HAR05289

<center>

Inviting Dissent:
Classroom Practices for Nurturing Communities of Readers
in the Early School Years

</center>

<center>

Pauline Harris & Barbra McKenzie
Faculty of Education
University of Wollongong
Pauline_Harris@uow.edu.au

</center>

In the context of the early school years, this paper examines established classroom practices that focus on engaging young readers with texts. The lens used for this exploration is provided by transtextuality theory that accounts for ways in which texts build networks of meaning for readers to negotiate. Transtextuality theory originated in and serves literary criticism. However, this paper will demonstrate how this theory provides teachers and researchers with tools for interrogating classroom practices that seek to develop young readers as meaning makers. Examples of teaching strategies and learning experiences will be shared. These examples sometimes see dissent over interpretation arise among children or between teacher and children. This paper will identify ways that this creative dissent may be constructively managed as a positive resource for making meaning from texts. These classroom examples will be workshopped and explored in terms of how they nurture readers as navigators of meanings in the texts they read, view, share, recollect and talk about at school.

<center>

Problem and Purpose

</center>

In classroom talk around texts, many possible meanings arise from the text-in-hand and from the individuals who are gathered around the text. Orchestrating diverse perspectives in the face of required outcomes, instructional plans and time constraints can be a dilemma for teachers. Comments that children make might appear tangential and irrelevant, and yet be germane to the meaning they are making with the text-in-hand (Harris, Trezise & Winser, 2002). Comments may conform to or digress from a teacher's expectations and plans. Children's comments spring from the transaction between text and child (Rosenblatt, 1978), and the dispositions and resources children bring to the classroom. It therefore is appropriate, indeed necessary, to reflect on what in the text and in the child evoke the comments that children make and which are used by teachers to assist learning.

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to examine early grade classroom scenarios of classroom talk around texts and interrogate how this talk might accommodate dissent as well as consensus of perspectives.

Conceptual Framework

This paper's examination of classroom talk around texts is framed by theories of transtextuality (Genette, 1997. 1998; Kristeva, 1984). These theories explain the multi-layered nature of texts by identifying ways that texts build meaning through connections they make within themselves and to other texts and genres beyond. These connections have been categorised as follows.

Categories of Transtextuality

One category consists of connections between the text-in-hand and its surrounding elements through which the text is presented. These elements include book covers, title pages, layout, visual media and font styles, and are referred to as paratextuality (Genette, 1997). Paratextuality is significant for framing readers' expectations and moulding their interpretations of the text-in-hand

A second category concerns connections inside the text-in-hand, among its components such as its words and pictures, or stages in its organisation (such as orientation, complications and resolution in a narrative). These internal connections are called intratextuality (Stam, Burgoyne & Flitterman-Lewis, 1992). Intratextuality is important for providing structures inside the text for readers to negotiate and shape their interpretations and reader pathways.

A third category is made up of connections between the text-in-hand and texts and experiences that lie beyond it. This category is called intertextuality (Genette, 1998). Intertextuality rests not only in the text that evokes connections – it also rests in the reader who brings and detects particular connections that shape their interpretation of the text-in-hand.

A fourth category of transtextuality is more abstract and is made up of connections between the text-in-hand and broader groups of texts such as genre/s with which the text might be associated. Referred to as architextuality (Genette, 1998), these connections are important to framing a reader's sense of purpose and structure for the text-in-hand.

Finally, a fifth category concerns connections between the text-in-hand and other texts or genres that it might innovate on or transform. Called hypotextuality (Genette, 1998), this category embraces texts such as parodies, retellings, translations, sequels and the like. These connections do not always occur but are significant for drawing the reader into the realm of critical literacy and interrogating what changes have been made, to what effect and why.

A clear trend emerging from the previous classroom study on which this paper draws, is the recurrent use of the above links to organise and resource talk around texts (Harris *et al*, 2002). Further, conflicts commonly arose when these links were brought into view and dissent emerged (Harris *et al*, 2002). This dissent involved conflicts between connections that teachers planned and prioritised, and unexpected connections that children brought into view.

Hence this paper seeks to revisit three classroom scenarios from this study, in order to examine classroom talk around texts and interrogate how this talk might accommodate dissent as well as consensus of perspectives. In so doing, this paper demonstrates how an understanding of transtextuality can inform the way we think about and plan classroom talk around texts.

A Sociocultural Perspective of Classroom Talk

In applying transtextuality to classroom talk, a sociocultural perspective of classroom interactions is used. In the context of classroom talk around texts, talk and related activity are viewed from a Vygotskian perspective of 'leading activity' (Bodrova & Leong, 1996, p.50) that nurtures and extends children as literacy learners. Appropriately planned and tuning into children's needs and perspectives, talk and related materials and activities ideally provide tools and mediators to assist children to attain higher levels of literacy development (Vygotsky, 1978; Leontyev, 1981). In so doing, we are advocating teachers' use of ways to move children from assisted or shared performance such as occurs in talk around texts, towards the gaining of independence and responsibility (Bodrova & Leong, 1996, p.68).

In classroom talk around texts, various texts and experiences converge and are rewritten by readers against the backdrop of their own texts and experiences. What and whose connections count are relevant concerns and ones that are related to power in classroom interactions. Transtextuality theory portrays the open-ended nature of texts that give rise to multiple interpretations. Interpretation of text and perception of its transtextual nature is an individual matter between reader and text (Rosenblatt, 1978). The reader may stretch a text's boundaries and draw on sources they deem relevant for interpreting and appreciating the text in hand. The power to do so is not just a matter for teachers and the connections they deem appropriate to seek and validate. Making connections in classroom talk around texts is a matter for children as well as teachers to explore and articulate.

In teacher-led interactions, however, children may be seen to approximate their teacher's point of view rather than express their own ideas (Ruddell & Unrau, 2004). Patterns that may shape this kind of participation are those that see teachers initiate questions to which children answer and are evaluated on the appropriateness of their response (Dillon, 1994; Hickman, 2002).

Interactional Difficulties Around Texts and their Transtextual Connections

An inevitable part of evaluating children's responses is giving or withholding validation. Validation of children's connections is important because transtextuality in classrooms is about both learning and cultural capital (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Harris *et al*, 2002). Children make connections to texts, experiences and genres that they have known and experienced in their personal lives. These connections cut across various media of texts as well as lived experiences and are significant components of children's funds of knowledge (Moll & Gonzalez, 1990).

Some of what children share is taken up by their teacher and peers. In such instances, a child's knowledge is validated and so carries certain cultural capital (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). A sense of status is given to children making such connections, by virtue of others, especially the teacher, appreciating their connections. Sometimes, though, children's connections may not be recognized or deemed relevant – and any sense of status or cultural capital may be diminished as a result (Harris *et al*, 2002). In each instance of validation, the issue is one of not just what but whose perspective counts.

Control is thus a significant issue in classroom talk around texts, and one that is inextricably bound with variations in dispositions and perceptions among participants (Bernstein, 1977, 1990). These dispositions and perceptions are shaped and continue to be shaped by individuals' experiences and backgrounds in old and new settings (Bernstein, 1977, 1990; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990).

A teacher, for example, may come to a class interaction around a text with the disposition and plan to talk about texts in terms of their relationship to predetermined genres, and so assist children's understanding of those genres. Children, on the other hand, may and in fact do come with various other dispositions, some compatible with the teacher's orientation, some not. For example, children may make more specific connections between the text-in-hand and other texts they have encountered. Or children may make connections to genres other than those that the teacher has in mind. Or children may talk about connections in different terms from the teacher, shaped by their backgrounds and experiences that they bring to the interaction.

What happens in the face of dispositions and perceptions that, on reflection, transtextually 'make sense' but which are at odds with one another? Who controls interactions around the text-in-hand can tilt the field in favour of their agenda and preferred perspectives (Bernstein, 1977, 1990). Thus interactions around texts are multi-layered, and conflicts that arise can be illuminated by understanding the ways in which texts give rise to multiple possibilities through the multi-faceted connections they create; and by contextualising those connections in classroom interactions wherein issues of control and framing tensions are present.

Questions for Analysing Classroom Talk Around Texts

Against this backdrop of the importance of connections when teacher and children gather around a text in their classroom, transtextuality provides a lens for examining classroom talk. These theories are applied in this paper within a sociocultural perspective of classroom talk and interactional difficulties that arise therein.

Specifically, the paper examines three classroom scenarios that document classroom talk around texts. These scenarios are intended as vignettes for demonstrating the usefulness of this paper's theoretical framework of transtextuality for understanding the complexities of teacher-class interactions around texts. Each of these scenarios comes from the first author's research (Harris *et al*, 2002) that systematically investigated classroom talk around texts. One of its key findings was that many challenges and conflicts arise in this talk. This paper now takes up three of these scenarios. In so doing, this paper applies transtextuality theories of texts and sociocultural perspectives of classroom interactions to interrogating each scenario and to identifying alternative strategies for resolving difficulties and finding a place for dissent as well as consensus among participants.

To analyse these scenarios for this paper, the following questions are asked:
1. What is the instructional focus of the talk?
2. What is the transtextual nature of this focus?
3. What is the conflict that arises?
4. What is the transtextual nature of this conflict?
   a. What links did the teacher prioritise?
   b. What other links came into view?

5. What strategies were used to manage this conflict?
    a. How did the teacher's response serve the instructional agenda at hand?
    b. How did the teacher's response serve the children as readers and participants?
6. What alternative strategies does transtextuality suggest?

Suggested alternative strategies are intended only as illustrating leading activities in the Vygotskian sense – that is, strategies that provide opportunities for children and teacher alike to engage with multiple perspectives, and build bridges from children's existing knowledge to new knowledge. These strategies are meant to be neither prescriptive nor exhaustive.

Classroom Scenarios of Classroom Talk Around Texts

In this section, three classroom scenarios have been chosen on the basis of their ability to represent a range of transtextual difficulties previously documented (Harris *et al*, 2002). These scenarios are analysed in relation to the questions identified in the preceding 'Conceptual Framework'. The purpose of this section is to examine early grade classroom scenarios of classroom talk around texts and explore how this talk might accommodate dissent as well as consensus of perspectives. In so doing, the relevance of transtextuality as a framework for reflecting on classroom talk around texts is highlighted. It is not our purpose to make judgments on teachers. Possible alternative suggestions are included not with a prescriptive intent, but simply to illustrate how transtextuality provides a lens for reflecting on and generating classroom practices.

Classroom Scenario A – Predators

The first scenario, shown in Figure 1, comes from a Year One classroom and
[Insert Figure 1 here]
focuses on narratives, making intertextual links to stories and architextual links to narrative genres. As shown in the analysis in Figure 1, this extract illustrates a conflict between different genres. The teacher is working within a narrative code, signalled by words such as 'meanies', 'stories' and 'villains'. A child shifted the teacher's framing focus to an information report genre with the response 'predator', a term associated with factual texts.

Figure 1 identifies strategies the teacher used to deal with this conflict and move the lesson on. Validation was given to the child offering 'predators', in terms of the idea if not the term itself. In so doing, the lesson retained its planned focus on narratives. Understandably, choices are made in lessons about what to take up and what not to take up, in light of time and planned and mandated outcomes (Harris *et al*, 2002). The choice here to retain a focus on narratives is therefore understandable.

Exploring this scenario through a transtextual lens, some elastic might have been put on the narrative focus by exploring the unexpected relationship between 'predator' and 'villain' and the two distinct genres implied by these terms. Using a transtextual approach, a teacher also might explore with the child what made him think of the word and where he had encountered it previously. This exploration might have been taken up with the rest of the class, to continue to establish some shared understandings about 'predators' and other possible terms that might come to the fore in this exploration. Such

discussion conceivably could see children range across a range of experiences in books, films, DVDs, songs, television and in real-life.

While time for this discussion might appear a luxury, a transtextual approach maintains the value of allowing children's prior understandings and experiences to come to the fore; shared understandings to be negotiated; and multiple points of view acknowledged and related explicitly to the instructional focus at hand.

Classroom Scenario B – 'Meg's Eggs'

The second scenario comes from a Kindergarten classroom and is shown in Figure 2. The instructional focus was on procedural genre, specifically recipes. The

[Insert Figure 2 here]

springboard to procedural genres was a spell embedded in the picturebook narrative 'Meg's Eggs' (Nicoll & Pienkowski, 1975) (a picturebook about a witch called Meg whose spells go hilariously wrong).

The planned instructional focus was framed by making transtextual links between the spell in the narrative and recipes. These links involved an analogy between witches, spells, cauldrons and making spells on the one hand, and mothers, recipes, ovens and cooking on the other hand. This analogy was complex in the intertextual links it involved between texts and lived experiences, while simultaneously making more abstract architextual links to text types.

This scenario saw a second instructional focus come into view – building intratextual links inside the 'Meg's Eggs' text between content and structure. The part of the text under focus depicted the spell being made and its result of 'three big eggs' (instead of three small eggs Meg had hoped to make for breakfast). The teacher sought to reach beyond the text-in-hand and relate the spell to a procedure, using the pictures as a guide to steps involved in the procedure. Children, however, remained in the narrative frame and talked about what was happening in story terms, as seen in Figure 2.

The transtextual nature of these conflicts is quite complex. While the teacher intended the spell to lead into recipes as procedural genre, spells were talked about in terms of witches, wizards and cauldrons that evoke stories. Spells also were linked to cooking in the home and to the class jelly-making activity. The instructional purpose of this link was stretched when children discussed these links in specific and concrete terms while the teacher attempted to use more technical terms such as 'ingredients' associated with procedural texts.

In response to these conflicts, the teacher validated children's responses that approximated the instructional plan, and corrected, reworded or rephrased those responses that did not. For example, when using the text to draw links to procedural texts, the teacher read, '"Plink plonk plunk"', and asked, 'What's happening there?' A child went to answer, 'Three-' and was stopped by the teacher who said, 'No, what's happening? Edward?' Edward replied 'Eggs are coming out of the---'. Again the teacher redirected, 'But what's happened? What's happened? All the ingredients have what? What have they done?'

Again the strategies used to manage this conflict are understandable and indicates pressure of time that this teacher later expressed (Harris et al, 2002). A transtextual lens suggests possible ways forward that might accommodate children's perspectives while working towards the instructional plan at hand. The use of the

spell embedded in a narrative unintentionally invited associations with the narrative in hand, as narrative was a more familiar genre than procedure to these children. The link between spell and procedural genre was a complicated one: involving connections between a spell embedded in a story and a procedural genre, as well as between fiction and lived experiences. Under these circumstances, many different links can and did come into view.

To manage these divergent perspectives, these connections need to be taken on board as they play a significant part in how children learn, as previously stated. A tool such as a Venn Diagram could assist the organisation and conceptualisation of these various perspectives: listing and grouping what goes with 'stories like "Meg's Eggs"', what 'goes with spells like "Three frogs' legs"' and what goes with 'procedural texts like recipes'.

Given that a spell was used as the initial link, then having the children actually make a spell could provide a tangible experience of the procedure. Such an activity would also provide a transition from a story frame of fiction to a procedural frame of lived experience. Building on the activity, children could recount orally and in writing what they did, transposing this as a procedural text to show someone else how make the spell – thereby using intertextual links among the text-in-hand ("Meg's Eggs'), hands-on, spoken and written activities.

Another alternative is having children bring in real-life instances of procedural texts from their homes, such as games instructions with which they might be familiar and which could provide a focus for more talk and activity. In so doing, children's funds of knowledge (Moll & Gonzalez, 1994) would be validated and used as resources for new learning.

Classroom Scenario C – 'Keep Out of the Kitchen Mum'

The third and final scenario is shown in Figure 3 and portrays a teacher and a Year One class talking about the front cover of a children's cookbook. The instructional
[Insert Figure 3 here]
plan for this lesson was to immerse children in recipes as instances of procedural texts. The lesson began with a paratextual focus on the book's front cover and asking the children to predict the kind of text between the covers.

Tensions emerged when children intertextually reached beyond the book's cover to interpret the cover and what its images and title might suggest about the nature of the text inside. Children's links framed their predictions as story, which may well have been evoked by the book's ambiguous title that does not necessarily evoke a cookbook. The images on the cover that showed ingredients and cooking implements could signal either a cookbook or a story that involves children cooking in the kitchen. When a child predicted a story about making pancakes, he made an intertextual link to a lesson earlier that day when the class had been discussing Pancake Day that was imminent.

In response to the conflict between procedural and narrative genres, the teacher focused on the images on the book's cover to implicitly highlight the book as a cookbook. The teacher also appealed to the size of the book and its 'many pages' to redirect predictions away from a story about pancakes – 'Do you think we need all that for pancakes?' However, in a story frame of mind, the children were able to conceive that a story about making pancakes (not how to cook them) could take that many pages. The

teacher also asked children to explore what the children pictured on the cover might do in the kitchen. The teacher concluded by telling the children the text's genre and made a link to forthcoming classroom experiences.

The paratexts of children's books are intended by authors and illustrators to frame readers' expectations and interpretations. However, how a reader transacts with the paratext of a book is an individual matter, and different associations can and do arise for different children gathered around a paratext. Of course, the paratext does not stop with the front cover. Opening the book to view title pages, contents tables, layout and visuals would provide further paratextual clues about the procedural genre in hand.

From a transtextuality perspective, children's predictions, while not matching the text-in-hand or the teacher's plans, were valid none the less. To be in a position to validate children's responses, an open mind and a supportive lesson structure needs to be adopted. One such structure may be provided by a Directed Listening Think Activity (Rapp Ruddell, 1993). Children could be asked to predict the text from the title alone; then the front cover; then the back cover; then the title pages, the contents table and so on. This activity would invite and accommodate multiple perspectives; and ask children to monitor and modify their predictions each time more information in the paratext is revealed. Children then could share their line of thinking with the teacher and one another, and point out critical points when their predictions shifted – and, as importantly, what in the text and in themselves caused shifts in their thinking.

Discussion

The three classroom scenarios examined in this paper reflect the type of interaction patterns that characterised those found in the study (Harris *et al*, 2002). Typically, classroom talk around texts followed the sequence of teacher's initiation of question, child's response, and teacher evaluation of response (Dillon, 1994; Hickman, 2002).

These scenarios are also representative of pressures teachers perceived that led them to trying to expedite rather than explore children's responses and perspectives. In teacher interviews, time to cover required outcomes emerged as a key constraint. Stopping to clarify and negotiate children's connections are important processes but take time. Confronted with conflicts such as the conflicts illustrated in this paper, teachers often used their authority to correct and redirect perceived inappropriate contributions.

Ways forward lie in recognising the different kinds of connections that come in and out of view and which shape the various perspectives of participants. A transtextual analysis of these three scenarios reveals how different kinds of connections can be evoked by the one text or question. These different connections may not fall only in the same category – for example, a child making an architextual link to narrative genre while the teacher is working with an architextual link to procedural genre. Disparate connections also may straddle different categories and see the teacher and child working categorically in different places at the same time. For example, the teacher may be architextually working between the text-in-hand and its genre, such as the spell in 'Meg's Eggs' and its procedural genre. Instead, children might be working intratextually inside the text, such as relating Meg's spell to the story's pictures and what was happening in the story.

Transtextuality is a complex reality of classroom talk around texts and needs to be realised and managed as such. Transtextuality provides tools for reflecting on classroom talk around texts. At times, the conflicts that arise in this talk might seem transitory and insignificant in the context of the fuller lesson. However, these moments are significant because of the transtextual tensions they signify and which continue to manifest themselves in talk around texts. If managed effectively, transtextual conflicts can provide important teachable moments that, while unplanned or unexpected, are not tangential and can serve the outcomes at hand, if alternative routes to those outcomes are taken.

As teachers consider their classroom practices, they might reflect on practices such as: provision of opportunities for children to initiate connections that children see relevant at the time; uptake and acknowledgment of children's connections; selection of texts and an appreciation of the connections they might evoke in readers and which readers might bring to the text; and strategies and interaction patterns that assist explorations of connections and construction of pathways to new ideas and learning.

Along these pathways, dissent may be encountered between teacher and children or among children themselves. This dissent may be understood in terms of clashes or tensions around the transtextual focus at hand; and behind those tensions, differences in dispositions and ways of talking about texts and their constituents. If such dissent is met with a theoretically informed stance and a preparedness to share control and negotiate the framing focus, then constructive solutions may be found that exploit dissent to resource ways forward to new learning and the fulfilment of outcomes.

References

Bernstein, B. (1977) *Class, codes and control. Volume 3. Towards a theory of educational transmissions*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bernstein, B. (1990) *Class, codes and control. Volume 4. The structuring of pedagogic discourse*. London: Routledge.

Bloome, D. & Egan-Robertson, A. (1993) The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons. *Reading Research Quarterly, 28, 4*, 305-333.

Bodrova, E., & Leong, D. (1996). *Tools of the mind: The Vygotskian approach to Early Childhood Education*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture (Nice, Richard, Trans.). Sage Publications, London.

Dillon, J. (1994). *Using discussion in classrooms*. Buckingham: Open University Press

Genette, G. (1992) *Introduction to the architext*. (transl. J.E. Lewin). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Genette, G. (1997) Paratexts*: the Thresholds of Textuality (Literature, Culture, Theory Ser., No. 20)*. Transl. Lewin, J. E. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Genette, G. (1998) *Palimpsests: literature in the second degree (Stages)* Transl. C. Newman & C. Doubinsky. Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Harris, P., Trezise, J. & Winser, W.N. (2002) 'Is the story on my face?' Intertextual conflicts during teacher-class interactions around texts in early grade classrooms. *Research in the Teaching of English, 37, 9*-54.

Hickman, S. (2002). *Social significance of questioning in classroom discourse*. (Online). Available URL: http://cla.libart.calpoly.edu/~jbattenb/papers/hickman.html (Accessed 10th February 2005)

Kristeva, J. (1984) *Revolution in poetic language*. New York: Columbia U.P.

Leontyev, A. N. (1981). *Problems of the development of the mind*. Moscow: Progress

Moll, L.C. & Gonzalez, N. (1994) Lessons from research with language-minority children. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 26,* 4: 439-456.

Nicoll, H. & Pienkowski, J. (1975). *Meg's Eggs*. Middlesex: Puffin.

Rapp Ruddell, M. (1993) *Teaching content reading and writing*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Rosenblatt, L. (1978) *The reader, the text, the poem – the transactional theory of the literary work Carbondale*: Southern Illinois U.P.

Ruddell, R.B. & Unrau, N.J. (2004) Reading as a meaning construction process: the reader, the text and the teacher. In Ruddell, R.B., Ruddell, M.R. & Singer, H. (Eds.) *Theoretical models and processes of reading*. 5th Edn. Newark: I.R.A.

Stam, R., Burgoyne, R. & Flitterman-Lewis, S. (1992) *New Vocabularies in Film Semiotics*. London: Routledge.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Figure 1. Analysis of Classroom Scenario A – Predators

What is the instructional focus? Narratives – villains.	

What is the transtextual nature of this focus?
Intertextual – links to stories with villains
Architextual – narrative genre

What is the conflict that arises?
A label for wrong-doing characters in narratives – the teacher sought the word 'villain' and a child instead offered 'predator':

T: If there's somebody that's mean in the story, and we've seen lots of these mean people in movies, we call them the baddies, but what's the <u>right</u> word for them? Do you know, R?
R: Predators?
T: Predators? That's a big word. What does that mean?
R: Um, some like, um, an animal that eats another animal, like a fox eats a hen
T: Good boy. Yes, there might be a fox in <u>this story</u> that's waiting to eat the hen.
T: But all those meanies in stories, whether they're animals or they're people that try and cause harm, they're called the villains. Usually they never win.

What is the transtextual nature of this conflict?
Architextual conflict: crossed frames of reference between narrative and information text

What links did the teacher prioritise?	**What other links came into view?**
Links to narrative	Links to factual texts such as information reports

What strategies were used to manage this conflict?
The teacher sought clarification ("What does that mean?"), reframed the child's response in terms of narrative ('Yes there might be a fox *in this story*' – validating the idea but not the term), and reinforced narrative as the framing focus and the preferred term for wrong-doing characters in narratives ('All those meanies in stories…they're called *villains*')

How did these strategies serve the instructional agenda?	**How did these strategies serve the children?**
The agenda retained its focus on narrative and resisted diverting to other genres	Narrative frame was made explicit for children, but did not explore links between narrative and factual genres that came into view.

What alternative strategies does transtextuality suggest?
Bringing narrative and information texts together into focus. Exploring with the child and other children where they and encountered predators. Exploring why a fox in a story might be called a villain but in a factual piece be called a predator.

Figure 2. Analysis of Classroom Scenario B – 'Meg's Eggs'

What is the instructional focus?	Procedural genre – recipes

What is the transtextual nature of this focus?
Architextual – linking spells to recipes as procedural texts
Intertextual – linking spells to cooking in children's homes and in the classroom

What is the conflict that arises?

Various conflicts arise in this scenario from different genres, texts and activities coming into view that frame the talk and shift the teacher's focus:

T: What's a spell?
C3: It's magic.
T: What kind of people have spells?
C4: Witches and wizards.
T: Yes, good boy. Witches and wizards make spells. [re-reads spell] 'Lizards and newts, three loud hoots, green frogs' legs, three big eggs.' What does [Meg] make her spell in?
C2: A cauldron.
T: What did Meg put into the pot? What do we call the things we put into a pot to cook?
C5: Ingredients.
T: Those things are called ingredients. Let's write it on the board. [writes] [points to book] These are the ingredients for Meg's spell. When the ingredients are written down, what is it called? Mummy might have a book full of these at home. It starts with the sound /r/.
C6: Recipe.
T: Good boy. A witch's spell and a recipe are almost the same except Mum uses a recipe and cooks in a..?
C5: Oven.
T: In an oven or a pot. And witches use spells and they cook in a …?
C3: Pot, pot, cauldron!
T: Cauldron. Very good.
[Teach leads the talk into recounting a jelly-making activity done the previous day. Action verbs such as 'poured' (corrected from 'put') and 'dissolved' (a child was corrected for using 'vanished') were emphasised, as were terms for the stages of a procedural text: 'ingredients' and 'method'.]
T: [returning focus on 'Meg's Eggs'] All right, do you think the spell would be the same [as recipes at home, previously discussed]?
C7 : No.
T : So if some, let's have a look, let's have a look at what Meg did. OK, well, when Meg put all her ingredients together, [reading "Meg's eggs" text], "lizards and newts, three loud hoots, green frogs' legs, three big eggs". What's this part of the spell ? Cathy?
C3: The ingredients.
T : Good girl. That's the ingredients, that's what Meg used and she made her spell. Tony, are you listening? And then, [reading caption in illustration next to three cracking eggs] "Plink plonk plunk".
T: What's happening there?
C3: Three---
T : No, what's happening? Edward?
C2: Eggs are coming out of the----
T : But what's happened? What's happened? All the ingredients have what? What have they done?
C8 : She's got big ones!
T : That's right, she's got huge ones because all the ingredients have mixed together to make something--
C9 : Big!
T : To make something new and it was big eggs. So what's happened is all the ingredients have been put together and the method showed us how to put them all together and something new comes out of it. So a spell does work the same way.

What is the transtextual nature of this conflict?
- Architextual tensions between narrative and procedural genres
- Intertextual tensions between recipes and lived experiences
- Intratextual tensions when talking about the word/picture relationships to describe procedures rather than tell the story

What links did the teacher prioritise?	**What other links came into view?**
Architextual links to procedural genres, specifically recipes.	Links to narratives, nursery rhymes, jelly-making activity, cooking at home, As well, links between words and pictures inside the text that focused children on describing the story rather than the procedure behind the spell.

What strategies were used to manage this conflict?
Validating responses that approximated the plan (e.g., 'Cauldron. Very good'), redirecting questioning, correcting or rewording children's responses (e.g., Child's response 'Big' was re-phrased 'To make something *new*').

How did these strategies serve the instructional agenda?	**How did these strategies serve the children?**
The lesson was moved along.	Children tried to approximate expected responses but were diverted from their interests in the story at hand and their concrete talk about the story or their jelly-making activity.

What alternative strategies does transtextuality suggest?
Given the complex transtextual nature of instructional foci like the one in this scenario, many different links can and do come into view. An alternative pathway might be using teacher modelling and guidance to assist children make a spell, recount orally and in writing what they did, and transposing this as a procedural text to show someone else how make the spell. Children also might be asked to bring in procedural texts from their homes, such as games instructions with which they might be familiar and which would provide concrete examples in-hand.

Figure 3. Analysis of Classroom Scenario C – 'Keep Out of the Kitchen, Mum'

What is the instructional focus?   Predicting the text from its front cover

What is the transtextual nature of this focus? Paratextual – predicting the text from its immediate surrounds Architextual – procedural genre (cookbook and recipes)

What is the conflict that arises? The teacher is seeking cookbook-related predictions, while children talk about their predictions in terms of a story: T: [Reading] 'Keep Out of the Kitchen, Mum'. What do you think is going to be in this? [pointing to the title] It is said distinctly, 'Keep out of the Kitchen Mum, and it's got all this stuff around it [pointing to illustrations of food and kitchen implements on the cover] C1: A surprise. T: What sort of surprise? You've got to give me an answer that tells me you've really thought of something. C2: They want their Mum out of the kitchen because they're gonna make a pancake for her. [Pancakes were not shown on the book's cover. This comment made a link to an earlier part of the lesson where the class had been discussing making pancakes on Shrove Tuesday at the beginning of Lent.] T: Well look, how many pages in this book. Do you think we need all that for pancakes? All right. Well, C2 is well and truly on the right track. Follow it through a bit further. They want their Mum to stay out of the kitchen because, because .....why? [Children continue with their predictions of stories about children cooking for their mother]. T: [Bringing children's predictions to an end] It's a *cookbook* that has things in it that children can make by themselves and it's going to be very handy to us because later in the year we are going to be making our own healthy lunches.

What is the transtextual nature of this conflict? As children focused on the book's Paratexts, they used other experiences and story genres to frame their expectations of the text. Children's connections diverted them from the cookbook genre of the text-in-hand and their teacher's expectations.

What links did the teacher prioritise? Links to procedural genre – specifically cookbooks and recipes.	**What other links came into view?** Links to Pancake Day Links to stories by the children.

What strategies were used to manage this conflict? The teacher focused on the images on the book's cover, redirected predictions away from a story about pancakes, asked children to explore what the children on the cover might do in the kitchen, and told the children the text's genre.

How did these strategies serve the instructional agenda? Children persisted with a narrative frame. Identifying the genre moved the lesson on.	**How did these strategies serve the children?** Bridges not built between story and procedural texts.

What alternative strategies does transtextuality suggest? Framing questions as open-ended and acknowledging divergent responses. Recording children's predictions and asking them to identify what on the book's cover evokes their prediction.