt were important for their own growth as writers and as literate people (Sha'Nequa, Retrospective Interview (RI), May, 10, 2010; Boo, RI, May 21, 2010; Tommy, RI, May 25, 2010). From the earliest days of the school year, both teachers established classroom cultures that supported their students across time by daily interactions or "habits of performance" (Erickson, 2006, p. 13) of structures in their classrooms to reflect aspects of writing workshop including assigning long term writing projects to which students returned again and again, teaching using occasional mini lessons, and holding writing conferences to guide and support their students.

Inside of those weekly and, sometimes, daily writing conferences, both teachers wove together their own *structures, relational moves,* and *instructional moves* to establish predictable yet flexible classroom patterns upon which students could rely and their students would came to associate with John and Kathy's teaching practices.

<center>**Structures in the Writing Conference:**</center>

<center>**Beginnings and Endings, Parts, and Duration**</center>

Approach, Opening, Closing, and Exiting the Writing Conference

Both Kathy and John used writing conferences to teach their students to be independent writers, to get to know their students, and to differentiate instruction. They,

like Atwell (1997), wanted to both engage with their students and stay in control of how they used their classroom time. Thus, routinely they moved around to their students, conferring with many students each week. That they routinely employed structural patterns for beginning and ending writing conferences -- how to approach a student, how to open a conversation, how to signal its end, as well as how to exit a conference smoothly – permitted them to get around to all their students, to stay in control of their time, and helped them to carry out their pedagogical goal of teaching writing in a workshop setting.

The ways that both teachers signaled beginnings and endings of writing conferences, also signaled to students, including those who were not being directly addressed, that personalized teaching was about to take place – teaching that was different from a more traditional approach with an instructor directing the action from the front of the room. These beginnings and endings served as "social furniture" (Tharp & Gallimore, 1991) and demarcated the boundaries of writing conferences as containers of particular speech activities that, through repetition, "sediment" (Erickson, 2006) the kinds of things that John and Kathy's "we" actually did. Broadly speaking, the "we" speaks to the classroom culture that the teachers had set up; more specifically, the "we" was that everyone was viewed as a writer. Boundaries serve to keep some things out, and other things in; the repeated marking out of spaces that support the students' writing sends a message that indicates the normality of "here, we are all writers."

It may be that writing conferences are a speech genre as there are patterned or typical ways of interacting, and a writing conference is clearly bounded from other

110

conversations. In her editorial introduction to "Speech Genres," Morris (in Bakhtin, 1994) elucidated speech genres as "a typical form of utterance associated with a particular sphere of communication (e.g. the workplace, the sewing circle, the military)" (p.80). Bakhtin pointed to how a situation or context serves to signal a shift in speech genres for those that are initiated into them: "We learn to cast out speech in generic forms and, when hearing others' speech, we guess its genre from the very first word; we predict a certain length….If speech genres did not exist and we had not mastered them, if we had to originate them during the speech process and construct each utterance at will for the first time, speech communication would be almost impossible…." (Bakhtin, 1994, p. 84). When John and Kathy initiated writing conferences, the students recognized the shift in speech genre from the classroom context into which they had been initiated; the bounded beginnings and endings, as well as the internal structures, discussed below, signaled the shift into writing conferences. John and Kathy, as insider or expert writers conscripted the beginnings and endings to mark out the time and space where these newcomer writers could participate as writers by writing among other writers, by talking with peers about their writing, and by both participating in and overhearing one-to-one talk with experts about writing.

Approach and Opening

  Approach. John's students were routinely in the computer lab for all but one of the video sessions. The video data from across the year shows students seated at long tables set away from the walls and John, as an ambient presence, customarily walking around those tables slowly and observing students at work from a variety of angles,

reading screens all the while. For example, he might walk up to and stand behind a student, so that he can read the student's screen as he did as Reggie was working (Feb. 4, 2009, Video); or he might read as he continued walking slowly as he did that same day as Boo was working; sometimes these engagements led to conversation as it did with Margarita (Nov. 10, 2009, Video). Students were able to summon him easily by a glance or by speaking his name, as Christina did (Nov. 12, 2009, Video). Occasionally, he turned to a student after he had just conversed with one sitting nearby as he turned to Lydia after a conference with Margarita (Nov. 10, 2009, Video). If John felt that a student was being overly social, John walked right up to him or her, stood or sat nearby, and did a short check-in to encourage the student to use the time to write (Video, March 2, 2010, Tommy; Sabrina/Tupac). Disinclined to interrupt their writing as long as they *were* writing, John consistently approached his students in these various ways, the purposes of which varied – interest, encouragement, easy access to expertise, surveilling and holding students to high expectations.

Kathy's room was set up with student desks in rows or in pods of three or four. Seating was tight, rows were very narrow, and it was impossible to be able to walk around the end of a row or around a pod of students near the wall. Remaining in a kneeling position, Kathy frequently worked her way down one side of a row and up the other. Students could see that she was coming, probably overhear conferences with nearby students because of the proximity, and likely estimate when she'd be along to talk with them (Video, Oct. 22, 2009, Julien). At other times, Kathy worked her way around to students in a less linear fashion, and, as needed, walk right to a student if she perceived

that he or she was having difficulty writing or staying focused (Video, April 6, 2010,

Pedro); after intervening with one student, Kathy then sometimes turned to a nearby

student and asked how he or she was doing (Video, Oct. 22, 2010, Brooke). While using

a different management approach than John, Kathy got around to each of her students for

writing conferences. Begun early in the year in both classrooms, John and Kathy's

students came to expect one-to-one teaching, support, encouragement, interest, and

affirmation as they developed as writers (Table 4.1 *Physical approach to students for a*

writing conference).

Table 4.1 Physical approach to students for a writing conference from HyperResearch transcripts sampling	John O'Brien frequency in video sample	Kathy Hampshire frequency in video sample
Teacher approaches from behind	5	0
Teacher scoots on knees over to student	0	6
Student summons teacher, verbally or nonverbally	15	1
Teacher ambles over	7	1
Teacher turns to student	4	3
Teacher walks right to student	7	6
Walks slowly by, reads, maybe talks	17	1

Openings. Who says what first is a characteristic of any conversation, or writing

conference (Table 4.2 *Opening the writing conference - first words*). Both Kathy and

John relied upon a few flexible introductions. Kathy frequently asked, "How are you

doing?" sometimes using the student's name, and sometimes not (Video, Oct. 22, 2009,

Pedro). The meaning of the "How are you doing?" questions appeared to be understood

by students to mean, "How do you think your writing or writing process is going at this moment?". This greeting is an example that points to a shared understanding of the intertextual (Bloome et al., 2005) nature of repeated events-as-texts over time; in all the video data I reviewed, I never heard a student respond to that general query out of context of their writing – which points to the writing conference *as* a speech genre. John was more apt to ask about whether students had an idea about which they were interested in writing and what that was (Video, Nov. 10, 2009, Boo). Or, sometimes he opened a writing conference by asking a student what he planned to say in the first sentences (Video, Nov. 12, 2009, Tupac). In both classrooms, students sometimes answered the teacher query even before John or Kathy voiced it (Video, Nov. 10, 2009, Margarita; Video, Feb. 19, 2010, Brooke), which also points to shared intertextuality (Bloome et al., 2005) inside the speech event. In these instances, the instructional move was a progress check where the teacher asked, for example, what topic the student chose, or what part the student was on. Additionally, in both rooms, occasionally students called the teacher over with a specific question as Tupac asked of John, "So, do I just do all of them?" (Video, Feb. 4, 2010) or with a reassurance question as Jake asked of Kathy, "Miss, is mine okay?" (Video, April 8, 2010), to which both teachers responded in an effort to help the students continue to work on their writing.

Table 4.2 Opening the writing conference - first words conference from HyperResearch transcripts sampling	John O'Brien frequency in video sample	Kathy Hampshire frequency in video sample
What will you say in your first sentence?	3	1
How are you doing?	1	7

Do you have an idea for what to write about?	6	1
Student answers unvoiced teacher query	4	4
Student asks query of teacher	3	3
Student asks a "reassurance" question (e.g., How am I doing?)	3	2
Teacher answers unasked student query	2	1

Closing and Exiting the Writing Conference

Closings. Both John and Kathy signaled the end of the conference in a variety of ways (Table 4.3 *Closing --Leaving the student with a task)*. For example, either might have said something like "Good," "Fine," or "Okay" (Video, Feb. 23, 2010, Fake); and, both generally left the student with a next step ("You're going to talk about how friendship is important in Smoke Signals but mostly this is going to be about your view of friendship, 'kay? -- so tell me your story," Video, Oct. 22, 2009, Sha'Nequa). Kathy and John also encouraged elaboration by leaving students with an instructional suggestion to think about and jot down connections with their own lives of a given topic (Video, Feb. 4, 2010, Tupac). As one of the four sides of the boundaries of the writing conference – along with approach, openings, and exiting or leave-taking -- closings give both parties the opportunity to speak any final thoughts and to transition away from the encounter.

Table 4.3 Closing -- Leaving the student with a task from HyperResearch transcripts sampling	John O'Brien frequency in video sample	Kathy Hampshire frequency in video sample
Signaling closing by saying something like "Good", "Fine", or "Okay"	10	5
Teacher implies task, in closing (e.g., "T: Any experiences that are connected with your life? (reads) That's perfect [message: write down your connections to your own life]")	3	2

Teacher closes writing conference by saying, "Just keep writing"	1	0
Teacher clearly leaves student with next step (e.g., T: "You're going to talk about how friendship is important in Smoke Signals but mostly this is going to be about your view of friendship, 'kay? -- so tell me your story")	4	9
Teacher affirms that student's writing is well in hand	3	0
In closing, teacher instructs student to "get something written"	5	0
In closing, teacher uses pointed humor, e.g."S: What did I do? T: Nothing, that's the problem….ahhggg"	2	0

Leave taking. Physically exiting the writing conference requires that teachers know how much time, instruction, and/or attention are enough and both teachers accomplished this in different ways (Table 4.4 *Leave taking – physically exiting the writing conference*). Both Kathy and John preferred to conduct shorter conferences (discussed in the next section), which enabled them to get around to everyone more frequently. As if to underscore this, John sometimes signaled the end of a conference first by standing as he concluded his remarks (Video, Nov. 10, 2009, Boo), then by walking away (Video, Feb. 4, 2010, Tommy) – a strategy employed by Kathy as well (Video, April 6, 2010, Pedro). Kathy often conferred in a kneeling position, and in that position, made her way to the next student. Moreover, they both left, sometimes, with a promise to be back as they left the writer with a bite-sized task to attempt (Video, Feb. 19, 2010, Brooke). The "promise to be back" move may be a strategy that lends a steadying hand to a writer whose confidence the teacher perceives as wobbly. Moreover, this move may function as a connecting thread between conversations, underscoring in a small way the dialogical nature of the interaction and of the classroom.

116

Table 4.4 Leave taking –physically exiting the writing conference from HyperResearch transcripts sampling	John O'Brien frequency in video sample	Kathy Hampshire frequency in video sample
Teacher, while on knees, scoots off	0	2
Teacher walks off immediately following closing statement	17	4
Teacher stands to signal end of conference	5	2
Teacher leaves with promise to come back	1	1

The relatively predictable ways John and Kathy managed approaches, openings, closings and exiting signaled to students the boundedness of writing conferences as a speech genre and also worked to activate student participation in them. These beginnings and endings "contribute inseparable aspects whose combinations create a landscape – shapes, degrees, textures – of community membership" (Lavé & Wenger, 1991, p. 35). Writing conferences occurred in both classrooms at the same time as people were writing which helped to arrange the activity setting in such a way as to reinforce the importance of writing. Students were able to see and hear other students' writing conferences with John and Kathy, which created a continuous backdrop of conversation about writing, during writing time. That the teachers made their way around to students, demonstrated to students that teachers believed that their engagement and participation in writing during that part of class time was critical to their developing writer-selves as their participation as writers "is an evolving, continuously renewed set of relations" (Lavé & Wenger, 1991, p. 50).

Internal Structures: Parts of a Writing Conference

A deliberate agenda to teach writing as a process (Graves, 1983; Calkins, 1994; Ray & Laminack, 2001) includes conducting writing conferences. Calkins' (1994) broadly named the patterns of interaction of a writing conference by which teachers of writing shape their instruction to the needs of the student writer. In these introductory remarks to my discussion and examination of writing conference parts, I describe those parts and their aims. I then engage in a consideration of teaching and learning as assisted performance in the zone of proximal development by which to view the fundamental purposes of these writing conference parts. Following that, I move to findings on duration and discuss these same writing conference parts in context of the examples and data snippets examined.

Research, decide, teach – and name. As internal structures of the writing conference, Calkins's (1994) description of its parts is helpful in delineating the geography of the zone in which a teacher must orient himself/herself and then proceed in order to accomplish instructional goals. The parts are: 1) *research*, or read the student's work to inform instructional decision-making; 2) *decide*, or know what the instructional focus will be; and, 3) *teach*, or communicate the instructional focus to the student in a way that the student can take it up. Calkins, Hartman, and White (2005) added "naming" as an essential component where the teacher complements the student substantively on some aspect of his writing and moved into second place in this sequence. To inform my work, I draw on Bomer's (2010, p. 9) re-vitalization of these four components as she argues that naming is the "key" to teaching a student that he knows more than he thinks

he knows. As an insider/expert in the community of practice of writers, naming of a skill not fully realized by the student does not only the interpersonal work of a complement, but more importantly, as a consistent and repeated social interaction, helps the student build up his or her writer-toolkit to which he or she can return. As part of the student's legitimate peripheral participation (Lavé & Wenger, 1991) in a community of writers, the student is being sponsored by an insider who is both supporting the newcomer where needed, and pointing out where the newcomer is becoming competent. Whether or not the teacher is physically present at some other time, it is possible that these interactions will help the student constitute his or her own metacognitive strategies. Using self-speech, the student may find that "consciously reconjuring the voice of a tutor" (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, p. 39) will be an aid in the self-talking through of his or her own list of skills when confronted with a difficult writing task.

Assisted performance. The teaching structures I discuss in this section are about how these two teachers interacted with their students in zones of proximal development. Because I examine features within writing conferences, it is helpful to consider how teaching and learning may be taking place. Thinking of "assisted performance" as what the child can do with help is the basis of the concept of Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development. Tharp and Gallimore (1988) explained their mapping of this zone, prefacing it as situated, individualized and social:

There is no single zone for each individual. For any domain of skill, a ZPD can be created. There are cultural zones as well as individual zones because there are

119

cultural variations in the competencies that a child must acquire through social

interactions in a particular society. (p. 31)

Further, they offer a "general definition of teaching: *Teaching consists in assisting*

performance through the ZPD. Teaching can be said to occur when assistance is offered

at points in the ZPD at which performance requires assistance" (p. 31 italics original).

Identifying the zone of proximal development as a four stage, recursive process

Tharp and Gallimore (1988) distinguished the *first stage* as one where learners rely upon

others for "outside regulation of task performance" (p. 33). It is here where directions,

modeling, and conversation about a task occur. Moreover, it is in this first stage where

scaffolding (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976) is especially helpful in task simplification and

graduated assistance. In *stage two*, Tharp and Gallimore (1988) explained, the learner is

"assisted by the self" (p. 36) where he or she uses "self-directed speech" or some variant

in order to guide the self. They explained that in *stage three*, "all evidence of self-

regulation has vanished," and the learner performs the task smoothly, as at this point the

task "has been internalized" (p. 38). Moreover, at this stage, instruction would be

received as intrusive and disruptive. Recursion through the zone of proximal

development's stages begins in *stage four* where something learned is forgotten and the

learner needs re-instruction. It may that the skills are required in a new context, or that

the learner, himself or herself, is in a different state. The learner may reverse back into

stage two's self-assistance, or, if needed, may seek instruction from someone more

capable (p. 39). The *research*, *name*, *decide*, and *teach* internal structures of a writing

conference help the writing teacher to work with students in their zones of proximal

development to build new understanding on what they already know, and to help them articulate and instantiate their intentions as writers.

Internal Structures: Duration of Writing Conferences

In this next section, I begin by looking back at what the literature says about writing conference length; then, I discuss writing conferences of varying lengths and use the context of the *research, name, decide,* and *teach* framework (Bomer, 2010; Calkins, Hartman & White, 2005; Calkins, 1994) for identifying and inscribing their internal structures. Drawing from typically sampled (Patton, 1990) teacher-student encounters around writing, I demarcate categories of duration of writing conferences and display and examine examples of each.

Anderson (2000) and Perks (2005) argued that a productive writing conference is not possible unless it lasts, on average, five minutes, which works out to seeing four or five students each day or each member of a class of 30 students every six to eight days. In order to maximize and control instructional time, as a middle school teacher with multiple classes each day, Atwell (1998) talked about her practice of moving around the classroom somewhat randomly in order to respond quickly to students as needs arose, and, to meet her goal to "talk with *many* students each day" (p. 220, emphasis added). Graves (1994) identified a conference he held with Andy as "short"; indeed judging from the transcript it might have lasted about ten seconds (p. 62). Sperling's (1991) work in Mr. Petersen's 9th grade classroom demonstrates that writing conferences can last anywhere from ten seconds to about six minutes in class, and, 15 minutes for after-hours appointments. In order to reach everyone in her high school class within a week, Kittle

(2008) shared that, on average, her writing conferences lasted a little under four minutes to around six minutes. In the following discussion, I attempt to map internal structures

and teacher-student interactions inside writing conferences that are much shorter than five minutes, on average.

Kathy and John's writing conferences are grouped into the following categories which also reflect their frequency with category (a) representing the most frequent time spans, (b) the next most frequently occurring, and so forth (Table 4.5 *Duration of writing conferences*) with (a) the shortest, or, one to 15 seconds; and, 16 to 30 seconds; (b) pretty brief, or 31 to 54 seconds; and 55 to 65 seconds; (c) a minute-and-some, or, 66 to 90

Table 4.5 Duration of writing conferences HyperResearch transcripts sampling

John O'Brien			Kathy Hampshire		
n=instances in video sample			n=instances in video sample		
Time ↓	# WC N=87 ↓	% of Total ↓	Time ↓	#WC N=89 ↓	% of Total ↓
1-15s	31	20%	1-15s	18	20%
16-30s	17	13%	16-30s	12	13%
	Subtotal 1 ↓			**Subtotal 1** ↓	
1-30s	**N=48**	**55%**	**1-30s**	**N=30**	**34%**
31-54s	16	18%	31-54s	16	18%
55-65s	11	12%	55-65s	11	12%
	Subtotal 2 ↓			**Subtotal 2** ↓	
1-65s	**N=58**	**86%**	**1-65s**	**N=57**	**64%›**
66-90s	12	14%	66-90s	12	13.5%
	Subtotal 3 ↓			**Subtotal 3** ↓	
1-90s	**N=87**	**77%**	**1-90s**	**N=69**	**77.5%**
	Additional category ↓			**Additional category** ↓	
90s-3min	0	**0%**	90s-3min	12	13%
3min.+	0	**0%**	3min.+	8	9.5%
	(Total =100%)			**(Total =100%)**	

122

seconds; and (d) the longest, or, 90 seconds to three minutes and over. For the purposes of this report, I will limit my discussion in this section to categories "a" , "b", and "c" as those are the shortest categories and the ones that most warrant explication as to whether they are, or have value, as writing conferences. However, in Chapter Five, two of the longer writing conferences in this data set are closely examined on multiple levels: the first at one minute and 13 seconds, and the second, at two minutes and 49 seconds.

Category a) The shortest. The majority of John O'Brien's encounters with students around writing were coded as "walk-by" which refers to him slowly walking around the computer lab, looking briefly at students' screens, and occasionally making a comment about a student's process or progress. In this way, he monitored students, updated himself on their progress, and offered his assistance using his frequent proximity as a signaling device to students of his availability. Students were accustomed to this pattern of ambient teacher presence established by John at the beginning of the year, and most understood that they only had to look in his direction or gesture in order to have him stop and talk with them. Sabrina reported that she recognized his walk-by (Video, Feb. 4, 2010) as a positive way of checking on her because he knew her as a student and as a writer (SRI Feb. 26, 2010). Moreover, Boo recognized this pattern, after a walk-by (Video, Feb. 4, 2010), as one of on-call availability, and as a manifestation of John's high expectations for his growth and use of writing time (SRI March 2, 2010). These walk-bys may be a kind of writing conference. John *researched* by looking at screen and familiarized himself with students' work. His *naming* might have been implicit – that by the combination of reading the students' work, and withholding comment, taken in the

context of the classroom culture, he has aimed to build the idea of students as fellow writers and readers; he has essentially said, "You are engaged in writing and look like a writer to me." His *decision* was not to intervene; that the students he checked on, for the moment, "carrie[d]out a task without assistance from others" and that "what was guided by the other is now beginning to be guided by and directed by the self" (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, pp. 36-37). Moreover, the students may have been even further along in stage three with their "performance no longer developing [but] already developed" (p. 38). Does it mean that no teaching took place when we mean that no overt instruction took place? According to their general definition of teaching, Tharp and Gallimore (1988) may have said that teaching did not occur. However, John, directed by his own reflection-in-action (Schön, 1984) and pedagogical tactfulness (van Manen, 1991, 1995) subsumed his *teaching* into teacher presence in the form of ambient presence, non-interference, and perhaps even validation that the students were, in fact, doing just fine. John consciously paused his overt instruction until the students needed his support learning a new skill or reapplying previously learned skills in a new writing context. As an expert/insider, John still supported the participation of the novices in his charge:

> The notion of participation thus dissolves dichotomies between cerebral and embodied activity, between contemplation and involvement, between abstraction and experience: persons, actions, and the world are implicated in all thought, speech, knowing, and learning. (Lavé & Wenger, 1991, p.52)

124

Rather than risk derailing his students' processes, he supported his students' work by his informed confidence in them, his propinquity, and his availability to offer overt *teaching* when it was actually needed.

Kathy held a 27 second writing conference with Sha'Nequa (Video, April 6, 2010) who read her poem aloud to Kathy. The read-aloud served as Kathy's *research* phase. Kathy listened closely and *named* what Sha'Nequa was already doing as a writer: "I like so much how you say 'I'm not afraid to shine' and then you talk about 'living,' like staying alive." Kathy's instructional *decision* centered on affirming the sometimes-struggling Sha'Nequa as a fellow writer ("like what we talked about on the sticky notes, I love it") who took up some of the class's ideas about aliveness and ventriloquated (Bakhtin, 1981; Wertsch, 1991) them into her poem. Kathy intentionally and intertextually (Bloome et al., 2005) tied Sha'Nequa's poem to a recent class writing activity in which students jotted and shared on what made them feel most alive, and by doing so, positioned Sha'Nequa as a fellow-participant in a community of writers, and one that used the resources available to her to come up with a subject and text for a poem. Kathy's *teaching* in this instance dwelt in her recognition that Sha'Nequa's learning could best be assisted learning by consciously aligning her as a writer with the class-as-community-of-writers and to affirm Sha'Nequa's writerly decision to draw from the class's posted conversation. Kathy's teaching decision was to mirror and magnify Sha'Nequa's emergent writerly identity:

> Activities, tasks, functions, and understandings do not exist in isolation; they are
> part of broader systems of relations in which they have meaning. These systems

125

of relations arise out of and are reproduced and developed within social

communities, which are in part systems of relations among persons. The person

is defined by as well as defines these relations. Learning thus implies becoming a

different person with respect to the possibilities enabled by these systems of

relations. To ignore this aspect of learning is to overlook the fact that learning

involves the construction of identities. (Lavé & Wenger, 1991, p. 53)

Here too, as in the previous example with John, Kathy subsumed her overt *teaching* and

using pedagogical tact (van Manen, 1991, 1995), took the opportunity to strengthen

Sha'Nequa's confidence both as a writer, and as a smart, strong, and likeable person:

"like a person that I would want to hang out with." Moreover, Kathy is the expert or

insider here who is encouraging the efforts of this novice and whose comments can be

construed as encouragement for Sha'Nequa to keep writing.

Category b) Pretty brief. John held a 49 second writing conference with Tommy

(Video, Feb. 23, 2010), in which Tommy summoned John to ask for clarification on the

tenses of the verb *to have*. John squatted down, looked up at Tommy while listening, and

then, answered Tommy's questions. John's conference met the writing conference criteria

in the following ways: he *researched* by listening carefully to Tommy explain his

question; he implicitly *named* Tommy's line of questioning as important for a writer's

craft *by* his careful listening and response; and then, John *decided* and *taught* Tommy

about the verb's usage both directly and by giving examples of it in sentences:

John: Has and Have. "I have", " I HAVE a million dollars" Like right now, "I

HAD a million dollars," I'm saying I don't have it anymore, like it was in the past

126

Tommy: So "had" is in the past, past tense?

It appears that Tommy understood the difference between have and had from his last sentence, enough so that he could self-assist (stage two) as he continued to write; additionally, Tommy later reported that he was satisfied with the exchange (SRI, March 4, 2010). However, on inspection of his finished essay, Tommy's writing shows that he tended to remain in the present tense using "have" even when "had" would have been a more conventional usage (Artifact, Round 2, final copy "Desire"). It appears that Tommy did not have full control over his usage of have and had, or, perhaps he did have control immediately after the conference, but it slipped away before he could reconceptualize his understanding for himself.

Possibly, he realized that he didn't understand its use (stage four ZPD) then decided to ask John assistance to (re-)gain and understanding of the verb. Sperling (1991) talks about the two-sided instructional tango (p. 134) that a writing conference is – that it's both interactive and reciprocal. Moreover, a writing conference is collaborative to greater and lesser degrees; and that collaboration in on a continuum. Sperling (1990) talks about the highly collaborative conference as mutual control and active negotiation between teacher and student; and less collaborative conferences as "buying the teacher input" with "minimal…contribution" from the student (p. 315). Tommy's collaborative effort appeared to be acceptable, judging by the conference transcript, above. But, from looking at his paper, his collaborative effort may have been on the lower end; he didn't appear to take notes, or know to do the kind of reciprocal work needed in order to be able to conduct his own (stage two ZPD) self-talk or self-control (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988).

Of course, John could have said, "Take notes, this is important" but he did not. What appears to be important for Tommy, even if this particular writing conference's information did not end up in his writing, are the multiple instructional and relational opportunities he has for engaging with John, as he – Tommy – constructs his writer-self over the time arc of the school year. Moreover, all conferences may not conform to an "ideal" – "the teacher-student interactions may not be immediately linked or linkable to all the students' written products" (Sperling, 1991, p.136). It appears that Tommy needed several more reinforcing explanations and conversations with John before he would have been able to access that external talk, and re-shape it into internal self-guidance. It is likely that in all his years of schooling, Tommy has had instruction on *to have*, yet perhaps that instruction has not come at the right time, or in the right way, or even in close enough repetition for it to stick. It is apparent that Tommy needed and will continue to require repeated sedimenting (Erickson, 2006) instruction encounters concerning this verb's usage.

Kathy held a 65 second exchange with Fake (Video, Feb. 23, 2010) in which she intervened when Fake appeared to be overwhelmed with the volume of writing that he had been expected to produce over a couple of weeks, and turn in that very day. Kneeling next to his desk, Kathy read what he'd written up to that point, briefed him on the expectations, then encouraged him to finish "one thing at a time," starting with the essay that was closest to being complete. Kathy *researched* by reading his work; she *named* one of his essays as strong ("You have to work, not by putting your head down. Look, this is awesome. Did you finish it?"); she *decided* what Fake needed at that moment was

128

the ability to see one manageable task, and not "three essays due right now," as well as stamina to sustain the task. She *taught* into that need and focused on helping him see that he could accomplish his task ("Um, so finish this one, one thing at a time and then move onto one of these that you haven't done yet, okay"). Fake did end up finishing his assignment, and turned in three well-developed pieces (Artifacts, Round Two, 1, 2, 3). This writing conference contains examples of task reduction and management (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976); moreover, Kathy's instructional move served to teach Fake, the newcomer, some of the organizational strategies that an insider would use.

Category c) A minute-and-some. Kathy held a 72 second conference with Pedro (Video, Apr. 6, 2010) during a class in which students were writing poetry using sentence stem strips plucked from baskets passed around the room as poem-starters. As Kathy approached him, he summoned her saying, "I'm stuck, I'm stuck."

Kathy knelt next to him and whispered, "You're stuck?"

"I don't know what to do," Pedro replied.

Kathy then *researched* Pedro's work by reading aloud what he'd written up to that point: "My mother taught me how to walk/ my mother taught me how to talk/ my mother taught me how to eat/ my mother taught me how to read/ she taught me discipline..."

"I think that's this part," Pedro interjected, pointing to his notebook where he had written discipline as "dissaplin" (Artifact, Round Three, Pedro).

Kathy responded: "It's this (writing "discipline" on the notebook page and circling it) but that doesn't matter, it doesn't matter, the spelling doesn't matter That's beautiful

129

because you're rhyming and you know you don't have to rhyme and you can stop right here if you want   That was a poem."

"Oh okay," Pedro responded.

Pedro was concerned about misspelling discipline. Kathy strategically minimized his error, and *named* that Pedro had made a poem; she noted the rhyming strategy, and responded aesthetically to what he had written. Kathy's *teaching* focused on where he might go from here. Beginning by positioning him as agentive: "Do you want to start the next stanza with how she taught you those things?", Kathy then rattled off several questions that an aesthetic reader might want to know: "Like was she patient with you, was she nice to you, did she yell at you, like how did she teach you these things?"

"I'll just start on the next one and then..." responded Pedro, possibly satisfied that Kathy considered it a poem, and thus, his task was completed. Pedro indicated that he was ready to write his next poem, which was met with some resistance from Kathy.

Kathy persisted in *teaching* by pushing Pedro to expand his poem: "Well can you do more with this because it looks like you know a lot about this and as a reader, I want to know more about her so will you talk a little bit more about her here?"

Pedro did do more with the poem and added the lines: "She was carrying/ with love way high above./ Not that much money but her love was/ sweet as honey!" (Artifact, Round Three, Pedro). Moreover, in a subsequent interview, Pedro communicated confidence in his ability to write more poems: "'cause I know a poem doesn't have to like rhyme A poem is what you feel…and anything you write, it doesn't even have to make sense" (SRI May 10, 2010).

In that he was "stuck" at the start of the conference, Pedro may have experienced stage four of the zone of proximal development (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). Kathy's *naming* and subsequent *teaching* into his greater capacity than he knew during the conference, appears to have combined to assist Pedro's performance in the writing of poems. If she had not persisted in her efforts to have him do "more" with the poem, he probably would have considered it "done" rather than pushed himself to think a little more about his poem-writing. In addition to the stem "My mother taught me", Pedro wrote three other poems that day: "Some people say"; "If you only knew"; and, "Why won't you".

My aim is in this section on duration has been to discuss writing conferences of varying lengths and use the context of the *research, name, decide,* and *teach* internal structures framework (Bomer, 2010; Calkins, Hartman & White, 2005) using Bomer (2010) as a lens to examine the instructional and relational moves made inside those writing conference. Those considered in the literature to be short in duration (e.g. Anderson, 2000; Perks, 2005; Kittle, 2008) have been of particular interest as I have drawn on theories of teaching and learning (e.g., Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Lavé & Wenger, 1991) to explore whether and how they may have been vehicles of teaching and learning. Moreover, these short encounters explored here may be indicative of an instructional context that values frequent, short conferences as a way to both sediment learning (Erickson, 2006) and continually recharge and reconstruct the social learning context by keeping instruction both focused and spread among students, and by serving as frequent reminders to all that talk about writing is normal, desirable, part of the

131

dialogical classroom culture, and a component learning as a social endeavor (Wells, 2007c; Wells & Chang-Wells, 1992; Nystrand, 1997).

Relational Moves: Physical and Verbal

In their efforts to narrow the distance between the curriculum, and the students, Kathy and John employed an array of interpersonal strategies by which they sought to infuse pedagogical tact (Van Manen, 1995) into their ongoing practice (Table 4.6 *Relational moves --physical and verbal)*. Both were committed to teaching for student independence as readers and writers (Murray, 1984; Graves, 1994; Kaufman, 2000), both valued the experiences that students brought with them (Bomer & Bomer, 2001; Moll & Amanti, 2005) and both sought to engage students deeply by creating hybrid curricular-personal spaces for students to bring to their schoolwork their own experiences, responses, thoughts, and preferences (Bean, Bean & Bean, 1999; Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez & Tejeda, 1999; Smagorinsky, Zoss & Reed, 2006). It is still relatively common for students' experiences in classes to follow primarily an Initiation-Response-Evaluation Feedback (IRE/F) sequence (Mehan, 1979; Cazden, 2001;Wells, 2001) rather than dialogical patterns of classroom interactions. To encounter teachers like Kathy or John, who invite students into the conversations of teaching and learning, is somewhat unusual (Nystrand, 1997; Nystrand & Gamoran, 1997; Applebee, 1996; Christoph & Nystrand, 2001; Langer, 2009; Intrator & Kunzman, 2009). Tacitly, both teachers and students are aware that students are required by law to be in school, and by school rules to be in their seats, and that teachers and administrators have far more power than do students. John and Kathy's pedagogical decisions to create temporal, emotional, and physical spaces in

132

which students are treated as fellow readers and writers, despite the reductive climate of

high stakes testing in the district and in the state (Assaf, 2008; Morrell, 2010) are

illustrated in examples of their relational practices that follow. In this section, I use

examples of both physical and verbal moves from both teachers' practices to illuminate

the most typical.

Table 4.6 Relational moves--physical and verbal from HyperResearch transcripts sampling

Relational moves physical &verbal	John O'Brien Frequency	Kathy Hampshire Frequency
proximity as invitation	3	0
sigh	6	0
Smile	2	1
stands behind student	11	0
uses voice to cross room	6	2
hovers	1	4
moves away then circles back	7	0
on chair	8	3
signals calmness	1	0
sitting on floor	2	0
squats	5	0
kneeling	0	20
touch	1	7
uses gesture to cross room to student	1	0
welcoming body language	3	2
student signaling vulnerability	4	1
offers encouragement	7	7
self censors to honor student	5	2
self deprecating humor	6	1
shares family story	2	0
uses I statement to instruct	7	1
trust	9	3

Physical Gap-Closing Moves: *"(I) give up my height to them…"*

Sitting on chairs, sitting on the floor, kneeling, and squatting are ways that Kathy

and John managed to reduce the actual and symbolic distance between themselves and

their students who sit in chairs. For example, if Mr. O'Brien found himself in a

conference that was more than 10 seconds long, he would grab a chair, squat, or sit on the

floor near a student in order to

> *"(G)ive up my height to them…so they can talk because otherwise I don- I - I*
>
> *loom over them…and I think that's intimidating…ahhh because it is…so I sit on*
>
> *the floor a lot"* (Interview, Nov. 23, 2009, John O'Brien).

Giving up height, floor-sitting. During one writing conference early in the year

with Margarita (Video, Nov. 10, 2009), John was seen sitting on the floor, leaning back

on his hands, smiling slightly, and looking up at soft-spoken, former ESL student

Margarita as she attempted to articulate her position on her chosen topic of

argumentation, abortion. His laid-back affect belied his pointed instructional agenda as he

repeatedly pushed her toward articulating her position. In watching and re-watching this

conference, it was my impression that his diminished height and relaxed affect softened

the force associated with his four-time repetition (Lines 6, 10, 13 & 16) of his

instructional agenda.

Table 4.7 John O'Brien: Nov. 10, 2009 "Margarita" WC
[00:02:39.25] to [00:03:24.26] Duration: 41 seconds

Line #	Speaker	TRANSCRIPT
1.	John	*(says nothing – Ambles over, stands to her right and begins his physical descent to the floor [00:02:39.25])*
2.	Margarita	Abortion *(looking up at him)* [00:02:39.25]
3.	John	Abortion [00:02:41.21] *(as he is almost to a sitting position on floor)*
4.	Margarita	Yes
5.	John	Okay
6.	John	and what are you going to say about it? [video 2:42:02] *(in later stages of sitting process)*
7.	John	*completes sitting process sits down on floor beside her; looks up at her*
8.	Margarita	Uhhhhhh *(looking at computer screen, then turns to look at him at 2:48:04)*
9.	John	*(laughing)* [video 2:49:03]
10.	John	Your position, *continues looking up at her*
11.	John	that's what you need to think about [00:02:52.24]

134

12.	Margarita	My position?
13.	John	Yeah, what are you going to say about it?
14.	Margarita	*(faces him directly when he asks)*
15.	John	Like, "everyone should have one"
16.	John	that's what I mean by position *continues looking up at her*
17.	Margarita	Ummm
		(picks up a pen with both hands and looks at it)
16.	John	Or are just going to ssss talk about it?
17.	Margarita	I just want to tell like *(playing with pencil)*
18.	Margarita	that abortion is good?
		but in cases
19.	Margarita	Okay,
20.	Margarita	the only case that I put that is good?
21.	Margarita	is when the girl is raped *(looks directly at John)*
22.	John	Mmhmm *(continues looking up at her)* [video 3:16:26]
23.	Margarita	And
		And not when the girl is poor
		(pencil still in her two hands)
24.	John	'kay
		[00:03:21.24] *(holds gaze for 4 seconds)*
25.	Margarita	*(nods several times)*
26.	John	Okay
27.	John	There you go [00:03:24.26]
29.	Margarita	*(smiling to herself)*
30.	John	*(turns his head to talk to Lydia who is sitting next to Margarita)*

A little later, I asked Margarita about that writing conference and the impact it had on her thinking, her writing, and her writing process. She related that "sometimes I'm a good writer but like sometimes my mind is in other places" and that the talk inside writing conferences that Mr. O'Brien offers is helpful "because it straights [*sic*] like your your [*sic*] mind." She explained that the writing conference helped her achieve focus so that she was more able to hold on to that "good writer" clarity, and found that the "thoughts come quickly". When I asked her how often she experienced this kind of flow in her writing, she shared that she experienced it "every day a little bit [*sic*]" (Margarita, SRI, Nov. 19, 2009).

135

Indeed Margarita's writing, after her conference on Nov. 10 with Mr. O'Brien, shows slow, but steady progression in the building of her paper. The day of the conference, she had only a title written; two days later, she had about 60 words on her topic; on Nov. 16, she had about 300 words that she soon augmented to 400 by the time she turned it in on Nov. 18. Moreover, she used the assignment to consider both sides of the abortion argument and used family anecdotes, and envisionment of her protagonist's future self-reflecting back on her decision to forego an abortion (Artifacts, Round 1, Margarita).

This example of John's relational or gap-closing move with Margarita where he assumed a position lower than hers and combined it with a mild affect, in order to deploy his instructional agenda, is but one in which the embodied discursive layering, day after day, is conducive clearing a path for students to find their topics and their voices inside those topics (Johnston, 2004, p. 50). Mr. O'Brien's floor sitting, patience and classroom practice with Margarita illustrate his understanding of writing as a non-linear, and highly personalized process (Emig, 1971; Perl, 1979; Flower & Hayes, 1981) and his efforts to shape his practice to that understanding and to the needs of the student with whom he is conferring. He is able to aid her in navigating through the many conversations associated with her contentious topic because of trust build up from early in the school year (Vygotsky, 1978; Goldstein, 1999; Belhiah, 2009). The postures both teachers use in writing conferences -- sitting, squatting, or kneeling – serve to bring the teacher nearer to the student and to reduce teacher height so that John and Kathy are at eye level, or lower, with a student with whom either is conferencing.

Giving up height and a gesture of familiarity. In addressing why kneeling next to students is her preferred posture, Kathy highlights the need to both know and talk to her students as individuals. By positioning her upright torso alongside a student desk, kneeling reduces the physical space between teacher and student. In this proximity, she is on the inner edges of a personal space dimension usually reserved for close friends (Hall, 1966).

On October 22, Kathy was already in a kneeling posture from an exchange with a nearby student and initiated a writing conference with Julien in which he asked for clarification on the conventional use of quotation marks (Video, Oct. 22, 2009, Julien). In this conference, she can be seen leaning just her forearms on the student's desk and appears to be careful to respect the student's school-desk-size space bubble by keeping her upper arms close to her sides, and her hands off the student's desk except to touch student work. Even when she examined his notebook, she did so first by looking at it upside-down, then, she turned it halfway so that they could both read it. Then, in order to circle writing in his notebook, she borrowed Julien's pen by reaching across the desk while maintaining eye contact, gently taking it from his hand, which he permitted. Taken in context with the rest of the conference (Appendix K *Julien, WC, analysis, Oct. 22, 2009*) where Kathy uses both affirmations of and direct teaching into Julien's question about whether and how punctuation fits inside or outside of quotation marks, Kathy's particular pen-borrowing move carries with it an aura of the easy familiarity of an old friend. I counted only seven instances of touch in Kathy's HyperResearch data; and John, only one. Six of them occurred in April, near the end of school, one in February, and

none early in the school year when relationships were just getting established. Kathy may perceive this kind of a move as a relational antidote to her sanctioned teacher role as carrier of the official curriculum. It may be that this kind of touch-proxy move is a creative way of "touching" students without actually physically touching them. Teacher touch of students has become taboo; research shows that teachers tend to perceive that touching carries with it a high level of risk in that a touch will be misinterpreted, lead to disciplinary action, and/or career ruination (Andrzejewski & Davis, 2008). Kathy has made similar moves with other students: helping herself to a piece of popcorn (Video, Feb. 19, 2010, Brooke), and scooping up a dramatic feather pen and swishing it playfully around the room and at other students (besides Brooke) for a few seconds (Video, April 6, 2010, Brooke). In this way, Kathy makes micro-steps outside the prescribed role of "teacher", and seeks to insert in its place something else – perhaps some combination of trusted friend, mentor, and guide.

I asked Julian, in a later interview about this conference and if he found such short conversations with Kathy to be helpful. He replied affirmatively and that the just-in-time nature of her visits were especially helpful:

Yeah, I really do cause sometimes I do have questions and sometimes she's across the room and I can't get her

Well she has so much students to….to take care of and

Yeah

Sometimes whenever she gets around I really [*sic*] ask her for help sometimes….

(Julien, SRI, Jan. 11, 2010)

Several times a week, students wrote in their notebooks, in response to an open question that Kathy posed (e.g., Write about a time when you or someone you know was falsely accused; or, Have you ever felt like two people in one body; or, Who and what is an everyday hero?) or, in response to a theme that came up in their class text, such as alcohol abuse present in the film *Smoke Signals* (1998). Julien's notebook entry reflects his musings on the latter. Moreover, this entry helped him shape his thematic discussion for an essay, for which students could choose one of several themes (e.g., friendship, alcohol abuse, parents and children), and using the chosen theme as a lens, discuss the text's narrative and their own personal connections to the theme. From inspecting Julien's notebook entry #5, "Alcohol abuse is very important to stop…", one can see the punctuation that Kathy circled in the writing conference to remind him of their conversation:

> "I opened the door and he told us, [comma is circled] 'Are you related to Esteban Jackson [end quotes and question mark circled] ?'"

In his final, typed essay that incorporated some of his notebook drafting, Julien appeared to have gained control over quotation marks. He wrote:

> "I was feeling super happy because he was making an attempt to stop drinking, until he got up from the couch and said, 'I'll be right back [*sic*] I'm going to my friends [*sic*] house to pick up my tools for work tomorrow.'"
>
> (Artifact, Oct. 28, 2009)

Kathy's pen-borrowing touch-proxy move is but one moment amid a whole, cross-year context of sedimented moments of classroom interactions – some instructional

139

and others, relational -- and is not in itself, the cause of Julien's increasing ability to control punctuation; but, perhaps it contributed to a context that was hospitable for Julien's learning.

In considering this as a friendly or familiar micro-move, I draw upon van Manen's discussion of a phenomenology of tactful action that "the pedagogical lifeworld lacks the reflective distance that deliberative rationality of theory requires for its application" (1991, in 1995, p. 42) and propose that neither Kathy, nor John, came up with a list of moves, in a reflective moment at the beginning of the school year, and kept them on a notecard in a pocket for such occasions. Rather, I think Kathy's touch-proxy reflected her acting out of pedagogical tactfulness "'in a flash'" (p. 40); moreover, she might laugh in surprise if I asked her about it.

Verbal Gap-Closing Moves: Self-Deprecating Comments, and I-Statements

Kathy situated herself nearer to individual students purposively because "when you're talking closer to the student, you might understand how they need you to rephrase it…. so that's a part of conferencing that I think is really important " (SRI Kathy Nov.19, 2009). Within the confines of a crowded classroom, John and Kathy expressed the importance of talking one-to-one with students in order to observe their work, get to know them, and differentiate their instruction. They seem to have grasped that:

> [t]he roles we establish as teachers and the interactions we undertake with our
>
> students, through our questions, responses, and assignments, inexorably set out
>
> the possibilities for meaning in our classes and, in this way, the context of
>
> learning. This is a fact of social organization. (Nystrand, 1997, p. 9)

John and Kathy valued conversation as a teaching and learning tool for helping students with their writing. They understood that, "[s]ince learning is significantly shaped by learners' interactions, plus the responses they anticipate from teachers, peers and texts, a key issue concerns the dialogic potential of different kinds of instructional discourses for learning" (Nystrand, 1997, p. 11). Students have to feel comfortable enough to be conversational partners, so, both Kathy and John were willing to position students on a level that was higher than the level they, themselves occupied around a particular topic. The following examples illustrate verbal moves that both teachers deployed when needed, inside writing conferences.

Self-deprecation. Both Kathy and John utilized gently self-deprecating statements in their pedagogical toolkits in order to make themselves symbolically smaller – more human, less powerful – inside the writing conference. One day, for example, John and Tupac held a writing conference (Video, Nov. 12, 2009) in which John pointed out to Tupac that his essay's beginning conveyed that it was a school assignment and that once he "get[s] going, [he] might want to go back and get rid of the stuff at the beginning."

Tupac responded, "What, what! What? What's wrong with the beginning?"

Telling Tupac that he decided to stop interfering, John said, "I'll just shut up, just keep writing." John's self-deprecating move to self-silence was a symbolic shrinking of his teacher-self for the benefit of Tupac's ability to focus on his own writing process. It appears that John realized that he might, in fact, be interfering with Tupac's writing process: "Yeah he was writing, uuhm, I should have just let it go at that instead of

talking about the beginning at that point" (SRI Nov. 24, 2009, John). Even though he thought that Tupac needed instruction based on Tupac's beginning lines, and that he might have been in stage one of his zone of proximal development where he needed assistance (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988), John decided to back off. Based on Tupac's response, John perceived that his comment to Tupac was interpreted by Tupac to be an insult to his writing ability, if not to his person. John's decision was that, above all, Tupac's desire to continue to write was the most important thing that could happen at that moment; to have damaged the lines of communication would have signaled a difficult year for a teacher who valued dialogic encounters in his classroom.

I-Statements. Both John and Kathy shared their own writing and writing processes with their students, and both responded to students' talk and writing from their own experiences, as active and authentic listeners and engaged readers (McCarthey, 1992). Both negotiated subtle shifts in their own self-positioning (Davies & Harré, 1990) in order to reposition students as capable, interesting, and agentive.

In the midst of an early writing conference with Brooke (Video, Oct. 22, 2009) Kathy was sitting about four feet away from Brooke. The assignment was to connect issues in the movie *Smoke Signals* (1998) to those in the student's own life. Brooke had chosen loss, grief, and the work it takes to move one's life forward after a loss as her thematic connection. Kathy first made a physical gap-closing move similar to the pen-taking move she had made with Julien, above by reaching across the four foot span and reading Brooke's work aloud softly: "My dad is always talking about things he should have done differently while his father was alive."

Kathy had done her research by reading Brooke's piece and later shared with me that she decided in that writing conference that Brooke needed to know that her topic was relevant, that her experiences had value as topics of writing, and that her work would be of interest to readers (SRI Nov. 20, 2009, Kathy). In order to accomplish her instructional agenda, Kathy foregrounded herself as an engaged and sympathetic reader, and for those few seconds, turned to face Brooke, and said simply, "My dad does the same thing". In Kathy's tactful decision (van Manen, 1991) to use a gap-closing I-statement in this way, she moved from a d/Discourse of teacher-evaluator, to one of a fellow reader appreciating and resonating to the gravity of this important subject. Subsequent interactions in the writing conference show Kathy affirming Brooke's use of dialogue and transitions, with encouragement to keep writing. In a later interview in which I asked Brooke about that writing conference, she explained:

> Umm, it really helped cause I like, I was hoping that was what I could do it [*sic*] because if I wasn't able to use my father, like, use my dad's experience as an example, then I would have been, like, completely lost and so the fact that she came over and was, like, 'you can use that, it's fine, it connects to your life', it really helped me out…. Like, a lot….knowing [*sic*] like I could use him as, like, a little vee-way into um the paper, really helped. (SRI, Nov. 20, 2009, Brooke)

Brooke's comments indicated a degree of recognition and appreciation for the supports or dialogical classroom structures that Kathy had in place. On some level, Brooke saw that the one-to-one teacher-student talk helped her in her ongoing construction of her writer-self . That Kathy had consciously made herself approachable,

and had worked to narrow the distance between Brooke and the writing curriculum, also translated to a comfortable relationship established between Brooke and Kathy which made possible airing and sharing of sensitive slivers of each of their personal lives. Brooke reported in her interview above, that she felt encouraged to write about this important personal narrative. In the subsequent drafts and final version of her essay, Brooke moved smoothly between the film's characters' issues of loss, forgiveness, and acceptance and those that she witnessed and experienced by virtue of her father's grief, loss, and efforts to move forward over his own father's passing. Kathy may have realized Brooke's writing was strong when she read it out loud; it's possible that Brooke appeared to be in a stage three (independence) of her zone of proximal development (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). But, perhaps Kathy realized that Brooke needed something other than specific instruction. Judging from Brooke's interview reflection on this writing conference, she did not take the writing conference as a personal intrusion, perhaps pointing to her being in stage two – or, needing a bit of reinforcement – which, judging from Kathy's comment, Kathy seemed to sense. Kathy's decision to treat Brooke as a writer whose prose touched her personally, as a fellow-traveler in the world and as a fellow reader and writer, was her way of affirming Brooke's efforts to become a writer, by writing about what was important for her.

John and Kathy employed a variety of interpersonal means for relating to their students in non-threatening and supportive ways; both worked to make themselves smaller – both verbally and physically – inside writing conferences. These physical and verbal relational, gap-closing moves that John and Kathy deployed are embodiments of

144

the idea that "every moment, every second is situation-specific" (van Manen, 1995, p. 40). While these kind of gestures and verbal responses discussed in this section might appear to be impulsive, I propose that they are more like instances of John and Kathy maintaining self-reflexive dialogue (p.40). These instances may be among "several styles of intuitive practice: from acting in a largely self-forgetful manner to a kind of running inner speech that the interior eye of the ego maintains with the self" (p. 41) so that, in the end, each interaction is a layering or sedimenting (Erickson, 2006) of pedagogically tactful and appropriate moves for the individuals in the writing conferences and for the class as a whole by virtue of the normalcy of the practice and the proximal nature of any one conference to other students. Both John and Kathy's willingness symbolically and actually to "give up [their] height to them" by repositioning themselves both physically and verbally indicates that both were aware of the communicative import of embodied practice:

> The ultimate success of teaching actually may rely importantly on the
> 'knowledge' forms that inhere in practical actions, in an embodied thoughtfulness,
> and in the personal space, mood and relational atmosphere in which teachers find
> themselves with their students. The curricular thoughtfulness that good teachers
> learn to display towards children may depend precisely upon the internalized
> values, embodied qualities, thoughtful habits that constitute virtues of teaching.
> (van Manen, 1995, p. 48)

Deliberate placement of their bodies at or below the levels of those of their students, and making little forays into the personal space bubbles of their students sent messages

indicating that in John and Kathy's classrooms actual conversations were important. Moreover, along with their use of I-statements to own opinions and to frame advice as sharing rather than directing, and their use of self-deprecating comments to selectively and strategically shrink their teacher-presence, John and Kathy consciously and consistently conveyed their commitment to a dialogic classroom environment in which students were positioned as thoughtful, agentive, and worthy of respect.

Instructional Topics and Moves: Explaining, Drafting, and Reading

Introduction

John and Kathy used the writing conference as a context in which to figure out how to individualize their instruction (Bomer, 2010; Calkins, 1994), how to conform that instruction to the shapes of students' zones of proximal development, and how to teach into the places where students need support (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). In this section I briefly describe topics and moves made by Kathy and John using talk that are primarily instructional in nature inside the writing conferences. By *instructional* I mean particular kinds of conversations held with students inside writing conferences that are directly connected with and traceable to Kathy and John's writing curriculum: explanation of tasks and skills (Table 4.8 *Explanation of sub-sets of writing skills)*, those that help students to draft and revise (Table 4.9 *Conference talk as part of drafting/revision)*, and, those in which teachers serve as a reader for the student (Table 4.10 *Reading and commenting)*. I present short descriptions of some of the most frequently occurring in each category.

I arrived at these sometimes-overlapping findings by viewing Kathy and John's writing conferences across the data multiple times as well as by reviewing and revising the codings and categories I came up with using HyperResearch. For example, under the initital category, Instructional, I created 77 labels like "Brainstorming out loud" and "Mechanics made explict" (Appendix L *77 Instruction codes*). I then looked at frequencies, revisited the video data, re-examined transcripts uploaded into HyperResearch, and regrouped the open codes into more refined categories which I present in tables below and have bolded the most frequently occurring. These categories reflect specific ways John and Kathy taught writing inside writing conferences using talk. The first, *explaining*, relates to explication of conventions and processes of writing; the second, *drafting*, refers to conversations that help a student in the drafting and revision process; and the third, *reading*, refers to the teacher reading students' writing in order to assist student-writers to become more aware of the effect of their writing. Sperling (1990) explains the role of the writing conference in teaching students the norms and conventions of written expression:

> The teacher-student writing conference…is seen as a context embodying the social construction of written language acquisition, a context in which the student comes to 'inherit' the conventions of written language through bilateral pursuit of those conventions with a more able adult. (p. 318)

Each of these groups of instructional moves, and the smaller moves inside them are instances of John and Kathy's scaffolding (e.g. demonstration, marking critical features,

direction maintenance, recruiting the learner's interest, narrowing the task, and frustration control) their students in individualized ways (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976).

Explaining

What I refer to as explanation of tasks and sub-sets of writing skills includes actions like checking on student progress, teaching for narrowing of topic, teaching for structures in writing that move the reader through time, explaining an assignment, offering specific tips to students, teaching for usage or vocabulary; and, helping a student find connections between sub-topics. I present glimpses of three: Progress checks, explanations requested by students, and explicit teaching.

Table 4.8 Explanation of sub-sets of writing skills	John O'Brien frequency in video sample	Kathy Hampshire frequency in video sample
Progress check	**7**	**6**
Teaching for structure moving through time	3	0
Teaching for finding connections between sub-topics	2	7
Teaching for narrowing topic	8	2
Student seeking specific info from teacher as resource	**7**	**9**
Teaching by explaining assignment (teaching explicitly)	**13**	**12**
Teaching classification in essay	1	0
Teacher advises revision	1	0
Teaching organizing composition (T helps S organizationally)	2	3
Teacher checks on student topic	5	0
Teaching specific advice tips	3	2
Teaching vocabulary	4	1
Usage correction	3	3

Progress checks were usually quick and took various forms including looking in on a student to see that he or she began and expressing approval (Tommy, 17 seconds,

March 10, 2010, Video); asking a student where he was in the assignment (Pedro, 20 seconds Feb. 19, 2010, Video); and, expressing concern and asking for a revised plan when warranted (Diamond, 6 seconds, Oct. 22, 2009, Video).

Students seeking specific information from teachers and teachers' responses were often brief encounters. For example, a student reaching completion of one stage of a project asked if she should go on to the next stage (Brooke, 6 seconds, Nov. 2, 2009, Video); a student using a computer needed help getting out of an automatic formatting glitch in Word (Sabrina, 12 seconds, March 2, 2010, Video); or, the encounters were sometimes involved, like when a student asked for explanation of how an irregular verb worked (Tommy, 39 seconds, March 2, 2010, Video); or, when a student asked for help in expanding his writing (Boo, 46 seconds, March 4, 2010, Video).

Explicit teaching took a wide variety of forms. Such teaching included instructing a student to correctly punctuate and format narrative (Julien, Oct. 22, 2009, Video); explaining an assignment and modeling components of it to a student who missed the whole-class explanation by reviewing the overall goals and steps for the assignment, and the teacher re-telling his or her own personal example (Tupac, Feb. 4, 2010, Video); offering specific suggestions on how to structure an essay using flashbacks and flashforwards (Tommy, Feb. 5, 2010, Video); re-explaining an assignment to a student who needed clarification and drawing from that day's shared class reading to present the student with an example/model of a writer using her own experience to prove a point (Boo, Nov. 10, 2009, Video).

149

Drafting

When I say "drafting" I refer to conversations that lead to students clarifying their

writing goals, getting their ideas down on paper, or elaborating what they had already

written. Some of the instructional moves included the teacher using questioning to help

the student figure out what he or she wanted to say, teaching for expansion or

elaboration, and conversing with a student in such a way as to help the student settle on a

topic. Three move-types that occurred with the greatest frequency -- questioning,

elaboration, and topic selection are discussed below (Table 4.9 *Conference talk as part of*

Table 4.9 Conference talk as part of drafting and/or revision from HyperResearch transcripts sampling	John O'Brien frequency in video sample	Kathy Hampshire frequency in video sample
Teacher modeling out loud composing	0	6
Student with a topic block - stuck	0	7
Teacher advises write now cut later	3	0
Teacher using Questioning	6	18
Talk as prewrite	0	6
Write what you just said	0	3
Teacher explains how to elaborate	5	5
Student talks into space teacher created via question	0	7
Student writes inside the conference)	0	1
Teacher creates map for student	0	7
Teacher steers student toward topic	7	3
Brainstorming out loud	0	5
Connections life to topic	0	6
Student composes sentence by talk	0	2
Student talks about memory	2	4
Talk as direct scaffold	0	4

drafting/revision).

Both teachers used <u>questioning</u> inside writing conferences to help students decide

what to do by helping them focus their attention. Examples of this include asking a

student what he or she might say about a recently selected writing topic about which the student had not yet written more than a word or two (Margarita, Nov. 10, 2009, Video); and, after reading a student essay, asking the student how he had changed or grown as a result of an experience (e.g., more cautious now than before, more responsible for his brothers and sisters, etc.) and recommending that the student write that into his conclusion (Julien, Feb. 23, 2010, Video).

Using talk for teaching elaboration and expansion of the writing in progress was a priority for both teachers. For example, in order to lead the student toward elaboration, the teacher might have asked if the student noticed an attitudinal change along with an increased ability to read better as the student grew older, during the writing of a personal history of literacy (Boo, March 4, 2010, Video). In another example the teacher picked up on a one-word descriptor the student wrote of himself, asked him what he meant by that, and suggested that he give examples to expand the idea, then incorporate the examples into his writing (Fake, Feb. 19, 2010, Video).

Using talk to steer students toward topics is another way Kathy and John used the conversations in writing conferences to teach their writing curriculum. For example, teachers might, after conversing with a student about choices of topics, give an opinion about which one seems like it would be more interesting and more productive for the student (Tommy, Feb. 4, 2010, Video); or, teachers might help a student narrowing topic choices down to two broad areas as asking the student if she would like to do one, or the other (Brooke, Feb. 19, 2010, Video).

151

Reading

The *research* step in a writing conference often involves reading what a student has written and teaching requires an authentic response to that reading (McCarthey, 1992). Sometimes the teacher read the student work out loud and then asked about the piece while modeling the "other reader" for the student since "[w]riting, in a sense, does not exist until it is read" (Murray, 1982, p. 142). Moreover, in her research on written comments on student papers, Sperling (1994) outlined a framework for the "teacher-as-reader" which I adapt for consideration of John and Kathy's specific spoken comments about student writing. The teacher-as-reader orientations are: Interpretive - where the teacher-as-reader relates her own experiences, or her sense of the student's experiences; Social – where the teacher-as-reader steps outside the narrowly defined teacher role sanctioned by the institution; Cognitive/Emotive – where in the reading of student work, the teacher either analyzes the writing or expresses emotion as a result of reading it; Evaluative – the teacher decides the worth of the writing; Pedagogical – the teacher sees writing as a way to integrate teaching and learning (pp. 181-182). Below, I will describe moves John and Kathy made as teachers-as-readers, and locate them in the teacher-as-reader framework (Sperling, 1994). These moves include listening in order to teach, reading the student's work out loud, commenting on students' writing processes, and the silent reading of a student's writing.

Table 4.10 Reading and commenting on student work from HyperResearch transcripts sampling	John O'Brien frequency in video sample	Kathy Hampshire frequency in video sample
Teacher points to screen	3	2
Teacher listening closely use student's story to teach	**3**	**10**
Teacher reads student work – paper	**0**	**20**
(vocalizes student writing)		
Student comments on own writing process	0	8
Student reads own work	0	0
Writing as thinking	0	2
Teacher uses questions to plumb student logic	7	3
Teacher acknowledges that student is still thinking	5	0
Teacher comments complexity	0	2
Teacher comments on student's writing process	3	6
Teacher responds as reader	**0**	**26**
Teacher silently reading screen	**15**	**1**
Teacher responds to student's content	0	5
Teacher takes pleasure student language choice	1	0
Student offers teacher reason why little progress	1	0
Student tells a moral tale from home	0	1

<u>Teachers listen and use the student's story to teach</u> by listening carefully and closely. For example, by listening to a student talk about several topics, none of which the student wanted to let go, the teacher helped him find a single unifying connection through three of the most important to the student (Tupac, Nov. 10, 2009, Video). In this instance, the teacher responded from a Cognitive point of view as he helped Tupac analyze his options; and, the teacher responded from a Pedagogical place, as he viewed the integration of students' writing development and his instruction of their writing as intertwined.

<u>Reading and vocalizing student work</u>, the teacher read aloud several sections of a student's writing so they could both hear it, then wondered and commented aloud after

each reading. First, she read aloud through an introductory paragraph, and asked if the student was a young child in his essay. Then, she read a little more aloud where he wrote about smelling liquor on someone and getting a feeling of being unsafe. The teacher responded that it was interesting that the student was keying in to his remembered internal cautionary feelings; she read some more, and further responded that she liked the level of detail he incorporated into his essay (Julien, Feb. 23, 2010, Video). The teacher-as-reader took an Interpretive stance where she commented on her perception of his experience.

Commenting on students' writing process takes different forms. In one example, the teacher made his way around the computer lab and stopped to read one girl's screen. He pointed to her text and said that he liked how she was inserting notes to herself to keep her writing organized (Margarita, Feb. 5, 2010, Video). The teacher seemed to be coming from a Pedagogical orientation where he tied learning and writing to one another; moreover, his sharing of his approval could be construed to be somewhat Evaluative.

Responding as a reader had a high frequency rate for one teacher and none for the other. In one instance, she read a student's essay out loud where the student explained that she was no longer afraid to make intercom announcements at school. The teacher admired her student's bravery and shared her own fear of public speaking. Then, the teacher told a funny story about how she, unlike the brave student, was too fearful to make an announcement (Brooke, Feb. 19, 2010, Video). The teacher appears to have taken on a Social Orientation where she left her sanctioned teacher role and displayed a personal one.

Silently reading the screen had a high frequency rate for one teacher and not the other, as well. One example is when the teacher stopped to read a student's screen for three seconds, said nothing, and moved on (Lydia, Feb. 4, 2010, Video). Part of his pausing may have been intentional in order to give students a chance to make a bid for his attention, which this student did not. His stance could be construed as Evaluative, if by looking and saying nothing means that all is well. In addition, his silence is Pedagogical as he reported that he believed in the connection between writing and learning and does not want to interfere with his students' writing process unnecessarily, that to let them write is an aspect of teaching them how to write (SRI Nov. 24, 2009, John O'Brien).

In this final section of findings, I have briefly described some of the instructional moves within *explaining*, *drafting*, and *reading* that John and Kathy made in order to energize components of their writing curriculum inside writing conferences. While both teachers did whole class explanations of how to go about planning, designing, drafting, and revising at the start of each new writing project, they used writing conferences as opportunities to shape their instruction to the particular contours of their individual students' zones of proximal development.

Conclusion

This chapter explores three main areas of findings regarding features, relational dimensions, and classroom cultures of John and Kathy's practice of conducting regular writing conferences: *structures*, *relational* or *gap-closing moves*, and *instructional moves*.

155

Structures. The first area of findings, *structures,* addresses in part the study's query concerning features of writing conferences in the two classrooms, including – in the section on duration -- what students do afterward. Despite the variety of the ways Kathy and John created the boundedness of writing conferences through approaches and openings as well as closings and leave-takings, the onsets and endings of conferences took on consistently recognizable sets of features that became shared classroom norms and contexts as students appeared to understand, for example, that a generic greeting shared at the onset of a conference meant something different than if the student and teacher simply passed in the hall. Creating the recognizable edges of conferences served to activate the writing conference into a speech genre (Bakhtin, 1994). The internal structures that help differentiate a writing conference from other kinds of conversations through identification of parts such as researching, naming, deciding and teaching are both defining and at the same time, roomy, as I examined writing conferences to see whether and how those components were visible. Together with looking at writing conference variations in duration, the internal structures offer a way to extend thinking about teaching writing in writing conferences as a situated practice. That most of the writing conferences in this data set are well under the five minute average in the literature (Anderson, 2000; Perks, 2005; Kittle, 2008), points to consideration of whether and how these short conferences accomplish teaching and may serve to complicate notions of how teaching is constituted. Perhaps teaching across time is really a combination of single, identifiable teaching encounters, and situated, recursive, and "low-level" (Hanks, in Lavé

& Wenger, 1991, p. 19) layering of instructional/relational encounters between novices and experts.

Relational moves. The section on *relational or gap-closing moves* examines ways that these two teachers used both verbal and non-verbal positioning strategies in order to bring the curriculum and the student closer inside writing conference. Both teachers, like Atwell (1998), recognized the importance of moving around to students, and in doing so "give up [their] height" (John, Nov. 23, 2009, Interview) as a sort of offering or sacrifice to the larger endeavor of connecting with students in ways that establishes positive teacher-student relations, establishes a climate of community, and that is the least disruptive to a student who is in the midst of writing. The findings around self-deprecation as a verbal shrinking-of-official-teacher-self move, and both teachers' use of I-statements to step away from the official-teacher IRE/F mode, point to similar ends as did the moves both made to become physically less imposing in the writing conference. Both the physical and verbal self-shrinking moves required that teachers sacrificed pieces of themselves. The data examples show that both decided that their height, possibly their comfort, and their egos were at least partially expendable for the greater good of creating a positive relationship with a student, and creating a classroom atmosphere that is relaxed, affable, and productive.

Instructional moves. Addressing the question concerning identification of instructional features of writing conferences, is the section on *instructional moves*. This group of findings centers on ways that Kathy and John used talk inside writing conferences in order to meet specific instructional agendas, including *explaining*, or

157

teaching of writing conventions and strategies, *drafting*, or pre-writing using talk, and *reading*, or modeling and enacting various roles of the reader. *Explaining* is the area that hosted the most how-to conversations and were those that took the least time. Careful listening (Murray, 1984; Burbules & Rice, 1991) in *drafting* seemed to be a key factor in whether and how teachers were able to think alongside their students to develop or extend their writing. Ventriloquating (Bakhtin, 1981; Wertsch, 1991) the student's voice while *reading* it aloud, the teacher contributed to an ensemble of voices so that the student could hear his or her work anew; moreover, in teacher-as-reader roles (Sperling, 1994), the teachers responded in various ways to students' work in order to help their students realize the effect of their writing upon a reader.

Looking to Chapter Five. In the next chapter I will explore two cases of conferences in order to illustrate some practices that are typical of both teachers. John drew heavily upon relational moves, to forward his instructional agenda to help Tupac narrow his topic; and Kathy persistently shaped and reshaped her instructional tactics to help Sha'Nequa compose a strong opening sentence. By selecting one writing conference for each teacher, and by using thick description, I hope to illustrate how "the interactions reveal the force of the conference process in learning to write" (Sperling, 1991, p. 136), and how the interplay of structures, relational moves and instructional moves inside these situated teaching and learning events contribute to a dialogical learning environment.

Chapter Five: Portraits Of Practice:

Two Teachers, Two Writing Conferences

It is in this chapter where one writing conference per teacher in its entirety will be examined in order to study the myriad micro-exchanges within the speech event (Hymes, 1974) of writing conferences. In selecting these two conferences, I looked for those that would contain a number of the structures and moves explained in Chapter Four, and, thus, met the criteria for typical sampling (Patton, 1990), (Table 5.1 *Analysis table of moves…typically sampled).* Moreover, since conflict between teacher and student is evident in both conferences in this chapter, I felt that examination of these conferences would be more instructive than looking at conferences that went more smoothly. Additionally, I believe that showcasing the less easy encounters actually helps those of us interested in exploring the potential of writing conferences in high schools to better appreciate the micro-move work that John and Kathy did as part of their normal practice, to keep these particular conferences on track, and others as well. Some of those micro-moves include reframing, recovering, re-explaining, re-positioning, and more. An apt metaphor for some of what John and Kathy did in writing conferences is that they braided together some of the threads that we think of as belonging to structures, to relational moves, and to instructional moves; they strategically selected, picked up, and patterned threads into the braid that is the writing conference. They knew and were getting to know their students as people and as writers, and themselves as teachers and teachers of writing. The doing and the becoming were inseparable: "Granting legitimate peripheral participation to newcomers…is a reciprocal relation between persons and practice. This

means that the move of learners toward full participation in a community of practice does not take place in a static context. The practice itself is in motion" (Lavé & Wenger, 1991, p. 116). I chose these two writing conferences as cases that, taken together, display in whole-conference form the richness, density, and complexity of structures as well as of instructional and relational moves that reside throughout the data set as a whole.

Table 5. 1 Analysis table of moves that John and Kathy made in writing conferences that are typically sampled from the overall data set			John and Tupac WC Nov. 10, 2009	Kathy and Sha'Nequa WC Nov. 4, 2009
Structures **Of Writing Conferences**	**Openings & Closings**	Approach	√	√
		Opening	√	√
		Closing	√	√
		Exiting	√	√
	Parts - Internal	Researching	√	√
		Naming	implied	√
		Deciding	√	√
		Teaching	√	√
	Duration	one to 15 seconds & 16 to 30 seconds		
		31 to 54 seconds & 55 to 65 seconds		
		66 to 90 seconds	√	
		90 seconds to three minutes		√
		three minutes and over		
Instructional Moves Using Talk **Inside Writing Conferences**	**Explaining**	Progress check	√	√
		Explanation requested by student		
		Explicit teaching	√	√
	Drafting	Topic selection	√	√

Table 5.1 (continued)

		Questioning	√	√
		Elaboration	√	√
	Reading	Listening in order to teach	√	√
		Reading the student's work out loud		√
		Commenting on students' writing processes	√	√
		Silent reading of a student's writing	√	
Relational Moves Inside Writing Conferences interpersonal efforts to bring the curriculum and the student closer, or "gap-closing"	**Physical gap-closing moves**	***"(I) give up my height to them…"***	√	√
		Giving up height and a gesture of familiarity.		√
	Verbal Gap-Closing Moves	***Self-Deprecating Comments***	√	
		I-Statements		√

Key
√ = element is present in the writing conference described in Chapter Five.

Writing Conference: Tupac Williams and John O'Brien

Context

The writing conference presented here took place in the computer lab, toward the end of the first third of the school year, on November 10, 2009 (Table 5.1 *John and Tupac Writing Conference Nov. 10, 2009*). It lasted one minute and 13 seconds – one of John O'Brien's longer-lasting writing conferences and, as the last conference of the period, it took place close to the 4:15 end-of-day bell.

Line #	Speaker	Table 5.2 John and Tupac Writing Conference Nov. 10, 2009 (duration 1 minute 13 seconds)
1.	JOB	So what's the answer to that? [00:10:49.14]
2.	Tupac	I've got a lot of stuff that needs to be shared *(audio 18:58)*
3.	JOB	yeah but you don't want to talk about all of it *(JOB is descending into a seated position 11:01:28)*
4.	Tupac	Why!? It's interesting
5.	JOB	I know, but you want to narrow the topic down
6.	Tupac	I'm an interesting person! *(audio 00:19:05)*
7.	JOB	In that case, it would take too long and you would never finish because you have *so* many interesting things to talk about *(audio 00:19:12)*
8.	Tupac	"aight" *(audio 00:19:13)*
9.	JOB	So you might want to narrow it down to, like, one of them
10.	Tupac	Oooh, one, that's tough how about three? [11:17:18]
11.	JOB	Are they related other than through you? [00:11:22.02]
12.	Tupac	'kay
13.	JOB	I know you do music stuff, right?
14.	Tupac	Yeah
15.	JOB	So three of those things connected to that? *(audio 19:26)*
16.	Tupac	Well graphics
17.	JOB	So two of them are connected to that *(other audio 19:29)*
18.	Tupac	And video editing
19.	JOB	and?
20.	Tupac	That's it
21.	JOB	So talk about those two cause they're connected to music, right? *(audio 19:34)*
22.	Tupac	Yeah,
23.	Tupac	like yeah
24.	Tupac	I guess, yeah
25.	JOB	Cause normally, well like for ME-ee being the stupid guy that I am, I wouldn't think of those two things as connected to music so how is it connected *(audio 19:46)*
26.	Tupac	Cause like mix tape dub and stuff
27.	JOB	Hm. That's the kind of thing you should talk about
28.	Tupac	okay *(gutteral – sounds like ow-kay)* *(audio 19:55)*
29.	JOB	Was that a dismiss? *(laughing)*
30.	Tupac	Awe, Na Oh! It wasn't… *(laughing)*
31.	JOB	Oh! Whoa! *(laughing)* [00:12:02.24]

All of John's students were working on their persuasive essay assignment. He gave them options for finding a topic, such as discussing an issue in the world that they found problematic (e.g., Margarita chose to discuss abortion as a decision which is neither easy nor clean-cut; Tommy chose to address his growing critical awareness that mass media's messages are often untruthful), or a phenomenon (e.g., Joshua, a non focal

162

student, chose to write from his own experience about how paranormal events should be taken seriously), or something about what the student knew or could do that should be made known for eventual public good. Tupac decided to focus on this last option. John had just finished a writing conference with Tupac's friend, Sabrina, who sits nearby. As was customary for the students in this class, while in the computer lab, Tupac was sitting facing his computer. John approached Tupac from behind, and as he moved toward Tupac, read Tupac's monitor on which was written, "What area of my expertise needs sharing?" and nothing else (Tupac, Screenshot, Nov. 10, 2009, 4:08pm).

Line by Line with John and Tupac

Approach and opening: Lines 1 & 2. The writing conference began silently. *Approaching* Tupac by walking the few steps toward him, John's proximity signaled the onset of the encounter. John's *opening* of the conference was in two parts. First, he silently read Tupac's screen which also served as his *research* of the student's progress. Then as John continued his *opening*, and perhaps his *research* as well, he asked in a level voice, "So what's the answer to that?" (Line 1: Time 00:10:49.14). John moved a little closer as Tupac responded in what might have been a somewhat defensive manner, "I've got a lot of stuff that needs to be shared" (Line 2). John's opening remark spoke directly into Tupac's framing of his own question on the computer screen, "What area of my expertise needs sharing?" By answering with a related question, John positioned Tupac as an authority, albeit, of his own life.

We're on the same side, but…: Lines 3 & 4, naming, deciding, teaching. As he made ready to sit in an empty chair next to Tupac, John said, "Yeah, but you don't

163

want to talk about all of it" (Line 3).   John's first word was one of alignment and general agreement with Tupac, "yeah", and may have been an implied or silent *naming* of what Tupac was already doing as a writer -- "yeah"-- he's figured out something he wants to talk about that's important to him, and "yeah" that's a good thing. However, John's next word, "but" signaled a discrepancy in that agreement. Moreover, John's instructional *decision* came into focus here as he worked to *teach* Tupac to find and/or narrow his topic, "you don't want to talk about all of it." John's use of "you" can be interpreted personally or generally. However Tupac received this message, John positioned Tupac as an intentional writer who maybe just needed a little reminding. The instructional sub-text was that "we writers must limit our scope." As John sank into the chair, and established eye contact with Tupac, Tupac responded with a curious combination of humor and defensiveness that his tonal emphasis suggested: "Why!? It's interesting!" (Line 4: Time 00:11:01.21—11 seconds has passed). Tupac appeared to have taken up a cautionary tone as if pushing back on a possibly-limited view of him that John might have held.

Braiding relational and instructional moves: Line 4. John repeated the relational move of alignment and agreement from line three in the transcript as he responded, "I know…." (Line 4) as he arranged his body to concur with this relational message for Tupac by leaning back in chair, continuing to face Tupac, hands folded across his lap. John then picked up the instructional thread and braided it into the conference: "but you want to narrow the topic down" (Line 4). This statement mirrored the instructional pattern used before, with "but" signaling a slight qualification; and, the "you" speaking simultaneously to Tupac, the individual, and obliquely to the plural "you"

164

of Tupac's membership in a community of writers. The relational messages are, "Yes, you *are* interesting," and "you are part of a collective *we*" of the writerly *us*. The inferred plural "you" was John's way of introducing the instructional message, that "*we* writers understand that we have to narrow our topics". Moreover, his physical presence was calm, relatively still, relaxed, attentive and centered, and may have been an instance of embodied tact, or tact mediated through gesture (van Manen, 1991, p. 81). John's body language said, "I am here, fully, with you."

The voice of reasonability: Lines 6 & 7. As if testing John's solidity, Tupac's rejoinder repeated his twice-made earlier assertion that he was worthy of attention, "I'm an interesting person" (Line 6), to which John replied: "In that case, it would take too long and you would never finish because you have so many interesting things to talk about. So you might want to narrow it down to one of them" (Line 7). John opened his response to Tupac using the language of consideration, "In that case…". At that point, Tupac opened up physically – a big backward leaning stretch with an open chest, and arms up over his head – which might have signaled an increase in his comfort level with John. Continuing to reframe his instructional tack through adapting a voice of reasonableness, and by using a cumulative sentence structure (In that case…and…because), John made his case that if Tupac talked about everything that was interesting about him "it would take too long and you would never finish". John then added a lightly humorous tone, and finished, "because you have *so* many interesting things to talk about." Both teachers drew on the heteroglossia or many-voicedness that surrounded them (Bakhtin, 1994, pp. 74-76). To illustrate a point for a student, they step

into and out of "voices" some of which are more their own than others. Maybe John stepped into a particular place in the chain of "reasonable" utterances and presumed that Tupac would be aware of the voice (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 91).

> Our speech, that is, all our utterances (including our creative works), is filled with others' words, varying degrees of otherness or varying degrees of "our-own-ness" ....These words of others carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework, and re-accentuate. (Bakhtin, 1986, p.89)

Drawing on or ventriloquating (Bakhtin, 1981) another voice – from anywhere -- becomes a reach for and picking up of a tool and a way to re-frame a statement. As I looked up at Kathy's empty silver frames hung helter-skelter, I sometimes thought of each as conduit for a stream of voices she (and John) called upon across the year.

"Aight": Intertextuality, Line 8. At this point in the conversation, Tupac responded in an informal register to John, "aight" (Line 8). The word "aight" is a way of saying "all right" in an informal register. It signals satisfaction, agreement, and "coolness" with a situation (JohnL, 2003). In the case of this writing conference, Tupac's switch to agreeability within this informal register may have signaled a watershed moment in the exchange when intersubjectivity (Wertsch, 1998) between the speakers was achieved – that is, it was here that Tupac and John were on the same page – where Tupac embraced John's efforts to offer him instruction as honest and without ulterior motive. Additionally, because the speakers were drawing upon various texts – Tupac's "expertise," John's content knowledge that he was intent on sharing, the text of the essay

166

that was emergent – this moment also might have been one of intertextuality (Bloome et al, 2005). Interestingly, Tupac responded to John's instructional and relational efforts at bringing him into the discursive world of writers through reciprocally bringing John into the discursive world of "coolness," if only momentarily.

"So you might want to narrow it down to, like, one of them": Lines 9 &10.
After the watershed moment, John's pattern of agreement-discrepency-instruction softened to one of agreement-suggestion: "So you might want to narrow it down to, like, one of them" (Line 9). Here, John repeated his message of narrowing the topic for the fourth time. Moreover, he twice softened it, first with the delicate "might" indicating choice, and then, with the casual "like" – a marker most frequently used by the students. The "like" here softened John's rather stark message, which was to choose one, period. As a teacher, John understood that he had to repeat his messages and do so in different ways for each student. Tupac responded much more conversationally, and with much more openness than prior to the watershed moment (Line 8), to John's suggestion for narrowing his topic: "Oooh, one, that's tough, how about three?" (Line 10: Time 11:17:18 - 26 seconds have passed). Tupac appeared to be have a hard time considering talking about just one topic and instead, suggested three. It's possible, too, that Tupac's rejoinder might be indicative of a world view where everything is negotiable – so he negotiated for three, rather than one.

Connecting the topics, Lines 11-19. John acted out of pedagogical tactfulness, and instead of insisting on one topic and risking shutting Tupac down, retained his belief in Tupac as an authority of his own life texts. Using instructional moves from the drafting

167

group including questioning and topic narrowing, John molded his instruction along the raw edge of Tupac's zone of proximal development and appeared determined to think along with him about it: "Are they related other then through you?" (Line 11). Here John asked Tupac to think outside himself. By saying simply, "'kay" (Line 12), Tupac indicated his willingness to consider how his three topics might be related in the world. John modeled a connection possibility by recalling an important detail from his prior knowledge of Tupac that also showed that he had been paying attention to Tupac the person-who-has-a-life-outside-of-school: "I know you do music stuff, right?" (Line 13), to which Tupac responded affirmatively, "Yeah" (Line 14). Continuing his efforts to help Tupac find the topic connections and articulate them, John did not tell, but asked: "So three of those things connected [*sic*] to that?" (Line 13). Here, John modeled a way of thinking about topic connection and at the same time was scaffolding a thinking space that Tupac could "step" into. Tupac considered the connections, and replied that his interests in art and music were connected: "Well, graphics" (Line 15). John was keeping a tally; they were working together on the same improvable object (Wells, 1999): "So two of them are connected to that" (Line 16); and, stepping inside the same sentence, Tupac added, "and video editing" (Line 17: Time 00:11:31.04 – 40 seconds have passed). Sensing the continuity, John added "aa-and?" (Line 18) drawing out the syllable as if to extend the thought-fishing-line. Indicating they had managed to inscribe the two needed lines from music to graphics, and from music to video editing, Tupac replied, "That's it" (Line 19).

"So talk about those two…." Lines 20-23. Having made it to the summit of the conference together, in a matter-of-fact and friendly tone, John made his next instructional move and pushed Tupac toward elaboration: "So talk about those two 'cause they're connected to music, right?" (Line 20). John was careful to be sure to tie their joint thinking back to music being the main area of Tupac's interest and expertise for this paper. This scaffolding move served to help Tupac focus his attention, and, it shows Tupac that John cared enough about him to listen carefully. Similar to his instructional move that he tempered with a relationally open interrogative, like earlier in Line 13 ("I know you do music stuff, right?"), John used a questioning format to make a scaffolded space for Tupac to reiterate his own connections to his own topic. In line 20, the focus was on Tupac. The sentence is imperative –with the "you-Tupac" implied; and as an imperative, John was scaffolding by directing Tupac's attentional traffic. John's last word in that sentence was "right?" – which was a request for an answer-word (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 290) of understanding: John wanted to be sure that intersubjectivity (Wertsch, 1998) existed between himself and Tupac, and not just in his imagination. Then, in a triplet of out-loud thinking, Tupac appeared to make the connections: "Yeah" (Line 21); "Like yeah" (Line 22); "I guess yeah" (Line 23).

Ventriloquating the audience voice, Line 25. Not satisfied that Tupac's triplet of "yeahs" indicated his clear understanding, and not ready to move on until he's really certain that Tupac's tie-backs to music between sub-topics were snugly knotted, John shifted gears and made a self-deprecating, relational move in order to forward his instructional agenda: "Cause normally, well like for me being the stupid guy that I am, I

169

wouldn't think of those two things as connected to music, so how does it connect?" (Line 25). John self-deprecated, and in the same breath, ventriloquated (Bakhtin, 1981) a general reader voice for Tupac, and as that reader, genuinely wanted to understand the connection, and needed Tupac's help in order to make the connection. In this braided teaching move, John deftly and symbolically switched places with Tupac, momentarily: John offered Tupac the expert status, and took the role of complete novice, all while he fundamentally retained his expert/insider status. John maintained a steadying hand on Tupac's legitimate peripheral participation – and in this way, pushed Tupac to elaborate in writing how it is for him that graphics and video editing connect to music. Both John and Tupac "filled several roles" (Hanks in Lavé & Wenger, 1991, p. 23) as they engaged in the teaching and learning process.

   Talk as pre-writing, Lines 26-28. Seeing John perform a non-expert reader's genuine need to be led to understand the connections between topics appeared to nudge Tupac into recalling a specific body of experience that he could draw from for examples. John created a space (Line 25) for Tupac to talk into so that Tupac could explain and illustrate the connections in his paper. Using talk to both express his understanding and as a way to pre-write an elaborative passage, Tupac responded: "Cause like mix tape and stuff" (Line 26). John affirmed Tupac's rather cryptic statement, and appeared to know that there was more behind the statement than Tupac was able to articulate at that moment. John replied: "That's the kind of thing you talk about" (Line 27). Tupac signaled assent, "Okay" (Line 28) and appeared deep in thought as he looked in the direction of his notes, not at the monitor, nor at John.

Closing and exiting the conference, Lines 29-31. John burst out laughing and asked, "Was that a dismiss?" (Line 29) ostensibly referring to Tupac's sudden lack of eye contact with him. The two had a history, earlier in the school year, where Tupac, while smiling, had made shooing motions to John on two occasions, as if to warn him away and assert his own sense of power. In both those occasions, John named what was going on ("dismiss"), and left the scene without any heated exchanges. Tupac's response in this instance was a definite, "Awe, nah" (Line 30) as if to say, "that's history." John continued to laugh out loud as he rose to leave and said, "Oh! Whoa! (Line 31). While still cautious, John appeared to be just as willing as Tupac to accept this new and positive turn in their relationship. As it turned out, looking backward from the end of the year, this writing conference did signal an upward tick, both in their relationship, and in Tupac's productivity in the class. Moreover, Tupac's subsequent drafts reflect more written with each block of time spent writing: Nov. 12, a full page; Nov. 16, one and a third pages; and the final copy on Nov. 19, six pages double-spaced – each showing more written each time focusing on three interconnected areas of interest – graphics, music, and film making (Artifacts, Round One).

"[G]oing and flowing," Interview with Tupac

Tupac later shared his perspective on his own growth across the year that he described, in part, in relation to his work in music and graphic design, "Ideas, yeah, he just helps me get that idea thing going and flowing." Moreover, in the same interview Tupac elaborated on his own noticing of the relational and instructional environment that John had arranged and how it met, prodded, and nourished him as a learner:

Mr. O'Brien kind of helps me and brings it down to my level where I can understand it   He's not afraid to sit next to me and just break things down for me to where I can understand it   And that's what I feel like [*sic*] how this changed like [*sic*] how my writing changed   All these years I just used to think of writing and reading as a chore   Like I said, I just thought of it like that, but when I came here, he just helped me realize it's not that   He just gave, he just put me in a whole different atmosphere and everything and just [*sic*]   By far this is my favorite class to come to because [*sic*] the way he is as a teacher   (RI, May 21, 2010)

Summary Comments: John and Tupac's Writing Conference

The writing conference between John and Tupac lasted for one minute and 13 seconds -- not a long time. Yet, so much happened. It started as a progress check where John asked Tupac, in a roundabout way, what he was going to write about. Tupac resisted John's advice to narrow his topic, possibly as a matter of saving face. John did not react to Tupac's defended position but gently yet persistently (Lines 7, 9, & 25) continued to ask Tupac to draw connections between his sub-topics. The tone shifted mid-conference when John and Tupac achieved a degree of intersubjectivity – signaled by Tupac's use of an informal register with John. From there, John deployed a relational strategy whereby he made himself smaller, verbally, inside the writing conference. In this way, he helped Tupac to realize that he needed to make the connection between his subtopics so that a reader who does not share Tupac's expertise could follow his narrative. Using a combination of content knowledge, humor and logic, John personalized his instructional

172

agenda into an instructional dialogue with Tupac, and after repeated attempts and modifications, found a way to explain, in a way that Tupac could understand, why topic narrowing is a vitally important writerly skill.

Also noteworthy, this is but one of many conferences John held across the school year. As he engaged with Tupac, the conversation was within easy earshot of several other students who may have benefited by this proximal instruction. Since the repetition, or longer-term sedimenting (Erickson, 2006) process is also a dialogic one, this particular instructional message that was repeated across the school year with many students to narrow one's topic, was, at that moment, occurring inside Tupac's writing conference, but was available to other students, proximally. Over time, the writing conferences, taken together, are assimilated by the members of the class, to varying and individual degrees:

> This is why the unique speech experience of each individual is shaped and developed in continuous and constant interaction with others' individual utterances. This experience can be characterized to some degree as the process of *assimilation*--more or less creative--of others' words (and not the words of a language). (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 89)

From the point of view of the other students, these ongoing side conversations about writing – these chains of utterance about writing – are dialogic in that they reach and are responded to by the students who are not directly being addressed – part of the ambient or "pervasive, low-level learning" (Hanks in Lavé & Wenger, 1991, p. 19).

173

Like the relational and instructional work in college writing center tutorials that Belhiah (2009) and Thompson (2009) addressed in their studies, John deftly braided threads of affective communication -- both verbal and non-verbal – with unequivocally instructional moves. But, unlike those studies, in which a appointment is made ahead of time for an uninterrupted span of time for one-to-one tutoring, John's writing conferences were seldom more than a minute long and took place during a class, nearby to the student where he or she worked. The conference between John and Tupac is one example of a high quality writing conference in a diverse public high school setting.

Writing Conference: Sha'Nequa Arnold and Kathy Hampshire

This chapter's second writing conference between Kathy and her student, Sha'Nequa, is particularly illustrative of teacher persistence. Across the data set, both teachers repeated, rephrased, and redeployed instructions in order to shape encounters in order to better meet their students. Here, Kathy deployed an arsenal of relational and instructional moves as she made mid-point corrections in her approaches and tried again and again to meet Sha'Nequa in her zone of proximal development. It is somewhat unusual in that it is among the longest recorded for this study at two minutes and 45 seconds; and, it takes place not in Kathy's classroom like most of the data I collected on her practice, but in the computer lab. I decided to include it just the same, because much instructional and relational work that is typical of her practice, and of the data set in general, as mentioned in the chapter introduction, is visible in this conference. Moreover, this conference contrasts markedly with the prior conference, between John and Tupac,

174

mainly because of its ambiguous immediate success, and because of Kathy's strategic use of IRE/F as scaffolding.

Context

The conference took place about mid-way into first period on Nov. 4, 2009 (Table 5.3 *Kathy and Sha'Nequa Writing Conference Nov. 4, 2009)*. During the prior week, Kathy decided to show her students a film that they could use as a shared class text. She chose the film *Smoke Signals* (1998) that centers on identity development of a group of adolescent friends and how they come to terms with challenges they face mostly from the adults in their lives. She decided to use the film as the basis of the writing assignment that is the subject of the writing conference with Sha'Nequa (Table 5.3 *Kathy and Sha'Nequa…)* that I present in the following pages. The assignment that the class was working on is a thematic exploration of the film. Students were expected to make an argument for and present evidence as to why they believed that the film spoke to one of several overarching themes such as friendship, relationships with fathers, alcoholism, loss, and forgiveness. Moreover, students were expected to make a connection to their chosen theme using evidence from their own experiences. Brooke was writing about forgiveness and acceptance; Fake was writing about the difficulty of forgiveness; Pedro and Julien addressed the collateral damage of alcoholism to a family. Sha'Nequa decided to address the theme of alcohol abuse, yet, at the point where the conference began, she had not yet established a focus. On this day in the lab, Kathy's conferences with students showed that some were in the beginning stages of their writing, and some had well developed arguments; few, at this point, had made personal connections explicit in their

175

writing. Kathy was making her way around to most of the students in the class. Kathy

approached Sha'Nequa, after conducting a short writing conference with Diamond, who

sat next to Sha'Nequa. Because they were working on desktop computers, they faced the

monitors.

Line	Speaker	*Table 5.3 Kathy and Sha'Nequa Writing Conference Nov. 4, 2009*
1.	KH	*[00:12:18.17] T approaches Sha'Nequa from behind having just done a WC with seat mate and friend, Diamond, next to her.*
2.	KH	*She pauses behind Sha'Nequa for 3-4 seconds in order to silently read her screen*
3.	KH	Ok-rhay
4.	KH	Also
5.	KH	*[12:26:11] As she speaks, KH takes a step in toward Sha'Nequa's left side. KH bends over from the waist and extends her arms so that she might touch keyboard or S's notes.*
6.	KH	something you could put in your first sentence?
7.	KH	that would make it a little stronger?
8.	KH	"Alcohol abuse plays a big part in the movie, Smoke Signals..."
9.	KH	Now, what I want to know
10.	KH	is what you're going to sa-ay? about the alcohol abuse [video 12:38:02]
11.	KH	so you could say, "alcohol abuse"
12.		or "The ----blank--- of alcohol abuse..."
13.	KH	What are you trying to say about alcohol abuse
14.	BOTH	*Looking at computer screen*
15.	Sha'Nequa:	All right okay *(low voice – whispery)*[video 12:46:02] (audio 00:15:03)
16.	KH	Well [video 12:47:00]
17.	KH	tell me [video 12:47:14]
18.	KH:	what you [video 12:49:07] (audio 00:15:06)
19.	Sha'Nequa	OHHhhh [video 12:49:04- :07]
20.	Sha'Nequa	Alcohol abuse is li-ike [video 12:51:29]
21.	Sha'Nequa	You do something like, you go crazy, you go off on people
22.	Sha'Nequa	and like, you're hurting your loved ones
23.	*Camera Angle*	*Can see both KH and Sha'Nequa – both look at screen*
24.	KH	Okay
25.	KH	"You've hurt your loved ones," "you go crazy," "and you go off on people" [00:13:00.12]
26.	KH	What kind of a force is that
27.	KH	Can you give me a word for that?
28.	KH	Like, if you were to finish the sentence, "alcohol abuse ii-iss -----------" [00:13:08.19]
29.	Sha'Nequa	Terrifying? *(soft voice)*

Table 5.3 (continued)

30.	KH	Terrifying –
31.	KH	Good
32.	KH	give me some more [video 13:12:15]
33.	Sha'Nequa	Hmmm I don't know -- like, destructive and stuff
34.		*Sha'Nequa turns to face KH who nods* [video 13:15:27]
35.	Sha'Nequa	'cause like he's hurting the family and stuff [00:13:18.11]
36.	KH	"destructive" is a really good word
37.	Sha'Nequa	okay
38.	KH	Ahm Put that word in here *(pointing to second line -- as seen in screen)*
39.	KH	If you were to put that word in here
40.	KH	How would you do that in that sentence [00:13:25.15]
41.	Sha'Nequa	okay
42.	Sha'Nequa	I don't know
43.	Sha'Nequa	I'd probably put it right here *(tapping same place on screen)*
44.	Sha'Nequa	"alcohol abuse is like being destructive where you're hurting the loved ones and the people that's around you..."
45.	KH	All right
46.	Sha'Nequa	something like that
47.	KH	Okay *(kneeling)*
48.	KH	I want that sentence in there …
49.	KH	too
		(reaching out-- almost touching the screen/ top of paper)
50.	KH	In the beginning –
51.	KH	I'm thinking so your reader knows exactly what you're trying to say
52.	KH	about alchohol abuse
53.	KH	you could say, "In the movie...." "The movie Smoke Signals shows that alcohol abuse is -----*(4 sec. pause – T/S gaze)* "
54.	KH	What was your word
55.	Sha'Nequa	Destructive
56.	KH	Yah.
57.	Sha'Nequa	Oh!
58.	Sha'Nequa	I went blank for a minute *(smiles)* [00:14:04.28]
59.	Sha'Nequa	*looks at her screen*
60.	KH	*(smiles back)* [00:14:04.28]
61.	KH	So that so that could be your first sentence *(shrugs right shoulder)*
62.	KH	It would be strong
63.	Sha'Nequa	okay
64.	KH	and it would get right to the point [00:14:09.27]
65.	Sha'Nequa	all right
66.	KH	"The movie Smoke Signals shows how alcohol abuse is very destructive"
67.	KH	or "how destructive alcohol abuse is"
68.	Sha'Nequa	mmm all right *(hand on mouse looking at screen)*
69.	KH	And I like the word "terrifying" too
70.	KH	you can also use that later on
71.	Sha'Nequa	So, put it right here? *(reaching out with left hand to quickly touch the screen)*
72.	KH	Yah bam
73.	KH	*(immediately mirrors her gesture by reaching out with her right arm to touch the screen)*
74.	KH	First sentence.

177

Table 5.3 (continued)

75.	Sha'Nequa	Okay
76.	Sha'Nequa	This is gonna delete I hope it doesn't *(looking at screen)* [14:29:12]
77.	Sha'Nequa	Okay so....
78.	KH	Okay so go up here *(points to screen)* [00:14:32.08]
79.	KH	I want you to re-write your whole first sentence soooo
80.	Sha'Nequa	I'll just take it out
81.	KH	Okay
82.	Sha'Nequa	Okay *(works on keyboard to delete a chunk)*
83.	KH	Ahm *(chin resting on both hands in a gesture of concentration -- composing out loud)* [14:40:04]
84.	KH	*(Pause)* [14:43:13]
85.	KH	"The movie Smoke Signals shows..."
86.	Sha'Nequa	*(types)*
87.	KH	Hold on You're erasing stuff
88.	Sha'Nequa	Yah That's what it did!
89.	KH	Whenever that happens, press insert I don't know why that happens
90.	Sha'Nequa	Oh wow *(does it – chuckles)* [14:58:29]
91.	KH	*(observes screen as Sha'Nequa types)*
92.	KH	All right
93.	KH	I'll be back
94.	KH	*(standing up)* You're the author, remember
95.	KH	So you can play with that word *(backing away hand gestures)*
96.	KH	I think the word 'destructive' is very powerful *(continues backing off – takes her leave)*

Line by Line with Kathy and Sha'Nequa

Approach and opening: Lines 1-7. Kathy stepped away from Diamond's side, moved behind her and *approached* Sha'Nequa (Line 1: Time 00:12:18.17), pausing for four seconds to silently read Sha'Nequa's screen (Line 2), which, we find out shortly in line 8, began "Alcohol abuse plays a big part in the movie *Smoke Signals*."

In this way, Kathy *researched* her student's progress. Kathy opened the exchange using the marker, "Ok-rhay" (Line 3) which sounded like a cross between "okay" and "all right"; and, it signaled that she was finished reading and had more to say. The next

thing Kathy said is "Also" (Line 4) which is an interesting word choice since it signaled that she and Sha'Nequa were already in the midst of conversation; this may be a relational move Kathy made in order to create an aura or atmosphere of intersubjectivity (Wertsch, 1998). Moreover, it was a move that aimed to pull Sha'Nequa into an already existing stream of dialogue—whether that stream was literal or figurative. The "also" translated into, "In addition to what you already have written there, you might consider…." At the same time that she said "also," Kathy took a step in toward Sha'Nequa's left side, bent over from the waist and extended her arms so that she could touch either the keyboard or Sha'Nequa's notes (Line 5). This physical distance-closing or gap-closing move might translate both relationally and instructionally to show that she was "with" the student and prepared to offer instructional assistance. This may have been a touch-proxy move as discussed in Chapter Four. Kathy *opened* with, "Something you could put in your first sentence?..." (Line 6), "that would make it a little stronger?"... (Line 7: time 00:12:29.11 – Time passed 11 seconds). At this point in the conference, Kathy was careful to frame what she intended to say as a suggestion as signaled by the rising intonation at the end of each phrase, leaving the choice ("could" in Line 6) to take the suggestion or not, up to student; this move to position Sha'Nequa as author appeared to be part of her teaching *decision*. Moreover, she *named* implicitly what Sha'Nequa was doing well already. The subtext is that Sha'Nequa's first sentence has merit; yet, by saying in line 7, "would make it a little stronger" Kathy used the assertive "would" in calling on her own authority, and at the same time, displayed sensitivity to Sha'Nequa by using the diminutive form -- "a little stronger" – a polite way of pointing to what needs

179

work. Additionally, her overall instructional *decision* was becoming clear as Kathy aimed for first sentence clarity and focus.

First sentence – "the blank of alcohol abuse": Lines 8-13. Bending over from the waist, as if to make herself a little smaller, and to get up next to Sha'Nequa, Kathy read Sha'Nequa's first line aloud, "Alcohol abuse plays a big part in the movie, Smoke Signals" (Line 8). In order to carry out her *teaching* plan, Kathy deployed a two-pronged approach: instructional – by positioning herself as interested reader, and relational -- by using an I-statement, "Now, what I want to know…" (Line 9); "…is what you're going to sa-ay? about the alcohol abuse" (Line 10). Elongating the key word, "sa-ay" as if to highlight it, Kathy further emphasized its importance by using a rising intonation to frame it as a question. Ventriloquating (Bakhtin, 1981) the voice of a reader interested in Sha'Nequa's story, Kathy performed what that reader wanted to know; that is, what about alcoholism was important to the author, Sha'Nequa, and what could Kathy -- the reader -- expect the paper to be about.

Kathy continued: "So you could say, 'alcohol abuse' or…"(Line 11); "the blank of alcohol abuse..." (Line 12). Deliberately using a slot-filling strategy here, Kathy attempted to scaffold Sha'Nequa's thinking about alcohol abuse, ostensibly looking for a word like impact, devastation, cost, or disruption. Then, with no pause, Kathy asked again, more directly, "Well, what are you trying to say about alcohol abuse" (Line 13: Time 00:12:45.02 – Time passed 27 seconds). Asked in a conversational tone, Line 13 is a direct invitation for Sha'Nequa to talk to her, at that moment, about the topic.

180

Maybe if I'm quiet, she'll go away: Lines 15-19. Both of them looked at the computer screen, then Sha'Nequa said in a whisper, "All right okay" (Line 15), indicating agreement or at least, agreeability. Both were silent for a second, then Kathy prompted her, "Well," (Line 16). Kathy's use of "well" might have been a signal to Sha'Nequa that she expected Sha'Nequa to step into that conversational space. After a pause of one second, Kathy continued, "tell me" (Line 17) which is a direct instruction to use talk, at that very moment, with her. Two seconds after "tell me", Kathy continued, "what you..." (Line 18) and left hanging the implied restatement of her original question (that is, "tell me what you want to say about alcohol abuse"). Sha'Nequa then responded with a surprised, and elongated "OHHhhh" (Line 19) almost as if she had not fully realized before that Kathy actually (and not rhetorically) expected her to participate, right then – literally -- with her, in an actual conversation. It's possible that an actual conversation with a teacher might have been such unfamiliar territory for Sha'Nequa that she assumed that it was not dialogue that was being asked for but the usual telling. Put another way, Sha'Nequa may have been used to being on the receiving end of "feedback" but not aware that feedback is also a loop back to the speaker. Another or related explanation could be that Sha'Nequa, unused to one-to-one teacher attention as many students might have been, used her whispery "All right okay" as a verbal version of an "if I'm quiet maybe she'll go away" strategy aimed at encouraging someone to leave, who is somehow threatening and who may have authority and/or power.

I did notice some other early-in-the-school-year deflection strategies that students called upon during writing conferences. On receiving a complement on the content of his

181

writing, while sitting with his friends, Pedro, seemingly reacting to being exposed, switched the focus abruptly to one of spelling, and kept it there (Oct. 22, 2009, Video and see Table 3.16 *Example analyzed transcript: Pedro*). In another example, on that same day, Julien doodled throughout the first half of the writing conference (Appendix K), and would not lift his eyes to hers until she directly answered a question of his. This would be something interesting to investigate further.

Drafting out loud: Lines 19-26. Sha'Nequa began using talk to compose, "Alcohol abuse is li-ike" (Line 20: Time 12:51:29); "you do something like, you go crazy, you go off on people" (Line 21); "and like, you're hurting your loved ones" (Line 22: Time 12:57:08). In a six second flood, Sha'Nequa addressed Kathy's question about what she wanted to emphasize about alcohol abuse. While both Kathy and Sha'Nequa were looking at the screen (Line 23), Kathy used the word, "Okay" (Line 23) as a transition, which may have signaled a degree of approval and uptake. Treating Sha'Nequa's spoken words as if they were a written text, she "read" them aloud by repeating them from memory: "You've hurt your loved ones, you go crazy, and you go off on people" (Line 25). Kathy's ventriloquation (Bakhtin, 1981) in line 25 of Sha'Nequa's words not only validated Sha'Nequa's efforts and showed that Kathy really was paying attention, but also permitted Sha'Nequa to hear her own words anew, channeled through another person.

Continuing to focus on Sha'Nequa's first sentence, Kathy asked for an abstract noun "What kind of a force is that" (Line 26) and without pausing, revised her approach slightly shifting her request from the abstract "force" to the more concrete "word": "Can

182

you give me a word for that?" (Line 27), this time with a rising intonation. An example of a reflection-in-action self-correction (Schön, 1984), one might surmise that Kathy decided that "word" was a more available concept for this student than an abstract noun like "force". Moreover, it's an example of a pedagogically tactful (van Manen, 1991) course correction: What's best for this student, right here, right now?

Three scaffolding strategies in one line: Line 28. For the second time in six seconds, Kathy revised her instructional approach, attempting with each reflection-in-action to come closer to Sha'Nequa's zone of proximal development: "Like, if you were to finish the sentence, "alcohol abuse iiissss -----" (Line 28: Time 00:13:08.19). Here, her elongated "is" was followed by silence that mimics a blank slot. Kathy drew on three scaffolding strategies (Wood, Bruner, Ross, 1976) in order to move Sha'Nequa toward a word that would serve as a descriptor or anchor for that first sentence. First, using direction maintenance ("Like, if you were to finish the sentence…") she invited Sha'Nequa into a "what if?" scenario (Johnston, 2004, p. 47) in order to consider the possibility of constructing a sentence that described alcohol abuse with one word. Then, Kathy marked a critical feature and narrowed the task ("alcohol abuse iiissss -----") by using an IRE/F sequence (Mehan, 1979; Cazden, 2001; Wells, 2001) in which she created a bounded space for Sha'Nequa to fill a word-slot.

Finding the word "Destructive": Lines 29-37. Complying with Kathy's request for a word to describe alcohol abuse, Sha'Nequa quietly posed, "Terrifying?" (Line 29), to fill the slot, to which Kathy responded in a mirroring move, "Terrifying" (Line 30). Quickly, Kathy responded again, this time with "Good" (Line 31) as both a validation of

183

Sha'Nequa's effort, and as an "E" or evaluative comment of the IRE/F sequence above in line 27. In what appeared to be an effort to help Sha'Nequa brainstorm some options, Kathy pushed her to "[g]ive me some more" (Line 32) as if part of her agenda was for Sha'Nequa to learn to move *beyond* responding to an IRE/F structure and learn to array options for herself prior to writing. Possibly uncertain, but thinking aloud just the same, Sha'Nequa said, "Hmmm I don't know -- like, destructive and stuff" (Line 33) as she turned to face Kathy who returned her gaze, and nodded (Line 34). The nod is a gestural variant of "good" as above in line 31, and may have been another evaluative response in the highly structured, and in this instance, highly scaffolded IRE/F sequence that Kathy had set up.

Continuing her sentence, "'cause like he's hurting the family and stuff" (Line 35), Sha'Nequa elaborated on "destructive" and appeared to be warming to the talk-as-drafting process that Kathy has aimed her toward. In one response, "'Destructive' is a really good word" (Line 36), Kathy called on two strategies. First, she mirrored Sha'Nequa's word choice, which amplified it, and second, she *named* that choice as a strong one. Sha'Nequa responded with a simple, "Okay" (Line 37), which might have been either agreement or agreeability.

Moving in closer, "if" and "how": Lines 38-46. Incrementally moving closer to the student and her writing, Kathy used her body to physically connect to Sha'Nequa's work, visible on the screen, by pointing to the first line of the piece. At the same time, she continued to heavily structure this conference, and gives Sha'Nequa an explicit instruction: "Ahm put that word in here" (Line 38). The screen touch may be evidence

of Kathy's intention to connect Sha'Nequa's ideas about what she wants to write about, to their conversation, to what she can write into her paper; it is a gesture of intertextuality (Bloome et al., 2005).

Then, revising her instruction again, and in a similar pattern to the earlier revisions, Kathy deployed a "what if" move similar to that in line 27, posing, "If you were to put that word in here" (Line 39), "how would you do that in that sentence" (Line 40). Using the "if" construction, permits the student to consider the possibility without the risk associated with actually having to write it that way (Johnston, 2004). Moreover, by staying near to her, and continuing to point to the place on the screen where the word would have gone, Kathy was subtly requiring Sha'Nequa to make that consideration. Because of the "if" construction, once she did make the consideration, she would then be free to choose whether to incorporate it or not. Additionally, Kathy's "how would you do that" question in line 40, asked Sha'Nequa to speak *as* a writer into Kathy's question. It asked her to both consider the word "destructive" and propose an authorial design for the sentence. It complicated the exchange by adding a layer of responsibility to Sha'Nequa's response. It's almost like Kathy tossed her a ball, and by doing so hoped that it would activate Sha'Nequa's ideas about what to do with it. Sha'Nequa's response was similar to her mild responses earlier in lines 33 & 35): "Okay" (Line 41), indicating either agreement or agreeability. Then, as she appeared still to be considering Kathy's requests, Sha'Nequa offered a more substantive, "I don't know" (Line 42).

Mirroring Kathy's touching move (Line 38), Sha'Nequa tapped on the screen -- possibly signaling an uptake of instruction, and possibly a desire to adhere her own

185

intentions onto Kathy's intertextual (Bloome et al, 2005) gesture in line 38 – and said somewhat hesitantly: "I'd probably put it right here" (Line 43). Then, speaking her own ideas *as if* they were written text that she was reading – she "read" them in a monotone voice: "Alcohol abuse is like being destructive where you're hurting the loved ones and the people that's [*sic*] around you..." (Line 44). Sounding like an approximation of her earlier out-loud composition (Lines 22 & 23), Sha'Nequa's words also resembled Kathy's earlier revoicing of those lines (Line 25). Kathy then responded mildly, "All right" (Line 45). Sha'Nequa appeared to accept Kathy's response as approval and finalized her efforts by saying, "Something like that" (Line 46: Time 00:13:43.02 – time passed, 58 seconds).

Getting down… and reflection-in-action repairs: Lines 47- 56. As Kathy knelt, she said, "Okay" (Line 47), and in what seemed to have been an explicit instructional effort to make herself understood without ambiguity she added, "I want that sentence in there …" (Line 48). A full second later, she added "too" (Line 49). It may be that when she heard herself use the forceful "I want" statement, she attempted to make a reflection-in-action (Schön, 1984) teaching adjustment and added the implied "me, too; I want that, too" tag-on as a way to position Sha'Nequa as not only *an* agentive author but *the* agentive author in this conference, a contention which Kathy's later closing conference lines support.

Then, in another intertextual move (Bloome et al., 2005), Kathy prefaced her next statement by reaching out and brushing the screen where the opening lines of the paper would appear on the monitor, then said "In the beginning" (Line 50). Kathy called upon

186

both gesture and speech to identify where in the paper they were speaking. Continuing to position Sha'Nequa as an agentive author, Kathy added the implication that Sha'Nequa as an author had real live readers. At the same time, Kathy underscored an instructional goal, the writerly obligation to strive for clarity: "I'm thinking so your reader knows exactly what you're trying to say" (Line 51), "about alcohol abuse…" (Line 52). Offering Sha'Nequa a way to frame that sentence, Kathy suggested: "…you could say…'The movie *Smoke Signals* shows that alcohol abuse is [*pause 4 seconds*]'" (Line 53).

There was fully a four second pause as teacher and student held each other's gaze as Kathy appeared to expect that Sha'Nequa would verbally insert "destructive" into that slot. Again, it seems that the student was reluctant or uncertain of what she was being asked to do. It seems like Sha'Nequa understood her role to be more of an observer than that of a full participant that Kathy seems to be striving for. Lavé and Wenger write that "newcomers' legitimate peripherality provides them with more than an 'observational' lookout post: It crucially involves *participation* as a way of learning – of both absorbing and being absorbed in the 'culture of practice'" (1991, p. 95, italics original). Kathy's facial expression grew solemn as she tried another tactic to make herself understood so that Sha'Nequa could participate in this effort to make her opening sentence more specific: "What was your word" (Line 54). Kathy uttered this with a downward emphasis – it does not come across as a question. Sha'Nequa replied, "Destructive" (Line 55), and Kathy responded with a short, *"Yah"* (Line 56: Time 00:14:02.22, Time passed 77 seconds or one minute, 17 seconds).

187

Would and could: "So that so that could be your first sentence": Lines 57 – 68. Sha'Nequa responded with, "Oh!" (Line 57), like she did in line 19; and with a smile added, "I went blank for a minute" (Line 58). It seems a little odd – perhaps this student may have been so unaccustomed to this kind of close encounter with a teacher that she had a hard time knowing what to do; maybe it's stressful for her; maybe she did go "blank." Also, in all her years in school, she might have learned that being quiet and agreeable is a way to deflect further teacher scrutiny – but that didn't seem to be working here – Kathy wasn't going away. Holding her smile, Sha'Nequa looked at her screen (Line 59). Kathy returned her smile, shrugged her right shoulder (Line 60), and, aiming for a *closing* of the conference so that Sha'Nequa had her next-step said, "So that could be your first sentence" (Line 61). Kathy used "could" to express imaginary possibility. Then in her next two lines (Lines 62 & 64) Kathy used the conditional, real-world "would," twice. Simply stating her summary argument, Kathy observed: "It would be strong" (Line 62); to which Sha'Nequa replied, "Okay" (Line 63); continuing, Kathy said, "and it would get right to the point" (Line 64); which garnered another agreeable response from Sha'Nequa, "All right" (Line 65). Then, as if to conclude the conference with a fresh modeling of what she wanted Sha'Nequa to do, Kathy drew on one of the voices available to her, the out-loud composing voice trying out possibilities for that first line: "The movie *Smoke Signals* shows how alcohol abuse is very destructive" (Line 66); "or, 'how destructive alcohol abuse is'…" (Line 67). Again, Sha'Nequa responded agreeably, while looking at the screen, hand on mouse, "mmm all right" (Line 68).

"So, put it right here?" "Yah bam": Lines 69 - 75. Perhaps still wanting to bring Sha'Nequa more into a participatory role in the composing process, Kathy repeated Sha'Nequa's earlier word and added, in what appears to be a validating move, "And I like the word 'terrifying' too" (Line 69); "you can also use that later on" (Line 70). Sha'Nequa, apparently still tentative, asked, "So, put it right here?" (Line 71) as she reached out with her left hand to quickly touch the screen and pointed to the place of the first line of her paper. Kathy answers in a register that is both casual and emphatic, "Yah bam" (Line 72) and immediately mirrors Sha'Nequa's gesture by reaching out with her right arm to touch the screen (Line 73).

The dialogic mirroring screen touch appears to be another intertextual moment mediated through gesture that is both relational ("we…") and instructional ("…are on the same page, and so put it here on *this* same page"). It also seems to be an instance of what I am calling reciprocal intertextuality: Sha'Nequa reciprocated (Line 70) Kathy's instruction; then Kathy reciprocated in Lines 72 and 73 both Sha'Nequa's verbal response, and her gestural move to connect. It appears that both participants in this writing conference were working hard to connect with one another. And, as if underscoring the location and importance of the subject of this conversation, Kathy added, "First sentence" (Line 74), to which Sha'Nequa responded, "okay" (Line 75: Time 00:14:26.07 – Time passed, 101 seconds or, one minute, 41 seconds).

Technical difficulties: Lines 79 – 91. After a couple of back and forths with a technical problem (Lines 76-79), Kathy restated her conclusion to the writing conference: "I want you to re-write your whole first sentence so" (Line 79).

"I'll just take it out," (Line 80) replied Sha'Nequa.

Kathy tried again -- after more technical difficulties (Lines 81-84) -- and dictated, "The movie *Smoke Signals* shows..." (Line 85). Sha'Nequa was typing as Kathy spoke (Line 86), and, Kathy noticed that as she typed, the text was disappearing (Line 87). Kathy told her to "press insert" to make the word processing program stop eating the text as it was being typed (Line 89). Then Sha'Nequa continued typing, as Kathy looked on (Line 91).

Not only superheroes say, "I'll be back": Lines 92-93. Yet again, Kathy attempted to *close* the writing conference and said, "All right" (Line 92). Attempting to leave Sha'Nequa with a sense that they would still be in dialogue even though this particular conference will have soon ended, said, "I'll be back" (Line 93). "I'll be back" can be interpreted as, "I am still 'with' you; I haven't given up on you; I expect that you will continue to work on this when I am absent; and, our engagement on this matter has not ended". It is a message of both solidarity and expectation that is relational and instructional: the student still has the respect of the teacher, is expected to do her part, and can count on her for continued instructional support. Moreover, the "I'll be back" move might be one way to help steady an unsure writer.

"You're the author, remember": Line 94. Seemingly intent on leaving Sha'Nequa infused with agency, as Kathy stood to make ready to leave, she said, "You're the author, remember" (Line 94). It may be that this was another reflection-in-action teaching repair as Kathy acted perhaps more forcefully (e.g. Lines 48, 79) than she would have liked to. On the other hand, it may be that Kathy's bigger-picture agenda had less to

do with fixing that first sentence and more to do with Sha'Nequa's development of an authorial identity which Kathy hinted at in Line 51: "I'm thinking so your reader knows exactly what you're trying to say…". It's an astonishing remark --"You're the author, remember" -- given the balkiness of the writing conference. Kathy may have been attempting to mark this conference for Sha'Nequa as a memorable first time that someone referred to her as an author. Perhaps Kathy wanted Sha'Nequa later to be able to draw on this text. In the present conference, Kathy may have been asking Sha'Nequa to draw upon a memory that she didn't yet have (I'm the author?). Perhaps Kathy thought her remark might have been part of the sedimenting process for Sha'Nequa to begin to build a writerly view of herself: Maybe Sha'Nequa didn't remember in this conference that she was "the author," but perhaps she did, another time.

   "So you can play with that word" and exiting : Lines 95-96. As she backed away, using a rolling hand gesture for emphasis, Kathy continued reflecting-in-action and adjusting her teaching to better fit with what she perceived Sha'Nequa to need at that moment, "So you can play with that word" (Line 95). A possible interpretation of line 95 might be, "because this is what authors (like you) do, they 'play with…word[s]'". As she *exited*, Kathy decided to tie this knot just a little more snugly – from the current elevated discussion back to the writing at hand -- specifically, back to a word that Sha'Nequa "wrote" back in line 33: "I think the word 'destructive' is very powerful" (Line 96: Time 00:15:08.23 -- Time passed, 135 seconds or, 2 minutes, 15 seconds).

191

Sha'Nequa's Essay and Interview

In Sha'Nequa's final copy, the opening line remained unchanged "Alcohol abuse plays a big part in the movie, Smoke Signals [*sic*]..." (Table 5.3 Writing conference, Line 8). In the second line of her final copy, she established her thesis that the "dad Arnold who is an alcoholic...really don't care [*sic*] about people nor himself" (Artifact, Round One, Alcohol Abuse). She went on to talk about how Arnold would fight with his wife, and upset his son. Then, in her second page Sha'Nequa told almost a parallel story relating incidents of her own father's battle with alcoholism, and how he would fight with his mother. In an interview with her a little later, Sha'Nequa talked about her writing process and how the second page/paragraph came to her much more easily than the first one and that she "typed a full page in ten minutes...a WHOLE page" (SRI Nov. 19, 2009). Clearly excited about her fluency, she stopped there, however, and did not explicitly connect to the film in the interview, or in her final essay.

Was the writing conference a success? It's hard to know what effect a single event has on anyone. But, perhaps Sha'Nequa did remember that she was the author and told this story the way she wanted to. She continued writing across the year, developing more fluency over time. She also told me that she liked it with Kathy would write on her paper and found being thought of as a "deep" person, motivating:

Well I love it when Ms. H writes on my paper because when we used to get them back, returned she write [*sic*] on our paper, some of them [*sic*] negative like what I need to work on [in] my paper but most of it's that I'm really deep or something

It makes me feel good because it's like I wrote something Ms. H likes (SRI, Feb. 26, 2010)

From Sha'Nequa's reflections, it appears that she valued her educational relationship with Kathy. Moreover, it appears that Sha'Nequa might have been adopting, slowly, and over time, an identity as someone who believed she had something important to say, and who has at least one person for whom her writing was "deep" and important.

Summary Comments: Kathy and Sha'Nequa's Writing Conference

Early in the writing conference, Kathy figured that Sha'Nequa had a vague idea for her essay, but that she needed help sharpening its focus. Engaging her in dialogue, Kathy elicited a descriptive word ("destructive") from Sha'Nequa and planned to use it to build on for a focus for the paper. Throughout most of the conference, Sha'Nequa appeared to be unwilling or unable to participate in the conference the way Kathy was inviting her to. Kathy then responded with multiple scaffolding moves including providing a task-narrowing IRE/F structure that Sha'Nequa could respond into. Moreover, she made many relational moves such as bending, kneeling to be smaller, positioning Sha'Nequa as decisive and agentive, using a casual register to convey explicitly instructional messages, and, creating intertextual subtexts which might have been aimed at continually inviting and re-inviting Sha'Nequa into fuller participation both inside the writing conference and in the class's writerly context Kathy was striving to create. Sha'Nequa did respond with a flurry of out-loud drafting in lines 20, 21, and 22; and she did mirror some of Kathy's words as well as Kathy's touching-the-screen gestures in what might have been efforts to be responsive to Kathy's intertextual

invitations. Kathy ended up dictating the first sentence to her, and left the conference with a seemingly revised agenda for Sha'Nequa: "You're the author, remember" (Line 94). It was as if Kathy realized, in that conference, that Sha'Nequa had little writerly identity from which to draw -- which might have contributed to her tentative participation.

The fine-grained analysis and discussion of this writing conference points to the importance of a teacher's willingness to persist in her efforts to bring a student into situated learning as a legitimate peripheral participant (Lavé & Wenger, 1991). Kathy's reflections-in-action (Schön, 1984) combined with her multiple scaffolding actions (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976), and efforts to affirm and amplify Sha'Nequa's ideas, as well as her simultaneous braiding of relational and instructional messages all point to the kind of pedagogical tactfulness (van Manen, 1991) and persistence it sometimes takes to make a sustained and sincere effort to invite students into larger literate conversations. While Kathy made every effort to invite Sha'Nequa into collaboration as Strauss and Xiang (2006) advised in their college writing conferences study's implications section, Sha'Nequa appeared to be reticent in engaging in this way with her teacher, with her own writing. Sha'Nequa's interview comments and later-in-the year writing growth points to a degree of internalization of the discourse of her teacher (McCarthey, 1994; Wells, 2007a). In considering how the conferences presented in this chapter might contribute to the professional literature, I recall Erickson's (1992) call to portray interactions as clearly as possible: "In attempting to change interaction patterns, it is often important to see their social ecology as richly and precisely as possible" (p. 250). It is my hope that the close

analysis of this conference between Kathy and Sha'Nequa may help magnify what

teacher commitment looks like, moment by moment, in a similar context.

Chapter Six: Discussion And Implications

What We Know Now: A Revisitation of Findings

Structures, Relational Moves, and Instructional Moves

Writing conference structures are the architecture of a conference – the shape, the space, and the layout. John and Kathy went to their students to conduct conferences; that gave John and Kathy greater control of the length of the conference (Atwell, 1998). Going to where the students were also got both teachers out among their students regularly, frequently, and in close proximity where students could easily ask questions and make contact. In addition, holding conferences where the students worked was the least disruptive to students in the midst of writing.

Approaches, openings, beginnings and endings. The beginnings and endings of the writing conferences which I show as *approaches, openings, beginnings* and *endings* demarcate their shape. These beginnings and endings, together with a set-aside time period for students to work on their writing, activated writing conferences as a speech genre (Bakhtin, 1994) and reinforced the idea of legitimate peripheral participation (Lavé & Wenger, 1991) that class members were at that time participating in writing and that the expert would be available to assist their performance (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). The layered levels of legitimate peripheral participation took place through conversations about writing, writing, thinking about what to write, and overhearing other people's conversations about writing. Beginnings and endings signaled a shift in milieu from one

196

kind of classroom activity setting to another (Sperling, 1981; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Sacks, Schegeloff & Jefferson, 1974; Bakhtin, 1994). Moreover, these two teachers managed the particulars of how they came over to a student (*approach*); with what words they opened the conference (*opening*); what task they left the student with and how that was communicated (*closings*); and, how the teachers exited the writing conference (*ending* or *leave-taking*).

  Internal structures: Parts of a writing conference. The internal structures of a writing conference delineate the layout of instructional "rooms" inside a writing conference where the instructional agenda is to be formulated and undertaken; the actual teacher and student inside a given instructional context determine the specifics. These parts included 1) *researching* or reading the student's work to inform instructional decision-making; 2) *naming* by which the teacher begins with what the student is already doing well and shares that with the student. Naming is a key move that is both relational and instructional; it sets a tone by positioning the student as a writer in a specific way, and which opens the way to the teacher moving ahead with his or her instructional agenda; 3) *deciding* on the instructional focus for the conference; and 4) *teaching*, or communicating information to the student aimed at helping his or her writing in a way that the student can understand and use (Calkins, 1994; Calkins, Hartman & White, 2005; Bomer, 2010). It is these internal structures that created spaces in which the teacher could "assist the performance" (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) of the student, helping the student do what he or she could not do on his or her own. Moreover, these structures spoke to those of effective classroom teachers where teachers were responsive to students' needs,

197

shaped instruction toward student autonomy, managed classrooms well, and built warm

classroom environments (Pianta & Stuhlman, 2009; Langer, 2000; Pressely et al., 2001;

Allington & Johnston, 2001).

     Internal structures: Duration of writing conferences. The time spans are the

temporal spaces of writing conferences; I identified four durational categories of writing

conferences and found that writing conferences in this data set generally took less time

than the five minute average discussed in some of the literature (Anderson, 2000; Perks,

2005; Kittle, 2008). Moreover, the conferences in this data set reflected the brevity hinted

at by Atwell (1998), Graves (1994) and Sperling (1991). Of these, the shortest lasted up

to 30 seconds; the mid-range conferences lasted 31 to 65 seconds; the longer ones, 66 to

90 seconds; and the least frequent, and also the longest group lasted anywhere between

90 seconds to three minutes and over. Within these conferences, I found evidence of the

parts of conferences (researching, naming, deciding, and teaching). The most striking

feature to me of these short writing conferences is their ambient quality – that is, these

two teachers invited many students to engage with them around writing on any given day.

In fact, John's shortest "conferences" -- the walk-bys – often showed little or no verbal

exchange and, yet, may have had value as constitutive acts of encouragement,

expectation, and availability. The short encounters explored in Chapter Four may point

toward a context that, over time and with repetition, sediments learning (Erickson, 2006)

with frequent interactions around writing that may continually construct and reconstitute

writing as a situated, cultural, and social practice (Lavé & Wenger, 1991; Nystrand,

1997; Hanks in Lavé & Wenger, 1991). The short writing conferences served to keep

students focused on their writing and were frequent reminders to all members that both teachers valued talk about writing as a natural and expected part of dialogical classroom culture (Wells, 2007c; Wells & Chang-Wells, 1992; Nystrand, 1997; Burbules & Rice, 1991).

Relational Moves: Physical and Verbal

Kathy and John employed relational moves aimed at bringing the student and the curriculum closer together that essentially made their teacher-selves actually and symbolically smaller, both physically and verbally, inside a writing conference. For example, both reduced their body size inside the writing conference by using such postures as floor-sitting, kneeling on the floor, squatting, and sitting in a chair. In addition, Kathy used what I call gestures of familiarity where she would reach for something that the student had as a way of establishing familiarity. This move may be a touch-proxy – a way to touch students without the risk associated with actual teacher touch (Andrzejewski & Davis, 2008). In addition, both drew from the heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1994) of their classrooms, as well as from selected social languages and/or d/Discourses (Bakhtin, 1981; Gee, 1996) and used words such a way as to recast themselves as less authoritarian, and less powerful by using self-deprecating comments, and I-statements. Moreover, these self-deprecating comments and I-statements were not only relational between individuals, but also spoke to the context of schooling in which teachers and students resided together; Kathy and John's centrifugal statements may have served to open spaces for dialogic classroom interactions by resisting some of the centripetal forces of schooling (Bakhtin, 1994; Tyack & Cuban, 1995) that pull people

into standardized, subtractive, and monologic classroom discourse (Valenzuela, 1999; Bomer & Bomer, 2001; Wells, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c). The desire to make themselves appear less threatening to their students speaks to the norms Kathy and John sought to establish; ones in which everyone was a writer, and, as a newcomer, was a legitimate peripheral participant in this practice (Lavé & Wenger, 1991).

Instructional Moves: Explaining, Drafting, and Reading

The instruction inside writing conferences took place in ways that I am calling *explaining*, or explication of conventions and processes of writing; *drafting*, or conversations that helped a student in the drafting and revision process; and *reading*, or ways that the teacher read students' writing in order to assist student-writers to become more aware of the effect of their writing. Both teachers used instructional moves to scaffold their students' learning in such ways as modeling, marking critical features, direction maintenance, recruiting the learner's interest, narrowing the task, and frustration control (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976) in highly individualized ways.

Looking in on Writing Conferences: John and Tupac; Kathy and Sha'Nequa

After repeated attempts and modifications, John found a way to explain to Tupac why it was important for him, as a writer, to narrow his topic. In unselfconscious reflection-in-action (Schön, 1984), John deftly braided threads of affective communication -- both verbal and non-verbal – with an unequivocally instructional agenda in such a way to both put Tupac at ease and to make his instructional points plain (Goldstein, 1999; Mahn, 2003; Mahn & John-Steiner, 2007). Similarly, Kathy had to

200

repeatedly revise her instructional plan and relational approach in the writing conference with Sha'Nequa who had a vague idea for her essay, but needed help creating a sharp focus which Kathy decided would be accomplished by a strong first sentence. Kathy persisted and initiated many intertextual instants (Bloome et al., 2005). Moreover, in Kathy's efforts to effectively assist Sha'Nequa's learning inside her zone of proximal development (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, 1991), Kathy deployed multiple scaffolding (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976) moves including using a strategic task-narrowing IRE/F (Mehan, 1979; Cazden, 2001; Wells, 2001) structure by which she attempted to sweep clear a verbal space for Sha'Nequa to speak into.

Both Kathy and John were working with students who did not especially welcome them at first and each conference shows variations in the collaboration continuum (Sperling, 1990). For example, Tupac started on the less collaborative end, and inside the conference, decided to become more collaborative from the mid-point, on. Sha'Nequa, on the other hand, appeared to be on the plus side of the collaboration continuum, but her repeated instances of mild acceptance or gentle resistance require the observer to continually question where she was, collaboration-wise, at any point in the conference. Both these conferences show how the braiding of relational and instructional moves makes meeting a student in his or her zone of proximal development even possible (Vygotsky, 1978; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Goldstein, 1999; Mahn, 2003; Mahn & John-Steiner, 2007). Finally, both conferences also indicate how careful listening was necessary to shape and re-shape the interactions in order to attempt to assist the performance of students (Murray, 1982; Burbules & Rice, 1991, 2010; Parker, 2010).

201

The importance of repeated engagements, teacher persistence, and the layering over time

of legitimate peripheral participation (Lavé & Wenger, 1991) all point to the kinds of

pedagogical tactfulness (van Manen, 1991) that John and Kathy displayed.

<div align="center">**Addressing the Research Questions**</div>

In this section I will discuss my research questions, one at a time, in order to look

at whether and how those questions were addressed in this study and in this report. I call

on data examples that I have shared in Chapters Four and Five in order to demonstrate

and talk through the current status of my original research questions. Moreover, my

questions have subsections that I address in turn.

Question One

What are the features of instructional conversations between teachers and students

about writing, what do students do after these conversations, and how do those

features change across a school year?

Subsection: "What are the features of instructional conversations between

teachers and students about writing…." In this first question I address writing

conferences as a form of instructional conversations. Instructional conversations (Tharp

& Gallimore, 1988) are intentional and systematic conversations that are "assisting

performances through a child's zone of proximal development (ZPD)"; and, in this view

of teaching and learning, teaching itself is "*redefined as assisted performance*" (Tharp &

Gallimore, 1991, p. 5, italics original). Moreover, dialogue is the primary form of that

assistance. Similar to the six elements of scaffolding -- demonstration, marking critical

<div align="center">202</div>

features, direction maintenance, recruiting the child's interest; narrowing the task, and frustration control (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976, p. 98), seven markers of instructional conversations include: modeling, feeding back, contingency managing, directing, questioning, explaining, and task structuring (Tharp & Gallimore, 1991, pp. 5-6), though, because of the situated and individual nature of them, not all are present in each instructional conversation. As a form of instructional conversation, writing conferences share these elements as well as those that mark scaffolding. When looking specifically at the features of writing conferences, the data from this study suggest that it is the external and internal structures that define those features: or, the shape (beginnings and endings), the space (duration), and the layout (research, name, decide and teach) of writing conferences. And, as *instructional* conversations, the features of writing conferences include the instructional strategies discussed in Chapter Four, including for example, the teaching-using-dialogue moves such as explaining, drafting, and reading. Moreover, the scaffolding-type actions that mark the generic instructional conversation occur within the internal structure, or layout, of the writing conference. While the data suggests that the relational moves that both teachers made, are part of what made these writing conferences, their primary role was to contour the exchange by creating a relational context in which the *instructional* conversations could happen.

Subsection: "what do students do after…." Here, I address the question about what students do after writing conferences. From the writing conference snippets examined in Chapter Four, as well as the two conferences in their entirety in Chapter Five, it appears that most of the students took up, to greater and lesser degrees, what the teachers'

instructional agendas were for them. In Kathy's writing conference with Fake on Feb. 23, 2010, she helped Fake to come up with a strategy for attacking a large work load. After the conference, Fake was able to focus his attention, keep writing, and turn in three good essays. Tupac and John's writing conference that was closely examined in Chapter Five was reflected in what Tupac did afterward. He did, in fact, take up John's teaching advice to narrow his topic to three interconnected sub-themes centered on his main interest of music (Artifact, Nov. 19, 2009). Looking at what Margarita did after her writing conference with John on Nov. 10 also shows progress. Her writing samples on this topic show cumulative growth over the next few days and indicate that her conference with John helped her to solidify her point of view for her paper. In a subsequent interview with her, she confirms this when she talked about how the writing conference helped her to focus and gain clarity on her topic.

Kathy met with some resistance from Pedro to "do more with" his poem on April 6, 2010. But, she maintained high expectations for Pedro and persisted in her instructional agenda. After the writing conference, Pedro's writing samples show that he did continue to improve the poem he was ready to leave; and, apparently experiencing some degree of fluency, continued to write three more poems. Sometimes what students do afterward in their work is not what one might have expected. Take, for example, the Feb. 23, 2010 writing conference between John and Tommy, the subject of which was the past tense of the verb *to have*. Even though Tommy repeated back to John the correct usage of the verb, and later in a follow up interview with me indicated that he was satisfied with the

instruction he received that day, his written usage of the verb in his final paper did not reflect this new understanding.

An important take-away here is that there is no ideal conference, and that what students do or don't do may not be causally related to what occurred in the writing conference (Sperling, 1991, p. 136). In fact, Freedman and Sperling (1985) addressed this somewhat when they talked about how writing conferences are spaces where students and teachers can come together to talk about what's important to the student whether or not it directly impacts the writing at hand. Their belief was that the conversation was part of an ongoing context that built and re-built itself with each encounter. Not at odds with a social view of teaching and learning, in legitimate peripheral participation, learners as newcomers are brought into membership in a new realm of activity, step by step, by experts or insiders. Learning occurs when, through repeated/routine activities, students learn "habits of performance" (Erickson, 2006, p. 11) and learn to focus their attention in ways like the insiders of the community of practice. Moreover, like in a d/Discourse community (Gee, 1996), and similar to question of where someone is on the collaboration continuum, not all participants display the same level of enthusiasm or hunger for the particular body of knowledge; Hanks (in Lavé & Wenger, 1991, p. 19) calls it "pervasive, low-level learning" and draws comparisons with the way a child learns a language.

Subsection: "how do those features change across a school year…." My data set is large and took me a long time to make sense of it. I simply was not able to get to every question that I originally had, including this part of question one that asked how features of writing conferences changed across the year. I do feel that it is still a good question,

however, and I do have raw data that I can examine at another time. Some of the features for which I might look for changes from fall, to winter, to spring, for example, include duration of writing conferences across the year and what differences in content of the class curriculum as well as which differences in individual writing conferences contributed to those changes. Similarly, I could re-sort some of my raw data for kinds of instructional moves made from fall to winter to spring and at the same time look at relational data in the areas that showed the most change to see whether and how changing relationships contributed to changing instructional patterns with particular students.

Question Two

What are the relational dimensions of those instructional conversations between teachers and students about writing and how do those dimensions change across a school year?

Subsection: "What are the relational dimensions of [writing conferences]…".
The data from this study shows that the two main branches of relational moves that both teachers made were those that were physical and verbal. In those I categorize as physical, they made their bodies smaller or less looming inside the writing conference, also, there were instances of strategic micro-moments of intimacy through touching objects shared in that context which I categorize as gestures of familiarity or touch-proxy, or in some instances, as intertextuality (e.g. touching the monitor screen). In those relational moves that I categorize as verbal, Kathy and John positioned themselves discursively as less capable – or, symbolically "smaller" in some particular way, than the student with whom one or the other was conferencing. These size and power reduction moves appeared to

help to screate an interpersonal context inside the writing conference where the conversation is hospitable to the ideas, thoughts, and feelings of the student.

Physical relational moves. For example, in John's floor-sitting writing conference with Margarita on Nov. 10, 2009, he pursued a rather forceful instructional agenda in which he insists, four times, that Margarita talk about her focus in her area of interest. Eventually, Margarita did expand on her topic, to John's satisfaction. It may have been that John's posture and accompanying affect (discussed in Chapter Four) contributed to Margarita's being able to engage productively with John. Moreover, her follow up interview comments focused on how helpful the conference actually was. In another example, Kathy knelt next to Fake's desk, with her torso upright and head lower than his, in their writing conference of Feb. 23, 2010 in which Fake was having trouble with task management. Fake was overwhelmed; Kathy's verbal instruction and the with-him-ness of her posture appear to have combined to both direct him (instruction) and sooth him (posture) to the point where he managed to be able to calm down and re-engage with his task.

Verbal relational moves. One example from the data set will suffice. In John and Tupac's writing conference on Nov. 10, 2009, discussed fully in Chapter Five, there is one line that shows both self-deprecation and an I-statement. In line 25, John works to convince Tupac why it's important that he articulate the connections between his sub-topics of interest and says, "[relational-self-deprecation] Cause normally, well like for ME-ee being the stupid guy that I am, [relational-I-statement] I wouldn't think of those two things as connected to music [instructional move] so how is it connected". John

207

appeared to realize that Tupac was on the verge of grasping his task (Lines 22, 23, and 24) but still needed John to create a personalized context, and, to shape the instruction a little more closely to Tupac's zone of proximal development. John seemed to understand that Tupac needed a personalized reason, embodied by a real-live interested reader, to make it crystal clear to Tupac why illustrating, in his essay, the connections for his readers was vital to being understood. John appeared to understand that Tupac would value his teacher's symbolic sacrifice of stature in order to help him/Tupac come to an understanding, which his subsequent writing and interviews bore out.

Subsection: "how do those [relational] dimensions change across a school year…." Similar to my original question of how the writing conferences as instructional conversations change across the school year, I was unable to address this question in this analysis. I do have ample raw data remaining to which I could address this question. I would be interested in looking at overall frequencies of relational moves from fall to winter to spring; more importantly, I would be interested in seeing which students' writing conferences appeared to have more or fewer relational dimensions and examine their progress with this question in mind. Moreover, it would be interesting to look at student reciprocity of relational dimensions in writing conferences; that is whether and how students resisted, received, and/or repaid the teachers' relational efforts inside writing conferences, as well as take a closer look at how this aspect of the data set impacted student writing.

Question Three

How can those relational dimensions be traced to larger patterns in the

classroom that the teacher establishes across time?

My pursuit of my primary questions about coming to some kind of understanding

about the features and relational dimensions of writing conferences, took precedence over

my investigation of this question. However, I can begin to address it, indirectly. The

larger patterns in both classrooms speak to both teachers' valuing of talk as a means to a

dialogic environment as their regular patterns of groupwork, projects, and time set aside

for writing and reading suggest. Moreover, that both teachers valued student choice in

reading (e.g. individual book selection) and writing (e.g. journals, self-selected topics

within broad writing assignment guidelines) speaks to an understanding of literate

practices as personal, situated, and as an ever-developing means by which students can

meet and interact in the world. That both John and Kathy welcomed their students'

bringing of their own experiences (e.g. Tommy's childhood in Viet Nam; Brooke's

experience of second-hand grief), and voices (Sha'Nequa's "shine"; Margarita's complex

ideas about abortion) to their writing assignments and, specifically, to writing

conferences with them as their teacher-mentors speaks to larger classroom patterns of

dialogicality built up over time.

Implications

Sedimentation

The findings from this study teaching suggest that teaching and learning in writing conferences reside in the micro-moments constructed by teacher and student inside that context. Furthermore, teaching and learning in these contexts may occur across time as an accumulation or sedimentation (Erickson, 2006) of repeated instructional and relational interactions. Legitimate peripheral participation (Lavé & Wenger, 1991) is a way to look at a social endeavor like the writing classes both teachers created and think of them as complex spaces where individual and collective learning takes place in zones of proximal development that are both individual (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) and collective (Erickson, 1996; Moll & Whitmore, 1996). Recalling that there is no ideal writing conference (Sperling, 1991), and that collaboration between writing conference participants is on a continuum even within one exchange (Sperling, 1990), the idea of sedimenting how "we" writers do things, offers an optimistic view of teaching in this way. Moreover, it decenters causality or *kronos* (Erickson, 2006) or the importance of the direct line of chronologically traceable events that lead to a desired outcome; and, instead, offers participation (Lavé & Wenger, 1991) as a complex and recursive movement through and between stages of zones of proximal development (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) that speak more to realizing the importance and variability of timing or *kairos* (Erickson, 2006) from one person to another.

Overhearing others' conversations, as discussed earlier, as a normal part of writing conference classroom practice speaks to each participant contributing his or her

efforts to an interweaving of thinking or a multiparty zone of proximal development (Erickson, 1996). The classes are sites of heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1994) where each member brings his or her own histories and voices; located in school, the institution contributes its own authoritative discourse (Bakhtin, 1994) to the mix. Students and teachers, alike, step into streams of utterances to draw upon social languages to use with each other and in their writing. The differences become part of the resources of the class and its participating members where dialogue is enriched (Burbules & Rice, 1991).

Gateways to Culturally Relevant Teaching

According to Gay (2000) culturally relevant teaching "is based on the assumption that when academic knowledge and skills are situated within the lived experiences and frames of reference of students, they are more personally meaningful, have higher interest appeal, and are learned more easily and thoroughly" (p. 106). Qualities of caring and tactful teaching were visible in John and Kathy's practices. Their regular holding of one-to-one writing conferences created a routine whereby they talked with their students, explained concepts, made assignments personally relevant through choice-based assignments, and held students to high standards.

Connected to culturally relevant teaching, pedagogical tact (van Manen, 1991, 1995) comes out of knowing what to teach and how to teach it and doing so within a teaching practice that is continually reflective as to what it is that a child needs in the moment, an aspect of practice that Schön (1984) called "reflection-in-action." Moreover, pedagogical tact arises out of genuine caring for students as individuals and as learners (Noddings, 1984, 2005). Pew Report data (Passel & Cohn, 2008) demonstrate that in the

coming decades more and more students, including those in secondary schools, will be children of color, English learners, immigrants, and, from low socioeconomic bracket households. At the same time, projections show that teachers will continue to be White and mostly female (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005). The importance of helping teachers to understand and value their students' experiences and backgrounds, as well as to better shape their instruction in culturally responsive ways, will only continue to grow.

Results of research on what students from middle and high school, of both genders, and from diverse backgrounds regard as motivating evidence of teacher caring included holding students to high expectations in day-to-day specific ways, careful explanation of concepts, making assignments fun, good classroom management, getting around to talk to and help students, and, involving parents as partners for the benefit of the student (Bosworth, 1995; Ferreira &Bosworth, 2001; Wentzel, 2002; Alder, 2002). Other research aimed at bettering instruction for Latino/a students mirrors those findings and points to the building of relationships with students as helpful to teachers' meaningful individualization of instruction (Jimenez & Rose, 2010; Garza, 2009), and that non-verbal affective regard translates as positive to Latino/a students (Martin & Mottet, 2011). Writing conferences can be enlisted as a practice in the teaching of writing that can help to establish a positive relational climate.

Writing conferences undertaken in classroom cultures like John and Kathy's can help teachers grow into better understanding of culturally responsive teaching if undertaken in a systematically reflective manner. Active reflection is important because teachers' beliefs and practices do not always align, despite teachers' best intentions that

212

they do (e.g. Freedman & Sperling, 1985; Freedman, Greenleaf & Sperling, 1987; McCarthey, 1992, 1994; Lipson et al., 2000). For example, in Kathy and John's classrooms, some students got more teacher attention and time, and some students received less, which might have occurred for any variety of reasons including teacher assessment of some students as progressing well on the one hand, and a possible lack of cultural responsiveness with particular students, on the other hand. It is natural for teachers, as people, to feel more comfortable or attuned to some students, and not to others; yet, it is imperative that teachers resist the inclination to visit one student over another, based solely on personal preference. In the interest of pursuit of both practicing communicative virtues (Burbules & Rice, 1991) with one's students, and growing one's own ability to practice culturally relevant teaching, it is necessary for educators to reflect deeply, systematically, and often. In order to be able to reflect accurately on whether and how the goods of writing conferences – teacher time and attention – are distributed equitably, it is important for teachers to figure out a way to record who they see each day and for how long, and to regularly examine and reflect on those data. Otherwise, the very structures teachers set up to help create a more democratic classroom environment, might instead, become a means by which to replicate inequities of resource distribution that exist in the society at large (Domhoff, 2011).

If teachers, White teachers in particular, are to pursue a the kind of transformationist pedagogy (Howard, 2006) that the nation's demographic trends call for (Passel & Cohn, 2008; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005), it makes sense to reflect upon three dynamically interconnected areas: practice, self, and students. Howard's (2006)

213

reflection model is intended to help White teachers focus their reflection in three main dimensions, "knowing my self," "knowing my practice," and "knowing my students" (p. 126) in order to become more aware of themselves as cultural beings, culturally responsive to their diverse students, and become an every more reliable part of the solution to tip the balance away from White dominance toward more equitable social norms.

Implications for Teacher Educators; English Teachers; Future Research

  For English education. Teacher educators can draw from studies such as this one for examples of dialogically arranged classrooms that extend across a school year and thus offer a realistic picture of possibility. Fine-grained portraits of teacher-student encounters over time, such as are presented here, that display, consider, and explicate building of relationships with students can offer models for preservice teachers to emulate, to compare with other teachers' writing conference practices, and perhaps, to critique, as well. It would be important, also, to be sure that preservice teachers had some depth of background in process writing instruction and thus, could evaluate for themselves the affordances and constraints that this study's variations in writing conference duration offer. Moreover, this study holds particular relevance for teacher educators as the teachers and students who gave of themselves for this research offer a likeness to current and future projected demographics of teachers and secondary school children over the next few decades.

  For practicing English teachers. This examination of John and Kathy's practices may encourage secondary English teachers to include regular writing

conferences in their curriculum. Many teachers, like the two in this study, see 100 or more students each day. Conducting regular writing conferences offers benefits to teachers facing pressures from state and district mandates to narrow their curriculum. One benefit is that one-to-one writing conferences can offer a way to get to know students as learners in ways that whole class discussions and other traditional teaching practices might not offer. Writing conferences also offer teachers a space in which instruction can be individualized in productive ways, and where teachers can guide their students' writing work as it unfolds.

Because of the regularity of their conferences and their proximal availability to students, John and Kathy were able to respond in a just-in-time way so that their students could keep writing. The brief conferences the two teachers in this study chose to employ worked in their own contexts. Brief conferences have their own affordances, already discussed; and, they also have constraints. The constraints center on the withholding of time and attention, perhaps unknowingly, from needful students at crucial junctures. For example, a too-short conference might not give a quiet or shy student sufficient time to warm up to a teacher-student interaction; perhaps the conversation would not go as deep as one a little longer would allow (e.g. four to five minutes) and, an important instructional and/or relational opportunity is missed.

Moreover, part of the context for any teachers who consider implementing writing conferences is the nature of the school's English department. Not unlike geese that fly in a vee formation, with John as the senior teacher who had been conducting writing conferences for years, Kathy was able to benefit from the reduced resistance that his

215

tenure and status permitted them both. Yet, both made sure that their curriculum was aligned with departmental expectations. It may be that a department is very flexible or quite rigid, or likely, somewhere in between. Some departments and members may be open to educators conducting writing conferences if they so choose; some departments might be so tightly scripted that stepping outside of the sanctioned curriculum appears impossible; others, on the same continuum of reduction of teacher choice and professional judgment, might go so far as to require writing conferences. Complications and considerations notwithstanding, conducting regular writing conferences offers secondary teachers an avenue to build a sense of community engagement in the endeavor of writing, to build individual relationships with their students, to look in on their students' learning processes, and to tend those individual and collective relationships across time.

For future research. I discussed above some of the implications this study raises for culturally appropriate practice. One line of investigation that could shed more light in that regard would be comparative case studies of students, and look at writing conference frequency and content, by race, across the school year. Not only might such an exploration show distribution of teacher attention and time, but also point to ways that teachers might be reflecting upon their practice, themselves, and their students; or, ways that they are not, and what any of those kinds of findings might means for students who depend upon teachers to help them grow in meaningful ways.

Some of the practice-based literature for teachers that focuses on writing workshop and writing conferences asks teachers to take an approach to conferences in

216

which longer engagements between teacher and students are recommended. The two teachers in this study, instead, decided that the shorter engagements worked for their particular contexts, and those of their students. One avenue of research that would be interesting would be to see a comparison between teachers who were using longer writing conferences and those who were using shorter ones. It would be interesting, too, if such research expanded its focus to include more than students' writing scores, or direct one-to-one correlations between the conferences and that day's writing. It could be revealing to examine writing conference participation and such components of a teenager's life as identity development, school identification, relationships with students and adults in school, and whether and how writing conferences affect overall participation in school. Moreover, studying the concurrent development of adolescents' out-of-school literacy pursuits might prove illuminating as well.

Contribution to Literature

This research attempts to extend the work on dialogic environments and writing conferences undertaken so thoroughly by Sperling (1990, 1991, 1992), Freedman & Sperling (1985), and McCarthey (1992) by considering the current contexts of high schools in the United States, and ways in which writing conferences can offer a particular kind of hybrid academic and relational platform where teachers and students can both work together on writing, and come to know one another as co-constructors of knowledge. My hope is that this research can also contribute to the conversations about writing conferences that others have begun such as Glasswell and Parr's (2009) work on younger writers; or, Strauss and Xiang's (2006), Lee and Schallert's (2008), and Liu's

(2009) explorations of writing conferences and English learners; or Belhiah's (2009) and Thompson's (2009) close examinations of conferences between college writing centers' tutors and tutees. Moreover, among the current contexts teachers face include onrushing forces from two directions: from one side, student populations in the United States are expected to become ever more diverse over the next few decades, and those same adolescents, research indicates, are and will be very much in need of competent and relationally available and caring teachers; and, from the other side, increased pressure from reduced school budgets, standardized testing, and standardized curricula, which combine to press teachers toward an atomized and reductive approach to teaching. This research speaks less to the needs of individual demographic groups of students and more to how teachers in similar schools as John's and Kathy's might think about, justify, and approach implementation of writing conferences in their own classrooms. Writing conferences offer teachers and students slivers of relationally hued spaces in which personalized teaching and learning can take place.

APPENDIX A

Kathy Hampshire's focal students: mid-year revisions, and quick view

1	**Revised January 11, 2010** FS: Julien Jackson (HM) draws have video data – need RI 10/22 √ 1/11/10 AND *FS: Matthew Reyes No video data, have writing, **need RI** BU: Pedro Gonzalez tends to overcorrect ("Kathy Hampshire" put him as a 2; I'm calling him a 1) have video data – need RI 10/22 √ 1/11/10
2	FS: JC Candy (ESL) have video data – **need** RI 10/22 and 11/3 √ 1/11/10 *BU: Lake -- have video data – **need RI** 10/22 and 11/3
3	FS: Sha'Nequa (AAF) (have video data and RI) 10/22 and 11/3 BU: Mac Daddy (bi-racial [AA/W or H] M) (have video data and RI) 10/22
4	*FS & BU : Jake (former ESL – AM) have video data – **need RI** 10/22 *FS & BU: Mark (AAM) have video data **NEED RI** 10/22 BOTH FS and BU to each other
5	FS & BU: Angela (HF) (have video data and RI) 11/3 AND FS & BU: Brooke (WF) (have video data and RI) 10/22 *Angela and Brooke are BOTH FS and BU to each other.
Totals	FS: T=8 3 HM 1 AAF 1AM & 1AAM 1HF & 1WF BU: T=3 1 HM 1 AF 1 biracial M

Class demographics: Out of 29 students	16 Hispanics = 55% of class 4 female 12 male 19 males {65.5%), 10 females (34.4%)	3 White = 10.3% 2 female 1 male	6 AA = 20.5% 3 female 3 male	4 Asian =13.7% 1 female 3 male

Quick View: Mid year revisions to Kathy Hampshire's focal students

1	2	3	4	5	
FS: Julien HM draws (AND) Matthew HM BU: Pedro HM	FS: JC Candy HM ESL BU: Lake AF ESL	FS: Sha'nequa AAF BU: Mac AA/W M	FS: Jake AM (BOTH FS) Mark AAM (quiet)	FS: Angela HF (BOTH FS) Brooke WF	8 FS: 4 males 3 females FS: 3 HM / 1 AAF/ 1 AM & 1AAM /1HF&1WF/ 3 BU: 1 males 1 female BU:1 HM/ 1AF/ 1 biracial M/

John O'Brien's students: Mid year sampling deliberations of focal students: 12/20/09 Anna's placement of kids after reading over their work

1 No one is a true "1"	**FS*:** Joshua Martinez (**HM**) great in interview – but I worry that he's not there enough –to be a focal student – maybe he can be the "1"? Attendance is tied up in this. **(no MT)** **Backup: Jane Doe – (maybe as backup "1" – "John" called her a "3" but, like Joshua, she has attendance issues.)**
2 NOTE: I am assigning "1" & "2" to stretch out the pool of writers so I can choose focal students.	**FS*: Tommy Oliver (AM)** (has a very hard time starting) **MT [K=6, "John" gave his a "6"]** He reflects that his writing is better when he has experience with the topic – big, important realization for him– as he told me in the RI I conducted with him – former ESL… Tommy is an interesting friendly kid – very interested in being a focal student. I think Tommy is a 2-3 in this group **Boo Zoo** (AAM) (strong voice – mechanical issues) **(no MT)**
3	**FS*: Lydia Sun** (AF) MT (K=6) fairly thoughtful – stays close to the language of the classroom – talks about how a book helped her to write about her own relationship with her sister. Very quiet student. **Backup FS: Tupac William (AAM)** High volume writer – sees a future self (graphics music etc) **MT [K=5]** summarized books at length, feels his writing has improved.
4	**FS*: Boo Zoo** (4K – me5 (AAM) sees self as a future writer. MT [K=6] discovers that 2 books, tho very different from each other, can both be "good" – Very proud and surprised at his progress as a reader-writer. Fairly stunning self assessment as a writer – using what he's reading as mentor text. **Backup FS: Sabrina Miller (AAF)** great narrative writing – use of dialogue – wants to be a better writer – **MT [K=6]** thoughtful & self-aware, live a better life as one of the purposes of writing. Regular student: **Reggie Guy** **(AAM)** great vocab and control – but doesn't tie in personal experiences (MT essay [K=6] v interesting about discovering dragons in his reading and how in a particular series they are POSITIONED as agentive and sentient – but devolves when considering his own writing). I would say that Sam is a 4. (kind of an outlier – brilliant, all over the map)
5	**FS*Christina Barbie (HF) [MT K=8])** ties in personal experience with world issues (very thoughtful MT essay about own writing **Backup FS: Margarita Limon (4-5)** (HF) [former ESL – articulates ESL fears very well] **MT [K=8]** essay – excellent discussion of 2 books she read; self as writer is stunning – very thoughtful filled with self understanding.

NOTES	Whole class=11 Not including *Jane Doe – is she on roster?*	**Focal students** **1=HM –Joshua Martinez v friendly** **2=AM – Tommy Oliver eager but awkward** **3= AF – Lydia Sun very quiet** **4=AAM – Benjamin Doolittle okay** **5=HF – Christina Barbie, okay; maybe Margarita TOO (?)**	**Backup FS** 1= Jane Doe, never talked to her 2= Boo Zoo, okay & kind of quiet 3= Tupac Williams, interesting assertive 4=Sabrina Miller, very sweet, friendly (Reggie Guy, Backup #2) 5=Margarita Limon, sweet a little shy

Cover Sheet All Data – Margarita Limon

STUDENT: "**MARGARITA LIMON**"   Teacher: John O'Brien
Focal Student YES (L1 Spanish; L2 English -- good videos – good data set
T (Nov) called her a "4-5"; in my sorting (jan) I called her a "5" backup to "Christina Barbie"

Image: IMG_1319.JPG

ROUND ONE (Fall; Oct.-Nov. 2009)							
Consent?	Early work -- various	draft 1: 11/10/09	draft 2: 11/12/09	interim draft 2.5: Mon 11/16	draft 3: 11/19/09	final copy: 11/24/09	Midterm Essay 12/17/09 Part 1: books read; Part 2: self eval writing
Yes	11.3 Essay "the stranger I know..." 1.5 pp uses dialogue	"Abortion" 4:09pm Screenshot -- title only Paper: One sentence **WC VIDEO**	"Abortion" one small paragraph (paper file)	Abortion 1/3 page single spaced	"Abortion" 1 ½ pp double spaced	Abortion 1.5 pp. dbl. spcd. Some changes from 11/19	Yes

<u>Nov. 5, 2009</u>
00:00:18 (1M 12S <u>conference with "Margarita"</u>)
To "Margarita": You don't have anything, no problem? –
(can't hear her or is it "Christina"?)
N: except for not knowing what to write
T No problem you don't see any
You could just be xxx (she laughs)
"Tommy" You said xxx ?
Yes I said she could use you annoying boys….
It's a sad comment

(<u>conference with "Margarita"</u> continues after some cross conversation)

00:01:20 **Code: Finding a topic**
T: Are you good at something – could you write about why dance was important
N: not in the right position right (camera is everywhere)

T: It's still same topic

WC Nov. 10 Giving up my height *** Have S sample**
Ambles over to where "Margarita" and "Lydia" sit
  2:41 – 3:27 "Margarita" (<u>Conference</u>)
  Code: What are you writing about?
  Code: This is a great example of T "giving up height" K sits on floor looks up at her
  What are you writing about
  Abortion
  What are you going to say about it
  S: Ahhhmmm
  Everybody should have one

SRI Nov. 19 WS330026 copy.WMA
TRANSCRIBED

Round 2 --- Love Quote/ Abstract Noun Writing Assignment					
Tues Feb 2, 2010 n the classroom (Have **Field Notes** from this day - - fairly extensive Pre-Writing for Assignment. Also have half page **memo about T/S Kidding Around** inside work in class.	**Thurs Feb. 4, 2010** (**videotaped** today in H Lab- have **Audio File** of Teacher -- Have **handwritten video notes by time stamp**. *Did I go over this day's video with Ss and T?*	**Friday Feb. 5, 2010 (FN) Videotaped** today in G-lab -- have **FN - handwritten** -- have **Audio File** of teacher	**Monday Feb. 8, 2010 Videotaped** today in H-Lab -- Have **Audio File** of Teacher	**Tuesday Feb. 9, 2010** Have **Video tape** (lab--) have **Audio File** of Teacher	DATE? Have **curricular handouts:** Ss could write one of three different essays 1) Foolish Lovd; 2) Love quote; and 3) Evolution of an Idea. Also have explanatory docs for each
Present in class	Screenshot: Love quote essay (#2) draft --Love has nothing to do with what you get... etc 4:08PM **WC**	**Where? X**	WC Feb. 4 ***Screenshot: 3:36PM -- substandtial chunks with directions to self in CAPS (writing process)**	**WC** Screenshot: Four full paragraphs, single spaced. 4:01PM	Final Copy – 1 ½ pp double spaced Love…**with what you are expecting to get...”**

Feb. 4, 2010
WC "Margarita" and "Lydia" 5:54-6:18 (no words with "Lydia" – walk-by)
5:54 Arms still crossed – walking behind "Margarita" and "Lydia" looking at their screens. Slows down, stops behind "Margarita".
5:59 "Margarita" vocalizes arrrgghh and puts her hands up to screen
T Okay that's fine
"Margarita" pulls away from monitor smiles – moves a little
6:03 T keep moving – looks at what "Lydia" is writing
Example of tensions in profession
 T: No I try not to read your stuff because then I try not to be the English Teacher
        Like I'm about to do
        (bends over, and points to screen) "This should be In the rain, not On the rain" 6;11 then mumbles
        something… I get, I get…..Yeahhh.

Feb 5, 2010
Walk by "Margarita"—32:53-33:00

34:29-34:54
        "Tommy" is sitting next to "Margarita"
T looks and points to her screen,   "I like what you are doing, putting the organization things in there" **[No S Sample on this day but it shows up on the Sample from Feb. 8]**

Feb. 8, 2010 **Huh? Dismissing students?** 19:58 "Margarita" starts asking him something says I'm not listening – I'm watching "Tommy" **Feb. 9, 2010** "Margarita" 27:40-28:18 (22 seconds) What did you write down? Trying to think of something… **[S Sample]** **SRI: Feb. 26 over Feb. 5 WS330092.WMA**

ROUND Three of writing and writing conferences John O'Brien period 7   WALK ON:the Paper

Day 1 in Lab Tuesday March 2, (have assignment handout and pre-work done in class last week). Have Video Tape and Teacher Audio File	Day 2 in lab Thursday March 4, 2010 NOTE: I have put the samples under this date though they were collected early in the period on Tues March 9 (sub in there). (have assignment handout, plus enhanced explanation) Have Video Tape and Teacher Audio File.	Day 3 in Lab Tuesday March 9, 2010 (sub today)	Day 4 in Lab Wed. March 10 I thought I asked John to do screenshots at the beginning of the period -- to capture the Ss work from YESTERDAY where are they?	March 11 Day 5 (and last) day in Lab – papers due today supposedly. John extending deadline to Friday (last day before break). (have assignment handout, plus enhanced explanation)	
Kindergarten I explored screenshot 16:09:27 3 para single spaced **WC**	Added a lot of text -- another full page using List Pre-K-12 method *[No WC]*	Short paragraphs (1 ½ pp single spaced) K-12 Literacy experiences. *[No WC]*	@ Screenshots: 1) 4:14pm Top hald of "c" paper; 2) or "d" WHERE ARE A & B?? PRESUMABLY TAKEN EARLIER IN THE CLASS? **WC**	"Living in Literature" 1.75 pp single spaced (paper) **WC**	
March 2, 2010 2:20 Drive by "Margarita" (can't see her face behind the monitor) **7:12-7:30 WC "Margarita"** How do you spell "clown"? T says something after this about glad he's a walking dictionary or some such. **[Have S sample]** **March 10** 4:38 HEAR "Margarita" (?) asking T about HIS essay **Code: S is making connection b/w teaching and teaching of writing** "Lydia" next to "Margarita" (keeps her head down and continues to work on her own essay) and Irving					

(across from "Margarita") who T ends up directing conversation toward – then he has a subsequent WC with Irving.

CODE: Unequal time b/w Males and Females   [have S Samples]

***

7:13-9:20 "Margarita" (amazing conversation Bi-lingual—this IS a Writing Conference)

Something about the list *(T is still squatting down in same place – he is over "Margarita"'s left shoulder)*

T: That's kind of a list, but

(T sits in chair)

T: You have a unique bi-literate perspective (then long exchange with "Margarita" about what it's been like for her and her reading habit.

(9:00-9:12 +/- S says she's better in Spanish than in English; T says I think you're better than you think you are; S smiles, says 'thanks' as she turns back to screen).

T: Ending comment – "It might look like a list right now, but I think you're doing okay".

Code: Bi Lingual background (more)

Code: Instructional – S concerned that she's not where she should be b/c of list

17:31 and thereabouts watching "Margarita" at computer (see her screen)

March 11, 2010 [Have S sample]

6:44-6:47 "Margarita" -- Drive by

Looks at "Margarita"'s screen (right next to "Lydia") Looks over her right shoulder

Code: Drive by

   T: Turns 180 degrees

SRI March 25 WS330107.WMA   and March 29 WS330114.WMA

End-of-Year RI   May 21 WS330170.WMA

APPENDIX D: Excerpt from fieldnotes

Appendix D
Excerpt from fieldnotes: John O'Brien Sept. 17, 2009, Period 7

Joshua Martinez: what are we doing with this – waves a paper (turns out to be a script for a play that he's in…) Wonders if he should read his lines (reading a line from Mice and Men – character is reading the book) flat or in the voice of Lennie/George?
JOB responds that he should probably read it in the voice of Lennie/George
JM nods, seems satisfied with the answer.
      PN: What a great question!
John transitions into peer (editing?)
Trading papers
Hands out a Peer Response Personal Narrative sheet to each student.
Christina Barbie asks him if he made it – she used this in Ms. Hampshire's room last year.
John: Says yes I made it based on Peter Elbow's work.
    MN: John is sitting 2 desks away from Christina. She takes the opportunity to speak to him a little – the Peter Elbow thing – then asks him how to spell "pedal"

Early into it, Tupac asks if they just pick a question or two (smiling)
John says no you have to do them all
Tupac says okay (smiles) then a minute later he says "oh, there's a backside too"
      PN: But as I write this, he's been hard at it – reading carefully, making notes. I don't see anyone who is not really working hard on this.

John is reading a novel while he waits.
He has a screensaver of a Renoir (?) up --- two women picking flowers. Beautiful, shared Western cultural artifact.

APPENDIX E: Excerpt of video notes

Table 3.15 (Now is Appendix E)
Example -- Excerpt of video notes: Kathy Hampshire April 13, 2010

Fake 19:05 - -22:57 WC and Instructional conference
T asks how he's doing – he says pretty bad – T asks him to explain – He says he's looked through several books and that nothing's moving him. T offers him another book to check out.
   Is that better – I have no feeling for reading these pomes today. She points to his poems – points out Before I die poem – She writes "You're a romantic" Has anyone ever called you this?

Interruption—desist – Mac Daddy earphones in midst of Anthony Williams' WC

Anthony W 23:00 – 25:07 WC Anthony W's going deep with the difficulty going to a new school --
You're shy – using loose paper

25:30 – 26: 40 New Student:
"Unbidden" – having this conversation about the poem he's chosen – pretty interesting.
"Trunk of secret words, I cry" **T is affirming his observation** that poem is about memory

*28:23 – 29:20 Interruption—*explanation to Mac Daddy then desist Pedro in the midst of JC Candy's WC
27:00 – 31:30 **WC JC Candy** (ends with Thank you Miss)
Picks a poem about "fake love" then after Pedro's interruption, T goes back to JC – points out how line breaks give power to certain words --

 (Surprisingly low key and kind
29:00-ish **desist** and conversation with Pedro– about him being careful about what's coming out of his mouth)

31:40 shot of **Matthew Reyes at her desk** - -he looks comfortable and she's fine with that
hey Matthew, do you have a journal?

32:15-33:30 Instructional Conversation (Not a WC?) **Luke -- He's concerned about being correct**

34:00 – 34:43 Pedro (you're lying to me) **Instructional conversation & WC** reminds him to stay focused –
34:44-36:14 WC or Instructional Conference How you doing -- Mac Daddy -- openly says how he's emotional – Sweet
T Sticks up for Mac Daddy
Sha'Nequa says something insulting – T says to Mac, she's just jealous (sticks up for him and shuts her down – then says I'm kidding – her manner is so smooth that it does not appear to be hurtful to Sha'Nequa at all but there IS a message there that says – treat him with respect
   o   I wonder how Mac feels about this
   o   I wonder how Sha'Nequa feels about this

APPENDIX F: Excerpt, writing conference transcript

Appendix F
Excerpt, writing conference transcript – Pedro, April 13, 2010

Transcript excerpt
April 13, 2010 WC "Pedro" [00:10:26.08] to [00:12:15.11]
***
Ice Cream Shoes -- why isn't this a "real" poem – 12:01
"Pedro" laughs the whole time out of what? Insecurity? until the end when she reassures him that his poem is good; KH remains serious the whole time they talk
***
KH: (To "Pedro") [00:10:26.08] Okay, show me some of this poetry that you wrote the other day, I want to read a little bit of it. (Kneels down next to "Pedro")
"Pedro": Laughs and shows her the poetry xx
KH: Oh yeah, okay. [00:10:42.13] This one was the one you felt wasn't a real poem right?
"Pedro": Yeah
KH: Why didn't you think it was a real poem?
"Pedro": He was laughing at me (pointing to the guy next to him)
KH: [00:10:50.02] Does that make it not a real poem?
"Pedro": I don't know. (laughing) It's just I read it wrong
KH: How wrong, what was wrong about it? [00:11:00.03]

BODY LANGUAGE MIRROR (KH and P are mimicking each other's body language with heads resting on hands; but one of P's arms is folded close in while KH's arm is extended out towards P)

"Pedro": Because it was supposed to be like who created them and start over again like all that. It dipped over and they thought that was going to be the answer who created them, and it was like, "ice cream shoes" [00:11:10.12]
KH: So "stars, planets, galaxies, moons, aliens, people who created them, ice cream shoes,"
"Pedro": Yeah (G covering mouth with fist)
KH: that's what they read?
"Pedro": Yeah Ice cream shoes created them (laughing) [00:11:20.11]
KH: [00:11:20.13] Okay who created them.
But it starts again, ice cream, shoes, stores, grass....

(stops conversation with "Pedro" to answer another student's question about paper for poem they are going to give to somebody else; she waits for understanding from student and wiggles her pencil while "Pedro" plays with glasses; misunderstanding from students about what goes in journal)

Okay [00:11:58.15] I like it, it's definitely a poem. Do you see that, I mean it's really good.
"Pedro": What does that say?
KH: It says "cool idea, it gets your reader thinking" (pointing at his paper)
"Pedro": Oh okay, (reading her words) "it gets your reader thinking" [00:12:12.11]
KH: Yeah. Okay I like it, good job [00:12:15.11]
(KH gets up and walks to Anthony)

Appendix G *Excerpt, all John O'Brien,WCs for March 4*
J O'Brien VID 3_4_10 **Finished!** **FULL TABLE of CONTENTS JOB 3.4.10** ******************************** 00:00:00- 00:02:52 and Class Notes: John is projecting revised assignment 4:00-5:20 ? ******************************** 4:00-4:59 "Joshua Martinez" (JOB sat) okay to be writing on multiple Word documents 5:05-5:20 "Joshua Martinez" JOB shares with him how another S is literally cutting and pasting his ideas on paper. ******************************** 10:45 John is debriefing with me about the TAKS adventure at school yesterday. ******************************** √"Tommy" short exchange – Kidding – go away you make me nervous. [00:11:38.22] to [00:11:58.27] [00:11:38.22] CODE: Resisting Alpha Male patterns? ******************************** 15:02- 16:02? "Joshua Martinez" asking for clarification (JOB sits) ******************************** [00:16:15.00] *camera on Tommy and Christina talking* ******************************** [00:19:07.22] *Tommy turns around, says something to "Margarita", and gets out of seat to look at her computer* ******************************** Management Tommy and Margarita (and Christina) [00:19:29.27] to [00:20:02.22] ******************************** √ Instructional Conference/Management Tommy says: "stop listening" -- LOTS of GAZE, sarcasm, then, reconciliation [00:21:55.28] to [00:22:41.04] CODE: another incident of resisting Alpha Male pattern? ******************************** Summary of Tommy's off task actions with Christina and Margarita[00:22:59.16] to[00:30:57.00] ******************************** YA Lit conversation with me: JOB recommended to me ******************************** √√√ TOMMY WC --Drive-By (yah--hhhh, yah--hhhh -- backward Puppy gaze) [00:31:28.06] to [00:31:38.18] (10 sec) CODE: RELATIONAL Mutual apology for sarcasm and brush-offs? ******************************** REGGIE Walk-By -- no summons, no words [00:31:43.29] to [00:31:50.27] (7 seconds) ******************************** √√√√ BOO WC [00:31:51.28] to [00:32:46.07] (physical shifts in body, gaze, gesture) THIS IS ONE FOR MICROANALYSIS "I used to think…" ******************************** END of Full TOC March 4, 2010

Excerpt, HyperResearch transcript coding – John, Feb. 4 & 5, 2010

HR_JOB_Feb4_and_Feb5_2010 copy.txt

Page Number

□ 1 of 1 ⇨   Font Settings...

elational- Humorous tone
losing- Good Fine Okay
losing-Uses pointed humor
elational-Trust
elational-T self censors to honor S
mbodiment Closing- T walks off
tudent- Lydia Non-FS
uration- 1 to 15 seconds
istructional-Walk by
istructional-T silently reading screen
Rspnse to Walk By- Stays writing does not eng
tudent- Margarita
uration- 1 to 15 seconds

reflects-The English Teacher not

istructional-Usage correction
mbodiment-gaze eye contact

mbodiment Closing- T walks off
losing- Good Fine Okay

JOB: Okay, no, okay, that's fine, I won't..... (resumes walking) [00:06:02.09]

****
LYDIA (3 seconds) bid
JOB makes Bid to Lydia for WC [00:06:02.09]
JOB: (mid step looks at Lydia's screen for couple of seconds) [00:06:05.00]

****
Margarita -- continuation WC [00:06:05.00] to [00:06:17.16] (12 seconds)
CODE: JOB doing "think aloud"
CODE: JOB resisting (unsucessfully) his The English Teacher tensions

M: XXXX
JOB: No I try not to read your stuff [00:06:05.20]
 because then I try not to be The English Teacher [00:06:07.23] and telling you to do something (as he moves back toward her screen)[00:06:08.23]
Like I‚Äôm about to do [00:06:10.00](bends over, and points to screen)
This should be "In the rain", not "on the rain‚Äù [00:06:12.00] (Margarita has hands to her head, holds JOB's gaze for a second)
(JOB moves off [00:06:15.03])
I get, I get ‚Ä¶ Yeahhh [00:06:17.16]

229

HyperResearch master code list (245 open codes)

Ambiguous-sub text do something else
    Anna JOB Conversation
    Approach - T scoots on knees over to S
    Approach- from behind
    Approach-S summons T
    Approach-T ambles over
    Approach-T turns to S
    Approach-T walks straight to S
    Behavior-Less distraction more writing
    Behavioral-Desist
    Behavioral-less talk more writing
    Closing - T scoots off
    Closing - T walks off
    Closing- Good Fine Okay
    Closing-Implies task
    Closing-Just keep writing
    Closing-leaves S with next step
    Closing-S project well in hand
    Closing-Stands
    Closing-T promises to come back
    Closing-T summarizes instruction
    Closing-task get something written
    Closing-Uses pointed humor
    Duration - 90s to 3min
    Duration - Over 3 min
    Duration- 1 to 15 seconds
    Duration- 16 to 30 seconds
    Duration- 31 to 54 seconds
    Duration-55 to 65 seconds
    Duration-66 to 90 seconds
    Embodiment - Big space S to T
    Embodiment - Head gesture
    Embodiment - S touch T
    Embodiment - Vocalization
    Embodiment Closing- T walks off
    Embodiment Gesture S Resists w humor
    Embodiment- S draws during WC

Embodiment- S patient polite
Embodiment- S signaling vulnerability
Embodiment- T distance during WC
Embodiment- T hand gestures
Embodiment- T points to screen
Embodiment- T proximity as invitation
Embodiment- T sigh
Embodiment- T Smile
Embodiment- T stands behind S
Embodiment- T uses voice to cross room to S
Embodiment- T walks by slowly
Embodiment-gaze eye contact
Embodiment-Lyrical movement
Embodiment-Object
Embodiment-S receptivity
Embodiment-S turns toward T
Embodiment-S uses voice to cross room to T
Embodiment-shield
Embodiment-T closes distance in WC
Embodiment-T hovers
Embodiment-T kneels
Embodiment-T moves away from S
Embodiment-T moves away then circles back
Embodiment-T on chair
Embodiment-T signals calmness
Embodiment-T sitting on floor
Embodiment-T squats
Embodiment-T stands signlg end of WC
Embodiment-T Touch
Embodiment-Uses gesture to cross room to S
Embodiment-Welcoming body language
Humor- T S laugh together
Humor-laughter
Instruction- progress check
Instruction- structure moving thru time
Instruction- T modeling out loud composing
Instruction-Finding connections between sub-topics
Instruction-Narrowing topic
Instruction-S seeking specific info from T as resource
Instruction-T listening closely use S story to teach
Instruction-T reads S work - paper
Instructional - Editing
Instructional - ESL
Instructional - explaining assignment

231

Instructional - Management other Ss
Instructional - Management surveys class
Instructional - S comments on S writing process
Instructional - S figures out mechanics
Instructional - S reads own work
Instructional - S topic block - stuck
Instructional - T advises write now cut later
Instructional - T closing gap
Instructional - T restates directions
Instructional - T using Questioning
Instructional - T validates S
Instructional - Talk as prewrite
Instructional - Whole class
Instructional - Word choice incl cuss
Instructional - Working at Home vs School
Instructional - Write what you just said
Instructional - Writing as thinking
Instructional -Proximal other Ss come in
Instructional -T explains how to elaborate
Instructional -Teaching for independence-not writing
Instructional- On point topic instruction
Instructional- Own personal stories
Instructional- S talks into T space
Instructional- S writes
Instructional- T creates map for S
Instructional- T names what S IS doing wrtg
Instructional- T steers S toward topic
Instructional- T uses questions to plumb S logic
Instructional-Brainstorming out loud
Instructional-Connections life to topic
Instructional-Double message eg fine-not
Instructional-Evaluative
Instructional-Gentle respectful tone
Instructional-How to classify in essay
Instructional-Invites Ss talk
Instructional-Management conversation
Instructional-Mechanics made explicit
Instructional-S composes sentence by Talk
Instructional-S re-states T instruction
Instructional-S talks about memory
Instructional-T ackn S still thinking
Instructional-T advises revision
Instructional-T attempts to helps S organizationally
Instructional-T checks on topic

Instructional-T comments complexity
Instructional-T comments on S writing process
Instructional-T giving specific advice tips
Instructional-T insists on keeping writing time
Instructional-T responds as Reader
Instructional-T silently reading screen
Instructional-T uses example from own life to instruct
Instructional-T uses You Want as way pzitn S
Instructional-T vocalizes S writing
Instructional-TAKS
Instructional-Talk as direct scaffold
Instructional-Teaching for independence as writer
Instructional-Teaching vocabulary
Instructional-Usage correction
Instructional-Uses I-statement to instruct
Instructional-Walk by
Intertextual- refers to prior conversation
Opening-First sentence
Opening-How are you doing
Opening-Idea
Opening-S answers unasked T query
Opening-S asks Q of T
Opening-S looking for reassurance
Opening-T answers unasked S query
Opening-T asks student about plans
Opening-T awaits S summons
Opening-T comments S progress
Opening-Topic
Relational - Cliques
Relational - Privacy
Relational - S deflects T attn
Relational - Smile
Relational - T responds to S content
Relational- High expectations
Relational- Humorous tone
Relational- S offers T smile
Relational- T asks S about pers life
Relational- Takes pleasure S lang choice
Relational-Alpha male stuff
Relational-Conv about Race
Relational-Humor with edge
Relational-Reconciliation
Relational-S open w T personal life
Relational-S to S tease

Relational-S wants to please T
Relational-Ss first Rules second
Relational-T approval
Relational-T mediates btw 2 S
Relational-T mirrors S words
Relational-T names behavior
Relational-T offers encouragement
Relational-T self as GREEN
Relational-T self censors to honor S
Relational-T self-depr humor
Relational-T shares family story
Relational-T uses I-statement to instruct
Relational-Trust
Research-effect of rschr presence
S in tutor role to other S
S Rspnse Instrcn - disappointment
S Rspnse Instrcn - surprise at own progress
S Rspnse Instrcn-resistance
S Rspnse Instrctn-Continues to engage T after closing
S Rspnse to Instr-takes it up
S Rspnse to Instrcn-Shows he IS on task
S Rspnse to Instructn - S starts writing
S Rspnse to Walk By- Stays writing does not engage T
S Rspnse to Walk By-S not engage T w words
S Rspsnse to Instrctn-Gently get rid of T
S to S - reassurance
S to S conversation
S to S playfulness
S to T- offers reason why little progress
S to T-Assertive - go away
S-Moral tale from home
Student KH Don NonFS
Student - Benjamin NonFS
Student - Joseph NonFS
Student - KH Alexander NonFS
Student - KH Angela -nonFS
Student - KH Anthony Williams NonFS
Student - KH Atticus NonFS
Student - KH Averry NonFS
Student - KH Dahvie NonFS
Student - KH Diamond NonFS
Student - KH Fake
Student - KH Jacinto Perez NonFS
Student - KH Jake NonFS

Student - KH JC Candy Nonfs
Student - KH John NonFS
Student - KH Julien
Student - KH Lake FSbu
Student - KH Luke NonFS
Student - KH Mac BUfs
Student - KH Mark FSbu
Student - KH Matthew Reyes NonFS
Student - KH Pedro
Student - KH Rachel NonFS
Student - KH Rudolfo NonFS
Student - KH ShaNequa
Student- J Martinez NonFS
Student- KH Billy Bob NonFS
Student- Lydia
Student- Lydia Non-FS
Student- Margarita
Student- Reggie
Student- Reggie Non FS
Student- Tommy
Student-Boo
Student-Christina Non FS
Student-KH Brooke
Student-Sabrina-Tupac
Student-Tupac
Surveillance by T
T Reflects on Practice
T reflects-The English Teacher not
Technology-T assists S
Technology-T own practices
Technology-Web control ISD
Turn-Taking- Possible CA exchange
_____ (End list of codes)

APPENDIX J

Transcription Conventions

Filled pause: um, hmm

Pause: very brief (,) ; elipses (beFORE…)

Timed pause (5s) (2+ seconds)

Emphasis: capital letters indicates an emphatic tone (VE-ry good) (Gee, 1999);
underlined word indicates a stresses word (<u>word</u>) (Gee, 1999)

Backchannel: uh-huh, yeah, o.k., (all) right

Minimal response: Uh-huh (= yes), mmm-hum (= yes), Uh-uh (= no), Yeah, O.K., (All)
Right

Paralinguistic: Nonverbal features in parentheses and in italics near relevant text

[Dialogue *(as she reads his work)*]; (*laughing*)

Additional features: On own line, in italics   (*As T reads his work, Julien sits with his
hands folded -- fingers working -- and his forearms resting on the desk*)

Analytic: xxx Indecipherable or doubtful hearing

Adapted from Gilewicz and Thonus (2003), and where marked, from Gee (1999).

APPENDIX K   Julien, WC, analysis, Oct. 22, 2009

KH DA Julien Jackson -- Quotation Marks WC
Oct. 22, 2009
Video: [00:13:54.18] TO [00:14:36.26] (sound is messed up)
Backup Audio: 13:48 TO 14:08 – file name: WS330008_KH_10_22_09.WMA
WC Duration: 18 seconds
Assignment: working on Smoke Signals paper.
Justification: This is only WC for this student for round one
Context: Julien often sat with a few other young men who were from Mexico. This clique had a studious tone – the students who sat there were very attentive to their work – while relaxed and reasonably social.
SRI file name: Have Julien's commentary on this WC in SRI: Jan. 11, 2010 WS330042.WMA TRANSCRIPT
Student work: 10/28 and prior - based on film "Smoke Signals" NOTES; drafts and 1st essay - some 2nd version of this ESSAY -- 70% looks like an early version -- typed – plus lots Teacher comments

Line #	Who	TRANSCRIPT	Social interaction (Relational)	Building Knowledge (Instructional)	Comments
1.	KH	KH on her knees, and just conducted a WC with JC Candy who is sitting next to Julien.			
2.	Julien	Julien has been listening in and watching the exchange.		Proximal learning	
3.	KH	KH turns to face Julien and scoots a couple of feet toward him, still on her knees.	Reduces her stature by going on her knees – makes herself smaller inside that small space	WC Approach (A)	
4.	KH	Her torso is vertical and about 8" from edge of his desk directly across from him; her left hand holds the audio recorder and her wrist bone rests on the edge of his desk; her hands do not touch his desk otherwise.	Respects S space. Creates a temporary initiate/consultative space.		
5.	KH:	"Julien" how are you doing {13:49 audio} [00:13:54.18]	T knows his name and uses it inside a friendly, generic greeting. Greeting to a person – not just as a T looking in on an	Opening (B)	INTERTEXTUAL understanding of the language of WCs

237

			assignment		
6.	Julien	Ok-ay *(sing-songy voice; S adds to a drawing on his book cover while speaking with teacher)*	Polite, generic response to generic greeting		Tone of response qualifies his response – masking. Is drawing a **distancing/deflection** move – that is, he doesn't have to look into her face esp when she is so close?
7.	Julien	I just had a question for you *(S continues drawing)*	(Intertextual) S understands that T refers to "how is your writing coming along?". Through use of "just" -- Indicates his need is minimal	S opens WC with a specific question – labels what is is about to ask	
8.	KH	mmHUH (video 13:59:11)	T signals that she is listening.	T listens to S question	S drawing as distancing? T does not react other than observe him drawing.
9.	Julien	Whenever you have, like whenever you're writing in quotes and you have a question and that's like the end of the sentence *(S continues drawing)*	Not looking KH in the face – his drawing task **deflects** this	S asks for the "rule"	
10.	KH:	mmHUH (video 14:00.10)	T signals that she is listening.		
11.	Julien	Where do you put the question mark, inside the quotes, or outside the quotes?	Interrogative	S narrows his question.	**Question: Inside**
12.	KH:	Inside the quotes	Declarative Mirrors S language	Direct answer to direct question	**Response: Inside**
13.	Julien	Inside? *(Julien stops drawing)*	Interrogative – Mirrors T language Signal for more explanation. Deflection stops.	Asking for fuller explanation	**Question: Inside**
14.	KH:	Inside	Declarative Mirrors S language	Answering his query without elaboration.	**Response: Inside**
15.	KH	Very good question, too –	Prefacing explanation of mechanics with Validating/Evaluative response (2X)	Evaluative: Assumes there are good questions and bad ones; and that this is somehow a "good" one.	Good/Bad Q
16.	Julien	Okay	Signals he accepts her answer and her evaluation of his question.		A bit of relief that it IS a "good" question
17.	KH	very good question	Validates his "good" question for the second time	Evaluative – good v bad q	Good/Bad Q
18.	KH:	Good	Evaluative/Validating	T is in her role as an evaluator/reader/teacher.	Good/Bad Q

19.	KH	That looks great [video 14:06:20] *(points to a place on his text with index finger)*	Validating	Evaluative	
20.	KH	*(T has read first bit, upside-down – then with her left hand which is closest to his notebook, she turns his notebook to herself with fingertips (not index finger), AND him in a shared positioning)*	Closing the gap-move		A closing of physical space
21.	KH	Dialogue *(as she reads his work)*	Making her thinking process visible to him as she reads his work	Names what he IS doing	
22.	KH	*(T says this as she reads the turned notebook – she rests her knuckles on the page and points to words with her left thumb) [video 14:08:01]*	Closing the gap-move	T is in her role as an evaluator/reader/teacher.	A closing of physical space – raised palm is off his page yet one digit points to the object of their shared attention. (? Thumb vs Index as pointer finger?)
23.	KH	awesome [video 14:08:57]	Validating (space closing with words?)	Evaluative	Teacher reads his work silently and comments as she moves down his page. Specifically praises his inclusion of dialogue
24.	Julien	*As T reads his work, Julien sits with his hands folded -- fingers working -- and his forearms resting on the desk*	respectful posture; a little nervous (?)		S seems pretty relaxed and very receptive to this T attention and interaction
25.	KH	VE-ry good [video 14:14:20]	Validating	Evaluative comment	
26.	KH	o *KH reaches across desk with left arm in a graceful motion – hand relaxed, palm up* o *Holds gaze with Julien* o *She completes the motion when she reaches for the pen in his hand.* o *He looks down at his hand, her hand, the pen [Video 14:15:11]* o *He gives up the pen, folds his hands.* o *She pulls her arm*	Closing the gap physical move		**The Pen Move** (?Does KH use physical space to aggressively close gap? eg. eating Brooke's snacks?)

		back, pen in hand, toward his paper [video 14:16:03]			
27.	Other S	Hampshire		Other student bids for attention	
28.	KH	I'll be right there	T is calm and polite		
29.	KH	(to Julien) beFORE…		Begins her individualized lesson to Julien	
30.	Julien	Uh-hum	Signals that he's listening		
31.	KH	…these quotes, there's always a comma, right there		Explains "the rule" as she writes it	
32.	KH	*T uses pen to circle something on his paper and uses pen to make a note on his paper [video 14:17:08]*	Student's work is in his notebook – front page folded back.	Leaving a way for him to refer to this instructional conversation. Very miminalist "intrusion" into S writing.	NOTE: This work is done in Julien's notebook which I have. KH on the video made small circling movements with an mechanical pencil – I have the page with her circles on it. Very minimal.
33.	Julien	Oh, okay *(he leans it for a better look [00:14:19.08]*			
34.	KH:	So, two things This -- question mark inside the front of these and the comma always remember that		Shift to very didactic mode – very much a moment of direct instruction	
35.	Julien	Also if it has like a point, right? Like it's the end of a sentence		Julien re-stating T instruction – checking himself with her as mediator	Julien doesn't have the word "period" – working to get it conceptually
36.	KH:	Hummum	Signals she's understanding him – Does not burden him with punctuation vocabulary -- listens	T gives S space to construct his understanding	
37.	Julien	It goes inside		Constructing his understanding	
38.	KH	Uh-hummm	Validate his work on his own understanding		
39.	Julien	Okay	Signals he's got it	Student begins Closing the WC	
40.	KH:	Okay	Mirrors S language	T agrees to closing the WC	
41.	KH	Perfect (AUDIO 14:08)	Signals WC is about to end	Formalizes End of WC Closing (A) – task is inferred	T signals that she, too, is satisfied with HIS uptake of the learning (Okay) AND that the encounter as a whole was satisfactory and

240

					is over (perfect).
42.	KH	*(KH rises to standing and walks away)* [Video 00:14:34.17]	Signals end of WC	Closing (B) Leave-Taking	

APPENDIX L   77 instructional codes – open coding HyperResearch

Code	Total	Min	Bar Graph
Instruction– progress check	13	0	
Instruction– structure moving thru time	3	0	
Instruction– T modeling out loud composing	6	0	
Instruction–Finding connections between sub-topics	9	0	
Instruction–Narrowing topic	10	0	
Instruction–S seeking specific info from T as resource		16	
Instruction–T listening closely use S story to teach	13	0	
Instruction–T reads S work – paper	13	0	
Instructional – Editing	3	0	
Instructional – ESL	1	0	
Instructional – explaining assignment	14	0	
Instructional – Management other Ss	2	0	
Instructional – Management surveys class	2	0	
Instructional – S comments on S writing process	8	0	
Instructional – S figures out mechanics	4	0	
Instructional – S reads own work	1	0	
Instructional – S topic block – stuck	7	0	
Instructional – T advises write now cut later	3	0	
Instructional – T closing gap	15	0	
Instructional – T restates directions	8	0	
Instructional – T using Questioning	24	0	
Instructional – T validates S	19	0	
Instructional – Talk as prewrite	6	0	
Instructional – Whole class	28	0	
Instructional – Word choice incl cuss	2	0	
Instructional – Working at Home vs School	2	0	
Instructional – Write what you just said	3	0	
Instructional – Writing as thinking	2	0	
Instructional –Proximal other Ss come in	9	0	
Instructional –T explains how to elaborate	10	0	
Instructional –Teaching for independence–not writing		9	
Instructional– On point topic instruction	11	0	
Instructional– Own personal stories	3	0	
Instructional– S talks into T space	7	0	
Instructional– S writes	1	0	
Instructional– T creates map for S	7	0	
Instructional– T names what S IS doing wrtg		28	0
Instructional– T steers S toward topic	10	0	
Instructional– T uses questions to plumb S logic	10	0	
Instructional–Brainstorming out loud	5	0	
Instructional–Connections life to topic	6	0	
Instructional–Double message eg fine-not	1	0	
Instructional–Evaluative	21	0	
Instructional–Gentle respectful tone	9	0	
Instructional–How to classify in essay	1	0	
Instructional–Invites Ss talk	7	0	

242

Code	Total	Min	Bar Graph
Instructional–Management conversation	1	0	
Instructional–Mechanics made explicit	3	0	
Instructional–S composes sentence by Talk		2	0
Instructional–S re-states T instruction	1	0	
Instructional–S talks about memory	6	0	
Instructional–T ackn S still thinking	5	0	
Instructional–T advises revision	1	0	
Instructional–T attempts to helps S organizationally		5	0
Instructional–T checks on topic	5	0	
Instructional–T comments complexity	2	0	
Instructional–T comments on S writing process		9	0
Instructional–T giving specific advice tips	5	0	
Instructional–T insists on keeping writing time		7	0
Instructional–T responds as Reader	26	0	
Instructional–T silently reading screen	16	0	
Instructional–T uses example from own life to instruct		3	
Instructional–T uses You Want as way pzitn S		7	0
Instructional–T vocalizes S writing	7	0	
Instructional–TAKS	1	0	
Instructional–Talk as direct scaffold	4	0	
Instructional–Teaching for independence as writer		6	0
Instructional–Teaching vocabulary	5	0	
Instructional–Usage correction	6	0	
Instructional–Uses I-statement to instruct	9	0	
Instructional–Walk by	16	0	

Total: 71   550

References

Alder, N. (2002). Interpretations of the meaning of care: Creating caring relationships in urban middle school classrooms. *Urban Education, 37*(2), 241-266.

Alder, N., & Moulton, M. R. (1998). Caring relationships: Perspectives from middle school students. . *Research in Middle Level Education Quarterly, 21*(3), 15-22.

Alexie, S. (Writer), & C. Eyre (Director) (1998). Smoke Signals. In S. Rosenfeldt & B. Carpener (Producer). Canada/USA.

Alexie, S. (2007). *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*. New York: Little, Brown and Co.

Allington, R. L., & Johnston, P. H. (2001). *Reading to learn: Lessons from exemplary fourth-grade classrooms*. New York: Guilford.

Anderman, L. H., & Freeman, T. M. (2004). Students' sense of belonging in school. In P. R. Pintrich & M. L. Maehr (Eds.), Advances in motivation and achievement (Vol. 13, pp. 27–63). Oxford, England: Elsevier.

Anderson, C. (2000). *How's It Going? A Practical Guide to Conferring With Student Writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Andrzejewski_, C. E., & Davis, H. A. (2008). Human contact in the classroom: Exploring how teachers talk about and negotiate touching students. *Teaching and Teacher Education 24*, 779–794.

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education, 162*(1), 67-92.

Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry, 11*(1), 1-42.

Applebee, A. N. (1996). *Curriculum as Conversation: Transforming Traditions of Teaching and Learning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Artman, Margaret A. (2005). What we say and do: The nature and role of verbal and nonverbal communication in teacher-student writing conferences. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee, United States -- Wisconsin. Retrieved April 22, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 3196004).

Assaf, L. (2008). Professional identity of a reading teacher: responding to high-stakes testing pressures. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 14* (3), 239-252.

Atwell, N. (1998). *In the Middle: New Understandings About Writing, Reading, and Learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1994). *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev and Voloshinov*. New York: Edward Arnold.

Beach, R., & Friedrich, T. (2006). Response to Writing. In C. A. MacArthur & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of Writing Research* (pp. 222-234). New York City: Guilford Press.

Bean, T. W., Bean, S. K., & Bean, K. F. (1999). Intergenerational conversations and two adolescents' multiple literacies: Implications for redefining content area literacy. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 42*(6), 438-448.

Belhiah, H. (2009). Tutoring as an embodied activity: How speech, gaze and body orientation are coordinated to conduct ESL tutorial business. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*, 829-841.

Bereiter, C. (1994). Implications of Postmodernism for Science, or, Science as Progressive Discourse. *Educational Psychologist, 29*(2), 3-12.

Blair, T. R., Rupley, W. H., & Nichols, W. D. (2007). The effective teacher of reading. Considering the "what" and "how" of instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 60*, 432-438.

Bloome, D., Carter, S. P., Christian, B. M., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005). *Discourse Analysis and the Study of Classroom Language and Literacy Events: A Microethnographic Perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bogdan, R. C., & Bicklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bogdan, R. C., & Bicklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods* (Fourth ed.). New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Bomer, R., & Bomer, K. (2001). Introduction: Questioning our teaching and making it better. In R. Bomer & K. Bomer (Eds.), *For a Better World: Reading and Writing for Social Action* (pp. 1-9). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Bomer, K. (2010). *Hidden Gems: Naming and Teaching from the Brilliance in Every Student's Writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Bosworth, K. (1995). Caring for Others and Being Cared For. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(9), 686-694.

Burbules, N. C., & Rice, S. (1991). Dialogue across differences. *Harvard Educational Review, 61*(4), 393-416.

Burbules, N. C., & Rice, S. (2010). On Pretending to Listen. *Teachers college record, 112*(11), 1-7 (10-11).

Calkins, L. M. (1994). *The Art of Teaching Writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Calkins, L., Hartman, A., & White, Z. R. (2005). *One to One : The Art of Conferring with Young Writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with Spoken Discourse*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Camangian, P. (2009). Real Talk Transformative English Teaching and Urban Youth. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Justice in Education* (pp. 497-507). Hoboken, NJ: Routledge.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cho, K., Schunn, C. D., & Charney, D. (2006). Typology and Perceived Helpfulness of Comments from Novice Peer Reviewers and Subject Matter Experts. *Written communication, 23*(3), 260-294.

Christoph, J. N., & Nystrand, M. (2001). Taking Risks, Negotiating Relationships: One Teacher's Transition Toward a Dialogic Classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English, 36*, 249-286.

City-Data.com. (2009). "Pseudonym *Govenor School in City, State"-- Test Results, Rating, Ranking, Detailed Profile and Report Card*. Retrieved June 10, 2009, from http://www.city-data.com/school/"govenor"-high-school-tx.html

City-Data.com. (2010). "Pseudonym *Govenor School in City, State" -- Test Results, Rating, Ranking, Detailed Profile and Report Card*. Retrieved April 24, 2011, from http://www.city-data.com/school/"govenor"-high-school-tx.html

Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. M. (2005). *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (Google Books ed.): AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education; Routledge.

Compton-Hall, M. (2004). Establishing a culture of acceptance: "This kinda stuff don't happen ever'where" *National Reading Conference Yearbook, 53*, 1-13.

Corsaro, W. (1981). Entering the child's world: Research strategies for field entry and data collection in a pre-school setting. In J. Green & C. Wallach (Eds.), *Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings* (pp. 117-147). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Cushman, K. (2003). *Fires in the bathroom* (electronic 2005 ed.). New York: The New Press.

Daniels, H. (2001). *Literature Circles: Voice and Choice in Book Clubs and Reading Groups* (2nd ed.). Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching*. Kutztown, PA: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Davies, B., & Harre´, R. (2001). Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & Simeon Yates (Eds.), *Discourse Theory and Practice* (pp. 261-271). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: the discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The Free Press.

Dinnen, J. L. D., & Collopy, R. M. B. (2009). An Analysis of Feedback Given to Strong and Weak Student Writers. *Reading horizons, 49*(3), 239-256.

DiPardo, A. (1994). Stimulated Recall in Research on Writing An Antidote to "I Don't Know, It Was Fine". In P. Smagorinsky (Ed.), *Speaking About Writing: Reflection on Research Methodology* (pp. 163-184). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dyson, A. H., & Ganeshi, C. (2005). *On the case: Approaches to Language and Literacy Research (An NCRLL Volume)*. New York: Teachers College.

Emig, J. (1971). *The Composing Process of 12th Graders*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). In the Field: Participating, Observing, and Jotting Notes. In *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes* (pp. 17-35). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Erickson, F. (1992). Ethnographic Microanalysis of Interaction. In M. D. LeCompte, W. L. Millroy & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education* (pp. 201-225). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.

Erickson, F. (1996). Going for the zone: the social and cognitive ecology of teacher-student interaction in classroom conversations. In D. Hicks (Ed.), *Discourse, learning and schooling* (pp. 29-63). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Erickson, F. (2006). *Talk and Social Theory: Ecologies of Speaking and Listening in Everyday Life*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Ferreira, M. M., & Bosworth, K. (2001). Defining Caring Teachers: Adolescents' Perspectives. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 36*(1), 24-30.

Fitzgerald, J., & Stamm, C. (1992). Variation in Writing Conference Influence on Revision: Two Cases. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 24*(1), 21-49.

Fletcher, R., & Portalupi, J. (2001). *Writing Workshop*. York, ME: Stenhouse.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32*(4), 365-387.

Fox, B. (1999). Directions in Research: Language and the Body. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 32*(1&2), 51-59.

Freedman, S. W., Greenleaf, C., & Sperling, M. (1987). *Response to Student Writing*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Freedman, S. W., & Sperling, M. (1985). Written Language Acquisition: The Role of Response and the Writing Conference. In S. W. Freedman (Ed.), *The Acquisition of Written Language: Response and Revision* (pp. 106-130). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Friere, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, Inc.

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. Hoboken, NJ: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Garza, R. (2009). Latino and White High School Students' Perceptions of Caring Behaviors: Are We Culturally Responsive to our Students? *Urban Education, 44*(3), 297-321.

Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated Recall Methodology in Second Language Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge Falmer.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. London: Routledge.

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture. In C. Geertz (Ed.), *The Interpretations of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.

Gilewicz, M., & Thonus, T. (2003). Close vertical transcription in writing center training and research. *Writing Center Journal 24*(1), 25-49.

Glasswell, K., & Parr, J. M. (2009). Teachable Moments: Linking Assessment and Teaching in Talk around Writing. *Language Arts, 86*(5), 352-361.

Goffman, E. (1981). Replies and Responses. In *Forms of Talk* (pp. 5-77). Philadelphia:
247

University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goldstein, L. S. (1999). The relational zone: The role of caring relationships in the co-construction of mind. *American Educational Research Journal, 36*(3), 647-673.

Goldstein, L. S. (March 1, 2007). Lecture: Interviewing [Power Point] (pp. 16): University of Texas at Austin.

Gonzalez, N. (2005). Beyond culture: The hybridity of funds of knowledge. In N. Gonzalez, L. C. Moll & C. Amanti (Eds.), *Funds of Knowedge* (pp. 29-46). Mahwah, NH: Erlbaum.

Goodman, K. S. (1969). Analysis of Oral Reading Miscues: Applied Psycholinguistics. *Reading Research Quarterly, 5*(1).

Graves, D. H. (1983). The child, the writing process and the role of the professional. In *A Researcher Learns to Write: Selected Articles and Monographs* (pp. 16-25). Exeter, NH: Heinemann.

Greene, S., & Higgins, L. (1994). "Once Upon a Time" The Use of Retrospective Accounts in Building Theory in Composition. In P. Smagorinsky (Ed.), *Speaking About Writing: Reflections on Research Methodology* (pp. 115-140). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Grossman, P., & McDonald, M. (2008). Back to the Future: Directions for Research in Teaching and Teacher Education. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(1), 184-205.

Gutierrez, K. D., Baquedano-Lopez, P., & Tejeda, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 6*(4), 286-303.

Hall, E. T. (1966). *The Hidden Dimension*. Garden City, NJ: Anchor Books.

Hanks, W. F. (1991). Forward by William Hanks. In J. Lave & E. Wenger (Eds.), *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation* (pp. 13-24). New York Cambridge University Press.

Hanks, W. F. (1996). Language Form and Communicative Practice. In J. J. Gumperz & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (GoogleBooks ed., pp. 232-270). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hargreaves, A. (2001). Emotional geographies of teaching. *Teachers college record, 103*(6), 1056-1080.

Hargreaves, A. (2000). Mixed Emotions: Teachers' Perceptions of their Interactions with Students. *Teaching and teacher education, 16*(8), 811-826.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, S. B., & Street, B. V. (2008). *Ethnography: Approaches to Language and Literacy Research (An NCRLL Volume)*. New York: Teachers College.

Hubbard, R. S., & Power, B. M. (1999). *Living the Questions: A Guide for Teacher-Researchers*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations of Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Immediacy Behaviors. (2008) in International Encyclopedia of Communication online. Retrieved from

http://www.communicationencyclopedia.com/public/tocnode?query=manusov&widen=1&result_number=3&from=search&id=g9781405131995_chunk_g978140513199525_ss13-1&type=std&fuzzy=0&slop=1

Intrator, S. M., & Kunzman, R. (2009). Who are adolescents today? Youth voices and what they tell us. In L. Christenbury, R. Bomer & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Handbook of Adolescent Literacy Research* (pp. 29-45). New York: The Guilford Press.

Jacobs, S. E., & Karliner, A. B. (1977). Helping Writers to Think: The Effect of Speech Roles in Individual Conferences on the Quality of Thought in Student Writing. *College English, 38*(5), 489-505.

Jimenez, R. T., & Rose, B. C. (2010). Knowing How to Know: Building Meaningful Relationships Through Instruction that Meets the Needs of Studnts Learning English *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(5), 403-412.

JohnL. (2003). "Aight", *Urban dictionary: The intertube dictionary*.

John-Steiner, V. (2000). *Creative Collaborations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Johnston, P. H. (2004). *Choice Words: How Our Language Affects Children's Learning*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kachur, R., & Prendergast, C. (1997). A Closer Look at Authentic Interaction: Profiles of Teacher-Student Talk in Two Classrooms. In M. Nystrand, A. Gamoran, R. Kachur & C. Prendergast (Eds.), *Opening Dialogue: Understanding the Dynamics of Language and Learning in the English Classroom* (pp. 75-88). New York City: Teachers College Press.

Kaufman, D. (2000). *Conferences and conversations listening to the literate classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Kittle, P. (2008). *Write Beside Them Risk, Voice, and Clarity in High School Writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Klem, A. M., & Connell, J. P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health*, 74, 262–273.

Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: a semiotic approach to literature and art* (Vol. GoogleBooks). New York: Columbia University Press.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Langer, J. A. (2009). Contexts for adolescent literacy. In L. Christenbury, R. Bomer & P. Smagorinsk (Eds.), *Handbook of Adolescent Literacy Research* (pp. 49-64). New York: The Guilford Press.

Larson, J., & Maier, M. (2000). Co-Authoring Classroom Texts: Shifting Participant Roles in Writing Activity. *Research in the Teaching of English, 34*, 468-497.

Lavé, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. New York City: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, G., & Schallert, D. L. (2008). Constructing Trust Between Teacher and Students Through Feedback and Revision Cycles in an EFL Classroom *Written communication, 25*(4), 506-537.

Libbey, H. P. (2004). Measuring Student Relationships to School: Attachment, Bonding, Connectedness, and Engagement. *Journal of school health, 74*(7), 274-283.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lipson, M. Y., Mosenthal, J., Daniels, P., & Woodside-Jiron, H. (2000). Process Writing in the Classrooms of Eleven Fifth-Grade Teachers with Different Orientations to Teaching and Learning. *The Elementary School Journal, 101*(2), 209-231.

Liu, Y.. ESL students in the college writing conferences: Perception and participation [Abstract]. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Arizona, United States -- Arizona. Retrieved April 22, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 3359771).

Luke, A. (1992). The Body Literate: Discourse and Inscription in Early Literacy Training. *Linguistics and Education, 4*, 107-129.

Mahn, H. (1997). *Dialogue Journals: Perspectives of Second Language Learners in a Vygotskian Theoretical Framework*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

Mahn, H. (2003). Periods in Child Development Vygotsky's Perspective. In A. Kozulin, S. M. Miller, B. Gindis, V. S. Ageyev & S. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Context* (pp. 119-137). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mahn, H., & John-Steiner, V. (2007). The Gift of Confidence: A Vygotskian View of Emotions. In G. Wells & G. Claxton (Eds.), *Learning for Life in the 21st Century: Sociocultural Perspectives on the Future* (electronic ed., pp. 46-58). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1995). *Designing qualitative research* (Second ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Martin, L., & Mottet, T. P. (2011). The Effect of Instructor Nonverbal Immediacy Behaviors and Feedback Sensitivity on Hispanic Students' Affective Learning Outcomes in Ninth-Grade Writing Conferences. *Communication education 60* (1), 1-19.

Matsumura, L. C., Patthey-Chavez, G. G., Valdés, R., & Garnier, H. (2002). Teacher feedback, writing assignment quality, and third-grade students' revision in lower- and higher-achieving urban schools. *The Elementary School Journal, 103* (1), 3-25.

McCall, G. J., & Simmons, J. L. (Eds.). (1969). *Issues in participant observation: A text and reader*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

McCarthey, S. J. (1992). The Teacher, The Author, and the Text: Variations in Form and Content of Writing Conferences. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 24*(1), 51-82.

McCarthey, S. J. (1994). Author, Text, and Talk: The Internalization of Dialogue from Social Interaction During Writing. *Reading Research Quarterly, 29*(3), 200-231.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack. *McIntosh, P. 1988. White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.*, 7.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mercer, N. (1995). *The Guided Construction of Knowledge: Talk Amongst Teachers and Learners*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.

Mercer, N. (2007). Developing Dialogues. In G. Wells & G. Claxton (Eds.), *Learning for Life in the 21st Century: Sociocultural Perspectives on the Future* (pp. 142-153). Chichester, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco John Wiley and Sons.

Merry, R., & Moyles, J. R. (2003). Scuppering discussion? Interaction in theory and practice. In J. R. Moyles, V. Esarte-Sarries, R. Merry, L. Hargreaves & F. Paterson (Eds.), *Interactive teaching in the primary school: digging deeper into meanings* (pp. 15-30). Portland, OR: Open University Press.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A source book of new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Miller, A. (1953). *The Crucible*. New York: Penguin Books.

Moher, T. A. (2007). The Writing Conference: Journeys into Not Knowing. In T. Newkirk & R. Kent (Eds.), *Teaching the neglected "R": Rethinking writing instruction in the secondary classroom* (pp. 26-38). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Moll, L. C., & Whimore, K. (1996). Vygotsky in Classroom Practice: Moving from Individual Transmission to Social Transaction. In E. A. Forman, N. Minick & C. A. Stone. (Eds.), *Contexts for learning: sociocultural dynamics in children's development* (electronic resource ed., pp. 19-42). New York: Oxford University Press.

Morrell, E. (2010). Adolescent literacy policy. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 54*(2), 146-149.

Murray, D. M. (1982). Teaching the Other Self: The Writer's First Reader. *College Composition and Communication, 33*(2), 140-147. NCTE. (1985). *Teaching Composition: A Position Statement*. Retrieved March 20, 2008, from http://www.ncte.org/about/over/positions/category/write/107690.htm

National Writing Project. (2010). *Research Brief: Writing Project Professional Development Continues to Yield Gains in Student Writing Achievement* (No. 2). Berkely, CA: National Writing Project at the University of California.

NCTE. (2004, 2008). *NCTE Beliefs about the Teaching of Writing*. Retrieved Feb. 5, 2011, from http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/writingbeliefs

NCTE. (2009). *NCTE / IRA Standards for the English Language Arts*, from http://www.ncte.org/standards

NCTE. (2007). *Adolescent Literacy A Policy Research Brief produced by The National Council of Teachers of English*. Urbana, Illinois The James R. Squire Office for Policy Research.

Nieto, S. (1999). 'Funny, You Don't Look Puerto Rican', and Other Musings on Developing a Philosophical Orientation to Multicultural Education Research. In

251

C. A. Grant (Ed.), *Multicultural Research: A Reflective Engagement with Race, Class, Gender and Sexual Orientation* (pp. 145-156). Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Noblit, G. W., & Rogers, D. L. (1995). In the meantime. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(9), 680-686.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (2005). *The Challenge to Care in Schools: An Alternative Approach to Education* (2nd ed.). NYC: Teachers College Press.

Nye, B., Konstantopoulos, S., & Hedges, L. (2004). How large are teacher effects? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 26,* 237–257.

Nystrand, M. (1997a). Dialogic Instruction: When Recitation Becomes Conversation. In M. Nystrand, A. Gamoran, R. Kachur & C. Prendergast (Eds.), *Opening Dialogue: Understanding the Dynamics of Language and Learning in the English Classroom* (pp. 1-29). New York: Teachers College Press.

Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (1997). The Big Picture: Language and Learning in Hundreds of English Classrooms. In M. Nystrand, A. Gamoran, R. Kachur & C. Prendergast (Eds.), *Opening Dialogue* (pp. 30-74).

Ochs, E. (1993/1979). Transcription as Theory. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The Discourse Reader* (pp. 167-187). London: Routledge.

O'Connor, M. C., & Michaels, S. (1996). Shifting Participant Frameworks: Orchestrating Thinking Practices in Group Discussion. In D. Hicks (Ed.), *Discourse, Learning, and Schooling* (pp. 63-103). New York: Cambridge University Press (Google Books).

O'Connor, M. C., & Michaels, S. (2007). When Is Dialogue 'Dialogic'? *Human Development, 50,* 275-285.

Parker, W. C. (2010). Listening to Strangers: Classroom Discussion in Democratic Education. *Teachers college record, 112*(11), 7-8 (1-9).

Passel, J. S., & Cohn, D. V. (2008). *(Pew Report) U.S. Population Projections: 2005-2050.* Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Pearson, P. D., & Gallagher, M. C. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. . *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 8*(3), 317-344.

Perks, K. (2005). Dialogue Folders: Creating Space to Engage Students in Conversation about Their Writing In T. M. McCann, L. R. Johannessen, E. A. Kahn, P. Smagorinsky & M. W. Smith (Eds.), *Reflective Teaching, Reflective Learning How to Develop Critically Engaged Readers, Writers, and Speakers.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Perl, S. (1979). The Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers. *Research in the Teaching of English, 13*(4), 317-336.

Peterson, S. S., & Kennedy, K. (2006). Sixth-Grade Teachers' Written Comments on Student Writing : Genre and Gender Differences. *Written communication, 21*(1), 36-62.

Pink, S. (2001). *Doing visual ethnography: Images, media and representation in*

research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Porter, D. (2008). Senior VP/Economic Development Austin Chamber of Commerce: Population Density: Persons Per Square Mile, 2008, *PDF*: Experian/Applied Geographic Solutions.

Powers, W. R. (2005). *Transcription techniques for the spoken word* (GoogleBookPreview ed.). Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

Pressley, M., Allington, R., Wharton-McDonald, R., Block, C.C., & Morrow, L.M. (2001). *Learning to read: Lessons from exemplary first grades*. New York Guildford.

Ray, K. W., & Laminack, L. L. (2001). Understanding the Essential Characteristics of the Writing Workshop. In *Writing Workshop: The Working through the Hard Parts (And They're All Hard Parts)* (pp. 1-15). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Ray, K. W., & Cleaveland, L. B. (2004). *About the Authors: Writing Workshop with our Youngest Authors*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Roeser, R.W., Eccles, J. S., & Sameroff, A. J. (2000). School as context of early adolescents' academic and socio-emotional development: A summary of research findings. *The Elementary School Journal*, 100, 443–472.

Rose, M. (1985). Complexity, rigor, evolving method and the puzzle of writer's block: Thoughts on composing-process research. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a Writer Can't Write*. New York: Guilford Press.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*, 696-735.

Schegeloff, E. (1998). Body Torque. *Social Research, 65*(3), 535-596.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening Up Closings. *Semiotica, 8*, 289-327.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Schön, D. A. (1984). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Schultz, K. (2010). After the Blackbird Whistles: Listening to Silence in Classrooms. *Teachers college record, 112*(11), 8-9 (1-8).

Scollin, R. (1999). Mediated Discourse and Social Interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 32*(1&2), 149-154.

Scollon, R. (2001). *Mediated Discourse: The Nexus of Practice*. New York: Routledge.

SEDL. *Evolution of the Concept "At-Risk": Identification Criteria for At-Risk Students in the Southwestern Region*. Retrieved Set. 15, 2009, from http://www.sedl.org/rural/atrisk/concept.html

Shields, C. M. M., & Edwards, M. M. (2005). *Dialogue Is Not Just Talk: A New Ground for Educational Leadership*. New York: Peter Lang.

Shochet I.M., D. M. R., Ham D. & Montague R., . (2006). School Connectedness Is an Underemphasized Parameter in Adolescent Mental Health: Results of a Community Prediction Study;. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 35*(2), 170–179.

Smagorinsky, P. (1997). Artistic Composing as Representational Process. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 18*, 87-105.

Smagorinsky, P., Zoss, M., & Reed, P. M. (2006). Residential interior design as complex

composition: A case study of a high school senior's composing process. *Written Composition, 23*, 295-330.

Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to Student Writing. *College composition and communication, 33*(2), 148-156.

Sperling, M. (1990). I Want To Talk To Each of You: Collaboration and the Teacher Student Writing Conference. *Research in the Teaching of English, 24*(3), 279-321.

Sperling, M. (1991). Dialogues of Deliberation: Conversation in the Teacher-Student Writing Conference. *Written Communication, 8*(2), 131-162.

Sperling, M. (1992). In-Class Writing Conferences: Fine-Tuned Duets in-the Classroom Ensemble. *English Journal, 81*(4), 65-71.

Sperling, M. (1994). Constructing the perspective of teacher-as-reader: A framework for studying response to student sriting. *Reseach in the Teaching of English, 28*(2), 175-207.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spindler, G. D., & Spindler, L. (1987). Teaching and Learning How to Do the Ethnography of Education. In G. D. Spindler & L. Spindler (Eds.), *Interpretive Ethnography of Education: At Home and Abroad* (pp. 17-36). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence-Erlbaum Associates.

Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple Case Study Analysis* New York: The Guilford Press.

Strauss, S., & Xiang, X. (2006). The Writing Conference as a Locus of Emergent Agency. *Written Communication, 23*(4), 355-396.

Street, B. (1993). The New Literacy Studies. In B. Street (Ed.), *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy* (pp. 430-442). London: Cambridge University Press.

Stuhlman, M. W., & Pianta, R. C. (2009). Profiles of Educational Quality in First Grade. *The Elementary School Journal, 109*(4), 323-342.

TEA. (2008). *2007-08 Report Card "Govenor" High School 22790xxxx*. Retrieved July 11, 2009, from http://www."crest".net/schools/cpi/AEIS_ReportCard/CHS_RC.pdf

TEA. (2009). *Final 2008 AYP Results "Govenor" High School 22790xxxxx*. Retrieved July 11, 2009, from http://www."crest"isd.net/schools/cpi/AYP/CHS_AYP.pdf

Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing Minds to Life: Teaching, Learning, and Schooling in Social Context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1991). *The Instructional Conversation: Teaching and Learning in Social Activity*. Berkeley, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence University of California.

Thompson, I. (2009). Scaffolding in the Writing Center: A Microanalysis of an Experienced Tutor's Verbal and Nonverbal Strategies. *Written Communication, 26*(4), 417-453.

Thonus, T. (2008). Acquaintanceship, familiarity, and coordinated laughter in writing tutorials. *Linguistics and Education, 19*, 333-350.

Tickle-Degnen, L., & Rosenthal, R. (1990). The Nature of Rapport and Its Nonverbal Correlates. *Psychological Inquiry, 1*(4), 285-293.

254

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering Toward Utopia A Century of Public School Reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

Underwood, J. (2008, June 24-28). *Effective feedback: guidelines for improving performance*. Paper presented at the 8th international conference on International conference for the learning science, Utrecht, The Netherlands.

Valencia, R. R. (2010). *Dismantling Contemporary Deficit Thinking* New York: Rutledge.

Valencia, R. (1997). Conceptualizing the Notion of Deficit Thinking. In R. Valencia (Ed.), *Conceptualizing the Notion of Deficit Thinking* (pp. 1-12). Abingdon Oxon, England: RoutledgeFalmer.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive Schooling: U.S.-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

van Manen, M. (1995). On the Epistemology of Reflective Practice. *Teachers and teaching: theory and practice, 1*(1), 33-50.

van Manen, M. (1991). *The tact of teaching: the meaning of pedagogical thoughtfulness*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walker, C. P., & Elias, D. (1987). Writing Conference Talk: Factors Associated with High- and Low-Rated Writing Conferences. *Research in the Teaching of English, 21*(3), 266-285.

Wells, G. (2007a). Semiotic Mediation, Dialogue and the Construction of Knowledge. *Human Development, 50*, 244-274.

Wells, G. (2007b). Who we become depends of the company we keep and on what we do and say together. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 100-103.

Wells, G. (2007c). The Mediating Role of Discoursing in Activity. *Mind, culture, and activity, 14*(3), 160-177.

Wells, G. (2001). The Case for Dialogic Inquiry. In G. Wells (Ed.), *Action, Talk and Text* (pp. 171-194). New York: Teachers College Press.

Wells, G., & Haneda, M. (2005). Extending Instructional Conversations. In O. D. Clifford R & L. A. Yamauchi (Eds.), *Culture and Context in Human Behavior Change: Theory, Research, and Applications* (pp. 1-23). New York: Peter Lang.

Wells, G., & Chang-Wells, G. L. (1992). *Constructing Knowledge Together: Classrooms as Centers of Inquiry and Literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wentzel, K. R. (2002). Are Effective Teachers Like Good Parents? Teaching Styles and Student Adjustment in Early Adolescence. *Child Development 73*(1), 287-301.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the Mind: A Sociocultural Approach to Mediated Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as Action* New York: Oxford University Press.

Winik, M. (1994). *Telling*. New York: Vintage Books.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The Role of Tutoring in Problem Solving. *Journal of Child Psychology &Psychiatry & Allied Disciplines, 17*(2), 89-100.

Worthy, J., Consalvo, A. L., Russell, K., & Bogard, T. (in press). Fostering Academic and Social Growth in a Primary Literacy Workshop Classroom: Restorying Students with Negative Reputations. *The elementary school journal*.

Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. (2000). *Doing Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.

Zembylas, M., & Isenbarger, L. (2002). Teaching Science to Students with Learning Disabilities: Subverting the Myths of Labeling through Teachers' Caring and Enthusiasm. *Research in Science Education, 32*(1), 55-79.