Chapter IV
Three Case Studies

This chapter presents three case studies of teacher/student dyads. These case studies reveal each student's development of independence as they moved along the path of learning to read and the teachers' interactions that supported this growth. Moreover, the cases provide a sense of the reading conversations that unfolded across the instructional program for each learner.

Dyad I: Pete and Liz

Pete and Liz comprised Dyad I. Pete was an African American student whose Observation Survey scores suggested strengths in text knowledge. (See Table 6.) He read a level 3 text at 93% accuracy but did not self-correct his miscues. He had limitations in letter and word knowledge indicated by Letter Identification and Dictation scores. His Concepts of Print score was high, and the Writing Vocabulary score was not unusual. He was a good candidate for the program. He needed help and indicated some knowledge of reading.

Table 6. Pete's September Observation Survey.

Letter ID	Word List	Concepts of Print	Writing Vocabulary	Dictation	Text Reading
38/54	0/20	14/24	2/open ended	2/27	3 93% nil sc
Note: These scores include Pete's score/ (and) total possible. Text Reading shows text level, percentage of success, ratio of self-correction					

Teachers are cautious about one assessment score and explore further. Before the first videotape session, Pete and Liz had spent two weeks Roaming Around in the Known (Clay, 1993b) by working together to explore what Pete knew, to get instructional routines worked out, and to find the best way to begin Pete's instruction. Pete was smiling and attentive with Liz. Pete liked to talk. He shared stories of his adventures with his mother, things his mother told him, and what he noticed during instructional tasks.

The Time I videotape session was of Pete in his second lesson of regular instruction. Liz, selected Painting, a level 3 book with strong picture support and only 24 words of text. The entire text is

> The baby painted the floor, and the wall, and the cupboard, and the table, and the chair, and the cat, and then Mom came in.

The phrases begin with the word *and* on six pages. Each page has a simple picture of the baby painting the object mentioned in the phrase on that page.

Liz began the book orientation by making and breaking the word "and" using magnetic letters. Pete practiced this activity. Next came the orientation conversation where Liz shared the book

with Pete. They looked through the pictures and discussed the story. Liz had Pete make predictions about the story events based on the pictures. A troublesome word was "cupboard" which Liz explored with Pete. A portion of the book orientation conversation is in Table 7. (See Appendix H for the entire transcript.

Table 7. Pete: Example Book Orientation, Time I, Painting.

Student	Teacher
Teaching Point: Teacher helps the student assemble "and" with lower case magnetic letters.	
	Can you do it in upper case, too?
Yes.	
Action: Student assembles the word in upper case letters.	
Teaching Point: Overview of text.	
	Action: Teacher picks up book and they both look at it. *Conversation:* Do you like to paint? This boy has paints at home and he is painting a picture. He is going to hang his picture. He looks about your age, doesn't he? And he has a baby in the house. Do you know what he forgot to do? (Points to picture)
What? (Looking at teacher)	
	He forgot to close up the paint when he went to hang his picture.
	Prediction question: What do you think the baby might do? (Points to picture)
Prediction (meaning): Get into the paint and spill it all over and get it on him. (Looking at picture)	
	He might do that or he might decide to paint things.
	Prompting Constructive Activity: Guess what he painted. (Points to picture)
What? (Looks at the teacher)	
	The floor. And he painted other parts of the house.

Pete's participation in the book orientation was limited to his short responses to Liz's questions. His final prediction is not supported by the illustrations. At the end of the exploration of illustrations he restated his prediction. (See Appendix D.)

During Pete's first attempt at reading, Liz helped Pete read continuous text by telling him the words on which he hesitated. Pete initially had trouble with the word "and." Liz had him reread the word and read it with him. When Pete missed "and" again, he self-corrected it. He had

difficulty with "and" several other times and self-corrected it before he got control of it. The last page was difficult for Pete so Liz did a shared reading of the page with Pete to support fluency, phrasing, meaning, and context. Pete's reading was slow and careful as shown in Table 8. (See Appendix I for complete transcript.)

Table 8. Pete: Example First Attempt, Time I, <u>Painting</u>.

Pete	Liz
Boy	He's baby
Paint	Painted with a linguistic explanation of the sentence.
Liz and Pete together: Baby painted	
The floor.	
Baby, (I mean not baby) and the wall, then...	AND
And baby (I mean not baby.) and the..	
	the what? Cupboard.

During the lesson, when Liz spoke Pete looked at her and smiled. Liz guided him verbally and by pointing for him to look at the text as she spoke. Liz questioned whether to help Pete learn to think about the reading process. Liz also showed Pete cues that might help him figure things out; like initial letters and their sounds for troublesome words, reading punctuation, and pointing to monitor his reading. Although Pete was unsure on the first attempt, the next day's running record was successful with no self-corrections. Pete had self-corrected "and" and "baby" on the first attempt and read them correctly on the running record as seen in Table 9.

Table 9. Pete: First Attempt and Running Record Scores, Time I, <u>Painting</u>.

Data Source	Errors	Error Rate	Accuracy	Self Correction Rate	Tolds
First Attempt	5	1.5	75%	Nil	6
Running Record	2	1.12	91%	Nil	0

Time II was videotaped on December 7. This session was 32 lessons later. The book <u>Go Back to Sleep</u> is more sophisticated than <u>Painting</u> and is a level 8. The interactions between Liz and Pete involved story meaning and the details of text. At one point Pete was concerned with his reading work and said, "But that should be 'reading' but it is not." Liz asked Pete to show her where he was. This conversation suggested that Pete was monitoring as he tried to integrate the meaning, structure, and visual aspects of reading. An interesting example occurred when Pete did not recognize the word "screamed." Liz did not tell him the word but prompted him to use the illustrations for meaning and visual information of initial letters as cues. (See Appendix J.) Table 10 lists Pete's scores for the new book first attempt and running record.

Table 10. Pete: First Attempt and Running Record Scores, Time II, <u>Go Back to Sleep</u>

Data Source	Errors	Error Rate	Accuracy	Self-Correction Rate	Tolds
First Attempt	6	1:12	89%	nil	0
Running Record	4	1:18	94%	1:5	0

Time III occurred on February 7, shortly before Pete was discontinued (graduated) from the program. Liz was offering higher-level texts and provided new instruction, as needed. Pete performed more of the reading task independently, including solving unexpected problems.

The new book was <u>Cow Up a Tree</u> and Pete introduced it to himself after a fast picture survey of the story. He discussed what he saw occurring in the illustrations and laughed at the pictures of a cow in a tree. When the cow got out of the tree, he speculated about how she got out of the tree. Liz pointed out an unknown word, "sulks," before the reading began. The reading scores are in Table 11.

Table 11. Pete: First Attempt and Running Record Scores, Time III, <u>Cow Up a Tree</u>.

Data Source	Errors	Error Rate	Accuracy	Self-Correction Rate	Tolds
First Attempt	18	1:9	89%	nil	0
Running Record	3	1:56	98%	1:2	0

Pete's program was summarized in Table 12. (See Appendix K.)

Table 12. Pete: Reading Recovery Program Record.

Lessons	Levels	Weeks	Miscues	Self-corrections	Tolds	Nil Responses	90% RR	100% RR
73	3-14	18	144	119	75	15/44	13	4

Pete's learning issues seemed to be related to the integration of the visual aspects of print, syntax, and the language of stories into the reading process. Liz had spent time explaining to him what cues to use to solve problems and how to think about the problems that occurred for him. First Liz focused instruction on the meaning of the story and the use of pictures to support meaning. Liz always considered visual information like initial letter/sound relationships. In time, the visual became more demanding, and Pete learned to consider meaning, visual, and syntax that became easy for him to integrate into the task. Pete provided examples of how he thought about his reading problems by thinking out loud as he attempted to solve them. In Time II, Pete could not

get "screamed." He started to say "said," but caught himself and said "yelled." He knew the visual cue did not match but needed Liz's help to expand his choices. Finally, he did say "screamed."

In the course of Pete's school year, he took the Observation Survey three times. These assessment results are recorded in Table 13.

Table 13. Pete: Observation Survey Scores.

Time	Letter ID	Word List	Concepts of Print	Written Vocab	Dictation	Text Reading*		
						A	B	C
Time I September	38/54	0/20	14/24	2/open	2/37	3	93%	nil
Time II February	54	17	21	43	34	12	95%	1:2
Time III June	**	**	**	48	34	14	95%	1:2
*Text reading scores include the A: text level, B: the percent of accuracy, and C: the self-correction ratio. ** Letter ID, Word List, and Concepts of Print not offered in June assessment that year.								

Peter began Reading Recovery after being identified in the lowest 10% of his classroom. He knew some things about reading, such as most of his letters and more than half of Clay's (1993a) identified Concepts about Print. He also read a level three book without self-correction of miscues. In terms of words, he had few sight words, wrote two known words, and sounded two words while writing a dictated sentence.

The teacher/student interactions provided scaffolding for Pete as he read. In the beginning Liz stressed story meaning and guided Pete to read continuous segments of text. Later Liz stressed increased use of visual cues while maintaining a focus on meaning and sentence structure. Liz fostered Pete's independence by teaching him reading strategies like cross-checking meaning and visual information to independently monitor his reading, self-correct, and know when his solutions were correct. She fostered Pete's control of his reading task by praising him for his successes. By the time he was discontinued, Pete could discuss what he did, monitor his reading, and self-correct reading miscues.

All of these activities occurred during normal individualized Reading Recovery lessons. The data were collected from videotapes and routine program documentation. The fostering of student independence produced a student who maintained independence after being discontinued from Reading Recovery. This was confirmed by Pete's June Observation Survey scores, which indicated reading progress after Reading Recovery lessons ended. This indicated that he could learn on his own (Clay, 1993b).

Dyad II: Bill and Nell

Bill was an African American student who had difficulty focusing on the lessons at the beginning of instruction. His teacher, Nell, found ways to establish intersubjectivity and a positive relationship with him. Nell taught Bill to remember other texts and lessons, to link knowledge, and enhance his memory for words, phrases, and ideas that were needed in current lessons. Sometimes Bill would stop reading to tell Nell about a word he was reading that was like one he remembered from another book. Bill also often said he was going to put the letters in his mouth to sound out a difficult word.

Nell told Bill she knew he was smart and was a reader. Bill's classroom teacher had him screened for ADD (Attention Deficit Disorder) because of his difficulties dealing with classroom expectations. Bill's classroom problems affected his Reading Recovery lessons when Bill was sent to the office at the time lessons were scheduled. He also missed parts of other lessons due to assemblies, snow days, and other school occurrences.

Bill had a visual problem evidenced by moving his head so close to the text that his nose almost touched the page. Nell recorded concerns about his vision on her lesson plan sheet several times. Bill got glasses, but he was not observed with glasses during the videotaped lessons. Nell did not mention lack of glasses as an issue.

Bill also had a constant runny nose and needed tissues during two of the videotaping sessions. The teacher minimized the interruptions by having tissues and a wastebasket at the instructional table. Bill rocked in his chair continually during early lessons. Nell held his chair in place and proceeded with the lesson without comment during the first two videotaping sessions. Bill often doubted that he could read the books given to him. Nell prompted with phrases like: "You are right you know," "I know what you are thinking," and "Keep going." She also chatted with Bill about the books they were reading. Nell was always cheery, conversational, and positive with Bill regardless of what he might do.

During the Roaming Around in the Known phase, Nell had taken opportunities to firm up things Bill knew, develop routines for future lessons, and learn how Bill learned best. Before the new book orientation and first attempt occurred, Nell showed Bill how to make "can" and "can't" with magnetic letters.

Time I videotaping occurred on October 13. This lesson was scheduled for two days after Roaming Around in the Known. For the new book orientation, Nell presented a level 4 book, I Can Jump, with language pattern and picture support. The orientation went smoothly and Bill read the text easily. Table 14 provides a brief example from that first attempt. This example includes a self-correction and Bill's going to another book to point out a recognized word. Nell commented after the reading that the book was too easy for Bill who scored 100% with a 1:1 self-correction rate.

Table 14. Bill: Example First Attempt, Time I, I Can Jump.

TEXT: I can run said the spider. I can't jump said the snail. I can fly said the butterfly.	
Bill	Nell
I can run said the grass/spider I can't run said the snail I can fly said the I know something Reaching for another book "I can fly" and "I can fly."	
	Good remembering. Good for you. It does say the same thing.

Time II was at lesson 32 on December 6. The book orientation went smoothly. When it was time for Bill to read, he expressed his attitude as he read the title Going Shopping in a silly voice and said, "This one is hard." "This one is hardy bears." Nell maintained the routine and got him back on task. Although Bill read correctly, he evaluated himself as incorrect.

This was a difficult lesson for Bill and for Nell. It was the longest first attempt recorded during the study. Bill exhibited avoidance behaviors, his nose ran constantly requiring regular pauses for tissues, he rocked in his chair continually while Nell held the chair, and he kept his face almost on the text as he tried to read. This was a critical lesson for Bill because although he was trying to avoid the task, Nell refused to give in to his difficult behaviors. This type of lession did not occur again. Bill seemed to be working so hard on individual words that he did not finish sentences, as shown in Table 15. Although Bill had problems with this text in the first attempt, the next day Bill's running record was 94% with a 1:2 self-correction rate.

Table 15. Bill: Example First Attempt, Time II, Going Shopping.

TEXT: One day in the school holidays my family went shopping in town.	
Bill	Nell
One day in the school holidays my family went shopping	
	Point to the word you are working on.
But I knew that.	
	You got it right. This is shopping. Let's finish the sentence.

For Time III, on February 17, Bill was near the end of his program. He was working in level 14 and 15 books. In this session, distracting behaviors were generally replaced with reading work. He introduced Help Me to himself. Nell explained the word "gnawed" to him before the reading began. He had problems with "who" and "help." He repeatedly corrected "Mr." after he missed it before "Lion." Bill also overrode the text with anticipated language. Bill discussed the story as he read. He could do the reading work that the story presented to him. The format with text and

illustrations merged was difficult for him as can be seen from his results in Table 16.

Table 16. Bill: Example First Attempt, Time III, <u>Help Me</u>.

TEXT: Who can get me out? YYI want to get out.	
Bill	Nell
Who can get me out? (Back to the beginning) Grrr said the, said Mr. Lion. I don't think I will be able to read this.	
	You are doing a great job.
After confusion caused by format of story.	
said Mr. Lion. Can, I can't get you. I can't get out. I know. I, I think this one sounds like out.	
	Does it? Ok, keep going.
Out, said for, (I don't know.)	
	Did you get it?
Oh yes, I can't get out of here. Yes.	
	Good job!

Bill gained flexibility and learned to use visual cues to solve reading miscues. He had a strong sense of story and remembered what he was told to the point that often his errors were phrases not single words, and rereading quickly resolved the miscues. This rereading to monitor was both useful for self-correction and a problem because it interfered with fluency. Nell repeatedly recorded a lack of fluent reading on the lesson plans until near the end of his program. A summary of Bill's program follows in Table 17.

Table 17. Bill: Example Reading Recovery Program Record.

Lessons	Levels	Weeks	Miscues	Self-corrections	Tolds	Nil Responses	90% RR	100% RR
74	B-16	21	198	324	138	5/44	5	4

The increases in writing vocabulary suggested that Bill continually learned new words although his word list score for sight vocabulary was low. Bill had learned to read in spite of problems with attention to task, lack of confidence, and health issues. Bill's Observation Survey scores are provided in Table 18.

Table 18. Bill: Observation Survey Scores.

	Letter ID	Word List	Concepts of Print	Written Vocab	Dictation	Text Reading*		
						A	B	C
Time I September	42/54	0/20	12/24	3/open	9/37	B†	100%	nil
Time II February	53	13	22	80	31	14	94%	1:2
Time III June	**	**	**	90	37	164	96%	1:3
*Text reading scores include the A: text level, B: the percent of accuracy, and C: the self-correction ratio. ** Letter ID, Word List, and Concepts of Print not offered in June assessment that year. †B = Some print awareness recorded (Can do a word/print match in text.)								

Originally, Bill knew most of his letters, scored well on Clay's Concepts of Print assessment, and successfully wrote a fourth of the dictation words and sounds. He had difficulty with the word test, and pointed to the word "no" in the text reading assessment. Bill began within the lowest 10% for academic performance in his classroom and he had discipline issues. He also did not see himself as a reader, as evidenced by his continual complaint that the reading work was too hard or that he could not do it.

In Time I, after the successful reading of <u>I Can Jump</u>, Nell had Bill write "can" on the chalk board. He had difficulty remembering it so she and Bill practiced it with "can't" to repeat what he had done with the magnetic letters. Then they worked for the flexibility of being able to generate the word with chalk. In Time II, Nell's scaffold of Bill's confusion helped him read the text. Nell taught new strategic behaviors to replace earlier frustrations. In Time III, some of Bill's earlier doubts of his ability persisted but Nell was able to help him overcome them. As reading improved, behaviors like rocking the chair and putting his head almost on the book to read decreased or disappeared.

It took a long time for Bill to apply any information effectively. Because of his difficulties with focusing on print while reading, he seemed to read phrases rather than words. When he noticed a mismatch between what he said and what he saw, he would self-correct whole phrases rather than words. This reading behavior caused a lack of fluency in reading, which improved late in his instructional program. Later visual cues helped self-corrections, and fluency improved but he was often a "messy" reader, doing excessive rereading or dialoguing about what links he was establishing to read accurately. He had control of his reading when he was discontinued. (See Appendix L.)

Dyad III: Sue and Gwen

Sue came into the program with the low Observation Survey scores and knew only 30 of the 54 letters expected on the Letter Identification section. She was verbal and seemed to enjoy being with Gwen. Sue did not know how to talk about the stories or lessons. Her Concepts of Print score was higher than her other assessment scores. She was generally unsure about the task before her and was unsuccessful on the text reading section of the survey. Gwen spent time checking what she knew and explaining things to her.

Before the Time I videotaping session on October 20, Gwen and Sue had completed eight lessons after two weeks of Roaming Around in the Known. Gwen had observed how Sue worked on reading tasks and then established some tasks and routines for future lessons. Sue's Time I book was Homes. This book contains a strong pattern and a series of pages where different animals and their homes are introduced. During the book orientation, Gwen shared the pictures and discussed the animals and their homes with Sue. Gwen taught the word "this," reminded Sue of the word "is," and explained the "pig" part of "guinea pig." During the first attempt, Sue had problems with "is," "home," and "guinea," as shown in Table 19. Her halted beginning suggested that she was unsure of the task.

Table 19. Sue: Example First Attempt, Time I, Homes.

TEXT: This is a home for a bird. This is a home for a dog. This is a home for a guinea pig.	
Sue	Gwen
This is?	
	Let's see if it works. This
This is a	
	Teacher and Student: home
for a bird. This is a home for a dog	
	Did that make sense?
(Shaking head yes) This is a home for a	
	guinea
A guinea pig	

Time II on December 2 was during lesson 30. The session exhibited good interaction. Sue was working hard. Then Gwen said, "Now, we are going to do your new book." Sue said, "Oh, no!" Gwen ignored the comment and the lesson progressed smoothly. The book Good for You contained 44 words and was a level 5. It did not have a story format but offered an inconsistent language pattern and a series of things that are good for people such as fresh air, games, and hugs. Sue was delighted to find her favorite character, Huggles, in the story. Linguistically the book was hard for Sue. When the pattern switched from "is" to "are," she was confused. Another linguistic problem was "else" seen in Table 20.

Table 20. Sue: Example First Attempt, Time II, <u>Good for You</u>.

Sue	Gwen
What, what, This is not what else.	
	Try it and see. That might be a good try. What
What else is good for you?	
	Are they asking you a question?
Yeah.	
	Do we say things like what else is good for you?

Time III on March 23 showed a more confident Sue who enjoyed reading the new book as evidenced by her smiles and conversation as she compared the experiences in the text to her own life. It was a big transition from the difficulties Sue had getting started in Time I. The book <u>The Loose Tooth</u> was the selection. Gwen began the orientation by reminding Sue of the loose tooth she had recently had. Sue joined in the orientation and took it over. Table 21 shows the teaching necessary for Sue to do her first attempt of reading the text. Sue prompted from least supportive to most supportive.

Table 21. Sue: Example First Attempt, Time III, <u>The Loose Tooth</u>.

Text: I showed it to my dad and he said it will come out soon.	
Sue	Gwen
I said it to my dad	
	You need to be checking. Go back and check carefully.
I said it to my dad.	
	And what does "said" begin with?
Sh	
	Say "said" "said"
Said. It starts with an "s."	
	Starts with an "s." Do we have an "s" here?
Yeah	
	But no, we don't. What do we have?
	Sh , that's different than "s," isn't it? Well, how do you get your mouth ready for "sh"?
Sh	
	I . . .
Sh	
I showed it to my dad to, too and he said it will come out soon.	

Sue went from level A to level 14. Her reading fluency was good though it was hard for her to learn to integrate cues. Initial letter/sound relationships helped her when meaning and structure were clear to her. Early word work included the letters "f" and "I." Some words were hard to remember. Table 22 summarizes her lessons.

Table 22. Sue: Reading Recovery Program Summary.

Lessons	Levels	Weeks	Miscues	Self-corrections	Tolds	Nil Responses	90% RR	100% RR
88	A-14	22	139	161	214	18	15	4

The Observation Survey scores showed Sue's growth from September to June after Reading Recovery instruction had ended in Table 23.

Table 23. Sue: Observation Survey Scores.

Time	Letter ID	Word List	Concepts of Print	Written Vocab	Dictation	Text Reading*		
						A	B	C
Time I September	30/54	0/20	8/24	2/open	2/37	A†	-	-il
Time II February	52	14	19	40	34	12	92%	1:2
Time III June	**	**	**	49	36	14	90%	1:5
*Text reading scores include the A: text level, B: the percent of accuracy, and C: the self-correction ratio. ** Letter ID, Word List, and Concepts of Print not offered in June assessment that year. †A = No print awareness recorded (Not able to do a word/print match in text.)								

Sue began her instruction with limited story, letter, and word knowledge. Gwen spent some instructional time explaining basic concepts of the world to her. Sue was slow to initiate discussion about using strategies.

Gwen tried to bring words, stories, and strategies to Sue right from the beginning. Sue read fluently and attempted reading work that Gwen questioned for in ways intended to help Sue think about how and why to use reading strategies. Sue and Gwen began on low-level books and were on level 5 in December for the Time II session. Sue rarely articulated her thinking, if not questioned by Gwen, as she solved reading problems. She did not verbally share her mental progress in self-correcting and monitoring. The dialogue within the dyad was generally Sue read, miscued, while Gwen monitored and prompted. The problems with "said" for "showed" in the Time III session indicated how Gwen worked to initiate strategy work with Sue. The rest of the

book went smoothly.

Sue became independent as a reader as shown by her monitoring of "what else" in Time II, self-correction, reading, and rereading and the self-orientation in Time III. Sue needed intentional fostering to be independent and to be an independent reader. Gwen used tolds to build text fluently. (See Appendix M.)

Synopsis

The three teacher/student dyads presented were both unique and similar. The students were similar because each student had difficulty trying to understand reading. Their assessment scores showed similar low scores, yet the needs of the students differed. The lowest students are often more different from each other than similar (Clay, 1991a). This is because these students incorporated clear information, some misconceptions, and numerous confusions that they could not correct on their own. They were often aware that their efforts were not successful yet they tended to practice their confusions. Therefore, they needed reflective instruction to help them correct their behaviors and perceptions.

During the instructional program each student learned to be an independent processor of text. Each was able to discover and correct miscues. Each was an engaged, empowered reader when their tutorial program ended. They liked to read and felt they could. The lessons were interactive with a partnership focused on figuring out what the books said and meant. The teachers modeled or taught the behaviors they expected from the students. In the process, the students became independent as well as successful readers. These dyads provided powerful examples of ways to foster students' independence. The transcripts of the dyads showed how students with unique problems learned to be independent average readers.