

Published in Linguistics and Education

Cairney, T.H. & Ashton, J. (2002). Three families, multiple discourses:
Examining differences in the literacy practices of home and school.
Linguistics and Education. Vol. 13, No. 3, pp 303-345.

THREE FAMILIES, MULTIPLE DISCOURSES: PARENTAL ROLES, CONSTRUCTIONS OF LITERACY AND DIVERSITY OF PEDAGOGIC PRACTICE

Trevor Cairney and Jean Ashton
University of Western Sydney

Paper accepted for publication in
Linguistics and Education

Contact details

Professor Trevor Cairney
Centre for Regional Research & Innovation
University of Western Sydney
Locked Bag 1797,
Penrith South DC, NSW, 1797
Australia

Fax: 61 2 4736 0036
Email: t.cairney@uws.edu.au

Dr Jean Ashton
School of Education and Early Childhood Studies
University of Western Sydney
Locked Bag 1797,
Penrith South DC, NSW, 1797
Australia

Fax: 61 2 4736 0413
Email: j.ashton@uws.edu.au

Three Families, Multiple Discourses: Parental Roles, Constructions Of Literacy And Diversity Of Pedagogic Practice

Abstract

To understand more fully what it means to be literate, we need to consider the people who use literacy and how it is constructed, defined and supported in varied contexts. In this paper we share part of an ongoing research project that has sought to understand the sociolinguistic complexity of literacy practices at home and school for a number of specific families.

This study examines the discourse practices of members of three families as they engage in shared reading activities. The families are unique both socially and culturally, and construct meanings about literacy according to their own ways of experiencing and using it. As well, they engage in sociolinguistic practices to support literacy learning and further their children's educational opportunities.

The data discussed was gathered as part of a large-scale study involving multiple ethnographies (Cairney & Green, 1997). The paper reports on an exploration of the nature of literacy practices in three diverse families. Specifically, it looks at the discourse practices families engage in as they support children's literacy understanding during shared story reading events. These events were examined to explore how the definitions of literacy implicitly held by parents and the roles they adopted in supporting their children, impacted on the literacy discourse practices of home story reading events.

Our discourse analysis of shared reading events indicated that while two families relied on implicit understandings of literacy that shared much in common, the strategies employed in supporting shared reading varied quite significantly. Furthermore, our analysis showed that while such events could be examined in terms of the cognitive support that parents offered, this in no way explained the complexity of what parents were doing as they supported their children's literacy learning.

What our analysis demonstrates is that the sociolinguistic complexity of literacy support that adults offer, makes it difficult (indeed unwise) to make simplistic statements concerning differences across literacy contexts, or even repeated occurrences of the same type of literacy event within a single context.

Hence, one could assume that where there is congruence between the pedagogical practices found at home and at school, this must also reflect a degree of intersubjectivity, developed through the parents' own experience of school, parent education programs and involvement in children's education. However, our work shows that without greater attention to the discourse practices, the picture is at best incomplete. Detailed discourse analysis of the kind we have undertaken offers us the power to look more deeply at the sociolinguistic strategies that are being employed. This in turn offers us opportunities to identify how pedagogical practices need to change both in the home and at school in order to more fully support all students as literacy users.

Introduction

To understand what it means to be literate we need to consider the people who use literacy. Literacy is not simply a unitary cognitive skill, rather it is a set of social practices that take place in a variety of social and cultural contexts (Gee, 1990; Cairney, 1995; Cairney & Ruge, 1998). Adopting a social constructivist perspective we see that literacy is constructed and defined by members of groups as they engage in different literate practices for specific purposes and encompasses the diversity such groups bring with them (Bruner, 1986; Gee, 1990). This places an emphasis on how literacy comes to be viewed by members of social and cultural groups through their participation in the literate activities within these groups. Moll (1993) suggests that this perspective shifts the focus of learning and literacy away from the individual to learning as participation within a “community of practice”.

Identity within a cultural group is both shaped by and shapes beliefs, values and practices as individuals share interactions and adapt their thinking as they make sense of their experiences (Au, 1993). Schools, classrooms, families and communities can all be understood as cultural groups constructing their own views of literacy and what it means to be literate (Cairney & Ruge, 1998). The research described in this paper has sought to gain a greater understanding of how literacy practices are shaped in home and school contexts and how parents, teachers and students develop shared understanding of what it means to be literate.

Family Literacies

Families construct and use literacy in ways which will differ according to a range of factors including socioeconomic levels, ethnicity, educational history, family stability, gender and health. The literacy values and practices of families have the potential to “shape the course of children’s literacy development in terms of the opportunities, recognition, interaction and models available to them” (Hannon, 1995, p. 104). Although recognising that there is as much diversity within groups such as families, as across them (Breen, Loudon, Barrat-Pugh, Rivalland, Rohl, Rhydwen, Lloyd & Carr, 1994; Cairney, Lowe & Sproats, 1995), a wide diversity of home literacy practices exists. Interestingly, there appears to be some migration of literacy practices across contexts. For example, while identifying the distinctive nature of home literacies, Barton (1997) found that literacies from other domains, such as work or school, were frequently carried out at home. This in turn was the base from which individuals moved out into other domains. Understanding more about the nature of literacy diversity, how it varies and moves across multiple contexts, and how it develops, is a topic of interest to many researchers.

It has been suggested that the most academically successful students are those whose family literacy practices are more congruent with school literacy practices. The corollary to this is that when home and school literacy practices are incongruent, it is thought that academic success may be compromised. Numerous studies in recent times have focused on the unity of literacy practice and conception, and its contribution to academic success. Cairney and his colleagues (Cairney, 1995; Cairney, Ruge, Buchanan, Lowe & Munsie, 1995; Cairney & Ruge, 1998), Galda, Cullinan and Strickland (1997) and others note that when school and family cultures match there is a mutuality of concern and understanding and literacy learning is facilitated. When there are mismatches, greater effort on the part of the school is required to ensure students' success.

However, if we focus purely on pedagogic practices there is a danger of perceiving families as deficit in literacy understanding and in turn, creating an agenda for schools which seeks to address this by conforming family literacy practices to a narrow range of reproducible school literacy practices. It is clear that parents support their children in many different ways and that this is not restricted to specific cultural and class groups. Even parents who have little formal education contribute significantly to their children's literacy understanding, (Auerbach, 1997; see also Barton, 1997). Auerbach found that while school staff felt it unlikely that some students received home academic support, in reality most parents desire their children to do well and go to great lengths to help them succeed. This finding has been supported in a variety of research projects (Cairney & Munsie, 1995a).

Part of the difficulty in making judgements about the way parents support children's literacy is that often teachers simply observe the pedagogic practices that parents appear to support without fully appreciating that differences in discourse practices can alter dramatically the impact of particular practices. In related research (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Cairney, 2000) conducted case studies of four schools (one secondary and three elementary) which had been identified as adopting innovative strategies to acknowledge and respond to differences in the language and literacy practices of the communities they serve. This work involved detailed observation and discourse analysis of the literacy practices of 35 case study children as they moved in and out of home, school and community contexts. These students were chosen to reflect diversity in culture, age, gender, ability and social class.

Observations were conducted in a total of eight classrooms across the three participating elementary schools. In addition, classroom observations were conducted across seven subject areas in Years 7 and 9 in the participating secondary school. A total of 82 days of classroom observation were conducted across the four schools. A number of questions were explored in

the study but one of particular relevance to the topic of this paper was “How do different interactional structures and ways of participating in literacy events contribute to the construction of different views of literacy?”

The data from the study showed that participants adopted different roles and relationships, norms and expectations, and ways of participating in literacy-related events and that these were not necessarily confined to specific pedagogic practices (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Cairney, 2000). Like Gutierrez (1994) Cairney and Ruge (1998) found that the participants involved in literacy events constructed different definitions of literacy as they interacted with others. The construction of differing notions of what constitutes literate action helped the researchers to make sense of the way in which parents and teachers attempted to support reading. Four distinct 'constructions of literacy' were identified through the discourse analyses in the study:

- *Literacy as Knowledge* was characterised by one participant (usually an adult) fulfilling the role of monitor of knowledge, while other participant(s) were accountable for reproducing knowledge to participate successfully in the literacy event.
- *Literacy as Performance* was characterised by one or more participants (usually children) being held accountable (usually by adults) for demonstrating a certain level of proficiency in a literacy-related task. In some instances the adult acted as arbiter of the quality of the performance.
- *Literacy as negotiated meaning making* involved each participant having the right to contribute to literacy interactions at will in such a way that meaning was maintained the focus of the literacy event.
- *Literacy as 'Doing School'* was characterised by an emphasis on procedural displays of classroom competence rather than on the literacy demands of the task.

In the case studies conducted as part of the current paper, the particular construction of literacy of literacy held by parents and the roles they adopted in interacting with their children had an impact on the pedagogic strategies adopted as well as their effectiveness. This will be explored in greater detail in the discourse analysis of literacy practices below.

School Literacies

Schools and classrooms are dynamic, interactional environments where individuals meet together for the purpose of schooling (Green, Kantor & Rogers, 1991). Situated definitions of what it is to be a teacher or a student and how one gains knowledge, are mutually constructed

through interactions within the culture of the classroom with its own unique system of values, beliefs and standards (Au, 1993). Students' conceptions of literacy based on the literate actions in which they engage outside the classroom, may be supported or constrained by school-based literacies, depending on their congruence (Santa Barbara Discourse Group, 1992).

In school, literacy is seen as central to many classroom activities. It is not only viewed as an object of study but it is both explicitly discussed and implicitly taught in all curriculum domains (Puro & Bloome, 1987). This differs markedly from home literacies, like jotting down a telephone number or reading a recipe. Home literacy is rarely explicitly evaluated, rather it is deemed successful if it serves its purpose (Barton, 1997).

Puro and Bloome (1987) note that the implicit nature of classroom communication is often overlooked, however it impacts greatly on instruction and what is learnt in school. Literacy is often used within the context of instruction and is constructed by teachers and students as they interact and learn about the "academic and social processes for acquiring knowledge and new learning strategies" (p.28). In this manner the object of study is embedded in the context of communication (both explicit and implicit) thereby effectively broadening the message.

Luke (1995) offers an explanation of why differences between the literacy practices of home and those explicitly and implicitly experienced by schools should influence academic success. He argues that when certain interactional patterns and textual practices are clearly preferred, they have the potential to systematically exclude students who may be economically marginalised or culturally different. Coe (1995) suggests that although such students may be highly literate within their own social or cultural sphere, limiting assessment to specific literacy practices disadvantages many of them.

Understanding pedagogical practices at home and school

In making sense of the variations we have observed in the literacy practices of the families within this study, we have drawn on two separate bodies of work: sociocultural theory and constructivism (as exemplified in the work of Vygotsky).

First, sociocultural theory has taught us that all texts are implicated in social relations. We learn to read and write by "being apprenticed to a social group" (Gee, 1990, p.45). Hence, the meanings we construct as we read and write reflect who we are, what we have experienced, what we know about language and the world, and also our purposes for creating them in the first place (Cairney, 1990; 1995). Types of discourse and the way we read or write them are the social constructs of specific groups. Literacy events at home and school are situated within relationships that establish processes for constructing oral and written texts.

Whilst the nature and functions of talk and literacy in the classroom are similar to that in the 'outside' world, language in all its forms within the classroom has uses that relate to specific cultural practices associated with schooling. As Gee (1990) points out, schools engage in particular Discourses. To be a teacher or a pupil in any school demands specific ways of using language, behaving, interacting, and adherence to sets of values and attitudes. The way we read and write are essentially the social constructs of specific groups. Individuals in turn, are enculturated into these literacy practices and their meanings. Hence, one might well transfer the literacy practices of school to home, but there is no guarantee that Discourses within which these practices are embedded will lead to the same instructional effects. Similarly, one could argue that transferring home literacy practices to school could suffer the same impediments. Heras (1993, p.276) suggests that classrooms have a range of "lived opportunities, possibilities, and constraints opened up.... (and dependent) on the configurations made possible by the institutional organization of the school and classroom *and* by the social and academic interactions within these institutional spaces." Hence, knowledge is always related to the opportunities students have to engage and interact with each other. Much less is known about how literacy is constructed at home, but there is no reason to question that it is similarly shaped by human interaction, as well as implicit roles and definitions of what it means to be literate.

Negotiation of roles and relationships is an important part of any social group. Fernie, Davies, Kantor and McMurray (1993) argue that classroom life involves constant negotiation between participants. Each of these participants negotiate roles, rights, obligations, norms and expectations from different positions. Heap (1991) points out that a teacher and his/her students jointly construct the contexts in which they work, defining the content of their learning, and the situated roles and relationships and the definitions of what counts as knowledge. Heath's (1983) work similarly suggests that knowledge and literacy events are also constructed differently across families and vary depending on culture and social class.

Such sociocultural variability has been illustrated in school contexts by the work of Gutierrez (1993). She found that when studying the effects of writing process instruction on elementary and secondary aged Latino children, differences across classrooms were characterized by particular participation structures. That is, the social hierarchies, discourse and interactional patterns and knowledge exchange systems varied from classroom to classroom. Furthermore, she found that the various patterns of social action, discourse and classroom activities formed "scripts" which were of three main types.

The first was labelled *recitation* and was found in 4 of 9 classrooms. It was characterized by a large degree of teacher direction and limited opportunities for students to interact with and receive help from peers.

The second was labeled *responsive* and was found in 3 of the 9 classrooms. While this script was still very much "teacher managed" it allowed for far more relaxed activity boundaries and participation structures, with student responses being solicited and encouraged, and opportunities being given for students to build on the responses of others.

The third type of script was labeled *responsive/collaborative*, and was observed in 2 classrooms. This type of script was characterized by a highly dynamic interactive learning context in which both the discourse and the knowledge were more frequently jointly constructed. In this type of classroom, the teacher more regularly acknowledged student contributions, and writing was seen "... not as a method, or a set of activities, but rather as a socially negotiated process of constructing oral and written texts, of interacting with others about texts, and of generating texts" (Gutierrez, 1994, p. 345).

What was clear from Gutierrez's work was that these differences between classrooms lead to the construction of specific models of literacy, rather than a single unitary definition. It would appear that through their actions, teachers (and I would add, parents) signal what they see as appropriate actions, what roles are possible (and are valued), how children are to take up roles, and what counts as appropriate literacy activities in the classroom (Heap, 1980).

The second body of work that has helped us to make sense of our findings is that derived from Rogoff and Vygotsky. Rogoff (1990), building on the work of Vygotsky (1978), claimed that we teach and learn from others by communicating through the use of language. She notes that guided participation in culturally valued activities supports intersubjectivity, or a sharing of focus and purpose between children and more skilled partners to accomplish a stated goal. Referring to this as "effective pedagogical practice", Ladson-Billings (1995a; 1995b), Cummins (1986) and Cairney and Ruge (1998) have highlighted the importance of collaborative culturally relevant pedagogy in order to empower students to assume greater control over their own learning. Central to this theoretical work is Vygotsky's assumption that learning moves from an initial form of guided learning to later independent learning. Vital to this is his concept of the Zone of Proximal Development. Vygotsky's (1978) ideas challenge traditional notions of developmentally appropriate learning. He proposed that there are in fact two developmental levels. The first Vygotsky termed "actual development" and defined it as "the level of development of a child's mental functions.... determined by independent problem solving" (p. 86). In other words, what a child can do alone at a particular point in time. The second,

"potential development" was defined as that which a child can achieve if given the benefit of support during the task. It is the ability to solve problems "under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (p. 86).

Vygotsky suggested that there is always a difference between these two forms of development and that this gap, the "Zone of Proximal Development" (ZPD) indicates the functions "...that have not yet matured but are in the process of maturation" (p.86). It is the ZPD that is critical for learning and instruction. He argued that learning creates the zone of proximal development; it "awakens a variety of internal development processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers. Once these processes are internalized, they become part of the child's independent developmental achievement" (p.90).

Rogoff (1990) points out that the ZPD is a dynamic region of sensitivity to learning the skills of culture, in which children develop through participation in problem solving with more experienced members of a group. Cole (1985) in turn argues that within the ZPD culture and cognition create each other.

The relationship of Rogoff's concept of guided participation to Vygotsky's work should be obvious. Central to guided participation is Vygotsky's concept of *intersubjectivity*. This is the process humans engage in when collaborating. It involves a sharing of focus and purpose between a child and another more skilled or knowledgeable person. This is essentially a process that involves cognitive, social and emotional exchange between participants in learning.

Of critical importance to this paper is the role that each of these concepts play in shaping classroom and home literacy events.

Given that schools and families are unique cultural entities in their own right, it is logical to assume that each develops a pedagogical approach consistent with its own experience and point of reference. It is the congruence or otherwise of specific literacy practices to the needs of the child who is learning that has more to do with educational success or failure than any perceived deficit in either cultural, social or personal conditions (Au, 1993; Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Cummins, 1986). The issue is not simply whether home literacy practice match school literacy practices, indeed, this may work against some students. Furthermore, it may be possible to examine such practices at a pedagogical level and note similarities (or differences) that are associated with other more subtle variations in discourse practices.

The study described in this paper examines the discourse practices of members of three families as they engaged in shared reading activities. As families are unique both socially and culturally, and construct meanings about literacy according to their own ways of experiencing

and using it, literacy conceptions are essentially reflected sociolinguistically through their pedagogy as reading is shared.

Methodology

Drawn from data gathered as part of a large-scale study involving multiple ethnographies (Cairney & Green, 1997), this paper reports on an exploration of the nature of literacy practices in three diverse families. Specifically, it looks at the discourses families engage in as they supported children's literacy understanding during shared story reading events. What we sought to explore was the relationship of the implicit roles and definitions of literacy adopted by parents and children, and the specific discourse and pedagogic practices observed in shared reading.

Data were collected systematically over a period of 24 months from two elementary school sites and eight families in the western suburbs of Sydney¹. The transcripts discussed in this paper are drawn from a much larger data set gathered for each family, which together includes:

- fieldnotes of 74 hours of observations gathered in homes
- 16 hours of videotaped interactions involving different family members
- 85 hours of audio recorded interactions between family members gathered by them acting as co-researchers;
- literacy artifacts and other documents.

Videotaped and audiotaped interactions have been transcribed and along with fieldnotes, have been coded using the qualitative data analysis software QSR NUD*IST². Although all data gathered as part of the larger study have been transcribed, only selected portions representing the social elements being discussed, have been included in this paper. To fully exemplify the interactions represented in these transcripts, symbols have been included to show speech acts, phonemic dimensions, comments by the researcher and indicators of individuals' roles and relationships (based on symbols adopted by Heritage, 1984 and Silverman, 1993) (see Appendix 1).

The transcripts selected for this paper demonstrate the pedagogical approach adopted by a mother (Sorensen and Wiltshire families) or father (Trapp family) to support home reading. Although specifically focusing on shared reading events in these examples, each transcript is representative of the approach used in general by the families in support of learning at home,

¹ Data for the Sorensen family were gathered during the first 2 years of the study by Dr Nora White, a post-doctoral research fellow, , and member of the research team.

² NUD*IST is a registered trademark of software designed to support the management and analysis of data allowing coding, searching and testing and provides an environment for creating and experimenting, questioning and theorising with a range of ideas.

and are representative of a number of similar shared reading events observed. Other events detailed in the larger data set include homework supervision, computer work and playing games such as 'Scrabble' and 'Find-a-word'.

The methodology used in the project involves a multi-step process (see Cairney & Ruge, 1998). The first step was to construct event maps representing the ways members of each family engages in literacy over time. The second step was to prepare a domain analysis (Spradley, 1980) to identify the range of activities used as participants engage in literacy and the way it was shaped by the discourse. Domain analysis is fundamental to microanalysis and "draws on the cultural significance of linguistic symbols to create and maintain shared meaning" (Coffee & Atkinson, 1996, p.89). It was from this stage of the analysis that transcripts relating to shared reading were identified.

The third step was a message by message, microanalysis which involved asking a series of questions (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1992). Questions relating to the roles and relationships of participants, time and space, conditions for communicating, goals and purpose, outcomes of the interactions and links between home and school were addressed. Within this stage itself an analysis of multiple layers of discourse occurs. By using a multi analysis process, the ways participants construct events through their actions and interactions are made visible (Green & Wallat, 1981; Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Kelly, Green & Crawford, 1996) (See Appendix 3 which provides an extract from a message unit analysis of the Sorensen transcript).

Within this paper three families are discussed and a detailed microanalysis is presented to demonstrate the sociocultural richness of literacy interactions. Transcribed data have been viewed with due consideration of the broader family context (See Families 1, 2 & 3). The overall meaning apparent from each transcribed event has also been determined and finally, a contextual analysis of the messages contained therein has been conducted.

What the transcripts demonstrate is the way families construct and support literacy in this context. Cairney and Ruge (1998) found that participants in literacy events adopt different roles and relationships and engage in interactions that are driven by specific norms, expectations and accepted ways of participating. This can vary across literacy events and contexts for literacy and has significance for the extent to which such events contribute to positive literacy learning experiences.

The coding system used to analyse these strategies draws upon the work of Green and Wallat (1981) and Bloome & Egan-Robertson (1993) (see Appendix 2). Items 1-3 indicate details of participants in conversations; items 4-7 detail the discourse form; items 8-25 highlight the

social interactional function or strategy adopted by participants to maintain on-task behaviour and items 26-32 are used to indicate semantic form. The final items (33-39) identify a range of issues typically drawn upon in discussion around literacy and are broadly characterised by the three geometric symbols shown. Under 'Procedures', appendix 2 also indicates linked units or continuity of discourse between participants and shows whether such discourse is thematically tied or potentially divergent.

Family 1 - The Sorensen Family

Val Sorensen and her two children live in a small rented cottage in Jonestown, close to the school. Andrew is 7 years old at the time of the study and in 2nd grade. Tori, Andrew's sister is 6 years of age and in 1st grade. Both children are bright and intelligent, achieving at an average or above average academic level. On occasion Val's teenage son Ricki who is approximately 17 years of age is also at the house although he does not live there permanently. Val has experienced a number of hardships in her life including the loss of a daughter many years ago from SIDS at 4 and 1/2 months.

Val is described by the Community Liaison Officer attached to the school, as being manic depressive. Subsequent events within the family certainly indicate significant mental health problems. At one stage she was seen to be undermining some of the initiatives established by the Community Liaison Officer and was thought to be trying to dissuade parents from participating in our research. A constant talker, Val is always ready to offer an opinion on a range of issues. She holds views about the management of the school, classroom discipline, homework issues, assessment and feedback and numerous other matters. Val speaks proudly of her own parenting efforts, and her demands of obedience from the children. Harsh punishment is swiftly administered when they break the rules and the children are often humiliated to the point of tears as their faults are catalogued. She holds strong views about the role of parents in education and speaks at length about the need for them to spend more time supporting their children.

Val talks constantly about the time she spends with Andrew and Tori, whom she knows to be intelligent children and as a parent, she sees her role as working hard to extend their abilities through homework assistance. Having participated in the TTALL³ program, Val enjoys

³ The Talk to a Literacy Learner (TTALL) Program was developed by Cairney & Munsie as part of a study funded by the New South Wales state government to support home and community relationships. The program is in widespread use within Australian schools as an educational program designed to introduce parents to strategies that can be used to support their children's literacy learning (Cairney & Munsie, 1995b).

helping children to read at school, and remarks that she thought that she should go into the tutoring business.

Home is a fairly chaotic environment, and is typically untidy and littered with ashtrays full of cigarette ends, newspapers and clothes. There is a bookcase with adult novels and children's books, including a dictionary and other children's reference books. Each child has a collection of storybooks and school-based material is stacked about. A wall in the eating area displays a corkboard that holds awards commemorating the children's achievements at school. On the wall a 'star chart' is also displayed. This is an incentive scheme designed to encourage positive behaviours at home and at school. A \$2 reward is offered when 20 stars have been earned for obedience, politeness and attentiveness.

Val is loud in her speech and frequently questions the children, leaving them little time to answer, before moving on to respond herself and extend with further questions and explanations. She is also strict in her disciplining of them and has high expectations in relation to their manners and speech.

When things are calm in the home, Val enjoys a lovely relationship with the Andrew and Tori. They are clearly very fond of her and listen with great attention when she reads to them or tells stories.

The transcript below is a partial record of an event that involved Val working with Tori (aged 6 years) in a shared reading session. The full transcript had 192 message units and was too long to represent fully in this paper. The analysis described is based on the full transcript. The reading took place in the kitchen, the place where most homework and other family events occurred. This shared reading event was representative of many similar events occurring throughout the week as part of the homework routine, and family story times.

As with the other reading events examined in this paper, the interactions examined provide an insight into constructions of literacy. They were reading a text Tori had chosen entitled "Mouse Monster". This picture book was at an appropriate level for a 1st grade reader.

Transcript 1 – The Sorensen Family (lines 001-096)

01. Mum: *Okay, what book have you got today?*
02. Tori: *Mouse Monster*
03. Mum: *OK, Read it for Mumma*
04. Tori: *Mouse Monster (.5)*
05. Mum: *Andrew, you gonna listen to this or what?*
06. Andrew: *Um, yeah ((in the distance))*
07. Tori: *The leaves was blowing in a, in the (.2) wind. The big (.6) l::ea:ves and little leaves, brown and red leaves and yellow leaves (.) they (.2) then?*
08. Mum: *when*
09. Tori: *When (.5)*

10. Mum: Sound it out
11. Tori: 'k'
12. Mum: No, sound it out (.3) not letter (.3) 'k' ((letter sound))
13. Tori: Ka::t::ie
14. Mum: Right, well what's the word?
15. Tori: Katie
16. Mum: Katie
17. Tori: now (.) played (.) in (.) them. Then they cr::ied and cried
18. Mum: They? (.3) What did they do? (.2) What did they do?
19. Tori: Cr::i::
20. Mum: Cr:ick:led
21. Tori: Crickled and crickled
22. Mum: Uh, Uh! Cr:a=
23. Tori: =ckled
24. Mum: Right, now what is it?
25. Tori: They crickled and crackled
26. Mum: Good girl! Good girl!
27. Tori: Kate
28. Mum: No!
29. Tori: Katie
30. Mum: That's good!
31. Tori: Mouse (.2)
32. Mum: I don't think mouse is there is it? Can you see the word mouse=
33. Tori: =No=
34. Mum: = or are you adding one?
35. Tori: Adding one
36. Mum: Ooh, Dear me! (.) Let's start that one again!
37. Tori: Katie (.5)
38. Mum: Come on baby! (.2) Now remember when there's=
39. Tori: made!
40. Mum: That's a good girl.
41. Tori: h::ou::s, holes in one leaf. (.2) That was her (.5)
42. Mum: Sound it! M::ar::s::
43. Tori: mask. She made holes in (.6)
44. Mum: That one's a hard one. Andrew can you help Tori with that word? That's one of your special words
45. Andrew: An:oth:er
46. Mum: Another
47. Tori: Another leaf. (.3) That (.) she
48. Mum: No!
49. Tori: That was her hat. She made holes her=in some little leaves. There (.2)
50. Mum: That one's a bit hard. These
51. Tori: These want
52. Mum: pardon me?
53. Tori: went on her tail.
54. Mum: Good girl!
55. Tori: Kate
56. Mum: Pardon me?
57. Tori: Katie (.2) Mo:: (.4) Mouse? Di::
58. Mum: d:a:n:ced
59. Tori: danced around=
60. Mum: =pardon me? U:n:d:er
61. Tori: oh
62. Mum: u:n:d:er
63. Tori: under? the (.2) swing (.) and she d:a:n:=
64. Mum: =As she danced

65. *Tori:* *she crackled?*
66. *Mum:* *No. Look at the word.*
67. *Tori:* *cri:ck:led and crackled. I am a Mouse (.) Monster she (.) sang. (.6) She danced into (.) the (.) Mouse house. Mother?*
68. *Mum:* *Mumma!*
69. *Tori:* *Mumma mouse (.) was (.) making ()*
70. *Mum:* *c:a:k:e=*
71. *Tori:* *=cake=*
72. *Mum:* *=s*
73. *Tori:* *cakes. Katie ()*
74. *Mum:* *Tori please!*
75. *Tori:* *cr::ickled and crackled as:keed*
76. *Mum:* *asked*
77. *Tori:* *asked Mumma (.) Mouse.*
78. *Mum:* *That was a really good try for asked, darlin', OK?*
79. *Tori:* *No, sh::ooted=*
80. *Mum:* *=sh:ou:ted*
81. *Tori:* *shouted Katie. This is a big mouse monster.*
82. *Mum:* *very good!*
83. *Tori:* *It (.) is (.)said Mumma Mouse. (.4) Why did (.2) did (.2) didn't I see that before. ((giggles)) I am w:ild ((spoken with shortened vowel))*
84. *Mum:* *Right, now that's wild*
85. *Tori:* *Wild*
86. *Mum:* *Wild ((said with shortened vowel)) is very good darling. You did try very hard, but that one goes to its name not to its sound. English is a very, very hard language to learn.*
87. *Tori:* *wild and (.9)*
88. *Mum:* *That's sav::age*
89. *Tori:* *savage*
90. *Mum:* *Good*
91. *Tori:* *said (.) the (.) Mouse Monster::: I (.) am (.)*
92. *Mum:* *fierce*
93. *Tori:* *fierce and*
94. *Mum:* *ferocious*
95. *Tori:* *ferocious*
96. *Mum:* *Oh, they're very hard words to say, aren't they?*

Discussion

The interaction between Tori and her mother commences with a question “*Okay. What book have you got today?*” (Line 01). Tori is then invited to read it out loud with her mother ‘guiding’ the reading. An analysis of conversational units indicates the various strategies that she used to guide the performance. This allows us to examine the construction of literacy that is dominant in this event and the way literacy is being defined and supported.

What characterises the full record of the interaction (see Appendix 3 for a sample of the message unit analysis) is the extent to which Tori’s mother relies on extending strategies that are very much at the word or sound level. In all, Tori’s mother intervenes more than 35 times to direct her to “*sound out*” (for example, lines 10, 12, 42), “*see (or look at) the word*” (lines 14, 32, 66), to give information on sound/symbol relationships or rules (Line 12, 20, 22, 58, 60, 62, 70,

80, 84, 88) and on one occasion she has Tori's brother help by encouraging him to assist Tori with "one of your special words" (Line 44). Almost all of these interventions involve simple statements designed to focus Tori's attention on words or sounds to enable the 'performance' to continue to completion (see Table 1 below).

In contrast Tori's mother does not offer one evaluative comment or statement that deals with the meaning that is being constructed. However, she does encourage Tori with the task on no less than 33 occasions, but only in relation to its completion, not the engagement with the text. For example, she uses confirming strategies and encourages her to keep reading with statements like: "let's start again" (Line 36); 'right' (Lines 14, 24, 84) "come on baby" (Line 38); 'that's a good girl', 'good girl' or 'good' (Line 26, 30, 40, 54, 82, 90); by stating that the task is "hard" (Line 44, 86, 96) and hence encouraging her implicitly to keep going. Midway through the dialogue Mum says, "that was a really good try for 'asked' darlin" (Line 78) and "you did try very hard..." (Line 86). At the completion of the reading Tori's mother noted "that was very good!" (in line 192 not displayed).

A third type of intervention involved Tori's mother using confirmation or restatement by re-reading a word (lines 46, 76), or phrase (lines 64) to help Tori continue with the task.

When one considers the role that Tori plays in the interaction it is very much the 'performer' completing the task. The analysis of message units shows an almost total absence of dialogue where Tori leads or initiates discussion. Only 7 clarifying statements were made by Tori in over 90 message units and there were no expressions of personal feeling, initiation of topics, focussing or restatements.

Rarely does Tori attempt to inject anything into the interaction beyond the reading of the words. On each of these occasions, she makes simple statements that serve to demonstrate her knowledge of sound/symbol relationships in response to her mother's help in this area (for example in lines 107 and 117 not displayed, Tori says "AEIOU" using letter names and "How come the 'a' sounds like an 'e'?") In the latter example Tori is seeking clarification over the letter/sound relationship as she links the text with the spoken word 'dancing'. Tori questions her mother about the text's use of the letter 'a' when she clearly hears her Mum pronounce the word with an 'e' (d[e]ncing). When challenged, Tori's mother is unable to clearly explain this anomaly. In attempting to do so she confuses the grammatical convention where an 'e' at the end of a word, lengthens the vowel contained within it. Tori's mother recognises that the explanation offered does little to enhance meaning for the child, and she quickly moves back to the story.

At a superficial level, the interactions evident in the transcript demonstrate support for the type of pedagogy often advocated by schools (see Wood Bruner & Ross, 1976; Gardner, 1994;

Cairney, 1995). Such scaffolding practices would suggest the need to ‘recruit’ or engage students in reading tasks, to reduce the degrees of freedom or simplify tasks and to offer immediate and constructive feedback. They would involve highlighting relevant elements or marking critical features enabling reflection on discrepancies between the child’s performance and the ideal, and there would be control of frustration and risk to ensure that failure does not become endemic, thereby destroying motivation and damaging self-esteem. Lastly, demonstration or modelling of idealised versions of the acts or skills under discussion, in conjunction with dialogic explanation, would be seen as critical feature of this pedagogy. As the transcript demonstrates, the child’s interest has been recruited (Line 01), there are attempts at simplifying the task (e.g. Line 20), and Tori’s mother has reduced the degrees of freedom to minimise frustration (e.g. Line 08). However, although somewhat strategic in her behaviour, what is missing from the dialogue between Tori and her mother, is a focus on the construction of meaning.

Table 1: Overview of strategic interactions during shared reading events by family⁴

Strategy definitions (refer to Appendix 2 for detail)	Sorensen Family (192 message lines)		Wiltshire Family (78 message lines)		Trapp Family (78 message lines)	
	Mother	Tori	Mother	Trisha	Father	Colin
8. Allocate Turn	1					
9. Bid for floor						
10. Clarifying	2	6	2	2		1
11. Confirming	16	1	6	2	3	1
12. Continuance		2	1	2	1	
13. Controlling	3		1			
14. Editing	1		2		2	
15. Express Personal	2					
16. Extending	7	2	3	1	1	
17. Focusing	33	9	10		3	
18. Ignoring						
19. Initiate Conversation		1				
20. Initiate Topic	1		1			
21. Other						
22. Refocusing	8				3	
23. Rejecting	5				28	
24. Requesting	2		1			1
25. Restating	2		3	3		
26. Propose:			1			
27. Recognise:						
28. Acknowledgement		1	2			

⁴ Note that items 1 to 7 are not included in the table as they relate to Items details of participants (1 to 3) in conversations and the overall discourse form (items 4 to 7)

29. Social Consequence	1					
30. Words/Message						
31. Interactional Unit						
32. Genre						
33. Reading	11	72	4	27		38
34. Writing						
35. School text/ reader						
36. Home text						
37. School instruction or convention						
38. Text authority						
39. Other literacies						

Family 2 – The Wiltshire Family

Michael and Anne Wiltshire along with their two little girls, Trisha and Ruby, are an upper middle class family, living comfortably in Western Sydney. Michael and Ann, in their early thirties are poised and confident in manner, and speak easily with teachers and other parents at Trisha's school. Trisha at six was gentle, self-possessed and articulate. Ruby, at the age of two, was also articulate, eager to say and do everything her big sister did.

Education is important to the Wiltshire family. Like most other parents, the Wiltshires desire the best for their children. Michael was educated at a private boy's school and later at University. Anne, born and raised in England completed A Levels at a private school, before travelling to Australia. Her return to England and University plans were interrupted by marriage and family. Anne does not work outside the home, preferring to spend time with the children and helping at the school. Anne and Michael believe it is essential to support their children's literacy at home and they spend time reinforcing school-based activities. For example, when the letter 'o' was the subject of focus, they searched the internet for information about 'o' subjects, like ostriches, and even drove to an ostrich farm close by to see these birds and obtain a feather.

The children are acquainted with a range of literacy practices at home. Reading newspapers and books, scanning architectural plans, writing invoices and cheques, following recipes, computer work and television viewing are all familiar practices for various family members. Literacy 'homework' is encouraged, although as this was not a requirement for kindergarten grade students, Trisha frequently set her own. Story writing and reading both school readers and story books from home are always favourite events.

The following transcript (numbered from 01 - 78) is from an audio recording of a shared book reading event when Trisha was in kindergarten. Mum (Anne), Trisha and Ruby were seated together with the story in the family room, where typically, homework and other shared

experiences took place. Trisha has selected one of her own books, "The Big Alfie and Annie Rose Story Book" by Shirley Hughes.

Transcript 2 – The Wiltshire Family (lines 01-78)

01. Mum: *Which story are we reading?*
02. Trisha: *The "Big Alfie and Annie Rose Story Book"*
03. Mum: *Now Ruby, you sit still and look at the pictures, OK?((a directive to younger child))*
04. Trisha: *Breakfast! (.) Early one morning Alfie helps his (.)*
05. Mum: *Helped*
06. Trisha: *Helped his baby sister Annie Rose out of her cot and they went downstairs=Alfie*
07. Mum: *No! look at that! Fullstop! So take a breath.*
08. Trisha: *Alfie went down forwards without holding onto the (.) bars*
09. Ruby: *((gurgles in background))*
10. Mum: *Ban:nis:ter*
11. Trisha: *bannister. Annie Rose went down backwards, feet first. Dad was in the kitchen having his breakfast so Alfie and Annie Rose (.) enjoyed?*
12. Mum: *No, joined!*
13. Trisha: *joined him and had breakfast too. Alfie sat up and (.) at the table and in a proper chair. He had a ch:: china*
14. Mum: *Yes, good girl=*
15. Trisha: *=bowl with bears mar::, marching*
16. Mum: *Yes, good girl*
17. Trisha: *all around the edge. Annie Rose sat in her high chair with the tray in front. She had a place:::*
18. Mum: *plas::tic*
19. Trisha: *plastic drink:: mug*
20. Mum: *drink::ing*
21. Trisha: *drinking mug and bowl and her own little spoon*
22. Mum: *there she is sitting up in her chair ((pointing to illustration for Ruby))*
23. Ruby: *mine! ((gurgling happily – recognises highchair as being like her own))*
24. Mum: *where's the high chair? ((responding to Ruby))*
25. Trisha: *While Alfie was eating up his cereal, Annie Rose pre:tend:ed she was playing in a band. She tram:::*
26. Mum: *Dr::um:::ed*
27. Ruby: *Dum:::=*
28. Trisha: *=drummed her spoon on the tray. Ring a ding*
29. Ruby: *Ring, ding*
30. Trisha: *Bong a dong. And sang very loudly. More more more cried=*
31. Mum: *groaned doolay*
32. Trisha: *doolay?*
33. Mum: *it 's just baby words, really, not proper words*
34. Trisha: *Bad*
35. Mum: *Dad*
36. Trisha: *Dad*
37. Ruby: *Dad*
38. Trisha: *is*
39. Mum: *hid*
40. Trisha: *be::neath*
41. Mum: *No! What is that?*

42. Ruby: beneath
43. Mum: be::hi::
44. Trisha: behind the Corn Flakes packet.
45. Mum: Mmm, good girl
46. Trisha: Annie Rose was singing and playing (.2) before?
47. Mum: because
48. Trisha: because it was so noisy ((tape off and on as Ruby interrupts the story))
49. Trisha: () with it in his bowl. Instead=
50. Mum: =instead. in his bowl instead.
51. Trisha: I said instead!
52. Mum: Mh, hh, I know!
53. Trisha: He made the crumble=
54. Mum: =Crumbly
55. Trisha: Crumbly biscuits into an 'is' ((sound combination))
56. Mum: I((name)) land! It sounds like 'I' ((name)) land but the 's' ((name)) is silent. It is island. That's what it looks like doesn't it?
57. Trisha: island, with a sea of milk all around. But soon the island got all soccy and (.1) soggy, and he gave each bear a piece of it (.) with the tip of his spoon. Alfie
58. Mum: No!
59. Trisha: I said Alfie?
60. Mum: No, its not Alfie
61. Trisha: After (.) that (.) brek, his breakfast looked rather messy
62. Mum: After that his breakfast looked rather messy. Well it did too, didn't it?
63. Trisha: Mh, mh
64. Mum: Would you like me to read one page
65. Trisha: Yep
66. Mum: Then Alfie kindly started to help Annie Rose with her breakfast. He filled up her drinking mug with milk. Annie Rose could drink out of it very well by herself, but when she held it up she started to drip the rest on her tray and on the floor. They had to get the floor cloth and mop it up. Annie Rose
Why don't you go and choose yourself a book, Ruby?((to distract Ruby))
Annie Rose could eat out of her bowl too when she wanted to. Alfie helped her hold her spoon up. But today she couldn't make up her mind where her breakfast was supposed to go. She tried putting it into her ear, then into her hair, then she started to spread it all over the place. Quite a bit of it went down her front.
Put it in here Annie Rose, said Alfie, opening his mouth very wide
67. Trisha: ((continuing)) Then Annie Rose opened her mouth very wide (.) too
68. Mum: Then Annie Rose opened her mouth very wide too, and?
69. Trisha: And put (.2) in a big spoonful. Mummy it says 'spoon' and then it's got 'full'=.
70. Mum: =That's right, spoonful!=
71. Trisha: =a compound word,
72. Mum: spoonful
73. Trisha: spoonful of break::fast
74. Mum: Yes
75. Trisha: all by herself. Look Annie Rose (.3) is eating up her breakfast (.) shood=
76. Mum: =shouted
77. Trisha: shouted Alfie, eating his ().
78. Mum: Well done, that was beautifully done!

Discussion

Shared reading events in the Wiltshire household occur daily and are much loved times of fun and enjoyment for parents and children alike. While ultimately the most important goal of shared reading is to support the learning of both girls, this objective is consequent to, rather than the motivation for this kind of family interaction. The explicit goal of shared reading in the Wiltshire family is for enjoyment. Enjoyment results as the participants engage in meaning making together.

The transcript of this literacy event and the message unit analysis (appendix 3 contains an example of how this was conducted) suggest that the pedagogical approach adopted by the Wiltshire family is in many ways congruent with the meaning based approach to shared reading recommended by many schools.

The sequence begins with a question, "*Which story are we reading*"? (line 01). The child's interest has already been recruited by engaging her in a story of her own choosing. The question is for Trisha, although Ruby, aged two is present and is also a keen participant in shared reading activities. Her interest is engaged as well and she is encouraged to follow the pictures as reading begins (line 03). Ruby is later asked to select her own book for sharing (embedded within conversation block 66) which serves a dual purpose at this point in time. Firstly, as Ruby's attention wavers, it helps her focus on a new goal, and secondly, by asking her to choose her own story, her interest is recruited afresh. Ruby's repeated phrases and squeals throughout the story (lines 09, 27, 29, 37, 42) are testimony to her active participation, however they rarely focus attention away from the story and generally pass without significant comment.

Trisha is a competent and confident reader, using voice to modulate expression and give emphasis. When uncertain of words she looks to the illustrations for context. In this example, Trisha has used the word "*bars*" (line 08) for the more difficult and unfamiliar word "*bannister*" (line 10) and "*beneath*" (line 40) rather than "*behind*" (line 44) when referring to Dad hidden behind the Corn flakes packet. In the first case, Trisha's mother, although emphasising the syllables, simply offers the correct word, something she does frequently throughout the story (see also lines 18, 20 & 26). This enables Trisha to continue the story without losing meaning. In the second case, her Mother asks Trisha to look more closely, again breaking up the word into its sound components. When the illustrations offer no contextual support, Trisha looks to the story itself for context. For example, although the text read "*joined*" (lines 12 & 13), the word "*enjoyed*" used by Trisha (line 11), could have logically followed the preceding text. In all, to maintain the flow and ensure the text is meaningful her Mother intervenes in this manner on 12 occasions.

Sometimes her Mother leaves Trisha to determine words for herself. In lines 83 and 91 several seconds pass before Trisha responds. In the first example, Trisha recognises the word required as “*too*” (line 67), however she is less confident, miscuing on the second, when she says “*shood*” (line 75) rather than “*shouted*” (line 76). Trisha herself knows that successful reading can result when sounds are emphasised. When this occurs spontaneously (lines 13, 15, 25, 73) Trisha’s Mother confirms her actions with, “*Yes, good girl*” (lines 14, 16). In line 78, when Trisha’s mother says, “*Well done, that was beautifully done!*”, we can see that the object of her verbal praise is not Trisha herself, but her reading efforts. She also remarks, “*That’s right!*” (line 70) when Trisha notes that “*spoonful*” is a compound word, reinforcing this by repeating the word components.

What is evident in this interaction is that a seamless construction of the story is of greater concern to Trisha’s mother, than focusing on letter/sound strategies (see the comparison of strategy types in Table 1). It is also apparent that Trisha and her Mother are engaged in meeting the goal together. Instead of merely ‘performing’ for an audience, Trisha questions the meaning of words (line 32), shows indignation when she feels her mother has misheard her (lines 51 and 59) and indicates agreement when reflecting on the illustration supporting the text (line 63). Furthermore, in line 71, we see it is Trisha who initiates discussion about the compound word.

As Wood et al. (1976), Gardner (1994) and Cairney (1995) note, marking critical features is an important pedagogical tool for facilitating understanding and learning independence. This is a strategy that Trisha’s mother uses to effect on a number of occasions. For example, when she emphasises the syllables in “*plas::tic*” (line 18), “*drink::ing*” (line 20) and “*Drr::um::ed*” (line 26), she is not only focusing on the letter/sound combinations which produce meaningful words, but she is also modeling an appropriate strategy to support word understanding. However, Trisha’s mother also appears to recognise that focussing solely on sounds when encountering a difficult word like ‘island’, can lead to frustration. As Trisha began to sound the ‘*is*’ ((with the shortened vowel ‘*i*’)) (line 55) in “island” her Mother intervenes saying, ‘*I ((letter name))land! It sounds like is ((shortened vowel)) land but the ‘s’ is silent, it is island. That’s what it looks like doesn’t it?*’ (lines 55-56). Not only did she imply approval of Trisha’s ‘sounding it out’ strategy (‘*i:s sounds like is*’) and (‘*That’s what it looks like doesn’t it?*’), she was also able to reduce frustration and simplify the task. Furthermore, her Mother had taken the opportunity to discuss the anomalous nature of the structure of ‘island’, noting that “‘*s’ is silent*” in this instance.

Trisha’s mother also used repetition when sentences had been fragmented to ensure that these goals were met. In particular, this occurred as the story progressed and it ensured that the continuity of the story theme was maintained. For example, in line 50, her Mother

repeated Trisha's last words. Whereas Trisha had read '*with it in his bowl. Instead.*', her mother changed the meter, repeating '*instead.* ...'*in his bowl instead.*' Trisha's mother also repeated story line 61 (line 62) which Trisha had read with a number of pauses. This occurred again (lines 67 & 68).

In line 64, when her Mother sensed Trisha was becoming tired, she asked her if she would like her to read for awhile. This served a number of purposes. Firstly, the frustration over miscued words was reduced and motivation was maintained. Secondly, it served as an effective demonstration of storybook reading as her Mother emphasised words and phrases where appropriate. Thirdly, as a more efficient reader, Trisha's mother reduced the overall length of time taken to read the story, thereby facilitating comprehension and her recall of the text.

Family 3 – The Trapp Family

Susan and Matthew Trapp and their children, Colin, Julie, Karen and Tom live in rented accommodation in Bullaton, a relatively new housing estate in Western Sydney. Susan and Matthew are in their early thirties, while Colin is nine, Julie is seven, Karen is five and Tom is four years of age. The family had recently been moved with the Australian Defence Force from Western Australia. The children are energetic, busy and demanding. Like many children they displayed sibling rivalry and there was much competition for their mother's time and attention. The two older children, Colin and Julie have been classified by the school as experiencing learning difficulties and each has been diagnosed with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. The ADHD is of greater concern at home than school where routines were more structured and classroom expectations more consistently reinforced.

Matthew had gone into the Defence Force straight from school, which he left after Year 10, and his education and training had ensued from there to the point where he became a specialist computer technician. Susan has a university degree but has done little work outside the home since the arrival of the children. Susan takes the leading role in supporting her children's education although she finds this a difficult task given the demands placed on her by the children and the sheer exhaustion she experiences much of the time. Matthew appears to be aloof with his children and is a strict disciplinarian.

There are numerous literacy artifacts displayed in the house, but the children do not participate much in literacy activities with the exception of homework, which is generally considered a chore. They have access to the computer when their father is not at home, but as they rarely take the time to complete computer tasks to their ultimate end, this is a source of

frustration rather than interest or satisfaction. The television and VCR are always popular and constantly playing, and formed a backdrop to every activity

The following transcript (numbered 101-181) is from an audio recording of a shared book reading event. It is representative of several transcripts of shared reading events between either Mum or Dad and one of the older children. Here Dad and Colin are engaged with one of the Richard Scarry books. The tape picks up the dialogue some way into the story. The rationale behind selection of this section of transcript was entirely arbitrary. Extending over many pages this small section is typical of the dialogue found throughout the document.

Transcript 3 – The Trapp Family (101-181)

101. Colin: *Watched by Trevor, Juniper screamed:: screamed to a (.)*
102. Dad: *No*
103. Colin: *screamed to a halt in the wet cond::iti(.)t*
104. Dad: *No*
105. Colin: *wet cont::ain:d*
106. Dad: *No, we said it before!*
107. Colin: *wet con:cr:tained? (.2) wet conc::ret?*
108. Dad: *No!*
109. Colin: *Contained?*
110. Dad: *No!*
111. Colin: *Oh, what was it? ((beginning to whine))*
112. Dad: *What was he doing? What was he doing?*
113. Colin: *He was (.3) stopping?*
114. Dad: *No, What was Trevor doing before?*
115. Colin: *Oh (.2) he was concreting?*
116. Dad: *Yeah, OK so what is it?*
117. Colin: *Concreting (.) outside the café*
118. Dad: *No, say it again!*
119. Colin: *Concreting*
120. Dad: *No, he was concreting, but what does the word say?*
121. Colin: *Wet concrete outside the cafe. (.2) Digging?*
122. Dad: *No!*
123. Colin: *During the=*
124. Dad: *=No!*
125. Colin: *(.2) Dragging the hose from=*
126. Dad: *=No!*
127. Colin: *hose, the fireman pushed=*
128. Dad: *=No!*
129. Colin: *down=*
130. Dad: *=No*
131. Colin: *rashed (.) down*
132. Dad: *No!*
133. Colin: *the back=*
134. Dad: *=No! come on!*

135. Colin: *rushed round the back to the bonfire. What, what's going on at (.2) on at Bella's, (.) Bella's asked Norman coming out of the shop to watch. But it was too late. All that was left on the=*
136. Dad: *=No!*
137. Colin: *(.) left, left of the, Bella's pile (.) of rubbish with a few smoke (.2) as (.4) remaining*
138. Dad: *No! Start again, a few*
139. Colin: *smoking?*
140. Dad: *yeah*
141. Colin: *smoking (.2) rammage?*
142. Dad: *not quite!*
143. Colin: *rem:mai:ns,*
144. Dad: *Mmmm*
145. Colin: *remains and there was no sign of the briefcase. Well that's it said Fireman Sam. Three thousand pounds=*
146. Dad: *=No!*
147. Colin: *(.3) three hundred pounds up in smoke. We've never=*
148. Dad: *=No!*
149. Colin: *We'll=*
150. Dad: *=No*
151. Colin: *Smoke. I'll never (.) I'll never repair that=*
152. Dad: *=No!*
153. Colin: *I'll never repay that.(.7) Its (.2) as we*
154. Dad: *No!*
155. Colin: *As it, (.) as it's (.2) you=*
156. Dad: *=No*
157. Colin: *As (.) as it's (.2) for you (.) as it's for you Bella=*
158. Dad: *=No!*
159. Colin: *As, as it's for you (.) Bella (.) I'll give you=*
160. Dad: *=No!*
161. Colin: *I'll have one last go, one last go at this job. Trevor ag:red? Greed, agreed with a wear: (.), wearing=*
162. Dad: *=No!*
163. Colin: *wetting?*
164. Dad: *No!*
165. Colin: *wearin?*
166. Dad: *close!*
167. Colin: *wear::y (.2) wear:y, weary?*
168. Dad: *Mmm*
169. Colin: *weary () as he looked at the tyre marks in the wet concrete. But it's=*
170. Dad: *=No!*
171. Colin: *but this may=*
172. Dad: *=No*
173. Colin: *but this is my last try (.) again=*
174. Dad: *=No!*
175. Colin: *my last try. Anymore marks (.) with (.) with*
176. Dad: *No!*
177. Colin: *any more marks, (.3)anymore (.3) anymore marks will have to stay, stay!. He said?*
178. Dad: *No!*
179. Colin: *He didn't see Norman grinning (.) as he listened , listened around the concr::*
180. Dad: *No!*

Discussion

This section of the interaction between Colin and his father commences as Colin reads from the text of the book. As occurred frequently, Colin miscued “*screamed*” for “*screeched*” (lines 101 & 103). Colin’s father responded to all such miscues and hence it took around 15 minutes to read just 20 short story lines. As a consequence of this, characters and context were largely forgotten and recall of past events was slow.

The message unit analysis and the transcript itself, confirm that the way his Father responded to Colin’s reading efforts suggested that he perceived his role as being an arbiter rather than guide or facilitator. His interaction was characterised by frequent “*no*” responses (recorded 31 times in this transcript) to Colin’s attempts. While his responses highlighted when a miscue had occurred, they offered no alternatives, nor did they prevent further miscues on the same word (lines 103, 105, 107; lines 161, 163, 165).

When Colin’s father used strategies to support his son’s reading efforts he focused on the correct structure of the word to provide meaning in the context of the story. For example, in Line 112 Father asks “*What was he doing. What was he doing?*” to encourage Colin to respond. It was the correct word, rather than the meaning behind the word that was being sought. When the child eventually gave the correct word, no evaluative comment was offered, nor was there confirmation or restatement to deal with the meaning that was being constructed. The degree to which Colin himself initiated interaction was minimal, and when he did ask “*Oh, what was it?*” (line 111), the response was constructed as another question. What is missing from this transcript is any indication of engagement by Colin to suggest that he has gained understanding, enjoyed the experience or progressed in his reading

Although the importance of engaging and maintaining children’s interest in learning activities has been attested (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976; Gardner, 1994; Cairney, 1995), there is little evidence of this here. Rather than helping to maintain interest and engagement, Colin’s Father’s gruff “*no*” each time is likely to have the reverse effect. The few attempts to maintain motivation with constructive feedback, for example, “*No start again, a few...*” (line 138), “*not quite*” (line 142), and “*No...close*” (line 161) are unlikely to have achieved their goal. Furthermore, while intended to keep Colin on task and focused on accurate reading, comments such as “*come on*” (line 132) only added to the frustration when there were difficulties in interpreting text. Moreover, rather than directing attention to the child’s reading attempts, such

comments emphasised personal behaviour which is likely to undermine confidence and reduce self-esteem.

In line 112, Colin's father asks, "*What was Trevor doing before?*" to which Colin replied hesitantly and questioningly, "*Oh (.4) he was concreting?*" (line 113). His Father's intention had been to direct Colin's thoughts back to a former line read several minutes earlier. This suggests that he assumed that recall of this line would offer sufficient clue to enable Colin to read "*Juniper screeched to a halt in the wet concrete outside the café*" (lines 101, 103 & 119 combined). Unfortunately, this intention was never clearly articulated as his Father merely said, "*Yeah, so OK what is it?*" (line 114). When Colin replied, "*concreting outside the café*" (line 115) his father again said, "*No, he was concreting, but what does the word say?*" (line 118). As meaning had already been lost, and the illustrations offered no contextual support, Colin was uncertain about this link. When Colin ultimately did complete the sentence (line 119), no word of congratulation or encouragement was offered. Instead, Colin's father responded to the next miscued word (also in line 119) with another sharp "*No*".

Rather than helping to control frustration and risk, which may have supported Colin's sense of achievement and offered a degree of success, it is likely that his Father's pedagogic approach had the reverse effect. Unable to model or demonstrate strategies such as breaking down words into smaller units or marking the critical features of words, by highlighting prefixes, suffixes or letter/sound relationships, Dad's approach was likely to support a maintenance of the status quo regarding Colin's reading. Colin was a poor reader, considerably weaker than many of his peers. He considered reading a chore because in his words "*(I) can't do it right*".

The implicit goal of reading as demonstrated by this transcript of the Trapp family appears to be to encourage word accuracy even at the expense of meaning. This had the effect of reducing enjoyment and meaning making for the reader.

Concluding Remarks

The data that we have presented provides an insight into the shared reading practices of three families. What they show is that within comparable literacy events there is considerable diversity in discourse practices. The transcript and message unit analyses demonstrate that even when similar pedagogical practices are being used, that variations in implicit constructions of literacy and the way story book interactions are shaped and supported, can lead to different outcomes in terms of effectiveness of parent support of reading. The transcripts also demonstrate the complex ways in which discourse practices are framed for individual children across the multiple contexts within which they acquire and use literacy. Tori and her mother,

along with Colin and his father regularly engage in literacy events driven by implicit constructions of literacy that are consistent with what Cairney & Ruge (1998) call “literacy as performance”.

As outlined earlier, this type of communication is characterised by interactions in which one or more participants (usually children) are held accountable (usually by adults) for demonstrating a certain level of proficiency in a literacy related task (Cairney & Ruge, 1998). The focus of these interactions is very much on the performance of the task, rather than the construction of meaning. And yet, while similar constructions of literacy are evident, there are many subtle differences in the discourse practices. As Table 1 shows, Colin’s father and Tori’s mother use different strategies, for example, Colin’s father makes frequent uses of a rejection strategy, typically “No”, whereas Tori’s mother rarely uses this strategy. Tori’s mother reads the text on 11 occasions whereas Colin’s father does not read any part of the text throughout the entire interaction. Finally, Tori’s mother makes good use of focusing strategies (on 33 occasions) whereas Colin’s father barely uses this strategy at all (just 3 times).

Similarly when we contrast the transcripts from the Wiltshire and Sorensen families we see different constructions of literacy evident but quite common sociolinguistic strategies. Trisha and her mother engage in shared reading practices that reflect a construction of literacy consistent with what Cairney and Ruge (1998) have termed “literacy as negotiated construction of meaning”. A quest for meaning drives their interaction around text. This is in contrast to the Sorensen family’s emphasis on literacy as performance. And yet, when one examines the strategies employed by Trisha’s mother they are quite similar, although there is evidence of Tori’s mother using more focusing, refocusing and rejecting strategies.

What the above interactions demonstrate is the sociolinguistic complexity of literacy events that occur in and out of school. It also demonstrates how similar pedagogical practices can have significantly different consequences for specific children depending on the constructions of literacy held by the child’s parents and the way discourse is structured as part of the literacy event. This very complexity makes it difficult (indeed unwise) to make simplistic statements concerning the impact of any differences that one identifies across literacy contexts or even repeated occurrences of the same type of literacy event within a single context.

As we outlined at the beginning of this paper, the data shared are but a small ‘slice’ of the data we have collected for these families. They demonstrate that any literacy event is not always as it seems. At a superficial level, each of the events transcribed and discussed demonstrate how parents engage and model some of reading support strategies that many classroom teachers would advocate. Indeed, one of the mothers, Val, had received instruction as part of the TTALL program (Cairney & Munsie, 1990) to provide scaffolded support for her

children as part of a shared reading event. However, neither Tori's mother, nor indeed Colin's father demonstrated an approach to shared reading that was consistent with most teachers' expectations of children when they engage shared reading events at school.

For example, Tori's mother's role within the shared reading event was such that opportunities for meaning making, deeper engagement with the text and enjoyment of the text were suppressed and in many instances lost altogether. Indeed, it is arguable that her emphasis on word and sound level support had little practical value because the interventions were often far from helpful, focussing Tori's attention on textual features that, rather than helping with decoding, often confused and overloaded short-term memory during the task.

In a similar manner, Colin's short-term memory was unable to maintain the links between ideas necessary for meaning across the whole text, due to the stop-start nature of the reading process. Prolonged pauses occurred as Colin's father acted as a gatekeeper, positioned to monitor his son's word construction, even at the expense of textual meaning. It also needs to be questioned, whether rejection strategies such as Father's emphatic and repeated "*no!*" could possibly do much to support Colin in overcoming his reading difficulties.

By contrast, shared reading events in the Wiltshire family seem focused on a different goal. Trisha's mother adopted strategies which not only offered word and sound level support, but which allowed for discussion about the literacy constructions within the text. Trisha was actively engaged in this event, not merely as performer, but as a co-constructor of knowledge and meaning.

Again, at a pedagogical level, if we apply a simple framework for analysing the form that scaffolding takes (e.g. that developed by Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976, see also Rogoff, 1990; Cairney, 1995, for further discussion), we see many of the elements of 'good' support in these illustrations. For example, in the events involving the Sorensen and Wiltshire families, the mothers recruited the children's interest, attempted to simplify tasks, maintained pursuit of the goal, noted the inconsistencies in children's performance, sought to control frustration, and attempted to demonstrate the act of reading. While adopting far fewer scaffolding strategies, Colin's father also attempted to maintain pursuit of the goal and noted inconsistencies.

Hence, one could assume that the evidence of common elements of scaffolding in action is also evidence of appropriate literacy support for these children. However, such a superficial analysis without greater attention to the discourse practices, leaves us with only part of the picture. Detailed discourse analysis of the kind we have undertaken offers us the power to also look more deeply at the sociolinguistic strategies within which the scaffolding practices are embedded. This in turn offers us opportunities to identify how pedagogical practices need to

change both in the home and at school in order to more fully support all students as literacy users. Furthermore, this increased understanding helps us to respond to the needs of parents as they seek to support their children as literacy learners.

This study offers a number of very clear implications for classroom practice as well as future research. First, there is a need to question any claims that specific pedagogical practices are able to meet the needs of all children. What our work has demonstrated is that similar pedagogic practices can have quite different effects and consequences depending on the literacy constructions and discourse practices within which they are embedded. Second, there is a need for further research that explores the impact that varied discourse practices of the type described have for children of varying class, cultural and language backgrounds. It is only by examining the discourse practices characterising shared reading events that we can make sound judgements about the extent to which the practices we encourage at school and home are effective.

References:

- Au, K. (1993). *Literacy instruction in multicultural settings*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Janovich College Publishers.
- Auerbach, E. (1997). Reading between the lines. In D. Taylor (Ed.). *Many families, many literacies: An international declaration of principles* (pp. 71-81). Portsmouth: Heinemann Trade.
- Barton, D. (1997). Family literacy programmes and home literacy practices. In D. Taylor (Ed.). *Many families, many literacies: An international declaration of principles* (pp.101-109). Portsmouth: Heinemann Trade.
- Bloome, D. & Egan-Robertson, A. (1993). The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28 (4), 305-333.
- Breen, M.P., Loudon, W., Barrat-Pugh, C., Rivalland, J., Rohl, M., Rhydwen, M., Lloyd, S. & Carr, T. (1994). *Literacy in its place: Literacy practices in urban and rural communities* (Vols. 1 & 2). Canberra: DEET.
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press
- Cairney, T.H. (1990). *Teaching reading comprehension: Meaning makers at work*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Cairney, T.H. (1995). *Pathways to literacy*. London: Cassell.
- Cairney, T.H. (2000). The construction of literacy and literacy learners. *Language Arts*. Vol. 77, No. 6, pp 496-505.
- Cairney, T.H. & Green, J. (1997). *Home-school partnerships: The development of shared understandings*. Australian Research Council Grant.
- Cairney, T.H. & Munsie, L. (1995a). *Beyond Tokenism: Parents as partners in literacy*. Portsmouth (NH): Heinemann.
- Cairney, T.H. & Munsie, L. (1995b) (2nd ed.). *Talk to a literacy learner program*. University of Western Sydney.
- Cairney, T.H., Lowe, K. & Sproats, E. (1995). *Literacy in transition: An investigation of the literacy practices of upper primary and junior secondary schools* (Vols. 1-3). Canberra: DEET.
- Cairney, T.H., Ruge, J., Buchanan, J., Lowe, K. & Munsie, L. (1995). *Developing partnerships: The home, school and community interface* (Vols. 1-3). Canberra: Department of Employment, Education & Training.
- Cairney, T.H. & Ruge, J. (1998). *Community literacy practices and schooling: Towards effective support for students*. Canberra: Department of Employment, Education & Training.
- Coe, R.M. (1995). *What students aren't learning at school: Assessing students' ability to situate their discourses*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, San Francisco.
- Coffey, A. & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complimentary research strategies*. London: Sage.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 18-36.
- Fernie, D., Davies, B., Kantor, R. & McMurray, P. (1993). Becoming a person in the preschool: Creating integrated gender, school culture, and peer culture positionings. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 6, 95-110.
- Galda, L., Cullinan, B.E. & Strickland, D.S. (1997). *Language, literacy and the child*. (2nd ed.). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Gardner, R.F. (1994). Self-regulated learners: Do early childhood educators facilitate this development? In E.J. Mellor & K.M. Coombe (Eds.), *Issues in early childhood services: Australian perspectives* (pp.39-52). Melbourne: WCB Publishers international Inc.

- Gee, J. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Green, J., Kantor, R. & Rogers, T. (1991). Exploring the complexity of language and learning in the classroom. In B. Jones & L. Idol (Eds.) *Educational values and cognitive instruction: Implications for reform* (Vol. 1) (pp. 333-364). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Green, J.L. & Wallat, C. (1981). Mapping instructional conversations: A sociolinguistic ethnography. In J. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), *Ethnography and language in educational settings* (pp.161-195). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Gutierrez, K.D. (1994). How talk, context and script shape contexts for learning: A cross-case comparison of journal sharing. *Linguistics and Education*, 5 (3 & 4).
- Hannon, P. (1995). *Literacy, home and school: Research and practice in teaching literacy with parents*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Heap, J. (1991). A situated perspective on what counts as reading. In C. Baker & A. Luke (Eds.), *Towards a critical sociology of reading pedagogy*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Heras, A.I. (1993). The construction of understanding in a sixth-grade classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 5, 275-299
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Kelly, G., Green, J. & Crawford, T. (1996). *Common talk and uncommon knowledge: Discourse analysis of the negotiation of science content across physics laboratory groups*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York, April.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). Introduction to themed issue on culturally relevant teaching. *Theory into practice*, 34 (3), 150-151.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32 (3), 465-491.
- Luke, A. (1995). *When literacy might/not make a difference: Textual practice and capital*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference.
- Moll, L. (1993). *Community-mediated educational practices*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference.
- Puro, P. & Bloome, D. (1987). Understanding classroom communication. *Theory into practice* Vol. XXVI, (1), 26-31.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking – Cognitive development in a social context*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group (1992). Constructing literacy in classrooms: Literate action as social accomplishment. In H. Marshall (Ed.) *Redefining student learning: Roots of educational change* (pp.). Ablex.
- Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data: methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications
- Spradley, J.P. (1980). *Participant observation*. Sydney: Holt, Rinehart & Winston Inc.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press.
- Wood, P., Bruner, J. & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem-solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17, 89-100.

Appendix 1 Transcription Symbol Key

Symbol	Application	Explanation
[Child: quite a [while Mother: [yeah	Left brackets indicate the point at which a current speaker's talk is overlapped by another's talk.
=	P1: that I'm aware of= P2: =Yes. Would you confirm that?	Equal signs. One at the end of a line and one at the beginning, indicates that there is no gap between the two lines.
(.4)	Yes (.2) yeah	Numbers in parenthesis indicate elapsed time in silence in tenths of a second.
(.)	To get (.) treatment	A dot in parenthesis indicates a tiny gap, probably no more than one-tenth of a second.
_____	<i>What's up?</i>	Underlining indicates some form of stress, via pitch and/or amplitude.
::	O::kay?	Colons indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound. The length of the row of colons indicates the length of the prolongation.
WORD	I've got ENOUGH TO WORRY ABOUT	Capitals, except at the beginnings of lines, indicate especially loud sounds relative to the surrounding talk.
.hhh	I feel that (.2) .hh	A row of h's prefixed by a dot indicates an in breath; without a dot, an out breath. The length of the row of h's indicates the length of the in' or out breath.
()	Future risks and () and life ()	Empty parentheses indicate the transcriber's inability to hear what was said.
(word)	Would you see (there) anything positive	Parenthesised words indicate possible hearings
(())	confirms that ((continues))	Double parentheses contain author's descriptions rather than transcriptions
. , ? !	What do you think?	Indicate speaker's intonation

Transcription symbols adapted from the work of:
 Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity.
 Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data: methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications

Appendix 2

Abbreviations, Symbols and Definitions used in Discourse Analysis

Participants

1. 'Speaker' and 'Addressee' on relevant lines
2. Adult – Upper case;
3. Child – Lower case

Discourse Form

4. Q = Question
5. S = Statement
6. R = Response (+/0/-)
7. Other

Social Interactional Function/Strategy

8. **Allocate Turn:** Deliberate act of giving another a turn at talk (Bloome & Egan-Robertson (1993).
9. **Bid for floor:** A strategy used as a deliberate bid for a turn to talk (Bloome & Egan-Robertson (1993).
- 10: **Clarifying:** Refers to messages meant to bring about explanations or redefinitions of a preceding behaviour. May take the form of a question or a response (Green & Wallat, 1981).
11. **Confirming:** Refers to verbal and non-verbal acceptance of preceding response (Green & Wallat, 1981).
12. **Continuance:** Verbal or non-verbal messages which provide cues to the speaker indicating that listener is following the speaker's message and the listener may continue his/her turn (Green & Wallat, 1981).
13. **Controlling:** Refers to messages concerned with the control of the interaction and/or behaviour of participants. May take the form of question or response (Green & Wallat, 1981).
14. **Editing:** Shifts or changes in content, form or strategy after the original message has begun. Encompasses false starts and words like "um", "uh". Indicates internal monitoring and/or mediating of message (Green & Wallat, 1981).
15. **Express Personal:** Expression of own feelings (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993).
16. **Extending:** Provides additional or new information about a topic. Can be spontaneously added or elicited. May take the form of a question or a response (Green & Wallat, 1981).
17. **Focusing:** Message may initiate discussion or aspect of discussion. Marked by shift in content of what is being discussed. Can be a question or response strategy. Coded as focusing as well as confirming, etc. when shifts focus (Green & Wallat, 1981).
18. **Ignoring:** Solely a response strategy, evident when no response forthcoming from question (Green & Wallat, 1981).
19. **Initiate Conversation:** Used to begin conversation (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993).
20. **Initiate Topic:** new topic of conversation placed on floor (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993).
21. **Other:** Included messages used to hold the floor and indicates transitions between events (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993).
22. **Refocusing:** Strategy to reestablish previous question or response (Green & Wallat, 1981).
23. **Rejecting:** Rejection of previous response or "no" in response to request for confirmation (Adapted by White, in press, from Green & Wallat, 1981).
24. **Requesting:** Requesting information or action from another (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993).
25. **Restating:** Repetition of all or part of the previous message or original speaker either by original speaker or other person. Also refers to paraphrases of previous questions or responses (Green & Wallat, 1981).

Semantics

26. **Propose:** Statements by a speaker either implicitly or explicitly formed in an effort to juxtapose past text and current conversation (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993).
27. **Recognise:** } Statements or actions at the intertextual level which show

- 28. **Acknowledgement:** } recognition and acknowledgement of links between text and conversation (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993).
- 29. **Social Consequence:** Statements or responses which identify participants as engaging/constructing meaning from text and socially as readers (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993).
- 30. **Words/Message:**
- 31. **Interactional Unit:**
- 32. **Genre:**

Literacy Issue

- 33. **Reading:** Constructing meaning from any written, book-based text either with parent, teacher, peer or alone.
- 34. **Writing:** Spontaneous symbolic representation or in response to home or school demands.
- 35. **School text/ reader:** Indicates focus on school-based event such as homework, school readers, stencils etc. which can also be adopted at home (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993).
- 36. **Home text:** Home book or piece of writing – not associated with school, although may be adopted at school (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993).
- 37. **School instruction or convention:** Indicates discourse around protocols associated with school. For example, style of writing, grammatical construction, correct pencil grip, position of margins etc. (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993).
- 38. **Text authority:** Authority derived from text itself (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993).
- 39. **Other literacies:** Not paper-based. May include use of computer, reading signs, message in music etc.

Procedures

- In the Linked Unit column (marked LU), the unbroken arrow indicates continuity of discourse between Parent and Child.
- Where units are marked 'Thematically tied' or 'Potentially divergent' refers to the cohesion being created. Units not directly following the thread of the lesson are 'potentially divergent' (Green & Wallat, 1981).

Symbols

- Reading: 
- Talk/interaction related to reading: 
- Talk/ interaction not related to print: 

Appendix 3
Sample from Sorensen Family Message Analysis – Transcript Lines 001 – 095, .

Transcript Line	LU	Speaker	Message Units Transcript Text	Potentially divergent units	Thematically tied units
01.	↓	Mum	OK, what book have you got today?		Q 20 <input type="checkbox"/>
02.		Tori	Mouse Monster		r 11 <input type="checkbox"/>
03.		Mum	OK, Read it for Mumma		S 8 <input type="checkbox"/>
04.		Tori	Mouse Monster. (.5)		r 12 <input type="checkbox"/>
05.		Mum	Andrew, you gonna listen to this or what?	Q 24 ○	
06.		Andrew	Um, yeah ((in the distance))	r+ 11 ○	
07.		Tori	The leaves was blowing in a, in the wind. The big (.6) l::ea:ves and little leaves, brown and red leaves and yellow leaves (.) they (.2) then?		33 <input type="checkbox"/>
08.		Mum	<u>when</u>		R 14 <input type="checkbox"/>
09.		Tori	When (.5)		33 <input type="checkbox"/>
10.		Mum	Sound it out		S 17 <input type="checkbox"/>
11.		Tori	'k' ((name))		r 17 <input type="checkbox"/>
12.		Mum	<u>Ng</u> , sound it out (.3) not letter (.3) 'k' ((letter sound))		S 17 <input type="checkbox"/>
13.		Tori	Ka::t::ie		r 17 <input type="checkbox"/>
14.		Mum	Right, well, what's the word?		Q22 <input type="checkbox"/>
15.		Tori	Katie		r 33 <input type="checkbox"/>
16.		Mum	Katie		S 33 <input type="checkbox"/>
17.		Tori	Now (.) played (.) in (.) them. Then they cr::ied and cried		33 <input type="checkbox"/>
18.		Mum	They? (.3) What did they do? (.2) What did they do?		Q 22 <input type="checkbox"/>
19.		Tori	Cr::i::		r 17 <input type="checkbox"/>
20.		Mum	Cr:ick:led		S17 <input type="checkbox"/>
21.		Tori	Crickled and crickled		33 <input type="checkbox"/>
22.		Mum	Uh, Uh! Cr:a=		S 17 <input type="checkbox"/>
23.		Tori	=ckled		r 17 <input type="checkbox"/>
24.		Mum	Right, now what is it?		Q 22 <input type="checkbox"/>
25.		Tori	They crickled and crackled		33 <input type="checkbox"/>
26.		Mum	Good girl! Good girl!		S 11 <input type="checkbox"/>
27.		Tori	Kate		33 <input type="checkbox"/>
28.		Mum	No!		R- 23 <input type="checkbox"/>
29.		Tori	Katie		33 <input type="checkbox"/>
30.		Mum	That's good!		S 11 <input type="checkbox"/>

031.
032.
033.
034.
035.
036.
037.
038.
039.
040.
041.
042.
043.
044.
045.
046.
047.
048.
049.
050.
051.
052.
053.
054.
055.
056.
057.
058.
059.
060.
061.
062.
063.
064.

Tori	Mouse (.2)
Mum	I don't think mouse is there is it? Can you see the word mouse=
Tori	=no=
Mum	=or are you adding one?
Tori	Adding one
Mum	Ooh, Dear me! Let's start that one again!
Tori	Katie (.5)
Mum	Come on baby! (.2) Now remember when there's=
Tori	Made!
Mum	That's a good girl
Tori	H::ou::s, holes in one leaf. (.2) That was her (.5)
Mum	Sound it out! M::ar::s::
Tori	Mask. She made holes in (.6)
Mum	That one's a hard one. Andrew can you help Tori with that word? That's one of your special words.
Andrew	An:oth:er
Mum	Another
Tori	Another leaf. (.3) That (.)
Mum	No!
Tori	That was her hat. She made holes her=in some little leaves. There (.2)
Mum	That one's a bit hard. <u>These</u>
Tori	These want
Mum	Pardon me?
Tori	Went on her tail
Mum	Good girl!
Tori	Kate Mouse () under the swing and ()
Mum	Pardon me?
Tori	Katie (.2) Mo:: (.4) Mouse? Di::
Mum	D:a:n:ced
Tori	Danced around=
Mum	Pardon me? U:n:d:er
Tori	Oh
Mum	U:n:d:er
Tori	Under? The (.2) swing (.) and she d:a:n:=
Mum	=As she danced

33	△
Q 16	□
r- 10	□
Q 10	□
r 10	□
S 22	□
33	△
S 22	□
33	△
R+ 11	□
33	△
S 17	□
33	△
S 16	□
Q 24	□
s 17	△
S 25	△
33	△
R- 23	□
33	△
S 17	□
33	□
Q 22	□
33	△
S 11	□
33	△
Q 22	□
33	△
S 17	△
33	△
Q 22	□
r 28	□
S 17	△
33	△
33	△

065.
066.
067.
068.
069.
070.
071.
072.
073.
074.
075.
076.
077.
078.
079.
080.
081.
082.
083.
084.
085.
086.
087.
088.
089.
090.
091.
092.
093.
094.
095.

Tori	She crackled?
Mum	No, look at the word
Tori	Cri:ck:led and crackled. I am a mouse (.) monster she (.) sang. (.6) She danced into (.) the (.) Mouse house. Mother?
Mum	Mumma!
Tori	Mumma mouse (.) was (.) making ()
Mum	C:a:k:e=
Tori	=cake=
Mum	=s
Tori	Cakes. Katie ()
Mum	Tori please! ((
Tori	Cri::ckled and crackled as:keed?
Mum	Asked
Tori	Asked Mumma (.) Mouse.
Mum	That was a really good try for asked, darlin", OK?
Tori	No, sh::ooted=
Mum	=sh:ou:ted
Tori	Shouted Katie. This is a big mouse monster.
Mum	Very good!
Tori	It (.) is(.) said Mumma Mouse. (.4)Why did (.2) did (.2) didn't I see that before. (giggles)) I am w:ild ((spoken with shortened vowel))
Mum	Right, Now that's wild
Tori	Wild
Mum	Wild ((said with shortened vowel)) is very good darling. You did try very hard but that one goes to its name, not to its sound. English is a very, very hard language to learn
Tori	Wild and (.9)
Mum	That's sav::age
Tori	Savage
Mum	Good
Tori	Said (.) the (.) Mouse monster:: I (.) am (.)
Mum	Fierce
Tori	Fierce and
Mum	Ferocious
Tori	Ferocious

S 29

33	△
R- 17	□
33	△
S 10	△
33	△
S 17	□
33	△
17	△
33	△
□	△
33	△
R 17	△
33	△
S 11	□
33	△
S 17	△
33	△
R+ 11	□
33	△
S 17	□
33	△
S 16	□
33	△
R 17	□
33	△
R+ 11	□
33	△
33	△
33	△
33	△
33	△