

2019 Wisconsin State Reading
Association Conference

February 7-9

*Observing Literacy Processing
Behaviors = Powerful Teaching*

Connie Briggs, Ph.D.
Texas Woman's University
cbriggs1@twu.edu

Father's New Game

P. 193

It was a cold winter day. Too cold for Mary and Susan to go outside. They wanted something interesting to do. They went to their father and asked if he would take them to a movie. He said, "I'm sorry, girls. Someone is coming to see why the washer isn't working. If you'll play by yourselves for a while, I'll think of a new game for you. But you must promise to stay in your room until I call you," "Okay," said Mary and Susan.

P. 194

Father wrote notes on pieces of paper and left them around the house. Each note gave a clue as to where to find the next note. Just as the person came to look at the washer, father called to them. "Mary, Susan, you can come out now!" Then he went into the basement.

P. 195

Mary and Susan came out of their room. They didn't see anything to play with. They thought that their father had forgotten to think of a new game for them to play. Then Susan noticed a piece of paper on the floor. She picked it up and read it aloud. "I'm cold but I give off heat. I'm light when I'm open but dark when I'm closed. What am I? Open me and you'll find the next clue." The girls walked around their house thinking. They came into the kitchen and looked around. "That's it!" yelled Mary. "The refrigerator!" She opened the door and found the next clue taped to the inside of the door. The girls were off again in search of the next clue. After an hour they had found five clues. The person who had fixed the washer was just leaving as Susan found the last clue. It read, "Nice job, girls. Let's go to a movie!"

Level: Two Narrative

Leslie, L. & Caldwell, J. (2001). Qualitative Reading Inventory-3. New York: Longman.

RUNNING RECORD SHEET

Name: _____ Date: _____ D. of B.: _____ Age: _____ yrs _____ mths

School: _____ Recorder: _____

Text Titles	Errors Running Words	Error Ratio	Accuracy Rate	Self-correction Ratio
Easy <u>Titch</u>	<u>5/21</u>	1: <u>24</u>	<u>95</u> %	1: <u>4</u>
Instructional _____	_____	1: _____	_____ %	1: _____
Hard _____	_____	1: _____	_____ %	1: _____

Directional movement

Analysis of Errors and Self-corrections

Information used or neglected [Meaning (M), Structure or Syntax (S), Visual (V)]

Easy M, S, and V used for most substitutions; one SC used Mand S and
 Instructional another used additional V information
 Hard _____

Cross-checking on information (Note that this behaviour changes over time)

Page	Title	Count		Analysis of Errors and Self-corrections	
		E	SC	Information used	
				E MSV	SC MSV
	<u>TITCH</u>				
	<u>✓✓✓</u>				
	<u>✓✓✓</u>				
	<u>✓✓ <u>bi- / ✓ / R</u> ✓</u> <u>bit</u>				
	<u>✓✓✓ <u>Peter</u></u> <u>Pete</u>	<u>1</u>			<u>(M)(S)(V)</u>
	<u>✓✓✓✓</u>				
	<u>✓✓✓ <u>gr- / ✓</u> ✓✓</u> <u>great</u>				
	<u>✓✓✓✓✓</u>				
	<u>✓✓✓✓✓✓</u>				
	<u>✓✓✓✓</u>				
	<u>✓ <u>fl- / ✓</u> ✓</u> <u>flew</u>				
	<u>✓✓✓</u>				
	<u>✓✓✓✓</u>				
	<u>✓✓✓</u>				
	<u>✓✓✓</u>				

WORKSHEET 1

Page		Count		Analysis of Errors and Self-corrections	
		E	SC	Information used	
				E MSV	SC MSV
	<p>✓✓✓✓ <u>pin-wheel</u> / ✓ <u>pinwheel</u></p> <p>✓✓ <u>had</u> ✓✓✓ <u>held</u></p>	1		(MSV)	
	<p>✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>✓✓✓✓</p>				
	<p>✓✓✓</p> <p>✓✓ <u>wooden</u> / SC ✓ <u>wooden</u></p>		1	M SV (MSV)	
	<p>✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>✓✓✓✓✓</p>				
	<p>✓✓ <u>had</u> ✓✓ <u>held</u></p>	1		(MSV)	
	<p>✓✓✓✓ <u>shovel</u> / sp- / SC <u>spade</u></p>		1	(MSV) (MSV)	
	<p>✓✓✓ - ✓ <u>fat</u></p>	1			
	<p>✓✓✓✓ <u>teeny</u> ✓ <u>tiny</u></p>	1		(MSV)	
	<p>✓✓✓✓</p> <p>✓✓</p> <p>✓✓</p>				
	<p>Read with expression and intonation. Mostly grouped words in phrases. Solved problems quickly.</p>	5	2	5	5 6 1 1 1

Planning for Group Instruction

Look at your records.

1. Verify group placement.
2. Check that the level of difficulty is contributing to successful reading (90% accuracy or above).
3. Think about phrasing and fluency from notes and records.
4. Look for patterns of responses based on analysis of errors and self-corrections.
5. Think about what the collective small group needs to learn next.

Plan for what needs to be learned next.

1. You may choose to teach a mini-lesson to the whole class or small group.
2. Tentatively regroup students who have similar needs to be addressed during instruction.

Reflect on a potential new book.

1. Will the book be appealing to the group?
2. What do you know about the children's reading behaviors and the book characteristics that will make for a successful first reading?
3. Does the book offer just the right amount of challenge to establish new competencies?

Prepare to introduce the text.

1. After reading the book to yourself, think about the aspects of the text you will have to make familiar to the children (M, S, VI). Think about meaning, tricky language structures, or words that will be difficult for students to analyze and work the recognition and rehearsal of those things into your book introduction.

Anticipate teaching support for individuals in the group.

1. Look at your running records for any patterns of responses in your students that may be problematic and that you anticipate will occur during instruction. Anticipate how you may teach or prompt in order to foster more efficient ways of problem-solving.

Assess.

1. Analyze running records for shifts in understanding.
2. Start with #1 again.

2019 Wisconsin State Literacy Convention

Observing Literacy Processing Behaviors = Powerful Teaching

Connie Briggs, Ph.D.
Texas Woman's University
Cbriggs1@twu.edu

References

Leader-directed Professional Development Resources:

- Sensitive Observation of Reading Behavior: Running Record, Part One
- Sensitive Observation of Reading Behavior: Analysis of Running Records of Text Reading, Part Two
- Sensitive Observation of Reading Behavior: Using Running Records to Make Teaching Decisions, Part Three.

Reading Recovery Council of North America www.rrcna.org

Articles:

Anderson, N. & Briggs, C. (2011). Reciprocity Between Reading and Writing: Strategic Processing as Common Ground. *The Reading Teacher* 64(7), 546-549.

Clay, M. M. (2004). Talking, Reading, & Writing. *The Journal of Reading Recovery* 3(2), 1-15.

Schwartz, R. M. (2005). Decisions, decisions: Responding to primary students during guided reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 58(5), 436-443.

Reciprocity Between Reading and Writing: Strategic Processing as Common Ground

Nancy L. Anderson, Connie Briggs

When we write, we read; when we read, we compose meaning. A wide body of research documents the reading–writing connection (see, e.g., Fitzgerald & Shanahan, 2000; Harste & Short, 1988; Pearson, 1990; Shanahan, 1980; Tierney & Pearson, 1983). Making this connection has important implications for all readers, and particularly for those who experience difficulty in learning to read and write.

Based on our work with children who struggle, we focus on reciprocal cognitive operations or strategies that draw on sources of knowledge used in both reading and writing (Clay, 1991; Rumelhart, 1994). These in-the-head decision-making or processing systems are what children use to make sense of how print works.

Our aim in this column is to explain teaching for reciprocity from a strategic processing perspective. We also provide some explicit language for teachers to use in helping children build common ground between reading and writing.

Writing for Readers Who Struggle

In an effort to make learning easier, educators often teach reading and writing as separate, sequential processes, with reading coming first. This denies children the opportunity to construct shared, powerful, strategic operations (Askew & Frasier, 1999; Boocock, McNaughton, & Parr, 1998; Chomsky, 1971). “When children are clearly getting left behind by their faster-learning classmates, it is very important to

work with reading and writing together” (Clay, 2001, p. 11). Struggling readers who do not have opportunities to write may struggle even more with literacy.

Children need to write for authentic purposes. In doing so, they move from ideas, to composing a message, to searching for ways to record their messages while monitoring their message production (Clay, 2001). Children need to become both author and audience by giving and receiving genuine responses that value their voices and choices. Through these interactions, they express themselves and construct identities (Dyson, 1997).

Reciprocity: Strategic Processing

What children do and say while reading and writing can provide evidence of their mental activity or higher order cognitive processing (Vygotsky, 1978). Close observations of young children learning to read reveal patterns of errors that provide a window into their strategic processing (Clay, 1991; Goodman & Goodman, 1994). Searching, monitoring, and self-correcting are strategic operations with particular significance for successful reading and writing (Clay, 2005). Searching is the mental action of seeking out information in print. Monitoring is checking on oneself throughout the process of reading and writing. Self-correcting means independently fixing one’s errors.

The cognitive processes used in reading are identical to those involved in writing (DeFord, 1994). As children read, they search, monitor, and self-correct

for and with meaning (semantics), structure (syntax), and graphophonic information (sound–letter–word patterns). As they write, children create social and imaginary worlds (Dyson, 1997), drawing on meanings in their lives (semantics). They use their oral language and knowledge of how writing in books and other texts sounds (syntax) to group words together and represent their meanings. They search for ways to express themselves using their knowledge of conventions of print and graphophonic information.

By observing the strategic activity of struggling learners while they read and write continuous text, common ground between reading and writing becomes evident. Table 1 presents examples of reciprocal processing behaviors that teachers may observe.

Teaching for Reciprocity

Explicit teaching to help students understand the reciprocal nature of reading and writing is a powerful tool for accelerating learning. To illustrate clear evidence of strategic, reciprocal processing, we share examples from John Paul (pseudonym), a first-grade student Nancy (first author) worked with in writing and reading.

Searching for Meaning

Writing. John Paul described how happy he was that it was his friend’s birthday. Nancy said, “Think about everything you said. You’re the author; what could you write about that?” John Paul orally composed “I like birthdays, and today is Brent’s birthday.” In composing, John Paul searched for meaning and structure to compose a message.

Reading. When he came to the sentence “The caterpillar was safe” in Beverley Randell’s (1995) *Hedgehog Is Hungry*, John Paul stopped at the word *safe*. His introduction to the book had provided him with an overview of the story, so he knew that the caterpillar was not going to be eaten. Nancy decided to help John Paul draw on his ability to search for meaning and structure. She asked, “Think about the story. What would make sense?” John Paul reread to search for meaning and then said, “Safe.”

In these examples, John Paul was able to search for meaning by drawing on his prior knowledge of the world and on information from and about the story. His teacher explicitly drew on meaning and structure as sources of information. Teachers often underestimate the power of language structure and default to graphophonic information. Struggling readers need

Table 1
Common Ground Between Reading and Writing

Strategic processing	Writer	Reader
Searching for meaning	Generates ideas with an audience in mind	Uses print to construct meaning
Monitoring for meaning	Checks that the message makes sense	Checks that the message makes sense
Searching for structure	Anticipates the order of words based on how book language and oral language sound	Groups words together in phrases to represent the intended message
Monitoring for structure	Checks the order of words supporting the intended message	Rereads (out loud or holding the message in the mind) to check that the word order communicates the intended message
Searching for graphophonic information	Uses knowledge of how letters, words, and print work to record the message	Seeks out graphophonic input from print in relation to meaning and structure
Monitoring for graphophonic information	Checks and detects any discrepancies between anticipated message and graphophonic input	Checks and detects that the print represents the message
Self-correcting	Detects and corrects	Detects and corrects

to recognize that their prior experiences and language are important sources of information they can use to search, monitor, and subsequently self-correct.

Searching for Graphophonic Information

Writing. Perhaps the most obvious process shared by reading and writing is searching for graphophonic information. When John Paul wanted to write the word *birthday*, he sounded /b/-/b/-/b/ before appealing to Nancy. Nancy said, "Say it slowly and think about what you would expect to see." John Paul searched for graphophonic information, slowly articulated the first part of the word, and wrote "brth." He then monitored his attempt, stopped, looked at Nancy, and said, "That doesn't look right." Then he self-corrected by inserting an *i*.

Reading. Returning to *Hedgehog Is Hungry*, John Paul came to the word *hungry* and stopped. To make reciprocity explicit, Nancy said, "Think about how you say words slowly in writing. That will help you in reading." John Paul then said "hun-gry," separating

the syllables as he searched for and located graphophonic information on the page. Nancy said, "Good work. You made that look right."

These examples show how John Paul was able to search in writing and reading for graphophonic information by linking phonological and orthographic information and then self-correcting.

Supporting Learning With Powerful Tools

Teachers need to use explicit language that helps children connect reading and writing. This language serves as a scaffold, supporting interactions with children and helping teachers to learn from observations of students. Table 2 presents parallel teaching moves for reading and writing and suggests specific language to use during small-group or individual instruction. The table serves as a starting point for reciprocity with children; it is not meant as a comprehensive list. As teachers interact with children and respond to them as readers and writers, they will create additional opportunities to support reciprocity.

Table 2
Teaching for Reciprocal Processing in Reading and Writing

Strategic process	Teaching reading	Teaching writing
Searching for meaning	(Based on genre, title, cover illustration, etc.), what is this story about? Think about the story. What would make sense?	Encourage genuine conversations. What do you want to say? What will the reader need to know?
Monitoring for meaning	Did that make sense?	Reread and check. Is that what you wanted to say?
Searching for structure	Reread and try something that would sound right.	You said.... What can you write about that?
Monitoring for structure	You said.... Can we say it that way?	Reread and check. Is that the way you want it to sound?
Searching for graphophonic information	What do you know about that word? Think about writing. What would the letters (or word) say if you were writing?	Say the word slowly and think about what would look or sound right.
Monitoring for graphophonic information	Try that again and make sure it looks right.	Run your finger underneath the word. Say it slowly. Does it look right?
Self-correction	You thought about the story and went back to make it look right. I like the way you are thinking.	You went back and decided the word wasn't quite right, and then fixed it. You were really thinking about your message.

Teaching reading and writing as reciprocal processes is a powerful tool for supporting struggling learners. Furthermore, making explicit connections to searching, monitoring, and self-correcting exponentially increases children's opportunities to develop parallel processes for reading and writing. As teachers explore this reciprocal relationship in the classroom, they will be surprised at how children learn more quickly as they begin to make connections (Clay, 2001; DeFord, Lyons, & Pinnell, 1991). When you teach reading and writing together, it is a two-for-one deal—a deal we simply cannot pass up.

References

- Askew, B.J., & Frasier, D. (1999). Early writing: An exploration of literacy opportunities. *Literacy Teaching and Learning*, 4(1), 43–66.
- Boocock, C., McNaughton, S., & Parr, J.M. (1998). The early development of a self-extending system in writing. *Literacy Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 41–58.
- Chomsky, C. (1971). Write first: Read later. *Childhood Education*, 47(6), 296–299.
- Clay, M.M. (1991). Reading errors and self correction behavior. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 39(1), 47–56, 69.
- Clay, M.M. (2001). *Change over time in children's literacy development*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M.M. (2005). *Literacy lessons designed for individuals. Part two: Teaching procedures*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- DeFord, D.E. (1994). Early writing: Teachers and children in Reading Recovery. *Literacy, Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 31–56.
- DeFord, D.E., Lyons, C.A., & Pinnell, G.S. (1991). *Bridges to literacy: Learning from Reading Recovery*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Dyson, A.H. (1997). *Writing superheroes: Contemporary childhood, popular culture, and classroom literacy*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fitzgerald, J., & Shanahan, T. (2000). Reading and writing relations and their development. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(1), 39–50. doi:10.1207/S15326985EP3501_5
- Goodman, Y.M., & Goodman, K.S. (1994). To err is human: Learning about language processes by analyzing miscues. In R.B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed., pp. 104–123). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Harste, J.C., & Short, K.G. (1988). *Creating classrooms for authors: The reading–writing connection*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Pearson, P.D. (1990). Foreword. In T. Shanahan (Ed.), *Reading and writing together: New perspectives for the classroom* (pp. v–vi). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- Rumelhart, D.E. (1994). Toward an interactive model of reading. In R.B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed., pp. 864–894). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Shanahan, T. (1980). The impact of writing instruction on learning to read. *Reading World*, 19(4), 357–368.
- Tierney, R.J., & Pearson, P.D. (1983). Toward a composing model of reading. *Language Arts*, 60(5), 568–580.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds. & Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Literature Cited

Randell, B. (1995). *Hedgehog is hungry*. Crystal Lake, IL: Rigby.

Anderson teaches at Texas Woman's University and tutors children in the Denton Independent School District in Denton, Texas, USA; e-mail nanderson@twu.edu. Briggs teaches at Texas Woman's University, Denton, USA; e-mail cbriggs1@twu.edu.

The department editors welcome reader comments. Connie Briggs teaches at Texas Woman's University, Denton, USA; e-mail cbriggs1@twu.edu. Catherine Compton-Lilly teaches at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA; e-mail comptonlilly@wisc.edu.

Copyright of Reading Teacher is the property of International Reading Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.