NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, tests publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

EXPLORING THE USE OF DIALOGUE JOURNALS IN LANGUAGE TUTORING

BY

NADIA HOCHACHKA

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1987

ISBN 0-315-40886-3

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Nadia Hochachka

TITLE OF THESIS: Dialogue Journals in Language Tutoring

DEGREE: M. Ed.

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1987

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Nadia Hochachka
(Signed)

10108 - 134 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta T5E 1J1

Date: Aug. 19, 1987

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Exploring the Use of Dialogue Journals in Language Tutoring", submitted by Nadia Hochachka in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Grace Malicky
(Supervisor)

....

....

Date: Aug. 12, 1987

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my father, who urged me to study, and my mother, who made it easy; also to Julian, Mary, Olga, Stef, Fred, and Peter, who have indulged me and so encouraged me through years of learning.

ABSTRACT

There has been increasing interest in journal writing, both for content learning and for personal exploration. However, journal writing has not been extensively investigated as a remedial tool in reading and writing. Th purpose of this study was to explore the use of dialogue journals between individual students and tutors in a "pull-out" tutoring situation.

Three tutors, selected from a graduate course in clinical reading in which a ten-week tutoring period was required, and their three students were observed during eac of their tutoring sessions. All sessions were taped, as were the individual interviews with tutors and students, held at the end of the tutoring period. In addition, copi of all journal writing were made.

Transcripts of taped data were analysed through extensive rereading and notemaking. In addition, through qualitative analysis of the journal writing, a number of dimensions of the journal texts were identified and used t compare the writing content, style, and mechanics of individual writers.

Initially, all three of the students showed eagerness about the interactive writing, recognizing it as a familia social situation. But their continued enthusiasm depended on how clearly they understood the nature and purpose of th activity. Moreover, their performance was influenced by th degree of their involvement in the development of

procedures. Particularly important was their recognition that the focus was on content, not correctness. Yet within this purposeful framework, the students showed a keen interest in the form of the journal writing. Once involved they produced an impressive amount of writing and, in it, showed an impressive amount of language knowledge.

The findings reaffirm the increasingly acknowledged emphasis, among educators, on the importance of taking contextual factors into account in assessing students' language competence and planning their learning experiences. It is critical, especially in remedial situations, to incorporate into writing activities the social element that seems to allow students to feel at ease and so to gain access to their extensive language experience and knowledge. The findings indicate that dialogue journal writing can be one means of achieving this.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A thesis is not a literary masterpiece, yet it is for most graduate students a major literary undertaking. Its preparation rests squarely on many people's shoulders, in the same way as do major literary works:

> For masterpieces are not single and solitary births; they are the outcome of many years of thinking in common, of thinking by the body of the people, so that the experience of the mass is behind the single voice (Woolf, 1929., p. 68).

Thus, I want to acknowledge the many inspired writers whose words have influenced my research and the writing of my thesis.

Many other people have encouraged and helped me. First, this study was possible only because three teachers and their students were generous enough to allow me into their tutoring sessions and to share their journal writing with me. I very much appreciate their participation and good will throughout the research.

Several university people helped in ways that made the study easier. The staff in the Reading and Language Center helped me to arrange an efficient procedure for copying the journal writing during this study. I appreciate this help and the support I received during my entire graduate period especially from Sonia Rywak. I also appreciate the help of the patient staff in the CMPA during the printing of the final draft of my thesis. And I acknowledge the collegiality of Darryl Grams who often shared ideas about

research, and suggestions about word processing; he helped make an office out of a cool dungeon.

Other friends, and my whole family, showed an interest in my research and offered regular encouragement. I value both the comments and support they gave. I especially appreciate Maureen Sanders who, besides sharing ideas, cheeriness, and editorial feedback, spent many hours with me on the word processor. Maureen's assistance enabled me to produce the thesis drafts efficiently and to print the thesis myself, and her friendship made the task enjoyable!

Producing a thesis is more meaningful because it is done with some readers in mind. I appreciate the participation of the examining members of my thesis committee, Dr. David Dillon and Dr. John Oster. Their questions and observations caused the discussion of my thesis to be a challenging exploration of the very nature of dialogue journal writing. I feel both appreciation and delight at the fact that, as a result, my thesis oral was a turning point in my thinking, not an end point.

My primary reader of course was Dr. Grace Malicky, my supervisor, who has been a superb coach. I have benefited from her direct and incisive feedback, as well as her good sense. Equally important, her guidance has been accompanied by optimism and respect, which were for me key sources of inspiration. This was particularly true in the early stages of the research, but also throughout the thesis preparation. I am deeply grateful for Dr. Malicky's support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

> Student to tutor, on being asked about the reason for writing in his dialogue journal every day: 'cause you're going to write something back!

Most elementary teachers probably agree that when children first come to school, they expect to learn to read and write. Authorities in the field of reading and writing have made this observation as well, and some suggest that writing comes first and can contribute to reading. For example, Martha King stated, in a presentation to reading specialists (October 8, 1985), that children love writing and write even earlier than they read. And Graves reports the following comment from an interview with Donald Durrell: "'We have known for years the child's first urge is to write and not read and we haven't taken advantage of this fact'" (Graves, 1984, p. 64). Graves himself states that when students cannot write, they are robbed of not only a means of expression but a valuable means of developing thinking and reading power (Graves, 1984, p. 63).

Unfortunately, some children fail to develop as expected in reading and writing and as a result fall behind their peers in school work. At the same time, they lose great amounts of the satisfaction and confidence that can be associated with learning and with sharing of knowledge; they

lose the image of themselves as readers and writers, as learners. These are the children who sometimes are identified for special remedial attention, either within their own classrooms or in resource rooms or special learning centers. Their needs are both academic and emotional; progress in reading and writing is connected not only with learning of strategies and with practice but critically too with the children's development of some belief in their ability to learn. Effective means of helping them to resurrect this belief in themselves are essential.

This is one reason that literacy development has become a widely researched topic. Much research and thinking has in recent years examined in detail, often in natural learning settings such as homes and classrooms, the development of literacy and in particular the central role of a student's own experience and knowledge as a basis for learning (Harste et al, 1984; Juliebo, 1985; Sanders, 1986; Smith, 1983). Not surprisingly, a considerable amount of the research effort has focused on the teaching of writing (Graves, 1982; 1984; Murray, 1984; Smith, 1984a). What is emerging is a recognition that lessons about conventions and ways of approaching particular compositions are not in themselves facilitative of writing development, even though they are important. What seems more primary is the relationship between the writing and the writer. It seems

important for students to write regularly for real reasons and, while writing, to get responses and help. As Murray (1984) states, "The challenge is to combine experience with instruction" (p. xiii).

> Allison: Mm. We'd do these little lessons - answer the questions - an' I didn't think it had anything to do with reading.
> Researcher: Oh my.
> Allison: It's just like my spelling - I don't think it has anything to do with spelling in my textbooks but....
> - from interview with Allison

It seems critical that a student should feel some connection with a topic, some personal sense of purpose in writing about it. But the relevance of given topics cannot be predicted, and it is not socially defined, as is sometimes thought. It is not necessarily the case, for example, that a certain topic such as "relationships" or "drugs" or "abortion" or "pollution" will appeal to most adolescents; or that "money management" or "career change" will appeal to most middle-aged students; or that "animals" or "friends" will appeal to all young students. Rather, relevance is ascribed to a topic by each writer.

While students may not, at first, recognize any personal connections to prescribed topics, such topics may become important if each student has an opportunity, through talk and free writing and reading, to "get into" the topic and find those of its aspects that connect, in some way, with personal experience and knowledge, and with personal

questions. From that point, a student often moves on to explore new knowledge and to write about it in a meaningful way - and sometimes in a surprisingly powerful way. This personal involvement with a topic seems to be essential as a basis for the development of writing abilities. When such engagement is present, information about writing becomes useful for a writer, especiallly if it is offered while a piece of writing is in progress so that the information has a purpose in the task at hand. In this context, criticism and suggestions can be productive because they allow a writer to gauge whether his intentions are being conveyed.

In the framework of these observations, it is not surprising that free writing, and more particularly journal writing, has grown in popularity as a way for writers to explore topics, and to discover what particular links and entries they can make to the topics. In schools, it has become relatively common to schedule periods for uninterrupted sustained spontaneous writing (USSW), or to designate certain times for regular journal writing. Some teachers allow at least some time for free writing and discussion as part of every writing task. It is not uncommon for a teacher to read students' journals, and some teachers regularly write back, establishing a written conversation with each student. The journal becomes a means of offering feedback, information, or encouragement; asking questions or advice; or simply sharing thoughts - chatting,

when time is limited for doing so face to face. Thus, the notion of a dialogue journal emerges - a continuous regular written exchange between individual students and their teacher.

> Thursday, Feb. 27th
>
> Hi Allison,
>
> I'm writing my journal before lunch today because time is going to be very short for the rest of today....
>
> This morning I've been...organizing the testing for the little girl next Monday out at her school. Everything has to be planned very carefully because if I leave anything behind at the university it will cause nothing but problems, that's for sure! Actually, Allison, I'm a bit concerned about how the testing will go because this little girl is very, very shy and doesn't talk very much to anybody at school, and you know how important talking is in the testing. Do you have any advice for me on how I might help her to feel comfortable enough to talk to me? You've been in the testing situation and you know how it feels to meet a stranger like that so you might have some very helpful suggestions for me on this one.
>
> - from tutor's journal

> Well Don't go strat into your testing. talk to her let her no you say all the same things you said to me and more And thell her about me.
>
> - Allison's response

This interactive type of writing has inspired great enthusiasm from some teachers. Because of this, and especially because this type of writing acknowledges the critically important personal framework for effective writing, it seemed to me a promising tool for students whose writing has been assessed as very poor, students who write very little, and with great difficulty and pain. Perhaps these students, who have failed to fulfill their early

expectations that in school they will learn to read and write, need opportunities to write to someone who accepts their ideas - no matter what they are about, no matter how elaborate or sparse, no matter how awkwardly written. Perhaps these students need responses to their ideas - written responses in which they see their own ideas and words reflected.

> March 14
> I woke op and went to shcool the last piriod it was the funest piriod.
> - from Tim's journal
>
> Why was the last period the most fun?
> - tutor's response

Through such written conversations, these students may see the links between their ideas and those held by other people, and they may realize that they have knowledge that is of interest and value to others. They may discover that they can use writing as a means of sharing their knowledge, as well as their views and feelings about it. They may even discover that writing can be enjoyable.

> Allison: ...they're just little short passages that - we - have a lot of fun with them.
> Researcher: Mhm.
> Allison: Tell secretive things!
> - from interview with Allison

In sum, the students may rediscover an image of themselves as learners.

> Tutor: No, I think I know you well enough to know that it's true (that Frank is a good learner). I've seen it.
> Frank: Only sometimes.

Tutor: Oh, I think - that when you believe it, it's true.
Frank: Only sometimes though.
Tutor: Do you believe it all the time or only sometimes?
Frank: Sometimes.
Tutor: I think that's the whole key, you know that?
Frank: Sometimes I'm a brat.
Tutor: Well I think every kid is. I think every - person is. I can do that too you know.
Frank: How come you're never a brat around me?
Tutor: Well, 'cause I'm here for a different reason.

- from final tutoring session

In light of these speculations, it seemed to me worthwhile to explore ways of arranging a tutoring situation so as to incorporate daily written conversations between child and tutor. That exploration became the purpose of the present study.

CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

> Looked back on, the experiences others have related merge into the experiences we have had ourselves...it is by experience 'as we' that we build the common world in which we live (Britton, 1970, p. 116).

Journal writing is being mentioned more and more frequently in the literature as a promising tool for helping children - and adults - discover that writing and reading can be very useful in their lives. Journals are being used in a variety of ways and at all educational levels. While some teachers have their students write primarily for themselves, others incorporate a response to the journal entries.

Dialogue Journals

Hipple (1985) studied journal writing in a kindergarten. Each day, a couple of the children shared their writing with the total group. Hipple reports that the journal sharing helped the children develop abilities in describing, questioning, and listening (p. 257). She notes that not only did both the content and language of the children's journals become more sophisticated during the course of the year, but also she became a better teacher as

a result of recognizing the variety of patterns characterizing her children's writing development.

Fulwiler (1985) reports on the use of free writing with a slightly older child - grade three. Through the journal, the child looked at her own experiences in school (e.g. a fire drill, a field trip) and at her school work (e.g. ideas about a piece of reading). In Fulwiler's view, such journals can "help young students become more aware of themselves as writers and learners" (p. 55).

The same kind of awareness was the basis for Atwell's (1985) use of journals with junior high school students. Atwell used letters as "written conferences" (p. 152) to help her students extend their thoughts about books. The students were able to draw on their experiences when writing about their reading; through writing, they could uncover the significance of both what they were reading and what they were discovering about their own lives by writing about them in the context of their reading.

Similarly, Hayes and Bahruth (1985) used written dialogue - dialogue journals - in working with adolescent students from Mexican-American migrant families. The authors report that the dialogue journals proved extremely useful to their students, and they identify several characteristics of dialogue journals that explain their usefulness. First, the journals represented functional writing, offering the students a chance to write to a real

person who responded, and so to see a use for writing in their lives. As well, the dialogue journals offered the students models of language use by their teachers that sometimes led to corrections being made by the students in future journal entries. Further, the dialogue journals provided reading material each day, and a chance to ask questions and make comments about books and writing. Because of these aspects of the dialogue journals, the authors conclude that "journal writing provided the bridge of confidence between our children and both of us. Journal writing also built an additional bridge, a bridge that led into the kinds of expository writing and reading that our children were expected to do in school" (p. 102). In relation to the children's learning, the authors clearly emphasize the importance of the children's realizing that they could learn and of their interest in learning.

Enthusiasm about discovering how to learn is reflected in several other reports on journal writing. One report mentions high school students who used learning logs to reflect daily about both the content of their learning in math and how they were doing (Pradl & Mayher, 1985). Another mentions college students who used expressive writing to reflect on their reading each day (Collins, 1985). A third mentions graduate students in education who used dialogue journals to explore with each other and with their instructor their ideas about teaching and education

(Mikkelsen, 1985); a similar use of a dialogue journal in two of my graduate courses with David Dillon (1985) was a transformational aspect of my own graduate work.

Besides being used with students, journals have been used successfully in professional development. Yinger (1985) reports that when teachers used journals to examine their thinking and planning, they not only clarified their ideas but to their surprise found themselves understanding and solving problems that had been wearing them down: "Their morale improved and they began to see themselves as teachers who could make the most of any situation rather than as victims of circumstances and external influences" (p. 28). In this report, as in those concerning students, self-discovery clearly was a major outcome of the reflective writing, along with clarification of knowledge in a variety of areas. Such outcomes are consistent with the view that language is a tool for learning, not just a tool for communicating (Britton, 1970; Graves, 1984; Murray, 1984; Smith, 1982).

Dialogue journals have been used productively not only with general populations, but also with special groups. Staton (1985) reports on the successful use of such journals with hearing-impaired children from primary to college level. In discussing the merits of dialogue journals with these students, Staton notes several useful features of the journals: that they are more like conversations than like

formal writing assignments; that they include a variety of language functions - e.g. questioning, speculating, reporting; that the journals, because they are interactive, combine reading and writing into one event; and that, because the journals are embedded in daily class activities, they provide the necessary context for the students to understand new language (p. 132). I would add that the journals are embedded in the students' lives outside of class, not just in class, and that this is a critical part of the necessary context for the students to understand new learning.

The use of dialogue journals with hearing-impaired students was based on Staton's (1982) initial report on the use of dialogue journals (see also Kreeft, 1984). In the grade six class that Staton studied, the journal work was based on the teacher's goals and the students' individual needs and interests. Each student's written interaction with the teacher was a kind of "thinking together" (Staton, 1985, p. 150). Staton notes that many common activities are learned in this way, by a person's performing them with a more experienced or skilled person, and the importance of this kind of support in a child's learning has also been emphasized by other theorists in education (see especially Vygotsky, 1968; Britton, 1970; and Smith, 1982).

The studies reported here suggest a number of key ingredients that make dialogue journal writing useful in the

development of literacy. Perhaps the most basic of these is the fact that dialogue journal writing is a genuine writing situation (Mayher et al, 1983, p. 67). The writing occurs in a social framework and offers the freedom to write about topics that are of personal significance. The students can relate the writing to their own lives and evaluate their writing relative to that produced by someone else.

The importance of these aspects of language use to learning and development are well documented. Many authors have noted that language is by its nature a social thing, that our language derives its meaning from a particular interpretive community and that we learn it as we strive to make sense of our experiences in that community (Britton, 1970; Harste et al, 1984; Smith 1984). In other words, we learn language, written as well as spoken, when we use it in genuine language situations. Mayher et al (1983) suggest that students who have trouble with writing probably have had little response to the substance of their writing; they have had little experience with genuine writing situations (p. 67). Dialogue journal writing is an opportunity for students to gain some of this experience, as they write frequently about matters of importance to them and get regular responses to what they say.

Theoretical Framework

The critical importance of experience with real writing situations is a pervasive theme in the works of James Britton and of Frank Smith. Their way of conceptualizing writing, along with my own experience with dialogue journal writing, caused me to speculate about the value of dialogue journal writing with problem writers. It is the ideas of these two authors that form the primary theoretical basis for the present study.

Making Sense of the World

In an interview with John Mayher (Mayher et al, 1983), Britton makes the following statement about children's purposes in writing:

> There is no doubt that one of the intentions they bring with them to school is that of making sense of experience as it comes to them. As an instrument for making sense of experience writing can help them fulfill that deep-seated intention (p. 12).

Britton's statement arises out of his analysis of the relationship between language and experience. Britton's theory is consistent with Kelly's (1963) theory of personal constructs, which highlights man's construing and reconstruing of events in an effort to identify similarities to past experience so as to predict the future. Britton (1970) too views man as a creature that seeks to represent events to himself in an orderly way, on the basis of past

experience, so as to give meaning to current experience and to anticipate the future. But Britton emphasizes, relative to this process, the central place of language, operating as an extremely efficient organizing system - "a key way" (p. 19) of representing experience. He states, "We don't learn from higgledy-piggledy events as they strike our senses; we learn from events as we interpret them, and one of the main ways of interpreting them is by talking about them - by giving them shape in language" (Britton, 1982, p. 98).

Britton points out that, while various types of animals can develop rudimentary classifications based on similarities among repeated experiences, man's use of language allows for a much more extensive system of possibilities. Language allows man to classify even experiences that are not readily available to the senses - abstractions, such as "holidays" or "fear". As a result, language allows man to remove himself from the immediate present; he is free to draw on past and future, on both real and imagined events, in constructing and perpetually upgrading his representation of reality. In other words, he can move out of a participant role and adopt a spectator's stance relative to his own and other people's experiences.

> We habitually use talk to go back over events and interpret them, make sense of them in a way that we were unable to while they were taking place....to work upon our representation of the particular experience and our world representation in order to incorporate the one into the other more fully (Britton, 1970, p. 19).

In the spectator role, then, a person's focus is on not just a particular event, but a total world picture - "the total context into which every experience has to be fitted" (Britton, 1982, p. 105).

Britton (1970) acknowledges the primary role of a person's community in this process of constructing and reconstructing his view of the world. He notes that while young children's use of language may put together various types of experience that their parents distinguish (e.g. "dog" may refer to cats and horses, not just dogs), added experience and use of language leads children to take over the classifications embodied in the language of their communities. Moreover, children in different parts of the world come to divide experiences in somewhat different ways, in accordance with the particular needs and purposes of their societies. The familiar example of the Eskimo people developing a number of words for snow reflects the critical importance of snow in their lives, not any objective difference in their snow and that found in other parts of the world where the single word "snow" suffices.

While languages differ in how they categorize objects, the very important thing is that in all societies the identification of objects and experiences is made through language, and modified through language on the basis of people's experiences. Britton (1970) points out that, when we discover or invent something new, one of the first things

that we do is to name it, and "it is the name that marks its existence in (our) society or in the world of human affairs" (p. 24). In the same sense, speaking about one's experiences - or writing about them - is a way of naming them. Doing so marks a person's existence in his society. (See Britton, 1970, p. 120, for his discussion of Auden's way of defining poetry as 'paying homage by naming'.) Evaluating our interpretation of experience relative to others allows us to corroborate not only our ideas of particular physical aspects of the world, such as snow or chairs; even more important, we are "having our value systems...checked and calibrated against those of other people" (Britton, 1982, p. 106).

Britton (1970) identifies a final aspect of this evolutionary process of representing the world to ourselves. He states that what we attend to at a particular time is likely to be only partly new - to "straddle the familiar and the unfamiliar...the new being incorporated only at points where it relates to what is already there" (p. 32). Perhaps this is the basis for Britton's statement, in another part of the interview with Mayher, that "abstract and impersonal writing is the appropriate end product for writing in physics, biology..., and so on. That's the goal we're aiming at. But if you insist on that from the start...then the learning process of moving from personal writing to more abstract never happens" (Mayher et al, 1983, p. 80).

The need to constantly form and maintain this link between what a child knows and what is new is basic to Britton's strong belief in the importance of language, both spoken and written, in school work, as indicated in this statement about both the place of writing in school and the kind of writing that is needed there:

> We have seen that talk is a major instrument of learning in infancy; that the infant learns by talking and that he learns to talk by talking. In trying to explain why it is that normal children succeed in this astonishing task of learning to talk we suggested it was because the two tasks - learning in the most general sense, that is, making sense of the world, and learning to talk - are so closely enmeshed. When we arrive at the school stage we must add writing and reading to talking, but the stress upon the operational value of language use remains the same....Putting this at its simplest, what children use language for in school must be 'operations' and not 'dummy runs'. They must continue to use it to make sense of the world (Britton, 1970, p. 129).

Conditions for Learning

Britton is talking here about real language situations. This and his other remarks about the role of language in relation to learning reflect the idea that learning, and language learning in particular, is selective, being influenced by a child's past experience in a particular community. This notion also informs Smith's theorizing about learning and about language learning. Smith (1982) suggests that language learning, like all learning, is a selective process. He suggests that it occurs when a person

is receptive to learning and attends to particular aspects of his experience.

Smith (1982) describes the conditions for learning by reference to three concepts: demonstrations, engagement, and sensitivity (p. 170). His description of these conditions is based on his assertion that learning is the natural activity of the brain, a position that is contrary to that of some educators who seem to think that the brain learns only when prodded into doing so:

> It is the business of the brain to learn... and it is no more 'normal' for the brain not to be learning than it is for the human musculature as a whole to be limp. What needs to be explained is not how learning takes place on the occasions when it does but what is lacking in the situation on those occasions when it does not (p. 163).

While, on the basis of Smith's premises, it is predictable that children are learning much of the time, what they learn at a particular time is less predictable. It depends on demonstrations. According to Smith (1982) children learn language just as they do other things, through the use they make of it. That is, they learn language through recognizing how they use it, or through understanding the use others make of it:

> It is necessary to see (or hear) something being done, and to understand why it is being done. There must be a demonstration which, in effect, says 'This is how something is done' (p. 170).

Smith (1982) notes that the world is full of demonstrations (p. 170). He notes that objects demonstrate what they are like, how they are made, and how they can be used; people's actions demonstrate what can be done, how things can be done, and what the doers feel about the acts; books demonstrate how words are spelled and put together, along with many other conventions related to writing; even our own thoughts offer demonstrations, private ones related to actions or events, and these private demonstrations can occur through writing. Clearly, we are immersed in demonstrations; we cannot avoid them.

In spite of the pervasiveness of demonstrations, we experience only some of them. Smith (1982) notes that demonstrations are relative, unique to individuals (p. 171). He says that an object or event is a demonstration to a particular person only if that person understands the purpose behind that object or event. Similarly, an action or artifact involving language demonstrates how intentions and the conventions of language are related - but only if the purpose behind the convention is understood. When recognizing what a language user is trying to achieve, a person may see how a particular language convention makes that achievement possible.

While understanding makes something a demonstration, learning will not necessarily occur on the basis of the demonstration; the demonstration can, in effect, go in one

side of the brain and out the other. To learn, we must be involved:

> For learning to take place there has to be engagement with a demonstration, as direct and immediate as the manner in which gears engage in a mechanical device (Smith, 1982, p. 171).

Sometimes we are especially conscious of being engaged with something, as when in reading we notice an unusual spelling of a word we have never seen written before or a particularly effective way of expressing something (Smith, 1982, p. 172). But, according to Smith, we generally learn without awareness - "our engagements are unsuspected" (p. 172), as we focus our attention on making sense of our experiences.

Smith's way of explaining engagement, or the coming together of a learner and a demonstration, is consistent with Britton's way of characterizing a learner in terms of attending to particular aspects of experience, showing interest in experiences that link something new with what is known. Smith (1982) suggests that when we strive to make sense of anything, we anticipate and predict alternative possibilities, basing our predictions on what we know; we develop a theory of the world, "a theory that is an interpreted summary of all past experience (Smith, 1983, p. 121). In the gear metaphor, we engage particular "hooks that are necessary for ...'grasping' a situation" (p. 173). Smith notes that the emphasis on past experience in

determining what we attend to is consistent with research showing that our memory of an event is determined by how we made sense of that event. Thus, Smith suggests that learning occurs when, on the basis of existing knowledge, we become engaged with a new demonstration: "the way we make sense of a demonstration, relating it to the organization of what we already know, constitutes what we may learn from the demonstration" (p. 173).

Since many demonstrations involve other people, we learn by relating our experiences to those of other people around us, as Smith (1982) notes:

> Such learning is in a sense vicarious; we learn from what someone else is doing or has done as if we were doing it ourselves....But such learning is vicarious in the subtlest of ways; it does not even require an overt intention on our part, only the normal effort of involvement and understanding (p. 173).

But it is critical not to read this statement too lightly, for even though learning may seem effortless and engagement is likely to occur when we understand a situation, in fact, often engagement does not occur. Smith accounts for this, in his theory, by identifying a third learning condition, sensitivity, which is characterized in terms of expectation: "It is I think when we expect learning to occur, when in fact we take the learning for granted and do not give it a thought, that engagement takes place" (p. 174). But Smith talks of a price for learning, as well as a value: a price, for example in terms of effort and the possibility of

failure or error. He acknowledges that we may not want to pay the price; we may not expose ourselves to a learning opportunity if we fear we will fail or fear the consequences of error. Yet learning depends on our perceiving the possibility, our freedom from the fear of failure:

> Engagement requires a reaching toward the learning opportunity, not in the sense of strain or effort but in the sense of an openness, often characterized simply as 'interest'....a commitment with confidence to learning (Smith, 1982, p. 175).

The possibility of such sensitivity on the part of some students, especially those with problems, depends on how they think they are perceived by their teachers and others in their community. Smith (1982) reflects on the curious frequency with which expectations of failure, on the part of children, seem to emanate from adults, and the frequency with which such expectations are prophetic (p. 175). These observations again echo Britton's (1970) thinking, evident in his endorsement of a particular kind of relationship between teacher and student; it is "a relationship of simple reciprocity: between teacher and any individual child an acceptance of each by the other, as persons" (p. 182).

In this kind of framework, a student has a chance of developing increased confidence to learn. In written dialogue with a tutor, a student has the opportunity to develop increased sensitivity to written language, to the extent that the student and the tutor write to each other as

persons. This kind of teacher-student relationship seems to be not only in Britton's mind but also in Smith's, when he makes the following statement:

> Children do not learn by collecting rules that they then apply to the business of being a writer. But in the process of trying to write they can become sensitive to conventions. Many authors have given credit to their teachers for encouraging them to write and helping them to avoid their own errors, but no authors to my knowledge have ever said that lessons in grammar...made them into writers (Smith, 1982, p. 192).

Britton's and Smith's ideas led me to expect that dialogue journal writing could be a way for a student in a clinical situation to come to grips with difficulties in reading and writing. In the familiar framework of conversation, a student could take for granted that he or she could use language appropriately, and so could become engaged with written dialogue. The student could come to see that writing and reading can be purposeful activities. In the supportive social context of the dialogue journal, the student could use the writing to review and make sense of experiences and feelings associated with learning occurring both inside and outside of school.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

> We don't often write anything that is merely communication. There's nearly always an element of 'finding out,' of exploration (James Britton, 1982, p. 110).

This study was carried out in the Reading and Language Center at the University of Alberta. The center is part of the Educational Clinic which is a teaching clinic for graduate students in school psychology, counselling psychology, and language arts. Clients are referred to the center by school personnel, parents, employers, or social service workers, and some clients refer themselves.

In the center, tutoring of children with reading difficulty is done within the framework of a graduate course in Elementary Education. As this was the source of students and tutors for my study, the period of tutoring in my study was determined by the timetables of that course. Each tutor was required to carry out ten sessions of tutoring. At first, tutors met their students once a week for an hour, but part way through the tutoring period, they began to meet twice weekly so as to finish comfortably before the end of the university term.

Permission to carry on research was granted by parents as part of the general intake procedure at the center.

However, as a matter of orientation and courtesy, I met briefly with the parents of each student at the beginning of the tutoring to inform them of the nature of my study and to discuss any questions or concerns they might have. I did the same with each of the students, at the same time asking their permission to look at their journal writing and to copy it. A parent of each student in the study signed a simple form indicating approval of his or her child's participation in the study. A sample of the form is found in Appendix A.

Sample

Since the study was set in a teaching center, the sample was predefined both by the available referrals and by the training needs of the center. Of the group of children selected for tutoring in the academic term when my study was conducted, I identified those that were as close together in age as possible at mid-elementary level. At this age, students normally would be using writing in their school work, though referred students presumably would not be using it effectively.

Tutors were selected from the graduate class in a course on clinical reading. The instructor, a faculty member in the Department of Elementary Education, had selected from the list of children referred to the center

one child for each class member. Of the tutors who had been assigned students of mid-elementary school age, the instructor and I selected three tutors whose previous experience with dialogue journals was as varied as possible. In this way, we hoped to sample as broad a range as possible of approaches in the use of dialogue journal writing, to suit the exploratory intent of the study. Additional criteria for selection of tutors were their interest in using writing in their tutoring, their willingness to share their journal writing with me, and their interest in participating in the study. They were assured that participation would have no bearing on their course grades.

On the basis of the joint criteria for selecting students and for selecting tutors, the final sample included the following two sets of participants:

Students: two students in grade 5 - Frank and Allison; one student in grade 3 - Tim.

Tutors: a female tutor, Joan, who had used dialogue journals consistently with her primary classes for years; a male tutor, Phil, who had used dialogue journals regularly in his classes for about five years, varying his approach according to his perception of the students' special needs from time to time; a female tutor, Pat, who had never used journals in her teaching, but was very interested in exploring ways of doing so.

My role in the Reading and Language Center, that of a teaching assistant, included consultation with the graduate students about their work with their clients in the framework of their clinical course. All members of the

graduate class had tutorials with their instructor, not just with me. These tutorial arrangements, of course, included the three tutors who participated in my study. However, in an effort to minimize systematic effects on the tutors in their ways of using dialogue journals, both the instructor and I endeavored to avoid extensive discussion with them about the dialogue journal writing, though we answered questions and dealt with concerns arising from the use of dialogue journal writing in the tutoring.

Data Gathering

Before the first tutoring session of each child, I met individually with the tutors to review the study and to confirm their decisions to participate. I did this with the students at the beginning of their first tutoring sessions.

During the ten-week period during which tutors worked with their assigned students, I taped all of the sessions carried out by the three tutors in my study. I sat in on most of their sessions and occasionally made brief notes. When I had to miss part or all of a session because of overlapping schedules or off-campus scheduling of particular sessions, I relied on the tutors' reports to supplement the tapes of the sessions. In addition, each week, I obtained copies of each student-tutor pair's dialogue journal writing. The copying was done either during a session,

while other work was in progress, or during the week subsequent to a session.

As part of the weekly data collecting, I read the journals, transcribed the tapes, and wrote notes on both the journal texts and the transcripts - i.e. made expanded field notes (Spradley, 1980). Prompt transcription of tapes and expansion of notes was important to the reliability of my observations, for continuous involvement with the data helped me to maintain a constant viewpoint in relation to the students and tutors and their sessions together. In addition, comparison of field notes against transcripts served as an ongoing validity check. A further check on the validity of my observations was provided by the informal reports and the interpretations offered by the tutors and by the course instructor. Ultimately too, the journal texts, which were analysed in the context of what went on in the tutoring sessions, served as a check on validity, for conclusions reached about the dialogue journal writing had to be consistent with the events observed around the actual writing.

Just once, during the period of observation, I failed to transcribe a set of tapes prior to the subsequent week's sessions. The resulting confusion I felt while observing during the subsequent week, and while finally transcribing the missed tapes, reinforced for me the importance of keeping up with transcribing and notemaking. This, as well

as attending sessions consistently and receiving the journal writing week by week, helped me to develop a sense of the progression of tutoring with each tutor-student pair. My consistent involvement also helped all participants - students, tutors, and me - to feel relatively at ease with each other during tutoring sessions. Both tutors and students indicated that they were not bothered by my presence and that they did not feel as if they wanted to censor particular information when writing their journals. At the same time, I came to feel part of the tutoring scene, less of an obstruction.

At the last tutoring session for each child, or soon after, I held an interview separately with each tutor and child. The interviews were taped and transcribed in the same way as sessions had been. These interviews were intended, first, as an opportunity for the tutors and students to comment on their dialogue journal writing or ask about the study. In addition, the interviews served as a source of data; they provided an important validity check on my notes and interpretations.

Data Analysis

Transcripts and Notes

The analysis of data was not based directly on any predetermined conceptual scheme. I expected that each tutor

might approach the journal writing in a different way, depending on individual tutoring goals as well as personal values and teaching styles. I also expected differences among the children, associated with their individual characteristics of background, temperament, and educational need. Thus, I examined the transcripts and notes for evidence of patterns of approach and response that might indicate how each tutor and child was construing the nature, purpose, and value of the dialogue journal writing experience and how each was feeling about it in the context of the tutoring. Themes that appeared to be common in both transcripts and notes were related to and, to some extent, corroborated by reference to the actual writing produced in the journals and the transcripts of the interviews with the tutors and children. For example, at the same time as degree of student control appeared in the tutoring transcripts and notes as a significant theme, reflected in clear and persistent differences among tutor-student pairs in their discussion of procedures, it appeared in the texts as differences in frequency of writing as well as amount and apparent ease of writing. Furthermore, the tutors each made reference, in their final interviews, to the importance of the children's taking some responsibility for their journal writing.

In the review of the transcripts and notes, a major tool of my analysis was my own writing. Even as I

made extended fieldnotes after transcribing the tapes of each week's sessions, my analysis was beginning - a kind of formative analysis which supported the continuing observations, as indicated earlier. The transcribing, done by hand, revealed with remarkable clarity and impact the repetition of certain types of statements or actions by particular students and tutors. This often suggested an interpretation that was not apparent earlier when immediate emotional reactions to events in a session had led to hasty speculations about what had gone on. The process of transcribing required a look at the data in specific, rather than global, terms. Seeing what exactly was said, how often, with what intonation, and in what temporal relation to other events and comments made it possible to see more accurately the pattern and significance of what had been happening during a session. It also guided the search for evidence in subsequent sessions to support interpretations and clarify them; but sometimes it led to a new or revised interpretation, as a different viewpoint was carried into a subsequent session.

The generative quality of writing was especially apparent throughout the reading of and writing about the complete sets of transcripts and journals, once the tutoring was finished. At this time, notemaking led increasingly to a recognition of the interconnectedness of particular events. Repeated reference to certain types of events and

repeated use of certain terms in the notes became more noticeable with each rereading. This is illustrated by notations such as the following: "Here it is again - she's always modeling the kind of thing she's talking about;" or "Here's another way that the journal writing is embedded in the tutoring as a whole." It is in this sense that patterns emerged in the notes, as I sought to interrelate the key concepts that I was using and to express them in generalizations that were consistent with the transcripts of sessions and interviews, and with the texts of the dialogue journals.

Journal Texts

Notemaking was not only a means of analysing and exploring the significance of field observations and transcripts; it also was the critical part of the qualitative analysis of the journal texts. Just as writing had been used to explore the transcripts and fieldnotes, in order to identify patterns of procedure and student behavior during dialogue writing, so writing was used as a means of exploring the texts produced by the students and tutors, and as a means of focusing the analysis of the texts.

Notemaking helped in identification of writing styles, as journals were read and reread. This total viewing was intended to reveal patterns in the text to investigate in more detail. Because both educators and the general

public commonly assess and describe writing relative to content and form, these broad areas were used as a framework for examining the journal texts. I looked for similarities and differences across students, across tutors, and between students and tutors. Dimensions became apparent relative to both content and form. For content, the following four dimensions were identified for analysis:

- subjects written about;
- amount of text produced;
- continuity, or extent of focus on individual topics beyond a single mention;
- language functions reflected by individual statements in the journals.

The dimensions that seemed apparent for form were the following:

- organizational features;
- types of sentences;
- types of vocabulary;
- rhetorical devices;
- mechanics of writing.

To allow for systematic analysis of the dialogue journal writing, each of the above dimensions was elaborated with a set of specific descriptive categories. Like the identification of the dimensions, categories were identified by critical examination of the actual journal texts, followed by successive trial analyses on several samples of text, until a stable set of categories was in place for each dimension. These categories are presented below.

Subjects Written About. Through the procedure of qualitative analysis, it became apparent that, for subjects

written about, the most functional categories for describing and comparing the texts of the separate writers were the following four broad ones:

- home;
- school;
- tutoring;
- world affairs.

Tabulations were also made of the frequencies with which entries and responses referred to more than one topic. These tabulations, in combination with amount of writing, served as an index of the scope and focus of a writer's journal entries and responses.

Amount of Writing. For amount of writing, the following categories were identified:

- total number of thought units;
- average number of thought units per entry or per response;
- total number of words;
- average number of words per entry or per response;
- average number of words per thought unit;
- range relative to number of words per entry or per response.

Continuity. In addition to amount of writing, the extent to which single topics were pursued was examined. This dimension, continuity, was described by the following four categories:

- topic continues for two successive entries;
- topic continues for more than two successive entries;
- topic is resurrected;
- topic is continued in the form of an extension to an entry, as a result of the partner's written response to the entry.

Language Functions. For language functions, the following descriptive categories were used:

- reporting general facts;
- reporting personal facts;
- reporting opinions;
- maintaining dialogue (greeting, thanking, promising, agreeing, apologizing);
- explaining;
- requesting information/action;
- exploring/reflecting/speculating;
- responding to questions or comments;
- acknowledging/valuing the writing partner;
- modeling;
- correcting.

Many of the journal entries, and even some of the generally-shorter responses, contained more language functions than one, and the frequency with which this occurred was tabulated, providing one type of index of the complexity of the language occurring in the journal texts.

Categorization of statements for language functions wa done strictly relative to the context, both within the text and surrounding it, in the tutoring as a whole. Thus, for example, while a particular statement by a tutor might seem to be a question - "Why don't you bring me one of your stories?" - it might in fact serve as a request. To further illustrate, a tutor might write a statement of opinion that served not merely as a sharing of a personal impression, bu as a means of acknowledging the student: "I think [redacted] worked hard today." In the context of situation, this statement served as an indication of the tutor's pleasure at noticing the student pay attention to the activities at hand more

diligently than he had up to that point in tutoring. To achieve the greatest possible reliability in identifying the language functions, I made repeated judgments on samples of text on different days, especially on statements that seemed ambiguous.

Organization. In a similar way as the content dimensions were elaborated, so each dimension of form was specified according to functional descriptive categories. For the first dimension, organization, the following features occurred frequently in the texts and therefore were used as categories of description:

- leads/conclusions;
- transitions;
- indenting;
- dates.

More than one of these features occurred in many of the journal entries, and the frequency with which this occurred was tabulated.

Types of Sentences. For categorizing sentences, the following common types were used:

- simple;
- compound;
- complex;
- compound-complex.

As well, to reflect sentence variety, tabulations were made of the frequency with which more than one type of sentence occurred in entries and in responses.

Vocabulary and Usage. For examining vocabulary, the frequencies with which entries or responses contained

abstract terms were recorded; figurative language was included. In addition, the number of entries or responses in which slang or jargon occurred was recorded. Jargon included specialized vocabulary, which was used occasionally: e.g. "stand" (referring to a volcano); "thesis".

Rhetorical Devices. Rhetorical devices included only two categories:

- emphasis, achieved intentionally through choice of words, phrasing, punctuation, bold letters etc.;
- interactional features - e.g. use of a person's name or the pronoun "you"; use of an idiosyncratic device such as a happy face sign to make a personal contact in the writing.

Diction. On the basis of all of these aspects of expression, a global judgment was made, week by week, about the level of usage in each writer's text. The intent was to recognize both the level of sophistication of the writing and its tone, on a continuum from informal (colloquial, conversational) to quite formal language.

Mechanics. To assess the success with which the students used these conventions of form, a final set of categories related to mechanics of writing was used. Several of these categories identified levels of correctness for aspects of transcription:

- sentence structure;
- punctuation;
- capitalization;
- spelling.

Besides level of spelling correctness, several other types of events were tabulated, again to indicate the number of entries or responses in which any of these occurred:

- word errors - such things as a word written as two words (e.g. "to day"); two words written as one (e.g. "bakein" for "back in"); errors in writing a common idiom (e.g. "sort in" for "sort of");
- unreadable words;
- "good" spelling errors - incorrectly spelled words that were very easy to read and were often nearly correct (e.g. "anamals" for "animals", "fin" for "fine", "are" for "our".

Finally, besides levels of correctness and indications of error, the mechanics dimension included two categories that reflected a writer's approach towards the writing task:

- level of monitoring - three categories (more than twice per entry or per response, once or twice, none);
- appearance - consistency of letter size, spacing of words and lines, and use of non-print features such as borders in a complementary or distracting way.

The categories of the mechanics dimension were used in full acknowledgement that dialogue journal writing is first-draft production. The purpose was descriptive, not evaluative. It is also important to acknowledge that the dimensions and their categories are somewhat arbitrary. Yet they are consistent with commonly used categories for describing written text, and they served as a constant frame of reference for analysing the dialogue journal writing of the six people in the study.

The analysis of individual journal texts was carried out separately for entries and for responses. The entries of each writer's journal were numbered consecutively, as were the responses to the writing partner. Individual entries and responses were categorized on each dimension, and the number in each category was tabulated. The tabulations did not represent individual occurrences of particular writing events; rather, the tabulations represented the number of entries or responses in which particular writing events occurred, whether only once or a number of times.

After the texts were analysed, week by week, for the whole tutoring period, the tabulations for each writer were drawn together into two groups, one set for the first half of tutoring and one set for the last half. For ease of comparison, the frequencies for these two periods were also expressed in percentages. The grouping of data in this way focused the search for trends and facilitated the notemaking related to the extensive tabulations that had been made for each of the dimensions. Sample tabulation and summary sheets appear in Appendix C.

Philosophical Framework

Notwithstanding my intention and specific efforts to remain open in making observations and working with the data, certainly my analysis and interpretation were

influenced by my beliefs about language and learning. Most important was my belief in the power of personal and exploratory writing as a learning tool for students, and particularly the power of functional writing as a means for students to learn about writing itself. Also important was my belief in the power of writing to lead students to explore and revalue themselves. In this regard, I believe in the primary role of interpersonal communication, conveyed through writing as well as through speech and other means, as a ground for learning.

In the context of these beliefs, I was especially interested in certain aspects of the journal writing. I wanted to see how the activity might change over the weeks, as students and tutors developed their relationships. So I looked for evidence of changes in the ways the tutors and students handled the journal writing, and changes in the writing itself. I also looked for evidence of problems associated with the use of the dialogue journals in the context of only once-a-week meetings between tutors and students, and of ways that tutors and students dealt with the problems. Further, while I wanted to focus on just the portion of each session that was related to the dialogue journal writing, and not analyse entire tutoring sessions, I wanted to see how the dialogue writing related to the other activities.

Throughout the analysis, I was particularly interested in evidence of changes in the extent to which the children took control of their work during journal time, or the extent to which they directly expressed or demonstrated assurance in their work. While such outcomes could not be directly attributed to dialogue journal writing, they are aspects of the way the students were using the dialogue journal writing for their own purposes. These aspects of their dialogue journal writing helped me to see whether the activity was deemed by the students as being significant in the overall progression of the tutoring.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

Approaches to Dialogue Journal Writing

> I found it - really nice....she (the tutor) talked a lot about what's going on around... and, if I didn't find out what was going on... it might have been...like a bird...you don't see them too often, but, they're there!
> - Student to researcher, on dialogue journals

Over the course of the ten tutoring sessions, major differences were evident in the ways that the three tutors handled the dialogue journal writing. Differences showed up most clearly in the initiating procedures, in the structuring of dialogue journal writing session by session, and in the journal writing itself. These differences reflected the different definitions and purposes for dialogue journal writing among the tutors. To some extent, these differences in approach seem to account for the variations among the students in their ways of responding to the dialogue journal writing.

Getting Started

One of the first areas of differences among the three tutors was their way of initiating the dialogue journal writing. While each of them decided to use two books - one for the student and one for the tutor to write in during the

week and exchange at each session - they did different things with the books at the beginning of the ten-week tutoring period.

Joan and Allison

Joan phoned her student, Allison, ten days before their first session, indicating that it was important that they start talking to each other. Because they could not be phoning back and forth, Joan asked Allison to buy a book and start writing down her thoughts each day - "just things that happen to you, how you feel; things that made you happy, things that made you sad - whatever you like, just talk to me." Joan also said that she would be doing the same and that they would share each other's writing in the first session. Joan's call gave Allison a clear indication of the purpose of the journal writing - to talk to each other.

Sharing Responsibility. While Joan's call provided a general framework, it also gave Allison some responsibility for the detailed structuring of the activity. She had to decide what kind of book to get, how to use it, and what to write in it. Allison's original idea was to compare the dialogue journal with a diary, and with that familiar structure in mind, she could easily begin her dialogue writing on her own. At the same time, she appreciated the opportunity to evaluate her way of starting by comparing it to Joan's dialogue journal writing, in their first session:

> The first time I - I had no idea on what she'd be writing an' what I'd be writing. Once I saw hers I'd - like I was kind o' screwed up the first time - but I found out what we were doing so after I found out, 'lot easier....An' I got in an' I found out I was doing something wrong.
>
> - from interview with Allison

Offering Models. Allison's comment confirms Joan's belief in the importance of offering a model. To demonstrate what she thought a journal was for, Joan wrote about a variety of topics, including reports about events in the news and in her own life, as well as extensive reflections on the events. In her reflections, she often included related information and her own feelings about particular events. She also included periodic references to the importance of the writing. This was one way of putting the journal work into a teaching context. Joan intended that her entries would be natural but would incorporate certain kinds of information and ways of writing.

A Social Context. Joan addressed her entries to Allison. She often used Allison's name within the text too. In the first entry, she wrote an explanatory note about the spaces she had left after each of the entries. The note indicated that the spaces were for answers: "then it's your turn...to keep this journal going for another week, just like I have done this week. Ok?" By including this note, Joan demonstrated one common use of writing: to give instructions or explanations about procedures. Moreover, she demonstrated the central place of writing, not talking,

in journal time. Most important, she demonstrated that the writing was to be a continuing interaction in which each shared equally.

Right from the start, then, Joan was providing a clear definition of, and structure for, the journal writing, yet the framework allowed, and even required, Allison to decide exactly how she would do the task. Allison's early involvement in defining the dialogue journal activity undoubtedly contributed to the confidence she referred to in her interview later on: "...in reading class, I know I'm a lot more confident in myself."

Pat and Frank

While Joan and Allison began the dialogue journal writing before the first tutoring session, thus allowing Allison to bring some experience with it and some notion of it to the first tutoring session, the other two tutors introduced the journal writing at the first session. Pat introduced the journal writing as the final activity of her first session with Frank. She used only one book initially, writing a brief entry in it and then handing the book to Frank. They wrote back and forth to each other several times, establishing not only a written dialogue but also a lively interaction, which both of them clearly enjoyed.

Establishing a Social Framework. The comfort between Pat and Frank was apparent over just three written

exchanges. Pat used direct address, along with personal comments which were directly related to the situation, to quickly establish a written interaction that had a real social purpose - to help her and Frank get to know each other.

The lively interaction between Pat and Frank during the journal writing was in dramatic contrast to the very subdued deliberate manner of their interaction during the earlier part of the tutoring session. While during tutoring Frank had been relatively passive and his voice quiet, he became relaxed and animated during the dialogue writing, smiling and chattering while Pat wrote. The monotone disappeared and, after the first written exchange, he no longer sat quietly waiting. He looked over and watched Pat write, and after a couple of written exchanges, he got up out of his chair and looked over her shoulder.

Focusing on Meaning, Leading by Following. Frank also became more alert, as he relaxed. While looking over Pat's shoulder, he read her entry aloud as she wrote it, and he anticipated some of the words she was writing; he remarked that there were quite a few big words. When Pat pointed to a few of those words and read each one, including "university", Frank said "I knew that!" He said the same thing when Pat pointed out that "students" was the same as "student" except for the last letter. And he read the word "elementary" by the time Pat had written half of the word.

Yet during his earlier reading, he had been reluctant to guess or anticipate words he did not know.

Paradoxically, the very activities that, during tutoring, had elicited cautious and timid responses from Frank (for example, predicting word endings) seemed enjoyable to him during the dialogue writing, when his attention was on receiving a personal message and responding to it. The importance of the social framework in shifting the focus from performance and correctness to meaning, where correctness served the interests of communication, was evident very early. As a result, Pat was able to do some teaching incidentally, at a time when Frank was receptive to learning, and when he was attentive to the usefulness of written words, not intimidated by their structure and difficulty.

Sharing Models. Frank's relaxed tone showed in his journal writing too, during that session. He followed Pat's pattern, addressing her directly and writing in a "getting-to-know-you" vein:

> Hi Pat
> How have you pine this week.
> ...
>
> Hi Pat
> I have been fine are you a tether here

Defining Purpose. While this initial written dialogue was enjoyable, and useful relative to the tutoring of the first session, and while this early writing served as an

example of what would be done during subsequent tutoring sessions, it required very little initiative from Frank at the time. Moreover, it left no clear definition of the purpose of the dialogue journal writing beyond that particular episode. While getting to know each other might be the basis for continuing a written dialogue, that was not articulated; nor were the procedures for doing so, beyond the instruction to write something every day. At that point, Frank did not have to consider what the journal could be or decide how exactly he would do it. This absence of definition would prove to be a critical variable in the dialogue journal writing in the weeks that followed, as Frank struggled to differentiate the dialogue journal writing from various tutoring tasks.

Phil and Tim

Phil and Tim also began their dialogue journal writing at their first meeting. Phil introduced the dialogue journal writing part way through the session. His likening of the journal to a diary triggered a familiar image for Tim: "Sort of like a pen pal!" This remark indicated that at that point Tim recognized the essential nature of the journal writing activity.

Focusing on Meaning in a Social Context. Tim's pen-pal framework seemed to allow him to write eagerly and freely. Like Frank and Allison, he showed no concern, in that first

session, about errors, focusing instead on the message he was sharing. During that session, he wrote his longest entry of the entire ten weeks, reporting the major events of his day from noon to bedtime. He wrote as if he were addressing someone, and, although he did not include a salutation, he did include a reference to Phil: "I went down to the university to get tutored by Paul."

Even though Tim did not address Phil directly, the social relationship seemed important. For one thing, Tim made sure to mention Phil. And later, when Phil asked Tim, by way of a recap of instructions, why he would be writing every day, Tim answered, "'cause you're going to write something back!"

Importance of Models and Experience. In spite of this statement and its implied involvement, Tim was not sufficiently engaged in the dialogue writing after one episode to carry on independently outside of the immediate relationship with Phil. In the absence of an experience of some "writing back", being asked to write whatever he could was too open-ended for Tim, especially when full procedures for doing the writing - where to write in the book, how much to write, what to include - were not jointly worked out. Although eager, Tim would continue to show a need for clearer guidelines and for some first-hand experience with the dialogue writing, to help him maintain a commitment to it by discovering its unique social value separate from the

pleasures of direct conversation with Phil at tutoring sessions.

During the week after tutoring began, the three students responded in different ways to the dialogue journal writing. Allison continued to write daily, as she had begun to do prior to her first session. The other two students did not continue to write independently, and they displayed bewilderment about the activity at their second sessions. It was as if they had left all of their "tutoring" thoughts behind in the clinic after finishing their first sessions. Having enjoyed the activity of journal writing, but having had no primary responsibility for establishing journal writing routines, they seemed to expect that all of their work, including dialogue journal writing, would be done in the tutoring sessions and directed by their tutors, in spite of verbal instructions to the contrary.

The Early Weeks: Structuring the Journal Writing

While the three student-tutor pairs enjoyed a productive experience with dialogue journal writing at their first tutoring sessions, the differences in their ways of starting influenced their ways of handling the activity during the subsequent weeks. Differences were apparent in the amount of time spent on dialogue journal writing, the

amount of writing, and the amount and kind of talking during journal time. While the differences were associated with varying amounts of stress and difficulty during journal times, each pair developed a workable routine by the middle of the tutoring period.

Joan and Allison

Consistency of Procedure. One of the most obvious characteristics of the journal writing, for Joan and Allison, was its predictability. Even before the first session, Allison and Joan were writing in their dialogue journals on a daily basis, and the pattern for use of space in the book, and for use of time in each session, did not change after the first session. Each session began with journals. Joan allowed enough time for herself and Allison to read all of each other's entries from the previous week, and also to write responses, to read each other's responses, and sometimes to write final comments. In this way, Joan and Allison spent at least fifteen minutes, and as much as twenty-five minutes, of each hour-long session in silent concentration on messages written to each other.

The predictability of the pattern allowed Allison and Joan to use almost all of their time on sharing each other's journals, very little on maintenance or redefinition of procedures. Apart from the efficiency of such a routine, it engendered comfort as well. Allison did not have to feel

anxious about whether she was doing things "right"; she did not have to waste excessive energy trying to figure out what was going on.

This comfortable pattern continued week after week, as Allison and Joan became more familiar with each other. Its smoothness seemed to be based on their mutual clear sense of what they expected of each other in relation to the journal writing and was undoubtedly reinforced for Allison by the satisfaction of writing without the anticipation that the work would be corrected. Allison saw the writing not as an assigned task, but as a pleasant pastime:

> ...it was...something to do when you're at home an' on the weekends.
>
> - from interview with Allison

Embedding Extends the Framework for Journal Writing.

The predictability of the journal writing routine was consistent with the tutoring sessions as a whole; other tasks were carefully structured too. In addition, the relationships between tasks in a session were noted. In the following excerpt, for example, Joan relates spelling done in tutoring and spelling she has noticed in the journal:

> J: We're going to talk about some spelling tonight, but did you read my comment - about your spelling?
> A: Where?
> J: In your journal - where I write things.
>
> - from session 4, Feb. 25th

After making this comment, Joan continued at some length pointing out the changes in Allison's spelling in her

journal writing over the weeks and engaging Allison in some reflection about it:

> J: ...let me, show you - what I mean, Allison. Because this is so important. I...took a look through - your journal - back here - and here, and here....I found, when I went through your story (written at intake to the Centre), that you had twenty percent of the words in your story spelled wrongly. Now, in your journal, I'm finding that you...have cut that right down.... And that's a big improvement.
> A: Well -
> J: Over three or four weeks, heh?
> A: A lot of it was carelessness.
> J: Well of course!
> A: Yeh.
> J: And...later on tonight, we're going to start building in monitoring - monitoring. That is....

Joan explained the term "monitoring", showing Allison a sample of her own work in progress and then moving back to Allison's writing, thus relating the notion of monitoring to Allison's immediate experience:

> J: You see how many times I've had to go back, recheck it, rethink, cross words out, add another thought -
> A: It looks like wiggles.
> J: It does, doesn't it.... I'm noticing places in here (flips pages in Allison's journal) where you were monitoring. ...I notice where sometimes - like here - you've erased and corrected - like here.... You know, these are monitoring things - these are things that you're doing now that you were not doing before. You're starting to use it.
> - session 4, Feb. 25th

Thus, Joan took advantage of the journal writing to make a teaching point and laid a foundation for work they would do later in the session. While she was referring to self-correction, and praising Allison's use of it, she was

not correcting Allison's work or requiring Allison to make corrections.

In a similar way, Joan took advantage of an opportunity to relate spelling to reading, in the context of Allison's journal writing. When at one point Joan had trouble reading a section of Allison's journal, Joan wrote a question, as a response to that particular entry:

> J: What is Mom's world winning lasso (lasagna)??? Now I'm really curious! You'll really have to explain this one tonight!
> A: (Written response) It's spost to be lazonya.
> J: (Final written comment) Lasagna is my favorite food!!
>
> - Allison's journal, Feb. 24th

At this point, Allison had an opportunity and a reason to review what she had written, and to revise it to make it understandable to Joan. Allison's independent correction, "lazonya", was much closer to the conventional spelling than the original version was, and Joan took the opportunity to use the word in her final written comment, so that Allison could see the conventional spelling in a context that might help her remember it.

The exchange between Joan and Allison about the spelling of a key word was not only informative to Allison, and pertinent to Joan's teaching goals, but enjoyable as well. Rather than feel criticised for her misspelling, Allison shared a chuckle with Joan about it, and she likely gained another bit of confidence in her ability to learn to

spell. All the while, she was not really thinking at all about learning and teaching, but mainly about lasagna!

Reinforcing Purpose. In addition to relating journal writing to other aspects of tutoring and school work, Joan frequently mentioned the journal in ways that emphasized her belief in its importance and reinforced its purpose, as illustrated in the following excerpts:

> Tonight - we're going to share our journals and ...the journals are so important - they really are so important, aren't they, 'cause they're talking - in...print....
>
> - session 6, March 4th

> I love to read your journal; I love to read your ideas and...that's really what it's all about, isn't it - we're talking to each other here.
>
> - session 4, Feb. 25th

The ubiquity of such messages was part of the predictability of procedures, allowing Allison to feel at ease about what was going on and to focus her attention on her task.

Comfort Associated With Clear Expectations. Allison's comfort showed in her relaxed posture and her confident manner on entering the classroom. Although she chatted enthusiastically with Joan on the way into each session, moved tables and chairs around, cleaned the blackboard, and arranged Joan's taperecorder and books, Allison very quickly refocused her energy when Joan took out her own journal. With only brief introductory remarks to each other, they exchanged books and became lost in them:

> J: Ok, Allison...let's begin - with our journals today.

A: Mhm.
J: Did you manage to get all of your entries done this last week?
A: (Inaudible)
J: Mm. That's good....is longer this time, isn't it? (Refers to an entry in Allison's journal.)
A: Yeh.
J: We're not going to be able to continue with our journals right to the end this time, Allison. What we'll do is we'll work on the...reading and writing part for fifteen minutes - as much as we have done - ok?

...(They work in silence for about 15 minutes.)

J: I think our time has...run out now, so,... let's...do our little trade and we'll just see if there's any little thing that we'd like to make a comment on.

...(another long period of silence)

J: I just made a couple of little comments, perhaps. Did you make any in there?
A: Two.
J: You did? Ok; I'll...(looks at the comments) - ok!

- session 3, Feb. 20th

During the long silence of a journal sharing period, Allison never interrupted Joan; only a periodic chuckle or sigh, and the hollow scratch of pens, broke the silence, until they finished off and put the journals aside. Having established, through experience and shared guidelines, that journal time was quiet time, and that enough time would be available for an entire cycle of journal sharing, their attention was fully engaged with the journals. Paradoxically, while totally silent and separate, they were at the same time totally engaged with each other through th written dialogue. The valuable relationship developing in

the journals during the subsequent weeks fed the tutoring sessions, as both Allison and Joan carried the attitudes of concentration and cooperation into the particular tutoring activities of each day.

Pat and Frank.

School Anxieties Revisited. Frank approached the journal period of his second session with spectacular displays of anxiety, conveyed in his voice and words and also in his behavior:

P: Here is the book that we used last week.
F: Woy - oy - oy - oy - oy - oy.
P: Remember this one when we were writing notes back and forth to each other?
F: Yes - oh - ee.
P: Ok. What I did this week was I wrote a note to you every day - Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, today.
F: (Interrupts) Oh b
o
y.
- session 2, Feb. 10th

During the rest of the session, Frank continued responding in this unnatural voice while Pat attempted to explain the dialogue writing procedure:

P: The only thing is I'm not going to allow you to read them all.
F: (Inaudible but voice expresses displeasure.)
P: No fun at all. You get to take this book home with you.
F: A
h.
P: Ok. And today I'll let you read any one of these (entries) you want to pick, and I'd like you to take the book home and, during the week, you write something each day.
F: Each day!

...

P: So you can write anything you like in the book. It doesn't have to be -
F: Oh - wu - u!

...

P: Do you want to look at this one?
F: "Where - all - of - the--" (reads)
P: - read that one?
F: (Whispers as reads. Grunts. Sighs.) I'll read another one...ok I'll read this one....
- session 2, Feb. 10th

Importance of Clear Purpose. The tone of despair and displeasure in Frank's voice here was in striking contrast to his relaxed and attentive tone during the first journal writing episode the previous week. But the episode here differed too. Whereas, in the first session, the dialogue had proceeded step by step, with Pat and Frank taking turns writing as they would in a normal conversation, in this session he was faced with a series of statements, not just one at a time, and he seemed unsure which one to answer.

In other words, the activity was no longer like a conversation. Pat's open-ended approach, while intended to allow Frank freedom, in choosing which entry to look at, in fact removed the interactive element that had made the first journal episode enjoyable and sensible. Frank no longer was faced with a social situation, one that made sense to him, but an isolated piece of reading and an arbitrary assignment for writing - language tasks not unlike those he faced in school:

P: You write whatever you feel like writing - for today; and I'll write something in this book, for today (introduces second book). And then we're each going to take a book home during the week.
F: Oh boy (low voice).
P: You write something every day and I'll write something every day.
F: What if I forget a day?
P: Well try not to. And if you do, then I guess you can do two things the next day.
F: Uh. GOLLY! GEE!? (Deep sigh)

- session 2, Feb. 10th

When writing was painfully hard to do, writing "whatever you feel like writing" might seem an absurd request; there was no such thing, especially when the inherent communicative purpose and the support of a social relationship were removed, leaving only the familiar arbitrariness and fear associated with a writing assignment. In the abstract context of a discussion about the journal writing, Frank could not imagine what he and Pat could talk about in a written exchange. Without the continuity of consecutive entries and responses, the nature of the task remained, for Frank, undefined, and its purpose lost.

Importance of a Familiar Social Framework. In spite of Frank's apparent bewilderment and his verbal resistance, he did participate successfully in a written dialogue with Pat once they began taking turns again. The tone of his written remarks was calm and personal, as he addressed Pat directly:

10.02.86 Thayou for bering the computer Pat I went skiing on firday.

- Frank's journal, Feb. 10th

But, while Frank waited for Pat to finish writing, he stood and sat, fiddled with the tape recorder, stood and sat - only momentarily engaged, while writing his very brief responses.

What seemed to be missing for Frank, at this point, was the familiarity and integrity of a social framework, to give both purpose and specific direction to his dialogue writing. Picking out a piece of a journal to read, and an unrelated topic to write about, seemed at this point arbitrary and puzzling tasks. Everything had changed since Frank's first experience with the journal writing. Having little experience writing to an absent person, he could not make sense of the situation, or recognize its connection with the previous journal writing episode. Whereas Pat's intention was to introduce changes gradually, and thus make each step manageable, the actual result was a fragmentation of Frank's tentative construct of dialogue writing. The absence of focus and sense were discomfitting to him and caused him, during the first few weeks, to put much of his energy into coping rather than into journal sharing.

Sharing Responsibility. Pat's belief in the necessity for Frank to become engaged with print in a personal way led her to persevere in her efforts to recapture the cooperative tone of their first interactive writing episode. Whenever possible, during tutoring, she attempted to involve Frank in

some negotiation and decision-making. Often it was in determining the order of tasks:

> ...read your book first? Do you want to read mine?
> - session 3, Feb. 17th

Sometimes, it was in choosing a particular item to write about, or to read:

> Would you like to choose some more (books) to take home?
> - session 3, Feb. 17th

Sometimes, it was in asking permission to read what he was writing:

> F: I wrote four words.
> P: Can I peek at the four words?
> - session 2, Feb. 10th

Although, at first, Frank seemed bewildered by having choices, Pat's persistence in offering them demonstrated that she believed that he did have preferences, and that she expected him to make choices. Moreover, she accepted his choices when he made them, allowing him to see and to deal with the consequences.

> F: How many times did you get to write?
> P: Just once.
> F: Once?!!
> P: Just once. I didn't know what you would think of it, because last week, when I wrote you all this, I thought you sounded kind of unhappy - you said 'Oh boy, am I ever in trouble.' And I thought 'Well I guess Frank doesn't like doing this so I'd better not write so much.'
> F: Oh (high-pitched voice).
> P: Was I wrong?
> F: Mm. Yes.
> - session 3, Feb. 17th

This exchange demonstrated to Frank that he had made a choice with major consequences. The fact that the consequences evidently surprised Frank suggests that in his school experience, it was uncommon for his wishes or statements to lead to any consequences - that teachers' actions possibly were independent of his choices. But in the journal writing, as in the tutoring generally, Pat did take his wishes into account. She, thereby, demonstrated to him that his thoughts and his initiative were valued, that in fact he himself was valued.

Pat's persistence and trust undoubtedly contributed to Frank's willingness, by session 4, to show some curiosity about the mutual writing and to cautiously share in the establishment of ground rules:

P: Now it was your idea to leave all this (journal sharing) to the end. I'm always curious to see.... Are you curious?
F: No.
P: No?
F: You don't have to write every day (tone suggests envy).
P: Well I would write every day, but you said I wrote too much, so -
F: Ba - a - a!
P: Do you want me to write every day?
F: It doesn't bother me.
P: We-ell (laughs). That's why I quit - it's 'cause you said it was too much.
F: (first phrase inaudible)...(I wish) I didn't have to write every day.
P: Well, how about we both write every day?
F: (Inaudible words; voice goes up and down as in 'ho hum'.)
P: Would you find it too much to read if I wrote every day?

F: No.
P: Ok, I'll do that.
- session 4, Feb. 24th

Although the length of each entry that Frank made, on the days between sessions, continued to be short, only one statement in most cases, he began to write consistently. He showed increasing comfort and involvement in the sessions, particularly in the journal sharing.

Phil and Tim

Clarifying Purpose and Expectations. Tim seemed perplexed by the journal writing when he came to his second tutoring session. When Phil brought out his journal, towards the end of the session, Tim said "Hm, hm, hm, hm," shaking his head while holding it in his hands. It was a surprisingly sincere display of disappointment. Tim had enjoyed the writing episode in the first session and had felt pleased about the fact that Phil was "going to write something back", but here he had nothing for Phil to write back about. In spite of Phil's reassurance, Tim stated that he was just mad that he hadn't done the journal writing, and he distracted himself frequently during the session by his preoccupation with his oversight.

Yet, Tim had had very little basis for doing the dialogue journal. He had had no experience with written dialogue, having written in the journal only once - an entry that was not addressed directly to Phil, or anyone else in

particular. Moreover, he had had no model for writing interactively, since Phil's first entry, presented below, had not been addressed to Tim:

> Today Tim came to the clinic to start tutoring. He sure has a good memory. In fact, he screwed up the lesson by knowing the book we were going to work with. I guess I better have more books next time.
> - Phil's journal, Feb. 5th

Phil's use of the third-person pronoun, rather than the more direct second-person pronoun, had suggested a personal journal, or a diary, rather than an interactive one. In addition, in the very first session, Phil had stated that the journal was for two purposes: first, that Tim needed to write, and second, that they would be able to take words from the journal for use in spelling activities. These statements seemed to define the journal writing as a school activity primarily. The statements did not include or emphasize communication in itself, as a purpose for the journal writing.

This multi-faceted frame of reference was confirmed by Phil's later comments about his use of journals (personal communication, May 13, 1986). Phil indicated that he wanted children to come to see a journal as a unique personal thing, so that each child would use it in whatever way he or she wished to - for notes, as a diary, for drawing, or for recording comments on an experience or a story. As well, Phil noted that he generally responded in various ways to children's journal entries: with a personal comment on an

experience a child had mentioned, with a list or some notes that offered information, or with a word of encouragement to the child. These responses were all intended for the child being written to but were not necessarily addressed to that child.

This construct of a journal was consistent with Phil's reference to a diary, when introducing Tim to dialogue writing. At the same time, Phil's early instructions had clearly indicated that the writing was being done for Tim, even if it was not addressed to him:

> P: ...we're gonna take a few minutes right now - you mentioned some things just now. I'd like to...start writing. Write about those things.
> T: Ok; so I just put, like 'I got out of school at 12:00 -
> P: Sure. And tell me why.
> - session 1, Feb. 5th

By saying "tell me why", Phil had provided for Tim a social framework for the journal writing.

Phil further demonstrated the social framework for the journal by writing a response to Tim's first entry. He included not only a reference to what Tim had written, but something new as well. He referred to "our" journal and promised to write more about a certain topic in future entries:

> Not a bad piece of writing. I am only upset with you calling me Paul. That is close but my name is..."Phil".
> I think it stinks that you got a half day off and I didn't!
> The name Paul got me thinking about a friend

of mine who is going to get a weird birthday gift.
I will tell you about it in my (our) journal.
- response to Tim's first (Feb.5th) entry

Besides offering reassurance to Tim, and showing him that the journal was for continuing discussion of topics that were of mutual interest to them, this entry also offered an example of a written exchange. The model seemed to help Tim to write a response, starting in much the same way as Phil had done:

Not bed it is a ver go slory (good story)..
- response to Phil's first (Feb. 5th) entry

Between the times when Tim read Phil's response and wrote his own to Phil, they continued a verbal dialogue in which Phil offered reassurance to Tim and additional procedural suggestions. Throughout the writing, in this second tutoring session, Tim chattered about both the written message he had received and the procedures:

P: Do you see how this thing works?
T: Mhm.
P: So. Do you want to do some writing on this?
T: I'm thinking.
P: Ok. Well you go ahead with that and I'll write some more.
...(short silence as they write)
If you can't think of something, that's fine - ok?
Are you worried about writing a whole bunch? No?
Because I might just write a little bit too.
That's ok. Ok? You worried about this?
T: M-m.
P: Ok. (Then they discuss the possibility of requesting Tim's mother to help by organizing Tim's journal writing time at home. In the end they agree to leave it up to Tim.)
- session 2, Feb. 10th

At the same time as Phil was offering reassurance, the extensive time being used in talking about journal writing reduced the amount of time left for writing, and Tim left the second session with very little additional experience in journal writing, and little more sense of his responsibility in it, than he had had the previous week.

Importance of Models. At the end of session 2, Tim and Phil exchanged journals. During the subsequent week, Tim faithfully followed the pattern of response he had experienced during session 2, when he and Phil had shared and answered each other's first journal entries. In the journal that Tim took home, he wrote a response to each of Phil's entries. In the responses, he included answers to Phil's questions and comments on Phil's statements, just as he had done during session 2. An example of Tim's responses appears below, along with Phil's related entry:

> Phil: Worked at home today. Trouble with working there though, is that people tend to interfere. People call trying to sell carpet cleaning, houses, and even diapers.
>
> - Phil's journal, Feb. 6th

> Tim's response: I stayed home on Feb. 13 and the phone rang allday for my Brothers and I to play or spend the night or play hockey

This response indicates that Tim had continued on the basis of a model in which he and Phil wrote interactively - as pen-pals might. But evidently, he expected that, after his own responses, Phil would write to him again, when they met the next time; Tim did not go on in his journal to make

new entries, as one would in a diary. The diary, which was Phil's model, clearly had not replaced Tim's own model of pen pals writing to each other.

Predictably, when Tim and Phil met for their third session, Phil was surprised to see that Tim had written responses, but no new entries. The following exchange demonstrates their different interpretations of the journal:

P: Let's see what you did here now....so you reacted to all these things that I wrote? Good....Did you keep a diary?...did you write something every day?
T: In that?
P: Yeh.
T: Well - well, yeh, but then, when I had hockey I did it - the day when I did one so then... (inaudible).
P: Where was that? Where did you do that?... So...you did this one here, I reacted to it, and I read it to you remember? And then I continued on in your book.
T: That's what I just noticed.
P: I...kept a diary, ok, so I kept my diary - in your book!
T: So you want me to keep my diary in your book!

- session 3, Feb. 19th

At this point, Tim seemed to recognize the difference between what he had done and what was expected; the notion of a diary seemed to be clear. But, although Phil stated that they would both write their diaries in the session, they continued their discussion of the procedures, and their conversation interrupted their attempts to write:

P: ...You get to go home and read all this stuff, whenever you feel like it, and...react to it if you want, or if you don't - just like you did here - but - tonight or today - you're gonna write your diary here.
T: 's today the 18th?

P: 19th.
T: 19th.
P: Ok? And I'm gonna do the same, ok; I'm gonna - ...do the 19th here - like that, alright; so now I'm back in my book. So what we've got here is we have combined journal: yours and mine are...mixed together - one week it's yours; the next week it's mine. Ok? So, what are you gonna do this week, then, if you get a chance? Look at these - uh-huh - and - what about over here?
T: Write what I did on February 19th till next Monday.
P: ...right. So you got...to do Wednesd[redacted], Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday - five days.
T: An[redacted] I'm gonna write in my -
P: Jo[redacted]al. Why don't we write now.
T: M[redacted]y's?
P: Today's.
T: Ok.
P: Alright. You write yours there.
T: I had out early from school today.
P: Again?!
T: 2:00 o'clock.
P: You should've come early!
T: We - we - my -I know my dad - my dad thought I wasn't gonna come so he took all of us home and then my mom said....

- session 3, Feb. 19th

As the lengthy conversation moved from one topic to another, it shifted the focus of attention away from journals and writing. It not only limited the time available for writing, but also demonstrated to Tim that talking was highly valued, perhaps more than writing. For a young student whose writing has not been associataed with satisfaction, the possibility of talking, rather than writing, might seem a relief. While Tim sometimes recognized that he was diverting the focus of the session away from the writing, even then, he did not necessarily revert to writing, or stay with it if he did.

After numerous conversational exchanges, during session 3, Tim must have reassessed his construct of dialogue writing; it was not a pen-pal experience. During the week, he did not write anything in the journal, and he approached the next session with the new expectation that he would have many opportunities to talk.

Reassessing the Purpose of the Journal Writing. During the entire 15 - 20 minutes of journal time in session 4, Tim continued behaving in very much the same way as he had in session 3. The journal seemed to be a vehicle for carrying on an extended conversation about a variety of experiences. Although Phil repeatedly returned to the idea that the intent of journal time was to write, he repeatedly became involved in conversation with Tim.

The conversations were, in part, a function of Phil's style of teaching, for in all of his work with Tim he encouraged Tim to talk and figure out what he was doing. Phil also consistently used his sense of humor to engage Tim in tasks, and he sometimes used a game to accomplish a tutoring task. Tim attended well during such activities, indicating that he enjoyed the relaxed tone of Phil's approach. Unfortunately, Phil's wish to engage Tim in a comfortable relationship undermined his teaching goals, to some extent, at journal times. Tim seemed unable to differentiate between a game as a vehicle for learning and a game as the primary activity of a session. On his own, he

did not easily monitor his distracting chatter, although he readily did so when Phil offered clear guidelines:

T: Tomorrow we're going for an hour down to this play.
P: (Points to Tim's journal, indicating that he should be writing his remarks.)
T: I know!

- session 4, Feb. 24th

But within seconds, Tim started up again, as if bursting with things to say that took too long to write.

When the journal period of session 4 passed in this way, with considerable talk and little writing, followed by a week in which Tim wrote only one entry in his journal, Phil took a firmer approach to the journal writing. In session 5 he insisted that "talking" during journal time be done in the journal itself:

P: I'm going to change the way we're doing this just a little bit....What I want you to do - is - this kind of writing - every day....
T: I have an excellent one for tomorrow.
P: Do you? Good.
T: We're goin' to - c' I tell you?
P: ...you can, but you can tell me in here - alright?
T: Yeh, but -
P: That's - no you can't.
T: Ah-h.
P: I don't want to hear about it anywhere but right here (points to journal) - deal?...that's what this is for.

- session 5, March 3rd

In this session, and again in session 6 the following week, Phil wrote the dates of each day of the week on separate pages of Tim's journal, showing him exactly where and how often he was expected to write a message. This

procedure seemed to clarify the task for Tim, for from that point on, he began to write at home every day.

The procedure followed during each session became established at the same time. During each session, they each wrote one entry in their journals. Then they exchanged books, without reading each other's messages, and put them aside. As a result, the amount of time devoted to journal writing in each session was reduced to only 3 to 5 minutes, but the activity was predictable. The pattern of writing seemed to be one of a personal diary that was written with another person in mind. Although Phil wrote responses on pages where Tim had written each week's entries, Tim did not respond to any of Phil's and did not address statements or questions to Phil in the journal. Tim continued to simply report events, consistent with the notion of diary writing:

> I woke up and wentto schooL. then I went home and did my homework.
>
> - Tim's journal, Mar. 6th

> I toled my friend that his light was brokeken. he step on a pes of glass.
>
> - Tim's journal, Mar. 10th

The notion of pen pals had been abandoned and replaced with the notion of a diary, and Tim kept the diary faithfully.

The Later Weeks: Developing Communication

As tutoring continued into the sixth, seventh and final few sessions and procedural concerns diminished, journal time became a calmer time, a regular part of tutoring. Energy went predominantly into constructive interaction and work, very little into procedural review. What this meant for the dialogue journal writing was that attention was focused almost entirely on the content, or messages, in the shared journals.

Joan and Allison

For Joan and Allison, in their dialogue journal writing, the predominance of the content had been evident very early; from the beginning, each session had included at least 15 minutes of silent journal sharing when Joan and Allison read and wrote responses to each other's entries. Joan had intentionally confined talk to the journals, during the first four or five weeks. But as the mutual expectation to write developed, Joan removed the constraint on talking during journal time. As early as session 4, she and Allison shared a brief conversation about their mutual enjoyment of lasagna, which Allison had written about, and they shared a laugh about Allison's spelling of "lasagna" - "lasso". The talking and the writing were closely associated, one serving the other:

J: ...just take a minute to read our comments. Ok. ...(At length, she begins laughing.) Ok, oh - ah (laughs again). Gotta write a comment about that one, heh?
A: Yeh (smiles).
J: (Laughs)
A: Well, you know what it is.
J: It's - yeh; it's, ah, - it's delicious (She'd also, made a written statement about liking lasagna).
A: 'Specially when it's hot. I had it for lunch today and forgot...(inaudible) it cold.
J: Oh - what. Ah that's great. I really enjoyed that, Allison....

- session 4, Feb. 25th

Although they had dealt with the communication problem, associated with the misspelling of the word "lasagna", by writing questions and answers in the journal, the conversation enhanced the sharing by allowing for a nonverbal expression of mutual feelings, as well as allowing for spontaneous remarks about the written communication. In addition, while the talk did not use a large amount of the journal time, it inspired a useful discussion about spelling that related to both Allison's journal writing and her school writing.

Joan referred to a message she had written to Allison in the previous week's journal, in which she had said that she had been looking over the journal and had noticed, among other things, that Allison's spelling was improving. This remark was an uncommon occurrence, not just because

conversations were relatively infrequent in journal times, but also because it led to an extended discussion about the form and appearance of their written work - a focus that Joan generally avoided in the context of journal writing.

Joan worried, later, about the possibility that this discussion about spelling might divert the focus of the journals away from the messages and alter the nature of the journal writing. At the time, however, both Joan's written and her oral remarks about the appearance of Allison's journal were sincere responses to Allison's writing.

Even though the discussion focused on form for a while, that discussion showed Allison, in the framework of h[redacted] experience and her own writing, the purpose of monitoring in written communication. It showed her how meaning could be affected by spelling and other conventions. It also showed her that readers are helped by certain elements of format because these features of written work are part of the communication. For example, when in that same session Joan asked Allison to leave more space at the end of each journal entry, it was not an empty prescription made by a teacher but a request for space by a reader who wanted to write back:

J: Give me a little more space for my comments next time, heh?
A: Uh-huh.
J: Yeh...'cause to not start cramping... (inaudible) and you know me - talk so much -
A: Yeh.

- session 4, Feb. 25th

Even after session 4, Joan and Allison did not always have conversations about their journals, but it was not discouraged. Joan was more open to it, because she believed that the central place of writing in the journal activity had been demonstrated and extensively experienced by Allison, and would not likely be undermined:

> ...I don't think I began to discuss anything that was in the journal until about the fifth or the sixth class - on purpose because you have to build that - communicate through writing - uh - because you can imagine, if she had felt that she could have told me those things...or add details, no point in writing them down. And...so...it took me a long time before I actually invited her to tell me something more....By then she understood.
>
> - from interview with Joan

Talk Supports Purposes of the Journal. Even though Joan and Allison continued to focus mainly on writing, during journal time, the fact that they sometimes started with a conversation allowed them not only to increase their mutual understanding of each other's messages, and of each other, but also to check on how the journal writing was going. It also allowed them to identify problems that might not show up in the texts of the journals themselves:

> J: So how's our journal gone since...(inaudible)?
> A: I seem to be doing it but - on these little ones (refers to short interval between sessions when they met twice a week) I just do it on the Thursday night.
>
> - session 7, Mar. 6th

Through this remark, Allison was raising a serious problem, since the mutual expectation was that she and Joan would write every day. Allison had begun to feel pressured, rather than pleased or satisfied, by writing every day, and as a result, she was writing entries for several days all at once. She was approaching the dialogue writing as if it were merely a required school task. She was no longer engaged in a sincere communication, and the writing no longer was functional for her. It was becoming somewhat of a chore, rather than a written conversation.

Because of this shift in Allison's perspective, it was important to discuss, and possibly redefine the framework for the dialogue journal writing. In the next session (the 8th), Allison and Joan agreed that, during the following week, they would write journal entries only if they felt like doing so:

> J: ...it shouldn't be a chore. It's a - it's a sharing - it's a talking-with-writing thing. So it really shouldn't be a chore and if it's becoming a chore, it means that it's time to have a little break. That's the way I always look at it. So, as I say, for this next few days -
> A: Uh-huh.
> J: - as you will -
> A: Yup.
> J: - as you see a need - Ok? And I'll treat it the same way. But anyway, in the meantime, let's hear our journals tonight - the parts that we have.
> - session 8, Mar 11th

Their fairly long discussion had allowed Allison to express the difficulty she was having in doing all of her

work and keeping up with daily journal writing. The effect of the discussion was a further clarification of the nature of dialogue writing - a reinforcement of the fact that it was intended to be a sincere sharing of messages, not an assigned task. The mutual review of the framework for the writing showed Allison that problems are solvable through cooperation and negotiation.

Mutual Commitment Demonstrated. Allison also discovered that her ideas were valued. Not only had she been expected to share in deciding how her difficulty would be resolved, but also, the following week, she found that Joan had written to her several times during the week, when Allison herself had not written at all. Perhaps these written messages, and the associated conversations, together with Allison's freedom to decide whether to write or not, helped Allison feel confident that she was a true partner in the journal writing activity. She was willing to resume journal writing for the week remaining before the tenth and last tutoring session.

Allison's appreciation of Joan's willingness to negotiate the details of journal writing is corroborated in her own later remarks:

> ...that week - where we didn't really have to do anything? That really helped 'cause jus' - I found after a while, like - my - it was beginning to - become a bother 'cause - I had been getting a lot o' homework that week....
>
> - from interview with Allison

Allison's satisfaction with the tutoring situation and with her relationship-in-writing with Joan also were reflected in her journal entries during the last week. The entries looked unhurried. Besides details, the entries conveyed a tone of confidence, as illustrated in the following excerpt from an entry about school events:

> ...When we ran I came in 2nd My friend...was 1st so my goal is to beat her. SO from now on that's how I want to run as fast or faster then her....I got my report card and it was far enof for me.
> - Allison's journal, March 18th

By the last session, Allison and Joan had shared a considerable amount of dialogue journal writing, with very little time spent on procedures. Even when they did encounter a problem, and certainly at other times, they mutually took responsibility for the interactive writing. Their relationship in the journals influenced the way they wrote in their journals, and also the way they worked together during the tutoring sessions.

Pat and Frank

Although Frank originally resisted the notion that his ideas were valuable, and he taxed his tutor's commitment to dialogue journal writing, gradually he responded to Pat's commitment and consistency. Once he became engaged in the sharing of messages, Frank gained at least five weeks of productive work in the journal.

Importance of Consistent Models. The change in Frank's response, while becoming evident during the weeks from sessions 2 to 4, was unmistakable in session 5. At this session, Frank's behavior suggested that he truly was "a changed person". When he and Pat turned to the dialogue journals, his first response was to note, by way of information rather than avoidance, the length of time they would work with the journals:

P: ...we'll do our journals - and we'll spend -
F: Ten minutes on that.
P: Ok.
F: And five minutes on reading.
P: Ok....

- session 5, Mar. 3rd

Second, Frank glanced over the journal he had just received from Pat and smiled broadly, acknowledging the fact that Pat really had written every day, as she had promised to do:

F: You wrote every day....
P: What do you think of that?
F: Nice. Good.

- session 5, Mar. 3rd

Getting right into the entries addressed to him, Frank sat calmly, apparently unselfconscious, for once. Sighs, quiet chuckles, and whispers signalled his engagement with the journal, until he noticed a small error in one of Pat's entries:

F: ...Winter Games was on - Tuesday.
P: I thought you said it was on Wednesday!
F: T - oh - I changed it, remember?

- session 5, Mar. 3rd

Correcting Pat on the detail, Frank grinned with satisfaction. After a while, he took the initiative to suggest that it was time to exchange books. And once he was finished writing his responses to Pat's entries, he leaned over to look at what she was writing, in response to his messages, as he had done only once before, during the first tutoring session.

Frank's engagement with the journal writing seemed to free Pat from constant vigilance of his reactive and unpredictable behavior. She too was able to pay more attention to the messages. As well, she found occasion, during the journal time, to reinforce one or two of the guidelines for journal work:

> Well I left you a little space there - if you want to tell me anything about it, I'd sure appreciate it.
> ...
> Maybe we should start a new rule that during this ten minutes all our talking has to go in the book, ok?
> - session 5, Mar. 3rd

Pat also had time to recognize Frank's involvement, and reflect it for him:

> P: Did you write anything for me?
> F: I'm thinking.
> P: Ok. It takes time to think about what you're going to say, doesn't it?
> - session 5, Mar. 3rd

Focus on Content. A critical variable, in Frank's apparent comfort and engagement, was the lack of testing and correction of journal entries and, instead, a consistent focus on the content of the written messages. Although,

throughout the final five or six weeks of tutoring, Pat and Frank regularly asked each other questions about particular words, or about format, the reason for the questions clearly was to understand the intended meanings:

F: Pa-t.
P: Mhm?
F: What's this word - 'offiffs'?
P: 'Playoffs'.
F: 'Playoffs' - oh.
- session 5, Mar. 3rd

F: (Whispers; inaudible).
P: (Looks over at his journal) 'Honest'.
F: That's 'honest'?!
P: The 'h' is silent.
- session 7, Mar. 17th

The remarkable transformation in Frank's manner, that began to show so clearly during session 5, was highlighted, near the end of that session, when he used a slang expression that he had used in earlier sessions. In this case, however, his voice did not sound guttural and jeering, but merely frustrated, a sincere indication that he was having difficulty answering a question Pat had asked him in one of her journal entries:

F: What? Oh, jees - it's a hard one!
P: I bet you're thinking about the time, are you?
F: Sort of, but - it's a hard question.
- session 5, Mar. 3rd

Importance of Shared Commitment. In these later weeks, as Frank became more comfortable with the writing, his attention was increasingly on work, rather than on himself. His face and posture showed a corresponding calmness and increase in attentiveness. He smiled more and frowned less.

He sat longer without getting up or squirming. And he looked at the materials they were working with, and made comments that were pertinent to the work.

Moreover, Frank continued to show initiative by suggesting the order of activities, and by offering information while working. In these ways, he cooperated with Pat in all of the tutoring tasks. He even began to monitor his own work, and to reflect on the experience of the learning, as suggested by this comment he made in one of the later sessions, when he and Pat were mapping his ideas for a piece of writing: "This really makes sense!"

This was a rare comment for Frank, and in the following exchange, he again showed his amazement at the idea that language learning can be enjoyable:

> P: (In journal): On Fridays I usually go to a school to help some children write stories. I really enjoy that.
> F: (Reading the entry): 's that right?!
> - session 6, Mar. 10th

Frank's increased engagement with the writing was nowhere more evident than in session 7, when, on his initiative, he became involved with Pat in revising the following entry that she had written:

> I've been looking at the results of the reading that that girl I told you about did. I think that I'll suggest some things for her teacher....
> - Pat's journal, Mar. 13th

Because Pat had used the word "that" twice in a row, Frank suggested they revise the entry. They became involved in a

very long peer-editing episode, which was characterised by numerous trials and rereadings, and many chuckles. The discussion completely engrossed both Pat and Frank, and Frank consistently attended to the meaning of the message, making suggestions for improving its clarity:

> P: An' I think that that makes sense!
> F: Well. I don't. I still don't get this line.
> P: Would it help if I got rid of it completely, Frank?
> F: I - it makes sense if you'd a' got rid of the 'did' and made it 'her'.
> P: Ok.
> ...
> P: Ok. Now we can continue with our own work, eh?
> F: Yeh. (They continue working silently for several more minutes as if nothing had interrupted.)
>
> - session 7, Mar. 17th

The intense and extended concentration and the cooperation that were apparent during the editing suggest a partnership that is quite unlike the tense teacher-student relationship that had existed in the very early days of journal writing. And Frank's generally cooperative behavior continued through to the end of tutoring. It is as if he had realized that Pat was sincerely interested in understanding him, not merely in checking his performance.

Recognizing Purposes for Writing. Frank's effective participation over the weeks was complemented by a developing good humor. Illustrated in the following excerpt, this sense of humor seemed to reflect an increasing comfort, and an increasing awareness, by Frank that he could use language effectively and purposefully:

P: Did you bring your journal, Frank?

F: (nods - negative).
P: Is it in the car?
F: In the bag!
P: (Laughs). I should know you by now - you're teasing again. You thought I'd just flip, didn't you?

- session 7, Mar. 17th

The changing tone of the sessions led to a more productive use of journal sharing time. During session 9, for example, Pat and Frank spent most of the 17 minutes of their journal time working silently. In addition, Frank's body language and his brief comments showed his comfort. He easily dealt with questions about the text of his journal, showing none of his early anxieties about making sense of a piece of writing that looked like nonsense:

F: ...that word.
P: 'Lucky'.
F: Oh.
P: Did you get this one?
F: 'Special'.
P: ...so if something's really special -
F: 'Lucky - lucky you.' I get it.
P: Makes sense, eh?
F: Yeh.

- session 9, Apr. 1st

Frank's increased confidence and calmness were apparent in the final session too, when he again participated seriously and reflectively in both a written dialogue and a discussion around it, in which the beginnings of a new view of himself as a learner, and competent person, emerged. In a touching exchange about what it means to be a learner, quoted in chapter one, Frank seemed struck by Pat's reference to him as a good learner. He said, "Sometimes I'm

a brat," as if that precludes his being a learner. The dawning recognition that being a learner is not synonymous with being perfect reflects the degree to which Frank shifted his attention, over the weeks, away from his preoccupation with his inability to write, as he became involved in the meaning and nature of the writing.

Phil and Tim

During the final weeks of tutoring, Tim settled into a calm predictable journal writing routine. Session 5 seemed to be a turning point, for Tim finally abandoned his early model of pen pals and took on the diary framework that he was seeing in Phil's journal writing and was experiencing in the sessions. As a result, he became more relaxed in the sessions, as if comforted by having clear guidelines and a regular opportunity to work with Phil.

Clear Expectations and Shared Commitment. One of the main events concurrent to Tim's changed behavior was Phil's explicit structuring of the journal writing. Again, as he had done in session 4, Phil dated Tim's journal pages for the subsequent week, thus pointing out when and where each day's writing would be done:

> P: So there's March 5th - and...that's for your work today - and then...
> T: March 6th.
> P: After March 6th - that would be Thursday - then you could do March 7th.
> - session 6, Mar. 5th

Besides offering these clear instructions, Phil avoided "kidding" about the task, as he had sometimes done, and he avoided conversing at length with Tim about other topics. After spontaneous introductory remarks about a topic of mutual interest, such as their pet cats, Phil moved directly back to the journal writing:

> P: Well, that's really too bad (Refers to the death of Tim's cat). How long did you have him?
> T: Almost a year.
> P: Yeh?
> T: I got her - seven days before my birthday.
> P: ...We have some...(inaudible) to do before you go. So there, I've put in the dates for you...for each day, starting with today.
> T: Yeh.
>
> - session 6, Mar. 5th

The striking contrast between Phil's tone of gentle firmness at this point and his more jovial and gregarious approach at previous sessions seemed to calm Tim who was inclined to copy Phil's behavior. Tim checked himself when he began to talk while they were writing:

> We got a little - oh yeh - oh yeh
> (Resumes writing.)
>
> - session 6, Mar. 5th

The silence continued for approximately five minutes. This was a long, sustained writing event, compared to previous writing episodes which had rarely exceeded twenty or thirty seconds.

During the subsequent week, Tim wrote a journal entry on each of the pages that had been dated for him (Mar. 6, 7, 8, 9). He did not write any responses to Phil's messages of

the previous week. In fact, no evidence exists, either in the interview data or the notes from individual sessions, to indicate whether Tim even read Phil's journal entries or responses. He seemed to be following a diary-writing schema, not a dialogue-writing one. It seemed that he merely continued each day where he had left off the previous day, entering a report of his experiences for that day, but not necessarily addressing it to anyone, or anticipating any response.

Recognition of Models. In this, Tim was following a clear model - the model he observed and experienced during journal writing time at each session. At one point, he had asked whether to write answers, as if still seeking a pen-pal, but he had been instructed not to:

> T: Should I write back to these?
> P: ...no. Go ahead. No - you go ahead with this....no I'd like you to write for today. And you can do these later - when you have some time.
>
> - session 6, Mar. 5th

Phil's instructions did not emphasize writing back; in fact, they conveyed a concern about using time for doing so. This hint, together with the actual experience of not writing or sharing responses during the session, seemed a clear indication that what was valued most was the new entries. Thus, during the week, Tim continued writing new entries, giving up his original intention to write interactively.

Importance of the Social Element. Tim's reward for doing the daily entries was associated with the satisfaction of pleasing Phil, not with discovering a personal message from him. The journal was not, at that point, a framework for the developing relationship between Tim and Phil, though, as one of the tutoring activities they shared, it supported their tutoring relationship.

While Tim gained the satisfaction of thinking that he pleased Phil by writing in his journal, Phil did not gain the rewards he had expected from the joint journal writing, and he wondered why Tim wasn't answering his questions and responding to his written messages:

> P: I wish this last couple of weeks I could get some reactions from him, and see what kinds of things that he comes up with.... - from interview with Phil

Even though the journal writing was fulfilling only part of Phil's expectations, the activity continued comfortably throughout the final tutoring sessions. Approximately four minutes of writing was done in each session. The writing was sometimes accompanied by a brief conversation - often about procedures, or about spelling or usage:

> T: ...(Writes). How do you spell 'broken'?
> P: How would you put it?
> T: B - r - o - c - e - n?
> P: K - e - n.
> T: Bro - ken....I told him his light was broken in the playroom (Refers to statement he has written in his journal).

P: Yeh?
T: It was...(Explains how the light got broken).
P: Yeh, yeh. Oh, you've done...a good start.

- session 8, Mar. 12th

The comfort of the free-writing situation was often apparent in the conversations:

P: So how's...the old journal doing?
T: I didn't do it (grins) - no, I'm just kidding!
P: Oh, ho - ho ho ho (makes an exaggerated expression of grief).
T: He he he - I did it!
P: So did I (flips pages). In fact I got carried away one day.
T: I wrote about my reconciliation on the 15th.

- session 9, Mar. 17th

This exchange suggests not only a mutual spontaneity that is in contrast to the manipulativeness that characterized Tim's behavior on earlier occasions; it also indicates that Tim felt at ease raising topics of personal importance. During the subsequent few minutes, he had the satisfaction of sharing his knowledge about a topic (reconciliation) that was new to Phil. This experience of talking as equals, in association with the journal writing, undoubtedly helped Tim believe Phil's words of praise and encouragement.

Tim's comfort with his tutoring was evident in his regretful statement at the mention of the completion of tutoring:

And then we're - I'm done here?!

- session 9, Mar. 17th

At this point, Tim was eager to initiate a real pen-pal exchange with Phil after the termination of tutoring:

P: ...if you want to, we could talk about writing letters back and forth....
T: Like pen pals.
P: Sure.

- session 9, Mar. 17th

Whether or not Tim followed up on Phil's invitation to exchange letters by mail, his intrigue with the idea suggests that, to him, interactive writing had continued to have some appeal, and possibly it could have some merit.

Discussion of Approaches To Dialogue Journals

Tim responds enthusiastically, "you're going to write something back!" Frank becomes uncharacteristically lively and attentive as he and his tutor exchange several notes; he even predicts long words, as his tutor writes them, though several minutes earlier, he had resisted doing so during part of a lesson on reading. And Allison writes at length about herself and her activities; she writes a sympathetic response to her tutor, and she signs her statement with a happy face. In these and other ways, the students in this study showed how important a social framework is in writing. It is one of several aspects of the dialogue journal situation that inspired the students to want to write more than they normally did.

The Social Dimension

In their ready response, the students bear out the accepted notion that language learning is a social activity (Wells, 1981; Newman, 1985; Harste et al, 1984). Their enthusiasm seems to echo Britton's observation (1970) that "our interest in other people's lives is a primary one" (p. 115; see also Meek, 1982, p. 160; Moffett & Wagner, 1983, p. 299). The students' obvious interest in their tutors' written dialogue is reminiscent of Britton's further observation that young people will listen for hours to adults, if allowed, showing a "particular interest in those who seem to represent people they might become" (Britton, 1970, p. 116).

Familiar Context

Besides the social element of the dialogue writing, other aspects of context facilitated the writing, particularly the similarity of dialogue writing to spoken conversations. For the students, a conversational situation was one in which using language made sense. It gave them a frame of reference for selecting language, and they readily produced written language in their journals, in spite of their reported reluctance to read or write. Their behavior was consistent with the frequent observation by researchers that children expect language to be meaningful. Newman (1985) notes that "all of the research we've examined has

demonstrated that the most fundamental concern of language users is making sense" (p. 32); and she states that children "use what they know about language in one form to refine language in another" (p. 31). Likewise Smith (1983) states that writing and other aspects of language have the same roots: "the urge to make sense of the world and of oneself" (p. 78). He points out that "children will neither attend to nor willingly produce and practise language which does not seem to have a point (p. 75).

Low Risk Situation

In recognizing the conversational nature of the situation, the students not only recognized it as a familiar language situation, but they also perceived it as low risk (Harste et al, 1984, p. 131). This was in contrast to their perceptions of many school situations, where a "learned vulnerability" often led them not to participate (Harste et al, 1984, p. 140). Because much school learning, and the language associated with it, involves situations that are unfamiliar to a child, a child's language and learning strategies, developed in familiar situations outside of school, become ineffective (Wells, 1981, p. 18). For some children, this continues beyond the first years in school. As noted by Newman (1985), "The main problem for...nonfluent readers and writers is that, in school at least, they've stopped negotiating, they've stopped trying to make sense,

they've stopped taking risks" (p. 35). But, although the students might have felt perplexed by the constraints they perceived to be operating in school situations, the dialogue writing appeared to be both sensible and manageable to them. In this situation, they were freed somewhat of the fear associated with "the wraith of a schoolteacher, waiting to jump on every fault of punctuation or spelling, on every infelicity of expression" (Smith, 1982, p. 132). Smith emphasizes the need for such a separation between composition and transcription, noting that a writer can only attend to one thing at a time (p. 24).

Focus on Meaning

Other experts, such as Graves (1984), also emphasize that it is important for students to focus on their intended meanings without being distracted by concerns about transcription and correctness. Newman (1985) states that growth in writing depends on a student's willingness to experiment with language, to take risks (p. 18). By allowing themselves to use "functional transcription" to placehold the surface text, students can keep their attention on the creation of a unified text (Harste et al, 1984, p. 140). This seemed possible for the students in the present study once they construed the dialogue writing as a manageable language situation, one in which they need not be overly concerned about being evaluated. They seemed to

forget, for the moment, their own and others' concepts of themselves as non-writers, or reluctant readers, and they put their attention towards creating texts to share. In eagerly writing and reading the journals over an extended number of weeks, they beautifully illustrated the truth of Margaret Meek's (1982) suggestion that children who can read and don't are not necessarily 'reluctant readers' (p. 165). Instead, as she states, "they have not yet discovered what's in it for them, either because they don't read well enough or because they have had the wrong kind of books, or too restricted a choice" (p. 165). She suggests that "inexperienced readers need more experience" (p. 165).

Experience With Language

Experts have also suggested that experience is very important for writing. Graves (1984) and Newman (1985), for example, have emphasized that it is important for children to use language, including written language, and to see others use it in a variety of circumstances. As Meek (1982) states, "What the children really need is a great deal more time to read and write for their own satisfaction. This means more books, a wider selection of titles and different kinds of writing" (p. 160). Such experience helps children to discover some of the many functions for written language, and in the process to learn more about language; for experts know, as Smith (1982) reminds us (p. 170), that children do

not learn language and then apply it; they learn language and its uses simultaneously.

Having opportunities to write in many situations, and to share writing, also allows children to develop a concept of authorship, by seeing the effects of their own writing on others (Graves, 1984; Moffet & Wagner, 1983). In addition, while watching others, they can "see how (it) is done" (Smith, 1981, p. 108; see also Newman, 1985, p. 31, and Graves, 1984, p. 134). For the students in this study, journal writing was a situation in which they could regularly experience the effects of their own writing on the tutors, and could see their tutors write. It was a situation that met the conditions for literacy development recommended by Meek (1982):

> Admired adults are still the strongest factor in the reading business, and, in the same way, a child will never learn to write unless he has both occasion and encouragement (p. 161).

Showing and Helping

Meek, Newman, Graves, and Smith are not the first to emphasize the importance of demonstrations. The role of showing, along with helping, is central to Vygotsky's (1978) conceptualization of the zone of proximal development, which entails the observation that children can do more with help than they can on their own when learning something (p. 78). For the students in this study, the writing of dialogue

journals was an assisted activity. In it, the students predictably wrote more willingly than they had done in previous school writing and testing situations. This occurred in spite of the fact that the tutors provided some inadvertent demonstrations (Smith, 1981, p. 109), along with intended ones (e.g. when talk was encouraged, not writing, or when the dialogue journal was described in prescriptive and evaluative terms, somewhat like a school writing assignment). Apparently the tutors' own writing, combined with their feedback and help, demonstrated their commitment to the writing, and their acceptance of the students as writers. These demonstrations supported the students in their writing, and helped them to eventually see that they were junior partners (Smith, 1984a) - but partners indeed - in the dialogue writing. The important thing about this kind of partnership, for the students' literacy, is the likelihood that "what a child can do with assistance today she will be able to do by herself tomorrow" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 87).

Involvement and Attention

The partnership between teacher and student is important for another reason. It gives the students responsibility for making writing decisions, and this requires attention, and a commitment by the students. This kind of engagement is essential for efficient learning,

according to Smith (1981): "Learning occurs when the learner engages with a demonstration, so that it, in effect, becomes the learner's demonstration" (p. 109). Smith observes that we individually engage in particular kinds of demonstrations because, in particular situations, we are free of any fear that learning will not occur. He suggests that such engagement allows us to "assimilate the demonstration of another...and make it vicariously an action of our own" (p. 110). The importance of such involvement, or attentiveness, in children's development as writers is reaffirmed by Harste et al (1984):

> Since access to the process can only be gained through involvement in the process, strategies which allow language users to set aside perceived or real constraints and which permit engagement on the language user's terms are central to growth in literacy (p. 130).

Dialogue journal writing was just such a strategy. It allowed for the establishment of a partnership in which the students could negotiate their own terms for writing, agreeing to write, but choosing the experiences they wanted to share and the way they would share them. In this situation, the students seemed unconcerned about the possibility that they could not write. Their openness to writing seems to demonstrate Smith's propositions about learning (1981):

> Engagement takes place in the presence of appropriate demonstrations whenever we are sensitive to learning, and sensitivity is

> an absence of expectation that learning will not take place (p. 111).

What was in it (Meek, 1982) for the students, because of their engagement, was the discovery that writing can be enjoyable. The satisfaction of sharing what they know was possible, in the dialogue journals, and for once, the students could play with the language that they and their tutors produced, even laugh about it.

Final Word

In effect, what the tutors did, by including the dialogue writing in their work with the children, was to make, for each child, an opportunity to join the literacy club (Smith, 1984a). In Smith's terms, "this means lots of collaborative and meaningful reading and writing activities, the kinds of things that are often characterized as extras, rewards or even 'frills', things like stories (reading and writing), poems, plays, letters..." (p. 12). What Smith is recommending for children are simply the kinds of things that we usually use writing for, and his suggestion is reaffirmed by Newman (1985), when she points out that "research has shown that...children...need to use writing for the same purposes adults use it: to keep journals, to leave messages...and to explore ideas....Our role is to create situations in which children can discover the predictability of print for themselves" (p. 21).

The way that such purposeful language use allows children to join the literacy club is described by Smith as follows (1984a):

> ...children can see what written language is for, all its manifold utilities for writers and readers....They are admitted as junior members; no-one expects them to be very skilled themselves, but they are helped to write and to read whenever they have a purpose or interest of their own in such activities....children can see others engaging profitably in literacy activities who are the kind of people the children see themselves as being (p. 8).

In the particular language situation of shared journal writing, this implies the expectation, by both students and tutors, that the students will eventually be able to write like the tutors do, and that the tutors will help them do so. For students such as the three in this study, this vision of themselves may be radically different than the pessimistic ones they have had, yet it is a condition of their writing development. While expecting something is not enough to ensure getting it, the expectation or vision is a first step towards that end: "Expectation does not guarantee learning, of course, but it makes it possible" (Smith, 1984a, p. 2).

The Journal Texts

The students in this study demonstrated that, even in the absence of daily contact with their tutors, they would sustain daily conversations in writing over a period of weeks. The journal writing thus produced a substantial sample of writing by each student. The sections that follow will discuss the contents of the journals, as well as aspects of style and mechanics characterising the texts, for the three students and their tutors. Details of the analyses appear in Appendix D.

Contents of the Journals

On the basis of patterns noted in the journals, the following dimensions of the journal contents were established. They were examined separately for entries and for responses:

1. subjects written about;
2. amount of writing;
3. language functions served by the writing;
4. ways of establishing continuity.

Subjects Written About

Student Entries. For all three students, topics associated with home were mentioned most often in the early weeks of the dialogue journal writing, although the specific topics written about were somewhat different. Frank most often wrote about friends and sports:

Pat

13 (Feb. 13th) We have terche canvanshin mie firand is coming over. wath have you bintoing?

Frank

14.20.86 (Feb. 14th) I an going skicng....

Allison wrote about family and fairly often about sports:

Sat 8

Hi!

Today I had a lot of running to do. I had to run the 50m and I came in 3 out of 5. I also ran in a rely my team came in 2 out of 5. Then at 3:15 my mom came and got me and we went to rimby. After dinner I went out skating. Then I came back in and wached T.V. (Feb. 8th)

Tim sometimes isolated family, friends, or sports to write about, but generally he mentioned them merely in the course of listing one or more events of each day, related to home, school, and sometimes tutoring::

Mar 11

I woo kup and ate my breakfast. then I went outside to play hockey tell wewer ready to go to School. after school I went home and did my homework.

Differentiation of Patterns. As weeks went by, Frank and Tim continued to write very often about topics associated with home:

06.02.86 I have a hocky game to day.

(Frank)

mar 16

I Woke up and then I went in to the liveing room amd wat (watched) the ctans (cartoons).

(Tim)

Frank wrote only rarely about school, almost never mentioning more than one topic per entry. Tim wrote somewhat less often about school than he had at first; more often than before, he wrote about only one or two topics, rather than attempting to list everything that he did in a day.

Over time, Allison's focus shifted somewhat toward school, though she still often mentioned home too. Her school topics, like her home ones, often focused on people - classmates and teachers - and sports, especially skiing and volleyball, but also swimming, skating, badminton, and softball. She included a number of topics in some of her entries, but often highlighted one:

> Sun March 2
> Today I wock up in the city because we slepped over. So we went to bingo and I won 10$ and my grandma won 50$. But we had to shar with the other to kids.

A subject that each of the students mentioned occasionally was tutoring. Allison sometimes expressed anticipation of a session: "And I'm Looking forward to seeing you tonight" (Feb. 4). Tim mentioned tutoring when it was one of the events in a day:

> Mar. 3
> I wookup and ate Brakfast and ithen I went to School. Afther School I went to the unifrecity to get touterd by Phil.

And Frank wrote questions, on several occasions, about what they would do, or whether they could work on the computer: "do you now wine we mint get the comporat" (Feb. 19)?

World news (e.g. the crash of the space shuttle) was mentioned only by Allison, and only in a couple of very early entries, probably reflecting her slight uncertainty, initially, about appropriate topics to write about in the journal.

Tutor Entries. The writing patterns of the tutors were somewhat parallel to those of the respective students. Joan and Phil often wrote about more than one topic in a single entry. They wrote about home topics very often in the early weeks:

> February 6th
>
> Hi there, Allison!
>
> Today is a special day for me because it's my daughter's birthday. Her name is.... (Joan)

> Feb. 5
>
> ...I am going to dinner with a friend tonight. He might offer me a job to teach in his school next year. I sure hope he does anyway. (Phil)

Pat's relatively lower frequency of writing about home topics was associated with her greater tendency to focus on only one topic in an entry. This practice was consistent with her intention to make her entries easy for Frank to read, a caution that took into account his early reticence about writing and reading daily journal entries. If Pat had written longer entries, she might have mentioned a home

topic; certainly home events were the focus of some of her entries:

> Friday, February 7, 1986
>
> Hi Frank,
>
> Today our school had a family dance. It was really fun. Have you ever been to a family dance Frank? What kind of music do you like best?
>
> Pat

The tutors differed only slightly in their tendency to write about subjects other than home and school. A noticeable difference, however, was Joan's particular tendency to include reflections about the world, incorporating these into her writing about school and home topics. This was especially characteristic of her early entries:

> Sunday 2nd (Feb.)
>
> Hello Allison,
>
> Did you have a happy day today, Allison? I enjoyed my day very much. I've been out walking and planning my week ahead. So I guess that today has been a walking, thinking day.
>
> While I was out walking, I couldn't help but notice how fresh and clear the air is in Edmonton. Many cities don't have such beautiful clean air. In big cities like San Francisco and Tokyo the air is so badly polluted by industries and car exhaust that people are often warned to stay indoors to protect their health. These cities depend on the wind to blow the pollution away and keep the air clean enough for people to breathe safely. Every night the television news gives a weather report and a pollution report so that people can plan their activities for the next day. For example, a jogger may plan to run laps in a gym instead of jogging in a park or cyclists may plan to take a bus to work instead of riding their bicycles. I'm so glad that we have fresh, clean air in

> our city. It makes our life so much more enjoyable. Don't you think so, Allison?

All three tutors continued throughout the ten weeks to make periodic mention of the tutoring, occasionally reinforcing procedures, but usually remarking on the good work that the students were doing.

Responses. Whereas, in their entries, students and tutors wrote about a variety of topics of their own choosing, the topics that students and tutors wrote about in their responses tended to match the topics of the entries being responded to. Thus for example, the few responses that Tim wrote to Phil, all done in the first weeks, related to topics in the home category, which was the most frequent focus of Phil's early entries:

> I play center and some times defence.
>
> A year ago I use to play soccer (Tim's responses to Phil's Feb. 8th entry in which Phil asked about sports).

Phil's most frequent response category also was home, corresponding to Tim's writing most frequently about topics in this category.

In a similar way, Allison's later responses included a world news item because Joan had written about a world news topic. And Joan's later responses included very frequent mention of school topics, in line with Allison's writing more frequently about these in her later entries:

> Science fairs usually do take a long, time, Allison. I'm happy to hear

> that you enjoyed it so much (Joan's response to Allison's entry of March 5th).

Frank's responses also tended to match his tutor's entries, in later weeks, when he had established a stable journal writing habit. His most frequent responses were in the home and tutoring categories, which were Pat's most frequent subject categories in her later entries:

> I felt fin wen I`rond (read) for the first time (Frank's response to Pat's entry of March 11th in which she asked how Frank had felt when he read for her in their first session together).

However, Pat's response topics did not consistently match those which Frank wrote about; this is probably because most of Pat's responses were global ones, relating to Frank's entries for a whole week at a time:

> Thank-you for writing every day, Frank. I like to hear how things are going for you. It sounds like both of us had a lot of homework ... (Pat's response to Frank's entries for the week ending on March 2nd).

In these responses Pat's intention seemed to be to encourage Frank rather than to respond substantively to what he had written.

Amount of Writing

Students. Differences among writers also were apparent in the varying lengths of the entries and responses. The total number of words that each student wrote, over the ten

weeks, is listed below, along with each student's average number of words per entry and per response.

Table 1. Amount of Writing: Students

	Total Words	Words per Entry	Words per Response
Frank	625	8.4	7.1
Tim	743	24.8	12.6
Allison	2937	55.1	15.8

These figures show that, while the three students wrote quite different amounts in their entries, the differences were smaller in the responses, which of course were tied to the tutors' writing, and were not strictly self-initiated. The figures also show that Frank wrote, on average, almost as many words in his responses as he did in his entries, even though many of his responses were single words or phrases. Tim's and Allison's responses were somewhat longer than Frank's; this was mainly because they tended to write full sentences, not because they were more likely to respond to a tutor entry. Unfortunately, Tim's sample of responses spanned only two of the ten weeks, but these gave an indication of how he might have written additional responses.

The lengths of the students' thought units varied, along with the lengths of their entries. Frank's idea units averaged 5.8 words, Tim's were 7.8, and Allison's were 8.5. The following excerpts illustrate the differences in both

lengths of entries and lengths of individual statements, among the three students:

Allison: Hi! [illegible]day when we wock up I ate breakfist and went out to skat. I got to go up town and by groars all by my self. Then I went skating with my cousins. Then we went home (Feb. 9th).

Frank: I hand a lond (lot) of homework (Feb. 27th).

Tim: I woke up and went out Side to Shout at my brother then I will go to SchooL then I went don to the univecity to get toterd by Phil (Mar. 17th).

The above comparisons indicate that Tim's statements were only slightly shorter, on average, than Allison's, in spite of his being younger. Although his statements were generally less complex, his writing was quite fluent, being elaborated to some extent. Frank's statements were the least elaborated, reflecting his caution in writing. Still, once started, he wrote consistently, both entries and responses, indicating that the dialogue was a productive writing framework for him.

Tutors. The varying amounts of writing the tutors produced are shown below, along with the average lengths of their entries and responses.

Table 2: Amount of Writing: Tutors

	Total Words	Words per Entry	Words per Response
Joan	10,649	201.2	39
Pat	2,505	43.8	23.4
Phil	3,850	62.5	21

Joan wrote long entries. She generally elaborated, and often reflected on the topic or topics introduced in an entry, and she responded at least once to every entry her student wrote. Sometimes she also responded to her student's responses, taking every opportunity possible to add to the written dialogue.

Pat and Phil wrote shorter entries, possibly in part because of their students' presumed expectations and reading abilities. Pat was mindful of Frank's early reluctance to read a large volume of her writing, and she continued to write brief entries throughout the ten weeks, even after the dialogue writing had been established. Because, in her entries, Pat's topics were minimally elaborated, and her statements fairly simple, many of her responses were almost as long as her entries.

Phil wrote somewhat longer entries than Pat, and generally elaborated his topics, but because he wrote simply for his younger student, the total number of words was moderate. While his entries were developed at some length, his responses were generally very short (7.3 words per thought unit compared with Pat's 9.5 words and Joan's 10.4, and his own 9.2 for entries). The following responses illustrate the contrast in lengths of statements, as well as in lengths of overall responses, for the three tutors.

Phil: Where do you sleep over? What do you do on a sleepover? Do you just sleep? We didn't sleep very much when I went

on sleepovers (Response to Tim's Mar. 7th entry).

Pat: I really like reading the notes you write. Do you like writing notes here with me or at home (Response to Frank's entries ending on Feb. 16th)?

Joan: I didn't realize that you have a choir in your school also, Allison. I used to sing in my school choir when I was in school too. How long will you have to wait to find out if you're in the play now (Response to Feb. 25th entry)?

These samples indicate that Phil's short response statements resulted, in part, from the fact that his responses contained a large number of questions, typically short expressions. The questions undoubtedly were intended to elicit more writing from Tim, and represent one more way that Phil and the other tutors attempted to engage their students in meaningful writing.

Language Functions

Additional ways in which tutors and students attempted to engage each other in written dialogue emerge from an examination of the language functions served by the journal entries and responses. All three tutors and all three students used statements that served a number of functions, but the patterns of use differed in ways that again reflect the different framework each tutor brought to the journal writing.

Allison. In light of the fact that Allison wrote relatively long entries, and elaborated statements, it is

perhaps not surprising that her writing consistently served a variety of functions. In her entries, the reporting function predominated, along with the responding function (statements added to entries in answer to Joan's remarks on them):

> Hi!
> Today we had gym and when we play bad mitten I lost and was cut out of the turniment. I didn't do much more than that, Untill I went to my totorial (Feb. 27th).
>
> Joan's response: I used to play badminton when I was in school too, Allison. Like you, I also lost and got put out of the tournament. But I still enjoyed the fun of playing!
>
> Allison's extention: So do I.

While, in her entries, Allison was narrating her daily experiences, and thus was primarily reporting, her responses to Joan's entries served a greater range of functions, tuned to the substance and tone of Joan's entries. Sometimes, Allison reflected on how Joan might have felt in a situation written about; other times, she answered questions, or reported personal facts; sometimes she even gave advice or encouragement, as illustrated in her response below:

> Joan: ...I'll be up very late tonight because I want to finish that writing I was showing you....If it really goes well I should have my final copy in good shape before lunch. Cross your fingers for me...Allison (Feb. 25th)!
>
> Allison's response: Good luck my dad has been working on papper to.

In all these ways, Allison showed her perceptiveness of the intent and significance of Joan's written entries; she showed, at the same time, the extent of her engagement in the written dialogue, and involvement in the relationship developing in the dialogue.

Frank. Frank also showed a considerable degree of engagement in his dialogue with Pat, especially during the early entries. While the majority of his entries, like Allison's, contained reporting, in some he made statements thanking Pat for something, asking questions, or answering Pat's questions:

Frank: I have a reading block today (Mar. 13th).

Pat's response: What do you mean by a reading block, Frank?

Frank continues: I mean that we have a reading thing than we have to aser some casins (questions).

In Frank's responses, the answering function predominated, but Frank continued to make occasional statements that served other functions, such as agreeing, thanking, or requesting. He even corrected Pat sometimes, as shown in the following response to one of her entries:

Pat: It was nice to talk to you on the phone, Frank. As you know I called your school and asked Mrs. Lomey to give you something from your social studies or science to bring...that you and I could read together. What do you think of that idea (Mar. 6th)?

Frank's response: o.k.
Lomme (rather than Lomey).

Frank's correcting Pat's writing suggests that, by that time (the sixth week), he had developed a high degree of comfort and involvement in the written dialogue.

Tim. By contrast to Frank, Tim wrote mainly statements that served a reporting function, in his entries:

> I wokeup at 6:30 and watced catons tell
> 8:00 then the plumer came to are house
> to fix the drier (Apr. 1st).

However, in responses, Tim too showed an inclination to engage in dialogue. In his few responses, he answered questions and made statements reporting opinions or facts. In some responses, he offered comments or reflections on Phil's statements, showing understanding and appreciation for what Phil had written. This is illustrated in the following exchange:

> Phil: ...Today I did almost nothing
> but read...(Feb. 9th).
>
> Tim's response: I have read 2and a half
> of the books you gave me
> to read.

The fact that Tim did not continue to write responses, and the absence of more than one function (reporting) in his later entries, suggests that, after the first few weeks, he was no longer engaged in a written dialogue, but had reconstrued the writing activity, viewing it as merely a personal journal. While the journal served as a starting point for rich oral dialogue, and led to a greater quantity of writing than Tim would have produced otherwise, it did

not serve as a means of written communication, and Tim's writing did not show the variety of language functions that it might have, if he had been engaged in a dialogue.

Tutor Entries. The tutors all used the dialogue journal as a means of accomplishing a variety of purposes. Reporting was, predictably, a persistent function served by all of their entries, indicating that, like their students, the tutors were, first of all, narrating some of their experiences. They all reported personal facts in many of their entries, and opinions in some of them. In fact, Joan reported opinions in the majority of her entries, possibly as a way of encouraging her student to feel free to write openly; the same purpose might have underlain her questions, which occurred in many early entries, but fewer of the later ones. Opinions and questions are apparent in the following sample:

> Friday, February 14th
>
> Hello Allison!
>
> Happy Valentine's Day!
>
> Did you know that Valentine's Day is pretty much a North American custom?... Many countries...do not celebrate it. However, I think it's a wonderful tradition ....I think most people work at friendship and caring all year round anyway, don't you?
>
> We drove over by (your) Grandma's hotel to buy some groceries at the big Superstore this afternoon....I suppose that store is always busy like that! Is that where you go to buy your groceries?

Pat's entries also included questions frequently, though a relatively small number of her entries included opinions:

> Wednesday
> Did you have fun at your winter games day? I visited a school that had a winter fun day today and I thought of you at your special day. Was there any snow left in your school yard?...(Feb. 26th).

Phil used questions sometimes, as well, to maintain the written conversation:

> ...It sounds like you played in some kind of tournament. How many games did you play anyway? Are you going to play soccer this summer?...(Feb. 29th).

All three tutors included statements praising, or in some other way acknowledging, their students, as well as statements of greeting, which clearly seemed intended to draw the students into dialogue. For example, the following greeting from Phil's March 24th entry not only served as a conversation opener; it also connoted an appreciation for Tim, serving to encourage him in the tutoring, and possibly in the journal writing specifically:

> I was disappointed when you couldn't come today.

Some language functions were characteristic of a particular tutor's writing. For example, three functions were particularly frequent in Joan's entries. One was imagining - reflecting on an experience or event, or trying to imagine a different situation; another was extending an

entry, by responding to the student's questions or remarks; and a third was modeling standard written usage, in the context of a response. All of these functions are illustrated in the following excerpt from Joan's Feb. 22nd entry:

> ...I'm really glad that the weather is warming up again today. It was very pleasant walking to the university this morning. Maybe Spring will come now.
> Today there were about a hundred high school students...here. They were running up and down the hallway and yelling....They probably didn't realize that we work in our offices all through the weekend here.
>
> Allison's response: I've never run up and down hallways shoting and there soposto set and exaple
>
> Joan's extension: Set an example is absolutely right Allison! They're supposed to but they don't!

Joan reflected on the possibility of spring coming, and on what the students might have thought. Then, on the basis of Allison's response, Joan extended her entry, rounding off the dialogue and, at the same time, offering models of the conventional spelling of several words that Allison had used, including "example" and "supposed to".

Through these three language functions - imagining, extending, and modeling - Joan facilitated the dialogue between herself and Allison. In addition, she informed Allison about various topics, and about various ways of thinking and writing about them. These outcomes were

consistent with Joan's intention that the journal writing should be embedded in both Allison's and her own daily experiences, especially in their tutoring experiences.

Tutor Responses. The tutors' responses, like their entries, served a range of functions. The majority of responses included questioning. This was a means of encouraging the students to write, as illustrated in the following excerpt related to Frank's journal entry of March 14th:

> Frank: I gond a dedachin (detention) yostday.
>
> Pat's response: Was that your first detention, Frank? How long did it last? Do you want to tell me about it?
>
> Frank continues, inserting the following answers into Pat's text: Yes; Today; by goming in lant (late) when I was palying hocky

Reporting was less common than questioning, in the tutors' responses. However, reporting of personal facts, such as statements indicating pleasure with the students' writing, was another way to encourage the students to write, as were statements of acknowledgement, used to some extent by all tutors in their responses. For example, in responding to Frank's entries for the week ending March 2nd, Pat acknowledged him for writing and added a personal fact, a statement that reflected her own feelings:

> ...Thank-you for writing every day, Frank. I like to hear how things are going for you....

In responses to their students, all of the tutors used some of their students' words, providing models of correct spelling. Joan did this in a regular and deliberate way, in her responses, as she did in writing extensions to her entries:

> Allison: Today...I spent most of the day with mom's friend. She has a little gril how is 3 and is very modey she gets upset very esey...(Feb. 14th).
>
> Joan's response: It seems to me that lots of three year olds are moody and get upset quite easily, Allison. I wonder why?....

Such responses, by modeling conventions of written language, such as spelling and reflective thinking, served a teaching function, helping Allison to extend her knowledge about the world, and about language. All along, however, sharing ideas was the overriding goal of the writing.

Continuity

A final aspect of content to be considered is continuity. By continuing or returning to topics in separate entries, and by extending entries, as a result of questions or other responses from the writing partner, the students and tutors showed their engagement in dialogue, and their intention to maintain it.

Continuity Across Entries. All of the students and tutors occasionally carried on for two or more days, writing about a single event or idea. This is a common

conversational strategy, used by people to keep each other informed. The following example is taken from Phil's journal:

> March 18
> What a terrible day. I went to my teacher with some work and she just didn't like it. I was depressed the rest of the night. Now I have to start again!
>
> March 19
> I feel better today but I still have all that work to redo....

Resurrecting A Topic. An intention to keep each other informed was further demonstrated when a student or a tutor brought up a topic again, after a number of days. This practice of resurrecting a topic one or more times was a way of bringing the other person up to date. All three tutors, and two of the students (Frank and Allison), did it. In the following excerpt, Allison promised to follow up on an event and did so:

> Feb. 6th entry: ...For track a run lead we have a race on Sat 8 I'll tell you how I did then!
>
> Feb. 8th entry: ...I had to run the 50m and I came in 3 out of 5. I also ran in a rely my team came in 2 out of 5.

Joan often resurrected more than one topic in a single entry, carrying on a number of threads, as conversations commonly do. In the following excerpt from her March 3rd entry, she reported back on her use of advice Allison had given her in response to a previous question, and she

brought up, again, a recurring topic, the effect of the weather on Allison's skiing plans:

> ...I went out...to test the little girl this morning Allison. I used your advice and it worked like magic! At first she was very nervous....
>
> You were right about the snow, Allison. It does seem to have disappeared very quickly. I'm afraid you won't be able to do any skiing with your class just yet....

The fairly frequent resurrection of topics made the journal dialogues sound credible, like real people talking. Moreover, the remembering of, and wondering about, the dialogue over time suggests that these students and tutors were writing about experiences they cared about, not arbitrarily putting down items merely for the sake of getting the task done. The absence of these aspects of continuity in Tim's writing is consistent with his treating the activity as a diary, not a dialogue.

Extending An Entry. Also absent from Tim's and Phil's entries was continuity within entries. Because they did not share their entries and respond to them during tutoring sessions, responses to the entries of one week had to be written in the subsequent week, and further comments (extensions) based on those responses had to be written during a third week. As Tim did not write responses to Phil's entries beyond the early weeks of journal writing, Phil had no stimulus for extending his individual entries.

Tim did not extend any of his entries, even though Phil always responded to them, as illustrated here:

> Tim: ...We went to Mcdanales. we got a McMilloin (Feb. 19th).
>
> Phil: Have you won anything yet at MacDonalds?

The absence of answers again suggests that Tim was moving forward in his journal, making new entries only, as befits diary writing.

The other students and tutors did extend some of their entries, on the basis of their partners' responses. During journal sharing in sessions, Frank answered virtually all of Pat's questions; most of them appeared within her entries. Her practice of responding to groups of Frank's entries, rather than to each one singly, meant that Frank's opportunities to extend his entries on the basis of Pat's comments were limited. Pat herself only occasionally extended an entry, as a result of a question or other response from Frank. As a result, their shared journal reading and writing, in sessions, generally involved only one round of turn-taking.

By contrast, as indicated in the discussion on modeling, Allison and Joan regularly extended their entries on the basis of each other's responses, making their journal times, in sessions, to some degree an ongoing written interaction. This interaction demonstrated repeatedly, for

Allison, the essential nature of the dialogue journal writing.

Organization and Expression in the Journals

By definition, the journal writing was narrative; students and tutors were telling about their experiences. But within that broad framework, each writer organized entries and used language in a characteristic way. To describe writing styles, I have considered the following dimensions of structure and expression:

1. organization of entries;
2. structure of sentences;
3. type of vocabulary;
4. use of particular rhetorical devices.

Rather than focus on each dimension, I have described individual students and tutors relative to all of the dimensions, in order to portray the unique writing style of each tutor and student. For the same reason, entries and responses are considered together, for each writer.

Tim

Format. Tim's entries were presented in a fairly consistent way. He dated each entry, and he usually double spaced his writing, making it easy to read:

> mar 12
>
> I wookup and wen to the table to eat
>
> breakfast. then I went to school. and
>
> got my report carde then I went Phil's

hose to get totered

The third-person reference to Phil, in this entry, reflects the diary framework within which Tim wrote.

Organization. Consistent with the diary framework, Tim often began an entry with "I woke up", as in the entry quoted above, and organized his statements chronologically. The first statement of an entry generally referred to the beginning of the day, and the last statement to the last event of the day, or the final significant event. The phrase "I woke up" served as a time marker, along with other transitions, such as "then" which Tim used frequently.

Not all of Tim's entries included a full list of a day's events. Some had only the first and last, though still beginning with the chronological marker, "I woke up":

Mar 6
I wookup and went to School. then
I went home and did my homewe

Some entries seemed only to have a beginning:

Mar 9
I wookup and played with my toys

While Tim's persistent use of "I woke up" and "then" suggests a sequence, or a list, of events, his frequent inclusion of only one or two events suggests a desire to highlight just one. Sometimes, even in his early writing, Tim succeeded in achieving some focus, using a lead sentence, and including at least some elaboration:

Feb. 19

I was sick all day yes te day. I
hade the croup at night. We went to
Mcdanales. we got a McMilloin.

Later entries more often included only one event. Tim's March 8th entry, for example, suggests that on that day his preoccupation was with the sleepover introduced in the entry of the preceding day:

I was ther tel 5:00 then I went home.

Similarly, in a number of entries, such as the one for March 14th, he selected one particular period of his school day to mention:

I woke up and went to SchooL the
last piriod it was the funest piriod

At least once, Tim wrote a focused entry, in which he elaborated a particular aspect of his day:

March 18

These are the word for are test.

won't
don't
can't
isn't
haven't
doesn't

I' am stadying the word mow and
my dad will be testing me to see
wat I luned

But subsequent entries again were relatively unelaborated:

March 22

I was Iinviteded to a sleep over
at my frends house

March 24

it was fun we had gym
and wat a 3 hour filme

mar 28

no schooL
we pLayed
and pLayed
tell we cood (got?) are (our)
mote bices (motorbikes) out

Thus, while Tim was not in full control of the organization, and continued to use the introductory phrase "I woke up" in many entries, as if intending to report on the whole day, he more and more often selected a particular item for each entry. This suggests that he was developing a new structure that would allow him to write about only interesting or important events. He might have worked out the structure more fully if he had been more immediately involved in dialogue writing. Phil's responses, especially the questions, could have helped Tim to see what to elaborate so as to achieve some focus, and to communicate an understandable and clear message.

Sentence Structure. Tim's sentence construction also seemed to be influenced by his point of view and organization. In his early entries, when he was aiming to include all of the events of his days, he strung his statements together, connecting them repeatedly with "then", as illustrated in the following entry:

Mar 5

I went to SchooL and the (then) we got erelidishe (early dismissal) and the I went (to) get toterd by Phil. then I went home and then I did my work then I went to hockey.

While this stringing together of statements sometimes occurs in young children's excited recountings of their experiences, Tim's talk was usually fluent and varied. Furthermore, he showed in his later entries that he could write in a more sophisticated way. While simple sentences still predominated, they often included elaborative parts, such as compound predicates or infinitive phrases:

I wookup and wen to the table to eat breakfast (Mar. 12th)

In addition, he did occasionally write a complex sentence:

...I went outside to play hockey tell wewer ready to go to SchooL (Mar. 11th)

Vocabulary. The diary framework seemed to influence Tim's vocabulary too. While his vocabulary in talk was personal and expressive, his journal never contained

enthusiastic phrases such as "D'you know what?!" His journal vocabulary was predominantly denotative:

Feb 25

I went to SchooL and then

i went to hockey

The relatively few instances of connotative usage involved the same word - "fun":

March 23

it (sleepover) was int fan beacase

he didnt want to play weme

mar: 25

It was in't fun we did'nt gent

gym...

Responses. Tim's ability to write fluently, and with more enthusiasm, was somewhat evident in his responses. Although few in number, they included varied sentences and personal language:

I had my first tournament game and we won
...(Response to Phil's Feb. 7th entry).

Tim's inclusion of the outcome of the event hints at his good feeling about it. Similarly, in the following exchange, Tim seemed to be merely reporting, but in the context of Phil's statement, he was showing that he could imagine how it was for Phil to be interrupted repeatedly while working at home:

Phil: Worked at home today. Trouble with

> working there though, is that people tend to interfere. People call trying to sell carpet cleaning, houses, and even diapers (Feb. 6th entry).

Tim's response: I Stayed home on Feb. 13 and the phone rang allday for my Brothers and I to play or Spend the night or play hockey

Like Phil, Tim included a series of interruptions that he himself had experienced while being at home, indicating that he was relating his statement precisely to what Phil had written. The immediate social framework, created by the presence of Phil's entry, seemed to help Tim write in a focused and expressive way, and this suggests that he might have done so in his entries, if he had viewed them as part of the communication which he enjoyed so much in talks with Phil.

Phil

Format. To achieve an inviting format for his young reader, Phil used printing and double-spacing. In addition, he left fairly wide margins on all sides of his pages, and space around his letters and words, creating an impression of lightness and manageability to the pages.

Organization. Phil's entries were also clearly and consistently structured. Each of the entries began with a lead statement that introduced the major topic of the entry. A time word, such as "today" or "tonight", appeared in many of the leads, giving them a tone of immediacy:

Today Tim came to the clinic to start tutoring...(Feb. 5th).

I visited my Great Aunt and Uncle tonight... (Feb. 11th).

Today I had a date with a writing assignment ...(Mar. 6th).

A chronological structure was further created by Phil's frequent use of time words as transitions between paragraphs:

Feb. 7

It's Friday. I worked at home again....

This evening I went....

Sentence Structure. The use of time for structuring narrative writing is natural, and undoubtedly reflects Phil's sensitivity to the reading level of his student. In the same way, Phil's regular use of a variety of sentence types made the writing sound natural, and thereby made it more readable.

All of the entries contained simple sentences, some abbreviated, as is common in oral conversation:

Worked at home today (Feb. 6th).

But in addition to the simple sentences, compound sentences appeared in over half of Phil's entries, and complex sentences in approximately one-third of them; a few entries also contained compound-complex sentences:

> ...There must have been 30 ladies there and when I walked in, everyone of them turned and stared at me (Feb. 21st).

Vocabulary. The natural conversational tone of Phil's writing was particularly apparent in his vocabulary and usage. While he occasionally used abstract, and even technical, words that might have been unfamiliar to Tim (e.g. assignment, fate, publishable, lecture), the majority of the numerous abstract terms he used were common expressions that Tim likely was familiar with (e.g. upset, chance, hope, and others). Some of these appear in the following excerpt:

> Today Tim came to the university....Boy, was he upset with himself. He didn't get a chance to work on our journal....I hope he does not stay unhappy because the journal is for fun. I get to hear about him and he gets to see what I am doing...(Feb. 10th).

Both "fun" and "I get to" connote encouragement. Many of the entries contained terms such as these, expressing Phil's feelings.

Phil also used many figurative expressions to convey feelings. In the following entry, for example, Phil's affection for his great aunt is conveyed by the phrase "one neat lady":

> ...She has carrot colored hair and is one neat lady (Mar. 10th).

Sometimes, Phil's connotative expressions were intended to give a picture of a place, as well as a feeling:

> ...It's a huge greenhouse....There are tonnes of plants...(Feb. 14th).

Tone. Besides making the writing more readable, Phil's casual and conversational language helped him show, in his writing, that Tim was a partner, an equal in the journal writing. This is illustrated in the following expression of exasperation about a term paper that was taking too long:

> ...That kind of a day really grates on my nerves. How about you? You must feel like that when you have a lot of homework (Mar. 6th)!

By using a common adult expression, "grates on my nerves", Phil acknowledged Tim's ability to understand the adult experience.

Phil's language was made personal, and relevant to Tim, in other ways too. Phil often used the pronoun "we", or addressed Tim directly with "you":

> ...It sounds like you were busy on those two days over Teachers' Convention (Feb. 20th).

Sometimes the direct address was at the beginning or end of an entry, so the lead or conclusion focused the whole entry on Tim, or encouraged him into a dialogue:

> Feb. 8
> Say Tim - How is your hockey going?...
>
> Feb. 9
> Tomorrow we get together for our tutoring....

Perhaps the most obvious aspect of Phil's language that made it sound friendly and appealing to a young reader was

his colloquial usage. Throughout the journal, Phil used very casual terms, often slang expressions:

> Say Tim...(Feb. 8th).
>
> ...a playground with slides and stuff for the kids (Feb. 14th).
>
> I'm glad you liked 'Where The Wild Things Are'. It's by a guy named Maurice Sendak. He's written a whole bunch of books (Feb. 20th).
>
> They (a church group) are kind of like scouts (Feb. 25th).
>
> Boy I was tired (Mar. 15th).

The conversational tone of Phil's writing not only made it easier to read, but also connoted a peer relationship, not one of tutor to student. This likely was intended to encourage Tim to write freely, and to feel sure of himself in the writing. Unfortunately, these potential benefits were lost, to a considerable degree, because Tim did not view the journal as a medium of conversation, and did not write responses. However, the fact that the same friendly tone was evident in Phil's talk, during sessions, undoubtedly encouraged Tim to feel comfortable, and to write in his journal regularly, even if he did it simply to please Phil.

Allison

Format. Allison always dated her entries, and set them in from the margin which contained the dates. Sometimes she used a salutation, suggesting that she held a letter-writing

framework. The fact that she often wrote about more than one topic suggests that she intended to report on a whole day, but she generally developed one topic more than the others, giving enough detail to show what exactly was happening:

> Feb. 14 86 Today was that one day of the year when every one is in love. I spent most of the day with mom's friend. She has a little gril how is 3 and is very modey she gets upset very esey. She allso has avery small little boy. I got alon best with her little boy corey. Then when we did come home with my dad we wacht moveis with my nabors.

Organization. To frame her written remarks, Allison generally used leads and conclusions. She began a majority of her entries with "Today", as in the entry quoted above. In this way, she identified a main focus for each entry. Also illustrated above is a way in which she concluded many entries: reporting the event that ended the day. Sometimes these endings were particularly direct:

> ...Well I need lots of rest to night I don't want to be tried tomoro (Feb. 7th)

To further structure her writing, Allison used transitions in the majority of her entries. Sometimes she used them extensively:

> Sat 22 86
> Hi
> Today my mom went curling. And we went to Edmonton to visit my Grandma. My Grandma was busy so we hung out with my aunt Peggy. First we went to feed the foxes witch was gross. It smelled like chicken

> gusts. Then we feed the foxes their food. When we got back from feeding the foxes we went swimming. Then we went home (Feb. 22).

Sentence Structure. While organizational features helped make Allison's writing easy to read, other features gave it sophistication and substance, and helped capture Allison's vibrant speaking voice. For one thing, Allison's writing was characterized by remarkable sentence variety. While almost all of her entries contained some simple sentences, the majority of her entries also contained compound or complex sentences, and approximately 20 percent of the entries contained compound-complex sentences. This dense style of writing is illustrated in the following excerpts:

> ...When she (teacher) was go (gone) we made a card for her because we wanted to show her how we fet and we were santend (saddened) in the news that she mit die (Feb. 5th).

> ...It was to let (late) to go to bingo so we went to the hotel and I talk to grandpa about haveing the class come out to see the foxes (Mar. 1st).

The varied sentences added to the interest of the entries. They also allowed Allison to express very precisely the relationships among her statements, adding to the clarity that she achieved by merely reporting exact details.

Vocabulary. The maturity of Allison's writing was also reflected in her choice of words. While she used many

concrete terms to describe events, she also used abstract terms, sometimes figurative expressions, as illustrated here: "...forcine cookies (that) look like pancakes" (Feb. 7th); "...I...climbed into bed and fell fast asleep" (Mar. 17th). Many of her expressions were rich in connotative meaning. For example, pride and pleasure are apparent in the following excerpts:

> ...I got to go up town and by groars all by my self (Feb. 9th);
>
> ...Then at my 4 h meating...I was juged. It was scary (Feb. 13th).

At the same time as Allison's usage was varied and sophisticated, it was definitely conversational, appropriate to the letter-writing framework. She regularly used contractions, as well as conversational expressions such as "well", "sure", and other colloquial phrases:

> Well, it's back to the books for me (Mar. 3rd).
>
> Well I'm shur glade about the snow...(Response to Joan's entry of Mar. 5th).
>
> Today we sat around...(Mar. 1st).
>
> Fairly good right (Mar. 19th)!

Allison also regularly used the pronoun "you"; and her salutation, when used, was the informal "Hi"! Moreover, she showed that she had Joan in mind when, on several occasions, she used a happy face sign, in place of a signature, as in this response to Joan's entry of February 26th:

You shur are bisy with pappers (papers)!

Rhetorical Devices. Besides giving her writing a conversational tone, Allison's choices of words and phrases allowed her to achieve emphasis, contributing to the vigor and clarity of her expression. This is illustrated, below, by her use of words "micro-seconds" and "world-winning", and the phrase "and that's not a lie":

> ...Micro-seconds before it (the space shuttle) blow...(Jan. 28th);
>
> ...Then we went home and had my moms world winning lasso (lasanga) and thats not a lie (Feb. 24th).

Sometimes she used emphatic words such as "just" or "did", to help make a point:

> Today we did (didn't) do much we just watched the curling finls (Mar. 9th).
>
> Hi!
> Today was a rather boring day most fridays are. We do nothing in school no fun stuff. But we did have the mime... (Feb. 7th).

The second excerpt also illustrates her use of punctuation for emphasis ("Hi!"), and extensions ("...no fun stuff"). And in some of these phrases, she used repetition to gain further emphasis:

> ...in math we had much work to do not hard work but much work (Feb. 5th)

Tone. The combination of these features of organization and expression, in Allison's entries and

responses, resulted in mature and interesting writing. And while Allison's usage was conversational, even at the beginning, it became progressively less formal. Over the weeks, it became more conversational, more personal and good-natured, especially in responses, where Allison might have felt especially aware of her student status relative to Joan, but wrote more like a peer. The progression is illustrated in these responses, written at intervals over the ten weeks:

> Ronda (tutor's daughter) sounds a lot like me and I hope like Ronda I can improve my writing, spelling and reading (Response to Joan's entry of Feb. 6th).
>
> I'm sorry that you had one of those days. If I had one of those days I'd finish it with a hot bath (Response to Joan's entry of Feb. 11th).
>
> I've never run up and down hallways shoting (shouting) and there (they're) soposto set and exaple (Response to Joan's entry of Feb.22nd).
>
> I'm glade that I've gotten better to but well (we'll) see how much I've imperved when we get or (our) report cards tomoro (Response to Joan's entry of March 16th).

The statements are, first, somewhat formal, then polite, and then assertive. The same contrast in tone, suggesting increasing comfort in her writing role, is apparent in Allison's entries, as illustrated in the ones below, written early and late in the tutoring period:

Hi!
Today I Did A lot of things the first thing I did today was computers I did a report on a pet I would like to have. Then I....After nutrion (nutrition) we have math....Guring Reading... (Feb. 5th).

Today is one of the last times all be righting to you. Well when I got to school I had not much to do in french but when we went to gym we ran race and the gym teacher picked out the 6 worst gril runners to run a race and then the 6 best and I was one of them so When we ran I came in 2nd my friend Daina was 1st so my goal is to beat her. SO from now on thats how I want to run as fast or faster then her....And I got my report card and it was far enof for me (Mar. 18th)

Later, she added the following statements to the last entry, by way of clarification, requested by Joan:

It (report card) pleased me! I plane to take her (the friend) by surprize.

As these excerpts indicate, Allison moved from relatively cautious responding, and somewhat formal reporting, to sympathetic responding and good-natured sharing. Her tone became somewhat more reflective, and more assertive, in later writing. The progression reflects the development, in the shared writing, of a true partnership in which Allison was confident enough to sympathize and give advice to her tutor, and even to brag a little!

Joan

The progression apparent in Allison's writing might have occurred independently of Joan. On the other hand, Allison might have continued writing minimally elaborated entries, as she did before seeing Joan's journal, and cautious crisp responses, as she did in her first session. But the striking change in length and tone of Allison's writing, after the first exchange, suggests that she was paying attention to Joan's model.

Format. Joan's style and attitude were first apparent in the way she structured her entries. She used a letter format, always addressing Allison in a salutation:

> Hi Allison (Jan. 28th);
> Hi there, Allison (Feb. 3rd);
> Here we are again, Allison (Feb. 7th);
> Hello Allison (Mar. 19th).

Not only in the salutations, but within the writing too, she frequently addressed Allison by name, creating a distinctly social framework for the writing. The explicit social element was further apparent in Joan's regular use of greetings to begin, and sometimes to end, her entries:

> Tuesday Feb. 25th
>
> Hi there Allison,
>
> Did we ever have a good tutorial tonight!...(She discusses some of her own work, a paper in progress, and ends with another greeting.)...Cross your fingers for me this time, Allison!

Organization. A social element also informed the characteristic structure of Joan's entries. Her extensive

elaboration included not just information, but also personal views and feelings, intended to help Allison feel at ease to reveal her own ideas and feelings. Joan's careful organization, often chronological, of the details around one or more main points, was intended to help Allison by making the writing more readable, and by modeling ways to organize writing:

> Wednesday, Feb. 26th
>
> Hello Allison,
>
> What a day this has been! I'm absolutely exhausted!
>
> Firstly, I did finish the final copy of my writing before breakfast this morning. It's a really good paper and I'm very proud of it. That final copy sure looks good! It was worth every single minute.
>
> Then, after I arrived at university I did some work for our tutorial tomorrow evening and then hurried to a tutorial of my own. That was a good learning session for me. After that I went to another tutoial with Dr. Baker and she gave me some good advice for my thesis, which I really appreciated.
>
> After lunch I went out to visit a school for a couple of hours because I'll be testing a student there next week so I had to gather all of the information. I didn't have to visit your school so this was a new thing for me. However, I'll just be testing this new student. No tutorials will be given at all.
>
> Tonight I'm going to be writing a rough draft for another paper so I'd better get started now. I'm looking forward to our tutorial tomorrow so I'll see you then, Allison. In the meantime, I'm off to be an author again!

Sentence Structure. At the same time as Joan organized her entries so as to make them more readable, she avoided talking down to Allison, but consistently used natural language. As is evident in the entry quoted above, Joan's

entries generally contained several types of sentences: simple, compound, and complex. A large proportion of the entries also contained compound-complex sentences, especially in the early weeks, when the entries were often reflective. The highly embedded expression enabled Joan to show Allison how a person might think about a topic, and how one might speak, or write, about it.

Vocabulary. Joan's intention to speak naturally also showed in her word choices. She made extensive use of abstract language. In addition, approximately one third of her entries contained specialized vocabulary, such as "tutorial", "draft" (writing), or "proposal" (thesis). But she generally used these words in a context that included many concrete details and personal terms that would help Allison know the meanings of new words:

> ...I've also been working on the second draft of a big paper. It's coming along very well this time too so maybe I'll be able to write my finished copy soon. It's the proposal, or big plan, for my thesis so a lot of hours of thought and writing has gone into it" (Mar. 6th).

Tone. Another aspect of Joan's expression that might have helped, or at least encouraged, Allison's reading was the very positive tone of most of the writing. It reinforced the messages of encouragement, acceptance, and praise, carried both implicitly and directly in Joan's journal entries and responses:

I couldn't go to bed without writing in the

journal. We had a good tutorial tonight. I hope you felt good about it because.... This morning I handed two pieces of my writing to my teachers so I'll be looking forward to meeting them soon and getting some more advice to help me with my learning. Like we said once before, my learning is really for me just like your learning is really for you, Allison.
Keep up the good work with your learning.
(Mar. 4th)

Joan's optimism sometimes took the form of sensitive reflection on her environment. This was a personal way of helping Allison expand her world view, and appreciate her world:

I'm writing my journal very very early today. You're still asleep because it's only five o'clock in the morning....
Have you ever thought how beautiful the city looks at night, Allison? My apartment is way up high on the twenty-first floor so I am looking down over the city. At night it looks like a fairyland.... (Feb. 28th).

A particularly important aspect of Joan's honest language was her willingness to admit problems, and ask for Allison's views or information. This is illustrated in her previously quoted entry of February 27th, when she expressed concern about the testing of a school child and asked Allison's advice on the matter. In the same entry, Joan admitted to a struggle with some writing, but even here she spoke with optimism:

I was not a great author last night, just scratching and changing every word. I think I was just too tired to think straight. I'll try again to finish my rough draft today.

These remarks conveyed acceptance of Allison as an authority on her own experience, and as an equal in the dialogue.

Joan's attitude of respect, so clearly implied in her expression, was further conveyed by the mere fact that Joan reliably wrote a reply to every one of Allison's entries, and often followed up a topic, with remarks or questions in a subsequent entry, as illustrated below:

> ...I went out to that school to test the little girl this morning Allison. I used your advice and it worked like magic! ...(Mar. 3rd).

Joan's complex, but natural, clear, and personal language, together with a clear structure, complemented content that focused on Allison. The style of Joan's writing served not only to model various aspects of writing, but also to create a very positive tone in the journal. It demonstrated to Allison a sincere dialogue in writing, and encouraged her to explore, in the journal, both her ideas and her writing abilities.

Frank

Format and Organization. Frank's entries were generally short, unelaborated: one statement, sometimes two or three. Organization was therefore not a major aspect of the writing. However, Frank generally set up his entries in a predictable way, dating each one, and indenting the first word:

11.20.86
Thakyou for the book to read.

25.02.86 My Winder games was very funny.

These standard features helped make Frank's entries readable, and suggest that, if he had written longer entries, he might have incorporated more features of organization.

Sentence Structure. Whether writing one or several statements, in an entry, Frank's individual statements were relatively unelaborated. His entries contained mostly simple sentences:

20.02.86
Iam in a hockey drinind (tournament). Thow (those) book are very good.

In a few of his responses, however, Frank used complex or compound sentences, as well as simple ones. This is illustrated in the following responses he wrote to Pat's entry of March 15th, in which she asked how his hockey team was doing, and whether he was still playing:

We ment (might) be out and we ment be in

It is doing taromb1

Frank's use of at least a few compound or complex sentences indicates that he knew how to write them, and might have been more inclined to do so when not preoccupied

with deciding what to say. This was the case when he wrote responses. Because he took his leads from Pat's questions and remarks, his attention was not totally focused on generating ideas, as was the case when he wrote entries.

Vocabulary. The straightforward statements were paralleled, in Frank's writing, by generally denotative vocabulary. This is consistent with the fact that Frank was reporting general facts the majority of the time. However, he did use connotative vocabulary sometimes, especially when making statements that were clearly interactive. Many of these statements suggested a desire to please his tutor:

16.20.86 sorwe for not writing yosday

25.02.86 Thaing you for geting the compoter.

Even when the focus of these statements was on himself (e.g. when making a request), Frank's words conveyed his politeness, along with his wishes:

> Wenday (Wednesday) I sher hop we get to us the compeder on Monday (Apr. 2nd).

Frank used abstract language more often in writing responses than he did in his entries (in about 50 percent of the responses). Just as the clearly social framework of the responses encouraged more natural, varied sentences, it also encouraged a more personal expression. In answering Pat's questions, Frank revealed his feelings to some extent, as illustrated below:

I fell (felt) fin wen I rond (read)

for the first time (Response to Pat's entry of Mar. 11th in which she asked how Frank felt when he read for her the first time).

I tont enjoy inthing (Response to Pat's entry of Mar. 20th in which she asked Frank what he enjoys about social studies).

Thayou for bering the computer Pat... (Response to Pat's entry of Feb. 10th in which she mentioned the computer she had borrowed for that session).

Point of View. Frank's use of polite language, as in the last quote above, indicates that he saw the writing as a dialogue, at least part of the time. This was also apparent in the fact that he often used Pat's name or "you", and in the mere fact that he answered most of Pat's questions, however briefly.

In spite of these indications that the writing was a comfortable social activity for Frank, and in spite of the fact that his behavior generally reflected increasing comfort and involvement in the dialogue, he used interactive language less and less, in the journal. In the absence of responses from his tutor to each of his own entries, he kept his writing brief and impersonal, often answering questions with a single word, such as "fine" or "yes", or a short phrase:

Pat: How is your hockey (Mar. 1st entry)?
Frank: fin

Pat: What did you do during your Spring Break (Mar. 28th entry)?
Frank: Went to the fram

The considerable satisfaction that often showed on Frank's face during tutoring sessions was not reflected in his cryptic writing. Only the fact that he wrote, and even gleefully made small changes in several of Pat's entries, hinted at a growing confidence. Thus, while his approach to the writing changed, and became more free, his writing did not. He continued to write minimal entries, and his strong voice remained in talk, where Pat offered enthusiastic responses to every statement.

Pat

Format. Pat wrote simply and clearly, especially in the early weeks. Her entries were set up and organized in a predictable way, with dates (or days) and paragraph indentation appearing in all entries:

> Thursday, Feb. 6, 1986
>
> Hi Frank,
>
> What did you do today? I spent a busy day in the library looking for some books. How often do you have a chance to go to the school library?
>
> Pat

A similar format remained throughout the ten weeks, though in many of the later entries the date replaced the salutation, and the signature disappeared:

> Saturday (Mar. 8th)
>
> What an exciting day this was! My son's school relay team ran at the Butterdome today. It was packed with people cheering the runners. Our team won in the morning but lost the afternoon race. Still we were very proud of them.

Organization. The structure of Pat's entries was consistent too. An entry generally included a lead that introduced a topic, one or two sentences of elaboration, and a conclusion, which in many cases was a question, aimed at linking the entry with Frank's experience, and encouraging him to continue the dialogue:

> Thursday
> I'm still not finished my homework. That paper is taking so much time that I'm getting upset about it. Do you ever have work that is hard to do (Feb. 27th)?

Not many of the entries included transitions, probably because the entries were short.

Sentence Structure. To support the predictable structure of the entries, Pat used fairly direct language, especially at first. While about a third of the early entries contained compound or complex sentences, almost all of them contained simple sentences, as illustrated below:

> Friday
> On Fridays I usually go to a school to help some children write stories. I really enjoy that. You like writing stories don't you Frank? Could you bring one of your stories for me to read? I'm very interested in your ideas (Feb. 28th).

Although questions served to focus the entries on Frank, the simple and unelaborated statements sometimes gave a somewhat formal tone, somewhat of a teacher tone, rather than the spontaneous tone of a person-to-person conversation. Thus, in spite of Pat's frequent use of

Frank's name or the pronoun "you", the early entries demonstrated an impersonal style that might have encouraged Frank to also write briefly and objectively.

Pat's sentences became more varied and somewhat more elaborated in her later entries. Approximately two-thirds of them contained compound or complex sentences, in addition to simple ones, and a few of the entries contained compound-complex sentences:

> Sunday
> Gee, I just realized that I forgot to tell you that I tried to find some of your school books in the library. I have been thinking about you often this week as I've been looking through these books. I had trouble finding the reading books Mrs. Lomme wrote in her note but I think I have found the right science, math and social studies books. Please tell me what you think of the idea of using your school books sometimes in our lessons together (Mar. 16th).

The more elaborated sentences helped make the later entries sound more natural. Questions sounded somewhat less didactic, coming more naturally out of the substance of the entries, as illustrated in the following entry:

> Friday
> As I have told you before, this is the day when I go to school to help with story writing. One of my reasons for going is to find out what the children like to write about. What do you write about Frank (Mar. 14th)?

The question that ends this entry is a real question of Pat's; it reflects what she wanted to know, rather than shifting the focus arbitrarily to Frank.

Vocabulary. If Pat's more complex sentences contributed to an increasingly natural tone, her conversational expression did so even more. In the above entry, for example, the first statement invites Frank to recall a shared topic. The phrase "As I have told you before..." is commonly used in conversations to gain a person's attention. Pat's increasingly conversational tone is further apparent when one compares the respectful, slightly formal usage in the first example below with the informal tone of the second one, written a number of weeks later:

> Tuesday, Feb. 18
> I was very pleased with the reading you did today Frank. You seemed to be really trying your best.
> Pat

> Tuesday
> Well I finally finished my huge paper and handed it in to my Professor today. That was a big load off my mind to finally be finished.
> In one of your notes you told me that you had a lot of homework. Please tell me about it (Mar. 4th).

In spite of the slightly formal "please", the second entry contains no hint of the evaluative tone of the first one. The conversational "well", and the emphatic "finally" and "huge", strongly connote the weight of being a student, an experience that Frank undoubtedly could appreciate. The tone of oppression is reinforced by Pat's figurative "a big load off", and her repetition of "finally". These features

of the entry made its message very clear because they gave Frank an image and an idiom that he was familiar with. Pat's language here was strongly connotative, encouraging Frank to engage in some imaginative interpretation, based on his own experiences with school.

Although Pat had used connotative language in most of her earlier entries, it had often occurred in a context of evaluating, approving, or exposing Frank's work or feelings:

> ...I'm glad that you liked the story that you read yesterday at the University (Feb. 4th).
>
> ...You sure did well today. Did you feel that we worked hard (Feb. 10th)?

What if Frank had not liked the book, or not felt that he and Pat had worked hard! He might have felt some anxiety about displeasing Pat, if he had not written anything, yet writing negatively might have been even worse.

Some evaluation occurred in later entries, but it generally was in a context of candid statements and quite informal diction, conveying an unquestionably positive tone, as illustrated by the following excerpts from Pat's final set of entries:

> Wednesday
> I was supposed to give a talk in one of our classes today but there wasn't enough time for my turn....Do you like giving talks to your class?
>
> Frank I feel sort of sad that our sessions are over. I'm very pleased with all the things we've done together....I really learned a lot from you! Helping you has given me a chance to learn more ways of

helping children with reading and writing (Apr. 2nd).

In the first paragraph, Pat seems to be sharing a common student experience, not posing a pedagogical question to determine Frank's classroom performance. In the second paragraph, she again indicates clearly that she is a learner like Frank, not always an authority.

Responses. The style of Pat's responses was similar to that of her entries. Even though their number was limited, their tone became increasingly conversational, as illustrated by the following responses written early, part way, and late in the tutoring:

17.02.86
I really like reading the notes you write. Do you like writing notes here with me or at home?

Monday
I wish that we had lots of time to read and write in our journals, don't you? Do you think we should do our journals earlier and not leave them until the end of our session (Mar. 10th)?

Tuesday, April 1
I'm glad that you wrote every day. It sounds like you had a great week at the farm, with your cousins ....
Thanks for being a friend and making these lessons fuh. I always looked forward to seeing you.

The question in the first excerpt might have intimidated Frank. Certainly it hinted at the teacher-student relation existing between him and Pat, and colored the intent of the first statement; it suggests evaluation, not just

encouragement. But the second excerpt used a language of partners: "I wish...we...our journals, don't you"? As a result, the question in this entry doesn't seem to implicate the tutor-student relationship, as the first excerpt did by its use of "Do you like writing...here with me...?" The final excerpt, too, offered a candid expression of interpersonal sharing, and put the tutor, not the student, in a vulnerable spot: "Thanks for...making these lessons fun. I always looked forward to seeing you."

Effects of Dialogue. It seems likely that the positive tone of Pat's later passages and responses, and her persistent focus on Frank throughout the journal, were involved in Frank's developing comfort with reading and writing over the weeks of tutoring. Certainly, Frank's increasingly calm and initiating approach to the journal writing, if not the writing itself, suggested that he had begun to believe in the possibility that he could write and read successfully. This belief was at least reinforced and encouraged, if not specifically generated, by the dialogue writing Pat shared with him.

Mechanics of Writing

To explore the students' handling of mechanics, the sentences in their written texts were examined. Punctuation and capitalization were separated from sentence structure,

for purposes of analysis. Spelling also was analyzed. And the journal texts were examined for evidence of monitoring and for appearance. The levels of performance used for purposes of analysis are shown in Appendix D.

While the students' writing contained no clear indication of consistent improvement in mechanics over the ten weeks, the writing showed a considerable degree of regularity, suggesting that the students were aware of many writing conventions and controlled them in varying degrees. The considerable accuracy and consistency in the students' writing, together with the high level of monitoring apparent in each of the journals, suggests that the writing ability of each of the students was greater than it might have seemed on superficial examination.

Tim

Sentence Structure. Tim's writing became somewhat more fluent as the weeks went by. He less often wrote long entries consisting of run-on sentences joined by "and then". More often, he wrote somewhat shorter and more focused entries. As a result, sentence boundaries were generally more clear, and the structure of many sentences was correct. Tim continued to use "then" as a transition, and he used "and" correctly as a conjunction. Whether punctuation or capitals were included or not, sentences sounded discrete

from each other in the later entries, as illustrated in the following two entries, written March 6th and 7th:

> I wookup and went to SchooL. then
> I went home and did my homework.

> I wookup I went to SchooL then i went
> home Then I was Ivited to a sleepover

Punctuation and Capitalization. Although Tim's entries came to sound more fluent, his use of punctuation and capitalization remained inconsistent. Sometimes Tim used both correctly, but other times he omitted both, or used capitals when they were not needed. Each of these events is illustrated in the entries quoted above.

Spelling. Tim's spelling showed that he had a considerable awareness of how words are put together. In many entries, a high proportion of his words were accurately spelled. In addition, his misspellings generally were logical, reflecting an awareness of the sounds in the words, as well as the order of the sounds and some of the ways to represent them. Sample errors are listed below, to illustrate his hypotheses about words and his transitional stage of development towards conventional spelling:

ivited (invited)	totered (tutored)
ther (there)	erli (early)
diden (didn't)	liveing (living)
pes (piece)	piriod (period)
hose (house)	yes te day (yesterday)

Monitoring. Tim's systematic approach to spelling was reinforced by his frequent monitoring. He made erasures or writeovers in a high proportion of entries, especially the

later ones. Sometimes the changes were corrections, or attempted corrections. For example, "toled" (told) originally contained an "r" which was overwritten with an "l": tored - toled.

Many similar instances of spontaneous correcting appeared throughout Tim's journal, and some words that were used in early entries were changed in subsequent entries. For example, "woke up" was used in many entries. The phrase appeared in a number of forms, as indicated below, reflecting Tim's effort to work out the correct version:

wokeup - wookup - wook up -
woo kup - woke/wook (overwritten) up - 'woke up.

Sometimes, the effort to correct one word influenced the spelling of another. For example, in one entry (March 14th) in which "I woke up" was finally written correctly after a number of changes, Tim spelled the familiar word "school" first one way, then a second way, as follows: SccooL - Shcool ("c" overwritten by "h"). Though he had spelled the word correctly in previous entries, here he could not produce its correct spelling. His attention seemed to be totally engaged by the struggle with "woke up".

Appearance. Tim's struggle with mechanics was also apparent in the irregularity of his letter formation. His use of capitals incorrectly (e.g. SchooL) may have been partly a function of physical control and attention. Certainly his letters varied considerably in size, sometimes

filling up a full space, other times a half or a third, and sometimes straddling a line. This suggests that he could benefit from regular writing, which would allow him to work on the mechanics of writing and develop fluency. The potential benefits of regular writing seemed especially great for Tim in light of the fact that he demonstrated considerable awareness of writing conventions, but not clarity and automaticity in using them.

Responses. The usefulness of written dialogue in helping Tim develop greater control in his writing is suggested by the fact that, in his responses, his accuracy was somewhat greater than in his entries. Capitalization was often correct, in responses, though he had used capitals correctly in only a few of the later entries. Punctuation, while still incorrect in many of the responses, was more often corect than it was in the entries. Sentence structure was very often correct in the responses, as it was in the entries.

As with sentence structure, Tim's spelling accuracy also remained relatively high in his responses. In addition, he made fewer changes in spelling - monitored less often - in responses, indicating that he possibly felt more confident in writing responses than he did in writing entries. Though the number of responses that Tim wrote was small, and therefore interpretation must be cautious, the responses that he did write suggest that in the context of

immediate dialogue, as contrasted to the diary-writing framework of his entries, he produced more mature writing, and seemed to be more in control of it.

Allison

Sentence Structure. In a great majority of Allison's entries, sentence structure was accurate in a high proportion of sentences. This high level of accuracy is especially impressive considering the complexity of the sentences. When Allison's writing did contain errors in sentence structure, her intentions were reasonably clear; the sentences were close to correct. In the following entry, for example, written February 28th, Allison's first sentence was incomplete, but in the remaining sentences, she used a similar construction accurately:

> Today when my mom took us to the nabors to get on the bus. My friend told me what was giong to happen to her. Then when I got to school I did a lot of thing most of it work. Then when I went home I whent to a friends place to finsh my sience fair thing. When I came home my family was watching moves.

Allison's level of accuracy for sentence structure dropped somewhat in the later entries. This may reflect an increasing sense of freedom in her relationship with Joan, both in the journal and in the tutoring. Perhaps as Allison became more comfortable in the tutoring sessions, she felt less concerned about being correct, and more concerned about being candid, in her journal writing.

Punctuation and Capitalization. A drop in accuracy in later entries was also noticeable for punctuation, a sentence element closely tied to sentence structure. Capitalization, however, remained at a constant high level of accuracy.

Spelling. In all of Allison's entries, a high proportion of words were spelled correctly. While this suggests that she made few errors, in fact she made many. Because she wrote long entries, she could make many spelling errors, and still their proportion of the total text would be relatively low.

The spelling errors gave valuable information regarding Allison's knowledge of spelling patterns and her approach to words. Some words were spelled differently on different occasions, as Allison tried out various patterns. For example, "science" was spelled in the following ways in different entries: siece, sience, sicine, since. Most of the errors indicated that Allison was guided by sound, as well as by visual aspects of words. In addition, her errors reflected an awareness of the importance of meaning in determining the spelling of a word. A sample of Allison's errors appears below:

badma (badminton)	saing (saying)
misted (missed)	tickit (ticket)
slepped (slept)	wate (wait)
all (I'll)	serprize (surprise)
I'll (all)	haveing (having)
are (our)	resses (recess)

Allison's errors were logical and generally easily readable, reflecting a large amount of knowledge about how words are written. In addition, some words became more accurate after being used more than once, as indicated in the following examples: badma - bad mitten; tutoruils - totorial; let - late. In some cases (e.g. let-late, underlined in the following excerpt), the correction followed immediately upon Allison's seeing the word in Joan's journal text, as illustrated in the following exchange between Allison and Joan:

> Sat march 1
> Today we sat around until 1:o'clock. Then we went to see grandma. It was to <u>let</u> to go to bingo so we went to the hotel and I talk to grandpa about haveing the class come out to see the foxes.

Joan's response: What a great idea for a field trip for the class, Allison! I hope your Grandpa said 'yes'. I guess there's not much point in going to the bingo <u>late</u>.

Allison continues: They don't let us in that <u>late</u> (first written "let", then changed).

<u>Monitoring</u>. Allison's entries showed considerable evidence of monitoring. The frequent monitoring, together with Allison's demonstrated knowledge about words and sentences, represented a strong basis for her writing development.

<u>Appearance</u>. The final aspect of mechanics, appearance, showed little change, in Allison's writing, over the weeks.

Throughout her journal, her letter formation and spacing were relatively consistent, suggesting that, on the whole, Allison's attention to generating ideas did not interfere with the physical act of doing the writing, as is sometimes true of young writers.

Responses. Not surprisingly, in her responses Allison's accuracy was consistently high in all areas. In most of the responses, sentence structure was generally accurate. As well, punctuation and capitalization were used accurately much of the time, and a high proportion of words were spelled correctly. Many responses had no spelling errors at all.

In her responses, Allison monitored less often than she did in her entries. This undoubtedly was because responses were much shorter and simpler, and Allison could write them correctly on a first try. However, the greater fluency might also be associated with the fact that the responses were written adjacent to Joan's entries, so some words were available to copy. In at least a few instances, Allison's self-correction was clearly associated with a model. This was illustrated with the word "late" above, and the effect of a model is again evident in Allison's self-correction of the word "custom" in her response to Joan's February 14th entry, as indicated below:

> Joan: ...Did you know that Valentine's Day is pretty much a North American custom?....

> We drove over...to buy some groceries at the big Superstore this afternoon....I suppose that store is always busy like that!....

Allison's response: NO I did not no that valentine's day was a North American co/ustom ("o" overwritten with a "u"). Yes it is all ways busy like that....

Although Allison did not correct all of the spelling errors that Joan wrote correctly in her own writing, Joan's entries did provide models, and they gave Allison a reason to pay close attention to her writing. The goal of communicating was more immediate in the responses than it was when Allison wrote her entries, in isolation from either Joan's entries or Joan herself.

Frank

Sentence Structure. Sentence structure was accurate in a high proportion of the statements in Frank's entries. Frank's cautious approach, which resulted in his using only simple sentences almost all the time, likely helped him to maintain control of the writing.

Capitalization and Punctuation. Capitalization, while often accurate, was less consistent. Punctuation was often used correctly in the early entries, but it was often overlooked in the later entries.

Frank's attention to punctuation might have been distracted, in some cases, by his efforts to correct words.

For example, in the set of entries for the week ending March 16th, all of the five entries in which periods were missing included one or more changes, as illustrated by the March 15th entry below, in which the three underlined words contained overwriting, indicating that Frank had corrected them:

I want to a birthday Party

By contrast, two of the three entries that included periods had been written correctly on the first try, as illustrated by the following entry, for March 10th, which showed no changes:

I had fun today.

The apparent lack of attention to punctuation in the later entries might also have been associated to some extent with the fact that not all of Frank's entries were answered. Even though he continued faithfully to record at least a brief entry for each day, he possibly felt less enthusiastic, and less attentive, in writing the later entries than he had in writing the early ones, which occurred in a more clearly conversational framework. As if to emphasize this possibility, half of Frank's entries for the final week of journal writing literally faded off the page, as the script became larger, lighter, and more spaced out.

Monitoring. The change in accuracy of punctuation was paralleled by a decline in the frequency of monitoring.

Whereas evidence of monitoring appeared in almost all early entries, many later entries showed no evidence of it.

Spelling. In spite of Frank's monitoring and frequent attempts to correct the spelling of words, especially in early entries, spelling was the aspect of mechanics that showed the lowest accuracy level in Frank's entries. Although a high proportion of words were spelled correctly in some of the entries, in many of them only about half of the words were spelled correctly. However, the majority of the misspellings reflected Frank's awareness of the importance of sound in spelling, as illustrated in the following sample of errors:

thakyou (thank you)	aser (answer)
sorwe (sorry)	casins (cousins)
yosday (yesterday)	pratis (practice)
thow (those)	leving (leaving)
frink (French)	moter (motor)
wind (winter)	stat (stayed)

Many of these words suggest that Frank was aware of a spelling pattern but misused it - e.g. thow (those); moter (motor). In some words, he used different spellings at different times, indicating, again, that he was aware of a pattern and was trying to decide how to use it. This is illustrated in the multiple spellings below:

Im - Iam
hocky - hockey

Even though Frank continued to make many spelling errors throughout the ten weeks, the misspelled words became easier to read. In the following early entries, the word

"drinind" (tournament) might have been hard to guess without accompanying talk, or the presence of the subsequent entry:

> Iam in a hockey drinind...(Feb. 21st).
>
> today at are hockey game
> we lost 4 2...(Feb. 22nd).

By contrast, the misspelled words in the following late entry are relatively easy to recognize:

> tomoreo we have to run arawand
> are scohe 5 time (Apr. 3rd).

Appearance. Although Frank's writing looked somewhat irregular at first glance, and some of his unconventional spellings were somewhat distracting, in fact his writing was quite legible. Letter size and spacing were generally consistent, particularly within weekly groups of entries. The single exception was the final group of entries.

Although Frank drew boxes around the dates in most of his entries, they were generally complementary to the text; they even helped identify the beginnings of some entries. Only in a number of cases did the boxes distract from the writing, when they were ornamented with wiggly lines. The fact that this feature was less frequent in later entries suggests that it might have been associated with Frank's early hesitancy about the journal writing.

Responses. In almost all of Frank's responses, sentence structure was mostly accurate, as was capitalization. But in the responses, spelling too was

correct in a large proportion of words, unlike the spelling in the entries.

In responses, punctuation was accurate less often than in the entries. This suggests that Frank might have construed the responses as a different kind of writing than the entries. Possibly he considered one-word answers to questions not to be sentences, so that the choice of punctuation for these answers was not an issue. Consistent with this possibility, Frank squeezed his responses into Pat's text, using carrets or arrows.

Pat: How is your hockey? (fin) My [illegible]'s team won... (Mar. 1st).

Monitoring appeared less often in Frank's responses than in his entries. One reason likely was that responses were very short - often a phrase, or a common word such as "yes" or "fine". Frank wrote many of these correctly without apparent hesitation or change. This greater accuracy might also have been facilitated by the fact that he displayed a keen sense of involvement in writing the responses, and this engagement could have enhanced his attention to the writing.

Frank's relatively consistent performance in writing responses again indicates, as did Allison's, that the immediacy of written dialogue, as opposed to independent writing, done in isolation, was facilitative to these

student writers, helping them to become engaged in the writing and to discover purposes for writing.

Discussion of Journal Texts

Graves (1984) states that "in the past, we have focused on children's errors. For this reason we have grossly underestimated children's ability to write and to think" (p. 171). A close look at the actual writing in the students' dialogue journals shows that, contrary to what might be expected on the basis of surface appearances, the students used language appropriately and even expertly. They used a variety of language conventions with varying degrees of effectiveness to tell their stories and to express their ideas, and this becomes apparent when the writing is viewed in a descriptive frame of reference which allows one to look beyond errors. It becomes possible to recognize, with other researchers, "that learning to be a writer, like learning to become a speaker or reader, involves the refinement of many aspects of the process simultaneously" (Newman, 1985, p. 26).

Intentions

A striking feature of the students' writing is the extent to which it showed their intentions. Global intentions can be distinguished from focal ones (Smith, 1982, p. 88), and both were evident in the students'

writing. Allison's global intention initially was to write a diary; Frank's to write notes; and Tim's to write letters to a pen pal. These alternate ways of writing are conventions in themselves, and in selecting them, the students showed their sensitivity to the difference between written and spoken language (Smith, 1982, p. 78).

The more focused intentions that were revealed in the day-to-day texts clearly reflected the students' global intentions. Smith (1982) states that "authors express or fulfill their intentions through conventions" (p. 92). Indeed, the language of Allison's dialogue journal writing was expressive, like a diary, touching on outstanding events in her world - e.g. the crash of a space shuttle; her volleyball team's progress in a tournament. Frank's notes were very brief, tied into the notes his tutor wrote; his [redacted] was gleeful and playful, as it might be if he were passing secret notes under his desk to a classmate. At the same time, his notes were polite, acknowledging his age and role relationship to his tutor. And Tim's dialogue journal writing, at least initially, was long and, like a letter to a pen pal, included most of what was happening at the time.

Context and Experience

Thus, in the texts, as in the approaches to the journals, the importance of context was clear. Not only did the conversational framework of the dialogue journal writing

situation inspire the students to want to write, as indicated previously, but it also elicited appropriate language. The students' performance bears out the very important observation that "language comes to life only when functioning in some environment. . .some background of persons and actions and events from which the things which are said derive their meaning" (Halliday, 1978, p. 28). In the interactive or conversational framework, the students knew what to do - they knew the constraints of the situation, and they used language according to these perceived constraints (Harste et al, 1984, p. 130).

The students' comfort in dealing with the dialogue undoubtedly was based on constructs of conversational language developed through their experience with it in their daily living. As Kelly (1963) postulates, people develop constructs about particular experiences by operating in a systematic way similar to that of a scientist, observing, speculating about the meaning of an observation, checking it through experience. On the basis of many conversations that the students had listened to or participated in, they could predict what kind of language was required in the dialogue writing situation. The appropriate writing in their dialogue journals indicates, as has the research of Donaldson (1978), that when a learning situation is defined in children's terms - taking children's experiences into account - then children can show considerable sophistication

in their thinking and their use of language; they show that they know more than we might think they do (see also Goodman, 1986; Harste et al, 1984; Smith, 1983).

Not only did the students know the constraints of the situation, but as they produced their specific journal texts, they also showed an awareness of the constraints of language context, an awareness of the fact that "the text as a whole determines what each individual word might be" (Smith, 1982, p. 76). This was reflected in the students' writing styles, and even to some extent in their handling of mechanics, as they shaped their written language differently for a variety of uses. The language uses in the students' journals ranged from simple reporting, through ritualistic statements intended to merely begin or maintain a smooth dialogue, to subtle statements expressing empathy, pride, or intentions to persuade. In putting language to all these uses, the students demonstrated Newman's (1984) observation about the complexity of language in use - "that every utterance serves several different functions simultaneously" (p. 9; see also Smith, 1983, p. 55). The varied uses to which the children put language, in their journal writing, again seem to defy the diagnostic label "reluctant writer", and seem to confirm the following reflections by Smith (1983) about the importance of intentions and comfort in writing:

> Children should find nothing peculiar or

> exotic about writing; they should come to it as a natural means of expression and exploration like speech, music, play, and art. Children will strive to make sense of writing ... as long as (it) remains a natural and purposeful activity, made available without threat (p. 80).

Correctness Anxiety

Smith's reference to threat is pertinent to this study, for the students' concerns about conventions and mechanics did inhibit their written production to some extent, in spite of their comfort with the dialogue framework. It is as if they carried over to this situation their school expectations about the priority of accuracy in writing. Frank, for example, wrote very short statements, even when his conversation indicated that he was happily engaged in the dialogue. Allison sometimes wrote somewhat formally, as if to impress her tutor with her ability to produce well structured school writing; her early use of essay-type conventions seemed rather cumbersome in the context of a conversation about the routine events of a day. And in Tim's early writing, questions about spelling or about what to write often seemed to block his general intentions, so that his writing sounded impersonal and repetitious. In addition, the physical labor of putting text on paper seemed to discourage Tim, so that he stopped writing, in favor of talking, whenever he could get away with doing so.

Although the students eventually came to perceive the dialogue writing as a relatively low-risk situation, the

rich language of their dialogue journals might never have been produced if they had continued to worry about evaluation - i.e. if they had been attending to transcription more than to composing (Smith, 1982, p. 21). In the same way, the effectiveness of the students' written language might never be recognized in a school setting if their teachers were intending to evaluate the children's writing, and were paying attention to its form too much or too early (Harste et al, 1982; Murray, 1982; Rosen, 1969). In the dialogue writing, however, the students eventually could see that they were expected to write naturally, for the tutors themselves did so, and the tutors offered corrections only when asked, as recommended by Smith (1984, p. 12). The perceived level of risk is thus seen to influence not just students' willingness to write, as mentioned earlier, but also the specific qualities of the writing that is produced. Noting that the dialogue writing eventually became a meaning-based activity, we can say of the students in this study what Newman (1985) says of a nine-year-old friend, whose anxiety about producing a proper letter led him at first to write only a small amount, though he later wrote a much longer and richer letter: "Not until he'd received a reply...did (he) really decide...that letters to friends are first-draft affairs; neatness and accuracy aren't obligatory" (p. 79).

As indicated here, the students were helped by their tutors' demonstrations to feel at ease, and so to keep their focus on meaning. Rather than evaluate the students' writing, the tutors demonstrated, in their own writing, specific conventions of written language - ways of expressing, developing, and organizing ideas, and ways of spelling, ordering, and punctuating words. They demonstrated the importance of the students' ideas, by acknowledging or praising them regularly in the journals and by writing sincere questions about topics that were familiar to the students; sometimes the tutors even asked for advice. Thus the tutors acted like coaches, showing, encouraging, guiding; they showed their understanding that teachers do not control learning (Goodman, 1986, p. 29). In other words, they showed respect for the students, and this respect allowed the students to own their writing. It allowed them "to decide what they (would) write about, what they (would) say about it, and how much attention to pay to conventions at any particular time" (Newman, 1985, p. 31). This responsibility for the writing is a critical variable in literacy, according to many researchers (Newman, 1985, p. 3), and likely contributed to the quantity and relatively high quality of the students' journal writing.

Importance of Talk

Even as tutors received and sometimes discussed their students' written ideas, they demonstrated the integral connection of writing with reading, and of written language with oral language (Goodman, 1986; Britton, 1970; Newman, 1984; Harste et al, 1984; Smith, 1983; Moffett & Wagner, 1983). These connections influenced the students' writing. For Frank, the fact that Pat engaged in some casual discussion of the journal contents, while the writing was going on, might have been a critical factor in his recognition that writing as well as speech can be used in conversations. I propose that for him the talk served a supportive function, analogous to that served by drawing in a child's early writing (Dyson, 1982; 1983; Harste et al, 1984; Graves, 1984). To some extent, the talk replaced or added to what was written - new information elicited by the tutor's questions, exclamations, and other probes. But some of the time, the talk served merely to confirm the writing, restating or acknowledging it, as an illustration can enhance a text, and even help a reader to confirm an interpretation of it.

The link between writing, reading, and talking was important in a different way for Allison. It was made less often during the dialogue writing and reading, and more at other times. In casual conversations around the writing, she and her tutor often discussed events and ideas that had

been shared in the journal. Thus, rather than serving in a direct way to assist in the dialogue writing, the conversations helped to reaffirm the links between Allison's life outside of tutoring, which she wrote about, and her life in the tutoring. This kind of linking is considered of primary importance in literacy development (Calkins, 1986; Goodman, 1986; Malicky, 1985; Sanders, 1986) and undoubtedly facilitated Allison's increasing self-confidence as a learner.

As if to confirm the importance of connecting the writing to other forms of language, Tim's journal writing, which was not discussed or read, did not become for him a powerful tool for learning. His most functional language during tutoring was speech. But this means that he was missing the benefits associated with using the whole of one's language as a basis for language learning (Goodman, 1986; Newman, 1985). He was missing a chance to find out "that books and writing hold power and pleasure" (Moffett & Wagner, 1983, p. 174). As Smith says (1982), "anyone who does not write loses both power and potential comparable to losing a limb or sight or hearing" (p. 11).

Sometimes the talk associated with dialogue writing was related to the text in only a practical or a metalinguistic way, not a substantive one, as when either the tutor or the student asked what a particular word or phrase meant, or when they discussed alternate ways to write particular

sections of text. This again demonstrated to the students that attention to conventions was necessary in order to gain access to meaning, but was not of primary importance in itself. Especially for Frank, this represented a significant discovery, one that can be viewed as a major reconstruing of a part of his world. As Kelly (1963) states, "constructs are used for predictions of things to come, and...new things keep happening and our predictions keep turning out in expected or unexpected ways. Each day's experience calls for the consolidation of some aspects of our outlook, revision of some, and outright abandonment of others" (p. 14). Kelly further states that "there are always some alternative constructions available to choose among in dealing with the world. No one needs to paint himself into a corner...no one needs to be the victim of his biography" (p. 15). Recognizing the importance of meaning and intention in writing opened the possibility for Frank to begin to relate his own language to the somewhat impersonal language of the school (Rosen, 1972; Barnes, 1975).

Learning About Writing by Reading

The importance of self-concept in Frank's writing is reflected by the fact that he eventually felt free to suggest corrections in his tutor's journal text. This showed that he was reading as a writer (Smith, 1984b, p. 6), perhaps learning about writing by scrutinizing the text his

tutor had produced. Smith argues (1982) that we cannot explicitly teach what is needed in order for a person to write, and that most children - and adults - do not do enough writing to account for their extensive facility in doing it; he says, "rather...we must learn from exposure to writing, in other words from reading....reading done in a particular way" (p. 162). He is referring to selective reading, in which a person attends to particular characteristics of the text. Calkins (1986) emphasizes the same thing, in referring to a five-year-old who had inscribed his initials on the back cover of a book he had produced, as he had seen done on published books; she says, "already he views himself as an insider, as a member of the circle of authors" (p. 221). Calkins points out that when "children perceive themselves as authors, they will make connections with (what) they read. They'll notice the way a word is spelled...the presence of exclamation marks. For them as for me, reading will provide an opportunity to learn from their more skillful colleagues" (p. 221).

The fact that Frank and the other students paid attention to various aspects of the journal texts was also apparent in their consistent monitoring of their own writing. Their attention to the journal texts suggests that they were engaged with them (Smith, 1982, p. 171), noticing or attempting to figure out how particular aspects of the writing worked. In doing so they produced some

inconsistencies that might at first look like evidence of inattention, carelessness, or regression, but in fact were evidence of learning. For example, sometimes when Tim paid close attention to the spelling of one word, he mispelled another familiar one; he demonstrated the common observation that children do not necessarily always use what they know about language conventions (Clay, 1975; Newman, 1985). This was also reflected in Frank's variable spelling of some words, both correct and incorrect versions, and in Allison's occasional sentence errors when she was clearly trying out a sophisticated type of expression. These types of behaviors are consistent with the very basic observation of so many researchers that (written) language does not develop in a linear way, but that all aspects develop from the start (Harste et al, 1984; Newman, 1984) - "a rich intermingling of language learning across levels" (Clay, 1975, p. 19), a "testing of alternative...hypotheses" about the writing process (Harste et al, 1984, p. 11).

Final Word

The value of informal reflective writing, along with reading and talking, in the interests of exploring personal experiences is perhaps the most critical aspect of the dialogue journal writing experience. For the students in this study, the dialogue writing was an opportunity to move out of the anxious role of being a participant in a

classroom language experience. The role of participant is characterized by "the need...to act and decide in response to the social demands of human co-existence" (Britton, 1970, p. 105). The dialogue writing was a situation in which the students were freed from the pressure of deciding what to write for a particular assignment, or how to write it so as to please a teacher and get a passing grade. While writing their dialogue journals, the students could operate in the spectator role (Britton, 1970) - "on holiday from the world's affairs...contemplating experiences, enjoying them, vividly reconstructing them perhaps - but...not taking part" (p. 104). Rather than doing something with language, they were making something with it (Britton, 1984). They were standing back, getting a more distant perspective on their lives (Harding, 1972).

As a result of being in the spectator role, the students were free to pay attention in a way a participant cannot (Britton, 1970). They had the opportunity to reassess their school experiences, and possibly to see that school problems are solvable. Further, they had the opportunity to see more accurately what writing can be, to see that it can be a natural and useful way of using language. In a sense, they had an opportunity to play with their ideas, for they did not have to write any particular thing. Britton (1977) suggests that a dispassionate look at one's experiences through play is a very important means by

which a person assimilates the realities of the world of shared experience and one's inner world: "The essential purpose of activity in this area (play) for the individual will be to relate for himself inner necessity with the demands of the external world" (p. 46).

As in play, in reflective writing, one is in the spectator role - not the real actor at that time; not in the thick of the action. The positive effects of this position are suggested in this statement by Britton (1970):

> We have suggested that freedom from a participant's responsibilities allows a spectator to evaluate more broadly, to savour feelings, and to contemplate forms - the formal arrangement of feelings, of events and...of ideas, and the forms of the language, spoken or written, in which the whole is expressed (p. 121).

Britton's words are echoed in other discussions of personal writing (Moffett & Wagner, 1983, p. 297; Calkins, 1986, p. 3), and in the following analysis by Smith (1982) of the unique function of writing, compared with speech:

> ...not only can writing separate the producer of language from its recipient in time and space, with the possibility of reflection and review, but writing can also separate the producer from him or herself, so that one's own ideas can be examined more objectively (p. 16).

Britton suggests that while we sometimes take up the role of spectator for the pleasure of it, sometimes the written language in the role of spectator is concerned with something that needs to be said - "...the needs we have been referring to arise from the challenge experience may present

us with to reevaluate, to make changes in our value systems, the organization of our feelings about things" (Britton, 1970, p. 120-121). The challenge to students who are diagnosed as nonwriters is to reevaluate their perceptions about writing, and about themselves as learners. Just as one child, for example, used the Ramona stories by Beverly Cleary, and other stories that the child herself read and wrote, to identify her role in her own family (Sanders, 1986), so children in a tutoring situation need to write and read their stories, so as to identify more clearly their roles in their families and in their classrooms.

Telling of experiences is important; as children shape their narratives they transform the experiences and integrate them (Summerfield, 1986; Martin, 1983). As Britton (1970) notes, "we habitually use talk as a means of coming to grips with current or recent experience....In doing so (we are) using talk to add the new event to a body of experience that exists very largely as the outcome of similar talk on past occasions" (p. 30). In this regard, Britton aptly refers to the following statement by the American psychologist Joseph Church (1961), who touches on the familiar nature of this common conversational habit:

> It is obvious that for many people the verbalization of experience must take place retrospectively and that it requires the help of another person. The morning after the big dance, the telephone system is taxed while the matrons and adolescents exchange impressions until the event has

> been given verbal shape and so can enter into the corpus of their experience (p. 113).

For many children, school does not offer enough time or opportunity for such verbal shaping of experience. But it can be carried on through written language as well as oral, in a form such as a dialogue journal. Perhaps as students do this they can gain some of the benefits ascribed to writing by Calkins (1986): "Writing allows us to turn the chaos (in our lives) into something beautiful, to frame selected moments in our lives, to uncover and to celebrate the organizing patterns of our existence" (p. 3). Ultimately, what's in it for the students (Meek, 1982, p. 165), in such writing, is their very literacy, which depends on their willingness to see something beautiful in themselves - to see themselves not as failures but as writers and readers.

Something is in it for us teachers too, in functional writing activities such as shared dialogue journals. For us, this is a chance to look beyond the children's errors to their strengths, a chance to see that children's mistakes "provide opportunities for insights into the kinds of sophisticated decisions children are capable of making" (Newman, 1985, p. 81). Goodman (1986) notes that students who have trouble in reading and writing "often show progress in revaluing themselves as writers before they do as readers" (p. 58). In subsequent comments about journal

writing, Goodman emphasizes the importance, in this revaluing, of our recognizing the students' strengths:

> They start keeping journals and the entries get longer and longer....And their writing goes through the same remarkable rapid development that younger writers show, provided the teacher is there...to support and cheer them on and not wipe out their first efforts and early enthusiasm with re-penciled sarcasm....If the writing continues, the rest will follow. If it doesn't there won't be anything to spell or punctuate (p. 58).

Although the present students did not show the remarkable development mentioned by Goodman, their consistent monitoring of their own and their tutors' writing is some evidence that the "rest" indeed would follow if the journals were continued over a longer period of time.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

> The ultimate irony is that the brain's constant propensity to learn may in fact defeat learning; the brain can learn that particular things are not worth learning or are unlikely to be learned (Smith, 1983, p. 106).

Summary of the Study

Journal writing has been used increasingly in schools to extend the amount and variety of writing students do. Its power lies particularly in the facts that it is self-sponsored writing and is viewed, even by students, as first-draft writing. Thus, students draw on their own knowledge of the world to explore both familiar and new material, and they use conventions of writing without the anxiety that often accompanies school writing.

While the usefulness of dialogue journal writing in mobilizing students' language resources for learning has been observed in regular classrooms, it has not been exploited in work with problem readers and writers. Yet these students especially need to experience written language in a purposeful and natural framework. The present study was intended to explore ways of productively using journal writing with problem readers, in particular,

students who went for tutoring only once a week, outside a regular classroom.

The study was carried out in the Reading and Language Center of the University of Alberta, within the framework of a graduate course in clinical reading, in which a requirement is to work for ten sessions with a client who has been referred because of reading or writing problems. From the graduate class, three tutors were selected, who were interested in using writing in their tutoring, and whose clients were at a mid-elementary level. Permission was obtained from the tutors, their students, and the students' parents to observe each tutoring session and record it, as well as to copy the dialogue journal writing done during the entire period of tutoring.

Both the tutors and their students seemed at ease with the intrusion of a researcher and a small tape-recorder, and they indicated that they did not feel inclined to censor their dialogue journal writing because it was to be read by the researcher. They understood that it would be confidential, though it would be discussed and quoted anonymously in the writeup of the study.

At the end of the study, each tutor and each student was interviewed. The interviews were transcribed, as were the parts of the weekly tutoring tapes dealing with dialogue journal writing. The interviews provided a validity check on the interpretations of the dialogue journal writing

sessions and the descriptions of the dialogue journal texts. In addition, a continuing check on validity was achieved through the course instructor, who worked closely with each of the tutors, and who read and commented on all of the interpretations.

Transcripts were read and reread, and extensive notemaking was used to identify aspects of tutor and student behavior that appeared critical to the effectiveness of the dialogue journal writing. The journal texts were examined as well. Through qualitative analysis, a number of dimensions of content and form of the journal texts were identified, as indicated below:

Content
subjects written about;
amount of writing;
continuity;
language functions.

Form
organizational features;
sentences;
vocabulary and usage;
rhetorical devices;
mechanics.

For the purposes of analysis and discussion, each of these dimensions was defined by specific descriptive categories; these too were derived from the qualitative analysis of the journal texts.

The journal text of each writer was analysed separately for entries and for responses. Entries were numbered consecutively for the entire journal writing period;

responses were as well. Entries and responses were categorized, for each dimension, and tallied by weekly writing intervals, according to the number of entries and responses containing instances of each category. For example, for "subjects written about", tallies were made for each week of text, showing the number of entries and the number of responses that contained references to each of the four subject categories that had been identified: home, school, world affairs, and tutoring; tallies were also made of the number of entries in which more than one of these subjects was mentioned. To expedite the summarizing of weekly tallies, they were grouped separately for the first and last five tutoring sessions, and the grouped tallies were converted to percentages (e.g. percent of early entries containing references to the topic "school"; percent of late entries in which a topic was resurrected; percent of late responses containing simple sentences).

On the basis of the analyses of transcripts and journal texts, comparisons were made of the patterns of approach to dialogue journal writing by the three tutors and three students, and of their actual writing. These results were discussed in the theoretical framework provided by the writings of James Britton and Frank Smith, as well as other researchers who have focused on the importance of children's having many opportunities to use written language for

exploring their ideas in contexts that are familiar and interesting to them.

Major Conclusions and Implications of the Study

Since this study was exploratory, its results are not expected to be broadly generalizable. I have taken this into account in discussing the data, and I offer these conclusions as pivots for further study and reflection.

Perhaps the most important outcome of the study is its reinforcement of the importance, to language learning, of a familiar social context in which a student feels relatively at ease. The enthusiasm, consistency, and success with which the students participated in the dialogue journal writing suggests that the familiar conversational framework freed them to use their experiences as a basis for genuine exploration of ideas. The comfortable situation seemed to encourage the students to focus on the meaning of their language production without undue concern about its transcription. Their ability to produce meaningful text to a greater extent than might be expected of problem readers and writers seems to validate Smith's (1983) notion of sensitivity as a condition of learning; when not expecting to fail, the students seemed able to perform relatively effectively.

This outcome suggests that in classrooms and especially in clinical settings, students' knowledge will be more available to them if they write for purposes that are familiar to them as situations in which written language is used. Dialogue journals, along with letters, notes, memos, and other interactive writing are examples of such situations. But the dialogue has to be genuine. If a tutor responds in an evaluative way, a student may not benefit from the dialogue journal writing, for the most crucial element in a student's growth as a writer is a reader who, rather than assessing how the student writes, "will take up the dialogue of his ideas" (Martin, 1983, p. 157). As Hunt (1987) further points out, it is a reader's response, such as an exclamation of understanding or an admission of fear, that shows a writer the impact of his writing, not an analytic response about writing technique. Hunt suggests that as long as our model of the writing situation emphasizes technique and form, or writing skills for their own sake, we create "a situation in which any student's writing can never be more than an artificial example of text" (p. 231). He describes the contrast this way:

> If, however - and only if - we can begin creating situations in which students' writing serves the real purposes of writers and readers, we can respond to students' writing as though it were real, as though we were its readers serving our own purposes. It will <u>be</u> real. We will <u>be</u> its readers. We won't have to pretend, to imagine how it might be for someone to read it in a real situation" (p. 231).

Dialogue journal writing can be real, if it is treated as real communication by both tutor and student.

Closely related to the facilitative social nature of the dialogue journal are two other factors that seemed important in this study: the sharing of responsibility for the dialogue journals, and the clarity of purposes for the journals. When students shared decision making about the journal writing, and knew what was expected, their involvement was reflected in heightened initiative and increased self-confidence, both in the journal writing and in the tutoring generally. The students spontaneously offered suggestions about procedures, for example, and they wrote regularly, independently. They sometimes evaluated their work, stating directly, in their writing, whether they felt satisfied with their progress in school. They even offered advice to their tutors, either about a particular piece of writing or about some real-life situation they had discussed in their dialogue journals. This confidence and optimism likely stemmed from the students' implicit recognition that their dialogue was real, that they were taking part in a meaning-making activity with their tutors: "an active exchange from which meanings emerge and are seen to emerge" (Berthoff, 1986, p. 122).

These observations support the notion that students benefit by having responsibility for many aspects of their writing, including the establishment of purposes for

writing. This suggests, for the teacher, the role of a consultant, or perhaps an editor, who assists students with decisions about writing purposes, formats, and procedures, but does not prescribe them in specific terms. While this requires a comprehensive vision of learning goals, and a close understanding of individual student strengths and backgrounds, the payoff is that students' involvement in the planning and evaluation of their writing is likely to increase the degree of their engagement in the writing itself, leading them to want to write and do the best they can to create meaningful text.

At the same time as the study affirms the desirability of an emphasis on meaning, it also indicates that form is important to students when they write for purposes to which they are committed. The students in the present study used their tutors not only as conversational partners in writing, but also as coaches in the writing; and, as in many coach-novice relationships, the students seemed free to raise problems and ask for help. In turn, the tutors encouraged, helped, and praised the students, and showed them how to write in the journals, by doing so themselves and expecting the students to do so. As a result, the students adopted some of the patterns of writing and format which they saw in their teachers' texts. In addition, the students spontaneously demonstrated knowledge about various aspects of language, knowledge that was not previously

apparent in so-called structured learning settings. For example, Frank predicted unfamiliar words in a text and identified particular word patterns; and Allison sometimes used an obviously new type of expression or language structure, apparently unconcerned that it might come out somewhat awkwardly in her writing.

These observations again have implications for the teacher's role. While the notion of teacher as a consultant indicates the teacher's ultimate responsibility for the effectiveness of students' learning experiences, the image of a coach suggests that, on a moment-to-moment basis, the teacher functions more like an equal in the writing enterprise with students. The teacher indeed becomes a senior partner, as suggested by Smith (1984a) in his discussion of literacy development in terms of children's being made junior members of the literacy club. And, in the framework of the partnership, the relationship of teacher to students is a collaborative one, not so much a hierarchical one in which the teacher instructs the students through pre-planned and carefully controlled lessons. With help from a trusted adult partner, students can correct some of their errors themselves, as they recognize and try out various conventions of writing that suit their ends. In the course of writing, evaluation can be a part of helping, rather than being entirely a bureaucratic function.

Finally, this study reminds us that a dialogue journal can provide an extensive sample of a student's natural writing, spontaneous writing done when the student is not under pressure of evaluation. The usefulness of such a writing sample in both the journal writing and the tutoring generally was reflected in comments made by the tutors in their interviews, and it also became obvious through the analysis of the journal texts. It is likely that dialogue journals can be useful to classroom teachers too, as a source of information and insights about their students. The journals can help teachers understand the social contexts for the students' out-of-school learning, and the particular language strengths and idiosyncrasies of individual students.

While these outcomes seem to offer several general guidelines for using dialogue journal writing to help children discover the connection of reading and writing to their own language, the degree to which this occurs clearly depends on the authenticity of the dialogue. Interactive writing is truly a social situation only if both tutor and student view it as real dialogue and respond genuinely to what each other says. Even if procedures are clear, and are established jointly by a tutor and a student, the dialogue writing can become just a language arts exercise, an activity "tagged on" to other school work. The procedures are only as powerful as one's belief that real dialogue is

possible between a student and a tutor. Moreover, different procedures may be more effective for different students and tutors, depending on their purposes.

Implications for Research

In addition to noting several implications for teaching that have arisen from the present study, it is possible to identify several directions for research aimed at investigating specific aspects of dialogue journal writing. Some of the following suggestions for research may be profitably considered together, though they are listed, somewhat arbitrarily, as separate items:

1. Investigate the use of dialogue journal writing in a more intensive way, using one journal, not two separate ones, and exchanging journals more often than once a week;

2. Investigate their use over an extended period of time, using one journal and exchanging only once a week;

3. Investigate the intentional and systematic use of modeling, in a dialogue journal, as a means of helping students with writing conventions that occur in their journal texts;

4. Investigate the use of focused dialogue journals used specifically as learning logs, in which students write daily about their progress and problems with particular reading and writing events, including their feelings about these learning events - i.e. learning to read and write by

systematically writing about, and receiving written feedback on, one's reading and writing;

5. Investigate the use of classmates as dialogue writing partners for students, or the use of others in the community who, as writing partners, may facilitate the students' efforts to relate their school experiences to other aspects of their lives.

Final Word

This study is a reminder that even students who have been identified as problem readers and writers have extensive language knowledge and considerable competence, which become apparent when the students write in functional settings. This reaffirms the need for us to continually and persistently scrutinize our educational decision making, so as to acknowledge two things: first, students' strengths, and second, the importance of students' social relationships, in educational contexts, to their learning. Through interactive writing with students, we have opportunities to discover many of their strengths, and to reflect these to the students. We have opportunities to see the students' learning experiences from the individual students' perspectives, at least to some extent.

Gaining the students' perspectives is critical to the students' literacy, for it affects our very notions of what it takes for our students individually to become literate.

For students such as the ones in the present study, becoming literate is coming to see themselves as capable people - learners, not failures in our society. As Malicky (1985) states, in referring to recent research on literacy development, "Rather than learning how to read and write, literacy development is more an act of 'becoming someone' in our literate culture....The context of learning needs to receive at least as much attention as methods and materials" (p. 137-138).

Dialogue journal writing is one strategy that can help a tutor to take students and their experiences into account. Whether students focus on their own lives, and use dialogue writing to shape their thoughts about their experiences, or focus on school subjects, and use the journal writing to reflect on other people's ideas, as suggested by Fulwiler (1980), the dialogue journal writing can serve as a means of relating personal experiences and personal language to school learning. A tutor, as a senior partner in learning, can help the students to see beyond the written words to the context in which the words are used, to read the world along with the words, as Friere (1983; 1985) suggests is essential for literacy.

REFERENCES

Atwell, N. (1985). Writing and reading from the inside out. In J. Hansen, T. Newkirk, & D. Graves (Eds.), Breaking ground: Teachers relate reading and writing in the elementary school. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann Educational Books.

Barnes, D. (1975). From communication to curriculum. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

Berthoff, A. (1986). Reading the world...Reading the word: Paulo Freire's pedagogy of knowing. In T. Newkirk (Ed.), Only connect: Uniting reading and writing. Upper Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook.

Britton, J. (1970). Language and learning. Markham, Ont.: Penguin Books Canada.

Britton, J. (1977). The role of fantasy. In M. Meek, A. Warlow, & G. Barton (Eds.), The cool web: The pattern of children's reading. London: The Bodley Head.

Britton, J. (1984). Viewpoints: The distinction between participant and spectator role language in research and practice. Research in the Teaching of English, 18, 3, 320-330.

Calkins, L.M. (1986). The art of teaching writing. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann Educational Books.

Church, J. (1961). Language and the discovery of reality: A developmental psychology of cognition. New York: Random House.

Clay, M. (1975). What did I write? Aukland: Heinemann Educational Books.

Collins, C. (1985). The power of expressive writing in reading comprehension. Language Arts, 62, 1, 48-54.

Donaldson, M. (1978). Children's minds. London: Fontana Paperbacks.

Dyson, A.H. (1982). The emergence of visible language: Interrelationships between drawing and early writing. Visible Language, XVI, 4, 360-381.

Dyson, A.H. (1983). The role of oral language in early writing processes. Research in the Teaching of English, 17, 1, 1-30.

Freire, P. (1983). The importance of the act of reading. Boston Journal of Education, 165, 5-11.

Fulwiler, T. (1980). Journals across the disciplines. English Journal, 69, 9, 14-19.

Fulwiler, T. (1985). Writing and learning, grade three. Language Arts, 62, 1, 55-59.

Graves, D.H. (1984). A researcher learns to write. Exeter, N.H.: Heinemann Educational Books.

Goodman, K. (1986). What's whole in whole language? Richmond Hill, Ont.: Scholastic.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). Language as social semiotic. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Harding, D.W. (1972). The role of the onlooker. In A. Cashdan & E. Grugeon (Eds.), Language in education: A source book. London & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, in association with The Open University Press.

Harste, J.C., Woodward, V.A., & Burke, C.L. (1984). Language stories & literacy lessons. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann Educational Books.

Hayes, C.W. & Bahruth, R. (1985). Querer es poder. In J. Hansen, T. Newki[illegible] & D. Graves (Eds.), Breaking ground: Te[illegible]ers relate reading and writing in the elementary school. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann Educational Books.

Hipple, M.L. (1985). Journal writing in kindergarten. Language Arts, 62, 3, 255-261.

Hunt, R.A. (1987). "Could you put in lots of holes?" Modes of response to writing. Language Arts, 64, 2, 229-232.

Juliebo, M.F. (1985). The literacy world of five young children. Reading - Canada - Lecture, 3, 2, 126-134.

King, M. (1985). Presentation to fall meeting of the Northern Alberta Reading Specialists' Council, Edmonton, Alberta.

Kelly, G.A. (1963). A theory of personality: The psychology of personal constructs. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Kreeft, J. (1984). Dialogue writing - bridge from talk to essay writing. Language Arts, 61, 2, 141-150.

Malicky, G. (1985). The literacy world of five young children: Some further implications. Reading - Canada - Lecture, 3, 2, 137-138.

Martin, N. (1983). Mostly about writing: Selected essays by Nancy Martin. Upper Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook.

Mayher, J.S., Lester, N.B., & Pradl, G.M. (1983). Learning to write/writing to learn. Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook.

Meek, M. (1982). Learning to read. London: The Bodley Head.

Mikkelsen, N. (1985). Teaching teachers: What I learn. Language Arts, 62, 7, 742-753.

Moffett, J. & Wagner, B.J. (1983). Student-centered language arts and reading, K-13: A handbook for teachers. Third edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Murray, D.M. (1982). Learning by teaching. Upper Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook.

Murray, D.M. (1984). Write to learn. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Newman, J. (1984). The craft of children's writing. Richmond Hill, Ont.: Scholastic.

Newman, J. (Ed.). (1985). Whole language theory in use. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann Educational Books.

Pradl, G.M. (Ed.). (1982). Prospect and retrospect. Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook.

Pradl, G.M. & Mayher, J.S. (1985). Reinvigorating learning through writing. Educational Leadership, 42, 5, 4-8.

Reading the world and reading the word: An interview with Paulo Freire (1985). Language Arts, 62, 1, 15-21.

Rosen, H. (1969). A language policy across the curriculum: Introduction. In D. Barnes, with J. Britton, H. Rosen, & the London Association for the Teaching of English, Language, the learner and the school. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

Rosen, H. (1972). The language of textbooks. In A. Cashdan & E. Grugeon (Eds.), Language in education: A source book. London & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, in association with The Open University Press.

Sanders, M. (1986). One child's growth in literacy. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta.

Spradley, J.P. (1980). Participant observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Smith, F. (1981). Demonstrations, engagement and sensitivity: A revised approach to language learning. Language Arts, 58, 1, 103-112.

Smith, F. (1982). Writing and the writer. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Smith, F. (1983). Essays into literacy. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Smith, F. (1984a). Joining the literacy club. Victoria: Centre for the Teaching of Reading, in conjunction with Abel Press.

Smith, F. (1984b). Reading like a writer. Victoria: Centre for the Teaching of Reading, in conjunction with Abel Press.

Staton, J. (1985). Using dialogue journals for developing thinking, reading, and writing with hearing-impaired students. Volta Review, 87, 5, 127-154.

Staton, J., with Shuy, R., Kreeft, J., & Mrs. R. (1982). Analysis of dialogue journal writing as a communicative event. Final report. Vol. I. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C. National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C.

Summerfield, J.F. (1986). Framing narratives. In T. Newkirk (Ed.), Only connect: Uniting reading and writing. Upper Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Wells, G. (1981). Learning through interaction. Cambridge University Press.

Woolf, V. (1929). A room of one's own. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Yinger, R. (1985). Journal writing as a learning tool. Volta Review, 87, 5, 21-33.

APPENDIX A

PARENT APPROVAL FORM

February 3, 1986

I hereby give permission for _____ dialogue writing to be used in a research project in the Reading and Language Center.

_____

(Parent(s) signature)

APPENDIX B

SAMPLES OF DIALOGUE JOURNAL WRITING

Tim

Mar. 11

I woo up and ate my breakfast. then I went outside to play hockey to ll wewer ready to go to school. after school I went home and did my homework

This sounds like a more interesting day! At least you got to play hockey before school.

Phil

Feb. 25 208

Boy - nothing has worked today. I did some testing on a guy today who was talking forever. I ended up late for class, missed lunch and nearly forgot to get my daughter to her church group. The group is called 'messengers'. Have you ever heard of them? They are kind of like scouts.

Frank

21.20.86 ~~Jan~~ I am in a hockey drisind. 7 hau~~t~~ book are very good.

22,20-86 ~~I am~~ stoday at are hockey game we lost 4 2 we are having a brink sandgon day this week.

23.20 86 We are having a Wind game day on Wendday

Monday
I think that it is really funny that both you and I were writing about hockey! save dad

Pat

Thursday

Frank did I tell you that I have been visiting some schools to help student teachers? No I think of you every time I go to the Grade 5 class. They were talking about northern and southern areas of Canada. What do you enjoy about Social Studies? I don't enjoy anything

Friday

Is today the first day of your Spring Break? Rel. Hope that you will have a great holiday. Me to. It was so nice out that I went for a bike ride with my children! I just love the first bike ride of Spring! Have you had your bike out yet? Yes Is your acreage muddy? Here ment

- Allison

Thursday Feb 27

Hi!

Today we had ~~gym~~ gym and when we play bad mitten I lost and was cut out of the turniment. I didn't do much more that, Until I went to my tutorial.

I used to play badminton when I was in school too, Allison. Like you, I also lost and got put out of the tournament. But I still enjoyed the fun of playing! So do I.

fri Feb 28

Today when my mom took us to the nabors to get on the bus. My friend told me what was going to happen to her. Then when I got to school I did a lot of thing most of it work. Then when I went home I went to a friends place, to finsh my sience fair thing. When I came home my family was watching moves.

I didn't realise that you catch the bus at the neighbour's each morning. It's hard work to finish a project for the science fair, that's for sure! Well we got finished and had some fun to.

sat march 1

Today we sat around until 1'o'clock Then we went to see grandma. It was to let to go to bingo so we went to the hotel and I talk to grandpa about haveing the class come out to see the foxes.

Joan

Monday, March 3rd

Hello there, Allison,

Today has been a terrific day! Well, maybe not terrific, just great.

I went out to that school to test the little girl this morning Allison. I used your advice and it worked like magic! At first she was very nervous and shy, just for the first few minutes, so I talked with her like you suggested, explained the tests we'd be doing, and then told her all about how you felt too and she started to talk. As a matter of fact she got to be a regular chatterbox. So thanks to your good advice the testing went very well this morning. I really don't know what I'd do without you!

I'm very tired this evening because I stayed up nearly all night to write a paper. It's still all scratches and scribbles but I should get my second draft completed tonight. My thoughts about the topic are much clearer and better now.

You were right about the snow, Allison. It does seem to have disappeared very quickly. I'm afraid you won't be able to do any skiing with your class just yet. Not to worry. I'm sure we'll have some more snow before the end of March, because we usually do. I'll keep my fingers crossed for one more snowfall just for you and your class. I surely hope I might be able to go skiing.

I certainly hope you might be able to go skiing too, Allison.

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE TABULATION SHEETS

Tally Sheet for Content

Name:

Entries
Responses

Dimension & Categories	Week 1 .... Week 5**	Total	Notes
Subjects* School			
Home			
World Affairs			
Tutoring			
More than one			
Lang. Functions* Rep. genl. facts			
Rep. pers. facts			
Rep. opinions			
Maintaining dial.			
Explaining			
Request. info./actn.			
Exploring/reflecting			
Resp. to ques./comment			
Acknowledging			
Modeling			
Correcting			
More than one			
Amount Total T-units			
Ave. T/entry			
Total words			
Ave. wds./entry			
Ave. wds./T-unit			
Range (wds.)			
Continuity* Con. for 2 entries			
Con. more than 2			
Topic resurrected			
Con. in resp. to partner			

*Tallies of entries and responses that contain particular items.
**Tallies continue on a second sheet for weeks 6-10.

Summary Sheet for Content

Name:

Entries
Responses

Dimensions & Categories	Early Weeks*		Late Weeks*		Notes
	No.**	Percent	No.**	Percent	
Subjects*					
School					
Home					
World Affairs					
Tutoring					
More than one					
Lang. Functions*					
Rep. genl. facts					
Rep. pers. facts					
Rep. opinions					
Maintaining dial.					
Explaining					
Request. info./actn.					
Exploring/reflecting					
Resp. to ques./comment					
Acknowledging					
Modeling					
Correcting					
More than one					
Amount					
Total T-units					
Ave. T/entry					
Total words					
Ave. wds./entry					
Ave. wds./T-unit					
Range (wds.)					
Continuity*					
Con. for 2 entries					
Con. more than 2					
Topic resurrected					
Con. in resp. to partner					

*Early: first five weeks; late: last five weeks of journal writing.
**Total numbers of entries or responses tallied in each category.

Tally Sheet for Organization & Expression

Entries _____
Responses _____

Name:

Dimension & Categories	Week 1 ..... Week 5**	Total	Notes
Sentences Simple			
Compound			
Complex			
Comp.-Compl.			
More than one			
Vocabulary Abstract/figurative/ connotative terms			
Slang or jargon			
More than one			
Rhet. Devices Emphasis			
Interactnl. features			
More than one			
Org. Features Leads/Conclusions			
Transitions			
Indenting			
Dates			
More than one			

*Tallies of entries and responses that contain particular items.
**Tallies for weeks 6-10 recorded on a second sheet.

Summary Sheet for Organization & Expression

Name:

*Entries _____
Responses _____

Dimensions & Categories	Early Weeks*		Late Weeks*		Notes
	No.**	Percent	No.**	Percent	
Sentences Simple					
Compound					
Complex					
Comp.-Compl.					
More than one					
Vocabulary Abstract/figurative/ connotative terms					
Slang or jargon					
More than one					
Rhet. Devices Emphasis					
Interactnl. features					
More than one					
Org. Features Leads/Conclusions					
Transitions					
Indenting					
Dates					
More than one					

*Early: first five weeks; late: last five weeks of journal writing.
**Total numbers of entries or responses tallied in each category.

Tally Sheet for Mechanics

Entries _____
Responses _____

Name:

Dimension & Categories	Week 1 ..... Week 5**	Total	Notes
Sentence Structure Over 75% correct			
50%-75%			
Under 50%			
Punctuation Over 75%			
50%-75%			
Under 50%			
Capitalization Over 75%			
50%-75%			
Under 50%			
Spelling Over 75%			
50%-75%			
Under 50%			
Word errors			
Unreadable words			
"Good" errors			
Monitoring More than twice			
Once or twice			
None			
Appearance Letter size consistent			
Spacing consistent between words, lines			
Non-print features complementary			
Non-print features distracting			

*Tallies based on entries and responses (no. of entries or responses falling in each category, or containing a particular item).

**Tallies for weeks 6-10 recorded on a second sheet.

Summary Sheet for Mechanics

Entries _____
Responses _____

Name:

Dimensions & Categories	Early Weeks*		Late Weeks*		Notes
	No.**	Percent	No.**	Percent	
Sentence Structure Over 75% correct					
50%-75%					
Under 50%					
Punctuation Over 75%					
50%-75%					
Under 50%					
Capitalization Over 75%					
50%-75%					
Under 50%					
Spelling Over 75%					
50%-75%					
Under 50%					
Word errors					
Unreadable words					
"Good" errors					
Monitoring More than twice					
Once or twice					
None					
Appearance Letter size consistent					
Spacing consistent between words, lines					
Non-print features complementary					
Non-print features distracting					

*Early: first five weeks; late: last five weeks of journal writing.
**Total numbers of entries or responses tallied in each category.

APPENDIX D

TABLES SUMMARIZING DATA ON JOURNAL TEXTS

Table 3. Subjects Written About in Early and Late Entries and Responses

Subjects	Allison	Joan	Frank	Pat	Tim	Phil
(Entries)	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late
School	44%-69%*	65%-72%	26%-21%	32%-28%	83%-50%	36%-61%
Home	70-50	73-67	61-63	32-44	100-88	71-36
Tutoring	7-13	35-44	35-17	24-40	50-12	29-21
World Affairs	7-0	31-6	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0
More than one	33-31	81-67	17-0	0-16	100-38	71-18
(Responses)						
School	25-33	39-80	8-25	33-50	0-0	33-33
Home	45-56	64-47	42-40	17-25	38-0	67-58
Tutoring	10-17	14-7	58-35	50-38	63-0	33-9
World Affairs	20-6	7-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0
More than one	20-11	25-33	8-0	0-13	0-0	17-9

*Percentages based on entries and responses - i.e. percent of early and late entries and responses in which each subject is mentioned. (Early-late: first and last five weeks of journal writing.)

Table 4. Amount of Writing in Early and Late Entries and Responses

Amount Categories	Allison	Joan	Frank	Pat	Tim	Phil
(Entries)	Early-Late*	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late
Total T-units	171-107	482-302	37-32	97-121	25-58	217-168
Ave. T/entry	6.3-6.7	18.5-16.8	1.6-1.3	3.9-4.8	4.2-2.2	7.8-6
Total words	1409-928	5810-3221	199-194	991-1201	194-446	2006-1491
Ave.wds./entry	52.2-58	223.5-178.9	8.6-8.1	39.6-48	32.3-17.2	71.6-53.3
Ave.wds./T-unit	8.2-8.7	12.1-10.7	5.4-6.1	10.6-9.9	7.8-7.7	9.2-8.9
Range (wds.)	12 22 to - to 155 137	148 77 to - to 305 294	4 4 to - to 18 21	19 21 to - to 65 112	10 8 to - to 57 33	26 17 to - to 157 159
(Responses)						
Total T-units	37-30	116-51	23-36	17-16	14-0	19-31
Ave. T/response	1.9-1.7	4.1-3.4	1.9-1.8	2.8-2	1.8-0	3.2-2.6
Total words	333-267	1181-537	78-154	181-132	103-0	150-203
Ave.wds/response	16.7-14.8	42.2-35.8	6.5-7.7	30.2-16.5	12.6-0	25-16.9
Ave.wds./T-unit	9-8.9	10.2-10.5	3.4-4.3	10.7-8.3	7.4-0	7.9-6.6
Range (wds.)	6 6 to - to 33 38	16 19 to - to 142 76	1 1 to - to 18 28	16 6 to - to 66 51	2 to - 0 26	7 5 to - to 68 41

*Early: first five weeks of journal writing.
Late: last five weeks.

Table 5. Language Functions Evident in Early and Late Entries and Responses

Language Functions	Allison	Joan	Frank	Pat	Tim	Phil
(Entries)	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late
Rep.genl.facts	100%-100*	100-100	65-71	92-80	100-100	100-100
Rep.pers.facts	63-56	77-94	13-13	52-64	0-0	46-54
Rep. opinions	33-38	81-67	9-4	20-12	0-23	29-32
Maintaining dial.	4-13	31-61	17-0	12-40	0-0	21-18
Explaining	11-6	19-6	0-0	0-0	0-0	18-4
Request.info/actn.	0-0	69-28	13-13	64-84	0-0	21-14
Exploring/reflect	11-6	77-72	0-0	4-0	0-0	18-18
Responding	18-88	54-56	17-17	12-8	0-0	0-0
Acknowledging	0-0	23-44	0-0	8-24	0-0	14-18
Modeling	0-0	12-44	0-0	0-0	0-0	7-4
Correcting	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0
More than one	70-88	100-100	35-21	92-96	0-23	86-71
(Responses)						
Rep.genl.facts	15-17*	7-7	8-0	50-0	25-0	17-33
Rep.pers.facts	35-33	46-73	8-5	50-25	13-0	0-17
Rep. opinions	10-11	25-7	0-0	17-0	38-0	17-9
Maintaining	10-17	21-13	42-10	17-25	0-0	17-0
Explaining	0-6	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0
Requesting	0-17	39-67	17-0	67-75	0-0	67-92
Exploring/reflect	15-22	61-40	0-0	17-13	13-0	0-9
Responding	40-33	11-7	75-95	17-0	25-0	0-0
Acknowledging	20-17	29-40	0-5	17-13	0-0	17-0
Modeling	10-16	57-87	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0
Correcting	0-0	0-0	8-5	0-0	0-0	0-0
More than one	45-67	75-100	42-10	84-25	13-0	17-42

*Percent of entries and responses in which each language function was apparent. (Early-Late: first and last five weeks of journal writing.)

Table 6. Continuity of Subjects Written About In Early and Late Entries

Categories of Continuity	Allison	Joan	Frank	Pat	Tim	Phil
	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late
Con. for 2 entries	15%-6 *	0-39	9-13	4-4	0-4	18-21
Con. more than 2	0-0	0-6	0-4	0-0	0-0	4-4
Topic resurrected	11-38	50-50	17-8	28-44	0-0	32-29
Con. in response to partner	26-88	54-67	26-17	12-18	0-0	0-0

*Percent of entries falling in each category.

Table 7. Organizational Features of Early and Late Entries

Organizational Features	Allison	Joan	Frank	Pat	Tim	Phil
	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late
Leads, conclusions	85%-88%*	100-100	0-0	84-100	0-0	82-100
Transitions	67-69	84-100	0-0	5-20	100-65	21-57
Indenting	15-69	100-100	78-67	100-100	0-0	64-39
Dates	100-100	100-100	100-100	100-100	100-100	100-100
More than one	89-94	100-100	78-67	100-100	100-65	100-100

*Percent of entries containing particular features.
(Early-late: first and last five weeks of journal writing.)

Table 8. Types of Sentences Appearing in Early and Late Entries and Responses

Sentences	Allison	Joan	Frank	Pat	Tim	Phil
(Entries)	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late
Simple	96%-94%*	96-100	100-100	95-100	50-81	100-100
Compound	59-50	88-100	0-0	5-26	67-19	71-57
Complex	56-56	100-83	0-0	26-39	17-8	46-32
Comp.-Compl.	26-19	65-39	0-0	5-10	0-0	4-7
More than one	89-88	100-100	0-0	32-65	33-4	82-71
(Responses)						
Simple	85-67	89-73	100-95	83-89	88-0	100-100
Compound	20-17	19-13	0-5	17-0	25-0	17-0
Complex	20-22	64-80	0-14	50-10	0-0	17-0
Comp.-Compl.	0-6	19-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0
More than one	25-17	57-67	0-14	50-0	13-0	17-0

*Percent of entries and responses containing particular types of sentences.
(Early-late: first and last five weeks of journal writing.)

Table 9. Types of Vocabulary Appearing in Early and Late Entries and Responses

Vocabulary	Allison	Joan	Frank	Pat	Tim	Phil
(Entries)	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late
Abstract/ figurative/ connotative terms	74%-88%*	100-100	30-21	84-90	17-35	100-100
Slang or jargon	30-19	42-39	0-0	0-0	0-0	57-32
More than one	26-19	42-39	0-0	0-0	0-0	36-7
(Responses)						
Abstract/ figurative/ connotative terms	70-72*	96-87	45-53	100-33	75-0	33-67
Slang or jargon	10-17	7-7	0-5	0-0	0-0	17-8
More than one	5-11	7-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0

*Percent of entries and responses containing particular types of vocabulary.

Table 10. Rhetorical Devices Appearing in Early and Late Entries and Responses

Rhetorical Devices	Allison	Joan	Frank	Pat	Tim	Phil
(Entries)	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late	Early-Late
Emphasis	33%-19%*	73-67	0-0	21-45	0-4	46-46
Interaction features	48-44	100-100	30-4	89-90	0-0	36-32
(Responses)						
Emphasis	30-39	39-33	9-0	33-11	0-0	17-50
Interaction features	25-61	100-100	45-5	100-100	0-0	50-83

*Percent of entries and responses in which particular rhetorical devices appeared.
(Early-late: first and last five weeks of journal writing.)

Table 11. Performance Levels for Mechanics of Writing in Early and Late Entries

Performance Categories	Allison Early-Late	Frank Early-Late	Tim Early-Late
Sentence Structure Over 75% correct	89%-69%*	100-100	50-81
50% - 75%	11-31	0-0	0-8
Under 50%	0-0	0-0	50-11
Punctuation Over 75%	59-38	56-35	33-11
50%-75%	19-62	11-3	17-19
Under 50%	22-0	33-62	50-70
Capitalization Over 75%	63-75	56-59	17-4
50%-75%	37-25	27-24	66-58
Under 50%	0-0	17-17	17-38
Spelling Over 75%	100-100	39-35	83-70
50%-75%	0-0	50-52	17-30
Under 50%	0-0	11-13	0-0
Any word errors	15-38	39-28	50-35
Any unreadable words	7-13	22-10	0-0
Any "good" errors	100-100	67-69	83-92
Monitoring More than twice	63-56	0-7	67-92
Once or twice	26-31	89-62	33-4
None	11-13	11-31	0-4
Appearance Letter size consistent	93-88	100-96	33-42
Spacing consistent between words, lines	100-100	100-86	83-100
Non-print features complementary	Margins; happy face sign.	boxes around dates	Margins; double spacing
Non-print features distracting	-----	wavy lines around dates; often no margins	-----

*Percent of entries falling in particular categories.
(Early-late: first and last five weeks of journal writing.)

Table 12. Performance Levels for Mechanics of Writing in Early and Late Responses

Performance Categories	Allison Early-Late	Frank Early-Late	Tim Early-Late
Sentence Structure Over 75% correct	95%-94%*	100-95	100-0
50%-75%	0-0	0-0	0-0
Under 50%	5-6	0-5	0-0
Punctuation Over 75%	60-67	9-29	13-0
50%-75%	30-22	27-5	37-0
Under 50%	10-11	64-66	50-0
Capitalization Over 75%	70-72	55-62	50-0
50%-75%	30-22	18-19	37-0
Under 50%	0-6	27-19	13-0
Spelling Over 75%	90-78	55-52	63-0
50%-75%	10-22	36-43	37-0
Under 50%	0-0	9-5	0-0
Any word errors	15-0	45-19	0-0
Any unreadable words	0-0	0-0	0-0
Any "good" errors	70-83**	82-57**	62-0
Monitoring More than twice	10-6	0-5	50-0
Once or twice	45-38	45-43	13-0
None	45-56	55-52	37-0
Appearance Letter size consistent	100-100	100-100	25-0
Spacing consistent between words, lines	100-100	100-100	63-0
Non-print features complementary	yes	yes	yes
Non-print features distracting	-----	-----	-----

*Percent of responses falling in particular categories.

**Some responses contained no errors of any kind. Thus, the percentages do not fully reflect the high level of performance. Likewise, there was often no need to monitor, so the monitoring percents are low.