EVERYDAY LITERACY PRACTICES IN AND OUT OF SCHOOL
METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

WORK IN PROGRESS

Christine Ludwig
Department of Education
Queensland

Paul Herschell
Faculty of Education
Griffith University
Queensland

Director
Professor Peter Freebody
Faculty of Education
Griffith University
Queensland

_____

PROJECT TEAM

DirectorProfessor Peter Freebody

InvestigatorMs Christine Ludwig

Senior ResearchersMs Bronwyn Dwyer
Ms Jill Freiberg
Ms Stephanie Gunn

ResearchersMr Tim Forrest
Ms Sheridan Gray
Ms Meeri Hellsten
Mr Paul Herschell
Ms Haida Luke

Ms Judy Rose
Ms Joanne Wheeler

EVERYDAY LITERACY PRACTICES IN AND OUT OF SCHOOL

This paper aims to outline an ethnographic research project conducted
in Queensland with particular focus on the ethnomethodological
approaches to the collection, analysis and interpretation of the

extensive body of data. To this end I will describe briefly the background and purpose of the project, and the methodology employed for the collection of data. I will then briefly outline the analytical approaches to the analysis and interpretation of the data and discuss in more detail one of the analytical approaches drawing on systemic functional linguistic theory. I will use one of the transcripts from the large body of data to illustrate both the process of analysis and some of the interpretations of the data and consequent findings of the project.

INTRODUCTION

In studies of adult and child literacy an assumption is generally made that the literacy resources community members can draw on in daily life can be validly described and assessed as if they were a unitary set of essential or "underpinning' skills. That is the skills of reading and writing are typically taken to be context-free and transferable from one cultural and sub-cultural context to another.

Recently, however, linguists, sociologists, cognitive psychologists and literacy educators have, from varying perspectives, challenged this assumption, documenting the lack of 'transfer of training' from school literacy competencies to those called upon in work-place and community life, and arguing for the defining force of the contexts in which written texts are involved (eg Baker & Freebody, 1989; Baker & Luke, 1991; Brice-Heath, 1986; Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Freebody & Luke, 1990; Gee, 1991; Mikulecky, 1981). Part of the significance of this

challenge is that it draws attention away from abstract accounts of literacy competencies and onto the cognitive and social demands of the various situations in which people need to use written texts. Thus it offers parents, teachers, curriculum developers, researchers and employers specific ways of characterising meeting the needs of different learners in varying situations and cultural contexts.

This view of literacy is based on certain assumptions: that the literate requirements of the classroom, and of work, citizenship, and community participation differ in important ways; that these contexts call upon, select, and emphasise differing kinds of literacy competencies; and finally, that different literate environments shape people's understandings of the very nature, functions, and significance of literacy. That is, policy, curriculum, and teaching practices are based, explicitly or otherwise, both on descriptive, empirical claims about the actual uses of literacy in a community, and prescriptive claims about what sorts of literacy competencies should be used in a community. In spite of recent Commonwealth ILY initiatives, including the renewed interest in work-place literacy, and in spite of a proliferation of research on many aspects of literacy, there is very little available research on the actual uses of reading and writing in

everyday work, leisure and social relations.

Thus the theoretical position sketched above - that literacy practices are always socially and culturally embedded - must be viewed cautiously in the sense that it has been supported largely indirectly, by cross-cultural data of two sorts; ethnographic accounts and cognitive psychological studies of the beginnings of literacy among primary-oral cultures (Scribner & Cole, 1980; Street, 1984) and studies of oral language use among literate sub-cultures (Bernstein, 1975; Hasan , 1987). A few studies have directly addressed the pattterned literacy practices of literate groups marginalised through lack of access to educational provision: Lankshear (1987); Brice-Heath, (1986), Bull and Anstey, (!992) are notable instances. Aspects of these three research projects provided some methodological bases for this research project. Lankshear's effort in linking personal experiences in literacy with ideological/cultural conditions; Brice-Heath's categories of function and use; and Bull and Anstey's combination of survey data, task analysis, and ethnographic attitudes to and levels of literacy .in a rural community in rural community in southern Queensland.

The notion that literacy is best seen as involving context/specific cognitive and social resources rests on the broader idea that language competence is driven by contextual cultural demands, a background developed and documented by language ethnographers and by linguists working within a functional framework. This study, by exploring ways in which oral and written language uses are related in a range of concrete situations, has extended understanding of the beginnings and development of literate competencies. As such, it is also aimed to elaborate on Freebody's study of the suburban-school oral and written language use across a range of SES levels, and on Luke's study (both in progress) of literacy practices in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander classrooms. This study explores the extent to which and the ways in which these urban communities feel themselves to be involved in or alienated from the content and processes of literacy education.

This project, therefore, aims to detail the literacy practices of students in the early years of schooling, community members from a range of socio-economic backgrounds and of teachers in schools in these communities. The project is being conducted by Griffith University in collaboration with the Department of Education in Queensland, funded by the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) and managed

by Curriculum Corporation under the National Equity Program for Schools (NEPS) - Literacy and Learning National Component (LLNC).

THE PROJECT

This two year study is documenting, some prevalent quantitative and qualitative features of the networks of ideas and everyday practices

(such as oral language use, perceptions of language learning, leisure, and future, and demands in the school and wider community) and demands in and out of early childhood classrooms that shape the culture of literacy use connecting the practices in metropolitan urban and suburban economic schools.

The focus group for this project was students in their first three years of schooling. There is considerable research and professional experience that point to this as a period in which certain learnings about literacy are crucial for future success in and beyond the school years.

The project began in 1993. The first year of the project involved a study of literacy practices in and out of school and drew on ethnographic methodology. These practices have been documented and described briefly in an interim report. The report also describes the progress of the project, initial findings with illustrations, and recommendations for the second year of the project.

The second year of the project has involved further analysis and interpretation of the ethnographic data and descriptive work of the first year. Implications for school, classroom and community literacy practices have been identified. These will provide the basis for the identification and development of concrete, context-specific organisational, curricular, and pedagogic approaches in communities experiencing socio-economic disadvantage. From this research work a report will be produced that fully describes he findings and processes of the research and development phases of the first and second years of the project. The report will outline implications for educational policy, professional development, practice and school community relationships in relation to the development of the literacy practices of children from diverse cultural and socio-economic backgrounds. The report, will be completed in February 1995.

In 1995, the third year of the project, professional development print materials will be developed based on the findings of and using as illustration, the data collected from early-childhood classrooms and the community in the first and second years of the project. The development of print materials will focus on implementing change in the classroom based and will draw on the analytic features arising from the completed analysis of the interview, classroom and family transcripts and other relevant data. Based on the findings, selected literacy practices and certain aspects of literacy teaching will be developed and trialed. These practices, strategies, interactions and materials will be integrated into the school and the teachers' work as the focus of recommendations and illustrations for schools, teachers and parents The effects of the literacy practices among teachers and parents on learners will be examined, documented and integrated into materials for Curriculum Corporation.

Five state and Catholic Education schools were involved along with a
number of families within these school communities. Literacy practices
were observed in the school, specifically in Year levels 1 and 3, and
in the homes of 2 students and their families from each class.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The sample included four low socio-economic communities/schools and a
fifth community/school that was predominantly from middle to high
socio-economic status, as a comparison group. Four of the schools were
from the state system and one from the Catholic system.

The four low socio-economic communities schools were also selected to
include representation from other groups as in:

*   a significant presence of Aboriginal
and Torres Strait Islander children;
*   a significant presence of students
from non-English speaking backgrounds; and
*   students from largely Anglo-Celtic,
English-speaking backgrounds.

From each of the five communities/schools, a Year One and Year Three
class was invited to participate resulting in ten participating
classes. In addition to the teachers and students of the ten
participating classes, school participation also included
administration personnel such as the principal, other teachers such as
the teacher librarian, and support personnel such as learning support
teachers and teacher aides. The community participation included
student family members. The mixture of schools and family sites
allowed for a broad range of comparisons and contrasts among the
contextual and interactive features of the practices that bear on the
learning of reading and writing competencies.

Data Sources

A broad and detailed range of ethnographic data of the beliefs,
practices and artefacts that give rise to patterns of literacy use in
daily life was collected and examined. This data was collected from a
number of sources:
*   School Data: historical information,
demographic information, school policies and programs, prospectuses and
newsletters, maps, photographs, interview transcripts, field notes;
*   Classroom Data: Year Class
Overviews/Unit Plans, interview transcripts, classroom transcripts,
classroom observation notes, student work samples, field notes;
*   Family Data: interview transcripts,

family observation transcripts, family observation notes, children's
text samples (writing, reading, viewing, speaking, listening), field
notes; and
*   Community Data: historical
information, demographic information.

Schedules

The data sources provided for the detailed and thorough collection of
ethnographic data. The most significant information for the first year
of the project was gained from the surveys, designed as semi-structured
interviews, and the classroom and family observation schedules and
transcripts. The semi-structured interviews were developed and
administered to ensure maximum interaction with the interviewees.
Through posing open questions and using the survey questions as
prompts, rhetorical responses were less likely and the different
communication needs of the schools and families were able to be
accommodated.

*   The Administration Survey required
school administration to provide information about and their
perceptions/accounts of the school, the students and the wider
community.
*   The Teacher Survey required teachers
and other relevant support personnel to give information about and
their perceptions/accounts of the students, the school and surrounding
community, the language and literacy program, teacher background and
their views of learning, language and literacy.
*   The Family Survey required family
members to give information about and their perceptions of their child,
their family and the school.
*   The Student Survey required the
student to give information about an d their perceptions of themselves
and the school
*   The Classroom Observation Schedule was
designed to gather information to contextualise the audio transcripts
of the classroom interactions. These details illuminate the activity
sequences, timing, class organisation, resources and visual references.

Analytical Procedures

This study entailed in its first phase the collection of views of
school administrators, teachers, and support staff in interviews, as
well as the collection of extensive classroom transcript and
observation data from many classes in literacy learning in the early
school years.

The analysis in the first phase involved studying the interview and

observation data for large patterns relating to disadvantage and
learning in the early years. In the study of a very large corpus such
as this, the program of analysis entailed a number of steps that
enabled the focus to remain on the goals of the project, but which also
allowed the ways in which these goals were framed by the participants
themselves to appear.

Firstly the whole corpus of data from the schools and families was
scanned for themes or issues, and a grid showing themes and sources of
each theme and issue was developed. These could be through explicit
reference, through anecdotes, or through implications that represent
"guiding narratives".

Secondly, recurring general themes were found and then sections of
transcripts or samples that illustrate a theme or issue were selected,
that is, the corpus was thematised, seeing how the themes were
articulated in the accounts of participants in the interview talk and
acted out in the classroom and home talk.

In this initial pilot analysis, with respect to the interview data, the
concepts that were construed and particularised by the interviewees,
such as "culture", "community". "poverty", 'ethnicity". "school
success", and "literacy practices" were described under the headings of
the culture of the community surrounding the school, the nature of
school-community relations, and the issue of literacy.

In the initial analysis of the classroom transcripts the focus was on
the concept of "interactive trouble", displays of incompatible views of
what is or could be going on in the classroom. A number of types of
interactive trouble were identified:

*   epistemological trouble, the most

evident form, in which the student does not know the answer, sometime's
because the teacher or parent's preferred hearing/reading is not made
available in the question or in the teacher or parent's evaluative
feedback;

*   organisational trouble, in which
uncertain hearings are produced by features of the turn-taking cycles
such as in the uncertain selection of next-speakers, or in other
logistic features of the lesson, such as the need to write certain
words on a board in a certain order;

*   reasoning trouble, in which the
reasoning practices used in the development of questions and answers
are conventional in divergent sites, particularly out-of-school versus
in-school;

*   pedagogical differences, in which an
answer or offering is unacceptable because it draws upon a dispreferred
theory of reading/writing/learning (for example, whole language versus
phonic answers to questions about how to recognise a word);

*   relational trouble, in which the
speakers do not reciprocate the preferred relationships, displaying
instead "unharmonic" pace, pitch, loudness, proximity, eye contact,
humour, and so on, or uncertainties in the knowledge status of the
teacher or parent and student with respect to the topic at hand; and

*   stylistic trouble, in which certain
forms of expression (eg word choice) are preferred by the teacher or
parent with no explication for the choice.

By outlining types of interactive trouble some purchase is given to
understanding the barriers to participation facing some students in
literacy events. Thus the force of displaying patterns of talk that
exemplify trouble brings to awareness, not as "errors", but rather as
aspects of the problem of learning, most particularly facing students
from cultural circumstances differing from the adults working in the
school.

In the second phase, all of the data sources from the ethnographic
research were recruited again together with other significant data
sources, for more detailed analysis and interpretation. Three
analytical approaches were selected to confirm and enhance initial
findings and to provide more detailed, in depth and thorough evidential
support. These approaches are drawn from Conversational Analysis ,
Interpretive Analysis and Systemic Functional Linguistic theory.

Conversational Analysis

The family of approaches called Conversational Analysis (see Heritage,
1984, and, for examples, Baker & Freebody, 1986, Boden & Zimmerman,
1991; and Watson & Seiler, 1992) calls for close attention to the ways
in which people respond with interpretations of one another's talk and
thus display the cultural and cognitive resources they use to effect
certain outcomes that are at the one time biographical, institutional,
intellectual and cultural.

Conversational analysis is an approach to discourse analysis which has
been developed by a group of sociologists who call themselves
ethnomethodologists. It is concerned with the analysis of the
competences which ordinary speakers use and rely on when they engage in
intelligible, conversational interaction At its most basic, the

objective is to describe the procedures and expectations in terms of
which speakers produce their own behaviour and interpret the behaviour

of others. Conversation analysis is therefore primarily concerned with
the ways in which utterances accomplish particular actions by virtue of
their placement and participation within sequences of action It is
sequences and turns within sequences which are thus primary units of
analysis.

Heap's (1991) Discourse-action machinery is also being applied to the
conversational analysis of the classroom and home events. As
discourse-action machinery is task oriented it can be used for a wide
variety of tasks, which, however, must be accomplished through, in, and
as talk. The actions accomplished by means of the 'discourse-action
machinery' (of for instance home or classroom literacy sessions)
include speech acts. These acts are primarily devices for fostering
the accomplishment of non-verbal acts (such as reading, writing,
organising materials, etc), and getting help from the teacher or peers.

The process of using Conversational Analysis has entailed scanning the
entire corpus of classroom and family transcripts and selecting
specific literacy events for detailed structural analysis to determine
the nature of discourse/action machineries within the classroom
literacy events and home literacy events. This involves analysing the
directive/compliance sequences between participants and the number,
nature and purpose of insertions within directive/compliance sequences.

Interpretive Analysis

Interpretive analysis is a holistic type of analysis based on Jayyusi's
work (1982). By looking at the data as evidence of how people account
for the phenomena presented to them as problems in that situation the
analyst is given access to the cultural knowledges that are being
produced in response to the interview questions.

This analytical process entails looking at the entire corpus of
interview transcripts and choosing representative samples of talk to
exemplify the beliefs, theories and attitudes of participants in the
talk. The beliefs are analysed by looking at the attributes and cause
and effect chains that are used by the participant to talk about
concepts such as, literacy, and disadvantage. These are grouped into
head categories, and key themes. which are then used to examine
participants' accounts and how they attach qualities to those
categories and how they chain causes and effects of failure and
success, motivation and non-motivation, etc.

Systemic Functional Linguistic Analysis

Systemic Functional Linguistics is founded on the principle that
language is socially constructed, that is, that language develops to
meet the needs of people in context.

Systemic Functional Linguistics is concerned with how people use

language to produce meaning within clauses and across whole texts.
With this focus on meaning, a functional analysis looks at the building
blocks of language, words, and describes how they are put together to
construct meaning. It can also account for different meanings that are
produced if the same building blocks are put together in a different
way or if additional ones are introduced. Functional analysis is
concerned with describing the meanings which are produced as different
kinds of structures are used.

The analysis using Systemic Functional Linguistic theory draws on a

range of extensive work conducted by systemisists examining everyday
conversation, classroom discourse and parent talk (Hasan., Cloren,
Christie, Eggins, Williams, Gerot, Hunt, Iedema) This resource is
being used to analyse, both quantitatively and qualitatively, the full
corpus of data: the interview transcripts, classroom transcripts,
family transcripts, student work samples, field notes and planning,
program and policy documents.

As the three analyses have distinctive theoretical constructs it is
important that each is not compromised by the other. Because of this
each type of analysis has revealed themes and patterns of talk which is
distinctive. They have also revealed themes and patterns of talk which
are mutually reinforcable. Approached in this way the three analyses
can provide a balanced representation of findings from those that are
in common to all three and those that are distinctive to each type of
analysis.

In order to exemplify in more detail the analytical process and
interpretations from using systemic functional linguistic theory. One
of the classroom transcripts from the large body of data twill be used
to illustrate both the process of analysis and some of the
interpretations of the data.

Analytical process using systemic functional linguistics

The analysis of the interview and classroom and family transcripts is
guided by the following research questions:.
*   What kind of accounts do people
(teachers/parents) produce about links between poverty and literacy?
*   Do these accounts help to assist with
change in practice or do they hold the practices in place?
*   Do these accounts have any relation to
what goes on in a classroom/in the home and what teachers/parents
actually do with children in the classroom/in the home?
*   How are these connections made?
Is the way teachers/parents talk about children/literacy/ poverty in
 the interview similar to the way they are characterising the
 children/literacy/poverty in the classroom/in the home?

The phases of analysis include:

AINTERVIEWS

1.a)Select interview transcripts of one of each source (teacher,
parent, administrator, students, administrative assistant, other
support personnel) from each context (five communities).
b)Divide each transcripts into clauses.
c)Divide the clauses into Theme/Rheme.

2.a)Look for patterns in the talk and identify sections of talk for
deeper analysis.
b)Analyse selected sections of talk using grammatical resources eg
 cohesion, Theme, process types, attributes.
c)Interpret analyses and make commentary.

3.Identify patterns of grammatical resources that are used in the talk
and identify different participant's talk in different contexts.

4.Identify theories, beliefs and perceptions of participants evidenced
through the grammatical patterns.

5.Use these focuses for running through !KwicTeX and QuanTex Program

for quantitative analysis and summary.

BCLASSROOM AND FAMILY TRANSCRIPTS

1.a)Select significant transcripts identified through conversational
analysis and directive/compliance analysis (discourse-action
machinery).
b)Divide each transcripts into clauses.
c)Divide the clauses into Theme/Rheme.

2.a)Look for grammatical patterns in the talk.
b)Analyse further using grammatical resources eg Mood, speech function,
 lexical cohesion
c)Interpret analysis and make commentary.

3.Document in juxtaposition with interview analysis.

C!KWICTEX AND QUANTEX ANALYSIS

Quantitative analysis of the data is conducted using a new program
 called !KwicTex and QuanTex, a software program developed by, David
 Graddol in the UK.

1.a)Identify most frequently used words at a particular site.

b)Examine differences in terms of frequency and position of words in
 clauses.
c)Examine grammatical patterns around frequently used words.
e)Identify contextual differences in terms of usage.

2.Interpret and document the patterns the talk and identify
implications of findings.

3.Identify and document emerging themes in the talk.

Illustrative Example

To exemplify some of the analytical procedures a transcript from a Year
3 classroom will be analysed, both qualitatively and quantitatively,
and interpreted under some of the emerging themes.

Classroom Transcript

COPY CAT

^T:OK Looking at the covers. Who, what's on the... Ah Lara... Timothy.
Dimitri, Matthew. We don't hear what's going on. Lara, who's on the
cover?
^SL:A cat?
^T:Cats. What do you notice about the cats? Julian? Julian. What do you
notice about the cats. (0.2) Well anybody, hand up, what do you notice
about the cats on the cover?
^S:They're different
^T:Yes I realise that, but what else do you notice about the cats?
Joseph?
^SJ:They're going on a tree cause the dog's chasing them.
^T:Yes. There's something more I'd like to know about the cats. Look.
^S:Miss B Matthew's got my book.
^T:Um Sam.
^Ss:(talking)
^T:I can't hear. I... I can't hear a word of what Sam said, because we
have.. we have a lot of noise. What, what is different about the two
cats. That's what I'm looking for. Lara?

^SL:One's (..) and one's (..)
^T:Right exactly, one of them is going to be a copy cat. Matthew... Who
do you think might be the copy cat Dimitri? you're too busy talking to
Matthew.
^S:The little dog?
^T:The little dog..
^S:not a dog
^T:The little cat. OK Who thinks the little cat might be the copy cat?
Hands down. Who thinks the big cat might be the copy cat?
^Ss: (laughter)

^T: Don't laugh. We're now going to open it and read. Sam is going to help me read Open it up at the first cover.
^Ss/T:COPY CAT
'^T:You look on with... Turn the page
^Ss:(talking)
^T:Ah Stop. Stop. Re-read together. We don't all read at different times. We'll start again saying the title on the front page.
^Ss/^T:COPY CAT
^T:Turn the page
^Ss/^T:I GO UP THE PATH. YOU GO UP THE PATH. I GO UP THE STEPS. YOU GO UP THE STEPS. I GO INTO THE HOUSE. YOU GO INTO THE HOUSE. YOU LITTLE COPY CAT. CAT
^T:Turn the page
^Ss/^T:I GO DOWN THE STEPS YOU GO DOWN THE STEPS. I GO DOWN THE PATH. YOU GO DOWN THE PATH. I GO UP THE TREE. YOU GO UP TREE. YOU BIG COPY CAT.
^T:OK You've now read the story. Who was the copy cat? Hal?
^SH:The little one.
^T:Well you come here, on this page. I GO INTO THE HOUSE. YOU GO INTO THE HOUSE. YOU LITTLE COPY CAT. So that was the little cat. But..
^S:And then the big cat was the copy cat
^S:No
^T:Thank you Sam P. At the end.. I GO UP THE TREE. YOU GO UP THE TREE.
^Ss/^T:/YOU BIG COPY CAT.
^T:In this one, the big cat was gone urh.. the little cat went up the tree and the big one was following. Where in the other one, the big cat went into the house, followed by the little cat. So who was the copy cat really? Nathan?
^SN:Both of them
^T:Good boy. So nobody was right really well they said the big cat, and nobody was really right when they said the little cat. You were both right, because the both cats.
^S:Miss BI put my hand up for both
^T:Did you?
^Ss:No, no
^T:Right, (..) can work it out.

Analysis and commentary

Displays and portability of knowledge and learning

One of the major recurring features of the classroom talk is the way the pedagogy constructs particular kinds of displays of knowledge and learning. By analysing the talk we can see what is called on for display and what then becomes portable in terms of knowledge and learning.

What is being asked by the teacher to be displayed by the students in the transcript? It would seem in clauses 1-30 there is something obvious in the picture which will reveal what the teacher is looking

for (see Appendix 1 for clause analysis). The knowledge to be displayed can be gleaned from the picture. What is not made clear is

that the answer to the teacher's question is in the written text and not in the picture and that the question was about reading

This brings into question the extent to which common sense rather than textual knowledge is being asked to be displayed. This in turn leads to the question of how the students are able to make the transition from a common sense interpretation of a picture to displays of textual understanding and reading. In other words, textual knowledge in this extract is implicitly assumed whereas displays of textual knowledge are needed to successfully answer the question. This is expressed as a common sense interpretation of the picture rather than a linking of the title to the picture.

What is foregrounded as topical theme in the teacher's questions is the What (See Appendix 2 for Theme analysis). The point of departure in clauses 1-30 invariably alludes to the picture. However the you that is asked to notice is the literate you who is able to link the written and visual representations.

^T:4Lara, who's on the cover?
^SL:5A cat?

^T:6 Cats.
7What do you notice about the cats?
8Julian?
9Julian.
10What do you notice about the cats. (0.2)
11Well anybody, and up,
12what do you notice about the cats on the cover?
^S:13They're different
^T:14Yes I realise that,
15but what else do you notice about the cats?
16Joseph?
^SJ:17They're going on a tree
18cause the dog's chasing them
^T:19Yes.
20There's something more
21I'd like to know about the cats.
22Look
^S:23Miss B Matthew's got my book.
^T:24Um Sam.
^Ss25(talking)
^T:26I can't hear.
27I... I can't hear a word of what Sam said,
28because we have.. we have a lot of noise.
29What, what is different about the two cats.

```
30That's what I'm looking for. Lara?
^SL:31One's (..)
32and one's (..)
```

The students are being asked to display a literate self that can read
the title and relate it to the picture on the cover. However, that is
never made explicit. Rather, it is expressed as a "guess what is
inside my head" series of display questions with the teacher as the
primary knower (DK1 questions) (See Appendix 3 for exchange structure
analysis).

```
^T:4Lara, who's on the cover?Dk1
^T:7What do you notice about the cats?Dk1
^T10What do you notice about the cats. (0.2)Dk1
^T12what do you notice about the cats on the cover?Dk1
^T:14Yes I realise that,


15but what else do you notice about the cats?Dk1
^T:20There's something more
21I'd like to know about the cats.Dk1
^T:29What, what is different about the two cats
30That's what I'm looking for.Dk1
```

This is an illustration of how the displays of pedagogical knowledge
intertwine with displays of textual understanding at an assumed and
implicit level. In terms of word choice and grammatical organisation,
what is made explicit are displays of this interaction as common sense
interpretation.

Further grammatical illustration of this can be found in a reference
analysis of the demonstrative the. This reveals that throughout the
whole extract most of the specific reference is made exophorically to
the visual text and predominantly to the field of the story. Very
little specific reference is linked to the written text or textual
organisation. With the exception of the words in capitals, most of
what is referred to specifically are the characters in the text. The
following quantitative analysis by the !KwicTex program confirms this
analysis.

```
1 Ah  Lara (17.73/1.85%)
1 both (17.73/1.85%)
1 covers (17.73/1.85%)
1 end (17.73/1.85%)
1 first (17.73/1.85%)
1 front (17.73/1.85%)
1 other (17.73/1.85%)
1 story (17.73/1.85%)
1 title (17.73/1.85%)
1 two (17.73/1.85%)
```

```
2 cover (35.45/3.7%)
3 page (53.19/5.550%)
4 PATH (70.91/7.4%)
4 STEPS (70.91/7.4%)
4 TREE (70.91/7.4%)
5 big (88.65/9.25%)
5 cats (88.65/9.25%)
5 copy (88.65/9.25%)
5 HOUSE (88.65/9.25%)
7 little (124.11/12.96%)
```

Of the words that are specifically referred to 43 of the words are the
cats eg little cat, copy cat, cats, big cat. Of further interest, and
illustrative of what can be seen to be portable, is that these often
appear as the topical theme.

The other 11 are:

Turn the page

turn the page

turn the page
cats on the cover
who's on the cover
the title on the front
now you've read the story
the front page
the first cover

at the end
looking at the covers

It would seem that in terms of portable knowledge, it is information
about the cats which has been foregrounded and specifically referenced,
rather than information about the written text or textual organisation.
 In other words the field of the story is what is being talked about
and not how that field has been generated.

Interestingly the page, the cover, or the story are all placed in the
rheme. Apart from the usual pronouns, most of the topical themes are
about the cats in the field of the story. Most other topical themes
are classroom organisational features.

This would perhaps indicate that the teacher is asking for displays of
interpretations of actions of the cats. What is not asked for is a
display of knowledge about the how the text realises these
interpretations. For example, generic structure, textual features,

written and visual text relations or some information which does not
assume that the meaning the teacher wants is a natural consequence of
reading. It is also not made explicit that the activity is about
reading.

What then can be seen to be portable from this extract is knowledge
about the cats in the story and little about text and how to read.

Questioning and assessing talk

Another significant feature of classroom interaction is the role of
questioning in classroom interaction and how the patterns of
questioning affect the pedagogy and the learning.

The generic organisation of this extract highlights aspects of the
questioning patterns and illustrates the emphasis on doing the pedagogy
as opposed to doing the learning. It is also illustrative of the
foregrounded teaching agenda.

This extract is part of a lesson but as such appears to be part of a
Curriculum Macrogenre (Christie). It is illustrative of the following
generic structure:

ExposeClauses 1-49
TaskClauses 50 - 76
Task CollaborationClauses 77 - 112

Within each stage the questioning patterns demand different things of
the students.

Expose:Doing the pedagogy as "Guess what's inside my head."
The challenge for the student is to display a literate self. (Few
 students are successful)
Task: Doing the pedagogy "Listen and read."
The challenge for the student is to display procedural knowledge. (Most
 students are successful)
Task Collaboration: Doing the pedagogy as "Guess what's inside my
head.", where the teacher is the primary knower and the student is the
secondary knower, as represented in the recurring exchange structure:
Teacher DK1
Student K2
Teacher K1f

The challenge for the student is to display knowledge of the

commonsense field of the story, not of text or text production. Most
of the students are able to do this successfully although they are
evaluated as having failed.

To successfully complete this task the student must display different
aspects of pedagogical understanding. However, the displays of
literate selves in the expose phase are not made explicit but are
presented as a common sense reading.

The teachers talk is never up for adjustment whereas the students talk
is continually assessed by the teacher. There is no space for the
students to explicitly call for adjustment of the question. If the
teacher talk was available for adjustment in the expose there would
perhaps be a shift from a teaching agenda to a learning agenda. eg

^T:7What do you notice about the cats?

This phrase is never assessed by the teacher as to its
interpretability. However,

S:13They're different

is heard by the teacher as an obvious response but wrong. By not
hearing the student's response as a need to adjust her question, the
teacher is able to merely repeat the original question.

^T:14Yes I realise that,
15but what else do you notice about the cats?

The teacher does not analyse the answer They're different as calling
for adjustment to the question. In other words the students analyse
the teacher's talk as an assessment of their displays of knowledge.
However, in this and most other examples the reverse does not happen.

The principle of hearing and adjustment is not adhered to by the
teacher. Teachers appear to set a question in train and try to provide
clues as to how it might be answered, rather than by hearing the
student's answers as calling for adjustment of the question itself or
the background framing of the question. Analyses in terms of how
utterances are assessed reveals much about how the learning is
organised and made available to the students.

Integrated curriculum and pedagogy and focused learning

Pedagogically this lesson is presented as a characteristically "whole
language" experience. In other words the learning is seemingly
organised for the students to "discover" meaning through the stimulus
provided. However, this does not occur because not only it is
organised to come to a single shared conclusion but that conclusion is
directed by the teacher.

The lesson is less about the details of learning to read and more about
displaying everyday cultural experience and knowledge. This is
revealed in the lexical choices of the teacher:

5 s (88.65/1.02%)
5 Ss (88.65/1.02%)
6 about (106.38/1.22%)
6 Who (106.38/1.22%)
5 to (88.65/1.02%)
5 TREE (88.65/1.02%)
7 big (124.11/1.43%)

7 on (124.11/1.43%)
7 was (124.11/1.43%)
8 Cats (141.84/1.63%)
8 What (141.84/1.63%)
9 little (159.57/1.84%)
11 up (195.03/2.24%)
12 copy (212.76/2.45%)
12 I (212.76/2.45%)
16 GO (283.67/3.27%)
22 You (390.07/4.49%)
23 cat (407.8/4.6999%)
54 the (957.44/11.04%)

Rather than a focused teaching strategy such as demonstration,
modelling, and guided reading, which explicates a feature of text, the
lexical choices reveal an arbitrary integration of a set of knowledges
and learnings about the every day world.

Analysis of lexical cohesion reveals that this lesson is less about
learning to read and more about developing a strategy to come to a
shared cultural conclusion. Analyses of topical theme, lexical choices
and reference all point to the students and teachers "doing the
pedagogy" rather than focusing the learning on the production and
reading of text.

This is further illustrated by the students' choices of lexical items.
They are mostly everyday readings of the story as the real world.
There are no displays of knowledge about the production of text.

1 big (17.85/1.28%)
1 book (17.85/1.28%)
1 cause (17.85/1.28%)
1 chasing (17.85/1.28%)
1 copy (17.85/1.28%)
1 different (17.85/1.28%)
1 for (17.85/1.28%)
 going (17.85/1.28%)
1 got (17.85/1.28%)
1 hand (17.85/1.28%)
1 I (17.85/1.28%)

```
1 not (17.85/1.28%)
1 of (17.85/1.28%)
1 on (17.85/1.28%)
1 one (17.85/1.28%)
1 put (17.85/1.28%)
1 then (17.85/1.28%)
1 tree (17.85/1.28%)
1 up (17.85/1.28%)
1 was (17.85/1.28%)
2 And (35.70/2.56%)
2 Both (35.70/2.56%)
2 dog (35.70/2.56%)
2 little (35.70/2.56%)
2 Miss (35.70/2.56%)
2 my (35.70/2.56%)
2 them (35.70/2.56%)
2 They're (35.70/2.56%)
3 a (53.56/3.84%)
3 cat (53.56/3.84%)
3 No (53.56/3.84%)
5 The (89.28/6.41%)
```

As the quantitative analysis reveals the students are asked to display knowledge about:
-cats and dogs (subject matter)
-classroom procedures (pedagogy)
-textual organisation (although the request is never made explicit there are demands to display these understandings)
-theme and plot within the story (foregrounding the field of the story)

The purpose of the activity and the learning outcomes for the students are not achieved because the integration of the above features is never made clear. Rather the students have focused on exactly what the teacher has asked :them to focus on common sense knowledge within the text. Analysis of the text by the teachers and the students should possibly focus on the way students are asked to concentrate on knowledge within the text and yet display knowledge about the text.

Process of learning and explication of learning

When the student reveals,

^S: 109Miss B I put my hand up for both

it is only by that point in the lesson that a student has provided an appropriate response as heard by the teacher. Although "both cats" is the correct answer, the learning that appears to be valued is the processes of discovering the answer.

The generic organisation of the learning and the lesson both must be
adhered to in order for the class to come to the required conclusion.
Within the structure of the lesson is embedded the process by which the
conclusion can be reached. Thus this process is meant to be portable.
Unfortunately as the other analysis has shown what becomes portable
are surface everyday common sense knowledge about the cats in the story
and the pedagogy.

SELECTED INTERIM FINDINGS

As the full corpus of data has not yet been fully analysed a full set
of findings can not yet be provided. However, these seem to clear
trends in the findings.

Perceptions of literacy practices and disadvantage

In the majority of interview segments families from low socio-economic
backgrounds are viewed as unable to read critically, and have had poor
school experiences leading to negative attitudes. Middle class parents
are viewed as educated, inquiring and more confident in the school
environment.

Some teachers are very explicit in drawing up a dichotomy between low
socio-economic and middle class attributes eg low socio-economic: have
no experiences. lack learning skills, use restricted language, read at
functional level; middle class: have more experiences, value learning,
model reading. Some teachers sometimes acknowledge the possibility
that these features are not restricted to disadvantaged poor families,
but a closer examination of their talk indicates that they still see
perceive middle class attributes as the norm and a valuing of these
attributes by the school.

With respect to the home/school interface teachers recognise that
approaches to learning are different between home and school but

parents need to be educated in the "school approach" o literacy
learning; several espouse a two way communication but talk about
telling parents how to do "school".

Teachers and parents view the role of home in literacy development
differently: for example teachers suggest that parents expect the
school to be responsible for teaching reading and writing and see home
and school as separate, whereas parents clearly view the home role as
integral to teaching/learning.

The literacy programs and pedagogical approaches espoused by teachers
appear to be a conglomeration of different theories and strategies
sometimes described by teachers as an eclectic approach. What aspect

of each theory is taken on board by the teacher depends on their own learning and teaching experiences, their ideologies and their learning spiral.

Learning outcomes from literacy events developed in the school and in the home

There is concern for the extent to which students display awareness of the primary purpose of a lesson in terms of the known outcomes, and of the distinction between these and the secondary or even merely managerial goals of the teacher.

We have found many lessons in which the over-arching intended outcome of the lesson is stated in general terms by the teacher, but the completion of which is minimal, tokenish, and/or evident only in the last moments of the lesson.

The orientation to task completion that we have found in the home literacy events for both 'disadvantaged' and 'non-disadvantaged' students leads to a focus on the clarification of the outcomes in order to expedite the completion of the task.

The school literacy learning agenda

Many of the lessons studied in this project indicate that teachers often mix varying literacy activities which would best be kept separate as learning opportunities. For example, a lesson may involve some attention to the phonic patterns in English and be sprinkled at unpredictable points with references to everyday background knowledge. Often this mixing focuses attention away from the aspect of literacy that is available to be learned. These apparently random and unannounced mixtures are highly prevalent. They may reflect a belief in the importance of relying on students' everyday knowledge, but the talk generally does not explore or extend this knowledge in any developed way. They may also relate to general "key-words" in recent educational practice such as integrated curriculum contextualisation Even though those concepts do not entail haphazard or incidental mixtures of agenda, they may indeed be acted out in these ways by some educators.

Furthermore, it is the divergent conversations that engage the students. Their responses often indicate that taking part in this haphazard, "out-going" talk is clearly heard by them as the task of the lesson. This interactive pattern assumes particular significance if the students do not have, in their out-of-classroom environment, focused activities that enable them to see the need for learning distinctive aspects of reading and writing.

In the home literacy events of both 'disadvantaged' and

'non-disadvantaged' students, we have found a high degree of focus on
task completion. If anything, this focus is most narrowly pursued in
the 'disadvantaged' home sites, with parents working only to achieve
the spelling, formatting, comprehension, or composing demands of, say,
a homework task. This, however, presents a problem to these students
in a classroom in which the literacy focusing work needs to be done
selectively but inferentially by the students.

It is not necessarily recommended that lessons should be focused on
only one aspect of breading or writing, but rather that the various
components of literacy activities and their inter- relationships not
be randomly intertwined, muffling the clarity of the task of the
lesson.

The interface of home and school literacy

One of the major tasks of this project has been to compare the literacy
events in homes and classrooms. Our approach has been to study each
site as an interactive environment for learning about reading and
writing, and to then compare the interactive work done by teachers and
caregivers and thereby the differing work that needs to be done by
children as family members and as students.

While the family sites show considerably more variation than the
classroom sites, there are a number of similar and different features
that can be drawn out. One of the immediately noticeable contrasts is
to do with the strong orientation to task completion and the rapid
provision of answers in the home sites.

As well, many parents ask different kinds of questions, in their
teaching, and engage in different kinds of explorations of the texts.
Many questions, particularly but again not exclusively in 'free'
reading and writing session other than homework, are about choosing
material, sequence, or about genuinely gauging the child's knowledge
for the purposes of exploring the content or format.

Question-answer formats as the basic interactive teaching and learning
strategy

One of the premises guiding talk that has been shown by conversation
analysts is that interactants treat one another's talk as updated
analyses of what has been said before. An answer to a question, for
example, in everyday conversation, is heard partly as the hearer's
analysis of the what the question was about and what might count as an
appropriate answer. In these ways speakers adjust their talk to
account for the understanding shown in the other's talk.

In our study of the transcripts collected as part of this project we
find that this principle o hearing and adjustment is often not adhered

to by teachers. Rather, teachers appear to set a question in train and
try to provide clues to how it might be answered, rather than by
hearing the students' answers as calling for adjustment of the question
itself or the background framing of the question.

SUMMARY

It is often said that children come to school with "language". It is
however misleading to go to that level of abstraction, because it would
lead us to think that language necessarily allows all sorts of other
forms of language use such as reading and writing. In fact children
come to school as conversationalists, as people highly adept at turn
taking, topic shifting, topic maintenance, categorisation s

interruptions, and harmonising and deharmonising manoeuvres in
interactive talk.

These practices however vary and are highly changeable from sub-culture
to sub-culture, much more so than written language practices.
Therefore the encounter of schooling and the social contexts in which
that operates present a new and potentially very foreign set of
interactive expectations. The learning of literacy is always and
already embedded within those expectations and within the institutional
constraints placed upon teachers and administrators and curriculum
developers.

One of the major goals of this project is to alert teachers to the ways
in which institutional constraints affect their talk and affect the
versions of literate practice that they present to students. A further
goal is to elaborate on the literacy events that occur in homes and to
draw upon those as instances of one-to-one support and a different kind
of socio-cultural context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baker, C.D. (1991) Reading the texts of reading lessons. Australian
Journal of Reading. (Adelaide: Australian Reading Association),14,
5-20.

Baker, C.D. & Freebody, P. (1986) representation of questioning and

answering in student's first school books. Language in Society.
(Cambridge University Press: New York), 15, 451-483.

Baker, C.D. & Freebody, P. (1989) Talk around text: Constructions of
textual and teacher authority in classroom discourse. In S. de
Castell, A. Luke, and C. Luke (eds.) Language, authority and criticism:
readings on the school textbook. London/Philadelphia: Farmer Press, pp
263-283.

Baker, C.D. & Freebody, P. (in press) The crediting of literate
competence. Australian Journal of Language and Literacy.

Baker, C.D. & Luke, A. (eds.) (1991) Towards a critical sociology of
reading pedagogy. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bernstein, B. (1975) Class, codes and control: Towards a theory of
educational transmission. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bourdieu, P. (1991) Language and symbolic power. Cambridge, UK:
Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J-C. (1977) Reproduction in Education,
society and culture. London: Sage.

Brice-Heath, B. (1986) The functions and uses of literacy. In S.
DeCastell, A. Luke, & C. Luke (eds.) Literacy, society and schooling.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brice-Heath, B. (1983) Way with words. Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.

Bull, G. & Anstey, M. (1992) The literacy practices of a small
Queensland rural community: A report to the Queensland Department of
Education. Toowoomba: USQ Press.

Collerson, J. (1994) English Grammar a functional approach. NSW:
Primary English Teachers Association.

Connell, R.W. and others (1982) Making the difference. Sydney: Allen
and Unwin.

Cook-Gumperz, J. (1986) The social construction of literacy.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eggins, S. (1994). An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics.
 UK; Pinter Publishers Ltd.

Freebody, P. (1985a) Oral and written language: Some philosophical,

psychological and cultural points of contrast. Plenary address,
Australian Reading Association Annual Conference, Brisbane.

Freebody, P. (1985b) The language of student's first school books:
Transitions from oral to literate culture. Keynote address, Language
in Education Working Group (of Applied Linguistics Association of
Australia) Annual Conference, University of New England, Armidale.

Freebody, P. (1990) Research on classroom interaction: Part 1.
Introduction and descriptive approaches. Australian Journal of
Reading. 13, 324-330.

Freebody, P. (1991a) Research on classroom interaction: Part 2.
Linguistic approaches. Australian Journal of Reading. 14, 69-76.

Freebody, P. (1991b) research on classroom interaction: Part 3.
Interpretive approaches. Australian Journal of Reading. 14, 168-175.

Freebody, P. (1992a) Multi-Literacy in the Australian educational
context. In D. Myers (ed.) The Great literacy debate: The English
language in contemporary Australia. Australian Literacy Series.
Sydney: Australian Scholarly Publishing (pp 35-44).

Freebody, P. (1992b) The politics of literacy research: Classrooms,
curriculums, and assessment. Plenary address to the Literacy Strand,
Joint Australian and New Zealand Associations for research in Education
Annual Conference, Deakin University, Geelong, Victoria, November.

Freebody, P. (1993) Assembling reading and writing: How distinctions
construct literate competencies. In J. McGuirk (ed.) The right to
literacy: The rhetoric, the romance, the reality. Sydney: Australian
Council of Adult Literacy (pp 59-77).

Freebody, P. & Luke, A. (1990) Literacies programs: Debates and
demands in cultural context. Prospect, 5, 7-16.

Freebody, P. & Welch, A.R. (1993) Individualisation and domestication
in Australian literacy debates. In P. Freebody & A.R. Welch (eds.)
Knowledge, culture, and power: International perspectives on literacy
policies and practices. London: Falmer Press and Pittsburgh Press (pp
209-232).

Gee, J.P. (1990) Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in
discourses. London: Falmer Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985) An Introduction to Functional Grammar. UK:
Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985) Spoken and written language. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1987) Spoken and written modes of meaning. In R. Horowitsz & S.J. Samuels (eds.) Comprehending oral and written language. New York: Academic Press.

Hammond, J. (1990) Is learning to read and write the same as learning to speak? In F. Christie (ed.) Literacy for a changing world. Melbourne: ACER Press.

Hasan, R. (1987) Reading picture reading: Invisible instruction at home and in school. Sydney: 13th Australian Reading Association Conference.

Heap, J. (1991) A situated perspective on what counts as reading. In C.D. Baker & A. Luke (eds.) towards a critical sociology of reading pedagogy. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jayyusi, I. (1982) Categorisation and the moral order. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Lankshear, C with M. Lawler (1987) Literacy, schooling and revolution. London: farmer Press.

Luke, A., Freebody, P. & Gilbert, P. (1991) What counts as reading in the secondary school classroom: Selective traditions of reading practices and positions. In F. Christie, P Freebody et al. Teaching critical social literacy, Volume II. Report of a Project of National Significance to the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education and training on the preservice preparation of teacher or parents for teaching English literacy. (pp 142-157).

MacLure, M. & French. P. (1980) Routes to right answers: On pupil's strategies answering teacher or parent's questions. In P. Woods (ed.) Pupil strategies: Explorations in the Sociology of the School. London: Croom Helm.

Martin, J.R. (1990) Literacy in Science: Learning to handle text as technology. In F. Christie (ed.) Literacy for a changing world. Melbourne: ACER Press.

McKeown, G.R. & Freebody, P. (1988) The language of aboriginal and non-aboriginal students and the texts they encounter in schools. Australian Journal of reading. (Adelaide: Australian reading Association), 8, 115-126.

Ong, W. (1982) Orality and literacy. London: Methuen.

Scribner, S. & Cole, M. (1980) The psychology of literacy. Cambridge

MA: Harvard University Press.

Shuy, R. (1988) Identifying dimensions of classroom language. In J.L.
Green & J.O. Harker (eds.) Multiple perspective research in classroom
discourse. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Street, B.V. (1984) Literacy in theory and practice. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

Street, B.V. (in press) Cross-cultural perspectives on literacy.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tizard, B. & Hughes, M. (1984) Young Students Learning: Talking and
thinking at home and at school. London: Fontana.

Torrance, N. & Olsen (1985) Oral and literate competencies in the early
school years. In D. Olsen, N. Torrance, & A. Hildyard (eds.) Literacy,
language and learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watson, G. & Seiler, R.M. (eds.) (1992) Text in context: Contributions
to Ethnomethodology. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Wells, G. (1991) Talk about text: Where literacy is learned and
taught. In D. Booth & C. Thornley-Hall (eds.) The talk curriculum.
Ontario: Pembroke.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1:
Clauses

^T:1OK Looking at the covers.
2Who, what's on the... Ah Lara... Timothy. Dimitri, Matthew.
3We don't hear what's going on
4Lara, who's on the cover?

 ^SL:5A cat?
^T:6Cats.
7What do you notice about the cats?
8Julian?
9Julian.
10What do you notice about the cats. (0.2)
11Well anybody, hand up,
12what do you notice about the cats on the cover?
^S:13They're different
^T:14Yes I realise that,
15but what else do you notice about the cats?
16Joseph?
^SJ:17They're going on a tree
18cause the dog's chasing them.
^T:19Yes.
20There's something more
21I'd like to know about the cats.
22Look
'^S:23Miss B Matthew's got my book
^T:24 Um Sam
^Ss:25(talking)
^T:26I can't hear.
27I... I can't hear a word of what Sam said,
28because we have.. we have a lot of noise.
29What, what is different about the two cats.
30That's what I'm looking for
31Lara?
^SL:32One's (..)
33and one's (..)

^T:34Right exactly,
35one of them is going to be a copy cat.
36Matthew... Who do you think might be the copy cat
37Dimitri? you're too busy talking to Matthew.
^S:38The little dog?
^T:39The little dog.
^S:40not a dog
^T:41The little cat.
42OK Who thinks
43the little cat might be the copy cat?
44Hands down.
45Who thinks
46the big cat might be the copy cat?
^Ss:47(laughter)
^T:48Don't laugh.
49 We're now going to open it and read.
50Sam is going to help me read
51 Open it up at the first cover.
^Ss/^T:52COPY CAT
^T:53You look on with...
54Turn the page
^Ss:55(talking)
^T:56Ah Stop. Stop.
57Re-read together.
58We don't all read at different times.
59We'll start again saying the title on the front page.
^Ss/^T:60COPY CAT
^T:61Turn the page
^Ss/^T:62I GO UP THE PATH.
63YOU GO UP THE PATH.
64I GO UP THE STEPS.
65YOU GO UP THE STEPS.
66I GO INTO THE HOUSE.

67YOU GO INTO THE HOUSE
68YOU LITTLE COPY CAT. CAT
^T:69Turn the page
^Ss/^T:70I GO DOWN THE STEPS
71YOU GO DOWN THE STEPS.
72I GO DOWN THE PATH.
73YOU GO DOWN THE PATH
74I GO UP THE TREE.
75YOU GO UP TREE.
76YOU BIG COPY CAT.
^T:77OK You've now read the story.
78Who was the copy cat?
79Hal?
^SH:80The little one.
^T:81Well you come here, on this page.

82I GO INTO THE HOUSE.
83YOU GO INTO THE HOUSE.
84YOU LITTLE COPY CAT.
85So that was the little cat.
86But..
^S:87And then the big cat was the copy cat
^S:88No
^T:89Thank you Sam P.
90 At the end..
91I GO UP THE TREE.
92YOU GO UP THE TREE.
^Ss/^T:93YOU BIG COPY CAT.
^T:94In this one, the big cat was gone urh..
95the little cat went up the tree
96and the big one was following.
97Where in the other one, the big cat went into the house,
98followed by the little cat.
99So who was the copy cat really?
100Nathan?
^SN:101Both of them
^T:102Good boy.
103So nobody was right really
104well they said the big cat,
105and nobody was really right
106when they said the little cat.
107You were both right,
108because the both cats.
^S:109Miss B I put my hand up for both
^T:110Did you?
^Ss:111No, no
^T:112Right, (..) can work it out.

Appendix 2:   Theme/Rheme

ThemeRheme
TextualInterpersonalExperiential

^T:1OK Looking at the covers.
2Who, what's on the... Ah Lara Timothy. Dimitri, Matthew.
3We don't hear what's going on.
4Lara, who's on the cover?
^SL:5A cat?
^T:6Cats.
7What do you notice about the cats?
8Julian?
9Julian.
10What do you notice about the cats. (0.2)
11Well anybody, hand up,
12what do you notice about the cats on the cover?
^S:13They're different
^T:14Yes I realise that,
15but what else do you notice about the cats?
16Joseph?
^SJ:17They're going on a tree
18cause the dog's chasing them

^T:19Yes.
20There's something more
21I'd like to know about the cats.
22Look
^S:23Miss B Matthew's got my book.
^T:24Um Sam.
^Ss:25(talking)
^T:26I can't hear.
27I... I can't hear a word of what Sam said,
28because we have.. we have a lot of noise.
29What, what is different about the two cats.
30That's what I'm looking for.
31Lara?

^SL:32One's (..)
33and one's (..)

^T:34Right exactly,
35one of them is going to be a copy cat.
36Matthew... Who do you think might be the copy cat
37Dimitri? you're too busy talking to Matthew.
^S:38The little dog?
^T:39The little dog.
^S:40not a dog

^T:41The little cat.
42OK Who thinks
43the little cat might be the copy cat?
44Hands down
45Who thinks
46the big cat might be the copy cat?
^Ss:47(laughter)
^T:48Don't laugh
49 We're now going to open itand read.
50Sam is going to help me read.
51 Open it up at the first cover.
^Ss/^T:52COPY CAT
^T:53You look on with...
54Turn the page
^Ss:55(talking)
^T:56Ah Stop. Stop.
57Re-read together.
58Wedon't all read at different times.
59We'll start again saying the titleon the front page.
^Ss/^T:60COPY CAT
^T:61Turn the page
^Ss/^T:62I GO UP THE PATH
63YOU GO UP THE PATH.
64I GO UP THE STEPS.
65YOU GO UP THE STEPS.
66I GO INTO THE HOUSE.
67YOU GO INTO THE HOUSE.
68YOU LITTLE
COPY CAT.
CAT
^T:69Turn the page
^Ss/^T:70I GO DOWN THE STEPS
71YOU GO DOWN THE STEPS
72I GO DOWN THE PATH
73YOU GO DOWN THE PATH.
74I GO UP THE TREE.
75YOU GO UP TREE.
76YOU BIG

COPY CAT.
^T:77OK You've now read the story.
78Who was the copy cat?
79Hal?
^SH:80The little one
^T:81Well you come here, on this page.
82I GO INTO THE HOUSE.
83YOU GO INTO THE HOUSE.
84YOU LITTLE
COPY CAT.
85So that was the little cat.
86But..
^S:87And then the big cat was the copy cat
^S:88No
^T:89Thank you Sam P.
90 At the end..
91I GO UP THE TREE.
92YOU GO UP THE TREE.
^Ss/^T:93YOU BIG
COPY CAT.
^T:94In this one, the big cat was gone urh..
95the little cat went up the tree
96and the big one was following.
97Where in the other

one, the big cat went into thehouse,
98followed by the little cat.
99So who was the copy cat really?
100Nathan?
^SN:101Both of them
^T:102Good boy.
103So nobody was right really
104well they said the big cat,
105and nobody was really right
106when they said the little cat.
107You were both right,
108because the both cats.
^S:109Miss B I put my hand up for both
^T:110Did you?
^Ss:111No, no
^T:112Right, (..) can work it out.

Appendix 3: Mood/Speech Function/Exchange Structure

Paper Presented at the AARE Annual
Conference, Newcastle, 1994
Australian Association
for Research in Education

MoodSpeech Exchange FunctionStructure

^T:1OK Looking at the
covers.imperativecommandA2
2Who, what's on the...
Ah Lara... Timothy.
Dimitri, Matthew. interrogativequestionDk1
3We don't hear what's
going ondeclarativestatementA2
4Lara, who's on the cover?interrogativequestionDk1
^SL:5A cat?interrogativequestionK2
^T:6Cats.elliptical dec.acknowledge.K1f
7What do you notice
about the cats?interrogativequestionDk1
8Julian?
9Julian.
10What do you notice
about the cats. (0.2)interrogativequestionDk1
11Well anybody, hand up,imperativecommandA2
12what do you notice
about the cats on the
cover?interrogativequestionDk1
^S:13They're differentdeclarativeanswer
^T:14Yes I realise that,declarativeacknow./contrad.K1
15but what else do you
notice about the cats?interrogativequestionDk1
16Joseph?
^SJ:17They're going on a treedeclarativeanswerK2
18cause the dog's chasing
them.declarativeanswerK2
^T:19Yes.declarativeacknowled.K1f
20There's something moredeclarativestatementK1
21I'd like to know about
the cats.declarativequestionDk1
22LookimperativecommandK1
'^S:23Miss B Matthew's got
my bookdeclarativestatementA2

 ^T:24 Um Sam
^Ss:25(talking)
^T:26I can't hear.declarativestatementA2
27I... I can't hear a word of
what Sam said,declarativestatementA2
28because we have.. we
have a lot of noise.declarativestatementA2
29What, what is different
about the two cats.interrogativequestionDk1
30That's what I'm looking

fordeclarativestatementK1
31Lara?
^SL:32One's (..)declarativeanswerK2
33and one's (..)declarative answerK2
^T:34Right exactly,elliptical dec.acknowled.K1f
35one of them is going to
be a copy cat.declarativestatementK1
36Matthew... Who do you
think might be the copy
catinterrogativequestionDk1
37Dimitri? you're too busy
talking to Matthew.declarativestatementA2
^S:38The little dog?interrogativequestionK2
^T:39The little dog.elliptical dec.statementK1
^S:40not a dogelliptical dec.statementK2
^T:41The little catelliptical dec.statementK1
42OK Who thinksdeclarativequestionDk1
43the little cat might be the
copy cat?declarativequestionDk1
44Hands down.imperativecommandA2
45Who thinksinterrogativequestionDk1
46the big cat might be the
copy cat?interrogativequestionDk1
^Ss:47(laughter)
^T:48Don't laugh.imperativecommandA2
49 We're now going to open
it and read.declarativestatementA2
50Sam is going to help
me readdeclarativestatementA2
51 Open it up at the first
cover.imperativecommandA2
^Ss/^T:52COPY CATelliptical dec.statementA1
^T:53You look on with...imperativecommandA2
54Turn the pageimperativecommandA2
^Ss:55(talking)
^T:56Ah Stop. Stop.imperativecommandA2
57Re-read together.imperativecommandA2
58We don't all read at
different times.declarativestatementA2
59We'll start again saying
the title on the front page.declarativestatementA2
^Ss/^T:60COPY CATelliptical dec.statementA1
^T:61Turn the pageimperativecommandA2
^Ss/^T:62I GO UP THE PATH.declarativestatementA1
63YOU GO UP THE
PATH.declarativestatementA1
64I GO UP THE STEPS.declarativestatementA1

65YOU GO UP THE
STEPS.declarativestatementA1

66I GO INTO THE
HOUSE.declarativestatementA1

   67YOU GO INTO THE
HOUSEdeclarativestatementA1
68YOU LITTLE COPY
CAT. CATdeclarativestatementA1
^T:69Turn the pageimperativecommandA2
^Ss/^T:70I GO DOWN THE
STEPSdeclarativestatementA1
71YOU GO DOWN
THE STEPS.declarativestatementA1
72I GO DOWN THE
PATH.declarativestatementA1
73YOU GO DOWN
THE PATHdeclarativestatementA1
74I GO UP THE TREE.declarativestatementA1
75YOU GO UP TREE.declarativestatementA1
76YOU BIG COPY CAT.declarativestatementA1
^T:77OK You've now read
the story.declarativestatementK1
78Who was the copy cat?imperativequestionDk1
79Hal?
^SH:80The little one.elliptical dec.answerK2
^T:81Well you come here,
on this page.imperativecommandA2
82I GO INTO THE
HOUSE.declarativestatementA1
83YOU GO INTO THE
HOUSE.declarativestatementA1
84YOU LITTLE COPY
CAT.declarativestatementA1
85So that was the little cat.declarativestatementK1
86But..elliptical dec.statementK1
^S:87And then the big cat was
the copy catdeclarativeanswerK2
^S:88Noelliptical dec.disclaimerK1
^T:89Thank you Sam P.
90 At the end..elliptical dec.statementK1
91I GO UP THE TREE.declarativestatementA2
92YOU GO UP THE
TREE.declarativestatementA2
^Ss/^T:93YOU BIG COPY CAT.declarativestatementA2
^T:94In this one, the big cat
was gone urh..declarativestatementK1
95the little cat went up the
tree declarativestatementK1

96and the big one was

following.declarativestatementK1
97Where in the other one,
the big cat went into the
house,declarativestatementK1
98followed by the little cat.declarativestatementK1
99So who was the copy cat
really?interrogativequestionDk1
100Nathan?
^SN:101Both of themelliptical dec.answerK2
^T:102Good boy.elliptical dec.acknowled.K1f
103So nobody was right
reallydeclarativedisclaimerK1
104well they said the big cat,declarativedisclaimerK1
105and nobody was really
rightdeclarativedisclaimerK1
106when they said the little

cat.declarativedisclaimerK1
107You were both right,declarativeacknowled.K1
108because the both cats.declarativeacknowled.K1
^S:109Miss B I put my hand up
for bothdeclarativestatementK1
^T:110Did you?interrogativeanswerK2
^Ss:111No, noelliptical dec.disclaimerK1
^T:112Right, (..) can work it out.declarativeacknowled.K1f