

LITERACY LEARNING IN TWO GRADE ONE FRENCH IMMERSION CLASSROOMS :
A CASE STUDY OF THE TEACHERS' PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES

BY

GESTNY EWART

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Department of Curriculum and Humanities
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

(c) April, 1996



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-13113-0

Canada

Dissertation Abstracts International and Masters Abstracts International are arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation or thesis. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Literacy Learning in Two Grade One French Immersion

SUBJECT TERM

--	--	--	--

UMI

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

classrooms: A Case Study of the Teachers' Pedagogical Practices

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture	0729
Art History	0377
Cinema	0900
Dance	0378
Fine Arts	0357
Information Science	0723
Journalism	0391
Library Science	0399
Mass Communications	0708
Music	0413
Speech Communication	0459
Theater	0465

EDUCATION

General	0515
Administration	0514
Adult and Continuing	0516
Agricultural	0517
Art	0273
Bilingual and Multicultural	0282
Business	0688
Community College	0275
Curriculum and Instruction	0727
Early Childhood	0518
Elementary	0524
Finance	0277
Guidance and Counseling	0519
Health	0680
Higher	0745
History of	0520
Home Economics	0278
Industrial	0521
Language and Literature	0279
Mathematics	0280
Music	0522
Philosophy of	0998
Physical	0523

Psychology	0525
Reading	0535
Religious	0527
Sciences	0714
Secondary	0533
Social Sciences	0534
Sociology of	0340
Special	0529
Teacher Training	0530
Technology	0710
Tests and Measurements	0288
Vocational	0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language	
General	0679
Ancient	0289
Linguistics	0290
Modern	0291
Literature	
General	0401
Classical	0294
Comparative	0295
Medieval	0297
Modern	0298
African	0316
American	0591
Asian	0305
Canadian (English)	0352
Canadian (French)	0355
English	0593
Germanic	0311
Latin American	0312
Middle Eastern	0315
Romance	0313
Slavic and East European	0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy	0422
Religion	
General	0318
Biblical Studies	0321
Clergy	0319
History of	0320
Philosophy of	0322
Theology	0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies	0323
Anthropology	
Archaeology	0324
Cultural	0326
Physical	0327
Business Administration	
General	0310
Accounting	0272
Banking	0770
Management	0454
Marketing	0338
Canadian Studies	0385
Economics	
General	0501
Agricultural	0503
Commerce-Business	0505
Finance	0508
History	0509
Labor	0510
Theory	0511
Folklore	0358
Geography	0366
Gerontology	0351
History	
General	0578

Ancient	0579
Medieval	0581
Modern	0582
Black	0328
African	0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania	0332
Canadian	0334
European	0335
Latin American	0336
Middle Eastern	0333
United States	0337
History of Science	0585
Law	0398
Political Science	
General	0615
International Law and Relations	0616
Public Administration	0617
Recreation	0814
Social Work	0452
Sociology	
General	0626
Criminology and Penology	0627
Demography	0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies	0631
Individual and Family Studies	0628
Industrial and Labor Relations	0629
Public and Social Welfare	0630
Social Structure and Development	0700
Theory and Methods	0344
Transportation	0709
Urban and Regional Planning	0999
Women's Studies	0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture	
General	0473
Agronomy	0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition	0475
Animal Pathology	0476
Food Science and Technology	0359
Forestry and Wildlife	0478
Plant Culture	0479
Plant Pathology	0480
Plant Physiology	0817
Range Management	0777
Wood Technology	0746
Biology	
General	0306
Anatomy	0287
Biostatistics	0308
Botany	0309
Cell	0379
Ecology	0329
Entomology	0353
Genetics	0369
Limnology	0793
Microbiology	0410
Molecular	0307
Neuroscience	0317
Oceanography	0416
Physiology	0433
Radiation	0821
Veterinary Science	0778
Zoology	0472
Biophysics	
General	0786
Medical	0760
EARTH SCIENCES	
Biogeochemistry	0425
Geochemistry	0996

Geodesy	0370
Geology	0372
Geophysics	0373
Hydrology	0388
Mineralogy	0411
Paleobotany	0345
Paleoecology	0426
Paleontology	0418
Paleozoology	0985
Palynology	0427
Physical Geography	0368
Physical Oceanography	0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences	0768
Health Sciences	
General	0566
Audiology	0300
Chemotherapy	0992
Dentistry	0567
Education	0350
Hospital Management	0769
Human Development	0758
Immunology	0982
Medicine and Surgery	0564
Mental Health	0347
Nursing	0569
Nutrition	0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology	0380
Occupational Health and Therapy	0354
Ophthalmology	0381
Pathology	0571
Pharmacology	0419
Pharmacy	0572
Physical Therapy	0382
Public Health	0573
Radiology	0574
Recreation	0575

Speech Pathology	0460
Toxicology	0383
Home Economics	0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences	
Chemistry	
General	0485
Agricultural	0749
Analytical	0486
Biochemistry	0487
Inorganic	0488
Nuclear	0738
Organic	0490
Pharmaceutical	0491
Physical	0494
Polymer	0495
Radiation	0754
Mathematics	0405
Physics	
General	0605
Acoustics	0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics	0606
Atmospheric Science	0608
Atomic	0748
Electronics and Electricity	0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy	0798
Fluid and Plasma	0759
Molecular	0609
Nuclear	0610
Optics	0752
Radiation	0756
Solid State	0611
Statistics	0463
Applied Sciences	
Applied Mechanics	0346
Computer Science	0984

Engineering	
General	0537
Aerospace	0538
Agricultural	0539
Automotive	0540
Biomedical	0541
Chemical	0542
Civil	0543
Electronics and Electrical	0544
Heat and Thermodynamics	0348
Hydraulic	0545
Industrial	0546
Marine	0547
Materials Science	0794
Mechanical	0548
Metallurgy	0743
Mining	0551
Nuclear	0552
Packaging	0549
Petroleum	0765
Sanitary and Municipal	0554
System Science	0790
Geotechnology	0428
Operations Research	0796
Plastics Technology	0795
Textile Technology	0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General	0621
Behavioral	0384
Clinical	0622
Developmental	0620
Experimental	0623
Industrial	0624
Personality	0625
Physiological	0989
Psychobiology	0349
Psychometrics	0632
Social	0451

Nom _____

Dissertation Abstracts International est organisé en catégories de sujets. Veuillez s.v.p. choisir le sujet qui décrit le mieux votre thèse et inscrivez le code numérique approprié dans l'espace réservé ci-dessous.



U·M·I

SUJET

CODE DE SUJET

Catégories par sujets

HUMANITÉS ET SCIENCES SOCIALES

COMMUNICATIONS ET LES ARTS

Architecture	0729
Beaux-arts	0357
Bibliothéconomie	0399
Cinéma	0900
Communication verbale	0459
Communications	0708
Danse	0378
Histoire de l'art	0377
Journalisme	0391
Musique	0413
Sciences de l'information	0723
Théâtre	0465

ÉDUCATION

Généralités	515
Administration	0514
Art	0273
Collèges communautaires	0275
Commerce	0688
Économie domestique	0278
Éducation permanente	0516
Éducation préscolaire	0518
Éducation sanitaire	0680
Enseignement agricole	0517
Enseignement bilingue et multiculturel	0282
Enseignement industriel	0521
Enseignement primaire	0524
Enseignement professionnel	0747
Enseignement religieux	0527
Enseignement secondaire	0533
Enseignement spécial	0529
Enseignement supérieur	0745
Évaluation	0288
Finances	0277
Formation des enseignants	0530
Histoire de l'éducation	0520
Langues et littérature	0279

Lecture	0535
Mathématiques	0280
Musique	0522
Orientation et consultation	0519
Philosophie de l'éducation	0998
Physique	0523
Programmes d'études et enseignement	0727
Psychologie	0525
Sciences	0714
Sciences sociales	0534
Sociologie de l'éducation	0340
Technologie	0710

LANGUE, LITTÉRATURE ET LINGUISTIQUE

Langues	
Généralités	0679
Anciennes	0289
Linguistique	0290
Modernes	0291
Littérature	
Généralités	0401
Anciennes	0294
Comparée	0295
Médiévale	0297
Moderne	0298
Africaine	0316
Américaine	0591
Anglaise	0593
Asiatique	0305
Canadienne (Anglaise)	0352
Canadienne (Française)	0355
Germanique	0311
Latino-américaine	0312
Moyen-orientale	0315
Romane	0313
Slave et est-européenne	0314

PHILOSOPHIE, RELIGION ET THÉOLOGIE

Philosophie	0422
Religion	
Généralités	0318
Clergé	0319
Études bibliques	0321
Histoire des religions	0320
Philosophie de la religion	0322
Théologie	0469

SCIENCES SOCIALES

Anthropologie	
Archéologie	0324
Culturelle	0326
Physique	0327
Droit	0398
Économie	
Généralités	0501
Commerce-Affaires	0505
Économie agricole	0503
Économie du travail	0510
Finances	0508
Histoire	0509
Théorie	0511
Études américaines	0323
Études canadiennes	0385
Études féministes	0453
Folklore	0358
Géographie	0366
Gérontologie	0351
Gestion des affaires	
Généralités	0310
Administration	0454
Banques	0770
Comptabilité	0272
Marketing	0338
Histoire	
Histoire générale	0578

Ancienne	0579
Médiévale	0581
Moderne	0582
Histoire des noirs	0328
Africaine	0331
Canadienne	0334
États-Unis	0337
Européenne	0335
Moyen-orientale	0333
Latino-américaine	0336
Asie, Australie et Océanie	0332
Histoire des sciences	0585
Loisirs	0814
Planification urbaine et régionale	0999
Science politique	
Généralités	0615
Administration publique	0617
Droit et relations internationales	0616
Sociologie	
Généralités	0626
Aide et bien-être social	0630
Criminologie et établissements pénitentiaires	0627
Démographie	0938
Études de l'individu et de la famille	0628
Études des relations interethniques et des relations raciales	0631
Structure et développement social	0700
Théorie et méthodes	0344
Travail et relations industrielles	0629
Transports	0709
Travail social	0452

SCIENCES ET INGÉNIERIE

SCIENCES BIOLOGIQUES

Agriculture	
Généralités	0473
Agronomie	0285
Alimentation et technologie alimentaire	0359
Culture	0479
Élevage et alimentation	0475
Exploitation des pâturages	0777
Pathologie animale	0476
Pathologie végétale	0480
Physiologie végétale	0817
Sylviculture et taune	0478
Technologie du bois	0746
Biologie	
Généralités	0306
Anatomie	0287
Biologie (Statistiques)	0308
Biologie moléculaire	0307
Botanique	0309
Cellule	0379
Écologie	0329
Entomologie	0353
Génétique	0369
Limnologie	0793
Microbiologie	0410
Neurologie	0317
Océanographie	0416
Physiologie	0433
Radiation	0821
Science vétérinaire	0778
Zoologie	0472
Biophysique	
Généralités	0786
Médicale	0760

SCIENCES DE LA TERRE

Biogéochimie	0425
Géochimie	0996
Géodésie	0370
Géographie physique	0368

Géologie	0372
Géophysique	0373
Hydrologie	0388
Minéralogie	0411
Océanographie physique	0415
Paléobotanique	0345
Paléocéologie	0426
Paléontologie	0418
Paléozoologie	0985
Palynologie	0427

SCIENCES DE LA SANTÉ ET DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT

Économie domestique	0386
Sciences de l'environnement	0768
Sciences de la santé	
Généralités	0566
Administration des hôpitaux	0769
Alimentation et nutrition	0570
Audiologie	0300
Chimiothérapie	0992
Dentisterie	0567
Développement humain	0758
Enseignement	0350
Immunologie	0982
Loisirs	0575
Médecine du travail et thérapie	0354
Médecine et chirurgie	0564
Obstétrique et gynécologie	0380
Ophtalmologie	0381
Orthophonie	0460
Pathologie	0571
Pharmacie	0572
Pharmacologie	0419
Physiothérapie	0382
Radiologie	0574
Santé mentale	0347
Santé publique	0573
Soins infirmiers	0569
Toxicologie	0383

SCIENCES PHYSIQUES

Sciences Pures

Chimie	
Généralités	0485
Biochimie	0487
Chimie agricole	0749
Chimie analytique	0486
Chimie minérale	0488
Chimie nucléaire	0738
Chimie organique	0490
Chimie pharmaceutique	0491
Physique	0494
Polymères	0495
Radiation	0754
Mathématiques	0405
Physique	
Généralités	0605
Acoustique	0986
Astronomie et astrophysique	0606
Électronique et électricité	0607
Fluides et plasma	0759
Météorologie	0608
Optique	0752
Particules (Physique nucléaire)	0798
Physique atomique	0748
Physique de l'état solide	0611
Physique moléculaire	0609
Physique nucléaire	0610
Radiation	0756
Statistiques	0463

Sciences Appliquées Et Technologie

Informatique	0984
Ingénierie	
Généralités	0537
Agricole	0539
Automobile	0540

Biomédicale	0541
Chaleur et thermodynamique	0348
Conditionnement (Emballage)	0549
Génie aérospatial	0538
Génie chimique	0542
Génie civil	0543
Génie électronique et électrique	0544
Génie industriel	0546
Génie mécanique	0548
Génie nucléaire	0552
Ingénierie des systèmes	0790
Mécanique navale	0547
Métallurgie	0743
Science des matériaux	0794
Technique du pétrole	0765
Technique minière	0551
Techniques sanitaires et municipales	0554
Technologie hydraulique	0545
Mécanique appliquée	0346
Géotechnologie	0428
Matériaux plastiques (Technologie)	0795
Recherche opérationnelle	0796
Textiles et tissus (Technologie)	0794

PSYCHOLOGIE

Généralités	0621
Personnalité	0625
Psychobiologie	0349
Psychologie clinique	0622
Psychologie du comportement	0384
Psychologie du développement	0620
Psychologie expérimentale	0623
Psychologie industrielle	0624
Psychologie physiologique	0989
Psychologie sociale	0451
Psychométrie	0632



**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
COPYRIGHT PERMISSION**

**LITERACY LEARNING IN TWO GRADE ONE FRENCH IMMERSION CLASSROOMS:
A CASE STUDY OF THE TEACHERS' PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES**

BY

GESTNY EWART

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of**

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Gestny Ewart © 1996

**Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies
of this thesis/practicum, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis/practicum and
to lend or sell copies of the film, and to UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INC. to publish an abstract of this
thesis/practicum..**

**This reproduction or copy of this thesis has been made available by authority of the copyright owner solely
for the purpose of private study and research, and may only be reproduced and copied as permitted by
copyright laws or with express written authorization from the copyright owner.**

Abstract

This case study looks at the pedagogical practices of two teachers, and the role they played in the development literacy of young anglophone children who were immersed in French as a second language. In one classroom literacy instruction was carried out in French, and in the other classroom literacy instruction was carried out in English. Data collection methods included participant observation, interviewing, and the collection of some artifacts. Data were collected in the months of May and June in 1994 and were classified according to the materials the teacher used, the teacher's role, the student's role, evaluation, and "other." The data were then analyzed in each classroom and compared to research in the field of effective language classrooms.

The results of the data suggest that teachers who provide a structured instructional scaffold for their students provide a richer learning environment than those who do not provide this kind of support. The study describes the scaffold construct and its possible application in a grade one French immersion context. A second conclusion has to do with the complexity of the issue language of literacy instruction in early French immersion classrooms. Key elements in the discussion should include the pedagogical practice of the teacher which are based on his or her understanding of language development as well as the role literacy plays in the development of oracy.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge those people who have enabled me to come to this point in my learning. Firstly, I extend my sincere thanks to Dr. Stan Straw for his patience during my about-faces and for his support and suggestions throughout this process. Un remerciement tout spécial à Monsieur Hermann Duchesne, professeur agrégé au Collège universitaire de Saint-Boniface, pour ses encouragements et ses nombreux conseils tout au long de ce travail. Thank you to Dr. Wayne Serebrin for helping me ask new questions about my learning and the learning of young children. I am very thankful to my two teacher participants who generously opened their classroom doors to me. Thank you to my husband for the sacrifices he made so I could pursue this goal. Lastly, I would like to thank my mentor and friend Lucille Maurice, for sharing her wisdom, for having faith in me, and for her constant encouragement since well before this project was born.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
APPENDICES	v
CHAPTER ONE	1
1.1 About the Researcher	1
1.2 My Original Questions	4
1.3 Educational Value of the Present Study	7
CHAPTER TWO	9
2.1 Supporting Theory	9
2.1.1 Research in Reading in Second Language	9
2.1.2 Theory of Additive and Subtractive Bilingualism	12
2.1.3 Role of Literacy in the Development of Oracy	18
2.1.4 Effective Language Instruction	23
2.1.5 Conclusion	36
2.2 Methodology	37
2.2.1 Description of the Classrooms	37
2.2.2 Data Collection	41
2.2.3 Research Method	42
2.3 Trustworthiness	44
2.3.1 Time at Site and Triangulation	44
2.3.2 Researcher's Bias: Subjectivity	45
2.3.3 Belonging to the Learning Community: Rapport	47
2.3.4 Class Size and Teacher Experience	49
CHAPTER THREE	50
3.1 Introduction to Jeanne and her Classroom	50
3.2 Jeanne's View of the Development of Literacy	51
3.3 Links Between Literacy and Oracy, Between Reading and Writing ..	54
3.3.1 Personal Reading	55
3.3.2 <i>La petite chenille qui faisait des trous</i>	58
3.3.3 <i>Où est bébé éléphant</i>	65
3.3.4 Big Book Collection and Games	70
3.3.5 Learning About Language	72
3.4 The Role of Evaluation	77
3.5 Conclusion	80

CHAPTER FOUR	85
4.1 Introduction to Marie and her Classroom	85
4.2 Marie's View of the Development of Literacy	86
4.3 Links Between Literacy and Oracy, Between Reading and Writing ..	90
4.3.1 Oral Reading to the Children	91
4.3.2 Reading By the Students	93
4.3.3 Learning Centres	97
4.3.4 Conferencing and Writing	105
4.4 Evaluation	108
4.5 Français	109
4.6 Conclusion	111
CHAPTER 5	115
5.1 Definitions of Literacy and Roles of the Teachers	115
5.1.1 Definitions of literacy	115
5.1.2 Role of the Teacher: Jeanne	116
5.1.3 Role of the Teacher: Marie	120
5.2 Evaluation	122
5.3 Role of the Children and the Extent to Which They Appropriated Literacy	125
5.4 Abilities in <i>Français</i>	127
5.5 A Language-Rich Learning Environment	129
5.6 In Which Language Should Literacy be Introduced	131
5.7 Closing Remarks	134
REFERENCES	137

APPENDICES

	Page
Appendix A: Interviews with Jeanne	140
A.1 Interview with Jeanne: March, 1994	140
A.2 Interview with Jeanne: May 30, 1994	146
Appendix B: Audio Tapes in Jeanne's Classroom	149
B.1 May 24, 1994	149
B.2 June 8, 1994	151
Appendix C: Edited, Translated, and Categorized Field Notes from Jeanne's Classroom	152
C.1 Material	152
C.2 Teacher's Role	153
C.3 Students' Role	158
C.4 Evaluation	164
C.5 Other	165
Appendix D: Résumé of the Audio-video Cassette in Jeanne's Classroom	169
Appendix E: Text of <i>La petite chenille qui faisait des trous</i>	172
Appendix F: Text of <i>Papillon, papillon</i>	173
Appendix G: Interview with Marie	174
Appendix H: Categorized and Edited Field Notes from Marie's Classroom	181
H.1 Material	181
H.2 Teacher's Role	181
H.3 TA's Role	188
H.4 Students' Role	189
H.5 Evaluation	197
H.6 Other	198
H.7 Français	201
Appendix I: Résumé of the Audio-video Cassette in Marie's Classroom	203
Appendix J: Stages of Writing	205
Appendix K: Reading Continuum	206
Appendix L: Reading Development Continuum Strategies	208

Chapter One

1.1 About the Researcher

The subject of reading in French immersion classrooms has always been of particular interest to me. There are many questions which came to mind as I reflected on the literacy of young French immersion students: How do the children learn to read in a second language? What strategies facilitate the process? What kinds of transfers of learning take place in the area of literacy? Why do some children learn to read with the same ease with which they learn to speak and why do others seem to struggle? Yet, there was one question, specific to the immersion program, that seemed to provide a focus for understanding reading acquisition in a second language context: Does the language of initial reading instruction (i.e., in the first language or in the second language) play a role in reading acquisition?

Before I begin to share my initial thoughts on the question of the role of first or second language in reading acquisition, I think it is important to relate a bit of my background so the reader may better understand the questions I ask, the way I interpret data, and the conclusions I draw.

I have been working in the context of literacy in French immersion in Winnipeg schools since I graduated with a teaching certificate in 1977. My experience has been varied, and as a result I have had the opportunity to look at the literacy in French immersion from many perspectives. I taught English language arts from grades one to ten in three French immersion schools in Manitoba. I also worked as a curriculum consultant for English language arts in French immersion and French schools across the province, and I am presently teaching courses in

reading and immersion methodology to future Faculty of Education graduates at Saint-Boniface College.

Not only has my professional experience influenced my research, but my personal experiences have also influenced my view on literacy in a second language. I am anglophone, and I have learned French as a second language. I use my second language, however, for all the responsibilities related to my employment. French is also used in my home as it is the first language of my five-year old son and my spouse. As a result, I am able to use my second language in a variety of contexts for a variety of purposes with relative competence and ease. However, regardless of my experiences in reading and writing in my second language, I still feel more competent with my literacy skills in English. My personal experiences with literacy in a second language obviously impacted my thinking when I initially considered the question of the language in which literacy should be introduced in French immersion programs. From my experience, it seemed that the acquisition of literacy would be facilitated if children were engaged in initial literacy instruction in their first language.

Not only did my personal experiences suggest introducing literacy in the first language, my readings also suggested that children need a level of oral competency in order to acquire literacy. According to these readings, oral competency gives the children the vocabulary, the grammar and the phonetics of the language which, in turn, facilitate the acquisition of literacy. For anglophone children, the learner could capitalize on his or her linguistic background in English to develop literacy. As a result, it seemed logical to me that learners be introduced to English language arts in grade one. Apart from the time allotted to English in grade one, the

curriculum could be carried out in French, thereby giving the learners the opportunity to develop oracy in the second language. Instruction of literacy in French could be delayed until grade two when the children were more competent in the second language and could use their phonemic, syntactic and semantic knowledge to learn to read in French. In fact, for these reasons, Manitoba Education mandated the introduction of English language arts in grade one.

The policy of Manitoba does not reflect that of the other provinces across Canada. Outside Manitoba, schools tend to delay the introduction of English language arts until grade two or later (CAIT/ACPI, 1995). In other words, the children are introduced to literacy in their second language. That is, their initial literacy schooling is in the second language, a language that most of the children are unable to speak. The rationale for delaying English language arts is based on several assumptions. Firstly, children need as much exposure to French language as possible so that they may acquire the oral competency necessary for reading and writing. Secondly, if the children learn to read first in English they will be less interested in reading in French which will have detrimental effects on overall French competency. And finally, because the children will have had exposure to literacy in English they could more easily move into an English program and parents would be less committed to keeping the child in the French immersion program.

As I thought about how children acquire literacy and the role oral competency plays in the success of literacy acquisition, it became more and more difficult for me to accept a policy which introduced initial literacy acquisition in the second language. The assumptions which supported the delaying of English language arts seemed pedagogically unsound.

As a result, I decided to research the question in the context of my thesis for my Masters of Education. I wanted to see if children who were introduced to reading in their first language, English, would outperform children who were introduced to reading in their second language, French, on validated reading tests in both English and French. What started out to be a rather straight-forward quantitative research question precipitated major changes in my understanding of the questions I wanted to ask and how I intended to answer them.

1.2 My Original Question and Methodology

I had originally proposed a quantitative non-equivalent control group design in an effort to determine whether reading comprehension results would be affected by the language of instruction of initial literacy. The variables of interest for this study were reading comprehension and the language in which reading instruction was introduced. Reading comprehension, the dependent variable, referred to the child's ability to construct meaning actively from written discourse as measured by a modified miscue analysis and story retelling. The independent variable was the language in which initial reading instruction took place. In one case the grade one students would be exposed to reading instruction in French, and in another case the students were to be introduced to reading in English. Once the groups had been matched and had been exposed to the treatment, an analysis of covariance was to be conducted on the measures of reading comprehension. The discussion and conclusions were to be drawn, and it was hoped that the results of the study would help policy-makers in their decisions about the sequencing of reading in early French immersion programs.

One of the limitations I had identified in the proposal for the original quantitative

study was that I could not be sure I could match the classrooms based on the teachers' definitions of what reading was and the strategies they employed in their teaching of literacy. I addressed this limitation by visiting the classrooms and interviewing the teachers. I decided to visit a sample of classrooms from two different school divisions both of which offer early French immersion programs. One school division allows for no scheduled classroom time in English language arts in grade one; therefore, reading is introduced at school in the second language, French. The other school division schedules one hour and fifteen minutes of English language arts per day in grade one; as a result, children are introduced to reading at school in their first language, English.

In order to prepare for my visits and to provide me with a structure for my observations, I developed a questionnaire. The questions had to do with evaluation, teaching strategies, materials, and the teachers' philosophy about teaching and learning to read. I used these questions to guide my observations in the classroom, and I also used them to interview each teacher. As a result of my visits, I had a much clearer idea of how the various teachers developed their reading programs and I was better informed to respond to the limitation I had identified with regards to the pedagogical practices in the classrooms.

Although I visited only four classrooms it became obvious that the teachers' philosophies and strategies were very different. For example, one teacher saw reading as a risk-taking search for meaning, and she identified a good reader as someone who understands what is read. Some of her pedagogical practices included the reading and writing of Big Books, miming stories, and group discussions related to the literacy activities going on in the classroom. Another teacher saw reading as the identification of different phonemes. She said in order to help her children who are not reading or who

are in difficulty, she does phonics drills with them. In fact, she starts every English language arts class with a thirty minute phonics lesson for all the children, regardless of their reading ability. It was obvious to me that I could not assume that all the children would be subjected to similar philosophies and teaching strategies in the area of literacy development. This made matching of the two groups extremely difficult and jeopardized the design I had originally proposed.

Not only was my quasi-experimental design starting to appear less appropriate, but I began to question my beliefs about the acquisition of literacy. This had major repercussions on the theoretical basis upon which I had developed my original thesis proposal. It had seemed obvious to me that reading should be introduced at school in the child's first language as he or she would have the oral language necessary to transact with the text. However, as I observed in the classrooms in which the children were developing in French, I realized that I had ignored the importance of the links between literacy and oracy in the acquisition of language. In other words, to develop the child's oracy in French, I began to realize the importance of French literacy activities as part of the acquisition process. I also realized that the kinds of literacy acts varied greatly from one class to another, and this must have an impact on the development of the child's language, be it English or French.

As a result, when I reflected on my classroom observations, I came to understand that the question I had set out to answer in my original quasi-experimental design was perhaps not the most appropriate question, and the design I had chosen to better understand literacy in second language classrooms was not going to give me the kind of information I was seeking. My thinking shifted to the importance of the social context in which language is learned, in particular, the role of the teacher, the role of the

students and the interaction of these participants in the classroom.

1.3 The Educational Value of the Present Study

This paradigm shift from measuring outcomes using quantitative tests to determine whether reading comprehension results would be affected by the language of instruction of initial literacy to interpreting the actions of learners and teachers in particular cultural settings, gave rise to the present study. Its purpose is to contribute to our understanding of how children acquire literacy, the role of second language, and what kinds of environments best support literacy acquisition in early childhood French immersion classrooms.

Although my general interest revolved around the development of literacy of young anglophone children who are immersed in French as a second language, I decided to limit my study to the pedagogical practices of the teachers and the role they played in the development of this literacy. More specifically, I was interested in observing how the teacher made the link between literacy and oracy, as well as between reading and writing and how these connections were played out in the classroom. Secondly, I was curious to compare the teacher's definition of the development of literacy with the kinds of literacy acts that were taking place in her classroom in terms of materials used, the role of the teacher, and the involvement of the learner. My third area of interest involved evaluation: How did the teacher identify a good reader or a good writer? Was evaluation considered in curriculum planning? Did the children have a role to play in evaluation? To what extent did the children appropriate literacy? Finally, I wanted to get a better understanding of these questions as they related to literacy in the second language, French, and to literacy in the first language, English,

and the possible transfer of competency from one language to the other.

Chapter Two

In this chapter, I will review the theory and research that is relevant to the question of literacy and oracy acquisition in French immersion programs. Secondly, I will describe my methodology for the current study. Finally, I will discuss the trustworthiness of the results.

2.1 Supporting Theory

There are four major areas of knowledge which should be discussed with regards to my thesis proposal. One of these has to do with research in reading in a second language, another describes the theory of additive bilingualism, the third deals with the role of literacy in the development of oracy, and the fourth looks at effective language instruction in first language and teacher talk in second language classrooms.

2.1.1 Research in Reading in a Second Language

With regards to learning to read in a second language, reading researchers are of the opinion that the child should learn to read in the first language. Fillmore and Valadey (1987) review research in their chapter "Teaching Bilingual Learners":

There is no other area of the curriculum in which the arguments for beginning with native language instruction are clearer. Reading is unquestionably a language dependent skill. It is not possible to read in a language one does not know, if reading involves the act of making intelligible to oneself written texts of any complexity beyond that of strict

signs. (p. 661)

Kenneth Goodman (1973) expresses the same opinion; "Where at all feasible the child should achieve initial literacy within his own language, in fact within his own dialect." (p. 141). He notes certain implications for reading in a second language:

It will always be easier for a student to learn to read a language he already speaks. For young learners this clearly suggests a sequence of early focus on oral language and later introduction of reading, even in situations where the second language will be the medium of later education. (p. 142)

Cornaire (1991) also advances the position that a lack of linguistic knowledge is a major source of difficulty for readers in L₂. More specifically, she states that weaknesses in syntactic and semantic knowledge slow down reading and impede comprehension. Students who are not fluent orally in the language of the author are disadvantaged by these weaknesses, and reading and learning to read in the second language may very well become problematic for them.

Obviously, these researchers see the importance of oral competency in the language in which the child learns to read. The language of the author and the reader must be closely matched if we are to improve the likelihood of comprehension. This would support a sequencing in which the child would learn to read in the language in which he or she is fluent and then transfer this ability to the second language situation.

There have been specific studies conducted to investigate the effects of introducing reading in L₁ and in L₂. Downing (cited in Downing, 1984) suggests that when children begin to learn to read, they are in a state of cognitive confusion. His

cognitive clarity theory of learning to read describes the confusion of the beginning reader with regards to the function of reading and the coding rules of the writing system. Downing found that this confusion was compounded for those children learning to read in a second language because they did not have the advantage of being able to relate their school experiences to their native language experiences. Downing (1984) concludes:

As the cognitive clarity theory predicts, children whose school experience relates to familiar examples of their own mother tongue develop the concept of the phoneme more rapidly than children whose school instruction relies on unfamiliar examples from a second language. (p. 369)

As a result, it would seem that children learning to read in their native language have an advantage over those learning to read in a second language as their cognitive confusion is reduced.

Modiana (1968) conducted a study among several Indian tribes in the Highlands of Mexico close to the Guatemalan border. For this study, groups were compared from federal or state schools where reading was taught in the national or second language (L_2), to institute schools where reading was taught in the vernacular or first language (L_1). In the case of the institute schools, reading in the vernacular was terminated after the preparatory year at which time reading in the second language was introduced. She found that minority students who had first learned to read in their mother language read with greater comprehension in the national language than those who received all their reading instruction in the national language. The results of her study support the notion that reading should be introduced in the first language.

Rosier (1977) compared the effectiveness of initial reading instruction given to Navajo-speaking children in their native language with reading instruction given in English. Those who were taught to read in L₁ were given help in developing oral proficiency in L₂ before being introduced to reading in L₂, and at the end of the second grade, were transferred to English (L₂) reading. At the end of the three-year study which covered reading development from the first to the sixth grade, Rosier found that the minority group taught to read in L₁ outperformed the L₂ group in the English achievement tests (the *Stanford* and the *Metropolitan Achievement Tests*).

To summarize, then, reading researchers and language acquisition theorists such as Goodman, Cornaire, Downing, Rosier, Modiano are of the opinion that children, particularly children belonging to minority language groups, should learn to read in their first language. Their point of view is rooted in an assumption that comprehension is dependent, in part, on the reader's familiarity with the language to be read.

2.1.2 The Theory of Additive and Subtractive Bilingualism

Although reading researchers and language acquisition theorists support the notion that children should learn to read in their first language, results of research carried out in Canada showing that children enrolled in French immersion programs do not suffer academically because of their second language experience (See the Edwards review, 1989; Alberta Education, 1992.) Much research (Swain, 1974; Lambert & Tucker, 1972) was conducted in the 1970's on the outcomes of English-speaking Canadian French immersion students with respect to the sequencing of initial reading instruction in bilingual programs. The results show that there are no negative effects on English literacy and oracy if anglophone children are first introduced to reading in their

second language, French. Genesee (1979) concludes:

Thus the research evidence indicates that English-speaking, majority group children do not suffer detrimental effects to their English reading competence if they are initially taught to read in French, even when instruction in English reading is delayed until Grade 3. (p. 74)

Although research seems to be quite conclusive, there are certain limitations which should be mentioned. Carey (1991) refutes research such as that of Swain & Lapkin (1982) based on the latter's decision to use between-group comparisons comparing regular English program students to French immersion students. According to Carey, the two groups are not comparable; in the case of the immersion programs, it is more probable that a conscious choice has been made to send the child to a French immersion program while those attending the English schools are, by and large, in attendance because a choice was not made. Because the two groups are different, variables such as student motivation, home culture, teacher's methodology, parental attitude, and ethnolinguistic vitality are very difficult to control. Under such circumstances, a between-group comparison is compromised.

Another limitation to the studies which show no negative effects on English literacy and oracy if anglophone children are first introduced to reading in their second language, is the role of parental involvement. Cummins (1977) warned of the impact that parental involvement may have in the acquisition of literacy when he interpreted the research results of the 70's. He gives a cautionary note to delaying native reading instruction in immersion programs by suggesting, "that parental involvement in the reading process may interact with the sequencing of reading instruction"(p. 46). In other

words, the extent to which parents are involved in promoting literacy may have a direct influence in determining in which language children should be taught reading.

A study by Brassard (1990) which looked at the personal and social factors which influence the placement of children in the English or the French immersion elementary school program in a rural dual-track school in northwestern Alberta, suggests that parents in the immersion program are more confident in their children's ability to cope, volunteer more often at school, and read more frequently to their children at home. In this case, parental input in the children's literacy development is greater in the French immersion program than in the English program, which could contribute to the French immersion children's success in school.

To summarize, when one examines more closely the 1970's French immersion research, the problems of between-group comparisons and the role of parental involvement in the acquisition of literacy become apparent. Consequently, these limitations should be considered when interpreting this research.

A more recent study by Donaldson (1989) compared the reading achievement in English and in French of grade four students enrolled in an immersion program where English language instruction was delayed to grade four (experimental group) with comparable students enrolled in a program where English was introduced in grade three (comparison group). Using the B.C. Reading Assessment Test which was administered to all grade four English stream and French immersion students as part of the 1988 Provincial Assessment, she found no significant differences in performance in English between the two immersion groups even though one group had a full year less instructional time in English language arts. With respect to French reading achievement, she administered the Test de Lecture, originally administered in 1987 as

part of the Provincial French Immersion Assessment. Teacher ratings of the students' general reading ability and the mean percent scores for each of the four domains (Vocabulary, Literary Comprehension, Inferential/Critical Comprehension, and Graphic Materials) were compared.

Donaldson found that the students enrolled in the French immersion program which delayed English instruction until grade four attained significantly higher mean percent scores of three of the four domains in French reading comprehension than did the students in the comparison group. No significant difference was noted in the fourth domain, Graphic Materials. Such results suggest that not only are there no negative effects on English literacy if instruction in English language arts is delayed until grade four, but also delaying English language arts instruction, thus increasing exposure to the second language, French, may be beneficial to the development of skills in the second language.

The positive results in English-speaking majority children who are initially taught to read in French may also be explained in part by the theory of additive and subtractive bilingualism. This theory traces its roots to both the reported failure of bilingual programs and the reported success of French immersion programs in Canada. Results from research conducted between 1920 and 1960 (see Darcy, 1953; Peal and Lambert, 1962 for reviews of these studies) supported the general perception that bilingual education was detrimental to a child's development. Conversely, Canadian studies on French immersion children suggested that bilingualism had no detrimental effects on the child's development.

In order to explain this apparent contradiction, Lambert (1975, 1977) suggested that there are perhaps two forms of bilingualism, additive bilingualism and subtractive

bilingualism. Factors such as the relative social status of the two languages in question and the learner's perception of this status are instrumental in determining whether the learner is in an additive or subtractive bilingual situation. Additive bilingualism occurs when the two languages and the two cultures positively affect the learner as in the case such when the community and the family attribute positive values to both languages. As a result, the acquisition of the second language does not menace the acquisition of the first language. On the other hand, a situation of subtractive bilingualism will occur when the two languages are concurrent rather than complementary. In other words, when a community rejects its own socio-cultural values for those of another community which it considers both cultural and economically more prestigious, the new language will have the tendency to replace the first language which will in turn begin to deteriorate. This situation is found generally when a child of a minority language group receives his or her education in the language of the majority.

The research that showed that bilingual education was detrimental to children's development was based on minority language-speaking communities immersed in a second majority language-speaking communities. As a result, the children were in the process of replacing their first language with their second language. They were in a subtractive bilingual environment which explains the poor results of their bilingual education experience.

Lambert (1975) describes the anglophone student in French immersion programs in Canada as being in a setting of additive bilingualism. Because the children speak the language of the majority, English, they are in a position to benefit from an immersion in French and are in no danger of replacing their English with their French. In fact, French is added to their first language. As a result, the children in the French

immersion programs show varying degrees of competency in French at no apparent loss to the students' English.

The theory of additive and subtractive bilingualism is important in understanding the effects of second language instruction on first language acquisition in the context of French immersion programs in Canada. It helps explain why research shows no negative effects to children's English reading competency if reading is introduced in French. These majority English-speaking children are in an additive bilingual setting, and they run no risk of losing their English regardless of the fact that reading is introduced in French. In fact, English is so prevalent in their out-of-school environment that it is very possible that many learn to read without direct instruction from the teacher at school.

The purpose of my discussing research in reading in a second language and the theory of additive bilingualism is that these two areas of knowledge look at the question of second language and literacy from two points of view. Studies in reading in a second language in minority groups and the opinion of reading experts suggest that reading comprehension is enhanced when the linguistic knowledge of the reader corresponds to that of the author, which in turn supports the corollary that learning to read is facilitated when the process is carried out in the learner's native language. However, research in French immersion programs in Canada shows that there are no detrimental effects to first language competency when reading instruction is introduced in the second language. The theory of additive bilingualism which posits that the majority anglophone children in French immersion programs in Canada may show varying degrees of competency in French at no loss to their English, helps explain these results. These are two of the theories which help provide the philosophical basis for my thesis

proposal and serve as the impetus for some of the initial questions I have developed to structure my inquiry. Should language of initial reading instruction be determined according to research based on minority language groups and the opinion of reading experts which support initial reading in the child's first language or should it be determined by results of Canadian research based on majority language groups in the field of early French immersion? Another perspective soon came to the forefront in the discussion of language of instruction, and that was the role of literacy in the development of oracy.

2.1.3 The Role of Literacy in the Development of Oracy

There exists another conversation in the area of language acquisition which I believe is relevant to this study. This conversation has to do with the role of literacy in the development of oracy. Research (Clay, 1982) has shown that competency in oral language facilitates the acquisition of written language. Children depend on information from their oral language experience and knowledge of situation to help them negotiate meaning. Gradually, they become less dependent on oral language experiences and are able to use cues offered by the text. One of the reasons French immersion policy in Manitoba delays the introduction of reading in French until grade two is to give the children the opportunity to develop oracy in the second language in kindergarten and in grade one before introducing them to literacy.

But what seems to have been overlooked in the delay of the introduction of literacy is literacy's role in the development of oracy. In other words, instead of seeing oracy as a prerequisite to literacy, literacy and oracy can be seen as developing simultaneously, backstrapping each other to build a more meaningful and efficient

scaffold for language acquisition.

Harste, Woodward, & Burke (1984) contend that young children attend to print before entering school and that formal literacy programs should build from this knowledge. They reject the assumption that oral language must be in place before written language can be learned. Written language is not seen as simply a translation of oral language, but rather as a semiotic system that must be experienced for its own value. They writes:

A semiotic view would suggest that while oral and written language share much in common, both of these systems have their own semiotic potential which must be experienced directly.[...] In order to value written language, children must experience the social, cognitive, and linguistic potential written language as a system itself holds. (p. 63)

Early childhood classrooms which integrate reading and writing using the language experience approach provide the children with the opportunity to see the link between oral language and written language. Harste *et al.* (1984) do warn, however, in order for the children to experience the power of written language, they must also have the opportunity to write their own messages and to read authentic literature.

Second language researchers have shown that language learners can learn to read and write in their second language long before they have mastered the forms of the language. Rigg (1981) suggests the Language Experience Approach (LEA) in second language contexts encourages children to talk about things they are interested in, and the recording of these conversations provides for a wide variety of reading materials

they are able to read. During the first draft, the teacher can develop oral language activities, and the second draft may deal more specifically with written language. Rigg supports this approach if the children have a basic vocabulary in their second language and a desire to communicate. She defines those not possessing a basic vocabulary as those who are unable to speak at all, or those for whom connected discourse is painfully difficult. Generally speaking, children who have attended kindergarten in French immersion would not fall into this category, and therefore, could benefit from the Language Experience Approach. As a result, both oracy and literacy activities would enhance their second language acquisition.

Hudelson (1984) presents several general findings on second language reading and writing development in children. Although these findings are based on English as a second language, most of them may be transferred to French as a second language. One of the generalisations is that ESL learners are able to read English before they have complete oral control of the language, as shown when a miscue analysis is utilized. She recommends that children can and should begin reading fairly soon after they begin studying their second language. In the case of French immersion, would beginning reading in French in grade one after a French immersion kindergarten experience answer the call to "begin reading fairly soon after they begin studying in their second language?"

A second generalisation Hudelson (1984) makes is that reading comprehension is enhanced when the background knowledge and the cultural framework of the reader resemble that of the author. In the case of French immersion programs in Canada, the cultural framework that young anglophones are bringing to the reading task is very similar to that which a young French Canadian brings to the reading task. Therefore,

reading comprehension would be facilitated as long as the teacher is careful not to use materials that require specific knowledge about foreign countries in order to be understood.

Another generalisation reveals that, as in first language, writing in a second language interacts with reading and the two processes are closely related and complement each other. The work of Rigg supports this statement which show that children read their own written messages using unconventional spelling often before they read conventional English texts. Work by Urzua (1987) suggests that children who are helped in the writing process in second language using the kinds of techniques suggested by Graves (1983) such as peer response groups, encouraging the children to write about their own topics and to revise, are able to develop a sense of audience, a sense of voice and a sense of power in language much as first language users develop their control over written language. Uzura's (1987) work tends to support Hudelson's (1984) suggestion that children can and should be encouraged to write in their second language before they have complete control over the oral and written systems. Not only will these experiences serve to develop second language competency, these samples can be used to evaluate language development.

Gruter (1990) investigated second language writing development of twenty three early French immersion grade one students who wrote in a Whole Language classroom. In this study, she questions instruction that separates the language arts into distinct modes of speaking, reading, writing, and listening. She prefers an instructional approach which allows the children to read children's literature, and write self-generated discourse dealing with meaningful, self-selected subjects, relevant to the children. She writes:

In conclusion we recommend that for effective L₂ literacy learning, E.F.I. [early French immersion] students be allowed to explore the parameters of the language, to take risks with language, and to control, and be responsible for their own learning. With regard to writing, this means that children should have opportunities for the engagement and re-engagement in the process. They should be able to write for a variety of purposes and for a variety of audiences. When this happens they will be able to demonstrate that acquiring second language literacy can be as natural a process as it is in their first language. (p. 112)

It seems then, that research in second language acquisition supports the development of literacy and oracy simultaneously so that the learners will have at their disposal, richer and more diverse contexts which will enable them to develop their second language competencies. Hudelson (1984) states:

It is both useless and, ultimately, impossible to separate out the language processes in our teaching (i.e., to attempt to teach only listening or speaking or only reading or writing, although some elementary ESL curricula still try to do so), or to try to present ESL material in a linear sequence of listening, speaking, reading, and writing....Second language learners demonstrate that they are dealing with and making sense of language as a

totality rather than dealing with the language processes as separate entities. (p. 234)

Furthermore, we must not underestimate the ability of children to use literacy as a way of learning language, nor must we assume that complete oral competency is a prerequisite to literacy competency. As the learner moves back and forth from literacy situations to oracy situations and vice versa, linguistic knowledge is encountered, reinforced and then reapplied in a variety of contexts. It is this interaction which creates a most fertile ground for language acquisition.

In summary then, literacy appears to have an important role to play in the acquisition of language, and this role is equally important in the acquisition of second language. Not only are the children capable of gaining literacy knowledge with a basic oral competency, but by providing them with opportunities to read and write early on, they can use literacy to nurture the development of their oral competency of the language. By excluding children from literacy instruction, we may be depriving them of valuable sign systems necessary in making meaning out of language.

2.1.4 Effective Language Instruction

Effective language instruction is the final area of knowledge that bears upon the present study. In this section, I will review the literature which deals with the role of the teacher in reading instruction, writing instruction, and second language development in early French immersion classrooms.

In her literature review, Juel (1991) presents two basic paradigms for modeling reading acquisition: nonstage models of reading acquisition and stage models of reading acquisition. In both paradigms, the goal of reading is the search for meaning.

In one paradigm, the reading process is the same whether the reader is experienced or inexperienced with the difference being that the experienced reader has greater knowledge of language and the world than the nonexperienced reader. The most important cues in understanding text are semantic and syntactic; little attention is given to the graphic information on the page and, in fact, good readers use minimal graphohponic information. Juel (1991) refers to this paradigm as the "nonstage" models of reading acquisition as there are no qualitative differences to distinguish beginning readers from skilled readers. "*Quantitative* growth in language and world knowledge are seen as the promary factors that distinguish the reading of the skilled from the beginning reader." (p.762)

In the other paradigm, although the goal of reading is again the search for meaning, the way the reader becomes experienced differs in that the reader goes through different stages over time. In other words, there are qualitative differences between a beginning reader and an experienced reader. Juel refers to this paradigm as the "stage" models of reading acquisition. In the stage models of reading acquisition, it is the increasingly rapid and efficient use of graphophonic information that leads to better comprehension. The child passes through stages in which the graphic information is more speedily and efficiently used to identify printed words.

Juel (1991) then goes on to define each paradigm and to discuss questions raised by the models. In support of a stage model of reading acquisition, she cites studies which conclude that children pass through stages in reading development which reflect qualitatively different ways of identifying printed words. In the first stage or the selective-cue stage, the child relies upon random, environmental, and visual cues to identify words. In the second stage or the spelling-sound stage, the child gains grapho-

phonemic awareness. And in the last stage or the automatic stage, the child begins to identify words automatically either because of their phonological familiarity or their visual orthographic features. According to the researchers who support the principle that children pass through stages in their acquisition of literacy, the spelling-sound stage is the critical hurdle for children. The sooner the children master word recognition skills, the sooner they can attend fully to the meaning-making task of reading.

She then proceeds to describe what beginning reading instruction should look like based on these stages. For those children at the selective-cue stage, teaching practices include the common labeling of objects in the classroom with printed signs, "language experience" activities where students dictate words, sentences, or stories for the teacher to write, the use of "Big Books," where children can clearly see the print as their teachers read and the use of patterned, predictable text in chart stories.

The spelling-sound stage is supported through activities that develop the child's phonemic awareness. The use of patterned rhymed text as well as language experience stories or Big Books are examples of activities that help to develop phonemic awareness. Clay (1987) suggests that some children may not hear the different sounds in words and encourages teachers to articulate words slowly and naturally so the children may hear the different sounds of the language. Soon after the children have some phonemic awareness, they are ready to write using invented spelling. Although this may happen spontaneously, some children will need more help from the teacher. Juel also underlines the importance of keeping a balance between a little explicit phonics instruction and time spent actually reading.

When the children enter the automatic stage, it is important that they have the opportunity to practice repeated readings. This improves not only word identification,

fluency and reading speed, it has also been shown to improve comprehension (see Dowhower, 1987, for a review). Another technique to encourage students to read is to provide them with a classroom library and time in class to enjoy book activities such as reading to children, talking about books, and group silent reading.

Pearson and Fielding (1991) review the literature about reading comprehension instruction and the role of the teacher in comprehension instruction. What instruction actually looks like varies along several dimensions, each of which they see as a continuum. One dimension has to do with *task control*. By this, they mean who decides what kinds of learning tasks students will engage in, how the tasks will get carried out and how they will be evaluated. *Authenticity* refers to how much like real-life reading the texts and tasks are. The *teacher's role* varies according to how much teacher participation there is at various points and what the nature of that participation is. Pearson and Fielding argue that what a student learns about comprehension as a result of instruction depends as much upon where instruction falls on these continua as it does upon the precise nature of the comprehension activities that comprise the instruction.

They describe four major trends that characterize recent comprehension instructional research. The first trend is the more traditional one which sees the teacher as a task director, directing recitations, written practice, and study activities about texts. This trend is becoming less and less prevalent in the research.

The second trend which has received the largest share of research in the past sees the teacher as deliverer of explicit instruction in how to perform comprehension skills and strategies. Popular strategies are teacher modeling and explaining of thought processes. Rather than the teacher "telling" the children what to do, the teacher equips the children with the necessary learning strategies. In this instructional model, the

teacher starts out by playing a central role in modeling and sharing of cognitive strategies. The teacher gradually turns over more responsibility to the students and finally, the teacher hands over complete responsibility to the child who has become an independent learner.

The third trend is based on the scaffolding construct. The teacher's role is to provide the scaffolding necessary for the children to perform tasks they would otherwise be unable to perform of their own. This reflects Vygotsky's (Vygotsky, 1962) theory of the zone of proximal development. The ability of the teacher to provide the ongoing scaffolding depends on his or her interaction with the student. As the students respond, the teacher becomes aware of what can be accomplished and designs the next lesson accordingly. Examples of teaching strategies indicative of this instructional mode are reciprocal teaching, responsive teaching, or instructional conversations. The main difference between the teacher's role in scaffold instruction and explicit instruction is that in the former the teacher's instruction depends on an evaluation of the children's learning as well as the task at hand. Furthermore, in scaffold instruction, the child's interpretation of a text is not automatically considered wrong if it differs from that of the teacher's. Rather, this information is used to evaluate the child and help design the lesson.

The fourth trend sees the teacher as a coequal with students in what Pearson and Fielding (1991) call a "literary" community. Teachers can demonstrate their own uses of literacy tools but they cannot tell anyone what to do or how to do it. The teachers relinquish their role as director of activities and become facilitators. Classroom activities put the individual student choice, talk, and interpretation at the heart of comprehension instruction. This trend is, according to Pearson and Fielding (1991), the

antithesis of the explicit instruction mode and in their view, the scaffold instruction may be the best model to bridge the gap between the explicit instruction model and the child-centered model.

Another trend popular in the reading research is students' practice opportunities. Pearson and Fielding (1991) have found that giving children opportunities to read connected text in the classroom is valuable, providing practice is preceded by instruction for those who need it, is carried out on appropriate materials, is monitored to ensure that the children are actively engaged in the activity during the time allotted for it, and is accompanied by opportunities to talk about or otherwise respond to what was read in a literary community. The role of the teacher in free reading activities is important if the children are to benefit from the experience. And, the final trend the authors discovered in their review of reading comprehension instruction was the use of authentic materials to teach reading.

In the literature I reviewed on beginning reading and reading comprehension instruction, several issues are raised. It seems that the children pass through stages in the development of their reading ability. One of the stages, and the most critical according to Juel's (1991) review, is learning the grapho-phonemic correspondances. The children need to learn to decipher in order to learn to read, and early word recognition is important in reading comprehension. Instruction techniques such as Big Books, language experience charts, rhymes and patterned stories, repeated readings and free reading are examples of activities which support the different stages in beginning reading acquisition.

Just as the reviews of Pearson and Fielding (1991) and Juel (1991) have contributed to our understanding of effective classroom practices in the field of

beginning reading and reading comprehension, Applebee and Langer (1987), and the Hillocks' (1986) meta-analysis have given us some insight into the field of effective writing practices.

As Pearson and Fielding (1991) described different "trends" in the field of reading comprehension, Hillocks (1986) describes four different "modes of instruction" in his meta-analysis of research on written composition. The modes of instruction refer to the role assumed by the classroom teacher, the kinds and order of activities presented, and the specificity and clarity of objectives and learning tasks. The "presentational mode" is characterized by

- (1) relatively clear and specific objectives, e.g., to use particular rhetorical techniques; (2) lecture and teacher-led discussion dealing with concepts to be learned and applied; (3) the study of models and other materials which explain and illustrate the concept; (4) specific assignments or exercises which generally involve imitating a pattern or following rules that have been previously discussed; and (5) feedback following the writing, coming primarily from teachers. (p. 117)

This mode is very teacher-directed with the teacher being the dominant talker in the classroom. It appears to be quite similar to the first trend of which Pearson and Fielding (1991) spoke in regards to reading comprehension which is the more traditional of the four modes. In both cases, the teacher is seen as task director directing written practice and study activities about texts.

The second mode Hillocks (1986) calls the "natural process mode." It is characterized by:

- (1) generalized objectives, e.g., to increase fluency and skill in writing; (2) free writing about whatever interests the students, either in a journal or as a way of "exploring a subject"; (3) writing for audiences of peers; (4) generally positive feedback from peers; (5) opportunities to revise and rework writing; and (6) high levels of interaction among students. (p.119)

Hillocks describes the teacher in this model as "facilitator" whose role is to encourage the children in their growth and to free their imagination by providing a positive classroom atmosphere. They avoid studying writing models, and there is very little explicit structure in these kinds of classrooms. The children are called upon to make the choices traditionally made by the teacher. These choices have to do with their purpose for writing or the form most suitable to the purpose they have chosen. The natural process mode is very similar to Pearson's fourth trend which sees the teacher as a coequal with the students in a literary community. Furthermore, as in the natural process mode, the children in Pearson and Fielding (1991) fourth trend are also responsible for their own learning.

The third mode, the "environmental mode," is characterized by:

- (1) clear and specific objectives, e.g., to increase the use of specific detail and figurative language; (2) materials and problems selected to engage students with each other in specifiable processes important to some particular aspect

of writing; and (3) activities, such as small-group problem-centered discussions, conducive to high levels of peer interaction concerning specific tasks. (p. 122)

Unlike the presentational mode, teachers adhering to the environmental mode structure activities which permit the children to work in small groups before working individually. Although the teachers may have given a lesson before the group activity, they are not taught or lectured at as in the presentational mode. This mode differs from the natural process mode in that objectives are clearer and the students are engaged in structured tasks often based on models or criteria. In the environmental mode there is more of a balance between the teacher and the student. The teacher plans and selects materials which will engage the students in activities which permit interaction and identifiable learning outcomes. The environmental mode is very similar to what Pearson refers to as scaffolding construct which places the teacher in direct interaction with the learner. The teacher determines the learner's needs and designs instruction accordingly.

Applebee and Langer (1987) describe in more detail the notion of instructional scaffolding. They base their model on the work of socio-cultural theorists such as Bruner and Vygotsky. Vygotsky (1962) views language as a social and communicative activity. He argues that children learn to think in social-functional situations and become literate when they can internalize the structures of socially meaningful literacy acts. The teacher or parent provides the scaffold for such learning and helps the child develop beyond his or her independent capabilities, guiding the child through what Vygotsky calls the "zone of proximal development." Similarly, according to Applebee and Langer (1987), Bruner sees the importance of the child-adult relationship as critical to language learning, and written language as particularly effective in the development

of thinking. These authors draw the following conclusions about the theories of Vygotsky and Bruner:

Both Vygotsky and Bruner see language as learning growing out of a communicative relationship where the adult helps the child understand as well as complete new tasks. These authors also see literacy as encouraging the kinds of thinking and reasoning that can support higher levels of cognitive development. (p.140)

Language is seen to be at the heart of cognitive development. This development is supported in collaborative relationships with learners who are in a position to help one another understand.

Based on this socio-cultural theory of learning, Applebee and Langer (1987) propose a model for effective literacy instruction. Their model is comprised of five components that serve as a scaffold within which the teacher and learners work:

1. Ownership: Effective instructional tasks must allow room for students to have something of their own to say in their writing. (p. 141)
2. Appropriateness: Effective instructional tasks will build on literacy and thinking skills the students already have, helping them accomplish tasks they could not otherwise complete on their own. (p.142)
3. Support: To be an effective vehicle for learning, instructional tasks must make the structure of the activity clear and must guide the students through it in a way that

will provide effective strategies for use in other contexts.

(p.142)

4. Collaboration: The teacher's role is one of helping students toward new learning, rather than testing the adequacy of new learning. (p.143)

5. Internalization: As new learnings mature, they become internalized as part of the student's own repertoire. (p.144)

As Applebee and Langer (1987) conclude, such an approach to instruction necessitates changing the roles of teacher and learners. Evaluation criteria, class structure, and materials are all dependent on the students' needs. The teacher remains the architect for the classroom activities, but, as Langer and Applebee point out: "The activities planned need to provide scope for the students to develop their own purposes rather than fit into the teacher's predetermined framework" (p.145).

Contrary to Applebee and Langer (1987), Harste, Woodward, & Burke (1984) question the use of scaffolding as a means to facilitate the child's acquisition of language. They suggest that scaffolding obstructs natural language settings as the adult structures to the point of modeling the language as in behaviorist theory of language acquisition. They say,

The term 'scaffolding' assumes that the adult is in charge, simplifying, manipulating, or structuring the environment for learning. 'Scaffolding' as a term thus pulls attention away from the process to the environment and hence implies that language learning is the result of an environment-response bond. (p.61)

Harste *et al.* (1984) seem to favour a natural process mode which makes the teacher a co-equal with the learner in a literacy community with both child and adult actively structuring the literacy event. They seem to prefer the word 'tracking' which implies that both the child and the adult equally inform the conversation.

The fourth mode described by Hillocks (1986) is the "individualized mode."

In the individualized mode of instruction students receive instruction through tutorials, programmed materials of some kind, or a combination of the two. The focus of instruction may vary widely, from mechanics to researching, planning, and writing papers. The chief distinction is that this mode of instruction seeks to help students on an individualized basis. (p. 125)

The assumption behind this mode is that working with an individual student is more effective than working with the whole class or with a group of students.

What is of particular interest in Hillock's (1986) meta-analysis is his summary of experimental/control effect size statistics for modes of instruction. The mean effect size (.44) for treatments in the environmental mode is over two times as great as the mean effects for the other modes (presentational mode has a mean effect size of .02; natural process mode has a mean effect size of .19; and individualized mode has a mean effect size of .17). It would appear then, that modes of instruction for written composition like that of Applebee and Langer (1987) which correspond to Hillock's (1986) description of environmental treatments would most likely be the most effective for the improvement of the quality of student writing.

While the meta-analysis for written composition suggests that a scaffold

instruction treatment offers the best environment for the improvement of the quality of student writing, an equivalent meta-analysis does not exist in the field of reading. One could suggest that the trend Pearson and Fielding (1991) describe centering on the scaffolding construct in reading is very like the environmental mode of Hillocks (1991) and perhaps it too is the most effective treatment for the instruction of reading comprehension.

A review of effective language instruction would not be complete without looking at the role of the teacher in early French immersion classrooms. Although there is little research that describes the classroom environment in early French immersion programs, Tardif (1994) has looked at the interaction of teacher talk and children's responses. She examined eight transcripts from the classroom talk of one kindergarten French immersion teacher from September to June and once in September when the children were in grade one, three transcripts from two other kindergarten immersion teachers, and three nonimmersion kindergarten classes. She found that in an immersion context, the teachers were more likely to make modifications in their speech so the students would be exposed to a "comprehensible input" (Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982) than the teachers in nonimmersion classrooms. These modifications included greater use of self-repetition, linguistic modeling, and paraphrase. Furthermore, the results of the study indicated that the kindergarten classroom was highly context dependent. The teacher relied on pictures, objects, people, and events to contextualize the language for the learners. A previous study by Tardif (1991) also concluded that early immersion teachers utilized contextual clues and paralinguistic elements such as self-repetition, modeling, information, expansion, and teacher questions at least three times more often than regular teachers who participated in the study. In reference to the

immersion teacher's use of contextual clues and paralinguistic element Tardif (1994) writes:

The immersion environment thus appears set up to provide "scaffolds" (Bruner, 1975) that make it possible for young non-French speakers to understand what is required of them and to make sense of their learning experiences. (p. 477)

Lavallée (1990) defines a scaffold process model suitable to second language learning. In this model, the teacher embeds language and paralinguistic behaviors in learning situations. These behaviors evolve and change over time as the children become more competent language users. It seems then, that the scaffolding construct is a model employed for language acquisition in early French immersion classrooms.

2.1.5 Conclusion

In summary then, these four major areas of knowledge have much to contribute when trying to understand the development of literacy of young anglophone children attending a French immersion program. One field of research supports the introduction to literacy in the native language, citing the importance of matching the reader's language knowledge with that of the text. Another suggests that Canadian anglophone children attending French immersion programs may be introduced to literacy in their second language at no cost to their first language. The theory of additive bilingualism may help explain this success. The third area of research deals with the interplay of literacy and oracy in the development of second language competency and cites the importance of developing literacy with oracy so that the children may profit from their

literacy experiences to develop their oral competency.

The fourth and last field of knowledge that contributes to the understanding of the question, is that of effective language instruction. It seems that for written composition, teachers who use a scaffolding mode have the most effective results for the improvement of quality of students writing. In the field of reading, no meta-analysis has been done to compare the effectiveness of different instructional modes, but certain trends in reading comprehension instruction correspond very closely to the modes of instruction outlined by Hillocks in writing. Although there is little research on the effects of teacher talk on second language acquisition in early French immersion, an instructional mode which sets up scaffolds embedding language in contexts and using paralinguistic elements seems to be very popular with practioners and is supported by limited evidence.

2.2 Methodology

The description of the methodology is divided into three sections. The first section describes the two classrooms that participated in the study. The second section outlines the sources of the data collection, and the third section describes the research methods.

2.2.1 Description of the Classrooms

The classrooms were chosen from two neighbouring school divisions in Winnipeg, Saint-Boniface School Division and Saint-Vital School Division. Based on my knowledge of the two city areas, it appeared to me that the socio-economic status of the classroom chosen in Saint-Boniface was upper middle class, and the socio-economic

status of the classroom chosen in Saint-Vital was middle class. Both schools offered a total French immersion program from kindergarten to grade six. For the purpose of this study, the primary difference between the two school divisions was the language in which literacy was taught in grade one. The Saint-Boniface immersion program offered 100% French instruction in grade one which means that literacy was introduced in French with no instruction, formal or informal, in English language arts. The Saint-Boniface school division offered English language arts starting at Grade two for 25% of allotted teaching time. By contrast, the Saint-Vital immersion program offered a 70% French instruction in grade one. The remaining 30% was reserved for English language arts at which time literacy was introduced in English. One grade one classroom was chosen from each of the two school divisions.

The Saint-Boniface classroom was chosen according to the interviews I had conducted in preparation for my quantitative study. The teacher had twenty-five years experience as a classroom teacher and had also had experience as an early years curriculum consultant for Manitoba Education. According to my preliminary visit and interview with the teacher, I felt her teaching strategies reflected a philosophy which placed children at the centre of their learning and made them active participants in the learning process. Furthermore, the teacher, Jeanne (I have changed the teachers' names to protect their identities), seemed very comfortable with me in the classroom.

There were thirteen children in Jeanne's classroom, seven boys and six girls. They had all attended a French immersion kindergarten. English was generally spoken at home although, there were some parents who were able to speak French. Jeanne used books, songs, and poems as her primary source of language development. She placed great emphasis on the acquisition of oracy and reading. Her teaching style

resembled very closely to that which Pearson and Fielding (1991) called scaffolding construct. She constantly interacted with the students and used these evaluations to design her teaching so that the children were able to participate in tasks that were just beyond their reach. Pearson and Fielding (1991) also mentioned the trend of many teachers who provide opportunities for the children to practice reading. Jeanne's instructional style supported this trend as well. And finally, as Pearson and Fielding (1991) reported, many teachers are using authentic children's literature in their reading instruction. Again, Jeanne's choice of materials was indicative of this movement from controlled vocabulary readers to published trade books.

Writing activities in Jeanne's class consisted primarily of composing language experience stories often based on models. The objectives were specific and individual writing tasks were usually teacher-directed and in most instances, were dependent on teacher feedback. However, there were instances when the children were engaged with each other and encouraged to generate their own ideas. Jeanne's instructional mode for written composition most resembled a cross between the presentational mode and the environmental mode as described by Hillocks (1986).

Second language teaching strategies were very similar to those described by Tardif (1994) and Lavallée (1990). She used paralinguistic techniques such as question, expansion, self-repetition, and information and context elements such as mime, objects, props, pictures, and texts to embed the language in a context-rich environment.

Generally speaking, Jeanne's teaching style for the development of oracy and literacy most resembled what Hillocks described as the environmental mode. She gave clear and specific objectives, she engaged children in group work aimed at

developing specific language learning processes, and encouraged peer interaction. She saw her role as one of providing the structure and tools which would enable the children to complete tasks they were unable to complete on their own.

I was far less familiar with the teachers in the Saint-Vital School Division. As a result, the classroom was chosen according to recommendations from three sources. I contacted the curriculum consultant responsible for French immersion schools in the Saint-Vital school division asking for suggestions about a grade one teacher whose teaching reflected a learner-centered philosophy. The curriculum consultant suggested Marie. Two principals who had worked with Marie also strongly supported her as an excellent candidate. Furthermore, they said she was very open to visitors in her classroom. She had participated on a committee responsible for creating a writing and reading continuum for the school division and had five years experience as a teacher.

There were twenty-four children in Marie's class, twelve boys and twelve girls. All but one had attended a French immersion kindergarten. Again, English was generally spoken at home but some parents were able to speak French. Marie used the children's written composition as her primary source of language development. The children engaged in many free writing activities and were encouraged to share primarily with their peers. Marie saw her role as one of facilitator, and her teaching style seemed most similar to what Hillocks called the natural process mode of instruction. As far as reading was concerned, it was more difficult to ascribe a trend to her reading comprehension instruction. However, based on her interviews and classroom observations, she most resembled the trend Pearson describes as teacher as facilitator and a coequal with students in a literary community.

Generally speaking, Marie's teaching style for the development of oracy and

literacy most resembled what Hillocks described as the natural process mode. Her objectives were general, she encouraged them to share with their peers, student choice was of utmost importance, and there was a high level of interaction among the students. She saw her role as one of providing a positive atmosphere in the classroom free of inhibiting structures and direct instruction which tend to stifle language learning.

Both Jeanne and Marie provided environments which were very supportive of literacy. There were many differences, however, which allowed for great variety in the kinds of data I was able to collect. The most obvious difference between Jeanne's and Marie's classrooms was that Jeanne taught literacy in French while Marie taught literacy in English. Another fundamental difference that came to light during my observations was that Jeanne's classroom was reading based and Marie's was writing based. A third difference had to do with their varying points of view with respect to the role of the teacher in language development. Jeanne saw her role as one of providing an instructional scaffold whereas Marie saw herself more as a facilitator of her students' learning. These language-rich environments enabled me to get a clearer sense of how language, and in particular literacy, is acquired and the role of the teacher in effective language instruction.

2.2.2 Data Collection

There were essentially three tools for data collection: my field notebook, audio-video recordings, and audio recordings. My field notebook consisted of the notes I made as I observed in the classrooms. With each visit, I would record the teacher's role, the children's role, the materials used, and any other information that I felt would give a picture of what was happening in the classroom. As I recorded my visits, I also

made notes of questions I had for the teachers. These questions may have been about teaching strategies, materials used, or incidents in the classroom for which I needed clarification. Oftentimes, as I was observing, I was also reflecting on different aspects of the teaching-learning experiences of the teacher, the children and myself. These reflections also took the form of notes in my field notebook.

A second tool for data collection was audio-video recordings. I used the video camera when I felt that field notes would be incomplete as a source of data. In some instances I wanted a more complete record of a particular teaching strategy and the children's reaction and involvement in that learning situation. In other instances, I wanted to record actual conversations. Sometimes, there was work posted on the walls or information on the blackboard that was important for my questions. The camera was a convenient tool for recording images and sounds that would not easily be recorded with my field notebook.

A third tool for data was audio recordings. The tape recorder was used when the video-camera was inappropriate. For example, I audio taped the interviews I held with the two teachers. I also used the tape recorder in the classroom to complement written observations; in some cases I wanted to reflect on what I was seeing as I was seeing it, and the tape recorder liberated me to pursue my thoughts on paper while recording data for analysis at a later date. The tape recorder was helpful at the outset of my observations as I did not want to overwhelm the children with a video camera. The tape recorder was more discreet.

2.2.3 Research Method

Observations were made in the two classrooms starting in May of 1994. I visited

Jeanne's classroom in the mornings when she taught Français and Marie's classroom first thing in the afternoon for English language arts and Français. It was not possible to attend every day for a variety of reasons; my schedule, sickness, inservices, parent meetings, excursions, or in-school events. Regardless, I was able to visit Jeanne's class fifteen times for a total of thirty and one half hours of observation and Marie's classroom twelve times for a total of twenty and one half hours of observation in the months of May and June.

I remained an observer in both situations, however, as the children grew used to me, they tended to come to me occasionally for help or to show me something they had done. Jeanne included me in her conversations with her children and sometimes involved me in classroom activities. Marie introduced me to her class, and I remained an observer for the duration of my visits. She would sometimes converse with me during my visits, but it was always out of earshot of the students.

My observations were inspired by the questions I had posed in my proposal. I was interested in the link between literacy and oracy, between reading and writing, and the role of evaluation in curriculum planning. With these questions in mind, I set out to record the dynamics of literacy development in the two classrooms.

Each day I entered the date and the time of my visit. As the lesson progressed, I noted the time in my field notebook as the activities changed. With the video camera, I usually imprinted the date on the film each time I recorded. My field notes helped me situate what was on video with my written observations of that particular day. In the case of the tape recordings, I recorded the date each time I recorded data. As a result, my data were organized chronologically.

As I became more familiar with the classrooms and my data, my questions

changed slightly. As a result, the observations I was making reflected these modifications. For example, I became more attentive to the kinds of conversations that were going on when the children were working in small groups. I followed more closely individual children rather than trying to capture the whole group at all times. I started to compare the information I had gathered from the teacher interviews with the teaching and learning strategies I was seeing in the classroom. I began to look more closely at the role of writing in the development of reading and at the role of literacy in the development of oracy.

The first set of observations was completed with the school year at the end of June. I had intended to visit both teachers in September with their new students but this was possible only with Jeanne. Marie was moved to a grade four classroom. I returned to Jeanne's classroom three times in September and October. The purpose of these return visits was to give me an idea of ability of a new group of children at the beginning of grade one.

Once I had completed my observations, I continued to transcribe my audio recordings and organize my video tapes according to the respective classroom. I classified my field notes into the following categories: materials, teacher's role, student's role, evaluation, and other. I then began the narrative describing what I saw in each classroom. The following two chapters recount my observations in Jeanne's classroom and then in Marie's classroom. The fifth chapter draws some conclusions about second language acquisition based on my observations in the two classrooms and my review of the literature.

2.3 Trustworthiness

2.3.1 Time at Site and Triangulation

Validity or trustworthiness of the study depends on several factors, two of which are time at site and triangulation. After having spent twenty and one half hours of observation in Marie's English language arts class and twenty and one half hours of observation in Jeanne's Français class as well as time interviewing and discussing with the two teachers, I felt I had a good idea of the kinds of strategies utilized by Jeanne and Marie and the role they played in the development of literacy. I used multiple data collection methods: participant observation (here I used field notes and audio-visual taping), interviewing (here I used audio taping), and the collection of some artifacts. As a result, I was able to call on a combination of methods to collect data and to draw conclusions which would increase the trustworthiness of the study.

2.3.2 Researcher's Bias: Subjectivity

Because there is no value-free research, it is vital that both the researcher and the reader be aware of the researcher's subjectivity. I came to learn about my subjectivity or biases as I made my observations. The process of observing in both classrooms, but particularly in Marie's classroom, made me more aware of myself and my teaching philosophy. This enabled me to look for instances of learning that I may have been blinded to in the past and to be more objective in my observations so that I could avoid being judgmental. Glesne and Pleshkin (1992) write about the enabling and disabling capacity of subjectivity:

It is necessary, however, to try and see what you are
not seeing, to detect what you are making less of than

could be made, so that you can temper as necessary
that which your subjectivity is pressing you to focus on.

(p. 104)

As a teacher, I believe that children pass through stages in their acquisition of literacy and provided they are surrounded by a rich linguistic environment, there will certainly be some that will learn to read and write without intervention from the teacher. However, there are children who need literacy instruction, direction, and follow-up in order to become competent language users. It is the teacher's responsibility to determine where each child is in his or her development and to provide that child with the necessary help which ensures not only a challenge but also success. A model of instruction based on Vygotsky's theory of proximal development in which the teacher provides a scaffold for the children's learning is congruent with my view of the role of the teacher in children's learning.

This philosophy made it easier for me as a researcher to understand the kinds of strategies Jeanne used in her class. Because I prefer a more structured and calm environment for both learning and for teaching, it was more difficult for me to observe in Marie's classroom and to understand the kind of learning that was taking place. This tension, however, forced me to question my own beliefs concerning literacy acquisition and the role of the teacher and the learner in the process. I questioned the extent to which the teacher should be involved in direct literacy instruction. I thought about the role of writing in the development of reading. I reflected on what it means to be teacher-centered, teacher-directed, and child-centered. The role of the children in decision-making and the balance between providing a challenge and yet ensuring an element of success were also part of my

reflections. Furthermore, it led me to look more closely at the children as they interacted with each other, and I became more aware of what it meant to learn from my observations of children. So, although the two classrooms posed a challenge for me as a researcher with regards to the teaching styles of the two teachers, both enabled me to reflect on some important questions about research and about the acquisition of literacy.

2.3.3 Belonging to the Learning Community: Rapport

Perhaps another issue that may have influenced my observations was the interpersonal relationships in the two classrooms. I had known Jeanne for many years and although she preferred the intimacy of being alone with her students, she accepted my request to observe in her classroom. Once I was invited, I became part of the community. As she interacted with her students, Jeanne would include me in discussions, joke with me, or ask me questions. She was very open to my participation with the children. At one point she read a book I had brought, let me teach a lesson, and was very comfortable when I would talk with the children as they were working individually or in groups. She invited me on a field trip to the zoo with her class and the other grade one group which gave me the opportunity to observe the children in an out-of-school context. We often chatted at recess and were very much at ease with each other's company.

Marie was a generous warm person, very willing to please. She accepted readily that I observe in her classroom. After a few observation sessions, I began to notice that she preferred that I remain an observer and not interact with the children (field notes/other: June 8, 9, 14, 22, 24). Any time a child would come to me for

help or to ask a question, Marie would send the student back to his or her desk. On the few occasions that she and I did discuss in the presence of the children, it was always out of earshot of the children. I felt less trusted and accepted, not so much by the children, but by Marie. As a result, I was less a part of Marie's community. I wonder if that may not have influenced the kinds of observations I was making in her classroom.

As Glesne and Peshkin (1992) write in their book on becoming a qualitative researcher,

In qualitative inquiry, the nature of relationships depends on two factors: the quality of our interactions to support our research- or rapport- and the quality of our self-awareness to manage the impact of self on our research- subjectivity. (p. 93)

I felt I had a good rapport with Jeanne as we had confidence in each other which made Jeanne comfortable with talking about her teaching and actively seeking out my inclusion in her community. Although I felt I had a friendly rapport with Marie, I also felt at times that she was defensive and apologetic when I asked her about her students or her teaching strategies (field notes/other: June 16, June 24). This indicated to me that perhaps she was anxious with my presence in the classroom. As a result I was more hesitant to interact with Marie and her students. This was rather unfortunate as I was less familiar with her teaching style and would have liked to have had the opportunity to be more a part of her classroom. Consequently, the data I obtained during my visits to her classroom were primarily based on my observations and not on my interactions with the children or with

Marie.

By reflecting on my rapport with the two teachers and by becoming more aware of my subjectivity, I have been able to better understand not only what I observed in the classroom, but also the kinds of observations and interpretations I made.

2.3.4 Class Size and Teacher Experience

Two other aspects which may have some impact on the interpretation of the data collected for this study are classroom size and teacher experience. Jeanne had thirty-five years of experience in education, with the majority of those being at the early years. She had also worked as a curriculum consultant with Manitoba Education for four years. Marie had five years of teaching experience and had participated on a divisional committee for early years literacy. Another point which differentiated the two classrooms was that Jeanne had thirteen students while Marie had twenty-four with a full time teaching assistant (TA).

The issues of subjectivity, rapport, classroom size and experience are very important when interpreting the data collected in this qualitative study. By having a better understanding of the researcher and the research conditions, one is able to have a clearer vision of what is a very complex phenomenon.

Chapter Three

This chapter summarizes the information I was able to gather from Jeanne and her classroom. I have divided the chapter into five sections. The first one is a brief introduction to Jeanne. This is followed by a recounting of Jeanne's view of the development of literacy based on interviews she and I recorded. The third section describes my observations in her classroom. These observations were based on how Jeanne made the links between literacy and oracy, between reading and writing. I attempt to examine these links in terms of the materials used, the role of the teacher, and the involvement of the learner. The fourth section deals with the role of evaluation. And the final section looks at the kinds of pedagogical practices that encourage language development.

3.1 Introduction to Jeanne and her Classroom

It was important to me that the teachers in question be comfortable with my presence and my questions. I wanted to be sure that I had access to observe what I wanted, to talk to whomever I wanted, to obtain and read whatever documents I required, and to do this for the duration of my the study. She was one of the four teachers I had visited when I had tested my original question and methodology for my quantitative study. Not only had she participated in the original teacher questionnaire, but I had also worked with Jeanne in the past and I was confident a good researcher-participant relationship was possible for the present study. Jeanne had been teaching for approximately thirty-five years.

The classroom was rich in print and in children's art work. For example, the

children had written about different activities they did in school and had illustrated their texts: "au gymnase je joue au hockey," "je me balance sur une corde," "je cours en zigzag," "dans la classe je suis triste parce que personne voulait jouer avec moi" (audio visual tape, May 12). There was a classroom library with trade books as well as books composed by the students. Poems, songs, and rhymes authored by Jeanne, her students, and professional authors were posted on the walls. There was a child-size house in one corner, and there were also many games organized on the shelves. Jeanne's desk was on the side of the classroom, and she used it as an area to collect her teaching materials. She never sat at her desk while the children were in the classroom. The children sat in three semi-circle rows facing the largest blackboard. There was also an area where they regrouped on the floor. At the back of the classroom was a large square table where the children displayed their findings from the playground or on the way to school. My desk was near this table. The classroom was relatively small, but there was ample room for Jeanne's thirteen students.

3.2 Jeanne's View of the Development of Literacy

I interviewed Jeanne on two occasions to discover her view of the development of reading and the development of writing and how these discourses are viewed in terms of materials used, the role of the teacher, and the involvement of the learner.

I asked Jeanne about the definition of reading and her description of a good reader. She said a good reader is interested in the message found in the text, understands what is read without necessarily being able to decode all the words,

reads with a purpose, and is not afraid to take risks. In order to learn to read, she said the teacher must ensure that the conditions for learning are available to the learners. She believed you have to stimulate the students, direct them, and give them the tools they need to learn to read and write. In this context, Jeanne sees herself as a teacher-directed pedagogue. However, she directed according to the needs and interests of the children in her class and in this context, she saw herself as child-centered. Jeanne made a distinction between child-centered and teacher-centered; "a teacher-centered approach is one which allows the teacher to deliver the same program year after year" (field notes/other, June 13) whereas a child-centered approach presumes that the program must change according to the child. So, Jeanne structured the learning environment based on her observations of the needs and interests of the children at hand. Her philosophy resembled the teaching mode characterized by Hillocks (1986) as an "environmental" which is similar to the scaffold construct described by Pearson and Fielding (1991).

As Jeanne had talked about the importance of structuring the activities according to the needs of the students, the question of evaluation became very important. Jeanne said she evaluated the children according to where they were in their own reading development; they may be emergent readers, readers ready to take certain risks, or may be those who are starting to decode the text. She said she did not compare the students to each other, but rather situated each individual with regards to the different stages of reading development. The evaluation strategy she most often used was observation, and she varied the activities for each student based on these observations.

When I asked her what she does with the children who are having difficulty,

she said she does not believe that children are in difficulty unless we put them there, and we often create our own problems. She takes each child where he or she is and works from there with the understanding that when the child enters grade two, they will be at different levels.

As far as materials were concerned, Jeanne said she used trade books, books composed by the children, or small books from a variety of reading series. She read two or three books to the children every day, and the children and Jeanne often composed collective stories based on the reading they had done from these book. Songs, poems, tapes and videos were also part of the materials she used; all of which provided the basis for her literacy instruction. Jeanne said she encouraged the children to write, and they had started to compose their own dictionaries.

Finally, I asked Jeanne about her view of literacy in a second language. More specifically, I asked if the children should learn to read initially in English or in French. She looked uncertain. She said that at the beginning of the year, there was not one child who could read in French and since then, three have told her they can read in English. When I asked if any could read in English at the beginning of the year, she said she did not know. However, Jeanne also mentioned that one year she followed the same students from grade one to grade two, and by the time the second week of school had gone by, half the class was able to read in English. She believed that the children transferred their ability to read in French to the ability to read in English. Although she had previously believed that the children should learn to read in their first language, she had now come to the conclusion that the language in which a child learns to read is less of an issue. She said that the way we go about teaching literacy today develops reading, writing, listening, and

speaking at the same time, and that was one of the reasons her students speak French so well. In other words, she saw the development of literacy and oracy as being inextricably linked, perhaps as "whole language."

Jeanne gave an example of how the development of literacy supported the development of oracy. The children had read a poem about a snowman from an experience chart. One of the lines in the poem was "bonhomme de neige tu as l'air content." Shortly after, she overheard the children talking and one said to the other, "tu as l'air triste aujourd'hui." The child was able to transfer knowledge acquired during a literary experience to an oral situation. Jeanne believed that in order to develop oracy, the children have to do more than just listen. She saw that reading and writing supported the development of oracy, and that oracy was essential in the development of literacy. It was in the best interests of the child's acquisition of language not to separate the whole into parts, but rather to develop reading, writing, listening and speaking simultaneously so that they may support one another. Jeanne concluded by saying that her goal was to ensure that her students liked books and liked reading, and she felt she had accomplished that.

3.3 The Links Between Literacy and Oracy, Between Reading and Writing

In order to deal with this section, I have organized it according to the kinds of activities in which the children were involved. These include personal reading, the reading of a trade book (*La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*), the writing of a book based on a collective reading activity (*Où est bébé éléphant*), a Big Book collection with accompanying literacy games, and various teacher-directed lessons aimed at creating an awareness about language. For each description, not only I

attempted to describe the role of the children and the teacher, but I have also commented on how I perceive the development of oracy and literacy as the children participate in the various activities.

3.3.1 Personal Reading

Jeanne had a home reading program and a period of time set aside each day for personal reading. The home reading program invited the children to read French books with accompanying audio tapes. Jeanne and two other teachers had made tapes of the fifty little books published by the Cataradi series. The children could take home a plastic bag with two books and the accompanying tapes. The directions to the parents were that the children should be able to read the books after listening to the tapes and following in the books a few times. Jeanne kept a note of which children had taken which books. In this way, the children could develop their oracy and literacy at home in the second language. It also sent a message to parents of the importance of reading outside the classroom. The children were also given the opportunity to take books both in English and French out of the school library.

The home reading program was reinforced with a personal reading program in the classroom. The children started each morning by greeting their teacher and me and then choosing a book from the classroom library. They read from their books for fifteen minutes, until the announcements came over the intercom. On several occasions they did not want to stop reading at 8:45, and Jeanne let them read for an extra fifteen minutes (field notes/teacher, June 1). Some children looked at the pages of many books, and others you could hear reading diligently story after story.

Jeanne explained that the majority of the books in the classroom library were books she had not yet read. Some were trade books, others were books composed by children, and others were from published reading series.

It was encouraging for Jeanne and myself to watch and hear the children during these fifteen to thirty or so minutes of personal reading. Most of them were reading the text as well as looking at the pictures. Some of them read many books during one session. One day Manon said she read eight books, and Julie answered saying she read four (field notes/students, June 15). Sometimes one or two of the students would ask Jeanne if they could read their book to the class. Michel read his books fluently (field notes/students, June 8), and Annie had her turn the next day. They were very proud of their accomplishments. Jean had the chance to read some of the riddles from his book to the class: ("Quelle couleur est plus chaude, rouge ou bleu?" (field notes/students, June 1), and his classmates thoroughly enjoyed that. Jeanne extended this sharing by discussing warm objects and cold objects and the corresponding colours. By giving the children the opportunity to share their reading with their peers, she was underlining the importance of reading as a social activity.

Roxanne asked me one day if she could read to me. She was unable to decode "restaurant" and "propriétaire" but simply jumped over the words and did not lose her rhythm (field notes/students, June 7). I helped her divide the word "propriétaire" into syllables, and we talked about the meaning. She was a very confident reader and not afraid to take risks. Sylvie, on the other hand, although she was very capable, was more agitated and had trouble concentrating. When she wanted to read to me, she made no attempt to read the words she did not

recognize (field notes/students, June 6). She looked at the whole page and read isolated words she was familiar with. Sylvie would change her book quite often, being content to look at the pictures. It bothered Jeanne that this little girl was late regularly for school as she had missed the equivalent of forty-seven hours of reading time since the year began. For Jeanne, the time set aside for personal reading was very important in the development of literacy.

Another little boy who was one of the three or four children who were not yet decoding, had chosen a book that Jeanne had previously read to the class. She told me it was the third time he had chosen the same book. Jeanne said that in the past it would have concerned her if she had three or four children at the end of grade one who were not yet reading independently. She said she much preferred the philosophy of today, to let the children progress according to their own speed. Those, she had said, who may not be strong in reading were often strong in drawing.

Once Manon got angry because Marc and Gaeton, two of the children who could not yet read independently, were talking and not reading their books (field notes/other, June 15).

Jeanne: Pourquoi tu veux qu'ils lisent? Est-ce que ça t'inquiète?

Jeanne asked Manon why she did not want the boys to talk. Manon said she wanted them to learn to read. Jeanne explained that part of reading was talking about the pictures and the books, but that they should try to read some of the story as well. It seemed to me that Jeanne was able to turn a negative situation into a learning experience which respected the development of each of her students and

underlined the importance of reading as a social experience.

3.3.2 *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*

One of the many strategies Jeanne used to develop literacy and oracy was to choose a published book as a starting point and create a variety of activities based on the book. One of the books she enjoyed was *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*. (See appendix for a copy of the text of the book.) She said it was a good book for the children as it developed their vocabulary, contained repetition to help them read, and touched on one of the themes of the Natural Science program. She had used the book in the past, and it had been well received by other classes. The format of the book was interesting as the pages were different sizes and the illustrations were original and colourful.

All the children grouped on the carpet in the corner with Jeanne sitting on a chair. Before starting reading *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*, Jeanne prepared the children for the reading by telling them what they would be asked to do immediately after she finished the story and also by letting them know what the long-term project would be for the book (field notes/teacher, May 16). She told them to look carefully at the pictures. She would read the book without stopping but when she finished, she would ask them what the story was about. Each child, she said, would have the chance to make his or her own book. All the children were very attentive when Jeanne was speaking and when she was reading: their eyes were focused on the book. Jeanne mentioned to me after this lesson that the most difficult thing for the children to learn to do at the beginning of the year was to concentrate (field notes/other, June 3). She ensured that she had the attention

of all the children before she started a lesson.

Jeanne read with a natural rhythm and lots of expression. She was careful to articulate each word without exaggerating in an effort to underline the sounds in French that were new to English-speaking children. This reminded me of what Clay (1987) had said about the importance of articulating the words so the children can hear the different sounds of the language.

As she read, she pointed out the links between the text and the illustrations, embedding the language in a visual context. As there was repetition in the book, she encouraged them to participate in the reading which the children did quite readily. They were even able to predict the text of a page that had been partly torn off. It was apparent they were accustomed to this strategy. They reacted with laughter and surprise to the story, indicating that they understood what had happened to the caterpillar.

Immediately following the reading of the book, Jeanne drew their attention to the Big Book she and students from a previous class had made from the story *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*. She started out by telling them that some of them were already capable of reading the story on their own. Jeanne followed the text with her hand as she read, and they all joined in the reading of the chorus. Although one boy was able to chime in only for the last line of the chorus, he diligently followed with his peers as they read. Some of the children were able to read the complete text with Jeanne. Everyone enjoyed success, and they all participated in the activity.

During this second reading, Jeanne stopped for certain vocabulary words that may not have been comprehensible through the clues in the illustrations. She

asked the questions in such a way that the children were able to give an answer without having to revert to their first language. For example, instead of asking "Qu'est-ce que 'grignote' veut dire?", which could very easily elicit a response such as "nibble," she asked "Quelle sorte d'animal grignote?" Someone answered "une souris," and she reminded them of another story they had read about a mouse who nibbled, therefore making links with previous knowledge. Then, to ensure the children had grasped the meaning of the word, she supplied further clues for the word by performing the gesture of "grignoter" to support the oral language.

Jeanne also used a lot of mime to help the children comprehend and to evaluate their comprehension (field notes/teacher, May 16). She asked them, "Que veut dire tortillant? Faites-le sans le dire en anglais." And they huddled on the carpet and wiggled like butterflies coming out of a cocoon as she verbalized the actions of the metamorphosis of a butterfly. She was very insistent that they use all means possible to communicate without having to resort to their first language. She went on by asking them questions about the cocoon and the butterfly enabling her to integrate her natural science curriculum into her lesson. She finished her discussion about the butterfly coming out of its cocoon by having all the children mime the metamorphosis of the caterpillar to the butterfly. The children spread out and Jeanne repeated, "Les chenilles rongent, elles étirent les ailes, les ailes sèchent, le papillon voltige"(field notes/teacher, May 16). As she described each action, the children performed the mime. This gave Jeanne the opportunity to verify their comprehension and the children the opportunity to participate actively in the acquisition of the language. As soon as the children had transformed into butterflies, Jeanne broke into a song about a butterfly, and they continued to flutter

around the room. She sang twice, and the children spontaneously joined in. (See appendix for text for the song *Papillon, papillon*)

This provided the transition to the next activity. Jeanne asked the children to go to their seats and together, they wrote the words for the butterfly song on the blackboard. At this point, Jeanne was able to make the link between oracy and written language. As she wrote the words, she asked the children how to spell them, sounding out the syllables which facilitated their grapho-phonemic awareness. She also drew their attention to the vocabulary. At one point she asked, what is "blé"? One child answered "wheat". She reformulated her question by asking "Qu'est-ce qu'on peut faire avec le blé?" (field notes/teacher, May 16). This enabled the children to give an answer without having to resort to their first language. She then asked, what is "un pré?" Someone answered with the French synonym, "un champs." They sang the butterfly song a couple of more times, and it was time to go to their music class.

The events described above were typical of Jeanne's teaching approach. In this case, Jeanne used a piece of children's literature, *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*, to develop literacy and oracy, embedding the language in a context-rich environment. The lessons were woven together using the theme of butterflies, and they moved easily from one activity to another enabling the children to engage themselves as readers, writers, speakers, and listeners. They also had the opportunity to learn about the language when, for example, they participated in writing the song about the butterfly. And they internalized the concept of metamorphosis as they sang the song, *Papillon, papillon*. Jeanne was able to develop the link between reading and writing as she followed with her hand in her

Big Book and encouraged the children to participate in the reading. She was also able to reinforce the link as she asked the children to help her write the words to the song. The variety of activities and materials ensured the attention and active participation of all the children, and they all were able to attain a certain level of success.

After their music class and recess, the children began the construction of their own book. Each child received a blank book with the appropriate number of pages and a piece of paper divided into boxes. Each box had a page of the text written in it, but the boxes were not in the correct order. The children were directed to find the box which contained the first page of the story, "Sur une feuille, un petit oeuf brille au clair de lune." Someone found the answer, and they all read the box together. As they were reading, Jeanne stood next to two of the boys who were not yet making the grapho-phonemic link and followed with her finger on their paper. She would often do this in a very discreet manner, just being there as a support for those who needed it. After they read the page together, she asked them what "Au clair de la lune" meant. They did not answer immediately but rather started singing a song they had learned, "*Au clair de la lune*." I enjoyed to see how they delighted themselves in song and interesting to see again, the link they were able to make between an oral experience and a written one.

For this particular activity, Jeanne gave directions as to where the children were to paste the text on the page in their own books (field notes/teacher, May 16). She said she did this for three reasons. Firstly, it reinforced vocabulary such as "en haut, en bas, à la droite, au milieu." Secondly, it encouraged them to follow directions orally. And thirdly, by placing the text in the same place as in the original

story, the children who were not yet reading independently were given an additional clue. Jeanne felt that they would have a better chance of success if the format of their personal book resembled as much as possible the Big Book and the published book that they would be reading again. Once they had glued their text on the first page, they ripped and cut construction paper to illustrate the message on the first page. Jeanne was quite insistent that the illustration reflect the text. She had drawn their attention to this during her reading of the book. She saw illustrating in this way as another opportunity to reinforce comprehension of the vocabulary. Jeanne moved from desk to desk asking each child to read the sentence, and they quietly talked in French among themselves. They talked about the moon and Jeanne asked them if it is always round, when is it not round, why is it not always round (field notes/teacher, May 16). Everyone was very calm and attentive, and Jeanne said this behaviour was typical when they were involved in a project they enjoyed. She continually congratulated them and encouraged them often, "C'est OK. Je sais que tu es capable." (field notes/evaluation, May 16)

Jeanne came back often, over the course of my visits, to continue with the theme of *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*. Earthworms, caterpillars, and cocoons were on display at the large square table at the back of the room for the children to observe. This provided a visual link to the literacy experiences. She had a cassette prepared with children recounting the story which she often played as the children were working on their own books. She constantly returned to the story reading with the children having them read in pairs, or reading on their own. Sometimes she read and all the children mimed the actions. Once the children had understood the story, Jeanne began a more detailed study of the language.

One day, she had written six groups of sentences on the board explaining the metamorphosis of a butterfly (audio-visual tape, May 20). The children recited the sentences and mimed them. Jeanne went over some of the vocabulary to ensure their comprehension and then started a lesson that drew their attention to certain aspects about the French language. For example, she asked them to identify the action words in each sentence. As they start to understand what was meant by an action word, they answered more and more quickly. Jeanne did not miss her chance to congratulate them. She then asked them to create their own sentences using the model, " Les papillons pondent des oeufs sur la branche." The children give responses such as:

Child: Les dinosaures pondent des oeufs sur la terre.

Michel: Les abeilles pondent des oeufs sur la ruche.

Jeanne repeated the sentence for Michel saying:

Jeanne: Oui, les abeilles pondent des oeufs *dans* la ruche.

In this instance, Jeanne was reinforcing the sentence structure, correcting the use of certain prepositions, and giving the children the opportunity to reinvest vocabulary and knowledge they had acquired in other situations.

She also mentioned the use of the pronoun "ils," asking them how she would spell "pondre" if they were talking about many butterflies. For one of the sentences, she asked one of the boys who was not yet decoding to point to the word "chenille" for her. He pointed to the correct word, and Jeanne asked him to explain how he knew that was the word. He said he recognized the letters "che," making clear to the children how they could decode words based on their previous

knowledge. She followed up by giving a quick lesson on the sound <che> and linked the second syllable, "ille" with a familiar word "fille." She then asked Joel to read the word "construit." When he seemed to be hesitating, she immediately asked the whole class to read the sentence with Joel at which point he was able to read the word successfully. Jeanne ensured that everyone participated in the lesson, and they were successful in their participation. This short lesson finished with the children miming the butterfly wiggling out of its cocoon and singing the song, *Papillon, papillon.*

In these examples, Jeanne had started with an authentic piece of literature to develop literacy and oracy. She used this literature to help the children learn to read, and read to learn. She developed their vocabulary, ensured that they understood what they were reading, questioned them on how they solved their literacy problems, gave them strategies so they could become independent readers, related the present lesson to previous learning, and brought their attention to grammatical and phonemic aspects of the language always in the context of a message they have read and understood.

The next example of literacy and oracy development in Jeanne's classroom, describes her use of a children's book to model writing.

3.3.3 *Où est bébé éléphant?*

Jeanne began by telling the children they were going to read, talk about a book, make a classroom book and then, perhaps, they would write individual books (field notes/teacher, May 27). Everyone was very attentive. Jeanne read from the trade book with much expression and many gestures. Once she had finished

reading, she asked if they liked the story and why they liked it. She asked how the mother elephant must have felt when she lost her baby, extending their comprehension. She drew their attention to certain passages from the story such as, "L'éléphant met sa trompe autour de l'arbre et tire l'arbre," and asked them to mime the sentence. In preparation for the next story they would be writing, she directed them in a discussion about the setting, talking about the flowers and the vegetation in the jungle. To reinforce their comprehension and to encourage their oral competency, she asked them to describe an elephant, its' ears, its' trunk, what it does with its' trunk, where it lives, and as they described, she made links with the illustrations. All the children participated in the discussion, and they always did so in French. As she reread the story in the form of a Big Book, the children joined in the reading.

She then had each child choose a page of his or her choice to illustrate for the classroom book, making sure she first asked her emergent readers so they were assured of being able to choose a page they could read independently (field notes/teacher, May 27). They were encouraged to collaborate on their illustrations and as they did so, Jeanne read an informative text about elephants and then circulated asking each child to read to her the text on his or her page. By illustrating the page, the children were reinvesting their comprehension of the written text in a visual form.

As the children continued their illustrations, Jeanne played some rhyming games using some of the words from the story (field notes/teacher, May 27), integrating some phonics instruction in the context of a familiar story. She then gave a short lesson on the word from the story "poisson" explaining the role of a

double "s" in French as compared to a single "s" as in the word "poison." It was time for recess, and the children replaced the pages of the story on the blackboard ledge. Once they had gone, Jeanne noticed that they had placed them in the order that followed the original text and commented to me on their comprehension based on this observation. After recess, each child read his or her page to the class, and the children asked each other questions about the illustrations. This was very similar to the idea of Author's Chair, except in this case, the children were sharing their drawings.

Again, through these examples I saw how Jeanne used authentic literature as source of knowledge and as a means to initiate children into the world of reading. She used written language as a trampoline for the development of oral language and then returned to the written message for the development of literacy. At all times she emphasized comprehension, active participation, and success.

On the next school day, Jeanne started out her lesson by distributing individual photocopies of the book, *Où est bébé éléphant?* Before she could back to the front of the room they had all started reading and she asked them to wait for her. But no! On they went. (field notes/students, May 30). She told them to choose a partner and they could go off in a corner and read to each other, taking turns. Many finished their reading and just started over again without any direction from Jeanne. I could hear them correcting themselves and each other. Once they had each read the story a couple of times, Jeanne regrouped them on the floor. She told them they were such good students and so capable, that they would write another story. They wanted to write about penguins, Jeanne wanted to write about bears. She invited them to write a book about penguins on their own.

Following the pattern of *Où est bébé éléphant?* and in preparation for their collective story, the children brainstormed about the conditions in the north for a polar bear and what a baby bear would probably like to do. They composed a story and Jeanne wrote the text on large mobile sheets as the children spelled the words for her (field notes/students, May 30). She congratulated them often and told them they were working very hard (field notes/evaluation, May 30). She introduced them to new vocabulary words based on their suggestions such as "il *creuse* dans la neige," and the children mimed a bear digging in the snow. One of the girls offered, "il fait des bêtises," and they brainstormed for the sort of tricks a baby bear would do. Michel suggested, "Il lance de la neige à son papa." The children loved this sentence. Michel said that the bear plays in the ocean because, he went on, there is an ocean up north. Jeanne incorporated the word "océan" in the story as it was a new word for the children, and obviously a word Michel has picked up in his reading. Here was another example of literacy supporting oracy.

As they wrote the story, Jeanne referred to the original elephant story to remind them of the structure. She also integrated instruction about the French language. For example, they discussed the difference between "de tout" and "du tout" in the context of their sentence, "Il n'a pas du tout froid." When they suggested the sentence "Papa ours promène avec mama ours. Il (s) cherche(nt) ...", Jeanne asked them how to spell "ils" and "cherchent." Then they discussed why "ils" had an "s" and why "cherchent" finished with "ent." She had made a similar comment with the sentence in a previous lesson, "Ils pondent des oeufs." When they read the sentence "Papa ours est gros et gras" some of the children pronounced the "s" at the end of "gros" et "gras". She reminded them there is no

"e" at the end so they do not pronounce the "s". As they composed, Jeanne went over the concept of a sentence and certain signs of punctuation. She asked the children to describe the bears and describe how they play, therefore encouraging them to brainstorm for adjectives and adverbs that would make their story clearer. As this part of the lesson came to a close, Jeanne reminded them of their original purpose by asking them to reread the whole story to make sure it made sense: "On va relire pour voir si l'histoire a du sens." (field notes/teacher, May 30). In this particular lesson, the children composed eight pages of the story together in thirty minutes. Although they had worked very hard, the rhythm of the lesson and the active participation of the students did not seem to have diminished their attention for the task.

The lessons I have described around the book, *Où est bébé éléphant?* exemplify how Jeanne used literature not only for developing reading and oracy, but more specifically in this case, how she made the link between reading and writing. By modelling after a book the children were familiar with, they become collective authors of their own story. She used this situation also to model sentence structures, rules of punctuation, spelling, and grammar. They were taught how to describe and how to integrate their knowledge about bears and the north into a story. Although she invited them to write their own stories, I did not see the results of any of their initiatives. I think this would have been an excellent opportunity for the children to reinvest their writing ability in a less structured environment. Jeanne moved freely and spontaneously from one activity to another, depending on the feedback of the children. The driving force behind her teaching and planning was the development of literacy and oracy in the second language. She insisted on the

attention and on the participation of her students in a structured environment which encouraged risk-taking and success.

3.3.4 Big Book Collection and Games

Jeanne had amassed a large selection of Big Books. Some of the books were reproductions of trade books, others were books children had written as collective stories with Jeanne, and others were books that the children had written collectively modelled on a trade book as was the case for *Où est bébé ours?* All the books in the Big Book collection were books that were familiar to the children. For each book, Jeanne had created a series of activities with varying degrees of difficulty. At different times during the day, the children found a partner and read the Big Books and played the accompanying games. The general objective of all the activities was to develop oracy and literacy in the French language. Jeanne provided the structure for language development, and the children participated actively within this structure, always using French as a means to communicate.

In most cases the children were free to choose their partners. Sometimes, however, Jeanne chose some of the groupings as she wanted to work more directly with certain children. At other times, she would place the children in groups so that more developed readers could help others as in a peer tutor arrangement. The children were free to work on the floor, at their desks, or in the hallways. They were to read the book first, either in unison, taking turns reading the pages, or each reading the complete story always taking care to read loud enough so that their partner could hear. Once each of the partners had read the story, they were to play the game. There was a great variety of games and each book had two or three

games accompanying it in large brown envelopes. One of the more common games was bingo; the children were to play bingo using the vocabulary found in the story. Another game consisted of associating vocabulary words or phrases with illustrations that were taken from the Big Book. Sometimes the children reconstructed the story by arranging the text that had been rewritten on strips of paper. Other times the children had to arrange sentences with words from the story that had been rewritten on cards. If the partners finished the games with one of the Big Books, they would choose another one and the process would start over.

It was interesting for me to watch, particularly in groups where the children were not necessarily at the same point in their reading development, how they would help each other in a calm and patient manner. For example, when one of the children was having difficulty reading the story, the other would wait and help after the reader had made an attempt at decoding the text. Sometimes the two would read together with the stronger reader echo reading quietly to the emergent reader. When they played the games, the children would give each other the chance to take their turn and would provide help only after a player was unable to read the card (audio-video tape 00.48.04, May 30).

Not only were the children able to benefit from each other, but this type of activity also gave Jeanne the opportunity to work individually with certain children (audio-video tape 00.49.00, May 30). All the children were actively involved in their reading or in playing the games that were contextualised by the books. The Big Book collection provided a good example of how Jeanne was able to develop comprehension and vocabulary from a literacy experience and use it as the basis for the development of oracy.

3.3.5 Learning About the Language

Once the children had understood the message of a text, Jeanne would often spend a few minutes on teacher-directed activities aimed at developing the children's grapho-phonemic, syntactic, or semantic awareness of the French language.

Jeanne always taught the sounds of the French language and the graphic transcription of these sounds in an authentic communicative context. These contexts varied. If Jeanne was teaching a song or poem, she would first ensure that the children had spent time interpreting the message. This was done through mime, gestures, discussion of vocabulary words, or by linking new concepts with real life experiences or previous knowledge. I have already described instances of Jeanne's use of paralinguistic elements and context clues to develop comprehension and an awareness of the French language with *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous* and *Où est bébé ours*. Jeanne's use of the song by Suzanne Pinel *Comme moi*, provides another example (audio-video tape, 01.43.25, May 30):

Comme moi

*Comme moi, chaque soir
Le soleil va se coucher
Il est très fatigué
D'avoir brillé toute la journée
Dodo soleil
Dodo mes amis (bis)*

*Et dans sa niche de bois
Maman chien chante au bébé
Wouf, wouf, wouf...
Wouf, wouf wouf, wouf...
Dodo Fido (bis)*

*Et sur le tapis gris
Maman chat chante au chaton*

Miaw, miaw, miaw...
Miaw, miaw, miaw, miaw...
Dodo Pompon (bis)

etc.

Jeanne: Pourquoi elle chante doucement?

Child: Pour qu'on puisse suivre les mots.

Two other children gave answers to which Jeanne agreed, and then followed up on the second response.

Jeanne: Oui, c'est ça. Elle veut endormir son bébé.

Endormir. Répète ça, endormir. Encore, endormir.

As Jeanne was repeating this, she held her hands together and rested her head on her hands as if she were sleeping.

Jeanne: Pourquoi est-ce que la maman chien chante au bébé?

Child: Pour l'endormir.

Jeanne repeated the structure several times changing the subject each time and having different children give answers. One boy's answer gave Jeanne the chance to explain the difference between "dormir" and "endormir."

Jeanne: Pourquoi maman chat chante au chaton?

Child: Elle veut dormir.

Jeanne: (She pretends to be sleeping). Oui, des fois les mamans vont dormir, mais elles veulent endormir leurs bébés.

As Jeanne spoke, she mimed the word "sleeping" and then cradled her arms as if

she were putting a baby to sleep when she said the word "endormir." The following example illustrates how she capitalized on the situation to show the children the plural form of the personal pronoun. She changed the indefinite article from "au" to "à ses bébés" so the children could hear that the new direct object was plural:

Jeanne: Pourquoi mamam abeille chante à ses bébés.

Child: Elle veut l'endormir.

Jeanne: Oui, elle veut /es endormir. Elle veut /ès endormir.

This was all she said about this complex sentence structure. She just introduced it to the children knowing very well that personal pronouns are a very difficult concept for the children to grasp.

Because songs and poems lend themselves to a closer look at phonics, she sometimes used these genres to familiarize the children with the sounds of the French language, particularly the ones that do not exist in English. After having listened to *Comme moi*, Jeanne displayed the cards she had prepared with the song printed on them. The children listened to the song a second time as Jeanne followed the text with her hand. She then drew their attention to the rhyming words, or she asked the children to find words that had a particular sound (audio video tape 01.43.25, June 1) :

*Et sur le tapis gris
Maman chat chante au chaton
Miaw, miaw, miaw...
Miaw, miaw, miaw, miaw...
Dodo Pompon (bis)*

Jeanne: Montre-moi avec ton doigt un mot qui dit une couleur.

A child pointed out the word "gris."

Jeanne: Montre-moi un mot qui rime avec "gris." On va tous chanter pour aider Robert.

The children sang the first line and Robert was able to identify the word "tapis."

Jeanne: Trouve-moi des mots avec le son <on> dedans.

The children had no trouble pointing out "chaton, pompon."

Jeanne: Trouve-moi des mots avec le son "ch."

Again the children identified "chat, chante, et chaton. "

*Comme moi, chaque soir
Le soleil va se coucher
Il est très fatigué
D'avoir brillé toute la journée
Dodo soleil
Dodo mes amis (bis)*

Jeanne: Trouve-moi les mots qui riment.

After two or three attempts, Jeanne realized that her question was beyond their reach. To reassure them she said that her question was very difficult, and they had not had much of a chance to learn the song. Then one of the girls pointed out "fatigué, coucher, et brillé." Someone suggested "soleil," and Jeanne pronounced it slowly so they could hear that the sound at the end was not the same.

These kinds of activities were done orally in the form of a brainstorming for only a few minutes at a time. On other occasions, Jeanne would invite the children to help her when she was writing on the blackboard or on poster paper, asking them to spell the words for their collective compositions. Often, she would refer them to well-known words when they were not sure the spelling of certain sounds making links between knowledge they already had and the new problem at hand. And finally, Jeanne was

very insistent that the children articulate correctly the sounds of the French language. If they were learning a new song for example, Jeanne would draw their attention to certain difficult pronunciations by repeating the words slowly and showing them the corresponding letters with her hand on the poster paper where the song had been transcribed. For example, the children repeated several times the line in the poem "L'écureuil court sur le fil d'électricité." There were many sounds in those few words that do not exist in English, and the children were still learning how to listen for them and articulate them. This was important if they were to become effective communicators.

Grapho-phonemic relationships were an integral part of Jeanne's teaching strategies. She incorporated instruction in this cueing system in the context of authentic communication and in so doing, developed oral and written language. In the section on *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*, I outlined some examples of how Jeanne integrated the study of the structure of the French language and the rules which govern its use in the context of a literary experience. She developed the children's awareness of the components of a sentence with, for example, an activity of sentence manipulation. Jeanne wrote on the board the first sentence from the book, *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*, in the following manner using a different coloured chalk for each part of the sentence (field notes/teacher, June 18):

Sur une feuille un petit oeuf brille au clair de lune.

The children then brainstormed and came up with the following sentences:

Dans mes bras un petit chat miaule au soleil.

Le matin à ma maison un petit lapin grignote dans sa cage.

Sur la route un petit lapin saute au dessus de la rivière.

Au cirque un gros lion grimpe sur une cage.

Dans le ciel le soleil brille au-dessus les nuages.

For each functional group, Jeanne asked the appropriate question such as "où", "qui", "quoi". She has also marked these words at the top of each column the children created as they invented new sentences. In this activity, the children were revisiting vocabulary and sentence structures they had already learned, and they were being sensitized to the parts of a sentence and the different roles these parts played in specifying or elaborating their thoughts. Next the children played with language by mixing up the parts to make new and sometimes, nonsensical sentences. By manipulating sentence parts, the children were learning about the French language without being asked to analyse it in an abstract way.

Jeanne's integration of grapho-phonemic instruction and the study of the structure of the language were both part of her agenda for the development of oracy and literacy of her learners. She capitalized on authentic communication contexts to help her students develop a certain awareness about the language they were learning and using to learn. Jeanne referred her students to knowledge they already possessed as well as introducing them to new concepts. And yet, in doing so, she was very careful to respect the cognitive and affective development of each child.

4. The Role of Evaluation

Jeanne used formative evaluation to monitor the language development and interests of her students, and her method was by and large, observation. In order to be aware of their personal reading habits, she noted which books the children took from

the read-at-home program. During the personal reading time at the beginning of the day, she moved from desk to desk listening if children wanted to read to her or observing which books were chosen. She also stopped to help children if they asked questions. At other times, she observed from a distance noting how many times the children changed their books and whether or not they read the words or looked at the pictures. She was also aware of which children chose to read a book during spare time.

When the students were playing the literacy games with the Big Book collection, Jeanne tended to choose some of the groups. She often put an emergent reader with independent ones and observed how they interacted. Sometimes she kept the three or four emergent readers in one group, and she worked directly with them. As she had mentioned in her interview, she evaluated the children according to where they were in their reading development, knowing that each child progressed at his or her own rate. She did not seem to be concerned that some of the children were at the emergent stage and others were decoding text. And she was quick to point out their strengths in areas other than literacy, particularly for those who she perceived as less mature and not yet ready to move beyond the emergent reading stage.

For those who were well on their way to becoming independent readers, Jeanne had her classroom activities structured in such a way that they too were challenged. She ensured that some of the games related to the Big Book collection corresponded to their needs. Furthermore, she often used the more advanced readers for paired reading activities, and the books in the classroom library were of a variety of topics and reading difficulty. During a collective reading or writing activity, Jeanne was careful to direct her questions so that all the children were encouraged to take risks but that they did so in a secure environment.

On one occasion during my visits, Jeanne evaluated the children's grapho-phonemic awareness on a more formal basis. She invited small homogeneous groups to sit with her in a corner of the classroom and asked them to spell about five to ten words on individual blackboards (field notes/evaluation, June 15). She reminded them to write syllables and to remember similar words with which they were familiar. In the case of an error, she pronounced what they had spelled so they could hear their invented spellings. When they spelled a sound correctly but misspelled the word, she reassured them there was no problem and showed them how the word was spelled. For the emergent readers, she asked them to place the vowels in a column. She then dictated one syllable words using the different vowel sounds, and the children placed the correct consonants around the appropriate vowels. She was very pleased that one of the emergent readers was starting to become aware of the grapho-phonemic relationships.

As far as reading and listening comprehension were concerned, Jeanne used a variety of evaluation tools. Mime as well as skits were very popular with the children, and Jeanne was able to evaluate their comprehension with these activities. She also used their illustrations to determine their interpretation of what they had read. When she read aloud to them, she was very conscious of their attention level and used this as a gauge of their understanding and interest in the activity.

Jeanne used no standardized tests or published tests. Her evaluation was based on her observations during regular classroom activities. She was constantly interacting with either the whole class, a small group, or individual students. Jeanne used her observations to monitor the development of each child and to develop her curriculum. The children were involved in their own evaluation to the extent that they

chose their reading materials, monitored each other in the many small group activities, and were called upon by Jeanne to recount what they had learned and what they knew how to do. Both Jeanne and her students were very proud of the progress they made during the school year.

3.5 Conclusion

To conclude, I have decided to draw some parallels between my observations in Jeanne's classroom and the literature on effective language instruction. First, I will discuss Jeanne's instructional techniques for the teaching of reading followed by the role of writing in her classroom. I will then look at the research on teacher talk in early French immersion classrooms.

Jeanne was very concerned that the children gain meaning from their literary experiences; she constantly attended to a variety of strategies in an attempt to ensure that the children comprehend what they read. As she saw each child at a different stage in their reading development and as she consciously taught the children to attend to the graphic information on the page, it would seem that she would support a stage model of reading that sees children pass through the selective-cue stage, the spelling sound stage, to the automatic stage. She used the kinds of techniques that Juel (1991) describes such as language experience activities where students dictate words, sentences, or stories. She used Big Books and patterned predictable text in chart stories. Jeanne also used a strategy suggested by Clay: she articulated words carefully, but naturally, so the children could hear the different sounds. This is particularly important in second language classrooms where there are many sounds which are new to the children.

Juel (1991) mentions the importance of giving the children the opportunity to practice repeated readings, an activity the children participate in when they read the Big Books, sing from their song books, and read the modelled stories. Both Juel (1991) and Pearson and Fielding (1991) also underline the importance of a classroom library and of giving the children time in class to enjoy book activities such as reading to the children, talking about books, and group silent reading. Jeanne circulated during the group silent reading time asking the children to share what they were reading with her or with the class.

If one was to categorize Jeanne's role as a teacher according to Pearson and Fielding's (1991) definition of trends in teaching reading comprehension, I would suggest that she was best described as a teacher who sees her role as providing a scaffold which allowed the children to perform tasks they would otherwise be unable to do by themselves. She was very aware of the abilities of each of her students, and she designed activities that required her help and yet, were within reach of the learner. She took advantage of collaborative teaching strategies such as paired reading and responsive teaching so that the children too could provide the necessary scaffolds for their peers. During the personal reading time, she shared control, and the children had the opportunity to apply their learning to new contexts.

It is more difficult to categorize Jeanne's teaching of writing as the children were not engaged in writing activities to the extent they were engaged in reading activities. As a result, there is a paucity of data upon which conclusions could be drawn. What data there are, however, suggest that Jeanne does not appear to use instructional scaffolding to the same extent in writing as she does in reading. She seems to be characterized more by a combination of the "presentational mode" and the

"environmental mode" described by Hillocks (1986). Jeanne gave specific objectives for her writing activities which is characteristic of both modes. The two modes differ in that the presentational mode emphasizes the teacher as presenter of knowledge whereas the environmental mode appears to place teacher and student more nearly in balance. Her writing instruction was at times presentational when she led the discussions for the collective stories which often imitated a pattern taken from a book or a song, yet, her instruction is also characteristic of the environmental mode as the collective stories are dependent on the ideas generated by the students. Sometimes the children are encouraged to interact with each other in order to get feedback and to learn identifiable writing skills: these are characteristics of the environmental mode.

According to the meta-analysis done by Hillocks, the presentational mode of instruction, although effective, is not as effective as the environmental mode of instruction or what Applebee and Langer (1987) call "instructional scaffolding." The main difference between the environmental mode and the presentational mode is that the former permits the children to work in small-group problem-centered discussions, conducive to high levels of peer interaction before working individually. A closer look at Applebee and Langer's model would suggest that the teacher must plan activities which provide scope for the students to develop their own purposes rather than fit into the teacher's predetermined framework. The presentational mode does not allow for this scope. It would appear, according to the literature, that perhaps a mode of instruction for writing which allows for more peer interaction, less direction from the teacher, and a release of control from the teacher would provide the most effective environment for the development of writing. The teacher provides the scaffold, but at some point, the children must have the opportunity to apply their learning independently to new

contexts.

The work of Hudelson (1984) and Uzura (1987) in the area of second language reading and writing development also suggests that children can and should be encouraged to write in their second language before they have complete control over the oral and written systems. Not only will these experiences serve to develop second language competency, these samples can be used to evaluate language development.

Of course, this release of control in the domain of writing has to be balanced with the importance of providing a supportive scaffold for second language acquisition. Asking grade one French immersing to write freely about any topic could put them in a very risky situation as their knowledge of their second language is still quite limited and as a result, the scaffold provided by the teacher is far less secure. This is particularly the case where invented spelling is less tolerated. Whereas in reading, the teacher is better able to provide a secure scaffold to the students as she has more control over the books at their disposal and consequently, can embed the second language in context-rich situations.

Modelling and embedding the second language in context-rich environments is paramount to second language acquisition. For example, when Jeanne asked the children to illustrate what they had written she was reinforcing their comprehension of the language by providing a visual context for the written text. Tardif (1994) spoke of the importance of giving the children a scaffold so that they can make sense of their learning experiences. Jeanne used a variety of techniques to ensure the children were exposed to a comprehensible input. She used contextual clues such as mime, gestures, pictures, objects, people, and events as well as paralanguage clues such as expansion, information, self-repetition, modelling and questions. The children had the

opportunity to reinvest their second language in a variety of situations: participating in teacher-led discussions, singing, choral readings; participating in collaborative activities such as paired reading, playing games, drama; and, in social activities such as excursions and unstructured play time. In the area of oracy, Jeanne was very successful in providing a learning environment that was structured but also gave the children the opportunity to use their newly acquired knowledge in different contexts.

In conclusion, my observations suggest that Jeanne's idea of the development of literacy was reflected in her classroom activities. She integrated literacy and oracy using authentic documents and she provided her students with many opportunities to actively participate in applying their new knowledge. She directed them in their learning and the kind of direction she provided was based on her observations of the children's needs and interests. In other words, she guided the children through what Vygotsky calls the "zone of proximal development." She accepted that each learner was at a different stage in his or her development and ensured that all of the children in her class were encouraged to take risks and were successful in their endeavours. She used a model of instruction for reading and oracy that is based on Vygotsky's theory of instructional scaffolding. Although her mode of instruction for writing was a cross between presentational and environmental, my observations and the literature lead me to believe that it would be more effective to use an environmental mode to a greater extent. Regardless, Jeanne's pedagogical strategies were very effective in ensuring that the learners in her class acquired their second language. The vast majority were reading independently, and they all spoke French freely in both academic and social contexts at end of the month of June. They were well on their way to becoming functionally bilingual.

Chapter Four

This chapter summarizes the information I was able to gather from Marie and her classroom. I have divided the chapter into five sections. The first one is a brief introduction to Marie. This is followed by a recounting of Marie's view of the development of literacy based on interviews she and I recorded. The third section describes my observations in her classroom. These observations record how Marie made the links between literacy and oracy, between reading and writing. I attempt to examine these links in terms of the materials used, the role of the teacher, and the involvement of the learner. The fourth section deals with the role of evaluation. The fifth section describes my observations during Marie's Français class, and the final section draws some conclusions. Again, this was a grade one group of students but in this case, the children were introduced to literacy in their first language, English.

1. Introduction to Marie and her Classroom

As I mentioned in my first chapter, I was less familiar with the teachers in the Saint-Vital school division. Marie was recommended to me by the curriculum consultant for French language programs in the school division as well as by two principals who had worked with her. As it was important to me that the teachers be comfortable with my presence, I was pleased that all three sources said that Marie was open to visitors in her classroom. I visited Marie's classroom in the afternoon when she was scheduled to teach English language arts.

There were twenty-four children in Marie's class, twelve boys and twelve

girls. All but one had attended a French immersion kindergarten. English was generally spoken at home, but some parents were able to speak French. Marie had a full-time teacher's assistant in her classroom, a young Québécoise. Under the direction of Marie, the TA worked with small groups. In particular, she worked with a group of five children, one of whom had not attended a French immersion kindergarten and four others with various difficulties. The TA also helped prepare teaching materials, file work, deal with conflicts in the classroom, and help with the general running of the classroom.

Marie had a very spacious classroom. The children sat at large round tables which seated four or five comfortably. In the centre of the classroom was an open space used to regroup the children on the floor. In one corner was a book stand with a selection of books that Marie said she changed on a monthly basis. In another were two computers. Along the back wall was a series of games and a table and chairs. And along the side wall was a counter with sink. Marie used the front wall and the blackboard as her focal point, but she did not use a desk. The walls were covered with the children's work. There were also posters of English word families, a list of the classroom rules, the calendar, a number line, and various classroom messages.

4.2 Marie's View of the Development of Literacy

Marie explained that she based her literacy instruction on a reading and writing continuum that she had helped develop as a member of a divisional committee designated to produce such a document. The reading continuum described different stages of reading development. This particular continuum moved

the readers from what they called magical stage, to self concepting, to bridging, to take-off, to independent. (See appendix for a copy of *Reading Continuum* and *Reading Development Continuum Strategies*). Although the continuum Marie gave to me did not describe each stage, it did provide a list of the strategies the teacher could employ to help move the child from one stage to the next. She said that most of the children were at the bridging to take-off stage, so she said she used strategies such as poem rebuilding, rewritten retellings, cloze, big books and predictable pattern books. She also incorporated the suggestions from the continuum in her learning centres. She included the parents in her literacy program by implementing a home reading program and by sending home a document describing how parents could help their children become good readers.

I asked Marie about her definition of a good reader which led her into the topic of evaluation. She said a good reader was someone who can understand, discuss and critique what he or she has read. She used the Brigance standardized reading test to evaluate the children's decoding skills as well as their expression and their articulation. For those who were able to decode, she evaluated their comprehension by asking the children to read the paragraphs and answer the questions included in the Brigance test. She also evaluated their comprehension by asking questions based on a story they had read from the reading series, *Impressions*. Their ability to read what they themselves had written as well as the ability to read the print in the classroom, were two additional sources that Marie used to evaluate the reading of her students.

When I asked Marie how she saw the development of reading, she referred to her rôle as a teacher. She saw herself as someone who used strategies to ensure

the child was sufficiently stimulated so that he or she might move to the next stage in development. If the child was not ready to learn certain concepts, at least he or she would have been exposed to the strategies she employed. She said she often worked with small groups regardless of whether they were having difficulties. This gave her the opportunity to work on expression, phonics, content or grammar, depending on their needs.

When I asked about oral reading, Marie said she read a poem or a story aloud every day to the children. They discussed the author, the illustrations, and different aspects of the books. She also had a home reading program. The children were invited to choose one of the books from the classroom library which held fifty books related to the themes being discussed in class and the seasons. Marie said she changed the books on a monthly basis. Each child had a sheet with three columns for the date, the title of the book, and comments the parents may help the children write. Once the sheet was completed, Marie gave them another one, and she kept a record of the child's home reading. On occasion, she said she telephoned the parents to encourage them to participate in the program.

Marie organized her curriculum around themes. She chose the themes according to the interests and the needs of the children. The interests were determined according to what the children wrote about in the writing folders or their journals, or the objects they brought into the classroom. Other themes were determined by the curriculum guide. Once a theme had been chosen, Marie used it to correlate different subjects. For example, when the theme was insects, she said she integrated insects into her math class by having the children add and subtract using plastic insect manipulatives. Most of the themes lasted about one month, but

by the end of the school year, Marie preferred to develop several themes in one month or in the same week in order to maintain the children's interest.

Marie said she did a lot of writing with her children. Some of her writers were at the drawing stage while others were able to compose stories. Those who were at the drawing stage would dictate their story to Marie or the teacher assistant. These stories would then be used for different reading activities such as putting the sentences in the correct order to tell the story or manipulating the words to reconstruct the sentences. She also used the children's stories to make flash cards. The children memorized the stories which, according to Marie, was not reading but at least the child was sight reading certain Dolch basic vocabulary words. So even if a child was not able to decode words phonetically, he or she had developed a certain sight vocabulary. For those who were able to write a story, she worked with them on their rough copies, and then they published their work. Marie gave me a copy of the evaluation she used to determine where each child was in terms of the "stages of writing." The stages were: scribbling, mock writing, random combination of letters, one letter per syllable, phonemic awareness, phonetic representation, transitional, independent, and skilled stage. Included after each stage is a description of the typical behaviour. (See Appendix for *Stages of Writing*).

Marie's emphasis on writing led me to ask her if her children wrote as much in French as in English. She said they wrote much less in French as they did not have the vocabulary. While they could write pages and pages in English, she had to encourage them to write a few sentences in French. For example, she said the children wrote their own problems in math using the French language. They could

use their word banks, their knowledge of French phonics, as well as certain key phrases they had learned. Those who were not able to write a few sentences could dictate them to either Marie or the TA. Marie had worked certain structures throughout the year such as "Quel(le) ___ préfères-tu?" or "C'est mon tour, c'est ton tour. Je pense que c'est___, Aujourd'hui, hier, demain, c'est, ce sont." She said the structures depended on the themes that were being discussed in class.

As far as reading was concerned, Marie believed that the children should learn to read in English and French at the same time. However, she said, the children understood much more when they read in their first language. In order to help the children's comprehension when Marie read in French, she said she relied more on the illustrations and encouraged prediction and discussion more so than when she read in English. When she came across a difficult word, she replaced it with a word familiar to the children. After reading, she said she would ask the children to retell the story in their own words which would develop their oracy in French and their comprehension.

Marie concluded by underlining the importance of developing themes based on the interests of the children and the curriculum guides. She used these themes to integrate different subjects and as a basis for her learning centres. Her use of reading and writing continuums indicated she saw literacy as a developmental process and that her role as a teacher was to provide opportunities for each child to progress at his or her own rate.

4.3 The Links Between Literacy and Oracy, Between Reading and Writing

As with Jeanne, I have decided to organize my observations in Marie's class

according to the kinds of activities in which the children were involved. Some of these activities included oral reading by Marie, reading by the students, learning centres, and conferencing.

Marie usually started her English language arts class by grouping the children on the floor in front of her. Most of the time, she started out by reading a story for about five to ten minutes. Then the children either wrote a message, worked on a phonics family, did some choral reading out of their readers, shared some writing or listened to directions for the learning centres. This part of the lesson lasted about thirty minutes. They would then go to their respective learning centres and work there for approximately thirty-five minutes. Sometimes Marie rotated the children once during the thirty-five minutes at the learning centres, but usually they stayed at the same centre for the entire time. If there was time before recess, the children might sometimes get together so some of them could share their work. If the children did not have the time to finish their centres, they finished their English work at another time during the day.

4.3.1 Oral Reading to the Children

Marie read to the children during eight of my eleven visits. The books she chose were related to the themes she was working on. She was just finishing a theme about animals when I started to observe in her classroom and the themes of dinosaurs, bubblegum day, jell-o day, the four seasons and watermelon day were developed during my visits.

Her pre-reading activities usually consisted of reading the title and either giving a purpose for the reading or making a link between the book and the

children's experience. For example, when she read a book about polar bears, she introduced her reading by reminding the children they had seen polar bears at the zoo (field notes/teacher, May 26). When they were reading a chapter book about bubblegum, she reminded them of problem, solution, who, what, where, when, and why; told them they would be doing their centres after the reading; and read the title and author (field notes/teacher, June 15). To introduce *The Meat Eaters Arrive* (field notes/teacher, June 16) and *The True Story of the Three Little Pigs* (field notes/teacher, May 26), she read the title, the dedication and the name of the author. She also mentioned that one of the children had written a story about pigs. On another occasion, she read three poems out of a dinosaur poetry book as the children were getting settled on the carpet (field notes /teacher, June 7). Marie gave the children a purpose for listening to the story *No Dinosaurs in the Park* by telling them they would learn something if they listened to the book (field notes/teacher, June 7). She then defined the word "theory" for the students as the book presented several theories to explain the extinction of the dinosaurs. Marie gave a purpose to the book *Dinosaur Garden* (field notes/teacher, June 14) by saying it was a book that interested her, and she wanted to share it with the children. Her pre-reading activities were very brief, and she typically started to read the story immediately.

Marie read the books with much expression. When she was reading *Meat Eaters Arrive*, she read very slowly to imitate the movements of the huge dinosaurs. She also encouraged the children to chime in with the reading if the book lent itself to this kind of participation (field notes/teacher, June 7). She rarely stopped during her reading but did, on occasion, for a variety of reasons. For the book, *What*

Happened to the Dinosaurs she made a link with knowledge they had gained from previous reading about dinosaur eggs (field notes/teacher, June 9). Sometimes she made a point about the meaning of a word, or asked a short comprehension question or a question to encourage the children to predict (field notes/teacher, June 8). When she read the chapter book about bubblegum she referred to the structure of a narrative asking them to identify the problem: "What's the problem? Who do you think the monster is?" (field notes/teacher, June 15). The structure of problem and solution was also reinforced in conferencing sessions. On one occasion, Marie read a nonfiction book about dinosaurs. The pre-reading activity for this book consisted of talking about other books in the series. The vocabulary was quite difficult and there was no discussion during or after the reading which could explain why few children participated in this activity (field notes/teacher, June 16).

Marie discussed little with the children after she read. She encouraged them to follow up individually by using the ideas from the stories in the writing journals, or she would use the books she had read in one of the learning centres she had developed. On most occasions, oral reading by the teacher took about five minutes of the classroom time. Marie's choice of books was always linked to the themes being studied in class, and although discussion about the books was limited, she always encouraged the children to respond in some way to what was read.

4.3.2 Reading By the Students

The children read as a group during two of my eleven visits. For this activity, they regrouped in a large circle in the centre of the classroom. Marie used the book, *Fly Away Home* from the *Impressions* series, published by Holt, Rinehart

and Winston. My first observations of group reading took about thirty minutes (audio-video tape 00.00.00 to 00.07.24, May 30). Marie familiarized the children with the structure of a text book by directing them to turn to the table of contents in their readers and choose a story. One child chose a story about dinosaurs, but Marie said that dinosaur month was in June and that they should choose something about animals or the zoo which was the theme they were presently working on. Before reading the selection that had been chosen, Marie reminded them of the short vowel sounds in "bellowed and cackled." She told them to look at the pictures if they could not read a word (field notes/teacher, May 26), encouraging them to use context in decoding the text. In order to remind them of the social conventions of oral reading, she went over some rules: "read slowly so that everyone can get the words and understand the story." (field notes/teacher, May 26). Those who were able, read the story aloud in unison. Danielle, who was able to decode the text, led the reading of the group. If she stopped, the chorus came to a standstill until she was able to continue.

Marie chose the next story, and the children started reading together. She stopped them at the word "elephant" and asked how they were able to read the word. One child answered, "because of the picture" (field notes/teacher, May 30). She then drew their attention to an exclamation point and they practised reading with expression.

Marie: What do you notice about 'quiet, we can't sleep!'

Child: An exclamation mark.

Marie: Let's read it with more expression.

Rather than telling them to read with more expression, she had *them* notice the punctuation in the story. About fourteen of the twenty-four children were reading, and the reading seemed to be led by a group of girls. When they would falter during the choral reading, the others who were reading with them would stop as well. Marie preferred to let the children join in as they wished, making their own choices about their involvement in their learning. They read the story together a couple of times.

After reading the story, Marie asked them to help her compose a message (audio-visual tape 00.07.24 to 00.09.15, May 30) directly linked to the story they had just read: "The baby beebee bird was noisy at night and quiet in the morning. The zoo animals couldn't sleep." By asking the children to relate the problem in the story, she was helping their comprehension and making them aware of the structure of a narrative. Once they had decided on the text, she encouraged the children to help her sound some of the words. This activity helped the children develop their phonemic awareness. For example, when writing the date, she asked them to sound out the word "Monday." They began with the letter <m> and then give the sound for a short /u/. She repeated the word pronouncing it with a short "o" sound to represent the letter "o" in Monday. They then played a game in which they draw a geometric form around individual words in the message. For example, a student asked another to draw a triangle around the word "zoo." Marie then asked the children to count the words in the message and reminded them they must be able to count a finger space between each word when they wrote themselves. The children were then directed to get out their journals and write a message. Marie circulated to see what the students wanted to write about. The TA worked with

one little boy who traced the date in his journal.

The next group reading activity was a reader's theatre of a story they had previously read, *The Coconut Game* (field notes/teacher, June 1). They read the story together, and Marie congratulated all the children by name whom she heard reading. At one point she asked Danielle to stop reading and asked the boys to participate which seemed to encourage their participation. Then she divided the story into three different roles according to the characters. As there were not enough roles for all the children, she told them they would not all participate. This was an activity that encouraged comprehension of the story. The children were having difficulty keeping track of their place and their roles (audio-visual tape 00.15.10, May 30). After the fourth reading, Marie asked the children to stop. As she preferred a teaching style that put the children in control of their learning, she asked them to resolve the problem of why the activity was not working :

Marie: Why isn't it working today?

Child: Kids are reading other kids' roles.

Marie: Why did it work better yesterday?

Child: Because we did it your way.

Marie started again. Not all the children were listening and she asked them to stop (field notes/teacher, June 1). They were encouraged to write solutions to the problem in their journals. Here was an very good example of how Marie was able to provide an authentic purpose for writing which gave the children their own voice in the resolution of the problem. On my next visit, the children read the story for me. Their technical problems had been worked out during my absence.

Marie organized individual reading by the students through the help of parent

volunteers. The resource teacher had given sessions to the kindergarten and grade one parents so they would know how to read to the children. The parent volunteers came to the school on Wednesdays. If the child could not read independently, the parent would read a story or they would read together. If a child was more independent, he or she would read to the parent. This arrangement was possible in Marie's class as she taught her language arts in English.

Marie also had a collection of library books at the back of the classroom, but there was no scheduled time for the entire class to participate in personal individual reading. It was available for those who desired to read. During my visits, the classroom library was not used. Reading was integrated in the learning centres that Marie developed in conjunction with the themes. Most of my visits gave me the opportunity to observe the children working in small groups at different learning centres.

5.3.3 Learning Centres

During the month I visited in Marie's class, she had developed three sets of learning centres. The first set involved five different activities. At one centre, the children were to list all the different flavours of Jell-o they could think of. They were encouraged to work together for this activity. At another centre, the children were to draw the beginning, middle and end of the story, *The Coconut Game*. At the third centre, the children were to determine the characters, the problem, and the solution for the story, *The Coconut Game*. The two centres which provided follow-up activities for *The Coconut Game* also helped develop the children's comprehension and their awareness of the structure of a story. The fourth centre,

Newspaper in the Classroom, was one that had been running for some time. There were a series of cards that gave directions for a variety of activities using the newspaper. The children could choose any activity they wished by reading the card and carrying out the instructions. A few of the children who were not able to read the instructions on the cards depended on help from others to complete the tasks. The last centre was journal writing. This centre provided the children with the opportunity to write freely about whatever interested them. Sometimes Marie would give them ideas. One day, she directed them to think about the puppet plays they had seen to help them with their writing. Marie chose the members of each group, and she decided who started at which centre. Generally, the centres lasted about five school days which gave each child a chance to visit one centre a day.

The second set of learning centres was developed around the themes of dinosaurs, and the four seasons. At one centre, Marie wanted the children to do some research about dinosaurs. She placed five books about dinosaurs, one of which was the factual book she had read earlier. The other four books were new to the children, and the reading level was fairly advanced. Later on during the week, she included the book *What Happened to the Dinosaurs* at this centre as well, integrating a familiar text with those that were unfamiliar. The children were to find three facts about dinosaurs and write them down.

The second centre required the children to listen to the book, *No Dinosaurs in the Park*, and draw a new title page for it. Here the children had the opportunity to listen to a familiar story and share their personal interpretation by creating a new title page. This was a particularly appropriate centre for those children who were not as developed in their reading and writing skills.

At the third centre, the children were directed to write about their favourite activity for each of the four seasons. This gave them the chance to write about something which was personal and of importance to them as individuals.

The fourth centre gave the opportunity for the children to work in their writing portfolios. The subject of their writing was completely up to the students. However, sometimes during a group activity, Marie would make suggestions of topics for the children to write about in their portfolios as she had done when she suggested the children write about a possible solution to the problem they encountered in their reader's theatre. On another occasion, she asked Gaston what he liked to do and suggested he write about that in his writing portfolio (field notes/teacher, June 8). She reminded them that they could start something new, revise an old piece, or finish a current piece, underlining the process of writing as something which is ongoing and recursive.

Marie was giving a phonics test to those children who were at the fifth centre. Here she was evaluating their ability to identify different sounds. She said she would use this information to help her with her report cards.

I was able to observe the work at these centres for five days. At the dinosaur research centre, all the children drew dinosaurs but very few were able to use the reference books to research facts about dinosaurs (field notes/students: June 7, June 8, June 15) and some were unable to read the directions (field notes/students, June 1). Those that did write some facts relied on their previous knowledge or on the classroom expert, Yvan. It was evident that the children recognized Yvan as someone who could help them write some facts, as they would consult him for information (field notes/students: June 9, June 14). His presence

encouraged a high level of interaction among the children. Few of them were able to complete the requirements at this centre. At one point Paul, who seemed to be having difficulty at the centre, declared, "I'm not learning anything" (field notes/other, June 14). The others in his group ignored him and continued with their work. There were, however, some children who were able to do the work.

Danielle, a very strong student, divided her page in two columns: one had the name of the dinosaur and the other had a fact about the dinosaur in point form (field notes/students, June 14). She was very well organized and was able to read some of the material at her disposal.

The children working on a new cover for the book *No Dinosaurs in the Park* found it very easy to get on task, and they all finished the activity. There was little evidence of a connection between their comprehension of the story and their illustrations other than they all drew dinosaurs, but they seemed to enjoy the centre and their success.

The groups working on the activities for the four seasons had varied levels of participation. Some children found it easy to get on task while others took more time. Some wrote up to seven sentences describing their favourite activity while others had difficulty writing one sentence (field notes/students, June 8). As Marie had mentioned, some were still at the drawing stage. She put no pressure on any of the children to complete a task that was beyond their ability. What was important to her was that each child have the opportunity to participate in each centre if she or he chose to do so. The results at the portfolio centre were similar. Some children were able to start writing or drawing immediately while others seemed stumped for up to twenty-five minutes and wrote nothing until there was a

change of activity (field notes/students, June 7). Generally speaking, most of the children seemed comfortable putting their ideas on paper (field notes/students, June 8). They were encouraged to use invented spelling which seemed to facilitate their fluency. Sometimes, however, when they were asked to reread their story, the originality of their spelling made rereading impossible (field notes, June 8). The children were encouraged and often chose to write a variety of genres. Although illustrated stories were the most popular, some children wrote poems, and on one occasion I observed Danielle writing a list.

At the phonics centre, Marie gave the children a phonics test. She read a word and the children were to write on a piece of paper the beginning letter of the word, or in the case of vowels, the middle letter of the word that made the vowel sound. Once the phonics test was completed the children could work at one of the other centres. The phonics centre took precedence over all, and the children had to do their test before they could go to a new centre.

When Marie was finished giving the phonics test to a group of children, she circulated in the classroom helping individual students. For example, she showed two girls how to use the index to find out about dinosaurs (field notes/teacher, June 15). She would ask children to read to her what they had written. In one case she congratulated Jon, telling him he had written a whole page and that she could read it (field notes/teacher, June 14). She told him his story had a person, problem and solution, and a beginning, middle, and end. On other occasions, she helped a child with the content of a story; giving suggestions to make it more clear or more interesting or making suggestions for writing topics (field notes/teacher, June 8, June 14). She also coached the children who were conferencing together, helping

them see how a conference can be used to improve their writing. Serge and Armance were conferencing, and Marie listened to Serge reading his story. "She asks Serge some questions and then asks him what he must add so she and Armance can better understand the story." (field notes /teacher, June 14). Annette had written a story about snow and had circled four words for which she was unsure of the spelling. One of the words she had circled was the word "snow", a word she had, in fact, spelled conventionally. Marie encouraged her to "sound out" the words she was unsure of and directed her to look around the classroom to check and see if there was a book about snow so she could check her spelling. Annette spent the next twenty-five minutes verifying her word. She discovered that she had spelt it correctly in the first place (field notes/teacher, June 7).

Marie assumed the role of facilitator in the children's learning rather than a director of activities. She would demonstrate her literacy skills, but her approach to teaching was one of letting the children discover independently the world of reading and writing. She preferred to help students on an individual basis rather than in whole group settings. Marie tended to help the children who sought out her aid, and the kind of feedback she gave varied according to the request of the child.

The TA would ask some of the children to read to her what they had written. But most often she worked with Luc, a little boy who had great difficulty executing the kinds of activities that were offered to the other children. On one occasion, the TA spent thirty minutes with Luc helping him copy the date and five words off the blackboard into his message book (field notes/students, June 7). Luc rarely collaborated with the other children in the class, and when the TA was not working with him, he seemed to be off in his own world.

Collaboration and talk were seen as a priority as evidenced by the physical setup of the classroom with large round tables that could accommodate several students and the structural organisation of Marie's teaching which revolved around learning centres. Sometimes the children would work at the learning centres in silence, and at other times there would be some discussion. The topics of discussion varied considerably. For example, during a dispute over one of the books, two little girls discussed whom the book belonged to, who was the "boss of the book," stealing, being mean, friends and getting arrested (field notes/students, June 9). A group of children talked about monsters, the rain, Japanese writing, Mutant Ninja turtles, the Stanley Cup, how they look alike, Barney the Dinosaur, Barney Flinstone (field notes/students, June 22). On one occasion, one of the boys read some directions to another at the Newspaper Centre. They tried touching their tongue to their nose and making rolling sounds with their tongue (field notes/students, June 22). Sometimes they would discuss in a corner, at the bulletin board, under the table, or at their desks (field notes/students, June 8).

There was also discussion among the children about the writing process. These conversations provided very good examples of how Marie had encouraged the children to write for their peers. Furthermore, by reading their work to each other and conferencing, there was interaction among the students. Most often, the conference consisted of either listening to a story and not providing any feedback, or listening and making mechanical corrections. On one such occasion, Paul was conferencing with Andréa (field notes/students, June 9). She tried to help him with his spelling but he did not appreciate her suggestions. He finally accepted her correction of "please", "well," and "one" but refused to change "basketball." Then

he asked her if she had any questions. When she said no, he sighed "Oh, almost everything is wrong." "No it isn't," she assured him. She then turned to Eric who had joined the twosome. He read his story, and Andréa asked them if they wanted to listen to her chapter book. "How many pages?" they asked. Eric left, and Paul listened. Sometimes the children would try to share but were unable either because no one wanted to listen (field notes/students, June 9), or they were unable to read their invented spelling, or they had dictated their book either to Marie or the TA and were unable to read it (field notes/students, June 9). Sometimes they would ask me if I would listen to their stories and, of course, there was often a chance to share with Marie or with the TA. Jon asked me to read a page from his book about Bonkers, a TV animated character. The book had been dictated by him, and he was to illustrate it. He knew what happened in his book, but could not read the words. When I asked him to try, he made up the story with no attempt to attend to the print (field notes/students, June 9).

On a couple of occasions after the children had been working at the learning centres, Marie regrouped the whole class and asked one member from each group to share something he or she had learned (field notes/teacher: June 7, June 8 and audio-visual tape 00.42.10, June 7). This was a way of valuing the learning of the students, of encouraging them to reflect on what they had learned, and of underlining the importance of sharing knowledge. Marie also used this time to remind them about what they would be doing the next day and how to be good listeners and to make good decisions. She did not insist on the attention of all the children for this sharing; she seemed to prefer to let the children make those decisions on their own.

The third set of learning centres was based on the bubblegum theme. At the listening centre, the children were to listen to a story and draw their favourite part. In their journals, they were to make a list of the things they could do with bubblegum. By instructing the children to make a list, Marie was exposing them to another genre in writing. She reinstated the Newspaper in the Classroom centre and for the fourth centre, the children were to make as many words as possible with the word "bubblegum." Finally, they were asked to make a bubblegum booklet in which they would write any words or sentences that came to mind when they thought of bubblegum. This was a free writing activity that they would perhaps revisit at a later date as a prewriting strategy. They could write a poem, story, or bubblegum rules. Again, Marie encouraged the children to write using a variety of genres.

Jacques was excluded by his classmates in the bubblegum word group. He started crying and so did Armance. Marie asked them how they could work together so that everyone was involved. She rarely gave her ideas on how such problems could be resolved. Instead, she presented it to the children so they might solve them on their own.

4.3.4 Conferencing and Writing

The children were familiar with conferencing as it was something that Marie integrated into her language arts program. As I mentioned earlier, the children often conferenced among themselves during the time set aside for learning centres. However, Marie also held more formal conferences in the form of an author's chair. I was able to observe a lesson with the author's chair on one of my visits. In this instance, Marie intervened only to remind the children how a conference should be

held. Those that were ready to share a first draft or those that were ready to publish were eligible to read their work. Final drafts were typed by Marie or the TA, glued into a book and illustrated. The best books, according to Marie, went to the library. She reminded the children of what to look for during a sharing: things they did not understand or person-problem-solution.

Marie: You raise your hand and if he picks you, you can ask your question. Listen for person, problem, and solution. Show respect by sitting in the listening position and looking at the person. Use your group voice. (field notes/teacher, May 26)

Luc was asked to read his dictated story. He could not read it so Marie helped him. The children told him it was "cool" and it was a "good story," giving him positive feedback for his efforts. Two other children shared, and their classmates were very quiet and attentive during the readings. They were in control of the conferences, and Marie acted as a presenter for each author explaining the work that had been done on the piece since the last conference. Sometimes she would make some suggestions to the story based on the questions asked by the children. The purpose of the conference was to share writing for an audience of peers, get some feedback, and have the opportunity to revise and rework their texts.

The children also conferenced regularly during their free writing time. The conferences in these cases permitted a child to read his or her work to a peer. There was little feedback, but the children were very good listeners. If feedback did occur, it usually centred around spelling errors (field notes/students, June 9).

An activity that Marie did with the children was to develop word families.

One day, she told the children they would be working on the <un> family (field notes/teacher, May 26). She then reviewed with the <ump> family by asking them to sight read the words they had brainstormed the previous day. They did the same activity with words that have the sound <un>. One of the words that was offered and accepted was "country." Andréa was chosen to write the words on the blackboard as the children brainstormed and helped her with the spelling. The lists of words were then written on a large sheet of paper and displayed on the wall. The word families were not necessarily referred to as Marie composed messages with the students; they seemed to be developed mainly to teach the children different sounds in a non-contextualised situation.

The practice of writing together was utilized when the children wrote the message about the story they read as a group, *The Baby Beebe Bird* (field notes/teacher, May 30). They composed it together and then copied it into their portfolio. Marie asked for their help in generating the ideas and she modelled the grapho-phonemic links. On another occasion they wrote a message to the parent volunteers, thanking them for their help during the year (audio-visual tape 01.06.40, June 13). They were to copy the message from the board but were encouraged to add additional sentences. In this example, Marie has provided a model for the children that they could expand on. One little boy wanted to write, "I am stupid in school." Marie talked to him, and they talked about what he could do to make things better.

Marie made the distinction between the "kid" way to write words and the "book" way being careful not to pass judgment. She encouraged the children to sound out the words they did not know how to spell (field notes/teacher, June 13)

but would ensure all the words were spelled correctly for publication. She also used the sounding-out strategy when a child could not read a word. They were very comfortable with invented spelling, and some of them would check with the better spellers to confirm their predictions. Sometimes, however, the spelling was so invented no one, including the author, could read it. Regardless, the majority of the children seemed to enjoy the opportunities to put their ideas on paper and they did so with relative ease.

4.4 Evaluation

Marie had a file folder for each student which held his or her work. Periodically, she would go through this file to see what the child had accomplished. She also had portfolios in which the children would keep their stories and special pieces which had been taken to the publication stage. She was always interacting with the children as they worked at their centres which gave her the opportunity to observe them on task as well.

As far as reading was concerned, the list of books that the child read at home was another source of information that Marie used in her evaluation. And, she gave a phonics test before the report cards to see which sounds the children were able to identify. She said that six of her twenty-four children were non-readers and this was based on the results of the Brigance test (field notes/evaluation, June 7). The resource teacher was also involved in the evaluation process. She tested the children's ability to read in English using a passage from the Brigance test. The child read the passage and she checked the decoding skills. She used the same passage in November, February and May to check their

progress. She also asked them some questions such as "What kind of reader are you? What is your favourite book? Do you read at home?"

It seemed that Marie relied heavily on the Brigance test and the resource teacher to determine the reading ability of her students, and she relied on the children's compositions in their writing portfolios to determine their writing ability. She did not talk to me about a possible link between the two, but perhaps she made these kinds of connections when she evaluated the overall literacy of her learners.

4.5 Français

I observed four Français classes. These were scheduled after the afternoon recess so they started at about 2:05 or 2:10 and continued until the end of the school day which was 2:45. Marie started with a group activity which lasted for fifteen to twenty minutes. Afterwards, Marie decided whether they would play or finish up some work. Some children played in French but most played in English. It was interesting to note that one group of girls who were playing in French switched into English as soon as there was a conflict.

Marie tended to work on specific sentence structures or vocabulary during these lessons. For example, she played a game whereby she distributed the pictures of different zoo animals, and as each child collected his or her work he or she would say for example, "c'est un tigre." Once each child had received his or her work, she then said, "Si vous avez un animal qui aime manger les poissons," and the child holding the picture of the polar bear would answer "J'ai un ours qui aime manger les poissons." (field notes/Français, May 26). On another occasion, they did the calender (audio-visual tape 00.09.15 to 00.12.56, May 30). A picture

of a plant or animal had been placed on each day of the month. It happened to be May 30 on the day of this lesson and the children recited in unison the name of the plant or animal represented on each day from May 1 to May 30 using the structure, "C'est un ____" or "Ce sont des ____." It was mostly a group of the girls who participated in this activity. Then they worked on "hier, aujourd'hui et demain" again using the calendar. As a writing activity, Marie had put the sentence on the board, "Je t'aime papa. Bonne fête des pères. De ____" Each child received a card in the shape of a shirt and was to write the message on the card for Father's Day.

During one lesson, Marie read a poem twice using an echo technique. She read each line and the children repeated it. This was followed by miming the poem three times to ensure comprehension (audio-video tape 00.12.56, May 30). She then read a story about a chicken, and the children mimed it with her twice (audio-video tape 00.12.56, May 30). The children did not see the text; she read from a book, and they listened. Their involvement was in either repeating the sentences she recited or miming the story. Some children chose not to participate. Marie's instructional strategies in these instances were modelling and self-repetition.

Marie was also teaching the children a song for the parent volunteers (field notes/Français, June 7). She had written the words on poster paper for the children to follow. Danielle read the words with no problem and so did Richard, but the others were unable to hear his quiet voice. Marie then played the music with a taped vocal accompaniment but the children were unable to follow the words on the poster paper. For one of the stanzas, there were no words for the children to follow. Marie did not sing with them so they depended on Danielle as their model

for the pronunciation and articulation of the words. On the next day, those who thought they knew the words were to face the back wall to avoid depending on the poster sheets. The two or three children who were able to read the words turned their back on the text and because they had not yet memorized the words, no one in the class was able to sing the song. Marie did not teach the song directly; she exposed the children to the printed text and supplied the audio support for the vocals.

The work in the Français class was of a more immediate nature. Marie used self-repetition and modelling. There was little information sharing, questioning, and expansion. It appeared that long-term learning experiences were reserved for English language arts. Forty-five minutes was reserved at the end of the afternoon for French, but on my visits half of this time became a continuation of the English class - as the children would either finish work in English or play in English.

5.6 Conclusion

To conclude, I will draw some parallels between my observations in Marie's classroom and the literature on effective language instruction. First I will discuss Marie's instructional techniques for the teaching of reading followed by the role of writing in her classroom. I have decided not to look at the role of teacher talk in the case of Marie's classroom, as the bulk of my data were collected during English language arts.

Marie said she viewed the acquisition of reading as a developmental process. Some of the strategies she used to develop reading included oral reading to the children, group oral reading by the students, and students' reading of their own

writing. Rather than explicit teaching of literacy skills, Marie preferred an approach that put her in the role of facilitator. In my opinion, she more closely reflected the fourth trend that characterizes comprehension instruction according to Pearson and Fielding's (1991) categorisation, the natural process mode. The fourth trend sees the teacher as a coequal with student in a literacy community. Although it did not seem that Marie participated to the point that she would be considered a coequal, she encouraged the children to share with their peers and there was a high level of interaction among the students. Teachers who reflect the natural process mode can demonstrate their own uses of literacy tools, but they cannot tell anyone what to do or how to do it. This was very similar to Marie's style of teaching. There was very little instruction in the context of real reading. Also, classroom activities indicative of this strand put the individual student choice at the heart of comprehension instruction. In this respect, Marie gave the children choices as to whether or not they wanted to participate in the activities that she had structured.

Based on my observations and the work of Juel (1991), I would suggest that a model of reading instruction based on the scaffold construct outlined by Pearson and Fielding (1991) would be a more effective model in teaching reading. In such a model, the teacher would design activities according to the children's abilities. Children would not be asked to participate in activities that were beyond their grasp. I observed a certain amount of frustration and non-participation on the part of the children who were not able to read the books at the learning centres or follow the group-reading lessons.

Furthermore, perhaps setting aside time for individual reading would help the children develop a desire to read by engaging them in personal reading either at the

classroom library or at the learning centres. In order to help them develop their ability to read, more attention could be given to teaching strategies aimed at the different stages in reading development. These strategies include labelling objects, language experience activities, Big Books, patterned predictable text in chart stories, and practice repeated reading. Such strategies oblige the teacher to take on a more active role in directing classroom activities. As the scaffold construct suggest, the teacher determines where the learner is and intervenes to help the learner accomplish tasks he or she is unable to complete alone. In my opinion, an approach which holds the child ultimately responsible for his or her learning may enjoy success for strong students, but this approach is not as effective for all students as an approach which sees language as a communicative relationship where the adult helps the child understand as well as complete new tasks.

As far as writing is concerned, Marie used a natural process mode. This mode is characterized by generalized objectives, free writing about whatever interests the students, either in a journal or as a way of exploring a subject, writing for audiences of peers, generally positive feedback from peers, opportunities to revise and rework writing, and high levels of interaction among students. Marie tended to provide an environment which had very little structure and, on most occasions, gave the children the opportunity to make choices about their purpose for writing and the form they wished to use. Marie's approach to teaching writing was very similar to her approach to teaching reading.

Hillocks (1986) in his meta-analysis, suggests that an instructional mode which resembles Vygotsky's scaffold construct is more than twice as effective in the improvement of the quality of student writing as either a presentational mode or

a natural process mode. Based on my observations in the classroom, I would support this conclusion. It seemed to me that the children who were strong language users were able to gain some knowledge in an environment where there was little instructional intervention from the teacher. However, I believe that all the children would benefit from instruction inspired from Applebee and Langer's (1987) instructional scaffold model. Children must have something of their own to say in their writing and effective instructional tasks should be built on skills that make the structure of the activity clear and guide the students through their new learning.

This concludes my chapter describing the observations I made in Marie's classroom. Marie had said that children pass through stages in their acquisition of literacy and she saw her role as one of providing her students with a variety of activities which would enable them to move through these stages according to their interests and needs. Her approach to the teaching of literacy was based on a philosophy that put the responsibility of learning in the hands of the children. Marie did little direct teaching, rather, she gave the children the opportunity to make their own decisions regarding the kinds of learning they wanted to do. She preferred using learning centres to organize her curriculum, and the children were involved most often in individual or small group projects. The extent to which they appropriated literacy depended on the extent to which they were engaged in the activities that Marie organized for them. Although I believe a more effective language learning environment is attained using instructional scaffolding, the environment provided by Marie was also supportive of language acquisition.

Chapter Five

In this chapter, I intend to draw some conclusions about my observations in the two classrooms. In order to do so, I have decided to compare and contrast the two classrooms according to the original questions I set out to answer. In other words, I will look at the role of the teacher in each situation, her definition of how literacy is developed, the role of evaluation, the role of the children, and the extent to which they appropriated literacy. Based on my observations and the literature I have reviewed, I will then describe what I consider to be an environment conducive to language acquisition. This will be followed by a description of my views concerning the language in which literacy is introduced. Finally, I will discuss the value of the present study.

5.1 Definitions of Literacy and Roles of the Teacher

5.1.1 Definitions of Literacy

Jeanne defined a good reader as someone who was interested in the message found in the text, understands what is read without necessarily being able to decode all the words, reads with a purpose, and is not afraid to take risks. She believed the role of the teacher was to stimulate the students, direct them, and give them the tools they need to learn to read and write. In this context, Jeanne saw herself as teacher-directed but also child-centered as she directed according to the needs and interests of the children in her class. Marie also defined a good reader as someone who can understand, discuss, and critique what he or she has read. She viewed reading as being developmental; all children pass through certain stages and

her role was to ensure she employed the correct teaching strategies according to where the learner was on a learning continuum.

So while they both spoke of the importance of comprehension, the ideas of reading with a purpose, taking risks and being interested in books seemed more explicitly important to Jeanne. Jeanne talked of "tools" necessary to the acquisition of literacy and her role in ensuring the children became literate. Marie saw the acquisition of literacy as being a natural passing from one stage to another. She was concerned about presenting the appropriate teaching strategy and providing students with activities based on their personal interests so they could move from one stage to the other on their own. In this sense, she seemed to be less teacher-directed and favoured an approach which placed the acquisition of literacy in the hands of the children.

5.1.2 Role of the Teacher: Jeanne

Jeanne's teaching style for reading comprehension was indicative of her definition of the development of literacy. She tended to use direct instruction in whole group activities making allowances for individual needs within this kind of a setting. In this context, the children participated in activities such as choral readings, singing, mime, discussion, and reader's theatre. The children not only participated in whole group activities, but they also worked collaboratively in small groups. She had time set aside whereby the children were able to read individually, draw or write, or play literacy games. She seemed aware at all times what each learner in her classroom was doing and she structured the activities according to her observations of their needs and interests. Her teaching style for reading

comprehension was based on a scaffold construct.

One of Jeanne's principle concerns in her teaching was comprehension, be it oral comprehension or written comprehension. She used authentic children's literature as a springboard for most of her literacy instruction. All subsequent activities hinged on the children's understanding of the story or poem. The use of gestures, mime, reader's theatre, and illustrations were all used to achieve this goal. In these situations, Jeanne would develop a purpose for reading and ensure all the children understood what they were reading without necessarily being able to decode all the words. The children were in a secure environment as the readings were always done as choral readings or in pairs unless a child offered to read individually. Jeanne would ensure that, if she directed a question at a particular student, the child was able to respond to it. So, even if some students were not able to read the text on their own, they were invited to participate in reading at no great risk to their self-esteem. They were challenged but not beyond their capabilities.

Once Jeanne was confident the children understood what was being read, she would draw their attention to specificity of the language be it syntax, phonics, or semantics. In the context of the story or poem they were reading, she might work on some of the phonic sounds or an aspect of French grammar. She might brainstorm with the children to develop their vocabulary. Most often she would make links with the children's previous knowledge enabling the learners to make connections between new concepts and old ones. Jeanne's purpose in drawing attention to the specifics of the language was to provide the children with some of the decoding tools necessary to read and write. This was always done orally in a

group setting and in the context of a text that had been read and understood by all the participants.

Jeanne was also very concerned with developing oracy in the second language. This was achieved through choral readings, individual readings, singing, discussion, and reader's theatre. Singing and choral reading were two predominant activities in Jeanne's classroom. Often the children would break out into song at the mention of a particular word and delighted in singing from the songbooks Jeanne had prepared for them. She was very particular about the children's pronunciation and insistent that they use what knowledge they had of the French language to communicate their ideas. She taught them how to listen and would often ask them to explain in their own words or gestures what they had understood. She also capitalized on opportunities to develop their vocabulary and to repeat the new vocabulary in a variety of contexts. The children's development of oracy was less structured when they were working in small groups but at no time did Jeanne ask them not to talk or to quiet down.

Jeanne incorporated writing using the trade books the children had read to model new stories. As a group they would rewrite stories and the children would then transfer the stories into Big Book formats or individual books. The children were free to write their own stories using the same model. The students also kept a personal dictionary of the words they chose based on those they knew how to spell. During my visits, there was little writing done on the children's own initiative and as a result, Jeanne did not use their personal writing as a source of reading material. She developed the concepts of plot, characterisation, and setting in a group setting. She taught the mechanics of spelling, grammar, and punctuation as she wrote with

the children. She also brought their attention to the specifics of the language in the context of a group reading session.

The importance she placed on reading was exemplified not only by the kinds of activities she directed during the *Français* class, but also by the fact that the children read to themselves every morning for fifteen or twenty minutes. All but two or three of the children were reading and decoding story after story during that time. And those who were not yet decoding were reading the pictures and every so often, reading some words. Everyone seemed to be on task and on occasion they would ask Jeanne if they could continue after the bell rang to start the day. She had accomplished one of her goals, and that was that the children take pleasure in books, even those who could not decode all the words. It was reassuring to Jeanne and me to hear all those voices reading aloud to themselves or talking about what they had just read.

As I observed in Jeanne's classroom, I was able to see how her definition of the development of literacy was supported by her role as teacher, particularly in the area of reading and oral development. Her teaching strategies were teacher-directed, and yet her choice of activities and her use of observation and interaction with the students pointed to a style which permitted the child to perform tasks that were just beyond their reach. She ensured that the children understood what they read, read with a purpose and were not afraid to take risks. She extended her comprehension activities so that the children could acquire some of the tools necessary to read and write in their second language. And she scheduled time for all the learners in her class to work individually or in small groups to practice their newly acquired ability and to develop a joy for reading. This was possible as all the

children were able to enjoy success in their endeavours.

5.1.3 Role of the Teacher: Marie

Marie was far less directive than Jeanne in her teaching style. She tended to favour learning centres and, as a result, the children spent most of their time in a less structured environment. In these situations, Marie chose the groups and assigned the centres but the children were free to participate if they chose to do so.. When Marie did regroup the children, they listened to a story, read from their readers and wrote a group message based on their reading, listened to instructions about the learning centres, or did some phonics work. There was very little direct instruction in these situations except for the writing of group messages and the brainstorming for the phonics families. Generally, the children directed the choral reading and listened as Marie read books to them. She saw her role as a one of providing activities that she felt would be of interest to the children.

For the most part, the children worked individually. Although they were in small groups at the learning centres, they most often completed the tasks on their own, asking either Marie or one of their friends for help if they needed it. Marie tended to move from child to child responding to specific needs rather than the needs of the group as a whole. Because most of the tasks at the learning centres involved writing, the acquisition of literacy was very dependent on the ability of the child to write and to discover for him or herself how to become literate. The children were responsible for their own learning. Her teaching style seemed more similar to what Hillocks (1986) described as the natural process mode.

While Jeanne used the reading of children's literature as a springboard for her

literacy activities, Marie used themes to organize her lessons with process writing as being the driving force behind her literacy instruction. She used a published reading series and trade books to teach reading and writing and, her main resource for literacy acquisition came from the children's own writing. Sometimes Marie was specific about the writing objectives, but more often the children had many opportunities to write freely on topics that she may suggest or they may choose. On occasion, these compositions would be taken to the published stage.

Marie directed the children in as much as she organized the centres, assigned the groups and chose which group would go to which centre. The rest of the decisions were basically up to the children. There was little, if any, direct instruction in a group setting and those individual students who sought out help may have found it from either Marie or one of their peers. Even with individual children, Marie did not appear to use much direct instruction. The stimulus for learning was provided for the children, and they were ultimately responsible for their learning. They worked according to their abilities and to their stage of development on the continuum she used. This was indicative of Marie's definition of literacy. She believed that all children passed through stages in the acquisition of literacy and that her role was to ensure she used the appropriate teaching strategies which would enable them to move from one stage to the next. Although the continuum she used had a variety of teaching strategies, my visits did not give me the opportunity to see many teaching strategies. She did not speak of her role in providing the "tools" necessary in the acquisition of literacy. Rather, she spoke of the kind of environment that allows the children to move along a learning continuum at their own pace and on their own accord. Particularly in the area of reading, she

saw her role primarily as someone who demonstrates literacy, not as someone who tells the children what to do or when to do it.

So, although Marie and Jeanne both agreed that children pass through stages in the development of literacy and that each child may be at a different stage which must be respected by the teacher, they also held very different opinions concerning their roles as teachers. Jeanne saw the teacher as playing an important *directive* role in providing the children with certain tools necessary to learn to read and write. She differentiated her teaching so that each learner in the class could participate in literacy acts. Marie, on the other hand, preferred to give the children the decision-making powers in their development of literacy. Her responsibility was to provide a rich language environment in which the children could acquire language according to their interests and needs without direct instruction from the teacher. Marie seemed to be less concerned with providing learning situations that were directed at specific needs; she preferred to establish more general objectives and let the children work according to their abilities.

5.2 Evaluation

Both Jeanne and Marie supported the idea that children develop at their own rate and that the evaluation should respect the individuality of each learner. As far as reading was concerned, Jeanne said she evaluated children according to where they were in their own reading development. They could be emergent readers, readers ready to take risks, or there might be those who were starting to decode. The strategy she most often used was observation. Whether the children were doing individual work, working in pairs or as a whole group, she always seemed to

be aware of their learning. In group settings, she watched the children as they read in unison. When they were at their desks reading together, she watched to see that the strips of paper they used to keep their place on the page moved down as their reading progressed. She would circulate during individual reading to listen to the children read and see what books they were choosing. On one occasion she tested small groups of children asking them to write words in order to check their grapho-phonemic skills. She designed the test and formed the groups according to the children's abilities. For Jeanne, evaluation seemed to rest predominantly on her observations of the children as they worked alone or as they interacted with her or with their peers in a variety of settings: whole group, small group, and individual. As Jeanne's writing instruction generally put the children in a whole group setting in which they composed with Jeanne, her evaluation of writing was based primarily on their ability to contribute orally to the language experience activity.

Marie also spoke of children moving through stages in reading and writing. Her main source of evaluation was observation of the children in the learning centres, their written artifacts, and published reading tests. The writing portfolios and journals contained the results of the children's efforts at the different learning centres. Marie said she reviewed them at regular intervals in order to evaluate her students' progress. Not only did Marie use portfolios and journals to evaluate her students, she also evaluated them as she moved from student to student as they worked in learning centres. In these cases, it would be the children who asked for help who would benefit from Marie's feedback, and the kind of help they sought generally involved some aspect of writing. The TA was usually responsible for those two or three children who were having the most difficulty, helping them

complete tasks that had been designed by Marie.

Marie was more dependent on outside resources for the instruction and evaluation of reading. She used a published reading series to teach reading and a published test to evaluate it. When I was observing, it was the resource teacher who was responsible for evaluating the children's reading ability, and she did so using the Brigance test. Marie gave them a phonics test as well. For those children who were able to write or who could read their invented spelling, Marie used their compositions to teach reading. Although she read trade books daily to the children, she did not use them as a tool to develop either oracy or literacy. In large group settings, there was little teacher-student interaction, and Marie did not seem to use these occasions to evaluate her students. When the children were engaged in a group reading session, there were often many who chose not to participate. There was not a scheduled time during the day for silent reading, and I did not see any student reading individually other than those who were able to read the materials at some of the learning centres. It was difficult to see how she evaluated the children's reading ability on a day-to-day basis.

Both Jeanne and Marie used observation as their primary source of evaluation. The kinds of literacy acts that were observed and the context in which the observations took place depended on the teaching strategies and objectives of the two teachers. Jeanne tended to observe and evaluate in large group, small group, or individual situations watching for the children's ability to comprehend whether they be listening, speaking, reading, or writing. Marie observed primarily in small groups or individual situations. Her observations were based primarily on the children's ability to write, and she used their writing portfolios as a source of

information. She supplemented her evaluation of their reading ability with the published test, Brigance.

5.3 Role of the Children and the Extent to Which They Appropriated Literacy

Jeanne's teaching style engaged the children in activities that were orchestrated primarily by her. She used direct instruction, and the children participated actively whether they were in a group or individual setting. They had little to do with the decision making in the classroom other than providing Jeanne with information to plan the curriculum. The children were always in a learning situation which guaranteed them success. Her primary goals were to develop oracy in the second language, to teach the children how to read, to ensure that the children understood what they read, and to instill in them a joy for books.

Based on my observations, Jeanne was very successful in achieving her goals. All her students were competent oral language users and comfortable in their second language setting. They invariably spoke to Jeanne in French. When they were involved in an activity that required French as the language to solve the problem, they were capable of performing the task. Examples of these activities were the Big Book games that Jeanne had developed or a writing activity or a reading activity. When they were involved in activities that did not necessarily require the French language, they would still communicate in French but would also at times resort to their first language. These occasions occurred when, for example, they were illustrating or free playing. They were comfortable to recount stories in their second language, participate in discussions, make jokes, and share their feelings.

Jeanne's students were also well on their way to becoming independent readers. While the majority of her learners could decode simple texts, those who were not yet at that stage were, according to Jeanne, a month or two away from that breakthrough. All the children enjoyed reading and looking at books as was evidenced by their keen interest during the personal reading time. It is more difficult to determine to what extent they developed the ability to write as there were fewer opportunities for them to be engaged individually in writing activities.

Marie's goals involved creating a learning environment that was interesting and which enabled the students to progress at their own speed in their acquisition of literacy. The role of the children was to participate to the best of their ability in the activities that interested them. As a result, they had a greater role to play when it came time to decide whether or not they would participate in an activity. Marie, like Jeanne, was still responsible for designing the activities. There was, however, one main difference. Jeanne ensured the participation of her learners by differentiating her teaching and her activities according to the needs of individual students. As a result, each student was capable of completing the task she had designed, and she ensured that they did so. Marie on the other hand, preferred to develop a variety of activities for all the children to complete, regardless of their stage of development. As a result, there were some activities which were too advanced for certain learners. In these cases, learners would not participate, and Marie would not insist that they do so. The children in Marie's class had more control over the extent to which they were engaged in literacy activities.

Marie's learners were given many opportunities to express themselves as writers and most of them seemed quite confident in this medium. Some of the

children were able to write stories using plot, characterisation, and setting. Others were working at composing a sentence or learning to copy words from the blackboard. There was little opportunity to determine their reading abilities apart from the few occasions that some of the children would read their written compositions or would lead the whole class in choral reading from their readers. Those who were unable to write or unable to read their invented spelling did very little reading that I could observe.

To summarize, the role of the children in both classes was quite different. In Marie's class, the children had more voice with regards to their participation in Marie's suggested literacy acts and more responsibility in their acquisition of literacy. In Jeanne's class, the children had fewer decisions to make and the literacy acquisition was aided through direct teaching. As far as the appropriation of literacy is concerned, it was evident that Jeanne's students were well on their way to becoming independent readers and yet, it was less clear where they were in terms of independent writing. In Marie's class, the children seemed comfortable with writing although they were at very different stages of development, and it is not clear to what extent they were able to read.

5.4 Abilities in *Français*

Although I did not collect much data in Marie's *Français* class, I was able to observe on five occasions. It was very apparent that the children in Marie's class in grade one were nowhere nearly as competent as Jeanne's children in the French language. Jeanne's children used their second language with relative ease and for a variety of purposes. They were able to participate in collaborative activities,

teacher-led activities and social activities using their second language to learn literacy and oracy and to develop concepts and construct new knowledge. Marie's children were still at a very early stage in their second language acquisition. Based on the kinds of activities I observed in Marie's *Français* class, it appeared they were able to understand orally the second language but their oral communication skills were limited to repeating structures that were developed by Marie using strategies such as self-repetition and modeling. I saw no evidence of Marie's students reading in French.

It seems to me there are several plausible explanations for this contrast: the children in Jeanne's class were in a total French environment with no scheduled time for English language arts, Jeanne is francophone and very proficient in French, one of Jeanne's primary goals in her classroom was to develop the children's second language, and her teaching strategies did not simply expose the children to the language but rather put the children in authentic communicative situations whereby they could use the language to learn. In other words, by using the French language to develop literacy, not only were the children learning how to read and write, they were using their literacy in the second language to develop their oracy in the second language. Furthermore, because of the rapidity with which they gained communicative skills in their second language, they were already able to use their French to construct knowledge. And finally, their ability to use their second language to construct knowledge improved their competency. It is hardly surprising then, that Jeanne's students were more competent second language users than Marie's students.

The facility with which Jeanne's students spoke French as well as their

success in reading had a great impact on my point of view with regards to the language of initial literacy instruction. I became more and more aware as the study evolved, of the importance of effective language instruction and of the role literacy plays in the development of oracy.

5.5 A Language-Rich Learning Environment

My observations in these two grade one French immersion classrooms as well as my review of the literature about effective language instruction leads me to draw some conclusions regarding ideal environments for language learning. I think a model of instruction based on Vygotsky's theory of instructional scaffolding where the adult is directly involved in helping the child complete new tasks that he or she would be unable to complete alone is more effective than either a strictly presentational mode or a natural process mode. In the presentational mode (Hillocks, 1986), children do not have the opportunity to create their own purposes for learning, and they do not take ownership of their learning. In the natural process mode (Hillocks, 1986), the children's learning depends on their ability to cope with little intervention from the teacher. This can be very frustrating, stagnating, and time consuming. Basing instruction on a scaffold construct (Hillocks, 1986; Pearson and Fielding, 1991; Applebee and Langer, 1987) means the teacher must define clear and specific objectives, ensure that the children have a voice in their learning, build on the child's previous knowledge, engage the students in collaborative learning situations, help the child toward new learning, and give them the opportunity to reinvest their new knowledge in new contexts.

Providing the children with direct instruction in reading via Big Books,

language experience charts, patterned rhymed text, and giving them the opportunity to practice their reading either by using reciprocal teaching, repeated reading, paired reading, or individual reading are examples of teaching strategies successful in the teaching of reading (Juel, 1991). Oral reading by the teacher is paramount, and this should be accompanied with pre-reading activities and post-reading activities (Juel, 1991; Pearson & Fielding, 1991). The use of games to reinforce vocabulary and manipulate the structure of the language is also important. Although students should have clear objectives for their writing, they must also have a voice in their choice of content and form. Furthermore, they should have the opportunity to participate in writing activities which enable them to explore their new found abilities in small group and individual settings. To develop second language competency, language must be embedded in context-rich environments which include the use of strategies aimed at developing literacy as a scaffold to develop oracy and vice versa. Again, these activities should be determined according to the needs and abilities of the individual student and instruction should be in consequence of this evaluation.

Not only does the research cited support instruction based on a scaffold construct, but my observations in the two classrooms also support an approach which directly involves the adult in helping the child complete new tasks. The kinds of practices that Jeanne implemented in her classroom to develop literacy and oracy were characteristic of instruction based on Vygotsky's theory of instructional scaffolding. The success her children enjoyed in the acquisition of language seems to provide qualitative evidence that such an approach is conducive to a very effective language learning environment.

5.6 In Which Language Should Literacy Be Introduced

When I think back on my original question, in which language should reading be introduced, I realize the issue is more complex than simply deciding on a language of instruction. My initial hunch, before I began the study, was that literacy should be taught in the child's first language. Now I am of the opinion that the language of instruction is secondary to the most important consideration and that is the strategies the teacher employs to teach literacy in the classroom. Furthermore, the issue cannot be resolved without reflecting on the goal of immersion programs: to develop second language proficiency.

A teacher who understands how language is acquired and is able to effectuate the appropriate teaching strategies according to the needs of the children in his or her classroom, is able to empower the children with language, whether it be the first language or the second language. The effectiveness of the teacher takes precedence over the language of instruction regardless of the abilities of the learners. In other words, even if the learner is at a very early stage of literacy development, he or she will benefit more from an effective teacher in a second language classroom than from a less effective teacher in a first language context.

In the hypothetical situation that the learner could be placed in one of two classrooms in which both teachers were equally effective, should literacy be introduced in the child's first language or in the child's second language? In an attempt to answer this question, we might consider the nature of literacy development and the goal of the immersion school, that is, to develop learners who are functionally bilingual.

Provincial policy in Manitoba stipulates that children attending French

immersion programs be exposed to seventy-five minutes of instruction in English language arts every day starting in grade one. The reasoning behind this policy is twofold. First, it supports the opinion of reading experts who suggest that children should learn to read in their first language and secondly, it allows the children time to develop oracy before they are exposed to literacy instruction in French in grade two. It is the latter of these two justifications that merits a closer look.

To what extent can oracy in the second language be developed without integrating some level of literacy? Research suggests literacy and oracy can be developed simultaneously, backstrapping each other to build a more meaningful and efficient scaffold for language acquisition. Oracy need not be taught to the exclusion of literacy and in fact, instruction in literacy could enhance oral competency. Observing in Jeanne's classroom where oracy and literacy were being developed in the second language gave me the opportunity to see how the children were able to benefit from this kind of approach. She used literature to develop not only the children's ability to read and write, but also to develop their listening and speaking skills in the second language. In this way, she was able to create a rich linguistic environment in which the children became competent language users.

Jeanne also commented on the role literacy plays in the development of oracy. In the past, she had been a strong advocate of children learning to read and write in their first language. However, with the recent trends in early language education which promoted integrating language across the curriculum and teaching language as a whole rather than as separate skills, she had changed her way of thinking. For Jeanne, integrating the second language in all the classroom activities facilitated language learning and made for very strong second language users. This

approach not only provided more "time on task" in the second language, it gave them a richer environment in which they could explore a variety of activities in French. The second language became not simply a content area but rather a means for learning.

Once the children learn to read in their second language, they quickly transfer this learning to their first language. My five years experience as a grade two English language arts teacher in two French immersion schools in which the children were exposed to literacy in French in grade one suggests that while many children arrive in grade two already able to read and write in their first language, it is a matter of a month or two before the other children have transferred their literacy abilities in French to English.

I do not believe there is a simple answer to the question of the language of initial literacy instruction just as there is not a simple test to compare students who have been exposed to English in grade one with those who have not been exposed to English in grade one. Each learning community is to some extent unique. The needs and interests of the children vary to form a mosaic unique to each classroom. The teacher's definition of language acquisition, his or her teaching strategies, the teacher's experience, the number of children in the classroom, the school environment, and the resources available are but a few of the elements which contribute to the complexity of the issue. The goals of the parents, child, teacher, school, and government policy with regards to second language competency play a role. The involvement of the parents in the children's education both at home and at the school are important. Any attempt to resolve the question must analyse the issue in all its complexity.

5.7 Closing Remarks

I see three principle values of the present study. Firstly, I think it is interesting that the present qualitative study supports work that has been done by quantitative researchers. Based on his meta-analysis, Hillocks (1987) describes the scaffold construct as a mode of instruction most successful for the improvement of the quality of writing. Pearson and Fielding (1991) suggest a similar trend in the area of reading instruction and Tardif (1994) and Lavallée (1990) describe a scaffold model for second language acquisition. My data, collected through qualitative methods, support such a model of instruction. According to my observations, teachers who provide structured instructional scaffolding for their students provide more effective learning environments than teachers who do not provide this kind of support.

Secondly, this study categorizes a variety of instructional models and describes what this author believes to be an effective language learning environment: a model of instruction based on Vygotsky's theory of instructional scaffolding. This model is defined and explained in terms of teaching strategies in the fields of reading, writing, and second language acquisition. Furthermore, the detailed description of the pedagogical practices of the teachers in two classrooms which are both supportive of literacy could be helpful to other teachers who would be interested in reading how different instructional models are played out in the classroom. Practitioners in early French immersion classrooms may find this useful in planning their curriculum or reflecting on their teaching strategies or theory of learning.

Perhaps the greatest value of this present study resides in the new questions

that arose during the course of my research. Some of these questions revolve around the role of the teacher. For example: What kinds of teaching approaches are most suitable when initial literacy instruction is to be carried out in French? Are they the same as those which are most effective if initial literacy instruction is in the child's first language? How can writing be used to teach reading and how can reading be used to teach writing in second language? How can literacy be used to support the development of oral language?

Other questions deal with the transfer of literacy skills from one language to another: Do children translate at the outset of their second language learning? If so, at what point do the children stop translating and start using their second language to learn? Does learning to read and write in the second language speed up the process?

A final set of questions has to do with the effects on the children when initial reading instruction is introduced in French: Are children who learn to read and write in French better able to use French in a variety of contexts for a variety of purposes than those who learn to read and write in English? Do children who learn to read in French enjoy reading more or less than those who learn to read in English; Do they have a lesser aversion for reading in French? Are there some children who would benefit to a greater extent by learning to read in their first language and others who may benefit more by learning to read in their second language? How would these children be identified? What kinds of literacy activities take place in the homes of children who attend French immersion schools?

This study helps reveal the complexity of the issue of language of literacy instruction in early French immersion classrooms. Answers to the aforementioned

questions would certainly help educators make sound decisions regarding the education of the children attending French immersion programs. The question, in what language should initial literacy be introduced, is a question that scratches at the surface of a phenomenon which is complex and dependent on many variables. Research is far from definitive and recent concern at national *Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers* conferences as well as a proliferation of studies at the provincial level attests to the ongoing debate on this question. My opinion made an about face during the course of this study. My knowledge of the reading process had led me to suspect that literacy should be introduced in the child's first language. However, based on my observations in two early French immersion classrooms, I have now come to believe that the effectiveness of the teacher is the most important consideration when discussing the language of literacy instruction, particularly in light of the role literacy can play in the development of competent second language users.

REFERENCES

- Applebee, A.N. & Langer, J.A. (1987). *How writing shapes thinking: A study of teaching and learning*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Alberta Education Department. (1992). *Language of testing study report*. Edmonton, AB: Author.
- Brassard, V. (1990). *Parents of students in French immersion and English programs: A comparative study*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta.
- Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers. (1995). *Introducing English language arts in early French immersion*. Nepean, ON: Carleton Board of Education.
- Carey, S. (1991). The culture of literacy in majority and minority language schools. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 47, 950-971.
- Clay, M. (1982). *Observing young readers: Selected papers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M. (1987). *The early detection of reading difficulties* (3rd ed.). Hong Kong: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Clay, M. (1991). Child development. In J. Flood, J. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (pp.40-46). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Cornaire, C. (1991). *Le point sur...La lecture en didactique des langues*. Anjou, QC: Centre éducatif et Culturel Inc.
- Cummins, J. (1977). Delaying native language reading instruction in immersion program: A cautionary note. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 34, 46-49.
- Darcy, N. (1953). A review of the literature on the effects of bilinguagism upon the measurement of intelligence. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 82, 21-57.
- Donaldson, C. (1989). *A comparison of the French and English reading skills of grade four students enrolled in two French immersion programs*: Unpublished master's thesis, Simon Fraser University.
- Dowhower, S.W. (1987). Effects of repeated reading on second-grade transitional readers' fluency and comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 22, 109-118.
- Downing, J. (1984). A source of cognitive confusion for beginning readers: Learning in a second language. *The Reading Teacher*, 37, 366-370.

- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Edwards, H. (1989). Literature review. In Halsall, N. *Immersion/regular program study*. Nepean, ON: Carleton Board of Education.
- Fillmore, L. & Valadey, C. (1987). Teaching bilingual learners. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (Third Edition.) New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Glesne, C. & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Genessee, F. (1979). Acquisition of reading skills in immersion programs. *Foreign Language Annals*, 12, 71-78.
- Goodman, K. (1973). Psycholinguistic universals in the reading process. In F. Smith (Ed.), *Psycholinguistics and Reading*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Graves, D. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Gruter, H. M. (1989). *Case study explorations of second language writing development in early French immersion grade one students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa.
- Harste, J.C., Woodward, V.A., & Burke, C.L. (1984). *Language stories and literacy lessons*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Hillocks, G., Jr. (1986). *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching*. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and NCRE.
- Hudelson, S. (1984). Kan yu ret an rayt in Ingles: Children become literate in English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18, 221-238.
- Juel, C. (1991). Beginning reading. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, R. Mosenthal, & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Volume II* (pp. 759-788). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Lambert, W. (1975). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In A. Wolfgang (Ed.), *Education of immigrant students*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Lambert, W. (1977). Effects of bilingualism on the individual. In P. A. Hornby (Ed.), *Bilingualism: Psychological, social, and educational implications*. New York: Academic Press.

- Lambert, W. & Tucker, G.R. (1972). *Bilingual education of children. The St. Lambert experiment*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Lavallée, B. (1990). *Teacher talk: The role of language and paralinguistics in a French immersion kindergarten*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta.
- Modiano, N. (1968). National or mother language in beginning reading: A comparative study. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 2, 32-43.
- Pearson, D. & Fielding, L. (1991). Comprehension instruction. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, R. Mosenthal, & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Volume II* (pp. 815-860). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Peal, E., & Lambert, W. (1962). The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs*, 76, 1-23.
- Rigg, P. (1981). Beginning to read in English the LEA way. In C.W. Twyford, W. Diehl, & K. Feathers (Eds.), *Reading English as a second language: Moving from theory* (pp.81-90). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Rosier, P. (1977). *A comparative study of two approaches of introducing initial reading to Navajo children: The direct method and the native language method*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff.
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1982). *Evaluating bilingual education: A Canadian case study*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Swain, M. (1974). French immersion programs across Canada. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31, 117-129.
- Tardif, C. (1994). Classroom teacher talk in early immersion. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50, 466-481.
- Tardif, C. (1991). Quelques traits distinctifs de la pédagogie d'immersion. *Études de linguistique appliquée*, 82, 39-51.
- Uzura, C. (1987). "You stopped too soon:" Second language children composing and revising. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 279-304.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and language*. (E. Hanfmann & G. Vakar, Trans.). Cambridge: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

APPENDIX A

Interviews with Jeanne

A.1 Interview with Jeanne: March, 1994

Jeanne: On avait commencé l'histoire des trois petits cochons, c'est une histoire qu'ils connaissent, alors je l'avais écrite tout simple disons pour qu'ils puissent la jouer parce que je voulais faire les pièces de théâtre, parce qu'ils aiment ça ce groupe, ça dépend des groupes, ils aiment ça jouer avec des marionnettes. Alors j'ai commencé l'histoire des trois petits cochons mais quand c'est arrivé que le loup a mangé le petit cochon, ils n'ont pas aimé ça. Ils ont dit non madame. Ce n'est pas comme ça. Il y a en avait un qui disait non madame il ne faut pas qu'il mange le cochon. Alors j'ai dit qu'on va la réécrire d'une différente façon. Je trouve que c'est bien ça. Alors on a composé et ils ont chacun une copie que je leur ai donnée hier et on est juste prêt à commencer ce genre de chose là. Alors on l'a lue ensemble quelques fois, il y a un narrateur. Ici les enfants vont illustrer après.

Gestny: Alors les enfants sont capables de lire tout ça?

Jeanne: J'aimerais qu'ils te la lisent cet après-midi. Oui, ils sont capables de la lire parce qu'on a lu l'histoire quelques fois, c'est une histoire vraiment familière mais en même temps j'insiste pour la prononciation, to get the flow, la fluidité...Mais on a fait des corrections. Tu sais quand tu écris quelque chose vite comme ça quand on a commencé à la faire ensemble il y a un qui a dit oh non, le loup ne peut pas dire ça parce qu'il y a deux petits cochons. Alors on l'avait changée, j'avais dit "ce petit cochon s'est échappé." Ils ont dit non il y a deux petits cochons qui se sont échappés. Alors ils peuvent venir à vraiment comprendre. Alors c'est ça cette histoire. Après ça, ce qu'ils vont faire eux-mêmes ils vont être capables de faire leur petite pièce sans s'occuper du livre mais ils vont avoir le vocabulaire.

Gestny: Alors le script va être spontané.

Jeanne: Oui ils vont avoir le vocabulaire. On va faire ça pour commencer ce matin. Par après, ils aiment bien faire ça, surtout l'histoire comme ça. On a fait l'histoire du petit singe.

Gestny: D'où viennent tes idées pour faire ça?

Jeanne: Ah bien, ça fait longtemps. Pause. Ils aiment bien faire ça. Même faire la patte, la queue, et après ils les avaient accrochées eux-mêmes. Ici les ovales sont tracés, mais juste l'affaire de placer les yeux au milieu. C'est intégrer le dessin, je veux dire le bricolage, ce n'est pas le dessin, c'est le bricolage...Ici, on avait pris une histoire à l'école puis après on a dit au gymnase, je veux qu'ils apprennent certaines structures comme au gymnase je fais ceci je fais cela, dans la classe, ils font la peinture pour

commencer, ensuite ils vont parler et moi j'ai écrit pour eux autres sur un bout de papier et ils l'ont recopié. Au gymnase je joue au hockey, je cours en zigzag....dans la classe je suis triste parce que personne ne veut jouer avec moi. C'était vrai cette fois là...je fais des maths, je regarde un film, je joue au outerspace...Chaque phrase est différente. Ça c'est une autre chose qu'on a fait en hiver, on a fait des poèmes.

Gestny: C'est toi qui a écrit ça?

Jeanne: Ce sont des poèmes qu'on a écrit et les enfants ont appris à les réciter. Mais c'est une drôle de chose parce que ils prennent la même...souvent après ça quand ils veulent faire des phrases ils sortent des expressions comme ceci... bonhomme de neige tu as l'air content. Des fois quand ils se parlent ils vont dire tu as l'air triste, tu as l'air content, tu vois alors ça c'est bien.

Gestny: Alors dans ce cas là c'est la lecture qui appuie l'oral.

Jeanne: Ah oui. Mais moi je trouve, pour qu'ils soient capables de parler il faut qu'ils aient plus que juste écouter.

Gestny: Alors tu as la lecture comme un appui à l'oral pas nécessairement l'oral un appui à la lecture.

Jeanne: C'est les deux. Et même l'écrit aussi.

Gestny: Est-ce que tu vois ça beaucoup dans l'écrit?

Jeanne: Mais ça nous avons commencé seulement au mois de février alors ils se trouvent les mots maintenant. On est à faire des dictionnaires aussi. Ah oui, ça c'est un autre petit livre qu'on a fait, *Regarde moi*, ça c'est son écriture à elle, c'est ça qu'elle voulait, je vais à cheval, elle a trouvé tout seul, je ne sais pas où elle l'a trouvé, faire des splits, elle m'a demandé, regarde moi je fais, regarde moi je vais...on n'a pas eu le temps de continuer parce que la semaine dernière on a eu St.Valentin. C'est ça le dictionnaire, on a appris un peu l'alphabet, puis depuis quelques semaines seulement, ils trouvent des mots qu'ils veulent. Au lieu d'avoir une banque de mots ailleurs, ils mettent leurs mots dans leur dictionnaire, les mots qu'ils veulent. Mais là il faut que ça soit écrit correctement parce que c'est un dictionnaire, alors il faut que je vérifie, après 5 ou 6. il y en a que ça leur prend un peu plus de temps ça tient plus à ceux qui sont plus intéressés à le faire...On a toujours 3 ou 4 projets en même temps.

Gestny: C'est quoi les projets dans le moment.

Jeanne: On a le dictionnaire qui va continuer jusqu'à la fin de l'année, chaque semaine on prend un nouveau livre, on a fait beaucoup les Grands Livres tu vois.

Gestny: Ça tu fais la lecture collective, toi tu lis puis les enfants embarquent avec toi.

Jeanne: Je lis quand j'introduis une nouvelle histoire tandis que les petits cochons ils

n'ont pas eu les mots, le texte devant eux-autres, c'est moi que lisait le texte. *Le petit singe*, ils ont le texte devant eux-autres...

Gestny: Est-ce qu'ils réfèrent au dictionnaire?

Jeanne: Oui, ils viennent juste de commencer. Là c'est le temps de le faire. Tu peux pas commencer trop vite. Là maintenant ils apprennent leur alphabet, s'il y a un mot qu'ils veulent savoir, ils vont finir par le savoir. Je trouve que ça a vraiment aidé quelques-un avec l'alphabet.

Gestny: Alors tu fais un livre comme ça par semaine?

Jeanne: Au moins, je commence quelque chose de nouveau chaque semaine que ça soit un poème ou une chanson ou un livre qu'on va travailler plus...Alors qu'est-ce qu'ils font là, ça c'est des livres qu'on a déjà faits, ceux là sont les premiers qu'on a faits c'est un vieux vieux livre, ils prennent le livre, ils vont s'installer avec quelqu'un, ils commencent par lire le livre.

Gestny: Comment est-ce qu'ils ont appris à lire le livre?

Jeanne: Parce qu'on l'a fait ensemble. Ce sont des livres qu'on a travaillé, qu'on a relu et relu, mais je ne m'attends pas que tous les enfants fassent ...?mais tu vas voir que c'est surprenant. Il y en a qui commencent à savoir les premiers livres qu'on a fait, ils y en a d'autres qui les savaient à mesure. Il y en a d'autres qui commence juste maintenant. C'est bien. Tout ce temps là ils pensent qu'ils lisent parce qu'ils lisent avec d'autres. Ils vont lire le livre et ils font le jeu qui va avec. Chaque livre a un jeu différent...Il y en a qui sont plus faciles. Dépendant ce qu'on fait ça peut être plus compliqué ou moins compliqué. Je ne veux pas toujours faire la même chose, c'est pour ça que j'ajoute des choses.

Gestny: Alors les livres que je vois ici, les livres de bibliothèque, tu fais la lecture à haute voix?

Jeanne: Ça c'est leurs livres quand ils arrivent le matin. Ils arrivent le matin, mettent leurs chaussures, aiguisent leur crayon, et cherchent un livre de bibliothèque.

Gestny: Et puis est-ce qu'ils lisent ou feuilletent?

Jeanne: Oh tu devrais entendre ça le matin. Ça fait brrrr brrrr puis ils essaient, c'est une routine tu vois de 8h30 à 8h45. Quelques fois je les laisse un peu après...ça leur dit que la lecture est plaisante quand même. Ça les sécurise.

Gestny: Est-ce que tu lis aux enfants?

Jeanne: Tous les jours, 2 ou 3 livres par jour. Mais pas simplement les choses qu'on va travailler non plus...J'ai aussi des livres de dictionnaire c'est bon pour trouver des mots s'ils veulent trouver des mots. Les dictionnaires sont en thèmes.

Gestny: D'après vous Jeanne, c'est quoi un bon lecteur?

Jeanne: Un bon lecteur c'est quelqu'un qui est vraiment intéressé.

Gestny: Tu as des élèves dans ta classe, pourquoi tu les considères des bons lecteurs?

Jeanne: Ils comprennent ce qu'ils lisent, ils lisent pour une raison, puis aussi ils n'ont pas peur de prendre des chances, ou d'essayer, ça ne veut pas dire qu'ils connaissent tous les mots, c'est quelqu'un qui n'a pas peur d'essayer, de prendre des risques...

Gestny: Qu'est-ce qui va arriver au petit garçon là.

Jeanne: Oh lui est capable. Tu vois ça varie dans une classe, quand ça arrive le temps de copier du tableau, ce n'est pas son fort, en mathématiques ah ça c'est différent. Il va refaire son travail après, peut-être quand je donne du travail aux autres, lui c'est ça qu'il va faire. Il y a des choses que j'insiste qu'il fasse. Tu vois quand on a fait son histoire à lui, il savait que j'étais pour passer son histoire à la machine, tu devrais voir comment il a bien écrit ça. Des fois je passe par dessous des choses...aujourd'hui les enfants étaient fatigués, même les plus forts alors je n'ai pas insisté, je passerai mon temps à le faire...Avec les petits je ne suis pas rigide comme j'étais avant, je sais quand ils veulent, ils sont capables. S'ils n'étaient pas si fatigués, j'aurais insisté.

Gestny: Comment faites-vous l'évaluation de la lecture?

Jeanne: Je fais comme les enfants qui débutent en lecture, ceux qui commencent à prendre des risques, et ceux qui font du progrès. Je diviserais comme ça en groupe dans ma tête. Je ne compare pas les enfants, je compare des différentes habilités.

Gestny: Alors tu les groupes dépendant où ils sont rendus dans leur développement de la lecture.

Jeanne: Tu veux dire pour les bulletins toi?

Gestny: Non, pas nécessairement.

Jeanne: Je n'ai pas vraiment besoin de les évaluer. Je les évalue chaque jour quand ils travaillent, comme j'ai évalué en choisissant certains jeux pour ceux qui étaient plus faibles. L'évaluation c'est pour moi pour clarifier le genre de travail que je vais leur donner par après.

Gestny: Alors tu fais l'évaluation pour déterminer leurs besoins.

Jeanne: Oui, ça a du bon sens ça? comme pour l'écrit, ça c'est évalué okay...Je fais l'évaluation surtout par l'observation et l'évaluation me sert à choisir le genre de travail que je vais leur donner...elle explique les jeux.. Les jeux sont évalués aussi.

Gestny: Comment voyez-vous le développement de la lecture chez les enfants? Qu'est-ce que vous faites pour encourager ce développement? Que faites-vous pour les enfants qui sont en difficulté?

Jeanne: Premièrement, je prends pour acquis qu'ils ne sont pas en difficulté à moins qu'on les met en difficulté nous-mêmes. Parce qu'on crée nos problèmes. Je les prends où ils sont, et par contre, en deuxième il faut qu'ils les prennent où ils sont, ils ne peuvent pas s'attendre que tous les enfants vont lire comme un tel ou tel. Lui fait juste commencer d'être capable de suivre. J'en ai deux qui font juste commencer d'être capable de suivre. Par contre il y en a qui font dès le début.

Gestny: Alors quand tu dis suivre, quand tu lis à haute voix, ou quand les enfants lisent, il est capable de suivre avec son doigt?

Jeanne: J'aime un petit carton surtout un carton de couleur parce que je peux voir exactement si les enfants bougent. Je peux en avoir 20 puis je peux voir s'ils sont capables de suivre. J'aime moins le doigt parce que ça découpe tout de suite en mots. Je veux la fluidité. C'est pour ça qu'ils lisent avec tant de fluidité. Je ne modère jamais sauf pour certains mots comme "s'écoulerais" je veux qu'ils le disent comme il faut. On ne peut pas simplifier l'histoire tout le temps! Pour eux-autres, ce n'est pas plus difficile un mot comme ça que...

Gestny: Alors tu les prends où ils sont puis tu suis leur développement en faisant de la lecture.

Jeanne: Je fais toujours la lecture collective avec le groupe tous les jours. On fait du travail comme ça tous les jours. Quand ça arrive le temps de faire les jeux, là c'est différent.

Gestny: C'est plutôt individuel?

Jeanne: Oui. Ils vont choisir les jeux. Ils vont demander de l'aide. Ils ne sont pas obligés de le faire tout seul, ils peuvent travailler avec quelqu'un d'autre, ils peuvent choisir avec qui ils veulent travailler. Et ça varie, ils vont changer. S'ils veulent vraiment faire un jeu difficile ils vont demander à quelqu'un qui va leur aider. Puis ils vont se corriger eux-mêmes! On n'appelle pas corriger tu vois, ce n'est pas des fautes qu'ils font. Ils s'entraident, ils se corrigent eux-mêmes. Ce n'est pas des fautes qu'ils font d'après eux.

Gestny: D'après toi, c'est quoi la lecture non-formelle?

Jeanne: La lecture non-formelle c'est ce qu'on a fait aujourd'hui. Je n'aime pas "informelle." Je l'emploie parce que qu'est-ce que c'est la lecture? Tu comprends le texte.

Gestny: Ce que tu as fait en français, ils font la même chose en anglais? Je ne vois

pas la différence vraiment. J'ai pensé qu'avec la lecture non-formelle, ils n'étaient pas sensé d'enseigner les sons. Mais évidemment il faut enseigner les sons parce qu'on fait la lecture et l'écriture ensemble.

Jeanne: Mais ce n'était pas juste des sons formels. Tant qu'à moi c'était plutôt de suivre une série, d'être obligé d'être rendu à une telle place.

Gestny: Et toi tu ne suis pas une série?

Jeanne: Non, par contre, les petits livres, on a utilisé beaucoup ceux là. C'est presque comme une petite série parce qu'il ya des mots qui se répètent. J'ai de la difficulté entre formelle et informelle. "Formelle" ça serait rendu au point où tu dirais l'enfant doit être capable de faire ceci avant d' aller faire cela. Mais il y en a, ça va leur prendre trois ans avant de savoir lire, et ça c'est correct.

Gestny: D'après toi, l'enfant, devrait-il apprenne à lire en français ou en anglais?

Jeanne: Si je demanderais aux enfants ici ceux qui lisent en français, il y en a trois qui m'ont dit qu'ils sont capables de lire en anglais depuis.

Gestny: Est-ce tu avais des enfants qui étaient capables de lire en anglais avant de venir en première année?

Jeanne: Je ne sais pas. J'en ai trois qui sont capables de lire en anglais maintenant.

Gestny: Alors ils ont transféré.

Jeanne: Et quand j'ai suivi le premier en deuxième au bout de la deuxième année, au bout de 2 semaines, il y avait la moitié de la classe qui lisait en anglais. Ils avaient tous appris des techniques, ils savaient ce que c'était lire, ils savaient ce que c'était des mots. Alors moi, ça ne me dérange pas comme celle là, ça simplifierait peut-être, je ne sais pas. Qu'est ce qu'on veut des enfants, je trouve que la façon qu'on enseigne la lecture ça développe l'oral plus en même temps. Je pense que ça c'est une des raisons que nos enfants parlent si bien; ils ont quand même plus de temps à le faire. Par contre on n'est pas dit de le faire formellement, alors ça nous enlève un peu la charge, parce qu'on peut le faire comme on veut. J'ai poussé un peu cet après-midi. Pour moi, j'ai toujours dit que les enfants devraient apprendre à lire dans leur langue maternelle, mais...on n'a pas le choix quand même.

Gestny: Moi aussi, mais je vois ce qui se passe. Moi je pense que beaucoup dépend du prof....

Jeanne: Tu n'as pas besoin d'être parfait, mais quand tu as de l'expérience de ce que c'est la lecture. Ce que je veux surtout ici, c'est qu'ils aiment ça. Puis ils aiment ça.

A.2 Interview with Jeanne May 30, 1994

La chanson Rap des enfants joue à l'intervox.

Jeanne présente son histoire de l'ours pour le livre collectif. Elle dit que les enfants peuvent faire le pingouin tout seul après. Ils écrivent l'histoire ensemble. Les enfants aident Jeanne avec l'épellation et le texte.

Jeanne: Tu sais, quand on dit laisser l'enfant aller à son rythme, ça ne veut pas dire qu'on ne l'encourage pas et qu'on ne le stimule pas. Il faut qu'on le dirige. Il faut être le modèle. Ce n'est pas de le laisser aller au hasard parce qu'il y en a qui apprendront jamais au hasard. Ils ont besoin de direction, ils ont besoin d'une bonne structure surtout au début. Ils ont besoin d'une certaine discipline interne, une certaine motivation interne, surtout une certaine discipline de soi. Alors les quelques enfants ici qui ne sont pas encore assez indépendants ce sont ceux qui n'ont pas assez d'attention tenace, ils n'ont pas pu tenir le coup. Ils font juste commencer maintenant.

Gestny: C'est pour ça que quand tu fais une leçon tu vas prendre ces enfants et tu vas faire des activités beaucoup plus dirigées?

Jeanne: Quand je fais une activité de lecture, j'essaie d'éclairer le passage autour. Si tu regardes autour de la classe, je n'ai pas la classe bourrée de toutes sortes de choses, des pancartes qui pendent ici, des choses qui pendent partout...

Gestny: Tu ne veux pas que ça soit trop stimulant non plus?

Jeanne: Non, tu veux que l'enfant soit capable de s'imaginer dans sa tête qu'est-ce qui se passe et tout ça. S'il est dérangé par toutes sortes de choses, tu sais qu'il y a des classes où il y a tellement de choses que même moi, je suis perdue. Il faut qu'ils apprennent à se concentrer.

Gestny: Alors toi tu trouves que c'est dangereux jusqu'à un certain point de laisser l'enfant suivre son rythme, il faut que *tu* suis le rythme, tu ne peux pas laisser l'enfant suivre le rythme tout seul.

Jeanne: Oui. Je veux dire l'enfant va se développer mais avec l'aide aussi.

Gestny parle de Vygotsky et la zone grise et le rôle du prof dans le développement de l'enfant. L'enfant n'est pas capable de développer les concepts scientifiques sans l'aide du prof.

Jeanne: Maintenant l'enfant a appris quelque chose. Maintenant il peut poursuivre faire quelques recherches. Il faut leur montrer comment faire. Et des fois je trouve que c'est bien beau, on les laisse travailler en petit groupe, mais en petit groupe en langue seconde, ils n'ont pas de modèle.

Gestny: Mais ils coupent des fois. Quelqu'un va dire, "je ne comprends pas." Ça

force l'enfant à restructurer sa phrase pour que l'autre puisse comprendre. Alors dans ce sens là, les pairs sont capables de travailler le français de leur confrères.

Jeanne: Oui mais au début de l'année c'est pas mal difficile.

Gestny: Alors, lorsque tu parles de l'enseignement, il faut que l'enfant ait une certaine direction.

Jeanne: Oui, je trouve aussi que lorsqu'on dit qu'il faut que l'enseignant soit là, ça ne veut pas dire juste physiquement, il faut qu'il soit vraiment à l'écoute de l'enfant. Ce qu'on a fait ce matin, les enfants qui pourraient faire un peu plus, mais il y en a d'autres...

Gestny: Julie était fâchée parce que quelqu'un a lu cocorico.

Jeanne: Ils veulent être motivés, ils veulent chercher quelque chose, ils ne veulent pas avoir tout mâché. Pour vraiment apprendre à lire, il faut une certaine structure, il faut se concentrer, il faut énormément d'écoute, la répétition.

Jeanne parle de la classe de musique.

Jeanne: Ils ont chanté une chanson là-bas qu'ils n'ont pas compris ce que c'était le titre. Alors on prend pour acquis des fois qu'ils connaissent. Pourtant je les ai vu mimer cette chanson. Ils ont oublié peut-être.

Gestny: Ou, peut-être le prof a fait des mimes, ils ont répété les mimes sans comprendre ce qu'ils faisaient.

Jeanne: C'est tellement important qu'ils comprennent le vocabulaire. C'est pour ça en les faisant mimer on voit s'ils comprennent ou non. On a fait beaucoup de mime au début de l'année. On fait souvent toute la classe ou lieu de choisir certains élèves.

Gestny: Est-ce que tu penses que c'était plus facile parce que tu en avais 15 ou est-ce que tu aurais fait la même chose avec plus?

Jeanne: J'aurais fait la même chose...*je n'entends pas*. On a discuté de ça hier parce que j'ai discuté mon plan de développement professionnel. J'ai dit à ma directrice que ça c'était quelque chose que je ne comptais pas faire cette année, avoir quelqu'un comme toi dans la classe. Dans le fond, je trouve que je vais profiter parce que Gestny me pose des questions comme, 'pourquoi as-tu fait ça et je réponds, 'parce que ça marche'. Et elle me demande pourquoi est-ce que ça marche? Là je suis obligée de penser pourquoi ça marche? Alors il faut quand même réfléchir, parce qu'il y a des choses et je fais comme d'habitude sans réaliser que c'est une bonne technique ou peut-être une autre technique serait mieux. Mais je pense que j'ai éliminé bien des choses qu'on faisait pour rien avant.

Gestny: Est-ce que tu as changé beaucoup?

Jeanne: Oh, j'ai éliminé bien des choses qu'on faisait. Une des choses que j'ai éliminé, une des routines, pas complètement, c'est le calendrier. Tu demandes aux enfants qu'est-ce que c'est le calendrier, il y en a qui vont dire que c'est une fiche sur le mur. Les enfants ne comprennent pas le concept de temps assez. Oui, on parle de chaque mois mais je ne passe pas une demi-heure à faire le calendrier parce que je trouve le concept quand même à cette âge là. Puis je sais que j'ai déjà vu les maternelles faire ça, tu leur demandais qu'est-ce que c'est aujourd'hui, c'est la tulipe aujourd'hui parce qu'on mettait la tulipe sur chaque jour. Ils ne comprennent pas encore qu'est-ce que c'est la journée, la semaine.

Gestny: Est-ce que tu aimes cette idée que je te pose des questions, que ça te force à réfléchir?

Jeanne: Oui, oui. Des fois j'ai un peu le bec à l'eau parce que je ne sais pas pourquoi.

Gestny: Quand tu m'as dit qu'il n'y a pas vraiment de l'enseignement dirigé comme tel, je pense que j'ai une idée de ce que tu veux dire.

Jeanne: Une autre chose, avec les tables et les enfants qui font face à tous les côtés, ça ne va pas leur aider non plus. Alors ils sont à des petites tables mais quand ça vient le temps de faire la lecture ils sont tous du bon côté pour regarder comme pour l'écriture. C'est terrible quand je vois les enfants qui essaient d'écrire, ils ont le dos là, puis le professeur écrit là-bas puis l'enfant écrit ici. C'est déjà assez difficile pour l'enfant, laisse faire transférer ça. Il faut faciliter quand même l'apprentissage.

Gestny: Tu peux pas juger un prof par l'aménagement physique de la classe.

Jeanne: C'est pour ça qu'ils vont juger un professeur fantastique parce que tu rentres, tu vois tous les centres. Peut-être ils n'observent pas assez qu'est-ce qui se passe.

APPENDIX B

Audio Tapes in Jeanne's Classroom

B.1 le 24 mai, 1994

Voices of the children...

Jeanne: Pensez dans quelle sorte de pays est-ce qu'il habite l'éléphant?

Enfants: La jungle.

Jeanne: Qu'est-ce qu'elle fait là-bas? Qu'est-ce qu'elle doit faire des fois?

Enfants: Il frappe d'autres animaux.

Jeanne: Tu penses qu'elle frappe avec sa trompe? Oui. Elle peut frapper d'autres animaux pour se défendre.

Enfants: Elle peut prendre les arbres avec sa trompe.

Jeanne: C'est vrai? Comment est-ce qu'elle fait ça?

Enfants: Elle met sa trompe autour et elle prendre...

Jeanne: Peux-tu nous montrer. Comment est-ce qu'elle fait. *Il parle.* Mets la chaise là, ça c'est un gros arbre. Qu'est-ce qu'elle fait avec.

Enfants: Elle met sa trompe autour...

Jeanne: Elle mets sa trompe où? Autour..et qu'est-ce qu'elle fait. *L'enfant a fait un geste.* Comment est-ce qu'on dit ça.

Enfants: Elle tire.

Jeanne: Elle quoi? *Tous les enfants répètent "tire."* Alors elle fait le tour de l'arbre avec sa trompe et elle tire. *Elle encourage les enfants à parler avec elle.* Est-ce qu'elle a pu arracher l'arbre?

Enfants: Il répond mais je n'entends pas.

Jeanne: Elle répète en disant qu'il y a des racines qui descendent trop bas dans la terre. Mais il y a des arbres qu'elle peut arracher?

Enfants: Oui.

Jeanne: Quoi d'autre. Merci. Elle peut arracher des arbres. Est-ce qu'elle peut faire d'autres choses avec sa trompe?

Un enfant répond mais je n'entends pas. Un autre ajoute quelque chose.

Jeanne: As-tu déjà vu ça?

Enfants: Ah oui. *Plusieurs répondent. La discussion continue.*

Jeanne: Alors ils peuvent lever quelqu'un en haut?

Enfants: Ah oui. *Ça continue.* L'éléphant habite dans un pays chaud.

Jeanne: Oui. L'éléphant habite dans un pays chaud. Dans un pays chaud, quelle sorte de végétation est-ce qu'on voit? Quelle sorte de choses qui poussent, des plantes qui poussent. Vous savez les amis, quand on fait un dessin il faut qu'on mette des plantes. Il va falloir dessiner des plantes. Quelle sorte de plantes est-ce qu'on va mettre? dans un pays chaud, dans la jungle? Quelle sorte de plantes est-ce qu'il y a?

Enfant: Un banana arbre.

Jeanne: Un arbre de bananes. Quelle sorte de feuilles est-ce qu'ils ont eux autres?

Ça continue....

Jeanne: Il y a aussi des belles couleurs dans la jungle. Quelle sont des belles couleurs?

Les enfants répondent et la discussion continue.

Jeanne: Alors quand tu fais ton dessin, il faut penser à toute ces belles choses là qui poussent dans la jungle.

Jeanne montre le Grand Livre aux élèves. Ils se mettent d'accord sur la couleur de l'éléphant. Ils lisent le livre ensemble. Ils s'arrêtent sur le son <ph>.

B.2 Audio transcript of Jeanne's class, June 8, 1994

Jeanne demande aux élèves qu'est-ce qu'ils ont appris.

Enfants: J'ai appris comment écrire, comment faire des maths, comment jouer avec les autres, j'ai appris comment bien écouter, j'ai appris à lire, je savais déjà comment écrire, ...à faire des dessins, on a appris comment écouter la personne qui parle, pourquoi est-ce que ça c'est important.

Jeanne: Qu'est-ce que ça veut dire ça, respecter les personnes.

Les réponses ne sont pas claires.

Jeanne: Est-ce que apprendre à lire se fait vite?

Enfants: Non.

Jeanne: Qu'est-ce qu'il faut faire?

Enfants: Il faut bien regarder les mots, écouter, essaie, bien ouvrir la bouche, répéter.

Les enfants sont en cercle et G. fait une discussion au sujet des fleurs et de cueillir des fleurs, un bouquet de fleurs, épouvantail... pourquoi est-ce qu'on a un épouvantail...montre moi comment faire un épouvantail.

APPENDIX C

Edited, Translated, and Categorized Data Obtained from my Observations in Jeanne's Classroom

C.1 Materials

May 12

Classroom library.

Children take home a plastic bag with two little books from the Catardi series.

Jeanne and two other teachers have made cassettes of all the books (2 books per cassette) 50 cassettes. They have the books for a couple of days. The only control is a note to parents telling them that the children should be able to read the books after listening to the tapes and following the books a few times. She notes which children have taken which books.

Rap by the grade three class over the PA system.

Message du jour over the PA system.

Rap song.

Songs printed in Big Books.

Books they have written collectively, each child contributing a page or composing the text together.

Big Books Jeanne has copied from published books.

Jeanne chooses five children to read from a reader. It was the first time they had seen multiple copies of the same book.

May 16

She has the book, *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*, on cassette read by grade one children.

Jeanne distributes blank books with spirals and photocopies of the text of *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous* spread out randomly.

They cut and rip construction paper to make their illustrations.

Jeanne plays music as they make their illustrations.

May 20

Poems written on poster paper that they have composed together based on a model.

Games that she has developed to go with her Big Books.

Scrambled words that go with the poems they have read in class.

Games stored in library pockets.

Books taped on cassettes.

May 27

Children read from a Big Book *Où est bébé éléphant?*

Children write a collective book based on the same model *Où est bébé ours?*

They have picture dictionaries that have uncoloured illustrations.

May 30

They really liked *Dot et la baleine* but were too tired to discuss it.

Photocopies of published texts they have read as Big Books.

Vocabulary games from a list Dubois-Buyse, 1ere and 1 à 6 according to Préfontaine. There are fifty-eight nouns and nine verbs.

Games with the Big Books such as bingo with simple words, with sentences, with illustrations and words, illustrated by the children of previous years, or illustrated professionally. Sometimes the vocabulary is beyond that found in the book but is in the same content area.

June 1

Words for songs written on poster paper.

June 3

The devinette book.

June 7

Big Books of *Où est bébé ours* and *Où est bébé éléphant*.

Individual copies of their collective books.

June 15

A picture of a spring scene.

A collective chart.

C.2 Teacher's role

May 12

Jeanne asks about the gym they had at 8:00 AM.

Jeanne leads discussion of rap, message du jour.

Jeanne mentions a rock-throwing incident and explains the follow-up without naming the boy.

Jeanne suggests they integrate the fact that the children gave her flowers in their rap song. "Est-ce que N dit [en] or [n]." She suggests they integrate their science project.

Jeanne asks how do I write "geais", a girl looks in a Big Book.

Jeanne chooses a song for them to sing.

"Nous avons fait des projet_" What do I need here? A child said "nous allons" so she explained the past tense and the future tense. "Des insectes, des plantes, des geais." She practices with one boy and then all together.

Jeanne directs them in a spelling game. They read the collective book page by page, and after each page they stand and face the back as Jeanne asks them questions. Spell "garçon, est, another word for "heureux," "heureuse," "oui mais un autre," "content," "le contraire à heureux," "ans," "année." She helps some children follow in their reading.

"What story did I read yesterday afternoon?" They discuss it. She had read it

twice and discussed it. She chooses a student, and they recount the story so the student acts it out. She questions the students as the story unfolds. The four seasons are written on the board. She encourages the children to participate. The activity is repeated with other children.

They read "l'hiver" after Jeanne draws their attention to the words.

Writing activity. "J'aime toutes les saisons mais je préfère ----." They can add if they want. A picture must accompany their drawing.

May 16

Jeanne reads *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous* telling the children to look carefully at the pictures. She tells them she will read the book without stopping but will ask them at the end what it is about. Each child, she says, will make a book. She reads showing the link between the text and the illustrations. She encourages them to participate in the reading of the book.

She reads with lots of expression.

She rereads the book which she has transformed into a Big Book.

She stops for certain vocabulary words, "Quelle sorte d'animal grignote?" "Que veut dire tortillant? Faites-le sans le dire en anglais."

She asks questions about the cocoon and the butterfly.

Jeanne says "les chenilles rongent, elles étirent les ailes, les ailes sèchent, le papillon voltige" as the children mime.

Jeanne sings a song about butterflies as the children "voltigent" around the class.

She sings it twice and the children join in and try to sing with her.

She asks what is "blé?" "What can we do with wheat?" "What is un "pré?"

She works with some students in small groups.

"At the beginning of the year, the children must learn to concentrate. That is the most difficult thing for them to learn to do."

Jeanne asks how their music class went.

"Qui peut trouver 'Sur une feuille...' "Que veut dire 'au clair de lune?' The children start singing *Au clair de la lune*.

Jeanne follows with her finger the lines of text for a child who cannot read.

She directs them in French, where to paste the page. They must follow the directions "en bas, à la gauche..." They are to draw the picture. They talk about the moon, "Est-ce qu'elle est toujours ronde?" What will you put on your page?

May 20

Jeanne puts six sentences on the board that have to do with caterpillars and cocoons. She asks questions about vocabulary, verbs, and they mime.

She works specifically with Alain and Gaeton.

They reread *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous* au complet.

She says to Gaeton often, I am going to ask you something afterwards. She asks a simple question.

She talks briefly about verbs.

Using a poem they have composed, she brainstorms with them to determine the rhymes [i,on,ain,ik]. She talks about the exclamation mark.

As the children draw, she talks about the text, makes predictions gives ideas for

their pictures.

May 27

Jeanne reads *Où est bébé éléphant* with lots of expression and gestures.

She asks children to describe an elephant, his trunk, what he does with his trunk, where he lives, his ears. She makes the link with the illustrations.

As the children are illustrating, she reads an informative text about elephants.

She circulates and asks the children to read their page.

She asks how the parents feel having lost their baby.

She plays a rhyme game as they work saying a word and the answer is found in the text: colère, cou, en bas, cris.

She works the vowels while trying to spell the words in their picture dictionary.

They are also to practice their printing here. She asks the children to make sentences with their words.

Sylvie: "Je joue avec mon poupée."

Jeanne: "avec *ma* poupée, pourquoi?"

Sylvie: "parce que je suis une fille."

She asks about the number of syllables in a word.

She refers them to the book *Où est bébé éléphant* for the sound in "pain: maintenant-main-pain."

They discuss the illustrations done by each other, and Jeanne decides who will ask the question to each illustrator.

May 30

She asks about the words "à la plage" from Michel's book. "What do you suppose is in the basket?" They brainstorm for "sandales," "plage," "sable."

"Vous êtes assez fins on va faire une autre histoire. Etes-vous capables? OUI!"

Jeanne décide qu'ils vont faire une histoire avec un ours.

She asks students how to spell the words, and she writes on Big Book paper.

"Il creuse dans la neige," and she mimes. This is suggested by her after a student suggests, "il lance les boules de neige."

She reuses Michel's word, "océan." It is a new word for the children.

They discuss the difference between "du tout" and "de tout" in the context of the sentence, "Il n'a pas du tout froid."

"On va relire pour voir si la phrase fait du sens."

"Papa ours se promène avec maman ours. Il_ cherche_. Comment est-ce je vais écrire 'il' and 'cherche'?"

They stop after eight pages.

She asks the children to help her read the pages. Papa ours est gros et grand. Some children pronounce the [s] so she reminds them there is no [e] so they do not pronounce the [s].

She tells them they should be able to make their own story now.

The kids say, "C'est facile" Jeanne says "C'est un peu difficile."

She chooses the groups placing a weaker reader in each group. She directs the children to read the words aloud so everyone in the group can hear.

They play the games that go with the Big Books.

She puts Gaeton and Alain together. The others can choose their partner. She tells the children not to read in a stilted manner but to read naturally. She reads *Que font les fées avec toutes ses dents?* She said she regrets after she was not better prepared to exploit the book. I had brought it and wanted her to read it because one boy had lost a tooth.

June 1

She sees they want to continue reading so she lets them go on until 9:00a.m. She invites them to the corner to learn a song that comes out of a grade four book. She asks Alain and Gaeton to come closer, asks them if they are comfortable, and tells them they will talk about the zoo this afternoon. She brings their attention to certain vocabulary words: "berceuses," "endormi," "bis."

She draws their attention to certain rhyming words, and they search for words that have particular sounds that Jeanne says [sh] et [f]. Gaeton and Louis give the answers.

She asks Alain the name of the dog and they sing the song so he can answer the question, he is still unable so another child gives the answer.

For the third stanza she asks about a word that is a colour that rhymes with gris, the sound [sh] and [an].

For the fourth she asks if there are more than one fish, "aux bébés ...poissons."

Julie notes the [x] marker for the plural of aux.

They become agitated, and she tells them to listen carefully to the end of the song so they can hear other "berceuses." One girl already identified the lullaby.

She tells them they will hear other lullabies this afternoon.

June 3

She draws their attention to the word "barrit." She rereads the devinette to see if their guess makes sense with the clues that have been given.

She refuses to continue before all the children pay attention.

She discusses "grignoter" and the leaf and the size of the caterpillar.

June 7

She puts "rat," "rose," "renard," "râteau," "ruche," and "raisin" on the board.

These are words from their dictionary.

She makes a devinette with "râteau," and has the children recite all the clues before they go on.

She continues with "renard" asking them again to recite the clues. They are very happy.

She congratulates them often.

Sylvie speaks in English, and Jeanne reminds her she is very capable to speak in French, which she does.

She asks if their parents will be happy to hear them read their book.

She distributes copies of *Où est bébé ours*. They are very excited.

She does round robin reading with this book. She said she does this because all the children want to read.

She starts with Alain and Gaeton. The first few pages are the easiest to read. No

one has anyone difficulty.

Jeanne picks the groups for the vocabulary games.

She reads *Le soleil* without stopping. There is not a sound as she reads. She shows the illustrations as she reads. The children add to the story once in a while.

She takes the same text that she has transformed into a Big Book.

She explains the reason there are no capitals in the book.

She discusses each page and invites the children to participate.

She talks about her childhood.

She makes links between the text and the children's experiences. "Who has a pool" "Qui" a des fraises?"

Jeanne asks what word replaces "les fraises."

She asks them to mime the last page; "Vous êtes une marguerite, ferme tes pétales, vous êtes une rose, un tournesol, toute la tête va pencher. C'est le matin fait face à la porte." Elle fait le tour de la classe pour montrer le voyage du soleil dans le ciel.

She makes the distinction between the head and the petals.

June 8

Jeanne talks about the calendar with them. She asks them to spell "juin."

She asks them what they learned this year.

She asks Jean to repeat what Mariette has just said. She explains what to do if they do not hear. They are to raise their hand.

She asks several students to repeat what others have said.

She explains "épouvanter."

She places the flowers in the vase and asks them to identify them. If they can name the flower of a part of the flower, they can put it in the vase.

June 13

She shows them a Big Book without a title and no illustrations and asks them to imagine the story in their head as she reads. She stops occasionally to ask them about the pictures in their heads. The story has lots of repetition.

She encourages them to participate after a few pages.

She announces the title at the end as the title makes up the last page of the story.

She underlines the link between being thoughtful toward others and the story.

They want to illustrate the story, but Jeanne says they will mime it before hand.

She shows them the props, most of which she has scrambled together with bits and pieces from the class.

June 15

She shows them a new series with the text on the back.

She asks Mariette to read the book.

Roxanne gets her nest.

Jeanne directs a discussion about how a nest is made. She works the vocabulary.

She reads a connected poem about a bird.

She insists on hearing all the words for the poem.

They are going to make a little book about the poem, and they must decide the number of pages and the text.

She reminds them of the sequence.

She reminds them that Nadine's class is coming this afternoon for the play, *Les trois petits cochons*.

After recess she tells them they will sing.

She follows with Gaeton and Alain saying the words before the tape. Gaeton is able to follow with his strip of paper.

She decides to sing *J'ai de la musique dans mon coeur*. They decide to sing *L'épouvantail*.

June 16

She discusses the morning message and congratulates those who listened.

She hears Gaeton reading and she congratulates him.

She asks them to read a Big Book and then to check off a list the books and games they have completed.

She says if they cannot read a book to ask a friend or her. A child suggests they read the syllables.

They can choose their own partner. Jeanne puts the stronger students in the hallway.

She checks each completed game before they put them away.

June 18

She asks them about their weekend.

She says she wants to do something different. On the board she writes "Sur une feuille un petit oeuf brille au clair de lune." with different coloured chalk. She asks, "Where is the action word, what shines, where does it happen, what answers the question when?"

As they compose the sentences, she asks the questions so they include all the parts in their sentences. She has identified the parts on the board above the different columns.

June 21

She insists that the children say hello politely and loudly. They practice.

She makes up riddles about the seasons. She does so because in the announcements this morning Sylvie mentioned the first day of summer.

She tells Jean how to look someone in the eyes when they are talking.

She shares a collective book with the children, and they have to tell their peers what it is they liked about each other's picture.

She reminds Jean three times to listen carefully.

She chooses the songs and previews the words.

C.3 Student's role

May 12

Children read books out loud, most of them they have not read before 8:30

One boy reads me the Chateau Nintendo book he has drawn and Jeanne has stapled.

Children discuss rap, message du jour. Julie answered the question about the message du jour in French showing a good understanding of the message. They recite their rap with their sheets A-H, I - M they just remembered. They recite together then one child recites individually. They compose the next verse together. They brainstorm to arrive at "Nous allons faire un projet." They sing the song from the Big Book, a song about birds in spring. They read their own page from a book they have made together. Children mime a story they read. Some act and the rest give oral prompts for dialogue and actions. One girl uses the words on the board to support her dialogue. Children participate in a discussion about summer activities. They answer in complete sentences in French. They speak very little during the writing activity. I hear the occasional words, always in French. One girl added a second line to her story. They all did pictures justifying their the reason they chose their season.

May 16

A boy who does not read takes a book that Jeanne read. Jeanne said that is the third time he has taken the same book. Children read during the announcements. They predict the text in *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*. They react to the reading with laughter and surprise. They read the Big Book of the *Petite chenille* in chorus. Some children are able to read the text. One boy chimes in for the last line on each page but follows with the children regardless. They mime a caterpillar coming out of its cocoon. They sit down and write the butterfly song together on the board and then sing. They make their illustration, talk in French a little amongst themselves, and read the text aloud as Jeanne asks different children to read. "Je vais à la toilette et je me lave les mains."

May 20

They sharpen their pencils, so they don't have to do it during the day, and she talks to each one in French, about something personal. They observe the earth worms, the caterpillars, and the cocoons that have been brought to class. The children recite and mime the sentences. They sing and mime the song *Papillon papillon*. They identify the verbs in each sentence and Jeanne circles them. They have no difficulty with this activity. They read using the expression of the exclamation mark. They rearrange the words that make up poems they have read in class. Some work alone, others with a partner. One child finds an error on G sheet "Le papillion sors." They read their book about the frog, *Glou Glou la grenouille* with the cassette. They play the games stored in the library pockets. They listen to the cassette of the *Petite chenille qui faisait des trous* and start

working on the second page.

They are invited to look at the pictures of the friends.

As she puts the book up beside the Big Book, the children spontaneously start to read.

May 27

Children participate in the discussion of *Où est bébé éléphant?*

They mime the story. "L'éléphant met sa trompe autour de l'arbre et il tire l'arbre."

The children talk about the vegetation, the flowers.

They reread the story and all the children participate.

The children choose a page of the text they want to write and illustrate. They are encouraged to collaborate in their work.

One girl checks a book for her illustration.

Children write a collective book "Où est maman ours?"

Children play a rhyme game offering words in the text and others.

Children place their pages against the board in the sequence, more or less of the story, without Jeanne having asked them.

Children work in their picture dictionary the letter "p."

They ask questions about the words.

Many children write the word before Jeanne spells it with them.

Mariette reads the elephant book in order to verify the order. Each child is invited to read his or her page.

They ask each other questions about the illustrations.

They are very calm.

They sing from their song book a song for the first time, and most of the students can read the text. They are accompanied by a cassette, *Je voyage*.

May 30

Michel tells Jeanne he can read a book, and she invites him to read it to the class.

All the children listen attentively.

They start to read their individual copies of *Où est bébé éléphant?* Jeanne says "wait for me!" They don't so she tells them to choose a partner and to share reading the books.

The children correct amongst themselves.

Once finished, they start over without Jeanne saying a word.

They write a collective story about a bear based on the elephant model. Their text is more elaborate, more descriptive.

They discuss what a baby bear would like to do, and they develop their vocabulary.

One girl offers "il fait des bêtises. Il lance de la neige à papa." The children love this sentence.

Michel says he plays in the ocean because there is an ocean in the north.

They play vocabulary games with a basic vocabulary matching the picture with the word to fill three cards with twelve words per card. They play the game twice.

June 1

Elizabeth reads her book to the class.

Jean wants to read a question from his book. "Quelle couleur est plus chaude,

rouge ou bleu?" They discuss warm objects and cold objects. Jean asks another question.

They listen to the song on cassette, *Comme moi* de Suzanne Pinel and follow with Jeanne as her hand goes under the words.

They are very attentive.

After discussing the vocabulary, they try to join in with the cassette particularly with the refrain.

They clap their hands to the ryming words without saying the words.

They count the syllables for four words.

They participate in the discussion about the song.

They sing it with the record.

They are very calm when it is time to go to the bathroom.

Upon returning, Jeanne has placed their song booklets on their desk and they start sing *Comme moi* immediately. They are invited to illustrate each stanza in the margin if they wish. They all do.

As they illustrate, Jeanne asks them to sing a couple of other songs they learned before Christmas.

After recess, Michel starts silent reading immediately as does Lisa.

The play a mime game. One child reads a stanza and mimes it, and the others must guess by posing questions in complete sentences which are answered in complete sentences.

They compose "Et sur sa belle toile, L'araigné chante au bébé."

Jeanne chooses the animal: "Et en Australie maman chante au Wallaby Wâ ... Dodo pochette."

Les élèves voulaient faire "tortue" mais Jeanne voulait faire escargot.

Jeanne: [ft] est le son, comment va-t-on l'écrire?

Elle prend des votes en cas d'impasse.

Les enfants lisent et dessinent les pages par deux.

June 3

They participate in the devinettes. They start reading after Jeanne has read the first one.

"J'ai deux cheval et un cheveux." Jeanne had just corrected that error.

They love the activity.

They do not know the meaning of "rugit" but are able to guess the word anyway.

They get mad when Jeanne gives them too many clues. They want the devinette to be difficult. The problem is that they read the clues themselves.

They sing *Comme moi* with the cassette and the Big Book they have illustrated. It will now become part of the collection.

They enjoy singing.

They exchange home reading books.

The book *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous* is passed out and the children follow the reading with the cassette. All the children follow.

"Mme, sais-tu où la poinçonneuse est?"

June 7

Roxanne reads for me. She cannot read "restaurant" and "propriétaire" but jumps

over them and does not stop the rhythm. I help her cut it into syllable, and she has no trouble. We talk about the meanings.

Jean reads the [r] words and says un rose. Jeanne says perfect except for one error. He corrects himself before she has a chance to say any more.

They make up their own devinettes.

They read *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous* with great ease. Jeanne reads next to Alain. There is not one voice that is louder than the others.

They finish with the song and the butterflies that "voltigent."

They start singing from their song booklets before Jeanne gets the record on. Some follow with strips of paper, others just read the words. All follow except Alain and Gaeton who have a little difficulty.

They play the vocabulary game 6-10.

Roxanne and Julie help the readers in their group. "es-tu endormi?"

Sylvie asks why there is "ses" at the end of "juteuses."

They start singing very loudly with gestures.

They say that a "margeurite" is margarine or a bird. Finally someone gives the answer in English.

June 8

Michel reads his book. His reading is excellent.

Sylvie is reading with me, and she doesn't even try with words she can't read. She will look at a whole page and just read isolated words she is familiar with.

She asks them what they learned this year. "I learned to write sentences, to speak well, mathematics, to write words, to do maths really well, to play with others, to listen well, to read, to make up songs in French, to draw, to listen."

She asks them what they have to do to read. "You have to look carefully at the words, listen, try, open your mouth wide, repeat well."

Michel guesses what will happen in the picture Jeanne shows them.

She insists on complete sentences, and that is what she gets.

Michel and Marc explain how to make a scarecrow. All the children are attentive.

Louis and Julie do the same. She develops their vocabulary as they try to give their directions.

They mime the "bourgeons."

Jeanne has written the words on cards and she asks the children to place the words with the pictures. She has done the same thing with sentences and stronger students read the sentences and place them with the appropriate pictures. Alain guesses "épouvantail" and everyone claps for him. Sylvie wants her own cards, and Jeanne says they will play that later.

I come back with flowers and the children are reading something about scarecrows.

It's a song. She plays the tape, and they try to follow their words.

They had no trouble reading the message I wrote them about the flowers. Their pronunciation helped me with my spelling "réchauffer."

June 13

They react to the conclusion to the story.

They answer her questions about the sequence of the story.

Julie tells her to get things ready while they are at recess.

June 15

Jean reads a story.

Manon says she read 8 books and Julie said she read 4.

They discuss the making of a nest as they pass around the nest. Everyone gets to touch it.

They read a poem about a nest and then mime it. Three mime and the others recite the poem. Everyone gets a turn to mime.

They start to write their books right away. Michel and Julie start with the text and the others with the illustrations. Michel wants to look in the book for certain words.

Julie has a library book in front of her. When I asked Michel why he started with the text, he said that is what Jeanne does.

They start singing *Musique de ton coeur* before the cassette.

Michel does not sing, Mariette moves with the music.

June 16

Sylvie is proud she has found "éléphant" and "aime."

They all participate in the games and reading and are excited about the idea of a list. Some have chosen to work alone.

Lisa has chosen to work with Mariette because she wants lots of checks. They can check off on their personal tally sheet how many books and games they read and play.

Some complete four books and games and others complete two.

Alain and Marc work together.

June 18

Jeanne asks the children what they did over the weekend.

"C'était ma fête."

"Je suis allée campé. Je suis allée chez des amis. Je suis allé au lac et j'ai vu un cerf." The word "cerf" is a transfer from reading.

Everyone has a chance to answer, and everyone answers in French except Jean who answers half in English and half in French.

They brainstorm for the following sentences:

Sur une feuille un petit oeuf brille au clair de lune.

Dans mes bras un petit chat miaule au soleil.

La matin à ma maison un petit lapin grignote dans sa cage. (Julie)

Sur la route un petit lapin saute au dessus de la rivière. (Jean)

Au cirque un gros lion grimpe sur une cage. (Alain)

Dans le ciel le soleil brille au dessus les nuages. (Elizabeth)

à travers les nuages.

sur toute la terre.

They play a game of mixing up the sentences.

June 21

They make up riddles.

Alain is very proud of his sentence in the collective book.

There are simple sentences and complex sentences with two to four subordinate phrases.

Marc corrects Lisa for "il/elle."

Enfant: "J'aime ton cheval." says a child to Jeanne holding a picture with several horses in it.

Jeanne: Lequel aimes-tu? Tu as dit *ton*.

Enfant: J'aime tous les cheveux.

Enfant: J'aime la crinière.

Julie wants paper to write a book *Où est bébé...*

They sing from their song booklet.

Jeanne has them sing a song they have never seen before. This is the first time they follow initially from the text. Michel sings more softly than the others.

They sing *Mon bateau* and then make a paper boat by folding the paper. They must follow the directions on the board.

C.4 Evaluation

May 12

She notes which children have taken which books from the read-at-home program. She just move around, moving from activity to activity, going with the flow, integrating class activities

Roxanne is chosen for the Bon français.

May 16

For the boy who is not yet reading, she does not do anything extra. She said he is very intelligent but very immature. She takes them in small groups to help them with their reading. She does not want them to feel "visés."

May 20

She puts strong students with weak students to play the games that she has prepared.

May 27

She saves more difficult text for more developed readers.

May 30

Puts two weak students in a group so she can work with them.

Puts a weaker student in each group with three strong students. She places the weak student in the middle.

June 1

Sylvie, Gaeton and Alain are just starting to decode words.

June 7

She chooses the groups and puts a weaker reader in each group.

June 13

She says she can tell by their eyes that they like the story.

June 15

She does testing with the blackboards. She invites small homogeneous groups up and asks them to spell about five to ten words each. She tells them to write by syllables, to remember similar words. She pronounces what they have spelled so they can hear their errors. When they spell a sound correctly but misspell the word, she says no problem and shows them how. She works some phonics. With Alain and Gaeton, she asks them to place the vowels in a column and then changes the consonants. She says Gaeton is starting to write the sounds correctly.

C.5 Other

May 12

Children want to read their rap to me.

Jeanne has to call role loudly over the reading of the children.

The spelling game they did not want to stop, and Jeanne said they would continue tomorrow.

She encourages them often.

She insists that their drawing be complete and representative of the text in question. At recess she often passes to see what they have drawn. She mentions that often her less-developed readers are very strong in visual arts.

During the improvisation she does very little correcting, particularly with the students that have less self-confidence.

Jeanne said she does very little planning. She had planned the writing activity but the rest was just the flow of the kids.

May 16

Jeanne never has to remind them to take a book when they come into the class.

She tells them they are capable; "Il y en a d'entre vous qui vont être capable de lire ce livre tout seul."

The children are very quiet. Jeanne is very calm. She congratulates and encourages them often. "C'est OK Je sais que tu es capable." She said they can speak in English or in French but when they have a project to do, they are very quiet and calm.

May 20

Even after being sick for three days, school closed for one day, Jeanne was not the least concerned that I be there. She is very sure of herself and not at all intimidated by my presence.

Jeanne changes the activity about every five to ten minutes.

I ask one girl to tell me which words were missing, and she reread the whole poem in order to answer.

Jeanne uses idiomatic expressions when talking to the students.

She insists on "Je suis allée". She corrects often both structure, vocabulary, and pronunciation.

She often says "We are going to work very hard" or "We have lots of work to do" or "We are going to do something you will really like."

When I asked her about why she used *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*, she said because you can do so much with it: vocabulary, seasons, days of the week, fruits, légumes, metamorphosis...

She asks the children to place the text as in the original because it serves as an "aide-mémoire," it helps the children recognize the text more quickly, particularly for the weaker readers.

There is no particular reason why she works certain phonetic sounds except that they appear in connected text.

The children work quietly.

May 27

They move from their desks to the carpet. They get up before recess to drink. They mime and work in the hall or in the classroom scattered around the room.

May 27

Jeanne gives lots of time for the children to think about their answers. She puts her arm around Mariette.

May 30

Mariette gave me some flowers.

They continue to read during and after the announcements.

They are very proud to hear their rap over the intercom.

"On travaille fort. Bravo!"

Jeanne is congratulated by her colleagues about the excellent quality of the RAP during the recess. She is obviously proud but passes the compliments on to the students.

May 31

We went to the zoo. All the children speak in French when Zac was there and when we were present. When they were at the sandbox, they spoke in English.

June 1

Roxanne reads during the announcements.

She said they count the syllables for their pronunciation and for their spelling.

She works certain sounds because they were there.

She made her "pancartes" this morning at 8:20.

She wanted to do the lullaby because it was light, it talked about animals, and they will compose some stanzas.

The other songs in their booklet were chosen for their vocabulary, their meaning, and Jeanne herself wanted to learn some new songs.

They have done four song booklets this year. She started with the songs of *Chez Hélène*.

When I asked Jeanne a question about *Au clair de (la) lune*, all the children started singing the song.

She is convinced that many teachers do not use direct instruction because they do not know how children learn to read and write. They need a structure, an internal motivation.

June 3

Jeanne says that teachers are born, it is innate. Her mother asked her questions all the time. She was very curious. She says the thing she that is most important for the children is the ability to concentrate.

Jeanne is fifty-seven.

June 7

All the children and Jeanne say hello. She insists on these politenesses with me and with their other teachers.

I am starting to see why Jeanne has children cut the words into syllables. She says that sometimes she puts a long word on the board, and they play a game to pronounce it.

Jeanne never raises her voice or gets mad at the children.

Marc is sleepy today.

Jeanne was visibly flattered when I told her she does not raise her voice. She knows she is demanding. She is very proud of her students.

June 8

The four weaker students, Gaeton, Michel, Lisa, and Louis visit the classroom library often rather than reading their books at their desks.

The children guess "bourdons" instead of "bourgeons." It must be from their library experience the other day with the librarian as she read a book with "bourdons."

Jeanne said the children feel proud and special that I am in their class.

She said they need the tools before they are able to do things such as research.

They need to hear the words often.

June 13

There are mother volunteers for hot dogs, library, and English language arts, but not in Jeanne's class as she has no English time scheduled.

When I asked Jeanne why she chose a story which took place in winter, she said she did so because there was repetition in it, she liked it, she wanted to mime, and to prepare for Friday.

She wanted real vegetables but Kaufmanns was out.

She said she could have asked the children to make the props, which they had done before, but this was more time efficient.

She had a story to and a library period today. She does not like to be pressed for time.

She likes to have fifteen minutes to discuss the stories she reads.

It is Lisa's birthday. She has a candle, a treat, a song and their discussion revolves around her.

We talked about teacher-centered and child-centered. She sees herself as a child-centered teacher. "You have to stimulate the students, direct them. Teacher-centered is one who can deliver the same program year after year."

The librarian said she reads the same books to FL₁ and FL₂, she animates to the same degree, and the children in FL₂ understand as well as those in FL₁. She says the discussions are less spontaneous but equally profound. They tend to slip into

English words. She said Jeanne's students often take the same book she has read and will mime it or read it. They read with her spontaneously. She is very impressed with their reading ability.

June 15

Roxanne has brought a nest, and Jeanne says as a result, she will change her lesson.

Jeanne says style is more teacher-directed than teacher-centered. She believes we must give the children the tools.

Jeanne is very proud that the children read until 9:00.

Manon is upset that Marc and Gaeton are not reading. Jeanne makes it clear that part of reading is talking about what you have read. She asks why it is important to read.

Jeanne recounts the incident of a former principal who wanted Jeanne to fail some students. She much prefers the philosophy of today, to let the children follow their own speed.

Gestny: Why did you decide to sing.

Jeanne: I felt like it. I wanted to change the activity.

Gestny: Why those two songs?

Jeanne: They were the last two we learned. It take about 10 days before they know a song.

She does not use the blackboard a whole lot.

While she is testing for the sounds, couples are discussing in French about their dads, and a group of three girls are discussing in English.

June 16

Jeanne says she has prepared the games to develop comprehension, decoding, and the ability to organize themselves. As I reread my notes, this reminds me of when they told me I should organize myself when I was teaching them a lesson on June 24.

June 21

She asks Sylvie why she is late. This really bothers Jeanne. She has missed the equivalent of forty-seven hours of reading time.

Again she mentions that each child has their own talent, and often those who are not strong in reading are strong in drawing.

She congratulates each child on their work.

June 24

I taught part of the class today. I wanted to see if they would like to write something on their own. They all participated.

Elizabeth is upset that her mother is not coming today to pick her up. She recounts the whole thing in French, sobbing at the same time. Jeanne is very calm and reassures her.

APPENDIX D

Résumé of the Audio-video Cassette in Jeanne's Classroom

le 24 mai 1994

- 00.00.00 Les enfants lisent à haute voix et sont à leur pupitre.
Lecture d'un texte et identification du mot d'action et discussion sur les animaux que pondent des oeufs.
Les enfants jouent les actions de la chenille.
- 00.09.38 Trouver des mots dans des pages écrites.
Les enfants miment une chenille attachée à sa branche et chantent la chanson sur le papillon.
- 00.12.06 Actions de la chenille. Cycle du papillon. Mots à retrouver dans phrases au tableau.
- 00.15.07 La comptine, "Le petit chat gris." L'enseignante dirige la récitation de la comptine.
- 00.19.56 À leur pupitre, ils replacent les parties d'une phrase dans l'ordre logique.
Travail en groupe de deux.
- 00.21.17 Chantent en lisant le texte.
- 00.21.39 *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*, lecture de deux pancartes. Un élève lit devant la classe.
- 00.24.06 Chanson du papillon avec actions.

le 27 mai 1994

- 00.24.40 L'alphabet en rimes.
- 00.27.13 La famille éléphant, livre illustré par la classe.
Lecture en groupe à partir d'affiches et identification de certains éléments comme la question.
On joue les éléphants pour mieux comprendre les actions.
Distribution des rôles pour illustrer les éléphants dans les nouvelles pages.
L'enseignante continue de raconter l'histoire pendant que les trois artistes sont à l'oeuvre.
Affiches avec textes que les enfants vont illustrer.
- 00.37.15 Un oiseau - phonétique.

le 30 mai 1994

- 00.38.49 Les enfants lisent à voix haute leur livre sur Bébé éléphant.
- 00.41.57 *Où est Bébé ours?* Création d'un livre dont la structure est parallèle à celle de l'histoire de Bébé éléphant. Ils rajoutent les détails.
- 00.46.50 Bingo - Travail de groupe - Association mot/images.
- 00.48.04 Lecture par deux d'un grand livre.
- 00.51.19 Centres: Jeu avec le vent. Cachent mots trouvés.
Jeu de bingo.
Association images/texte
Lecture de grands livres.

- 00.55.48 Animation du livre *Mais que font les fées avec toutes ces dents?*
Discussion et lecture.
- 01.14.52 Devine qui je suis...Jeu avec le nom des animaux.
- 01.07.04 Lecture individuelle d'un livre qu'ils ont décoré. Un élève lit à haute voix.

le 3 juin 1994

- 01.07.40 Découverte de la suite de l'histoire et illustration de l'histoire de *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*. Étude du prochain petit texte.
- 01.08.35 Mise en scène d'une histoire avec le lapin, le cheval, etc.

le 15 juin 1994

- 01.25.53 Lecture du début de l'histoire du lapin par un enfant. Les abris et les animaux.
Description d'un nid et découverte d'un vrai nid.
- 01.36.57 Musique créée avec les sons do, ré, bi, ju.

le 1 juin 1994

- 01.39.35 Lecture individuelle chacun à son pupitre.
- 01.43.25 Chanson de Suzanne Pinel, *Comme moi*.
Découverte de la chanson.
Discussion sur le type de la chanson (berceuse) et des actions décrites pendant la chanson. Travail de rimes, reconnaissance de mots et jeu avec la chanson.
- 01.55.35 Lecture de la chanson et les enfants chantent.
- 01.58.14 Deviner le nom d'un animal d'après les actions faites par un enfant et les enfants doivent poser des questions.

le 7 juin 1994 (deuxième cassette)

- 02.00.13 Devinette pour découvrir un mot qui commence par la lettre "r" parmi une liste de huit mots.
- 02.07.35 Devinettes avec la lettre "r" - deviner le mot "râteau."
- 02.12.10 *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*: lecture ensemble de l'histoire mais chacun à son pupitre.
Chanson du papillon.
- 02.17.20 *Où est bébé ours?* Il relisent l'histoire, chacun en lisant une partie.
- 02.21.35 Découverte d'un grand livre où une image représente du linge en train de sécher sur une corde étendue entre deux arbres. D'après l'image, trouver où se passe l'histoire, quel en est le contexte, etc. Histoire des ombres.
- 02.26.54 Chanson, *Y'a du soleil dans ma maison* de Suzanne Pinel. Ils jouent et interprètent la chanson.
- 02.32.43 Lettre de Gestny et bouquet de fleurs.
- 02.35.19 Jeu du lapin. Petite mise en scène théâtrale.

le 16 juin 1994

- 02.38.46 Centres des grands livres accompagnés de jeux.

le 24 juin 1994

02.39.19 Lecture individuelle, chacun à son pupitre.

APPENDIX E

Text of *La petite chenille qui faisait des trous**La petite chenille qui faisait des trous*

Sur une feuille, une petit oeuf brille au clair de lune.

Maintenant, le soleil se lève. C'est dimanche. Il fait beau: il fait chaud. Alors... clic, clac!...sort de l'oeuf une petite chenille qui a très faim.

Elle se met en route pour trouver à manger.

Le lundi elle trouve une pomme pour son repas. Elle y fait un trou pour manger, mais après, elle a encore très faim...

Le mardi, elle trouve deux poires pour son repas. Elle y fait deux trous, pour manger, mais après elle a encore très faim...

Le mercredi, elle trouve trois prunes pour son repas. Elle y fait trois trous, pour manger, mais après, elle a encore très faim...

Le jeudi, elle trouve quatre fraises pour son repas. Elle y fait quatre trous, pour manger, mais après, elle a encore très faim...

Le vendredi, elle trouve cinq oranges pour son repas. Elle y fait cinq trous, pour manger, mais après, elle a encore très faim...

Le samedi, elle trouve pour son repas un gâteau au chocolat, un cornet de glace, un cornichon, un morceau de gruyère, un saucisson, une sucette, une tranche de pain d'épice, une saucisse, une brioche, une tranche de pastèque...Dans toutes ces bonnes choses, elle fait , pour manger, un petit trou...Mais, ce soir-là, elle a très mal au ventre!

Le jour suivant, c'est de nouveau dimanche...Comme elle a trop mangé la veille, elle grignote une feuille. Maintenant, elle se sent beaucoup mieux!

La petite chenille qui faisait des trous n'a plus faim du tout. D'ailleurs, elle n'est plus petite, elle est devenue grande et grosse.

*Alors, elle se construit sa maison, qu'on appelle cocon, et elle y habite pendant plus de deux semaines. Puis elle le ronge, fait un trou dans le cocon, et sort en se tortillant pour devenir...
un merveilleux papillon!*

APPENDIX F

Text of *Papillon, papillon*

Papillon, Papillon

*Papillon, papillon,
Couleurs d'été,
Tu t'envoles,
Tu t'envoles.*

*Papillon, papillon,
Couleur de blé,
Tu t'envoles,
Dans les prés.*

APPENDIX G

Interview with Marie

Entrevue basée sur les questions

Gestny: De quelles stratégies te sers-tu afin de développer la lecture?

Marie: Quelles sont les stratégies, ça dépend du niveau de développement. Je prends des stades de développement en lecture. Ici ça dit "magical", et comme je t'ai dit "lap reading", "shared reading", "matched pictures with words", "reading to and talking", "environmental prints", "self-concepting", "bridging", les enfants comme Luc sont rendus à "self-concepting". Comment tu les amènes à bridging? *Et elle continue à lire la feuille...* puis "rhyming" puis c'est ça que tu as vu dans la classe. *Elle continue à lire la feuille...* Alors, quand je fais quelque chose en grand groupe en première année la plupart sont ici, alors tu vois des stratégies..."poem rebuilding," "rewritten retellings," "cloze," "big books," on a fait des grands livres comme groupe, "predictable pattern books." Tu as vu tout ça. "Take off, take-off to independence"...*Elle continue à lire sa feuille...* "Must read to a teacher every day" mais on a la lecture à la maison. "Read different editions of the same story" on a fait ça au passé, *Les trois petits cochons*. La lecture silencieuse...Elle ne sait pas ce que c'est "process talk". "What do you do when you come across a word you don't know?" Je pose la question, je regarde les mots qui sont cachés à l'intérieur du mot. Je regarde l'illustration, je lis le contexte, quel mot va faire le plus bon sens. "Bulk reading," "minimal cue message"...tu vois..."retelling." Alors mes idées pour mes centres viennent d'ici. Comme "retelling," "they had to do the beginning, middle and end." "Story patterns," "modelling," "story chants" et comme les cinq dinosaures aujourd'hui. Voici la feuille, les stratégies que j'emploie pour répondre aux besoins et pour amener l'enfant d'une stade de développement à une autre. Puis voici comment j'évalue, pour l'écriture, tu regardes pour ces caractéristiques et voici. Voici ce que je donne aux parents au début de l'année, des suggestions pour encourager la lecture à la maison.

Gestny: D'après vous c'est quoi un bon lecteur, décrivez-le. *At this point I had a technical problem and I realized during the interview that I had not recorded one of Marie's answers so I paraphrased what she said.* Alors tu as dit que c'est quelqu'un qui peut comprendre, qui peut discuter, qui peut critiquer. Et comment décidez-vous? Tu as Brigrance pour le décodage, l'expression, l'articulation, et puis tu m'as dit que ceux qui sont capables de décoder déjà, tu vas voir leur compréhension en te servant d'une histoire quelconque.

Marie: Oui, et aussi en posant des questions de compréhension.

Gestny: Basées sur une histoire d'*Impressions*?

Marie: Il y a aussi des questions de compréhension dans Brigance reliées au paragraphe que les enfants lisaient.

Gestny: Comment faites-vous l'évaluation. Bien tu dis Brigance, tu vois s'ils sont capables de lire ce qu'ils ont écrit et puis, si les enfants se servent des mots affichés autour de la salle de classe. Est-ce qu'il y a d'autres choses?

Marie: Non.

Gestny: Comment voyez-vous le développement de la lecture? Tu m'as parlé du continuum. Que faites-vous pour encourager ce développement. Tu m'as dit qu'il y a des stratégies que tu emploies.

Marie: Pour aider et exposer l'enfant et stimuler l'enfant, parce que l'enfant va se développer à sa propre vitesse mais il y a des choses qu'on peut faire pour encourager le développement et pour s'assurer que l'enfant est stimulé et exposé. Alors, si l'enfant est prêt, l'enfant va apprendre ou attraper certains concepts. Si l'enfant n'est pas prêt, au moins l'enfant a été exposé. Alors j'emploie des stratégies pour m'assurer que l'enfant est suffisamment stimulé pour aider l'enfant de développer d'un stade de développement à l'autre.

Gestny: Et quand tu travailles en petit groupe, tu fais ça surtout quand tu n'as pas de centres parce que tu peux travailler avec ceux qui ont de la difficulté, ou ceux...

Marie: Avec tout le monde, même ceux qui lisent sans difficulté. On a toujours du chemin à faire. Alors on peut travailler sur peut-être la ponctuation. On peut travailler sur l'expression, sur le contenu, un peu de phonétique, ou de la grammaire, il y a plusieurs possibilités.

Gestny: Que faites-vous pour les enfants qui sont en difficulté? Avec eux, tu travailles en petits groupes?

Marie: En mini-leçon. Comme tout le monde travaille sur le message du jour, ou les dossiers d'écriture, ou les journaux. Et puis je prends les petits groupes d'après un certain besoin. Si je vois plusieurs élèves qui sont prêts à essayer quelque chose de nouveau, ou certains qui n'ont pas appris ou qui n'ont pas été exposés à un certain concept, je prends ces élèves puis on travaille en petit groupe ensemble pour qu'ils puissent avoir plus de temps ensemble et pour qu'on puisse concentrer sur un concept et peut-être la prochaine fois ils auront besoin d'une autre mini-leçon.

Gestny: Et toi tu fais la lecture orale en anglais à tous les jours?

Marie: Oui, sois un poème ou une histoire chaque jour. Puis on discute l'écrivain, les illustrations, les différents aspects du livre.

Gestny: Et tu as le programme de lecture individuelle? Tu as 50 livres que tu apportes en classe. Tu les changes à tous les mois et les livres sont reliés soit avec

la saison, soit avec le thème, ou les deux, et l'enfant rentre le matin avec son sac en plastique et il fait l'échange du livre et les parents signent quelque chose.

Marie: Il y a une feuille avec trois colonnes, puis l'enfant doit écrire la date, le titre du livre, puis des commentaires et les parents peuvent aider à écrire les commentaires comme les enfants peuvent me dire si le livre était trop facile ou trop difficile, est-ce que c'était drôle. Et une fois que la feuille est remplie, je leur donne une autre feuille et comme ça je garde les feuilles et je sais qui participe et qui ne participe pas. Puis je peux téléphoner les parents et encourager les parents.

Gestny: Quand je t'ai posé la question, est-ce que les enfants devraient apprendre à lire en français ou en anglais, tu m'as dit les deux. Tu m'as dit, par contre, que tu as trouvé que quand tu veux faire la lecture, il n'y a pas autant de compréhension qu'il y aurait eu en anglais.

Marie: Non, alors il faut qu'on relise sur les illustrations, le visuel, on a des expressions qui vont sortir. Je leur donne les mots qui sont plus faciles. S'il y a un mot difficile, j'essaie de trouver un autre mot qui veut dire la même chose mais un mot qui est connu. Les enfants peuvent me redire les histoires, comme ça ils sont forcés de me parler et de me dire ce qu'ils ont compris mais il faut qu'on compte sur le visuel et les phrases clés, il faut que je lise plus lentement, il faut qu'on discute et prédise plus qu'on aurait en anglais.

Gestny: Alors ce que tu fais en français pour développer la lecture, premièrement tu mets l'accent sur le développement de l'oral. Quand tu fais le développement de la lecture c'est surtout de faire les illustrations et d'étiqueter les illustrations. Puis s'il y a une phrase complète, c'est toi qui l'a écrite au tableau et les élèves l'ont copiée.

Marie: Quand la situation se présente, les enfants sont toujours encouragés comme en anglais d'écrire leur propre phrase et d'employer leurs connaissances et leur épellation.

Gestny: Est-ce que tu trouves qu'ils écrivent autant en français qu'en anglais?

Marie: Non parce qu'ils n'ont pas encore le vocabulaire mais les enfants ne sont pas bloqués, ils veulent écrire en français alors j'essaie de présenter des situations où les enfants vont être forcés d'écrire quelques phrases au moins et c'est fatigant parce qu'ils peuvent écrire les pages et les pages en anglais parce que c'est leur langue maternelle mais au moins quelques phrases en français en première année je trouve que c'est une exigence qui est raisonnable et c'est toujours relié à un thème. Alors il y aurait toujours une banque de mots reliée à un thème et en plus les enfants j'intègre les matières alors on a toujours les problèmes écrits, comme deux araignées sont dans la cuisine et trois autres sont venues, combien il y en a en tout? Mais les enfants ont du écrire leurs propres phrases et leurs propres problèmes de maths en français alors les enfants ont dû employer leur connaissance de la phonétique puis il y avait aussi certaines expressions, certaines phrases clés puis ils ont dû les employer avec une illustration puis j'ai écrit en bas.

Souvent les enfants vont dicter les phrases, ceux qui sont moins développés, ceux qui sont prêts vont écrire des phrases comme quatre ou cinq phrases en français en employant leur connaissance de la phonétique et les expressions clés qu'ils connaissent. Et ceux qui sont moins développés sont quand même capable de me dire oralement leur pensée ou leur phrase et c'est comme une dictée et je peux écrire en bas et ensemble on peut lire la phrase et l'enfant peut toujours compter sur les illustrations. Et aussi, j'ai des questions je peux poser des questions et les enfants savent certaines expressions comme pour un graphique, quel est ton 'quoi que ça soit' préféré dépendant du thème. Maintenant notre thème est les dinosaures alors je peux poser la question et écrire la question Quel dinosaure préfères-tu? Puis on va étiqueter les dinosaures. Quand notre thème était les bestioles les enfants ont du faire un graphique. On fait un graphique pour chaque thème en maths. "Quel insecte préfères-tu?" "Quel fruit préfères-tu?" Alors les enfants sont habitués, ils peuvent lire "quel...préfères-tu".

Gestny: Alors ça c'est une structure que tu as travaillée toute l'année.

Marie: Oui.

Gestny: Est-ce qu'il y a une autre structure que tu as travaillée?

Marie: "C'est mon tour," "c'est ton tour," "je pense que c'est," "aujourd'hui," "hier," et "demain," la date intégrée avec le calendrier, "c'est," "ce sont," "voici"...dépendant de la situation et du thème.

Gestny: Comment est-ce que tu décides les thèmes?

Marie: Dépendant des intérêts et des besoins.

Gestny: Comment est-ce que tu détermènes les besoins et les intérêts des élèves?

Marie: C'est facile à voir quand les enfants écrivent dans leurs dossiers d'écriture ou dans leurs journaux parce que dépendant des sujets qu'ils choisissent. Aussi il faut que je considère les besoins d'après notre guide pédagogique. Alors il y a certains besoins, certains thèmes qui se présentent dans le guide pédagogique comme dans notre document provisoire des sciences de la nature il y a une section sur les bestioles. Alors je prends cette section sur les bestioles et j'intègre mon maths, j'intègre...

Gestny: Comment est-ce que tu intègres les maths?

Marie: Je prends le concept, disons que c'est l'addition et la soustraction puis je crée des problèmes, je me sers des manipulatives puis le matériel va être quelque chose qui est relié à notre thème. Alors si c'est l'addition ou la soustraction jusqu'à vingt, et notre thème serait les bestioles je vais choisir les mouches, les moustiques, les araignées en plastique. Notre thème maintenant c'est les dinosaures et on fait la résolution de problèmes et on pose des questions, et on écrit des problèmes en

français soit en grand groupe soit en petit groupe on peut manipuler des petits dinosaures en plastique.

Gestny: En ce qui concerne le développement de la lecture, si un enfant n'arrive pas à lire un mot quand il fait la lecture orale, qu'est-ce que tu lui dis pour qu'il soit capable de défricher le mot.

Marie: Je demande à l'enfant, "est-ce qu'il y a un petit mot qu'ils sont capables de lire à l'intérieur du grand mot?" "Est-ce qu'il y a quelque chose dans l'illustration qui va nous donner une indice?" "Si on élimine la phrase, est-ce qu'il y a un mot qui va faire du bon sens avec l'histoire, avec ce qui se passe dans l'histoire?" Ce sont trois stratégies. Les sons, la phonétique: "Est-ce qu'il y a des sons qu'il connaît, ou des parties du mot qu'il est capable de lire?" "Si on couvre la moitié du mot est-ce qu'il est capable de déchiffrer l'autre moitié?" Alors on emploie les stratégies que nous les adultes on emploie.

Gestny: Merci, je pense que c'est tout.

Marie: Tu vois ce que j'envoie et comment je communique à mes parents. Tu vois l'approche thématique et comment mon enseignement est basé sur les thèmes. J'intègre les différentes matières et les thèmes. Le besoin de mes élèves, il y a certains concepts qu'il faut enseigner en première année mais les guides pédagogiques nous disent...l'observation par exemple, la prédiction, l'heure, il faut que les enfants sachent additionner et soustraire en français et en maths, l'écriture, les quatre savoirs, l'anglais et français, l'art visuel, il faut que l'enfant se présente dans les portraits, il faut qu'il se serve de plusieurs matériaux en art visuel pour que l'enfant sache comment respecter le matériel et le traiter il faut qu'il sache comment se présenter sous forme visuelle. Il faut que l'enfant soit exposé aux artistes. On a nos besoins mais comment enseigner, c'est à nous. Je préfère enseigner par thèmes. Alors je prends ce que les guides me disent et aussi ce que les enfants me disent dans la journée, dans les conversations, quand les enfants amènent les objets de la maison, quand les enfants écrivent dans leur journaux, quand les enfants choisissent les sujets pour leurs histoires. Si un enfant écrit toujours au sujet des dinosaures je sais que l'enfant s'intéresse. Si l'enfant crée quelque chose à la maison et l'amène à l'école et c'est relié à un certain thème j'ai choisi les bestioles au mois de mars parce que les enfants sont naturellement curieux. Au printemps ils veulent toujours apporter des insectes puis les amener en classe. Les enfants font des petits projets chez eux puis souvent ils vont les amener comme tu as vu ce que l'enfant a fait avec les dinosaures avec son grand frère. L'enfant et son grand frère qui est en troisième année ont dessiné une trentaine de dinosaures. Alors ça c'est quelque chose qu'il faut valoriser et il faut qu'on profite de ces occasions. Alors, j'enseigne par thèmes, à peu près un thème par mois mais c'est la fin de l'année et les dinosaures on a déjà passé deux semaines et on a deux semaines d'école qui restent et au lieu d'avoir un grand thème je préfère les mini thèmes un petit trois quatre ou cinq jours et ensuite on change de thème parce que je veux garder l'intérêt de mes élèves. Alors pour garder l'intérêt je préfère les petits thèmes.

Un autre enregistrement.....

Marie: Ces élèves ne peuvent commencer à écrire une ébauche indépendamment, soit ils sont trop distraits ou ils ne peuvent pas concentrer ou pour une variété de raisons ces élèves ne sont pas capables de commencer avec une ébauche pour écrire alors au lieu les élèves vont dessiner mais ils ne vont pas avoir quelques phrases par écrit. Mais oralement ces élèves sont capables de dire une histoire. Ce qu'ils font ils vont dicter une histoire à soit l'auxiliaire ou le professeur. L'auxiliaire va prendre la dictée, l'auxiliaire va écrire l'histoire puis c'est comme l'inverse l'histoire est publiée parce que c'est bien épeler puis les phrases sont assez compliquées parce que les enfants ont mis plus de détails parce qu'ils n'ont pas pris le temps d'écrire. Après l'auxiliaire ou le professeur va découper chaque mot de cette histoire puis l'enfant pratique à lire les mots puis à mettre les mots en ordre puis à mettre les phrases en ordre. Alors l'enfant va avoir plusieurs expériences avec les mots et par le temps que l'enfant a pratiqué avec les mots et les phrases en les mettant en ordre, à la fin c'est la mémorisation mais au moins l'enfant était forcé de mettre le focus sur les mots alors à la fin l'enfant peut lire si tu veux son histoire alors avec Jon, il a fait son "reading recovery" dans plusieurs petits livres puis on a mis des cartes qui avaient les mots qui venaient de chaque histoire sauf qu'on élimine les mots qui se répètent comme les mots de Dolche. Si l'enfant a mis "the" dans son histoire on écrit "the" une fois. Alors l'enfant pratique avec ces mots et l'enfant fait des illustrations aussi et à la fin, l'enfant va lire son histoire. Avec Jon, il a publié son livre, son histoire était dictée on a publié ce que Jon a dicté et après ça on lui donne des expériences avec des mots et avec les pages et il apprend à lire son histoire à lui en mémorisant qui ne veut pas dire qu'il va apprendre à lire mais au moins il y a certains mots clés comme les mots de Dolche qu'il va commencer à lire. Il vient de nous donner "me" quand on a fait notre activité de "watermelon" c'était un mot qui était dans ses histoires. Alors, il a eu plusieurs expériences avec une banque de mots et on essaie de créer d'autres contextes pour que l'enfant puisse transférer les mots qu'il sait lire dans d'autres situations et même si Jon n'est pas capable de décoder, déchiffrer les mots en faisant des sons s'il n'est pas prêt ou s'il perd son attention ou quoi que ça soit, au moins notre but on espère qu'il est capable de reconnaître quelques mots à cause de ses expériences avec ses petits mots. C'est ça ce qu'on fait. Alors pour un enfant qui sait comment ou est capable de s'asseoir pour un bon bout de temps et d'écrire une ébauche, on travaille sur les détails sur le contexte, sur l'épellation, et on publie à la fin. C'est le contraire avec l'enfant qui ne peut pas commencer avec une ébauche. Il faut qu'on trouve un autre moyen de créer une histoire à la fin. Alors ça c'est la raison pour laquelle certains élèves comme Luc et Jon ont commencé avec une histoire publiée.

Gestny: C'est qui tes plus faibles? Luc et Jon.

Marie: Olivier aussi. Pas Jacques. Jacques a des difficultés avec la langue, sa langue maternelle et sa deuxième langue. Il va être évalué au mois de septembre, c'est quelque chose qu'on vient de découvrir.

Fin d'une entrevue avec Marie

Marie: Alors tu vois qu'il y a vingt-quatre différents niveaux de développement, dans la classe mais au moins tout le monde a été exposé à différentes choses.

Gestny: Et Jacques, s'il était capable de s'appliquer, est-ce qu'il serait capable de lire?

Marie: On n'est pas certain parce que j'ai une rencontre avec son père tout de suite après l'école aujourd'hui, avec le directeur et l'orthopédagogue parce qu'il a un cas de comportement. On a un système de comportement dans notre école quelque chose avec les cartes et le nombre de cartes qu'il a nous concerne alors on va suggérer au père de l'amener au médecin parce qu'on est un peu concerné qu'il a "attention deficit" et aussi on veut le référer au Child Guidance Clinic. La psychologue va travailler avec lui...ça m'a pris jusqu'au mois de janvier d'avoir la permission du père pour que Jacques puisse passer une période par semaine avec la conseillère.

APPENDIX H

Categorized and Edited Data in Marie's Classroom

H.1 Material

May 26

Published library books.

Their own writings.

May 30

Impressions

June 1 *Fly Away Home*

Poster paper for brainstorming.

Newspaper centre with activity cards.

Scribblers that serve as journals.

Booklets with spirals which serve to write drafts and illustrate.

Computers (3) that they can play with or that she uses to publish stories.

Listening centre.

H.2 Teacher's role

Marie tells the children what they will be doing that day.

She calls up a group one at a time.

She asks them to sit in a listening position and reads a book about polar bears.

She makes a link with the graph of their favourite animal at the zoo.

She reads quite quickly.

"Jacques thank you for watching and listening. That's a good decision."

Reminds them they can write about polar bears. She says she will leave the book open if they want to read it.

She mentions that Olivier is writing a story of the little pigs.

Introduces *The True Story of the Three Little Pigs*. She notes author and dedication.

She invites them to chime in.

She reads without stopping.

She reminds them to remember the story.

There are no questions or discussions at the end of the story.

She checks to see who is ready to share their first draft.

She reminds them they have five minutes, and then they will be conferencing.

The final books are typed and then glued into a book to be illustrated with coloured pencils. The best books go to the library.

The draft is finished when all the pages are complete.

They regroup for a conference. She reminds them what to look for: things they do not understand. "You raise your hand and if he picks you, you can ask your question. Listen for person, problem, and solution. Show respect by sitting in

the listening position and looking at the person. Use your group voice. "Why did you say he didn't have a home and he wanted a home?" She mentions that Cam may not publish.

She tells them that after Luc reads they can make some nice comments. She helps Luc in his reading. It was a dictated story, and he cannot read it. He has a section "About the Author."

Marie says "That makes you feel good inside."

She prepares the group for the third author. She said this author did some revisions. She suggests some additions to the story based on some questions by the students.

"All the children were good sharers."

They are told they have six minutes to finish their stories.

She says they will be soon working on their word families.

Today she works on the "un" family. She reviews the "ump" family from yesterday. They had brainstormed for words with "ump" and are now asked to sight read them. "What would make the "up" family?

Marie comments on upper case and lower case letters as Andr  a writes. She accepts "country."

She asks why Gaston did not need an upper case letter.

She asks them to read from a list of zoo words they made yesterday in conjunction with their visit at the zoo.

May 30

She brainstorms to find out how they could get some books because the library is closed.

She mentions the dinosaur theme, bubble gum day, watermelon day , jello day, freezie day.

She passes out *Fly Away Home* (Impressions) and directs them to turn to the Table of Contents.

Stops to send the attendance list.

They want to read a dinosaur story, but she says that June is dinosaur month.

They are allowed to choose a story about animals or the zoo.

She reminds them to look at the short vowels, "bellowed and cackled."

She also directs them to the picture for the clue.

She chooses the next story.

Marie: How did you know the word was elephant?

Children: Because of the picture.

Marie: What do you notice about 'quiet, we can't sleep?'

Children: An exclamation mark.

Marie: Let's read it with more expression.

She follows with one child in her book. She asks them to reread the quiet parts quietly.

"Can you think of a daily message for the story?"

"Who is sitting quietly and making a good decision?"

"What could we write?"

She tells them that free time will be used to write the date if they don't use their time efficiently.

"Does this look right?" She makes the distinction between upper case and lower case.

"The baby bee bee bird was noisy at night and quiet in the morning. The zoo animals couldn't sleep." She sounds out noisy. She thanks the children as they offer letters.

She sounds out the rest of the words and leaves spaces where there are letters missing.

"Who wants to play my colour game?" "Who can put a triangle around the word zoo?" "Who wants my job as the leader?" "Who can draw a circle around couldn't?" "A rectangle around .. an oval around..."

She asks them to count the finger spaces on the board to find out how many words. What do you do if you can't count the finger spaces? "Write bigger. "

They are asked to get their journal books which are stamped with the date.

Marie circulates to find out what they want to write about.

June 1

She works out her groupings for the centres as the children read *The Coconut Game*.

She asks Danielle to stop reading and asks the boys to participate. There seems to be more participation now. She names the children she can hear.

She reminds them they will not all have a turn... "show respect, make a good decision." "We move but no noises, we have to hear." She stops them and reminds them of their roles.

She asks them to solve the reading problem. Kids are reading other kids' roles. She asks Brigitte to show her what she means. It is totally in their hands. (This is the fourth reading of the same story.)

"Why did it work better yesterday?" "Because we did it your way."

Marie starts again. Not all the children are listening. She tells them to stop. She tells them they are having problems. If they have ideas to solve the problem, they are invited to write them in their journals which are found in one of the centres.

There are five centres: (The centres had been explained yesterday) She says "sht" often.

1. List different flavours of jello (work together)
2. Draw the beginning, middle, and end of *The Coconut Game*, an activity they have done before.
3. Newspapers in the classroom (they have already done this)
4. Person, problem, and solution for the *Coconut Game*.
5. Journal writing. She directs them to think about the puppet plays and to solve the reading problem.

She chooses the group and decides who is going where.

She talks a lot about good decisions. Seventeen minutes later all the children are ready.

June 7

"123 all eyes on me. Thank you to kids doing the circle."

She announces to the children they will be doing *The Coconut Game* for me.

She names the animals. They are not to talk, only to mime. Marie stops them and reminds them they should read together. Again one voice leads. Someone is reading a part. Marie stops them again. She congratulates the children. She starts reading a dinosaur poetry book before all the children are sitting. She reads 3 poems in a few seconds. There is no follow-up.

She asks them what they are learning about. They say dinosaurs and the 4 seasons.

She reads *No Dinosaurs in the Park*. She encourages them to participate in the reading. She asks them what "timid" means. Together they look it up in the dictionary. A child reads the definition, and they agree it must be frightened. "Are there really dinosaurs in the park or are they in his imagination." They answer yes/no and go on to the explanations of the centres.

The centres are:

1. Reading dinosaur books and finding three facts and writing them down. They have never seen these books before. There are about five. Most of them are of a very difficult reading ability.
2. Making a new cover for the book which was just read to them at the listening centre.
3. Writing about their favourite activity for each of the 4 seasons. When I asked her why they were doing this activity she said that Friday was 4 seasons day.
4. Writing portfolio.
5. Phonics testing group.

They are encouraged to help one another. All of these centres are individual. At 1:30 they are invited to come and share. Marie reads a couple of poems. "I will choose the children who are sitting in a listening position, who are concentrating, and who are showing respect. Gérald, you may share." "Why would you choose Eric's book?" "What is interesting in his drawing?" She chooses one member from each group to share.

June 8

Thank you to Annette who is ready, Luc who is ready. The children are everywhere. She has made an attempt to regroup them but there is no follow-through. They are quite excited.

She explains they will work on centres and then finish old work.

Yvan brought a dinosaur book, and Marie is reading a chapter. She asks a prediction question for content. She explains it is a chapter book. She reads very quickly and with much expression. "Will the dinosaur live?"

She asks the group to share the research from the dinosaur centre. Yvan, who is not from the centre, shares something his mother told him. Danielle said she has nothing to say about dinosaurs.

Marie does a rotation of the groups for the centres.

When she is not giving a phonics test, she is working individually with students, asking them to talk about what they are doing or what they wrote.

She asks Gaston what he likes to do and suggests he write about that.

They regroup for sharing and Marie decides who will share.

She finishes the story she started.

She asks them what they learned about the iguanadon. They mention about three facts.

June 9

She invites the children to come to the carpet, and she reads from the dinosaur poetry book. She reads several poems and shows the pictures. She encourages them to finish the sentence. She has trouble pronouncing, and she shows them how to read the phonetic spelling that is printed in the book.

She holds up *What Happened to the Dinosaurs* and says they can learn something if they listen to the book.

She asks Jacques to sit at his desk with his journal.

She defines "theory" and then leaves it out of the story and asks them to predict when the word appears.

She notes to the class a contradiction between two books with reference to dinosaur eggs.

She does not stop during the reading to check comprehension.

She congratulates the children who raise their hands to answer her vocabulary questions (theory).

"What's your theory?" I can't really hear. The children speak very softly. Four offer answers.

Marie suggests they write about their theory in their portfolios.

She announces that tomorrow will be a birthday party for the author of *Chicken Soup with Rice*. It is also dinosaur day so they will be very busy.

She reminds the portfolio group they revise, finish, or start something new.

She places the book *What Happened* in the research centre.

Marie asks Lucie why she started "I am.." She said she liked that.

At 1:38 they regroup, and she talks about cleaning up.

June 13

She directs them in writing a message for their parents.

What word is inside "year?"

They brainstorm for services parents did for them.

She continues despite the disruptions and sends Armance to get the TA. Gérald leaves, and everything is calmer.

Luc wants to contribute, and she tends not to ask him. At the end she asks him.

She directs them in activities to find little words in big words or to change letters to make new words.

As they work she tells them not to show her, she will pass by their desks.

She encourages them to sound out their words.

She tells them she should have brought some cards to show them how they open as they have not put them together so they open as cards.

Those who are finished are invited to listen to the dinosaur book. She starts with four children, and one other joins. She reads for three minutes.

At 1:20 they clean up because there is a concert in the gym for the parents. The TA says three children know the song well.

June 14

The children speak in English upon entering the classroom.

They are told they will do two centres today as yesterday was volunteer day. She reads *Dinosaur Garden*. She said it interested her, and she wanted to share it with the students. She reads with lots of expression and the children are attentive. She asks some questions during reading but no questions after reading.

She announces the groups.

At 12:38 she starts the phonics test.

12:45 she congratulates Jon. She tells him he has written a whole page and can read it.

She helps Armance and Serge conference. She tells Serge how to use spider legs to add to his story. She asks Serge some questions and then asks him what he must add so she and Armance can better understand the story.

She works with Jon asking him to read what he has written and congratulating him. She tells him he has a person, problem, and solution. She asks him about a beginning, middle, and end.

She invites them to regroup.

Back in centers, Marie shows Annette and Serge how to use the index to find information about dinosaurs.

Marie helps Jacques.

June 15

She reads a chapter from the bubble gum book. She mentions problem, solution, who, what...

Tells them what they will be doing after the reading.

Presents the title, author, and starts reading.

Asks a comprehension question, "Why isn't she getting up?"

Reads for two minutes and then asks, "What's the problem? Who do you think the monster is?"

Explains the centres and new groups for two weeks:

1. listening centre - Bubble Gum All the children answer at once. She asks the others to let Annette answer. They are to listen to the story and then they are to draw their favourite part.

2. journal - a list of the things you could do with bubble gum.

3. newspaper in the classroom

4. bubble gum words - "Can you sound it out?" "Not all at once." It takes quite a few seconds to tell them not to answer out loud. They give two letters at a time and are asked to sound them out. "Make as many words as you can using the letters of bubble gum." She tells them there is to be one writer at the centre.

Bubble gum booklet - write any words or sentences that come to mind when you think of bubble gum. They may write a story or poem. "Do carpet and bubble gum have anything in common?" "You can make bubble gum rules."

She divides the children into groups.

Due to crying, she says they have to work as a group. She stays there until the

problem is resolved. The problem has to do with the rule of one writer. They all want to use the felt pens.

She pulls out letters so they can manipulate them to make new words.

She asks Jon why that's his favourite part. "Read the page, sound it out, look at the picture." Interruption. "Sound it out, sound it out." He just guesses.

He tells me he can read the page.

Marie asks Danielle and Isabelle their favourite part.

If Andréa does not do a newspaper card, she can't go out for recess.

Those who speak French during free time will receive a penny to buy a bubble gum.

First five who are ready can share at group time.

Marie has bubble gum machine in her arms. She is just showing them for now.

"Show respect, speak French." She goes over respect.

June 16

She says she will read the *Meat Eaters Arrive*. She says she will have to hand out red cards. Tells them how to sit. "Make a good decision."

She talks about dinosaurs, watermelon, and bubble gum activities.

Reads title, author and illustrator. She reads slowly to show dinosaurs slow movement.

"Why are they worried?"

She asks the children to read the letter from the book. She reads with lots of expression.

"Were the Rex's really threatening neighbours?" She finishes the book.

What happened at the beginning of the bubble gum book?

She starts reading chapter two. "What has a heat register have to do with the story." She makes a link with a story they read at the beginning of the year, and another one at Halloween, Danielle's story.

She reads chapter three and the children are still very attentive. She reads chapter four, and there is no discussion of the story. She invites the children to read the letter in the book.

She saves the last chapter for bubble gum day.

She wants to share another book with them, a nonfiction one this time. She talks to them a lot. She talks about other books in the series. It is a factual book, and the children are less attentive.

The book seems quite difficult. There are no predictions or comprehension questions.

She announces what they will be doing tomorrow, there will be a bubble gum blowing contest.

She reassures Gaston who is concerned because he cannot blow a bubble. The other children reassure him also.

Marie helps the bubble gum word group.

June 22

She tells them this is their last bubble gum day and watermelon day is on Friday.

They regroup and talk about the writing process.

The kindergarten children are there. She conducts this discussion for them.

"How do you write a book?" "You sound out each letter."

She makes the distinction between the kid way and the book way.

"What happens after you have a lot of words?" "We chat about where, when, why, beginning, middle, and end, person, problem, solution."

"What else?" "Go back and write." Why? "Because we're not writing."

"The story is in your head and it's got a long way to travel."

The kindergarten children leave.

"What do you do if a person says they do not understand?" "You write more."

"What happens when everyone understands?" "Then we print it."

As she talks, 9 students are talking.

"Danika, what do you do with scissors and glue?" "Cut out the pictures and paste them."

"What happens next?" "You read it to the kids in a group voice."

"Then what happens about the kind comments?"

Then she tells them what they will be doing after recess including some centres in French time.

June 24

She tells me what they did in the morning for watermelon day. They did some estimating with the watermelon.

They start singing a song from a watermelon book that Marie is holding up.

There is no tune. She doesn't really model a tune.

Luc does not sing.

They brainstorm for new rhymes.

Two children play with books.

TA goes out with Gérald and comes back shortly after.

12:38, she continues trying to find more rhymes.

12:48, she starts reading the book, and there are many interruptions.

There are no pauses in the reading. She asks if watermelon juice dribbled down their cheek.

Some children cannot see the book.

"Put your name on your paper." "I don't have a paper." "What are we supposed to do?"

Children chase after chairs.

Marie writes the word on the board at 1:00. It takes about five minutes to write watermelon.

Marie writes the words in the board and does not ask the children how to spell them.

She gives them time to make their own words.

After recess they will eat watermelon.

She tells them to come into group. Then they get in line for a drink. It is hot today.

They brainstorm for word families and rhyming words.

Olivier gets a red card.

H.3 TA's role

May 26

Helps the children with illustrating.

Helps with discipline during Marie's reading. She also helps Jacques and Olivier. She also works with Luc and Gérald and Jon.

She distributes red cards.

June 7

TA moves from group to group to help the children at the centres.

June 7

TA continues work with Luc. She is helping him write something and she sounds out the words for him.

She watches Olivier and Jacques when they are in a group situation. Near the end she was taking down decor.

She also prepares booklets for the children or files their work.

She may look after Gérald as well.

She always works with individual children.

June 15

She prepares some work.

H.4 Student's Role

May 26

They are attentive during the story reading.

One group goes to a table with TA for illustrating.

Some are working on a first draft.

Andréa is quite happy to share her draft with me and explain how the writing folders work.

Brigitte read me her story.

They work very quietly.

They speculate on why or why not he doesn't have a home. They discuss how his parents died.

Luc reads his published story about the zoo. Comments are "It's cool, it's a good story."

Children are patient and quiet during conference.

The children are in control of the conference.

Andréa is chosen to write the phonics words.

The children spell the words.

Armance wants to write bunny in her English portfolio but is told that it is not English.

The children are asked to compose credit cards for those who speak French.

They are responsible for distributing the cards as well.

May 30

One girl chooses a story and reads the page number.

They read in unison. About sixty per-cent of the children are reading. There is no discussion.

They turn back to the Table of Contents as soon as they have finished the story. There is a lot of sounding out for this story. They vote on the name of an animal in the picture.

The reading is lead by a group of girls, particularly Danielle. All are looking in their books. No one is using his or her finger and not everyone is reading out loud.

A couple of children have now lost interest in the story and are not paying attention.

"Back to the Table of Contents" the children say in unison.

The children make a couple of suggestions for the daily message, and the children are invited to get their message book.

"Who can help me with the date?"

They help her spell Monday as she makes the phonetic sound for each letter. "m," "u," then "o." To me this is confusing.

Luc is working with TA. He is having difficulty forming his letters. He is still working on the date and not following the message at all. He writes May 30, Monday, and five words in thirty minutes.

One group at the back does not participate at all.

They reread the message together.

They participate in the colour game. Some do the activity in their message book.

Gaston, who has no finger spaces, counts them on the board.

Serge reads to Marie

Lucie reads to me asking me not to share with the others the content of her journal.

June 1

They are very excited. They have already read the story and are told they will mime it. They are instructed that they will read together then mime.

The unison reading of the *Coconut Game* is done mostly by Danielle and Brigitte.

The majority of the children are following, but not all, *The Coconut Game*.

Danielle loses her place, and the whole group stops reading.

One boy does not have a book. There are two extras on the table.

They reread with three children having a role. They are supposed to read the dialogue. They are confused about their parts. They are getting more distracted. The pit is in the centre of the circle. David mentions they need not all take a turn. It's like watching a movie. Elephant needs a book.

They are very agitated during the explanation of the centres. Olivier is aside.

At the newspaper table, Serge and Jon can't read the directions.

Danika is at the beginning, middle, and end and she starts copying the story.

Armance is having personal problems and Marie takes her aside.

June 7

They reread *The Coconut Game*, I think for my benefit.

Not all the children are following.

Some of them have memorized the story.

They are quite agitated when asked to sit for the story. Jacques is asked to sit at his place. He sits with me and is very agitated.

The dinosaur group is drawing well but no one is writing. In the four seasons group, Annette has written quite a bit about two seasons but the other two boys are quite stumped. Marie is giving a phonics test to two children. When they finish their test, they go to the portfolio group. The book cover group is drawing but there is no discussion. After fifteen minutes one boy has a tree trunk. The portfolio group is working. Gérald is at the listening centre.

The class is relatively calm. The portfolio group writes very little. In thirty minutes the portfolio group has three out of five members who have written a half a page. There seems to be little being done.

Danielle reads the most difficult dinosaur book. She and Véronique are the only two who have written some facts.

One girl is working on a story started January 28.

Annette is directed to circle the words she is unsure of. She circles four words she can't read and shows them to Marie. Marie asks her to check and see if there is a snow book. She has circled snow even though it was correct. This is the "book way."

Eric shares his book cover. Gérald shares his four seasons page. David shares from the portfolio group. She reads what she has written but there is no discussion. Danielle reads her fact from one dinosaur.

June 8

The four seasons group gets underway right away.

Marie gives a phonics dictation.

At 12:40, the children are ready to work.

The book cover group seems to be working well. There doesn't seem to be a link between the story and the picture. There is no "objectivation."

Jon, in the four seasons group, is very proud that he has written seven lines for winter. The TA asks him what he has written.

The dinosaur group is choosing some dinosaurs and will "make up" some facts about them. They make no attempt to read the books.

Jon is very tired. He has finished winter. Serge has written for winter also.

Marie asks him to read his text but he has difficulty reading his text. There is a lot of invented spelling.

Gérald is with the resource teacher. Marie was told that there is no point trying to teach him anything for the month of June. He is moving to Kelowna and someone said he is too upset to learn.

TA works with Luc.

Lucie reads her story to another.

Brigitte has described her dinosaur.

Jon reads to Marie what he wrote.

The children work on their portfolios. They seem very comfortable putting their ideas down on paper. Jacques does very little in his portfolio.

A couple of girls are off by themselves.

The boys count the lines they have filled.

Olivier seems to be disrupting the girls.

Eric has written nothing in his portfolio for twenty-five minutes.

A group of four children spend five to ten minutes posting their work at the bulletin board.

The girls read a love note to Jon. He is very embarrassed. Marie suggests, unknowingly, that maybe she would like to publish it.

Sarah and Olivier talk under the table.

Gaston conferences with Paul. Marie questions them about the conference.

Annette works hard trying to find the correct spelling for her four words. Marie gives her a hand. She encourages her to sound out the words.

She asks Jon to read.

At 1:15 Eric has still not written.

Jon gets out his *Bonkers* book that was dictated by him. He is in the process of illustrating it. He asks me for help to read a page so he can draw. He is unable to read but is familiar with the story and makes up the text as he goes along.

He makes no effort for a grapho-phonetic link.

Carey has not written anything in his portfolio.

Gérald, Jacques, Danielle, and four other girls chat while Marie works with Annette's invented spelling words.

Jon spends four minutes posting his work.

At 1:25 they regroup on the carpet. A few students share their work. At 1:40 they put their heads on their desks for recess.

Luc tries to read his dinosaur research story to Marie

June 9

They are very attentive as she reads.

One girl mentions something she learned in a French book.

The book seems difficult to me but most of the children are attentive. The book talks about the theories surrounding the disappearance of the dinosaurs but the introduction did not necessarily prepare them for that.

The new cover group gets right on task.

Marie has a dictée group.

Carina starts reading *No More Dinosaurs* with no problem. She shares a little with Gérald who has just returned to the classroom.

TA works with Luc at the four seasons centre.

They have an argument about the book Carina was reading. They talk about who it belongs to, who is the boss of the book, stealing, being mean, friends, and getting arrested.

The book cover group talks about wierdos.

Gérald draws in his portfolio. Serge is drawing and writing.

The book cover group is almost finished their work (12:50).

The research group is working at the titles and drawings of the dinosaurs.

"You're not supposed to copy, you're supposed to sound out."

Lucie is starting to write some facts, and Gaston is playing with his crayon.

1:00 the dictée is finished.

Paul conferences with Andréa. She tries to help him with his spelling but he doesn't like that. He says he wants to do it his way. He lets her correct

"please," "well," "one," but not "basketball." He asks her if she has any questions. "Oh, almost everything is wrong." "No it isn't."

Now she helps Eric and he moves beside her. He reads his story. Then she asks if they want to hear her chapter book. "How many pages?" Paul only listens.

Jon wants to read his story. Paul wants to read his puppy story. No one listens. Paul tries to read one of his earlier stories but can't because of the spelling.

Jon tries to read his story, *Bonkers*.

Marie invites those who are interested to listen to her dinosaur fact book to join her at the reading centre. About ten children group around her.

Lucie finishes her dinosaur fact page.

Four boys are working on their portfolio, two are doing their research, and two are doing their four seasons page.

Jon wants to read his story with me because he has forgotten. Andr  a is beside me also.

Gaston reads me his dinosaur fact page. He asked Yvan for the information.

Marie reads with a group from *Impressions*. They mime the dinosaur story they read together.

At 1:38 all the children are asked to sit around Marie.

Jon wants to finish his story in free time or recess.

June 13

They have trouble concentrating during brainstorming due to disruptions by Jacques. Or maybe, I have trouble concentrating.

They go to their seats and work on their thank you cards. They are not to take out felts until they have finished with a pencil. They are to copy the message and may add any extra.

Children get on task right away with unlined paper. They can fold the paper as they wish and print where they wish.

Olivier wants to write "I am stupid in school" and Marie asks him why. She asks him what he can do to make things better.

They are pretty quiet as they write their cards. Some add some extra reasons. They write for five to ten minutes and then color. Some go to the board to check the spelling.

Luc has written four or five words. He can't finger space between his words.

Jacques may now make a card. He had spent the time writing out his penalty.

Apparently that is to make him conscious of his behavior. The TA says it doesn't work for him.

Jon tells me he has to redo his card because his message was not on the right side of the page.

June 14

Danielle starts writing in her portfolio immediately.

Paul says "I'm not learning anything." He's in the dinosaur center.

Yvan draws a picture in his portfolio.

Paul talks to Erin about spelling, she spells something for him. He tells her he doesn't need help.

Armance is writing about a girl but doesn't know what will happen to the girl.
 They are working quietly.
 Eric and Isabelle are at the dinosaur center but do not talk.
 Yvan has started writing now.
 They recognize Yvan as being the expert on dinosaurs.
 Andréa reads and makes notes.
 Danielle makes a list in her portfolio.
 Armance writes before she draws. Yvan draws.
 Serge looks for someone to listen to his story and Armance accepts.
 Annette has written a bubble gum poem, and Marie invites her to practice it for bubble gum day.
 There are two children at the book cover group.
 The four seasons group is completing their page.
 Armance has trouble listening to Cory's story. Marie asks her to repeat what she has heard, then tells Serge to reread and tells Armance to listen well.
 Danielle has divided her page into two columns: one has the name of the dino and the other has a fact in note form.
 Danielle and company practice touching their tongue to their nose. Annette practices making rolling noises.
 Sarah shows her work to Marie
 They regroup and turn to the table of contents in *Impressions*. They read and act a dinosaur poem.
 Gérald goes with the TA.
 At 1:15 they go back to new centres.
 Sébastien works on the book he wants to publish.
 They are free to sit where they want.
 Armance wants to show me her "Grand Dossier."
 Serge is walking around.
 Eric is working on four seasons but is having trouble getting down to work.
 Jon asks Danielle to confirm something he said to another student.

June 15

Students were talking about their dreams. All the dreams were about dinosaurs.
 Jacques goes to his place during reading.
 They are attentive during reading.
 They exclude Jacques from the group, and he starts crying. Armance is crying as well.
 Marie asks how they can get everyone involved. One boy suggests they take turns.
 Journal group starts writing and/or drawing.
 Listening group follows with text.
 Newspaper activities: Annette has done three, Gaston has done about six.
 Brigitte writes in her bubble gum scribbler, Olivier draws.
 One boy reads the newspaper directions to another.
 Annette and Véronique work at newspapers, the other two boys play with the cards.
 Olivier write three pages for bubble gum book. All is written in invented spelling.

Sébastien has written several lines for bubble gum book.
 Several children crowd around Marie
 Serge does not participate in the newspaper centre.
 Children ask each other their favourite parts.
 At 1:15 they have eight words.
 Gaston chooses the "run is an action word" card. He prints "run" and colours.
 Brigitte reads her story to Marie from bubble gum booklet.
 My table talks about the Stanley Cup.
 The bubble gum words group is illustrating their page.
 Luc puts nothing on his page but a line.
 Olivier is very proud of his booklet..
 Sébastien works on his story.
 Lucie shares her journal and ideas for bubble gum (uses of bubble gum).
 Some of the children have trouble listening.
 David will share when others are ready. Yvan shares his favourite part of the book.
 Annette shares her work on the index page.
 Brigitte shares her bubble gum story.

June 16

Danika shares a story about a spider and Marie suggests she write about it in her journal.
 Sébastien asks Annette where the index is.
 Jacques sits with Danika and me, and Danika moves.
 Sébastien asks me for the index page, and Marie comes over and asks him to finish his book.
 Armance and Danika start writing in bubble gum booklet.
 Luc draws in journal, Danielle writes, Yvan writes, Isabelle writes.
 Sarah is distracted from newspaper centre. No one is there now.
 David and Lucie are cutting out letters. She finds some food and Jacques comes and puts her page on the floor. He can't seem to concentrate and is easily distracted.
 The listening group is doing their drawing now.
 The bubble gum group is arguing very loudly about who gets to play with the felts.
 Marie talks with Jacques. Annette and Olivier play.
 Marie talks with Jacques.
 1:10 Luc has written nothing.
 Isabelle is working on her dinosaur fact book.

June 22

Luc, Jon, Yvan, Danielle, Isabelle start writing the title on their bubble gum booklet.
 Ian starts drawing.
 Danielle and Isabelle talk about how they look alike.
 Isabelle asks Danielle how to spell bubble gum, house.
 The three boys draw and write.

Luc is difficult to understand.

Jacques asks Gérald what a word is.

She asks Danielle how to spell one and Jon offers "onu."

Jon starts writing.

Isabelle wants to get an eraser but Marie sends her back and tells her to cross out.

Jon said it's the best "b" he's ever done.

Luc scribbles out his writing, looks around, and talks about the rain.

J. and B. are the only ones talking. They laugh at Jon's sentence or are angry that he too is writing about a bubble gum house.

Yvan does not talk at all, neither does Danielle.

Yvan says he does not know what to write.

The girls say they can write a story or a poem or a song.

They worked for twelve minutes.

12:45

Annette, Andréa, Cory, Carina, and Gaston come with their journals and are supposed to talk about the uses of bubble gum.

They have already been writing for twelve minutes.

Annette draws and so does Carina.

Serge reads a page about his dog, Barney. They talk about Barney Flinstone and Barney the dinosaur.

They laugh about dinosaurs. They talk about dogs and kittens.

Serge wants a dog. Andréa and Serge fool around.

Andréa does not write or draw.

Annette is amazed that I have written so much.

Carina talks about Japanese writing.

Gaston mentions Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles.

Andréa writes and asks what else to do with bubble gum.

Gaston has put nothing on his page. He talks about strangers.

Carina colours and talks.

In twenty to thirty minutes, Gaston has written five words, Annette quite a few, Carina five or six words, Serge wrote quite a bit.

Brigitte, Eric and Stéphanie arrive to work on bubble gum words. They have been working for thirty minutes and have come up with six words. Marie says they must find another three.

Eric is fascinated by my writing. Eric tries manipulating the letters to make a word. He tries for one minute and then gives up.

They talk about the new kindergarten children in the classroom.

Brigitte gets them back on task.

She asks me to help her. I help them organize the letters, and they come up with three more words.

1:12 the next group arrives Paul, Danika, and Aaron.

Paul shows me his two activities: the alphabet and the framed comic.

Danika shows me different letters to make words with the vowel [a], two copies of the alphabet, her name and her picture, the alphabet card, crossword puzzles cut out, and her favourite sport (she has cut out a soccer ball).

Aaron had been sick for two weeks, and he shows me part of the alphabet.

Paul takes charge of the group telling who and when to participate
1:20 Sébastien, Lucie, David. Marie brings the Big Book of the bubble gum story.

They had drawn their favourite page and had written why they liked it.

They read the book with no difficulty. There is very little text.

They share with me the parts they liked the best. This whole activity took sixty minutes.

June 24

After the group time, some sit down, others sharpen pencils, others are at the board.

Gérald goes off to play. He lays down with a book covering his face.

Serge sits with me, and he writes a whole sentence while the class writes watermelon.

They do the activity together.

After they brainstorm for word families. They seem very agitated.

Olivier leaves with a red ticket.

Jacques leaves with the TA.

Sarah just walked in.

Jacques is laughing out loud.

Marie is getting impatient.

Serge and Jacques push the table.

She sends Serge to his desk.

They sing the song with new rhymes. One of the lines is changed "For if I go - do"

Paul notices the error and Marie says it's okay.

Marie encourages the children to read with her.

Jacques stops disturbing when he starts listening to the story.

She doesn't finish the story.

Jacques and Serge are to meet Marie at the "black table" in the office.

H.5 Evaluation

The resource teacher is testing the children's English reading. She uses the same passage in Nov., Feb., and May. She asks "What kind of reader are you? What is your favourite book? Do you read at home?" The child reads the passage, and she checks the decoding skills. She starts out by saying she should be doing something more whole language, she seems embarrassed. She holds her sheets very close but is very willing to discuss the results. The text comes from Brigance.

June 7

Phonics testing is done for the reports. She said all the children should know all the consonants and x number of vowels before grade two.

June 7

How do know who has done what centre? I check at the end of the week. She says six of her twenty-four students are non readers. I asked her what she based that on, and she said Brigrance.

H.6 Other

May 26

There are lots of interruptions: two adults come and go, one child leaves. A volunteer comes every Wednesday to read with the children. The independent readers read to her. For the others, she reads to them or they read the same story together.

The three children conferencing were at three different stages of their draft or story.

For the correction of their drafts: for certain students she does all the corrections, for others she asks them to circle three errors per page and they try and correct.

She is very proud of their oral French and written English.

Marie said that phonics should be taught in context. She uses Armance's example of wanting to write bunny in her story after working the "un" family. I had noticed that Marie did not make the link, and she did not let Armance write in her book because English was over.

May 30

They enter very excited and sit in front. Marie is very quick to regroup the children.

There is no pre-reading or follow-up.

The resource teacher gives training sessions so the kindergarten and grade one parents know how to read to the children at home. Parent volunteers read to the children individually at school.

During the writing of the message, someone comes in and gets two students. She seems to direct her questions to those who are sitting at the front.

As she works phonics with the message about the beebee bird, she does not refer to her word families.

TA leaves Luc and works with someone else. Luc continues to draw his letters painfully.

She congratulates them regularly and often asks them to quiet down.

She encourages them a lot in their writing with their ideas.

June 1

She tells me that I missed a lot yesterday.

The reading out of the *Impressions* books is done with the children sitting in a circle on the floor. Phonics activities and the "message du jour" is done with the children sitting in front of Marie. Reading to the children is done with the children sitting on the floor facing her.

I find it more difficult to observe here. The children seem more distracted.

June 7

She said it was too bad I didn't film yesterday. She said she wanted *The Coconut Game* filmed as the children resolved the problem.

She wants me to see how they did beginning, middle, and end. I said don't change anything.

I asked her why the children are changing the cover. She said to integrate the arts and to find out what their favourite part was.

I asked how she decided what sounds to test and she said she tested all the consonants and the short vowels.

They start the afternoon off on the floor with her, reading for about five to ten minutes. Then they either do a daily message, phonics family, choral reading, share some writing, listen to directions for the centres, or learn a song. At around 1:00 they go to the centres till about 1:35. They may stay at the same centre for thirty minutes or she may move them all after about ten or fifteen minutes. Then they get together to do some sharing. This is very flexible. Sometimes there is no sharing before recess.

What do you do if a group has not finished a centre. They will finish during the day.

At recess, Marie asks a group to stay in for their interpretation of *The Coconut Game*. She wants me to film. They have difficulty trying to read because of the invented spelling. They have memorized a lot of the text from the book.

Marie says she responds to the needs of the children like the dinosaur group who needed to do research.

The children are quite forward with my notes and with my equipment.

June 8

I wonder why Marie doesn't read more and talk about the reading?

I wonder why she thinks she has to do a phonics test for the report card?

Will the seasons or dinosaur centre be rewritten? She collects all the work and places it in their file and uses it to evaluate their progress.

It is hard for me to make notes. There is lots going on.

Marie tends to follow me if I approach a child. I think I should stay put a while longer.

Marie thinks Jacques is ADA. She says he lives with his father and there is little consistency in the discipline. She thinks Olivier is ADA also.

Marie asks Gaston to move away as he was talking to me. This is the first time he has spoken to me. I think she is uncomfortable with my being here.

Marie said that the child's experience takes priority over what happens in the centres. I wonder what experience she is talking about.

She says that the phonics test will take precedence over the book covers.

She said she has quite a few discipline problems. A few children see the counselor. She wants to give me some more information but she hasn't had time.

She is very patient with all the students. She never raises her voice.

She said Annette will correct the four words and that is it for that piece.

She said that the area is underprivileged, and there are quite a few problems.

Jon is neglected

Marie is very generous with her time.
She does not tell the children when she will be absent. She does not want to upset them.
She says she spends a lot of time talking to the parents.
She mentioned a lot of the students need a lot of stimulation.

June 9

The children are cleaning up their toys. They has recess inside.
As I listen in on the book cover group, Marie comes over to check on them.
Marie comes over to my group again so I move on.

June 13

She tells me what I missed on Friday for four seasons day. She is very excited about the pool she brought into the class. She divided the day into four seasons. The idea came from a teacher in Charleswood. She said it was too bad I wasn't there to get some pictures.

June 14

Jon wants to sit beside me but Marie wants him to sit by himself. She says he depends too much on adults and in grade two he has to be more independent. It seems to me he is searching for help because he needs it.
There are now some easier books in the dinosaur centre.

June 15

I wonder how many of the texts they write are reworked.
During the reading of the story, Jacques walks in and out burping. Aaron's mom comes in. The TA sits with two boys.

June 16

As I leave, she says how excited they are and could I imagine what it would be like if they were asked to be more controlled.

June 22

There are beautiful painted murals on the walls.
She wants me to be outside in the hall with the groups today. She gives them twelve minutes at each centre.
There are eight kindergarten children coming today.
Marie comes out and seems disappointed that I helped them organise the letters to make the words. I told her they asked me and that they were not getting any new words.

June 24

Marie attends to Serge when I start whispering to him.
"Quelle journée!" she says.
She tells me there is not much more teaching that will be going on, and I tell her it will be my last visit. She seems relieved.

H.7 Français

Discussion of the graph that was done with the substitute. She seems to be working the structure "Deux personnes ont préféré les singes."
 She discusses the animals they made with construction paper. "C'est un tigre."
 They say the phrase and then sit down with their animal.
 She plays a game "Si vous avez un animal qui aime manger les poissons." "J'ai un ours polaire qui aime manger les poissons." She has to calm them down.
 After they say a sentence with their animal, they can go play.
 Some children play in French but as soon as there was a problem about sharing the toys, they switch to English. The boys at the computer play in English.
 Jacques and Olivier work with the TA in their writing portfolio.

May 30

They sit in front to do the calendar. They write the date and draw an animal (One child does this). They recite the vocabulary for the calendar days. The first few days are plants, then comes the zoo animals. "C'est un... Ceux sont des ..." It is particularly a group of girls who participate.
 She calms them with "shh".
 Then they work "hier," "aujourd'hui," and "demain."
 She reads a story using the echo technique twice then does the mime with them three times:

Je m'appelle Monsieur le Loup
 Et je suis très très marabout
 Dans le bois Monsieur le Loup
 Lentement te suis partout
 Vites vites cachez-vous
 Il est derrière vous.

A few children follow the lesson.

She reads another story about a chicken. They mime it twice. The children talk amongst themselves in French.

The speed of the lesson seems slow and the children are getting agitated.
 She said integration of maths consists of using French words for adding and subtracting objects. For example, a girl draws $12 - 6 = 6$ using monkeys.
 Marie works with one child, four finish their math, and the rest play.

June 7

Danielle reads the song for the parent volunteers on the poster chart. She does so with no problem So does Gérald. No one can hear him.

She plays the music but the children cannot follow the words on the poster paper. Not all the words are written for them to follow. It is the second time they have heard the tape. Danielle can sing the words. Marie says they did very well. "Il me semble que vous avez compris le refrain." I wonder how she made that evaluation.

They sing a second time. Marie does not sing with them. They have no model for the articulation. She puts her hand to her ear at a stanza where the text is

not written for the children on the board. They seem to be completely lost. She says "sht" often.

At 2:18, they are instructed to complete their work. They seem to be working mainly in French.

June 8

Marie says they will play a game. They sing "si tu aimes les dinosaures tape tes mains..."

They now practice the song they are preparing for the volunteers. The words are posted for the second stanza but not the third. There is no explanation of the words. After singing it once with the cassette, those who think they know the words are asked to turn away from the words and sing it again. She wants to know if they have memorized them because the parent day is coming up.

June 16

There is on the blackboard: "Je t'aime papa. Bonne fête des pères de ____."

APPENDIX I

Résumé of the Audio-video Cassette in Marie's Classroom

le 30 mai 1994

- 00.00.00 Revue des règlements pendant la lecture en groupe. Les enfants sont assis en cercle. Ensemble, ils cherchent un texte dans leur livre de lecture qui traite des animaux.
- 00.07.24 Les enfants sont à leur bureau et écrivent (Spelling: The baby bee)
- 00.09.15 Recherche de mots connus (en français)
Calendrier avec répétition de la structure "C'est un, ce sont des..." et "hier, aujourd'hui, demain."
- 00.12.56 Théâtre-lu en groupe
- 00.14.00 Centres: 1. Dessiner le début, le milieu, et la fin d'une histoire.
2. Écrire des mots.
3. People, problem, solution
4. Journaux
- 00.15.10 Théâtre-lu

le 7 juin 1994

- 00.17.15 Marie explique au groupe ce qui va arriver vendredi: Four seasons' day
- 00.18.05 Partage de l'histoire *Dinosaurs in the Park*.
Revue des épitaphes, des auteurs...
- 00.21.34 Super fun dinosaurs: Centres
1. Livres de dinosaures à parcourir et remplir une feuille sur quelques types de dinosaures découverts ainsi que quelques informations sur chacun d'eux. Illustrer.
2. Dessiner la couverture du livre de l'histoire lue.
3. Writing folders.
4. Words sounds/phonétique pour bulletins
5. La feuille des quatre saisons
- 00.28.40 Lecture du livre sur les dinosaures.
- 00.29.58 Certains élèves présentent l'histoire qu'ils ont écrite sur l'éléphant.
- 00.35.30 Lecture en groupe sur les dinosaures.
- 00.39.23 Mise au point sur le stégosaure à deux cerveaux.
Centres.
- 00.42.10 Présentation et partage au groupe de travaux réalisés par quatre élèves dans les centres.
- 00.53.00 Lecture sur les dinosaures.
- 00.54.38 Chanson "Si tu aimes les stégosaures, lève la main..."
- 00.58.25 Répétition du chant "Merci" et étude du vocabulaire de la deuxième strophe.
- 01.01.45 Revue de la deuxième strophe,

le 13 juin

- 01.06.40 Lettre aux parents pour les remercier de leur aide.
Mots cachés dans d'autres mots / jeu de mots.

le 14 juin

- 01.15.17 Dinosaurs' garden
lecture en groupe et découverte du glossaire
- 01.19.20 lecture par deux d'une histoire qu'ils ont écrite
- 01.19.40 Trouver l'histoire qui traite des dinosaures dans le livre de lecture et ce, en s'aidant de la table des matières.
Lecture en grand groupe de l'histoire et questionnement.
Lecture du texte avec des enfants incarnant les actions des dinosaures de l'histoire.
- 01.27.55 Centres à finir.

le 24 juin 1994

- 01.39.50 Rimes / mots. Cat-mat en grand groupe.
Travail sur la famille des sons.
- 01.39.50 Écrire une autre version d'une chanson.
- 01.41.08 Lecture de *The Great Watermelon Birthday*.
- 01.46.56 Discussion en grand groupe.
- 01.47.54 Utiliser le mot watermelon et trouver le plus de mots contenus dans ce grand mot chacun séparément avant de se retrouver tous ensemble.
- 01.52.32 Retour en groupe classe - phonétique et épellation
Répétition de la chanson créée
- 01.56.42 lecture de livres en groupe.

APPENDIX J

Stages of Writing

S T A G E S O F W R I T I N G

[illegible]

APPENDIX K

Reading Continuum

A. MAGICAL

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> interested in books | <input type="checkbox"/> attentive listener |
| <input type="checkbox"/> pictures include letters | <input type="checkbox"/> notices print in environment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> improper book handling | <input type="checkbox"/> names book pictures |
| <input type="checkbox"/> meaning is magical | <input type="checkbox"/> plays with letters and words |

SELF-CONCEPTING

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> book handling skills developing | <input type="checkbox"/> "magically" imposes meaning for new print |
| <input type="checkbox"/> tries to read | <input type="checkbox"/> "reads" familiar books |
| <input type="checkbox"/> recognizes name | <input type="checkbox"/> recognizes signs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> some phonetics used | <input type="checkbox"/> makes story from pictures |
| <input type="checkbox"/> cannot pick words consistently | <input type="checkbox"/> can cloze orally |
| <input type="checkbox"/> rhymes | <input type="checkbox"/> recalls key words |
| <input type="checkbox"/> beginning of story grammar
(how stories go together) | <input type="checkbox"/> gives words with similar beginnings |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> gaining control over non-visual cues |

BRIDGING

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> reads own print | <input type="checkbox"/> can pick out words and letters |
| <input type="checkbox"/> uses picture clues | <input type="checkbox"/> matches words in chants |
| <input type="checkbox"/> enjoys chanting | <input type="checkbox"/> can read familiar prints |
| <input type="checkbox"/> not consistent recall between contexts | <input type="checkbox"/> increasing visual cues |

B. TAKE-OFF

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> conserves print between contexts | <input type="checkbox"/> wants to read often |
| <input type="checkbox"/> excited about reading | <input type="checkbox"/> reads in unfamiliar context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> reads everything | <input type="checkbox"/> realizes use of print |
| <input type="checkbox"/> some focusing at word level | <input type="checkbox"/> gaining control of process |
| <input type="checkbox"/> oral reading may be word-centered | <input type="checkbox"/> reading much environmental print |

INDEPENDENT

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> uses visual and non-visual cues | <input type="checkbox"/> meaning depends heavily on print |
| <input type="checkbox"/> reads for pleasure | <input type="checkbox"/> comprehends author's message |
| <input type="checkbox"/> brings experience to print | <input type="checkbox"/> reads with expression |
| <input type="checkbox"/> reads in word-clusters | <input type="checkbox"/> may read literally |
| <input type="checkbox"/> internalizes story patterns | <input type="checkbox"/> reads expressively with meaning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> prefers silent reading | |

SKILLED

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> can make inferences | <input type="checkbox"/> can process material far removed from experience |
| <input type="checkbox"/> reads variety of print | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> can conceptualize | <input type="checkbox"/> challenges validity of material |
| <input type="checkbox"/> discusses many story aspects | <input type="checkbox"/> learns from reading |
| <input type="checkbox"/> utilizes varied print forms | <input type="checkbox"/> uses appropriate reading speed |
-

ADVANCED SKILLED

- | |
|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> reading to fulfill everyday purposes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> successfully using variety of print |
| <input type="checkbox"/> regularly chooses to read variety of print |
| <input type="checkbox"/> reads to expand himself |
-

COMMENTS:C. 1 GRAPHO-PHONIC TRANSPARENCY

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> uses non-productive cueing | <input type="checkbox"/> tells his own story |
| <input type="checkbox"/> under-attending to print | <input type="checkbox"/> over-emphasis on non-visual cues |
| <input type="checkbox"/> confuses parts of word | <input type="checkbox"/> confusion about reading process |
| <input type="checkbox"/> reluctant to risk | |
-

C. 2 GRAPHONIC FIXATION

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> poor comprehension | <input type="checkbox"/> sounding out |
| <input type="checkbox"/> poor recall | <input type="checkbox"/> emphasis on word perfection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> over-attending on letters/words | <input type="checkbox"/> poor comprehension |
| <input type="checkbox"/> under-attending to non-visual cues | <input type="checkbox"/> little expression in oral reading |
| <input type="checkbox"/> confusion about reading process | <input type="checkbox"/> does not notice inappropriate words |
-

C. 3 DISINTEREST

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> not reading for pleasure | <input type="checkbox"/> does not value reading |
| <input type="checkbox"/> can read skillfully | <input type="checkbox"/> chooses non-book activities |
-

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX L

Reading Development Continuum Strategies

MAGICAL STAGE → SELF CONCEPTING

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1) Lap reading | 2) Reading to and talking |
| 3) Shared Reading/Big Books | 4) Experience with variety of books
eg. picture books, wordless books |
| 5) Match pictures with words | 6) Environment prints (simple, meaningful signs) |

SELF-CONCEPTING → BRIDGING

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1) Reading to/discussing | 2) Shared Reading |
| 3) Signs/labels/name tags | 4) Key Word Stories |
| 5) Oral rebus-use pictures to predict | 6) I Can Read folders |
| 7) Group retelling | 8) Taking dictation from the child |
| 9) Story from pictures sequence | 10) Rhyming |

BRIDGING → TAKE-OFF

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) "I Can Read" Folder | 2) Written Cloze |
| 3) Key Stories | 4) Written Retellings |
| 5) Modelling | 6) Poem rebuilding |
| 7) Brainstorming | 8) Frame sentences |
| 9) *Minimal Clues | 10) Big Books (corporate unlocking) |
| 11) Language Experience Stories | 12) Written Conversation |
| 13) Chants Short/
Choral Readings own copy | 14) Lots of predictable-patterned books |

TAKE-OFF → INDEPENDENT

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1) *Must read to a teacher every day | 2) Read-along partner reading |
| 3) Read different editions of the same story. | 4) Re-tellings |
| 5) Comprehension Model | 6) Minimal Cues* |
| 7) *Talking about Process | 8) Bulk Reading |
| 9) Book/Tapes | 10) Supportive Reading (Story chants) |
| 11) U.S.S.R. | 12) *Being read standard models |
| 13) Story grammar | 14) Story patterns (Modelling) |
| 15) Stories and tapes | 16) *Reading Standard Models |
| 17) *Process talk | 18) Sketch to stretch |
| 19) Closing the Circle | 20) *Key words |
| 21) Story Patterns | |