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ABSTRACT

Scaffolding Literacy Knowledge Within a One-On-One Tutoring Situation:
An Ethnographic Study

by

Diane K. Brantley

Dr. Maria J. Meyerson Committee Chair
Professor of Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The primary purpose of this study was to explore and describe the culture of tutoring to determine if America Reads Challenge (ARC) tutors were able to provide elementary school tutees with scaffolded literacy learning experiences. Three main educational theories formed the framework for this study: sociocultural theory of cognitive development, scaffolding, and activity theory. Relevant research related to the efficacy of tutoring programs also was included. The overarching research design was an ethnographic methodology that included the collection of video tape, followed up with informal interviews to substantiate the findings with the two tutoring dyads.
Subsequently, the data was analyzed, categorized, and described in a narrative format. Significant verbal interactions were placed on etic grids for more in-depth analysis. Similarities and differences across and within the tutoring dyads were identified and discussed.

Eight literacy strategy domains were constructed and remained stable across the tutoring dyads. Both tutors demonstrated an ability to provide their tutees with scaffolded literacy learning experiences, increasing and decreasing the amount of instructional support as needed.

Based on the findings, it is recommended that literacy tutors participate in thorough and ongoing training in the eight strategy domains identified in this study. Also, tutors need explicit instruction geared towards providing tutees with appropriately scaffolded learning experiences. While the findings of this study cannot be generalized to all situational contexts, other literacy tutoring programs may benefit from learning how university literacy tutors deliver instruction to needy students.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

According to the U.S. Census Bureau and the U.S. Center for Children in Poverty (1992), there is a direct relationship between levels of education and poverty. Children whose parents did not earn a high school diploma were twice as likely to live in poverty as children whose parents had completed high school. Children of poverty were also more likely to do poorly in school and less likely to graduate from high school themselves, leading to a cycle of intergenerational poverty (Philliber, Spillman & King, 1996).

Because of these alarming statistics, increased interest in early intervention and family literacy programs has developed over the past 20 years. While these interventions may take various forms such as Reading Recovery (Pinnell, 1997) and Success For All (Slavin, R.E., Madden, N., Karweit, N., Livermon, B., & Dolan, L., 1990), one-on-one tutoring has emerged as a viable tool in the effort to teach children how to
read. In a meta-analysis of 65 quality tutoring programs, promising achievement results were found across all of the published studies (Cohen, Kulik, & Kulik, 1982). Not only have academic gains been found to result from tutoring, many studies have found positive effects on the children's reading confidence, and motivation levels as well as their levels of efficacy in relation to reading (Cohen, et al., 1982; Lepper & Chabay, 1988; Topping & Whitely, 1990; and Merrill, 1995).

Despite a variety of research citing that tutoring promotes positive effects, few studies have focused on the precise reasons for its success (Cobb, 1998). Wasik and Slavin (1993) found that one-on-one instruction alone could not account for the academic gains made by children receiving individualized tutoring. Shanahan (1997) noted that tutoring programs generally led to small academic gains which surpassed achievement made through regular classroom instruction alone, but stated that tutoring in no way guarantees increased learning. In fact, Shanahan found that if the tutoring program is of poor quality, it can actually lead to lower academic gains for children.

Previous research studies have led me to question what separated more successful tutoring programs from less successful programs. Over the last 20 years, most researchers
have chosen to focus their efforts on the discrepancies in the achievement outcomes of children involved in the tutoring programs (Morris, Shaw & Perney, 1990; Vellutino, Scanlon, Sipay, Small, Pratt, Chen, & Denckla, 1996), rather than investigating why these discrepancies exist within the frameworks of the specific tutoring programs. If any speculations are made, researchers often focus on the initial cognitive differences among the children in the study instead of examining the nature of the instruction within the tutoring programs themselves (Shanahan, 1997). Juel (1996), however, attempted to document the instructional choices made by tutors in an effort to explain the outcome differences associated with one-on-one tutoring. She found that “the most successful tutors seemed (with minimum training from their instructors) to engage in scaffolded interactions” (p. 284). Juel attributed the variations in the children’s achievement to differences within the tutoring dyad itself, rather than to the initial differences in the abilities of the children.

Juel’s study opened an important dialogue on what I will call the “culture of tutoring;” the practices, routines, instructional and interpersonal discourses, activities, and behaviors exhibited during a tutoring session between a tutor and a tutee. By shifting the research focus from the
achievement levels and academic outputs of tutees to the tutoring situation itself, researchers are able to delve into the dynamics and interactions taking place between a tutor and a tutee to determine why tutoring works better for some children than for others.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to explore and describe the culture of tutoring in an attempt to determine if tutors were able to provide tutees with scaffolded learning experiences. Juel (1994) concluded from her study of tutoring that, “It is clearly the interaction between the academic activities and the social context of the tutoring situation that yields positive results” (p. 60). With this being said, it is imperative that researchers explore the dynamics of the tutoring situation at a micro-level in order to describe the relationships between the academic activities and the social context of the tutoring situation. Though this close examination of instructional practices and social interaction, it may be possible to develop more effective tutor training programs in the future.

The present research study built upon Juel’s findings and attempted to expound upon them by studying the culture of tutoring within a specific America Reads Challenge (ARC)
literacy tutoring program. In total, this study sought to paint an overall picture of the intricacies of a one-on-one tutoring situation.

This work contributes to the growing field of literacy research in several ways. First, it adds to the existing body of knowledge of one-on-one tutoring as an early intervention for young children struggling with reading. Second, it provides a window into the dynamics of a tutoring session by clearly delineating the practices and routines being utilized by literacy tutors. Third, it contributes to an understanding of what makes a tutoring session effective for children. Finally, it reinforces the need for a strong training program for individuals interested in becoming literacy tutors.

Research Questions

In order to describe the culture of tutoring accurately, the following questions guided the research study:

1. What practices and routines are present in a one-on-one literacy tutoring situation?

Implicit in this question is the understanding that the culture of the tutoring situation is described in detail including the discourse between the tutor and the tutee, the proximity of the tutor and tutee to each other during a session, the location
of the tutoring situation, the activities and materials being utilized, and the routines that occur within each session. In addition, the behaviors exhibited by the tutor and tutee throughout each session were considered.

2. What are the similarities and differences in these practices and routines across and within the tutoring dyads?

This question focused on the analysis of the similarities and differences both within and across the tutoring dyads. An attempt was made to describe effective literacy tutoring practices and literacy strategies in order to provide future tutors with a research-based training program.

3. Are tutors able to scaffold the literacy lessons in order to best meet the needs of the tutees? How does scaffolding manifest itself within the culture of tutoring?

Juel (1996) stated that the most successful tutors were able to scaffold learning appropriately for the tutee. Specifically, this study sought to ascertain what “appropriate scaffolding” would entail within the culture of tutoring. This question not only addressed the concept of scaffolding but also sought to delineate what specific tutoring practices and routines are most likely to help tutors to scaffold learning appropriately. The function of language use and nonverbal communication patterns were also addressed within this question.
Theoretical Framework for the Study

Human learning and development are complex processes that are difficult to understand without developing a rich understanding of the participants and the social context in which the learning takes place. In order to delve more deeply into the processes involved in learning and development, it is necessary to understand the interactions, discourses, learning activities, and situational contexts in which the interactions take place. This study attempted to make visible the process of learning, and more specifically, the process of learning to read within a one-on-one tutoring situation. The following two theories supported an expanded and holistic approach to the study of human learning and cognitive development: Sociocultural Theory of Cognitive Development and Activity Theory. While sociocultural theory formed the foundation for the study, activity theory provided a lens through which to view and understand the interactions that took place between the tutors and tutees within the confines of their tutoring sessions (Vygotsky, 1978; Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976; Wertsch, 1984; Engestrom & Middleton, 1996; Leont’ev, 1978; Rogoff, 1990).

Sociocultural Theory

"Vygotsky claimed that human development is relational. It consists of internal consciousness as well as external..."
behaviors, cognitive processes as well as social ones. Social context and other human beings play a vital role in the cognitive growth of the individual” (Jennings & Di, 1996, p. 78). An important aspect essential to this theory of cognitive development is the role of the learner in the learning process. The learner becomes an active agent, capable of assisting in, and eventually taking over, the learning process.

Within this theoretical construct, optimal instruction involves the co-construction of knowledge in a social situation between the learner and a more knowledgeable peer or adult. The instruction advances ahead of the learners’ present level of functioning and leads into what he or she would be unable to do alone. This instructional area has been called The Zone of Proximal Development or ZPD (Vygotsky, 1962).

One of the primary goals of any tutoring program should be to provide the tutees with appropriate and relevant reading instruction within their ZPD. Optimally, through this process of co-constructing knowledge, tutors scaffold the tutees’ learning experiences, gradually transferring the responsibility for learning to the tutees. Once the knowledge has been internalized, the high level of tutor support can begin to fade. As the responsibility for learning is completely transferred to the tutees, tutors then can direct tutees toward new learning goals.
The process of scaffolding consequently begins to repeat itself (Wood, Bruner and Ross, 1976).

To determine whether tutors in this study were able to scaffold their tutees’ learning, it was necessary to develop a deep understanding of the culture of tutoring. In order to do this, the tutoring situation was studied holistically taking into consideration the learning practices and routines, the interactions between the tutors and tutees, the discourse that took place within the tutoring sessions, and the context of the tutoring situations. Two tutoring dyads were studied using an ethnographic descriptive methodology. The results then were compared across and within the tutoring dyads in an attempt to identify the factors that made up the culture of tutoring.

Activity Theory

A second theoretical framework that guided this study was Activity Theory (Engestom & Middleton, 1996; Leont’ev, 1978; Rogoff, 1990). Activity theory is based upon the works of Vygotsky and other Russian researchers. It supports the tenet that cognitive development results from the social interactions between a child and a more knowledgeable mentor; however, activity theory places much more emphasis on the interactions and activities taking place within the learning situation.

Leont’ev (1978) further elaborated on the works Vygotsky
by stating that “a new unit of analysis is needed to carry out the Vygotskian enterprise” (p. 199). Rather than focusing on academic outcomes related to skill acquisition, Leont’ev believed it was imperative to devise a completely unique unit of analysis that was more reflective of Vygotsky’s theories of cognitive development. It was at this time that Leont’ev proposed the concept of utilizing activity as the appropriate measure of cognitive development.

Activity theory, therefore, views human development in dynamic terms and places its emphasis on the activity that takes place between at least two people within a specific social context. According to Davydov & Radzikhovskii, (1985), it is the “activity that determines the genesis, structure, and contents of the human mind” (p. 57). The activities become overt manifestations of the internal processes occurring at a specific moment in time (Dixon-Krauss, 1996; Rogoff, 1990). Leont’ev stipulated that the first step in analyzing activity had to involve a series of informal naturalistic observations from which initial inferences could be made. These inferences then would need to be verified through formal or informal interviews with the participants. Imbedded within activity theory is the notion that activity is purposeful; therefore, to understand the activity
fully it is imperative to explicate its purposes through participant interviews.

Within this research study, activity theory is related to the activities and interactions taking place within the tutoring dyad between a tutor and tutee during a literacy lesson. The ends or purposes have been identified along with the specific activities occurring within each tutoring session.

**Contextual Framework**

**America Reads Challenge Legislation**

The America Reads Challenge Initiative (1996) was a call to communities across the United States to ensure that all children would be able to read independently and with fluency and comprehension by the end of third grade. The federal legislation required that a local public school or school district collaborate with at least one other community agency to form a literacy network. These networks were required to include the following four components:

- The use of trained volunteers/tutors;
- provision of tutoring that supports local school-site reading programs;
- a focus on at-risk elementary school children who demonstrate the greatest literacy needs; and
• inclusion of a family literacy component (Wasik, 1997).

The legislation did not mandate how these four components were to be structured; rather, individual communities were given the responsibilities of developing programs which best fit the needs of their specific school population. As of January 2000, approximately 1,300 colleges and universities across the United States had developed America Reads Challenge (ARC) tutoring programs (US Department of Education, 2000).

To support the development and retention of the ARC tutoring program, the federal government allocated 2.7 billion dollars over a five-year period. The funds were to be used to train and pay university students to provide needy elementary school children with a high quality literacy tutoring program. Because the needs of each community are quite varied, it becomes necessary to conduct a needs analysis prior to developing an ARC program. The results of the needs analysis should then be used to guide the design of the program to ensure that appropriate instruction is being delivered to the children. At the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, such a program has been in place since 1997.

**History of the ARC Tutoring Program at UNLV**

In the fall of 1997, the first cohort of ARC tutors was hired and trained at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). Part
of their training involved taking part in the filming of a series of training videos. These videos were developed collaboratively by a cadre of education professors well versed in research-based literacy practices (Meyerson, Bean, Giorgis, McKinney, Perkins and Ramirez, 1997). The video series was 20 hours in length and covered a wide range of topics from Piaget’s Theory of Development to strategies for teaching English Language Learners (ELL). A training manual was written to accompany the videos (Meyerson, et.al., 1997); it contained copies of literacy assessments, literacy learning strategies, and a bibliography of developmentally appropriate reading materials. Together, these materials have been used to train more than 100 university tutors.

The tutors must maintain a minimum cumulative grade point average (GPA) of 2.0 on a 4.0 grading scale if they are employed as a work study tutor or a cumulative GPA of 2.5 if they are employed as a Regents Award Program (RAP) tutor. The RAP provides those students who are ineligible for financial aid with a monetary supplement if they are employed by the university as a student worker. Students from any academic major are eligible to work as an ARC tutor if they meet the above qualifications and successfully complete the required training program (Brantley, 1998).
As the ARC program progressed over the next two years, modifications were made to the training program based on feedback received from the university tutors and the participating elementary school teachers through a series of written surveys and interviews (Brantley, 1998). The training currently consists of 20 hours of hands-on strategy and assessment instruction, along with the use of portions of the videos.

While the mission of UNLV’s tutoring program is to improve tutees’ reading skills, it is very important to help tutees to develop positive attitudes toward reading. As a result, tutors have been trained to take the whole child into consideration when constructing instructional goals for each tutee. If the tutees are resistant to learning, it is important to lower their affective filter and create comfortable learning environments where tutees are free to take risks with their learning. Once rapport has been established, tutors can conduct assessments to determine tutees’ instructional reading levels prior to implementing literacy learning strategies which build on their individual strengths while taking into consideration their areas of need. The ARC training program teaches the tutors how to administer literacy assessments such as an informal reading inventory, a sight word recognition test, and a student reading
and writing attitude/interest interview; tutors also learn how to collect and interpret a writing sample.

Tutors use the results of these assessments to develop three literacy learning goals for individual tutees. Weekly lesson plans are written containing strategies which are intended to match the three literacy learning goals set by the tutor. As a component of the evaluative portion of the program, the tutor must determine how instruction will be delivered to each tutee. At the end of the week, tutors write a reflective summary evaluating each tutee’s progress during the previous week. These reflections, along with the literacy learning goals which have been set for the tutee, serve to drive the instruction for the upcoming week.

At the end of the formal training, tutors complete a job shadowing experience. Here the tutors spend two work days following experienced tutors as they interact with their tutees. Upon completion of the job shadowing experiences, tutors meet for a debriefing session to reflect upon the tutoring sessions they viewed during the previous two days. Follow-up training occurs as deemed necessary by the ARC coordinator.

Tutors are then placed at an elementary school site or community agency and assigned a case load of tutees. A caseload generally consists of five to six tutees who are seen
approximately four times each week. Due to scheduling issues or illness, some of the tutees may attend fewer sessions, though ultimately tutees are scheduled to attend four 30 minute tutoring sessions per week. Each site has an on-site tutoring supervisor who oversees the day-to-day running of the program. Along with their administrative duties, the supervisors carry a reduced load of tutees.

Researcher Role in the Study

My role at the university is to serve as the Coordinator of the ARC tutoring program. I joined the staff in the fall of 1998 after the program had been in place for one year. As coordinator, my duties include recruiting and hiring tutors, providing all of the initial and follow up training, locating and establishing new tutoring sites while overseeing the existing sites, and reaching out into the community to form a community-based literacy network.

My qualifications for the coordinator position rested on the fact that I held a masters degree in reading and language arts. Prior to assuming my present role, I worked for 11 years as a public school teacher, the last three years of which I worked in the capacity of reading specialist. My educational background is enhanced further by three years of experience teaching various methods courses to preservice teachers at UNLV.
Presently, I am in the final year of my doctoral studies in curriculum and instruction with an emphasis in literacy education.

After coordinating the program for one year, I sought feedback from all of the stakeholders and used this information to modify and expand the existing program. During the summer of 1999, the training handbook was revised resulting in modifications to the training program. Each year a component of the program is reviewed in order to improve the services provided to the children of the community.

Once the tutors are hired, trained, and placed at a tutoring site, my role shifts to that of a mentor and administrator to the tutors and the site supervisors. I am required to oversee all of the payroll paperwork as well as to deal with any problems which may arise concerning the program. Weekly visits are scheduled at each tutoring site with extra attention given to the novice tutors.

For the purposes of this study, I took on the role of a participant as observer (Merriam, 1998). Within this particular research stance, I continued my role as coordinator of the ARC tutoring program while also acting as the main researcher in the study. Because I am already known to the participants, it allowed me to gain access to the tutoring site and the tutoring
dyads with relative ease. This also allowed me to be more unobtrusive and less disruptive to the tutoring sessions.

Limitations of the Study

This study has a few limitations that need to be addressed. First, one possible limitation of this study is my dual role as the coordinator of the ARC tutoring program as well as the main researcher in the study. In order to minimize any potential bias, member checks were conducted throughout the research study in an attempt to triangulate the data and the inferences made based on the data collected. To further minimize this limitation, I was not present in the room during the taping of the tutoring sessions. The equipment was set up prior to the tutor and tutee entering the classroom and was removed after they had finished their session. At no time was I present during a tutoring session.

A second limitation of the study relates to the use of only two tutoring dyads for the research. This number was purposely small to allow for a more indepth recording of data. Each dyad was videotaped daily for thirty minutes for a duration of twelve sessions. This configuration lasted for approximately three and one half weeks, allowing for six hours of consecutive video data on each dyad. The context of the study was
somewhat limiting, though the goal of the research was not to generalize the results to other settings. Rather, the goal was to document and describe one very specific setting in great detail by using multiple data sources to enhance the richness of the findings.

Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation

Chapter Two contains a review of the literature as it relates to the present research study. The research topics include, but are not limited to, the following areas of study: Sociocultural Theory of Learning, Activity Theory, scaffolding, and tutoring as an early intervention model. A framework of solid research knowledge will be developed, leading directly to the questions presently under study.

Chapter Three consists of the specifics of the qualitative research methodology that were employed to answer the research questions. It contains a rich description of the research methods, data sources, setting, participants, and data analysis procedures. It concludes with a chart detailing the research time line.

Chapter Four presents the data collected in the study in a rich descriptive format. Once the data are described, then it
was analyzed using the appropriate qualitative research methods.

Finally, Chapter Five synthesizes the data and presents it in a summary form and includes recommendations for further research.

Definition of Terms

Definitions of the terms used in this research study follow below. While each term may represent a vast array of meanings in a general sense, they are being defined in specific terms as they relate to the study under investigation.

**Literacy Instruction**: involves the tutees’ abilities to “learn with text; to expand their ability to think broadly, deeply, and critically about ideas in text; to promote personal responses to text; to nurture a desire to read; and to develop life-long learners who can use printed information to satisfy personal needs and interests and fully and wisely participate in society” (Yopp & Yopp, 2000, p. 2).

**Literacy Learning Goal**: “Goals describe the cumulative effects of the learning process. They are normally written as general statements of instructional intent” (Maxim, 1999). In the case of a specific literacy learning goal, it refers to what a
tutor wants a tutee to know based on a variety of informal literacy assessments.

**Scaffolding:** the process of “controlling those elements of a task that are initially beyond the learner’s capability, thus permitting him (sic) to concentrate upon and complete only those elements which are within his range of competence” (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976, p. 9).

**ARC Tutee:** an elementary school child in kindergarten through grade five who is deemed to be in need of literacy assistance based on the observations, recommendations, and assessments of his or her classroom teacher.

**ARC Tutor:** defined as a university student currently enrolled in a minimum of six semester credits at the participating university. The tutor must have been interviewed and selected to deliver instruction to children and subsequently have completed the ARC training program successfully.

**Tutoring Dyad:** a specific tutoring group consisting of one ARC tutor and a designated ARC tutee. The tutor and the tutee meet for regularly scheduled literacy tutoring sessions two to four times each week for an uninterrupted thirty minute time block. The tutoring dyad meets on the tutee’s elementary school campus during the tutee’s regularly scheduled academic
day (Brantley, 1998).

**Zone of Proximal Development:** "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, pp. 85-86).
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter 2 presents a review of the research related to sociocultural theory of cognitive development, scaffolded instruction, and activity theory. Also included in the review of literature are relevant research studies related to one-on-one tutoring as an early intervention, specifically targeting research on individual tutoring programs that hold the most promise for teaching tutees how to read. The chapter ends with a synthesis of the research findings which provides the rationale for the present study.

Theoretical Framework
Sociocultural Theory and Scaffolding

“What the child can do in cooperation today, he (sic) can do alone tomorrow” (Vygotsky, 1962, p. 104).

Vygotsky believed that cognitive development took place
within a social context, or more specifically, that cognitive development resulted from a collaborative endeavor between a child and a more knowledgeable mentor. This collaboration may take various forms with one of the most intimate being the one-on-one tutoring situation. Optimally, Vygotsky claimed that instruction should advance ahead of where the learner presently is functioning, and lead into what the learner is unable to do alone. Vygotsky deemed this region of optimal instruction the Zone of Proximal Development or ZPD (Vygotsky, 1962).

The concept of the ZPD has been expanded upon over the years by many prominent researchers. Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976) have built upon the works of Vygotsky and found a direct relationship between his theories of cognitive development and one-on-one tutoring. They have designated the role of the tutor as one in which a (metaphorical) bridge or "scaffold" is constructed by the tutors in order to provide tutees with sufficient support during the learning process. Once tutees begin to understand, and subsequently internalize the new learning, the scaffold is removed slowly allowing tutees to stand on their own. The reciprocity that exists between tutors and tutees is what distinguishes scaffolded from modeled instruction (Winegar & Valsiner, 1992) thus making it more
sensitive to the individual needs of the tutees. The process is then repeated when a new concept or skill is introduced, allowing tutors and tutees to maintain dynamic and active roles in the learning process.

Wertsch (1984) expounded upon the scaffolding research by attempting to define the scaffolding of instruction and the process of learning that occurs within a learner’s ZPD. Wertsch decontextualized the process into three components. For this particular study, I have situated his work within the context of a tutoring situation. The first component in Wertsch’s model provides a situational definition, referring to the process tutors go through to determine the appropriate ZPD for their tutees. To assist in this determination, the tutors utilize a variety of dynamic and ongoing assessments, moving the tutees forward as they develop new levels of understanding of the concept under study. Once the levels have been found, the tutors help to activate and build upon each tutee’s prior knowledge and experiences utilizing a variety of teaching strategies. Tutors act to mediate the activities taking place within the tutoring sessions.

The second component, intersubjectivity (Rommetveit, 1974), involves the development of a mutual understanding of the concept under study by both the tutors and the tutees.
Intersubjectivity is maintained by creating a balance of support and challenge. Differing levels of intersubjectivity exist depending upon the degree of internalization which has taken place within the tutees. Internalization levels are determined by the tutees' ability to articulate an understanding of the concept and/or activity under study or by their ability to transfer the learning to a new situation.

In order for intersubjectivity, and subsequently internalization to occur, tutors must utilize a variety of psychological tools to aid in the learning process. These psychological tools are referred to as semiotic mediators, the third component of Wertsch's scaffolding process. Semiotic mediators generally take the form of language, letters, and numbers. Tutors utilize a variety of semiotic mediators as they lead tutees through the scaffolding process. In the present study, these mediators generally relate to language and letters, allowing tutors to incorporate a variety of language-based literacy strategies into their lessons.

Together the situational definition, intersubjectivity, and semiotic mediators must be present in order for optimal learning to occur as tutors and tutees co-construct knowledge. Figure 1 provides a visual of the process of scaffolding as it occurs within a teaching/learning situation.
In order to create a learning environment supportive of scaffolded instruction, all of the components depicted in Figure 1 must be present during the instructional process. Initially when a new concept or skill is introduced, the tutors accept full responsibility for instruction. Therefore instruction at this stage involves modeling, demonstrations, mini lessons, and other forms of tutor-initiated and controlled lessons. As the tutees begin to understand and internalize the skill or concept, tutors gradually release the responsibility for learning, eventually completely placing it into the hands of the tutees. During the process of releasing responsibility, tutors continually assess the...
tutees' levels of understanding, only letting go of this responsibility when deemed appropriate.

Though Figure 1 depicts the structure of a scaffolded learning experience as linear, it is imperative to realize that it is a dynamic process within an ever-changing situational context. Tutors may return tutees to the area of guided practice or modeling if the tutors feel that the tutees are experiencing difficulty with a specific skill or concept. The scaffolded learning environment is designed to be flexible, enabling tutors to target the tutees' specific needs. Ultimately the goal in any scaffolded learning experience is for tutees to internalize the knowledge being taught and then transfer it to a new learning situation, thus accepting full responsibility for their own learning.

Beed, Hawkins, and Roller (1991) found that the levels of instructional support provided by tutors widely vary at different stages of the scaffolding process. Complete modeling of a task with detailed descriptions of the elements involved demonstrate a high level of tutor support; in contrast, the use of tutors' clues and hints show a lower level of tutors' support.

Beed, et al., (1991) contend that scaffolding of instruction exists along a continuum ranging from a high level of tutor support to a low level of tutor support. Falling between these
two extremes are the stages of assisted modeling, element identification, and strategy naming (See Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Tutor Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Naming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.** Continuum of the Varying Levels of Tutor Support Provided During Scaffolded Instruction (Beed, Hawkins, and Roller, 1991)

Assisted modeling involves the modeling of a task by tutors who then invite tutees to participate in the task. Element identification occurs when tutees begin the task on their own and tutors verbalize the necessary elements of successful task completion as the tutees work on the tasks. Strategy naming requires much less involvement on the part of tutors. Here tutors simply name a strategy and ask the tutees to perform a task utilizing the specific strategy. The levels of scaffolded support identified above are consistent with Vygotsky’s
sociocultural approach to cognitive development by providing
the tutees with varying levels of mediated activity.

Gaskins, Rauch, Gensemer, Cunicelli, O’Hara, Six, and
Scott (1997) have developed a concise definition of scaffolding
that nicely brings together the ideas put forth by the authors
cited above.

In summary, scaffolding means explaining, demonstrating,
and jointly constructing an idealized version of
performance. Scaffolding recruits the student’s interest,
reducing the number of steps so the task is manageable,
maintaining students’ persistence toward the goal, making
critical features evident, and controlling frustration and
risk” (p. 47).

Therefore tutors and tutees are able to control the pacing of a
lesson to allow for individual needs, learning styles, and
interests thus making tutoring a very personal and valuable
form of instruction.

Activity Theory

Building upon sociocultural theory and scaffolding, activity
theory emerged as a viable framework for understanding and
describing situated activity. Activity theory should be
understood in terms of a culture of learning within a specific
context in which the participants jointly collaborate to form a
unit of mediated activity. More simply stated, activity cannot be
removed from its specific context without distorting its
meaning. The following section elaborates on the main
constructs and assumptions underlying activity theory, further expounding on sociocultural theory and scaffolded learning.

“A fundamental assumption of a sociocultural approach to mind is that what is to be described and explained is human action” (Wertsch, 1991, p. 8). Therefore, in order to truly understand the mind, it becomes necessary to view the mediated actions or activities under study within their natural social context. Activity theory seeks to provide a framework for the study of mediated activities within their natural setting.

In activity theory, the basic unit of study is the activity that takes place between at least two people within a specific social context (Leont’ev, 1978). Adding to sociocultural theorists’ belief that knowledge is socially constructed, activity theory examines knowledge acquisition by breaking the process into the actual interactions or “activities” transpiring within a specific learning culture. Activities are socially-situated and therefore must be studied within the learning context. To attempt to separate activities from their context would provide a skewed, and, ultimately, shallow understanding of the social situation.

Vygotsky (Engestrom & Middleton, 1996) has been criticized for not placing more emphasis on situational context within his theory of cognitive development. The inclusion of
activity theory adds richness to sociocultural theory, allowing for a deeper understanding of the social relationship between the participants within a more specific context. Activity theory should therefore be understood in terms of a community of practice, and within this specific community the participants jointly work together to form a unit of mediated activity. Within the confines of this research study, all activity between the tutors and tutees has been socially-situated in order to make explicit the process of scaffolded learning for each specific tutoring dyad.

The following underlying assumptions related to activity theory in relation to knowledge acquisition and cognitive development also served to guide this study. First, activity and development are dynamic social processes. In sociocultural theory, learning actually precedes development rather than development acting as the impetus for learning. This unique perspective was not supported by earlier learning theorists such as Piaget (Berk & Winsler, 1995).

Second, generally activity is goal-directed and context-based making it very difficult to generalize from one situational context to another. Activity does not hold the same meaning for people in different social settings, different cultures, and across gender lines.
Third, meaning and purpose are integral components of the developmental process making it imperative to elicit the specific meanings given to activities from those involved in the activities. Participants’ input is essential to a true understanding of the learning situation and adds an essential element of rigor to the findings.

Finally, culture and biology are both factors that have a significant impact on human development. Because of this last assumption, there is a wide range of variation in development across people, limiting the ability to devise one universal definition of development (Rogoff, 1990). Therefore, it becomes necessary to look at the specifics of a particular situation and a particular group of people in order to understand the activities and the subsequent learning taking place.

Activity theory supports an ethnographic research methodology by providing a unit by which to measure and analyze mediated activity thus making it an essential component in this research study. When combined with Hymes’ (1972) methods of ethnographic discourse analysis, a rich picture of the culture of tutoring within the two specific tutoring dyads emerged. Examples of scaffolded instruction were identified and placed on a speech grid that detailed the tutoring settings, participants, ends and goals, speech act
sequences, key instrumentalities, norms and interpretations, and the genres of the speech events. These details provided a context for the activities that took place within each tutoring session and allowed a rich picture of the culture of tutoring to emerge.

Tutoring Programs

A review of the research on literacy tutoring programs also provided a frame of reference for the current study. I began with an in-depth review of several successful tutoring programs in the hopes of determining the factors that separated more successful tutoring programs from less successful tutoring programs. The first studies presented focus on the specific components of a particular program, while the later studies delved more deeply into the tutors’ behaviors within the context of a tutoring situation. Together, these studies provided a foundation for my current research.

Allington (1995) noted: “Early intervention is often more successful than later intervention, and yet most participants in either remedial or special education are not referred until they have experienced several years of unsatisfactory school progress and often after they have been retained” (p. 22). Unfortunately, failure to provide students with early intervention
services tends to exacerbate the problem of the Matthew Effects in education. The Matthew Effect has been described as “a cumulative advantage phenomena” in which the children who have had advantageous early educational experiences learn more quickly and efficiently than those from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds (Stanovich, 1996). Over the course of several years, the results of the effect can lead to increased discrepancies in the reading achievement levels of these two groups of children. How can children be provided with rich early literacy experiences that enhance their reading abilities, and decrease or eliminate these achievement discrepancies?

Several early intervention programs were created in the hopes of providing an answer to this question. For the purposes of this review, the focus remained on one-to-one tutoring programs designed to help children who experienced reading difficulties. Five of the more successful programs are described below.

Reading Together Tutoring Program

Susan Neuman (1995) from Temple University in Pennsylvania collaborated with VISTA Volunteers Program to develop a community reading tutorial program for children in kindergarten and first grade. The Reading Together Tutoring Program was based on the “Schorr Principle of investing in two
generations at a time” (Schorr, 1988, p. 121). Eighty-nine parent volunteers were recruited from the poorest local neighborhoods to tutor two hours per week. Tutors were trained in phonemic awareness, story reading, and expressive oral and written language activities. When tutoring, they utilized prop boxes (Neuman & Gallagher, 1994) which contained picture books, chants, finger plays, writing materials, and jingles.

Although no formal systematic evaluation was conducted, interview data were collected to ascertain participants’ views of the tutoring program. Principals and teachers stated that the Reading Together Tutoring Program created school-wide enthusiasm for reading and matched the learning goals teachers had set for the program and its tutees. Principals welcomed the program into their schools because it provided increased individualized attention for the tutees and allowed a bond to develop between the community tutors and the children. Overall, the outcomes reported by the participants were positive in nature and supported tutoring as a school-wide literacy intervention program.

**Howard Street Tutoring Program**

A more structured, research-based literacy tutoring program called the Howard Street Tutoring Program was
developed in the mid-1980's on the north side of Chicago. The Howard Street Tutoring Program utilized volunteer tutors who worked in elementary schools to provide second and third grade children with after-school tutoring in reading (Morris, 1990, 1999). The tutors were unpaid community members who ranged in age from traditional undergraduate college students to retired citizens. Tutors were trained using a “modeling” approach in which they observed certified teachers tutoring a child. After the modeling session, the tutors and teachers met to discuss the tutoring sessions, specifically focusing on the teaching strategies utilized with the children. Then tutors worked with individual children while teachers observed the sessions. This process continued for approximately four sessions or until the teachers felt comfortable leaving the tutors on their own.

Reading teachers continued to provide the tutors with the appropriate lesson plans and materials for each child. These plans were modeled after the Reading Recovery Program (Clay, 1991). As per Reading Recovery, each lesson contained the following four components: 1) contextual reading at the child’s instructional level, 2) word study, 3) easy reading, and 4) reading to the child. Sessions were held twice each week for 45-60 minutes. Optimally, the tutors and tutees worked
together for an entire school year in order for the children to receive the maximum benefit of the tutoring.

The results of the tutoring program were quite significant. Word recognition, spelling, and oral reading scores were higher for those children receiving tutoring when compared to the scores of similar students who did not receive additional tutoring services. While the results of this study are promising, there was no mention of what caused the tutoring to be effective, and no attempt was made to compare the academic gains made across or within the tutoring dyads.

**Book Buddies Tutoring Program**

A more recent literacy tutoring program was developed based on a lesson plan format very similar to the plan used in the Howard Street Tutoring Program. The Book Buddies Program was created by Invernizzi, Juel, Rosemary, and Richards (1997) from the University of Virginia. Book Buddies was a one-on-one tutoring program designed to train community volunteers to help at-risk first grade children to improve their reading skills. The program utilized a pull-out model during which the tutors provided instruction to the children during their regular school day, rather than working with them after school. In the Book Buddies Program, children
are tutored twice each week for a 45 minute time period. Initially tutors were trained at the university for two hours prior to taking on a case-load of children.

On-site graduate students were paid to develop lesson plans for the Book Buddies and provided them with follow up training as needed. The lesson plans consisted of the following four components: (1) reading familiar books, (2) word study, (3) writing, and (4) reading a new story. To determine the effectiveness of this lesson plan format, the researchers conducted a factor analysis on the pre-test scores of the children and then compared them to the goals and structures of the children’s individualized lesson plans in order to determine whether the tutors were able to match their instruction to the needs of the individual children they tutored. Invernizzi, et al. (1997), found that “consistent with our initial beliefs about the need for a balanced approach (they) validated our lesson plan format” (p. 286). However, while the tutors seemed able to meet the instructional needs of the children, no attempt was made to study the social context of the tutoring situation or determine the factors that made the tutoring program a success.

**Stanford Mathematics Tutoring Program**

While not focused on literacy, the Stanford Mathematics
Tutoring Program sought to define the scaffolding techniques of expert mathematics tutors (Lepper, Drake & O’Donnell-Johnson, 1997). The researchers contacted local schools and tutoring agencies to recommend tutors who they considered to be “expert” tutors for participation in the study. These tutors were matched to elementary school tutees deemed to be in need of tutoring assistance in mathematics. The tutees were administered a pre-test to determine if they had a basic understanding of the necessary prerequisite mathematical skills and to ensure that they had not fully mastered the concepts to be taught. Based on these assessments, a very specific range of tutees were asked to participate in the study.

Once the tutors were identified and matched with tutees, the tutoring sessions were recorded on video tape. After each session, the tutors were asked to participate in a “think-aloud” meeting during which they commented on the sessions while viewing the video tapes. The think-alouds were audio-taped for future data analysis.

All of the data were analyzed to determine the goals, strategies, and techniques employed by the tutors in order to differentiate more successful tutors from less successful tutors. The data collected provided valuable support for their research.
question that specifically focused on identifying the qualities of an expert tutor.

Leper, et al. (1997), identified what they called the techniques and characteristics of expert tutors. They used the acronym INSPIRE to define the following seven characteristics: intelligent, nurturant, Socratic, progressive, indirect, reflective, and encouraging (p. 130).

Expert tutors were able to lead children in the right direction using questions, hints, prompts, and positive reinforcement rather than supplying them with the correct answers. While these characteristics included a cognitive component, they tended to focus on the affective side of tutoring, lending support to the notion of the importance of the interrelationship between tutors and tutees within a tutoring dyad.

University of Texas at Austin Cross-age Tutoring Program

The Cross-Age Tutoring Program (Juel, 1996) approached the tutoring process by utilizing college athletes to tutor needy elementary school students in reading. What distinguished this program from the others is that many of the tutors were themselves students from disadvantaged backgrounds considered to be in need of reading remediation. Thus, the program was created to increase the literacy levels of both the tutors and the tutees. Tutors spent 45 minutes twice each
week working with one child. In addition to the time spent tutoring, the tutors also spent 2.5 hours per week attending a reading class at the university that covered topics related to literacy and tutoring (Juel, 1996).

Thirty first grade students were tutored for one year, while an additional fifteen students were selected to receive "mentoring" from a university student. The mentoring program did not involve any academic assistance being rendered to the children; instead they spent time reading aloud to the children and forming a bond with them. Both groups of students were tested using the Iowa Test of Basic Skills pre and post. Initially the tutored students scored below the mentored students in reading achievement; on the post-tests they scored significantly higher.

In reviewing the test scores, Juel (1996) found wide discrepancies in the gains made within the group of children who received one-on-one tutoring. Since all of the tutors were trained using the same format, Juel was interested in finding out what factors accounted for the achievement discrepancies across the tutoring dyads. She identified three characteristics that seemed to differentiate a more successful tutoring dyad from a less successful tutoring dyad. First, successful tutors scaffolded the children’s reading and writing experiences to a
much greater extent. This included spending more time modeling the reading and writing process for the children. Second, successful tutors used more specific and developmentally appropriate phonics and writing activities with the children. Finally, successful tutors selected literature that was at the children’s instructional reading level. Overall, the more successful tutors tended to keep the children engaged in appropriate reading and writing activities throughout each entire tutoring session more than the less successful tutors. In addition, because the tutors were from diverse backgrounds and were considered needy themselves, they tended to be more empathetic to the tutees since they shared the culture of poverty with them. The tutors also were able to scaffold the tutees’ learning to varying degrees. This finding is important because it begins to make visible the process of scaffolding within the context of tutoring.

**Tutors’ Behaviors During Tutoring**

The results of Juel’s study opened a new line of research that related the social context of the learning situation to the level of success or lack of success for the intervention under study. In a similar vain, Graesser, Person, and Magliano (1995) conducted a study to determine the collaborative dialogic patterns that occurred within a tutoring dyad and compared the
results to the dialogic patterns typically found in whole class instruction. Their study provided valuable information related to the social context of a one-on-one tutoring situation. The most significant finding was the amount of active student learning taking place in the tutoring situation. While the tutees rarely initiated asking questions, overall they asked more questions in a one-on-one tutoring situation than they did during regular classroom instruction. The researchers also found that the quality of questions asked could be correlated positively with the achievement levels of the tutees. Tutees who asked higher level thinking questions demonstrated a higher degree of academic gains.

The researchers also found that none of the tutors used more advanced pedagogical strategies such as reciprocal teaching or modeling-scaffolding-fading techniques. In fact, most tutors relied on more scripted materials that had concrete examples and pre-written questions. The tutors also used more “textbook” examples when explaining a concept rather than using authentic examples drawn from their own experiences or the experiences of the tutees.

A collaborative problem-solving pattern was found to exist within many of the tutoring dyads. By studying these dyads, Graesser, et al. (1995), were able to identify a five step dialogue
pattern where: (1) tutors ask a question, (2) tutees answer the question, (3) tutors provide the tutees with relevant feedback, (4) tutors and tutees work collaboratively to improve the quality of the responses, and (5) tutors assess tutees’ understanding of the concept under study. When comparing these results with those of the classroom teachers’ dialogue patterns, the researchers found that the classroom teachers generally used only steps one, two, and three in their discussions with students.

Convergence toward shared meaning was another area researchers observed in this study. Graesser, Person, and Magliano (1995) found that the tutors and their tutees tended to develop local goals that were based on the individual needs of the tutees, though it was a process that developed slowly and was often somewhat fragmented. Tutors also were found to provide tutees with constant feedback, often “splicing” in the correct answers during the instructional dialogues. While many positive characteristics were noted within the various tutoring dyads, many characteristics were found to be underdeveloped. The researchers felt the tutors would benefit from increased educational training to improve the tutees’ academic achievement levels.
Summary

Over the past two decades, a research base has developed in relation to early intervention programs designed to help struggling readers. While the research has been quite varied, it does indicate that one-on-one tutoring is an effective method of instruction. Neuman (1995) found that tutoring created a school-wide enthusiasm for reading when tutors actively engaged children in reading books. In addition to increased motivation to read, Morris (1990, 1999) determined that one-on-one tutoring significantly increased the word recognition, spelling, and oral reading scores of the tutees when compared to the scores of students who did not receive individualized tutoring. Attempting to discover how tutoring could be designed to best meet the needs of specific students, Invernizzi, et al. (1997), concluded that a balanced approach to tutoring proved to be quite successful at meeting the instructional needs of tutees. In addition, Juel (1996) determined that tutees made the greatest academic gains when tutors appropriately scaffolded the learning activities the tutees received within each session.

Together, these studies support the use of one-on-one tutoring as an early intervention strategy; however, they also reinforce the findings that tutors must be provided with
sufficient educational training so that they are able to scaffold learning experiences for tutees. The next logical step in the research on tutoring is the study of how tutors effectively scaffold instruction, through an examination of the actual activities, interactions, practices, and routines that take place within a tutoring dyad. These specific areas are relevant when attempting to identify the characteristics of more successful tutoring dyads in which scaffolded instruction occurs and, thus, form the crux of the present study.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This research study was designed to explore and describe the culture of tutoring and to determine if America Reads Challenge (ARC) literacy tutors were able to provide their tutees with scaffolded learning experiences. In order for me to be able to develop a deeper understanding of the culture of tutoring within a specific situational context, it became necessary to not only look at the products of the instruction provided through one-on-one tutoring, but I also needed to describe and reconstruct the processes involved. To do this, I had to become immersed in the culture of tutoring through the use of an ethnographic research methodology.

According to Patton (1978, p. 15) “Qualitative methods are particularly oriented toward exploration, discovery, and inductive logic. An evaluative approach is inductive to the extent that the evaluator attempts to make sense of the
situation without imposing pre-existing expectations on the program or setting.” As a researcher, this required me to distance myself from the ARC tutoring program and focus specifically on the individuals who comprised two specific tutoring dyads as well as the interactions that took place between them over the course of twelve tutoring sessions. In addition by using an ethnographic approach to data collection, it allowed me to become immersed in the tutoring culture under study and “recapitulate the cultural scene” studied so that I could “envision the same scene” that was experienced by the participants (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993, p. 3).

The following research questions were formulated to guide this study: (a) What practices and routines are present in a one-on-one literacy tutoring situation? (b) What are the similarities and differences in these practices and routines across and within the tutoring dyads? (c) Are tutors able to appropriately scaffold the literacy lessons for the tutees? How does scaffolding manifest itself within the culture of tutoring?

**Pilot Study**

Prior to beginning the present study, a pilot study was conducted to determine the instructional strategies being utilized by ARC tutors, how often tutors used each strategy,
and if any instructional trends existed across four tutoring dyads. Two formal observations were made of each dyad during which the thirty-minute tutoring sessions were written verbatim in fieldnotes. Five to seven informal observations also took place over the course of an eight-week time period. During these observations, a tally reflecting the instructional strategies employed by each tutor was kept. Each individual tally sheet was placed on a chart documenting the combined results for all of the tutors. A domain analysis (Spradley, 1980) was constructed identifying the main strategies being utilized both within and across tutoring dyads (Brantley, 2000).

The results of the pilot study indicated that the tutors spent the majority of their tutoring time implementing what I call “learning environment” strategies. These are strategies that serve to enhance the tutees’ desire to take risks within the tutoring situation. Examples of the learning environment strategies included the use of positive reinforcement in the form of verbal praise and extrinsic rewards, listening and responding appropriately to the tutees, and modeling appropriate literacy behaviors (Brantley, 2000). These data suggest that the development of a warm relationship between tutors and tutees was of utmost importance to the tutors involved in the study.

A second area of focus for the tutors was on strategies
that would increase the tutees’ reading comprehension levels; reading comprehension strategies were utilized on 24 separate occasions. Strategies most often employed were the Directed Reading and Thinking Activity or DRTA (Stauffer, 1976); predictable texts based on the tutees’ interests and prior knowledge base (Rosenblatt, 1978); oral retellings; and a variety of questioning techniques (Ruddell & Ruddell, 1995).

When comparing the results of the domain analysis to the goals developed by the tutors, I found that each tutor had chosen to work on increasing the reading comprehension levels of the tutees. Overall, it seemed that all of the tutors believed that questioning was a way to build reading comprehension, though they may have approached the questioning of their tutees quite differently. Because the literacy learning goals matched the literacy lessons, these findings lent support to their high use of reading comprehension strategies within each tutoring session.

Each tutor had also set a reading fluency goal for each of the tutees, though they did not focus much of their tutoring time on achieving this goal. There proved to be a discrepancy between their instructional fluency goals and their actual instructional practices. Also the tutors tended to ignore the areas of spelling, writing, and word study in most of their
sessions. This is in direct conflict with the lesson plan format they had been taught while in training (Brantley, 2000).

The pilot study provided insights into the instructional practices taking place within a tutoring dyad leading to my heightened interest in study the factors that comprise the culture of tutoring. While the tutors set similar goals for their tutees, in actuality, they implemented them in a variety of different ways, thus, some of the tutors were more able to provide tutees' with scaffolded learning experiences.

Research Design of the Present Study

The present study built upon the findings of the pilot study with the intention of examining the culture of the tutoring session included the practices, routines, discourse, and nonverbal communication. This study incorporated a traditional ethnographic research design characterized by participant observation of one specific, bounded tutoring site. The site for this study is an elementary school in the Southwestern United States. Within this site, two specific tutoring dyads were studied over time (Goetz & Hansen, 1974); fieldnotes and video recordings were collected (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw, 1995), and the data were analyzed, categorized, interpreted, and triangulated prior to dissemination in this document.
Because I studied two very unique and diverse tutoring dyads, it was important to approach the data collection from a perspective that allowed me to see and record the tutoring sessions with as little impact on the participants as possible. I was able to do this by video recording the sessions without being present during the tutoring sessions. The videos provided the means to view the tutoring sessions repeatedly.

Site Description

This study took place on the campus of the Paradise Professional Development School located in Las Vegas, Nevada. PPDS is one of more than 150 elementary schools in the Clark County School District (CCSD). Its campus is situated on the northwest corner of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), though it remains under the sole control of the local school district. Because of its close ties to the university, many practicum students and student teachers are placed at PPDS. It also houses many teachers who have made a commitment to professional development and life-long learning. This is reflected in the many faculty members’ decisions to act as mentors to preservice and first-year teachers. The faculty and staff also maintain a high level of site-based decision-making power. These values are apparent as soon as you set foot in its campus.
The ARC tutoring program has been on the PPDS campus since it opened its doors in the fall of 1998. Presently, 11 ARC tutors work on its campus, providing approximately 60 children with one-on-one tutoring services each week. A bond has formed between the ARC tutors and the PPDS staff over the years adding significantly to the strength and longevity of the program. During the past three years, over 150 students have received tutoring services through the ARC program at PPDS. Teachers entrust their students to the tutors and often provide them with additional materials and suggestions for instruction. Tutors provide teachers with weekly written feedback that addresses both social and educational issues on each student attending the program.

The PPDS has a very diverse student population living within its school boundaries. Approximately 64% of the students qualify for free or reduced-price lunches. Twenty-six percent come from homes in which English is not their primary language. The student population has a high transciency rate with 65% of its students moving in and out of its boundaries within any given school year (CCSD Annual Report, 1999). All of these issues, along with the fact that the school has been designated as a Title I school, have created a variety of special learning needs for many of the students attending PPDS.
Participant Selection

Purposive non-probability sampling (Patton, 1978, 1990) was utilized to select the participants for this research study. This method of participant selection is based on the assumptions that “the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight” into some particular phenomena and, therefore, must select the sample in which the most data can be extracted (Merriam, 1998, p. 61). Therefore, the participants are chosen because they have a lot to offer the research project. Participants volunteered for the study; in the case of the PPDS children, both the tutees and their parents agreed to participate in the project (Appendix A).

For this research study, two tutoring dyads participated in the data collection process. Each dyad consisted of one university literacy tutor and one PPDS tutee. One of the tutors was an education major, while the other was not. This added dimension provided interesting insight and detail to the data collected. Both tutors were in the same training cohort; therefore, they received identical materials and instruction during their training sessions. When the study began, both tutors worked as an ARC tutor for one year, though not always at the same tutoring site. Each tutor also worked 15 hours per week, divided into 12 hours spent tutoring children and three
hours preparing their tutoring materials. Although gender and age were not a consideration in the selection process, both tutors were females under the age of 26.

Data Collection Procedures

Data Sources

Because of the detailed nature of this ethnographic study, multiple data sources were used to develop a deep understanding of the culture of tutoring. In order to capture the practices, routines, behaviors, language, and context of the tutoring situation, it became important to use video recordings or "ethnographic film" (Bellman & Jules-Rosette, 1977; Hiede, 1976; Hockings, 1975) to document the 12 consecutive tutoring sessions for each of the two tutoring dyads. Each session lasted approximately thirty-minutes, providing six hours of video recording for each dyad. At the end of each day I viewed each video tape and kept a journal containing ethnographic fieldnotes (Emerson, Fretz & Shaw, 1995). This journal not only contained written observations based on the tapes, but also contained questions and comments to be addressed in later interviews with the tutors. Descriptions of the materials being utilized, the situational context of the session, and any other
pertinent information was added to the transcriptions in the form of an ethnographic speech grid (Hymes, 1972).

Interviewing the participants became an important part of the data collection process because it allowed the tutors to clarify any questions I had that arose during the data collection period. Though the interviews took on many different forms, I utilized what Patton (1978) calls “an interview guide approach” (p. 116). This approach helped me to develop a series of issues and/or topics to be discussed prior to the interviews. The issues were not written in a formal questionnaire form; rather, they were written as general topics for discussion. This allowed me a greater degree of flexibility during the interviews so that I was able to find the most appropriate way to word the question depending on the context of the interview and the participant being interviewed.

For example, each interview was recorded and transcribed verbatim. The interview data was interwoven into the narratives of each tutoring session and served to triangulate and confirm or disconfirm any interpretations and conclusions that I made through the course of analyzing the data. The tutors’ observations and responses were added to the data previously collected as a way to increase the internal validity of the findings (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993).
In addition to the video recordings and interview transcripts, I reviewed the written lesson plans created by the tutors. These lesson plans were artifacts that added to the richness of the data. Each lesson plan included two or three literacy learning goals that the tutors developed for each tutee. The lesson plan also included procedures to be used in each tutoring session for the week. The procedures section listed the learning strategies and materials for each lesson. At the end of each week, the tutors completed the evaluation portion of the lesson describing how the tutoring sessions progressed during that week.

Each of the above data sources was individually and collectively analyzed in order to determine the similarities and differences in practices and routines that existed both within and across the tutoring dyads. The use of these multiple data sources enriched the data and served to triangulate the findings (Merriam, 1995).

Data Analysis

The data from this study were analyzed, categorized, compared, and contrasted using a methodology that seeks to “elicit meaning from the data” (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993, p. 235), rather than codifying and computing it. This process of
analysis resembles the construction of categories or domains as described by Spradley (1980). A domain analysis was used to sort the data into multiple categories; allowing a portrait to emerge that is reflective of the "big picture" of the phenomena or situation being studied. In this case, the big picture was the culture of tutoring. Frank (1999) refers to this process as making implicit knowledge explicit.

**Domain Analysis**

"A cultural domain is a category of cultural meaning that includes other smaller categories" (Spradley, 1980, p. 88). When analyzing a cultural domain, it is necessary to take into consideration the following three elements: (1) cover term, (2) included terms, and (3) semantic relationship (Spradley, 1980). The cover term refers to the specific name given to a cultural domain. The included terms are all of the subcategories of a domain, and the semantic relationship defines how the categories are linked or related.

The instructional strategy domains that resulted from the pilot study previously discussed in this chapter were applied to the present study. These eight domains represented the various instructional strategies tutors applied in their tutoring sessions: reading comprehension, reading fluency, writing, spelling, vocabulary enhancement, word attack, learning
environment and "other" domains. Within each domain, strategies were identified and categorized depending on the area of instruction the strategy enhanced. In the example shown in Table 1, the strategies identified are those that served to improve the tutees' reading comprehension. The strategies were observed, tallied and grouped into domains based on fieldnotes collected while observing several tutoring sessions.

Table 1  Cultural Domain: Reading Comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included Terms:</th>
<th>Retelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DRTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal-Visual Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Relationship:</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover term:</td>
<td>Reading comprehension strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discourse Analysis

A crucial aspect of the data collection process for this study involved the analysis of the discourse taking place within the tutoring dyads. For the purposes of this study, a meaning-based definition of discourse is used. Discourse is therefore
defined as, “a system (socially and culturally organized way of speaking) through which particular functions are realized” (Schriffin, 1994, p. 32). This definition of discourse moves away from a strict conversation analysis of language focusing on the grammar and structure of language, to a view of discourse as a meaning-making process that is socially-situated in a particular place, time and context. It allows for a greater depth of understanding related to the practices and routines taking place within a specific tutoring dyad.

While there are several approaches to discourse analysis, the most appropriate approach for this study involved the use of an “etic grid for ethnography” (Schriffin, 1994, p. 141). This method of discourse analysis was devised by Hymes (1972) as a way to distinguish what is important from what is unimportant within a particular speech event. Rather than focusing on the specific phonemic patterns of language, Hymes proposes using the speaking grid as a way to “discover a local (i.e. culturally relative) taxonomy of communicative units that are in some recognizable way bounded or integral” (Hymes, 1976, p.56). In other words, Hymes suggests looking at the entire speech event and then distinguishing the following components: (1) setting, (2) participants, (3) ends or purposes and goals, (4) sequence, (5) instrumentalities or nonverbal and
physical forms of speech, (6) norms of interaction and interpretations, and (7) genre or textual categories of the speech events (Schriffin, 1994; Hymes, 1976). This method of discourse analysis allowed for an ethnographic picture of the nonverbal communication and discourse within the confines of a specific tutoring situation to emerge. An example of a speech grid developed from discourse data collected in the earlier pilot study is presented in Table 2.

An ethnographic speech grid contains the following seven components: 1) Setting, 2) Participants, 3) Ends and Goals, 4) Speech Act Sequence, 5) Key Instrumentalities, 6) Norms and Interpretations, and 7) Genre of Speech Acts. In this study, the setting portion of the grid described the location of the tutoring session during a specific speech event. For each speech event, the participants are identified along with the specific goals for the tutoring session.

The speech act sequence provided a verbatim reconstruction of a specific interaction as it relates to the concept under study. For this study, most of the speech events reflect an example of a scaffolded learning experience. The key instrumentalities describe the materials, and tools utilized within a particular tutoring session.
Table 2  Example of a Speech Grid Created From Data Collected in the Pilot Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Elementary school classroom containing student desks and kidney-shaped tables; chairs are small; walls covered with posters and student work; tutor and tutee sitting side-by-side at two student desks</th>
<th>Observer comments: Room has two other tutoring dyads in it; dyads don’t seem to be distracted by the other groups working in the same classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tutor (S): female education graduate student, has 30 years previous teaching experience at the high school level; Tutee (T): 2nd grade female in need of reading help</td>
<td>They seem to have established a friendly rapport; they sit side-by-side and tend to have a lot of eye contact with each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends/Goals</td>
<td>To write a complete sentence with a capital letter at the beginning and a period at the end of the sentence</td>
<td>Seems to be working on developing a risk-free learning environment, encourages tutee to write a sentence based on a book they’ve previously read.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act Sequence</th>
<th>S: What would you like to write about?</th>
<th>Tutor attempts to build on the tutee’s prior knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech is divided into message units based on content of the speech act</td>
<td>T: (...) A kitten</td>
<td>(Continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(...) The brackets contain a specific number of dots. Each dot corresponds to one second pause.</td>
<td>S: I can help you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Here’s a kitten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: Right!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: Now what can the kitten do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Read</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: Good!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: Now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: how can you say that in a sentence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: The kitten can read</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: Wonderful!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: Write that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: in your reading log</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Instrumentalities</td>
<td>Physical materials: leveled books, white board and marker; lined paper and pencil; Communication: verbal/nonverbal; physical proximity: seated side-by-side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor offers praise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Tutor directs tutee toward the goal of writing a complete sentence by saying the sentence aloud first)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Tutor smiles at the tutor and writes the sentence in her journal unassisted using invented spelling; the tutor doesn’t correct the spelling prior to closing the journal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norms and interpretations/ genre of speech events related to the type of interaction taking place within a specific activity sequence. Appendix B offers a complete transcript of the ten minute teaching segment.

In the current study, I related the use of such discourse, both verbal and nonverbal, to the process of co-constructing knowledge within a one-on-one tutoring situation. The use of video tapes provided the opportunity to accurately document nonverbal behaviors exhibited during each tutoring session which were then added to the speech grid. Once the video tapes were transcribed and placed on a speech grid, a copy of the results was given to the participating tutor for their comments and questions. This provided for member checking of my interpretations and conclusions to ensure the validity and trustworthiness of my findings.
Summary

In summary, this research study utilized an ethnographic qualitative research design aimed at describing the culture of tutoring that exists within a one-on-one tutoring dyad. Ethnographic film was collected over a three and one-half week time period covering 12 tutoring sessions showing the practices, routines, discourse, setting, and other forms of nonverbal communication taking place between the tutors and tutees. Each video taped session was approximately 30 minutes in length.

Portions of the tutoring sessions were transcribed verbatim and placed on a speech grid (Hymes, 1972) for analysis. Data collected through the use of observations, and interviews were added to the speech grid and the trends both within and across tutoring dyads were analyzed using Spradley’s Domain Analysis (1980). Together the data were compared and contrasted to determine how the scaffolding of instruction manifests itself within the tutoring dyads, and helped to define the culture of tutoring. Appendix C contains a research time line reflecting the research questions, type of data collected, the process of analysis and literature supporting it, as well as the time frame of the data collection.

The specific findings of the study appear in chapter four in
a descriptive format that includes narratives describing the tutoring sessions, interview data, and speech grids containing evidence of scaffolded learning experiences.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS WITH COMMENTARY

Chapter Four presents research findings on the culture of tutoring that exists between and within two literacy tutoring dyads participating in the America Reads Tutoring Program (ARC). The results of this ethnographic study are reported in a narrative format based on the data collected through ethnographic film, interviews, fieldnotes, and artifact analysis.

I have organized the chapter in the following manner. First, the overall tutoring context is presented, detailing the aspects that are consistent across both tutoring dyads. Second, the participants in each tutoring dyad are described so readers may develop a picture of the individuals who comprised that dyad. Third, the three informal literacy assessments given to the tutees are described. These assessment results were used by tutors to determine the literacy learning goals for each tutee. Fourth, in a narrative section, each tutoring session is described.
in detail to including analysis and commentary, and tutor interview. In some cases, no interview was conducted; therefore, within the description of a specific tutoring session, the interview section may be absent. Fifth, evidence of instructional scaffolding, in particular tutoring sessions, is described using an ethnographic speech grid (Hymes, 1972). Included in each speech grid are examples of relevant verbal and non-verbal communications between the participants. In a subsequent section, each of twelve thirty-minute tutoring sessions is presented in a table or figure that summarizes the activities occurring within each tutoring dyad. Finally, trends across and within the tutoring dyads are identified and discussed.

**Tutoring Overview**

The tutoring overview section presents information that is consistent with all tutoring dyads working at PPDS. Deviations from the usual procedures have been addressed within the descriptions of each of the two specific tutoring dyads under study in this research project.
School Context

All of the tutoring sessions for tutoring dyads 1 and 2 took place in unoccupied classrooms at Paradise Professional Development School. Tutors were able to use these classrooms when particular classes were “off-track,” that is, the teacher and the children normally housed in the classrooms were not attending school during that specific time period. The school’s schedule rotates around five different tracks which is typical in this district. As a result, every three to four weeks, tutors relocated to another set of classrooms. This type of scheduling allows schools to house a higher number of students than they would be able to if they were on the traditional nine-month schedule.

Some of the tutors chose to work in the Great Room adjacent to the classrooms so that they wouldn’t have to relocate. These tutors worked at kidney-shaped tables in the large open space that led into each classroom. Though this space provided the tutors with ease of access, it did have its drawbacks. As a wide-open space it was subject to an increased noise level and constant foot traffic by students, teachers, and other visitors to the school. Tutoring dyads 1 and 2 worked in the Great Room only on a few occasions when the classrooms were being used for special activities.
Assessment Tools

During the ARC tutor training, all tutors were provided with instruction on the use of three literacy assessments: a) a reading and writing attitude survey, b) an informal reading inventory and, c) the collection of a writing sample. These assessments were to be administered during the first few weeks of instruction in order to provide the tutors with an understanding of the tutees’ strengths and areas of need. In conjunction with the tutees, tutors were instructed to develop a set of two to three literacy learning goals based on the results of the assessments. These goals were created to assist tutors in the development of relevant lesson plans. Each of the three assessment tools is detailed below.

Reading Attitude and Interest Survey

The development of the Reading Attitude and Interest Survey (Brantley, 2000) was influenced by a variety of other attitude and interest surveys that have emerged over the past two decades (Burke, 1977; Atwell, 1987; McKenna & Kear, 1990). This survey was given to all children participating in the ARC tutoring program as a way to determine their reading and writing interests, their perceptions of themselves as readers and writers, and the strategies they currently utilized when reading. The survey also allowed tutors to begin to establish a
relationship with the children as they had a discussion about each of the survey items. Tutors were encouraged to share their own interests, perceptions, and reading strategies with the children as they administered the survey. It included a Likert type rating scale and two short answer questions.

**Informal Reading Inventory**

The informal reading inventory used in the ARC program was adapted from an inventory developed by Silvaroli (1994). Modifications were made to the inventory to make it more accessible to the ARC literacy tutors. The revised version was less detailed and allowed minimally trained tutors to use it effectively to develop an understanding of the tutees’ oral reading accuracy levels and their reading comprehension levels. First, tutors were instructed to administer a graded word list to the tutees to determine a rudimentary starting point for administering the graded reading passages. Once the reading passage levels were determined, tutors asked tutees to read the passages silently with the understanding that they would be retelling the stories from memory. A series of questions served to guide the retellings, allowing the tutors to determine reading comprehension scores for each of the tutees. Tutees then reread the passages aloud so the tutors could calculate an oral reading accuracy scores. Tutors were taught to determine the
tutees’ frustration levels (a score of under 90%), instructional levels (a score of 90%-94%), and independent levels (a score of 95% and up) for both oral reading and reading comprehension. Ultimately, tutors attempted to locate the tutees’ instructional levels so that they would be able to provide reading instruction at the tutees’ optimal levels, also known as their Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978).

Writing Sample

During tutor training, tutors were shown how to obtain and review a writing sample in order to determine the tutees’ writing strengths and areas of need. Tutors were instructed to provide the tutees with a writing prompt and then allow the tutees at least ten minutes to write a draft. Tutors encouraged their tutees to “spell the words as they sounded” and write for the entire time period. Then tutors constructed a list of the tutees’ writing strengths and areas of need which could be used to drive the writing instruction taking place within their tutoring sessions. The writing samples did not provide the tutors with quantifiable scores; rather the samples enabled the tutors to have a real sample of the tutees’ writing to examine and compare with samples collected later in the school year. It was an informal assessment subject to interpretation by the tutors. Results from each of the assessments were combined
to provide tutors with an overall picture of their tutees’ literacy needs, abilities, and interests.

Tutoring Dyad # 1

Tutoring Dyad # 1 consisted of one university tutor, Sarah, and one elementary school tutee, Raymond. Sarah and Raymond have worked together for seven months, meeting three to four times each week for thirty-minutes at a time. Generally they worked one-on-one except for on a special day they called “Game Day.” Game Day occurred once every two weeks and was a time when two or three tutoring dyads would work together to play a game related to reading. Often they played Scrabble Junior, a game focused on the creation of words. Other times they would play a form of the game Concentration, in which the tutees would try to match their sight words. Tutors often modified the games to fit the needs of the participants, always requiring the tutees to read each word aloud.

Tutor # 1 - Sarah

Sarah is a 22 year old Caucasian female university student who has been employed as an ARC literacy tutor since January, 2000. Prior to working as a tutor for the university, she spent a year as a literacy tutor for elementary school children as a part of her studies at a local community college. Sarah came highly
recommended to the ARC program by her previous tutoring supervisor. In a letter of recommendation Sarah was described as "self-motivated, reliable, and dedicated to her students."

Sarah spent 20 hours attending the university-based ARC training program. As a part of her training, she shadowed an experienced tutor at PPDS. Sarah began tutoring children at PPDS in February, 2000. She carried a case load of five children whom she met with for thirty-minutes, four days per week.

Sarah was always reliable, missing work only once to have oral surgery. She exhibited a sincere dedication to her students and viewed her job as important to the lives of her students. Her lesson plans always were completed on time and provided sufficient detail for the collaborating classroom teacher to be able to know what was taking place during each tutoring session. Sarah consistently evaluated her tutees' progress informally and noted her findings at the end of each lesson plan. She kept copies of her lesson plans, assessment results, and work samples in a folder she maintained on each of the tutees in her case load.

At the time of this study, Sarah was in the first semester of her senior year of studies at the university. She majored in psychology and was expected to graduate in the winter of 2001. Since joining the ARC program, Sarah has made a
change in her long-term career goals; she has decided to pursue a graduate degree in reading at the university. This degree would allow her to work as a reading specialist at an elementary school. Prior to this study Sarah had planned to become a psychologist. In fact, she spent the summer of 2000 in Washington, D.C., working as an intern for the psychological division of the FBI. In interviews, Sarah stated that “working with children in a small group setting is where I see myself. I want to do the same things I am now doing as an America Reads tutor.”

**Tutee # 1 - Raymond**

Raymond is an eleven year old African-American boy who attended the PPDS. He is in the fifth grade and has attended PPDS since the spring of 2000. Raymond was referred to the ARC program by his fifth grade teacher because she felt he was performing below grade level in both reading and writing. Raymond has worked steadily with Sarah since September, 2000.

Raymond attended school regularly and always arrived promptly to his tutoring sessions. He kept track of when he was supposed to see his tutor and frequently questioned her as to when she was scheduled to return. Raymond appeared to enjoy working with Sarah and was always willing to complete
each assignment. In fact, over the course of data collection, Raymond often asked to stay and work with Sarah rather than attend physical education with his classmates.

Raymond is the oldest of four children, two of whom also attend PPDS. Raymond lives in an apartment with his mother, father, and three siblings. On a few occasions, Raymond discussed personal events with Sarah that had happened at home. He often spoke fondly of his family, especially in regard to his younger brother, J.C. When completing writing assignments, J.C. often emerged as one of the main characters of his stories.

Raymond’s demeanor during the tutoring sessions was positive; he often was seen smiling and laughing with Sarah. Raymond appeared to value the time spent with his tutor. They seemed to have developed a bond based on trust and mutual respect.

Sarah and Raymond spent most of their sessions in room number 53, except when it was occupied by teachers needing the extra space for teaching. Figure 3 provides a diagram of the arrangement of the classroom. As illustrated in this diagram, Sarah and Raymond always placed themselves side-by-side at a small group of student desks on the left side of the classroom. During their tutoring sessions the classroom door was propped
open, allowing other tutors to move freely in and out of the room as needed.

Figure 3. Dyad #1's Learning Environment

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Informal Assessment Results

Reading Attitude and Interest Survey

In September, 2000, Sarah orally administered the Reading and Writing Attitude Survey (Brantley, 2000) to Raymond. Raymond stated in the survey that he felt that reading “was always fun”, though he only sometimes liked to read at home. Raymond said that he only read at home a little bit which he classified as two to three times each week. Raymond reported that when he did read, he was interested in books in the Harry Potter series (J.K. Rowling), and books related to basketball, football, and many other sports. He also enjoyed reading comic books and books related to animals and cars. Raymond expressed a greater interest in writing than reading but added that he especially enjoyed reading books he had written himself. Often Raymond wrote books related to sporting events, cars, and adventures that involved him with his family and friends.

The next part of the survey delved into Raymond’s perception of himself as a reader. He felt that he was a good reader “only sometimes.” When asked if he had any difficulty recalling what he read, he stated that he “sometimes did have difficulty remembering” what happened in a story. In relation to word attack strategies, Raymond stated that he relied mainly on
sounding out words as his primary method of decoding unfamiliar words within a text. If that strategy did not work for him, he stated that he would “ask the teacher or ask his neighbor” to tell him the word. At that point he was unable to articulate any other word attack strategies that he utilized when reading. Later in the week, Sarah decided to give Raymond an informal reading inventory in order to determine the appropriate reading level for instruction.

**Informal Reading Inventory**

In September, 2000, Sarah administered the informal reading inventory to Raymond. She gave a small segment of the assessment each day for approximately one week. Sarah stated that she administered the assessment very slowly so as not to frustrate Raymond. She feared rushing this assessment may cause him to shut down and refuse to participate in the tutoring sessions.

First, Sarah administered the graded word list. Raymond was able to read the preprimer, primer, first, and second grade word lists with no errors. Next he read the third grade word list at a 90% accuracy rate. When given the fourth grade word list, Raymond scored a 60%, indicating that this was his frustration level.

Sarah used these results to determine the appropriate level
for administering the reading passage. Initially she had him read the third grade passage. His oral reading of this passage placed him at the 95% accuracy level which meant that he could decode the words at an independent level. When he was asked to retell the story, he was unable to recall at least 50% of the information, placing him within his frustration range. Because of this outcome, Sarah decided not to test him any further. Overall, the assessment results indicated that Raymond was reading two years below his present academic school level. From here, Sarah felt it was necessary to collect a sample of his writing for analysis.

Writing Sample

On September 20, 2000, Sarah had Raymond complete a writing sample based on a story they had just read together. Raymond wrote a three sentence story that has been rewritten below exactly as Raymond initially wrote it:

she wanted to grow up and she wanted to be a mail driver. and she wanted to be the funnest clown in the world. she wanted to walk on a tite Rope.

Based on this writing sample and a knowledge base Sarah possessed as a result of her years of tutoring experience, Sarah
determined that Raymond was writing at a level below his present (fifth grade) academic grade level. When interviewed, Sarah stated that Raymond needed to work on capitalization, sentence structure, sight word vocabulary, and spelling.

Based on the assessments administered to Raymond in his first two weeks of tutoring, Sarah decided upon the following three literacy learning goals:

1. To help Raymond to read at the fourth grade level.
2. To teach Raymond how to spell high frequency sight words.
3. To teach Raymond how to read high frequency sight words.

Tutor Interview

When interviewing Sarah, I asked her to elaborate on the specifics of each of the three literacy goals. This was done in an attempt to clarify exactly what her expectations were for Raymond during his tutoring sessions. Sarah indicated that goal one referred to being able to read fluently and comprehend materials that were at a fourth grade reading level. Though this would not bring him up to his present academic grade level, her hope was to help Raymond gain one year in his reading abilities over the course of the school year. Sarah expressed concern for Raymond stating that she “was worried he would not be able to keep up when he got to middle school.”

Sarah also expressed trepidation when discussing
Raymond’s writing and spelling levels and, therefore, felt it would be beneficial for Raymond to master as many words as possible from a list of the 300 most frequently used words in the English language. Sarah kept track of his mastery of these words, both in spelling and reading, on a notepad she brought to each tutoring session. Once he was able to spell and read them for five consecutive tutoring sessions, Sarah stated that she believed he had achieved mastery.

Analysis and Commentary

Sarah was diligent over the course of the 2000-2001 school year about writing lessons that focused on the achievement of Raymond’s literacy goals. When viewing the video tapes of the twelve tutoring sessions, I continually referred back to Sarah’s original lesson plans. This allowed me to compare her plans to the actual lessons that took place and then to correlate these to the above stated literacy learning goals. I found that Sarah was conscious of Raymond’s goals and generally developed lessons that would lead Raymond toward the achievement of these goals. Each of the sessions are described in great detail below and include the activities and strategies utilized within each session, the behaviors exhibited, and relevant instructional discourse.
Session Description

The first videotaped tutoring session began with a friendly exchange between Sarah and Raymond. She asked him about his day at school as well as expressing interest in how he was doing overall. In the previous week, they had spent a great deal of time writing a book based on the adventures of Raymond and his brother J.C. Today they decided to take a break from writing and to spend time reading a series of short books that Raymond had read over the course of the school year. The books were at various reading levels, ranging from an early second grade level to a late third grade level. Sarah placed six books in front of Raymond and he immediately recognized each of them. He said, “I remember reading these books a long time ago. Why are we reading them again?” Sarah explained to him that today was going to be a “review day” where they would practice reading the books for fluency. She wanted him to think about how he sounded as he read the books, and, if he wanted to, he could pretend that he was reading them aloud to his brother J.C. Raymond greatly liked that idea.

Raymond spent the first fifteen minutes of the session reading Green Eggs and Ham by Dr. Seuss. He said it was one...
of J.C.’s favorite books, and, he wanted to practice it so he could teach his brother to read it. Raymond read the book quite enthusiastically and asked if he could take it home with him. Sarah agreed to let him borrow it and told him to read it to everyone at home. Raymond beamed with excitement. Raymond then selected a joke book to read and they spent the remainder of the tutoring session reading and answering jokes.

**Analysis and Commentary**

Rereading familiar books was a highly motivating way to practice fluent reading. I began to immediately see the type of warm relationship that existed between Raymond and Sarah. Sarah understood Raymond’s areas of need as well as his areas of strength. She seemed to make a conscious effort to build upon his strengths and interests as a way to motivate him to read, therefore providing him with the necessary practice of various skills. Sarah seemed to be closely attuned to Raymond.

**Tutoring Session #2**

**Session Description**

Session #2 began with Sarah laying out five handwritten books on the desk in front of Raymond. This was to be an extremely special day, one highly anticipated by all of the students being tutored by Sarah. The five books were hard cover, bound books in which the tutees had written several
chapters featuring their own stories written over the course of the school year. Each tutee knew that the other tutees were creating individual books and knew that when all of the books were complete, they would be the first to read each other’s books. From subsequent interviews, I found out that each of the tutees often checked on each other’s progress in an attempt to determine when they would get to read each other’s books. Apparently the book writing project was a highly motivating project for Sarah’s tutees. The stories seemed to create a bond between the tutees even though they never had an opportunity to work together in their tutoring sessions.

During session #2, Raymond was able to read three of the handwritten books. He appeared to enjoy reading them because he often smiled and laughed as he read them aloud. Raymond exhibited the use of the following reading strategies as he read: a) self-corrections of oral miscues, b) rereading the sentence in order to use the sentence’s context clues to decode an unknown word, and c) initially using phonics to sound out and then blend together the sounds in a word in order to decode it.

At the conclusion of each book, Sarah asked Raymond to retell each story. Several times during this activity Raymond experienced some difficulty with recalling parts of the stories.
In the following speech grid (Speech Grid 1), Sarah provided assistance to Raymond during one of these difficult times. The grid provides a picture of a scaffolded learning experience. For a detailed description of a speech grid, refer back to Chapter Three (Hymes, 1972).

In the interaction, Sarah was able to help Raymond to retell the story through the use of leading questions rather than simply providing Raymond with the correct answers. Her questioning may have helped Raymond to retell a subsequent story by thinking back to the questions Sarah asked him that day. Sarah questioned and supported Raymond thus increasing the probability that he would feel comfortable taking risks with his responses. His comfort level was evident in his face, as he smiled and maintained eye contact with Sarah throughout the interaction. Throughout their sessions together, this type of questioning was frequently observed.

Tutor Interview

Later I asked Sarah to describe the processes that went into the creation of these books. She stated that in the beginning she spent a great deal of time with each tutee brainstorming possible writing topics.
### Speech Grid 1: Evidence of Scaffolded Comprehension

#### Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Elementary school classroom, cluster of student desks, tutor and tutee are sitting side-by-side.</th>
<th>Observer comments: No one else is in the room, they seem to be completely focused on the task at hand.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tutor # 1 - Sarah (S), Tutee # 1 - Raymond (R)</td>
<td>Friendly exchange, both are smiling, maintain eye contact throughout the interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends/Goals</td>
<td>Goal is to retell information Raymond read in a book entitled, “A Day With the Animals.”</td>
<td>Raymond seemed a little hesitant about retelling this story. He scratches his head and pauses quite a bit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Speech Act Sequence-Verbatim transcription of the speech event

(…) Each period within the brackets denotes a one second pause.

S: Ray, our time is almost up. Tell me what this story is about.
R: Um (…),
R: Um (…),
R: Um (…)
S: Who was in the story?
R: Blackie (…), and Tigger (…)
S: Good! What’d they do?
R: (…) They (…), um (…..).
S: Were they friends?
R: Ya.
S: Ah, ha!
R: They weren’t friends and when they got home they decided they should be friends.

Sarah maintained eye contact with Ray.

Ray scratches his head, pauses for 10 seconds total and doesn’t say anything but um.

Sarah allowed him 10 sec. of wait time before asking him a more specific question.

Looking at Sarah as he talks, Ray seemed to need reassurance.

Again, Sarah allowed a total of 5 sec. of wait time before asking another question.

Immediate response-smiling as he answers.

Ray smiled and maintained eye contact with Sarah.

(Continued)
Once the story topic was selected, each tutee spent time writing the story, one chapter at a time. Initially, each tutee wrote a rough copy of the chapter on paper using phonetic spelling to write the words. Together, Sarah and the tutee would go through the revising and editing process taking as much time as needed to finish the chapter. Next, each tutee would rewrite the story into a final paper draft prior to
publishing the chapter in the hard bound book. Then the tutees copied their final drafts into their published books using multicolored pens. When asked if the tutees then illustrated the books Sarah stated that “I didn’t feel comfortable letting them spend an entire tutoring session drawing pictures so I brought in magazines and let them select pictures to glue into their books. This cut down the illustration time quite a bit so we could spend the time on more important activities.”

This process of writing continued through the first few chapters of each tutee’s book, although once the tutees mastered the process Sarah cut out one step. Rather than having them write a final draft onto paper prior to writing it in their books, she later had them copy their corrected drafts directly into their books. This saved on instructional time which she felt comfortable doing because the tutees had mastered the process. Gradually the tutor was able to gradually hand over the responsibility of writing the story correctly to the tutees prior to having them recopy it into their books.

Without actually being there to see the process, I feel comfortable stating that scaffolded learning had occurred. Each tutee’s work folder contained pieces of writing that reflected the steps of the writing process, and I was able to verify the tutor’s statements by reviewing the samples of the tutee’s writing.
**Tutoring Session # 3**

**Session Description**

Session #3 began with a friendly exchange between Sarah and Raymond in which he described playing football with his brother J.C. the previous day after school. Raymond’s love of J.C. was apparent in all of his comments related to his younger brother. Next, Sarah went on to explain what they would be doing in the session. Sarah stated that “it has been a while since we read this book (Jersey) so I think we should go back to it and pick up where we left off.”

Sarah located chapter two and asked Raymond to recall the names of the book’s main characters. Raymond named two of the three main characters.

In order to model rereading a text to locate missing information, Sarah held the book in front of Raymond and flipped through the pages of the first chapter. She quickly scanned each page, stopping when she came to the name of the third character. Sarah read the paragraph aloud and asked Raymond if he could now name the missing character. Raymond immediately replied with the correct response.

Sarah and Raymond proceeded to partner read a chapter in the book. During partner reading, Sarah modeled reading with feeling and several word attack strategies including
rereading a sentence in order to decode a word using context clues and chunking words into syllables in order to decode them. Whenever Sarah read, she held the book in front of Raymond so he could see the print easily. When Raymond read, he would lie the book flat on the table in front of him.

**Analysis and Commentary**

As they were reading, Sarah did not spend much time questioning Raymond about the story. It seemed as if she missed an opportunity to check his comprehension. Later in the session she seemed to realize this and began to focus on comprehension by asking questions after each page. Often Raymond was unable to answer the questions presented, so she asked him to follow along as she read the story.

**Tutor Interview**

In a follow-up interview, I asked Sarah why she decided to model this particular strategy for Raymond. She referred back to a previous lesson when Raymond had such a difficult time retelling the story. Sarah felt that Raymond did not understand the strategy of scanning and rereading a text to find out information. She believed that this was a strategy he would need in order to be successful in middle school next year. This statement confirmed the learning goals she had selected for Raymond as well as concerns she had expressed regarding
difficulties he would have in middle school next year.

I also asked Sarah why she suddenly began asking
questions midway through the lesson, and she stated that she
"didn’t think Raymond was paying attention." I then inquired
as to what she would do in the future to keep his attention, and
she wasn’t sure at this point. I decided to focus on this aspect
of Raymond’s behavior as I viewed future tutoring sessions to
see if and how Sarah resolved this issue.

Tutoring Session # 4

Session Description

Session #4 began with Sarah asking how Raymond was
feeling on that particular day. Raymond smiled and stated that
he was having a good day “because we get to go to the
computer lab later.” Raymond went on to describe the new
computer lab that was housed in the Bennett Development
Center on the UNLV campus.

Raymond stated that he was creating another adventure
story about J.C. and himself, and he was quite excited about it.
Sarah asked Raymond if she could read the story when he
finished it, and he gave her a smile and an enthusiastic “Yes!”

Sarah and Raymond then opened the book Jersev to
chapter three and began to partner read the story. As Raymond
was reading an interesting interaction occurred that
demonstrated a level of metacognitive awareness in relation to the structure of text. Raymond’s articulation of his level of understanding is displayed in Speech Grid 2.

This particular interaction was telling in that it showed Raymond’s ability to take risks with Sarah as well as his ability to articulate an understanding of the conventions of writing. This interaction didn’t disrupt the flow of the lesson. They continued to partner read the remainder of the chapter, stopping to discuss its contents as deemed appropriate. Raymond earned a sticker for his hard work which he placed on the outside of his work folder. They left the session chatting about going to the computer lab.
Analysis and Commentary

Speech Grid 2: Evidence of Metacognitive Awareness on the Part of Tutee # 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>PPDS classroom, afternoon session lasting from 2:00 - 2:30 pm, tutor and tutee sitting side-by-side.</th>
<th>Observer’s Comments: Sarah and Raymond are the only tutors in the classroom today allowing for no outside distractions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tutor: Sarah (S), Tutee: Raymond (R).</td>
<td>Both participants seem relaxed today and eager to work together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends/Goals</td>
<td>In this particular interaction, Raymond appears to need clarification on a grammar rule he had previously learned and internalized.</td>
<td>Raymond showed a true sense of confusion when he read the word “and” at the beginning of a sentence. It made him stop in his tracks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
| Speech Act Sequence | R: She was going to have to get help from an (...) expert.  
S: Ex-  
R: Expert. And- hey I thought you couldn’t start a sentence with and?  
S: You’re not supposed to do that in writing, but they do it in books sometimes. Ya, when you’re writing, you’re never supposed to start a sentence with and. I don’t know why, but books do it anyways.  
S: No, No, No, you don’t do this! | Ray read aloud from the text, slowed down and looked at Sarah.  
Ray stops and looks at Sarah as he questions his own prior learning.  
Sarah tries to verbally reconfirm Raymond’s previous perceptions.  
Ray seems content with her response though she doesn’t appear to be comfortable with it. Ray then reads the rest of the page before handing the book over to Sarah.  
Sarah continued to read and stops when she comes to another sentence beginning with and. She points it out to Ray as she says no and then continues to read. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norms and Interpretation/ genre of speech events</td>
<td>Interaction is initiated by the tutee in order to clarify his understanding of the conventions of writing. It is a very informal speech event.</td>
<td>Raymond felt comfortable expressing his understandings to Sarah in order to confirm or disconfirm his knowledge base.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tutoring Session # 5

Session Description

Session #5 only lasted 15 minutes because Raymond’s class was going to make a trip to the computer lab to complete the final drafts of the students’ stories. Raymond arrived at the session bubbling with excitement about returning to the computer lab. He explained to Sarah that he would have to leave early to which Sarah responded, “Why don’t we just play a quick game of Hangman since you have to leave so soon.” She asked him if he remembered the procedures of the game and he responded in the affirmative. Sarah pulled out her list of 300 sight words as well as her note pad in order to determine which words she would work on with Raymond that day.

Sarah drew five lines on the board, along with the hangman’s platform and rope. Raymond began guessing letters while Sarah provided positive feedback and small hints that would lead him toward the correct answer. In Speech Grid 3, Sarah modeled the techniques for running a game of Hangman. In later sessions, this modeling and verbal interaction became very important.
Analysis and Commentary

Speech Grid 3: Evidence of the Modeling of Procedures for Playing Hangman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>PPDS classroom, Sarah and Raymond are sitting diagonal to each other at opposite corners of a student’s desk.</th>
<th>Observer’s Comments: Both Raymond and Sarah are relaxed and comfortable today.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tutor: Sarah (S), Tutee: Raymond (R).</td>
<td>Today seemed a little different. They sat diagonal to each other and it was much more playful than usual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends/ Goals</td>
<td>Spelling and reading of the 300 most frequently used words in the English language.</td>
<td>They seem to be working on the spelling and reading of sight words as well as on learning the procedures for playing the game of Hangman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Act Sequence</td>
<td>Key Instrumentalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| S: Ok Raymond, pick a letter. You may want to start with a vowel. Do you know why?  
R: Every word has a vowel in it.  
S: Right! What are the vowels? There are five of them.  
R: A, e, i, o, and u.  
S: Ya, now which one do you want to start with?  
R: E!  
S: Very good Raymond! The “e” goes right here.  
R: An s!  
S: No, there’s no “s”, so what do I do?  
R: Oh no, you have to draw my head right here.  
S: That’s ok Ray! Try again.  | PPDS classroom, sitting diagonal to each other, small white board and dry erase marker, list of high frequency words.  |
| Seems to be teaching him game strategy as well as checking his understanding of syntax.  
Checking his knowledge of vowels.  
Sarah mouths the letters in the word as she is counting the spaces. She then places the “e” in the appropriate space.  
Raymond is smiling and moving around excitedly.  
Raymond points to the noose on the rope.  
Sarah consoles him, smiling.  | When asked, Sarah said she wasn’t planning to do this today but the time constraints caused her to modify her lessons. She seems prepared for anything.  |
| (Continued)  | (Continued)  |
| Norms and Interpretations/ Genre of Speech | Informal instructional lesson using a game format to practice spelling and reading sight words. Tutor also spent time reinforcing the procedures and strategies for playing the game of Hangman. | It was a very fun, light and informal session. Sarah seemed inhibited by a lack of time but wanted to use their time together to work on a skill designated in the learning goals she set for Raymond. |

This session was somewhat limited by its short duration but Sarah seemed made the best of it by working on the spelling and reading of basic sight words. As I would find out later, she would then allow Raymond to take over the role of the teacher in the game of Hangman, thus transferring the responsibility for the learning into Raymond’s hands.

Tutor Interview

Sarah seemed to have a good understanding of how children learn and excel using scaffolded learning experiences, though she was not familiar with the actual concept of scaffolding. When I spoke to Sarah about it in an interview, she stated that “I think the kids learn faster by doing things themselves. It’s more fun that way and they seem to like being the teacher. Some of them really get into their role and take it very seriously.” Sarah’s point was reflected in session #6 when Raymond assumed responsibility for running the game of Hangman.
Tutoring Session # 6

Session Description

Session #6 was spent playing a game of Hangman with a slight variation on their regular format. In this game, Sarah asked Raymond to take on the role of the teacher while playing the game. She asked him if he wanted to "be the teacher or be the player". Raymond quickly chose to be the teacher. He immediately grabbed the white board and dry erase markers and was ready to play. Prior to playing, Sarah reviewed the instructions for playing the game, modeling how to take on the role of the teacher.

As the game proceeded, Raymond seemed to accept full responsibility for acting as the teacher during the game. In fact, he often made comments quite similar to ones made by Sarah in past games. When Sarah provided an incorrect letter, Raymond often said, "Oh, you’re so... close. Try a vowel." It was interesting to see him demonstrate his learning in this way. The instructional sequence appearing in the following Speech Grid (Speech Grid 4) took place prior to playing the game of Hangman and elaborates on the shift in responsibility in great detail.
### Speech Grid 4: Evidence of Release of Responsibility for Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>PPDS classroom, tutor and tutee are sitting diagonal to each other at a cluster of student desks.</th>
<th>Their seating is different when involved in a more competitive game as compared to when they are working on an activity together. Raymond smiles during the entire session showing his excitement for the game.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tutor: Sarah (S), Tutee: Raymond (R).</td>
<td>I also saw a goal of transferring the responsibility of learning onto Raymond's shoulders though this was not articulated by either party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends/Goals</td>
<td>To increase sight word vocabulary in both reading and spelling.</td>
<td>(Continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Act Sequence</td>
<td>S: Ray, this time when we play the Hangman game you’re going to (..), test me so you’re gonna have to know in your head how to spell it. So if the word is gone, then you’re gonna do this for me.</td>
<td>Sarah points to her head. Sarah demonstrates making the letter lines on the board. She has to take the pen out of his hand in order to demonstrate her point. She made four lines and filled them in as he says the letters in the word gone. Sarah draws a head in the noose. Ray looks into the air and scratches his head as he spells the word aloud. Sarah demonstrates where to place the letter “n”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | S: And you’re gonna do this (....), if I said an “a”. Is there an “a” in the word gone?  
R: G-o-n-e, gone. No, there’s no “a”.  
S: And you’re gonna test me and I’m gonna say, “There’s no “a”, darn.” But then if I say “n” then you’re gonna write it here. Ok?  
R: Ok, I’m ready! |  |
| Key Instrumentalities | Small white board, three dry erase markers, list of high frequency word, proximity. | Sarah is building on Raymond’s prior knowledge. |
| Norms and Interpretations/ Genre of Speech | Instructional interaction meant to increase Raymond’s sight word vocabulary both in reading and writing/informal genre of speech. | The game allowed Raymond to accept responsibility for learning. Great example of scaffolded instruction. |
I was amazed when I reviewed the film taken of Session #6. It epitomized the whole theory of scaffolded learning within the context of a simple game of Hangman. Referring back to the model of scaffolded learning created by J. Campione (1990,) that appears in chapter two, I was able to see the release of responsibility occur within this one lesson. Sarah visibly transferred the responsibility to Raymond when she handed the dry erase marker over to him. Prior to handing over the pen, she reminded him that they would first practice writing several words so that he would have a word bank to refer back to while playing the game.

Though the context of this interaction was quite simple, it provided a wonderfully explicit example of a tutor transferring the responsibility for learning to the tutee. It may be best to do so in a comfortable environment with a relatively easy or uncomplicated activity like this so that tutees feel comfortable with doing it independently. This exchange seemed to lay the groundwork for subsequent scaffolded learning experiences.

Tutoring Session # 7

Session Description

Session #7 involved the collaboration of three tutoring dyads made up of students demonstrating like abilities. The
three tutees sat next to each other in the classroom, each occupying one student desk. The three tutors sat around the periphery of the cluster of desks, offering help and advise as needed. Raymond seemed quite comfortable with his two fellow tutees. Per an informal interview, I discovered that this group played Scrabble Junior together once every two weeks.

When arriving in the classroom, the tutees immediately began to set up the game. They seemed to have developed a deep understanding of the rules, procedures, and strategies for playing the game of Scrabble Junior. Each tutee took a turn without any prompting from the tutors. Rarely did the tutors even speak during the game, and when they did speak, it was to offer praise for the word created.

**Analysis and Commentary**

This session seemed to be run entirely by the students and did not provide evidence of scaffolded learning on the part of the tutor; the session indicated that the tutees had internalized the rules and procedures for the game. The tutees were able to successfully play the game with no help from any of the tutors. This indicates that the modeling and guided practice of the procedures and strategies for playing the game were taught in previous lessons.
Session Description

Session #8 involved reading another chapter in the book *Jersey*. Again Sarah and Raymond decided to partner read the book, stopping to discuss the chapter at the end of every one to two pages. The session progressed nicely with little need to provide any assistance to Raymond as he read. Toward the end of the session, Raymond came upon a multisyllabic word, *technology*, which he was able to read without assistance. He stopped reading and asked Sarah if she knew how he knew how to read big words like *technology*. The interaction presented in Speech Grid 5 demonstrates the internalization of the “chunking” strategy that helps a reader to decode multisyllabic words.

Raymond demonstrated an understanding of the chunking strategy as he was able to clearly articulate how he learned the strategy. He also was able to transfer the learning to new situations and use chunking to decode unfamiliar words in new texts.
Analysis and Commentary

Speech Grid 5: **Evidence of the Internalization of the Chunking Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>PPDS classroom, sitting side-by-side partner reading a text, one other tutoring dyad was working in the room quietly.</th>
<th>Observer Comments: The room has one other tutoring dyad in it which does not seem to be a distraction to either dyad.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tutor: Sarah (S), Tutee: Raymond (R)</td>
<td>Raymond’s goal was to demonstrate his understanding of the chunking strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends/Goals</td>
<td>Sarah’s goal was to have Raymond read an instructional level text with fluency and comprehension</td>
<td>Raymond’s goal was to demonstrate his understanding of the chunking strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Act Sequence</th>
<th>R: Do you know how I know how to read all of these big words?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: No, how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: My mom, I didn't even know, my mom bought me these real big books, I don't know, these real big books that says, um (..), it says scary-tology or something like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: A scary book?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: Ya, it has something about scary stuff in it and it has big words like technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: Whoa!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: And I went like this: tech-nol-o-gy, and then my mom said that was right-technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond stopped reading and initiated the interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond looked very serious as he described the books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond uses his fingers to show the size of the big words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah scoots back in the chair and gives a look of surprise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond physically pretends to chunk the word technology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Act Sequence (Cont.)</th>
<th>S: So you got it the first time? Whoa! It must be good for you to read those books. They help you out with your reading.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: Ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: So you learned technology from those hard books?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: So that’s why you’re doing so good with those hard words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: Ya!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah smiles as she comments on Raymond’s ability to decode the word technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond nods his head yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond again nods yes and smiles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond continues to read.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Instrumentalities</th>
<th>The trade book, Jersey.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norms and Interpretations/Genre of Speech</th>
<th>Informal instructional speech for the purpose of describing strategies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond has taken on the instructional role. He shows a metacognitive awareness of the chunking strategy showing that he has internalized and subsequently transferred his learning to new situations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tutoring Session #9

**Session Description**

Session #9 involved the use of an activity that had not been utilized since the videotaping began. Sarah opened her
backpack and brought out a stack of worksheets covering a variety of different reading skills and activities. Sarah asked Raymond if he remembered completing these worksheets in the past. He stated that he remembered them and asked which one they were going to do that day. Raymond was asked to select a number between 1 and 32; he picked the number 30.

Worksheet number 30 contained a paragraph about Native Americans in the Southwest. Raymond was told to read the directions aloud and then use the information from the paragraph to complete the puzzle at the bottom of the page. Raymond read the directions and proceeded to read the passage to Sarah. It was a difficult piece of text but seemed to be at his instructional level. With Sarah’s help, Raymond successfully decoded such unfamiliar words as pueblo and adobe. Raymond exhibited the use of the chunking strategy while reading the passage.

After reading the text, Sarah provided detailed instructions and strategy ideas for completing the puzzle. Sarah used leading questions and examples to ensure that Raymond understood what was expected of him on this task. When Raymond experienced difficulty with one of the questions, Sarah led him to find the answer without giving him the answer. She was quite patient when working with Raymond,
allowing him to practice (guided practice) the strategies he was being taught. The following vignette (Speech Grid 6) provides an example of Sarah guiding Raymond through the process of rereading a text in order to locate information. This strategy was initially modeled by Sarah in a previous tutoring session. Speech Grid 6 provided an excellent example of scaffolded learning. In this situation, Sarah had previously modeled rereading a text to retrieve information.

In this case she provided Raymond with an environment in which he was free to take risks in order to practice the skill. Sarah sat near Raymond which enabled her to move in closer and provide any necessary support. Scaffolded instruction appeared to be a subtle piece of the activity taking place within almost every tutoring session. Though the degree of scaffolding varied depending upon the skill or strategy being taught, it was an obvious part of a majority of the tutoring sessions. The main exception to this occurred when Sarah and Raymond worked with another tutoring dyad which is what happens in the next tutoring session.
Analysis and Commentary

Speech Grid 6: Evidence of the Modeling of Rereading a Text to Locate Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>PPDS classroom, Sarah and Raymond are sitting side-by-side at a cluster of student desks.</th>
<th>Observer Comments: No one else is working in the classroom with them today. The room is very quiet and conducive to reading.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tutor: Sarah (S), Tutee: Raymond (R).</td>
<td>Participants are very relaxed and seemed to enjoy completing the puzzle together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends/Goals</td>
<td>To increase reading fluency and comprehension.</td>
<td>Sarah wanted Raymond to work on retrieving information from a non-fiction passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Act Sequence:</td>
<td>R: Which clue is easier? S: Easier! Well it doesn’t really matter because once you answer any of the questions it will help you with other answers because it will provide you with some of the letters. It’s just like a regular crossword puzzle. R: But what if I do it wrong? S: Then you’ll have to fix it because it will confuse you when you try to answer the other ones. It’s up to you but I think I’d start with number one.</td>
<td>Sarah tries to explain the strategy behind the activity of completing a crossword puzzle. Raymond wants to start with the easiest one. They seem to be at cross purposes right now but it is a very light and fun interaction nonetheless. Ray points to the puzzle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Act Sequence</th>
<th>R: Can I go like this? One-three-two-four?</th>
<th>Raymond points from #1 to #3 then down to #2 to #4. It was a diagonal pattern. He seemed to be checking to make sure all of his options were open.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: Oh ya, you can go any way you want.</td>
<td>Raymond begins to read clue #1 but gets stuck and looks to Sarah for help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: Hunts, that (...)</td>
<td>Sarah points at the word huts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: What's, what's this word?</td>
<td>Raymond looks very confused and asks Sarah to clarify the clue for him. He seemed to have a definition of hunts that didn’t match what he was reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: Hunts, hunts that some Native Americans live in. I don’t get it. It doesn’t make sense. What does hunts mean?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: No, the word’s huts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: Huts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: Huts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: Huts that some Native Americans live in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Act Sequence:</th>
<th>Sarah prompts Ray to use the rereading strategy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S: That's right. The story talked about some huts that the Native Americans lived in so now you need to look back in the story for the word huts.</td>
<td>Raymond proceeds to read the story in a whisper using his pencil to follow along. He generally doesn’t do this. He then pauses for four seconds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: I'm gonna look for the word huts.</td>
<td>He seemed confused and a little frustrated here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Ok.</td>
<td>He smiles when he realizes he's found the answer and proceeds to write it in the blank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: (...), R: Huts, (..................), R: I don't find no huts.</td>
<td>Raymond then moved on to number two. He continued on this way until he finished the puzzle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Keep reading.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: (.........), Huts called hogans. Hogans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: You got it! So there's your first answer. So now you have the letters a and o to help you with your next clue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Instrumentalities</th>
<th>Worksheet on Native Americans, pencil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norms and Interpretations/ Genre of Speech</td>
<td>The interaction was based on the need to instruct Ray on how to extract information from non-fiction text. They utilized instructional speech for a specific instructional goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t think Raymond understood Sarah’s instructional intentions. He seemed to focus solely on completing the puzzle, rather than truly understanding what he read.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tutoring Session # 10

Session Description

Tutoring session #10 involved a collaboration between Sarah and Raymond and their tutoring partners. Again, the three dyads worked out of the classroom shown in Figure 3 at the beginning of this chapter. They followed the same routine as they did in Session #7 when they played Scrabble Junior.

Tutor Interview

In a subsequent interview I asked Sarah why they were playing Scrabble Junior again this week. It was my understanding that the three tutoring dyads only collaborated once every two weeks. Sarah stated that the children had asked to work together again, and the tutors had agreed to let them play. Sarah and the other tutors felt that it was important for the children to have rich social interactions as a means of increasing their oral vocabulary. Another tutor informed me that the other two students in the group were English Language Learners (ELL) who were in need of a great deal of oral language development activities. Since Raymond needed to practice his spelling and sight word vocabulary, the tutors felt that this activity met the needs of all three of the children.

Analysis and Commentary

While watching the interaction, I found that Raymond
often took on the role of the teacher during the game. He was
two grade levels ahead of the two girls and seemed to take
pride in helping them to play the game. Raymond displayed
behaviors similar to those demonstrated when he took on the
role of teacher during a game of Hangman. It did seem that
Raymond internalized the role a teacher plays in the learning
process.

**Tutoring Session # 11**

**Session Description**

Session #11 showed Sarah and Raymond returning to a
chapter in the book *Jersey*. Prior to beginning to partner read
the text, Sarah made sure Raymond was comfortable by asking
him several questions about how his day was going so far.
Raymond did not discuss his school day; rather he revealed that
he and his family had experienced a rough evening the night
before because of some family problems that arose. He said it
caused him to get a poor grade on his spelling homework
because he didn’t have the time or the opportunity to complete
it the previous evening. Raymond was upset about what had
happened and stated that he hoped things would be okay when
he got home after school. This seemed to put a damper on
Raymond’s usual lighthearted demeanor, though he still
wanted to read with Sarah.
Sarah made a point of stopping to ask pertinent comprehension questions every few paragraphs. She seemed to sense Raymond’s inability to concentrate and wanted to ensure that he would have a successful tutoring session. Unfortunately, they had to read in the Great Room that day rather than using their usual tutoring location. This added an extra complication because the room was quite noisy. Three other tutoring dyads were located at kidney-shaped tables around the room. Several classes walked through the room during the thirty-minute time period, further adding to the distractions Raymond was experiencing.

Analysis and Commentary

Sarah seemed to be quite sensitive to Raymond’s circumstances along with the impact of working in the Great Room. She took on more of the responsibility for reading that day, often reading two pages to Raymond’s one page. Her questions were very literal and allowed Raymond to be successful. Sarah lavished Raymond with positive reinforcement which seemed to be just what Raymond needed. It was obvious that the bond between them was strong. Though this lesson did not show any forward movement toward the mastery of Raymond’s literacy goals, it was a valuable use of the tutoring time. The strength of the
relationship between Sarah and Raymond seemed to be one aspect or dimension of the process of instructional scaffolding that existed within this tutoring dyad. Without this bond, I believe that Sarah would not have been able to scaffold Raymond’s literacy learning as successfully as she has done.

_Tutoring Session # 12_

**Session Description**

Session #12 was the final tutoring session videotaped for the ethnographic research study. During this session Sarah revisited the writing process as Raymond began to write a story based on what he had read so far in the book _Jersey_. Sarah explained to Raymond that they would be writing a rough draft of a story based on a character introduced in the book. She called this specific type of writing a character biography.

To begin the biography, Raymond was asked to describe some of the book’s characters and to select one to describe in his writing. He quickly described the main character of the story, a girl named Hilary. Sarah removed a blank brainstorming map from her backpack and asked Raymond to write the character’s name in the center and then describe the character on the “rays” emanating from the center circle. Raymond asked Sarah how to spell a word and she kindly
reminded him that this was a “rough copy.” The purpose was to get his ideas down on paper rather than focusing on writing everything using conventional spelling. Sarah demonstrated using phonetic spelling on the white board by “stretching out” the word “recommend.” Raymond stated that he understood and proceeded to begin his character web.

After completing the web, Raymond and Sarah talked through each of the character’s descriptors. Sarah encouraged Raymond to expand on some of them in order to make the drafting stage flow more easily. Together they added depth to Raymond’s character cluster. Raymond then proceeded to draft his initial version of the story. Prior to this, Sarah reminded him to write in complete sentences and spell the words as they sounded. Raymond spent the rest of the session writing, stopping only to ask Sarah spelling questions. If the word was not phonetic, Sarah spelled it for him. If it was phonetic, Sarah pushed him to attempt spelling it on his own.

Tutor Interview

In a later interview I asked Sarah if Raymond always insisted on asking her to spell words for him even though she instructed him to spell them phonetically in his rough draft. Sarah stated that “He used to ask me for every other word. He’s much better now and usually only asks me for the real
hard words. Raymond has really improved his writing. He used to write just a couple of sentences and they usually did not start with capital letters.” This information put Raymond’s writing experiences into a more accurate perspective.

Analysis and Commentary

Session #12 was the final session video taped as part of the data collection period. At this point, I was able to identify many trends that crossed all of the tutoring sessions. Each session generally involved a reading and/or spelling component. Though prior to Session #12 I had not experienced Sarah and Raymond participating in the writing process, I knew they had spent time on it because of the handwritten book Raymond had completed at the onset of the videotaping.

The sessions took place over a three and one-half week time period in the spring of 2001 during Raymond’s regularly scheduled tutoring sessions. Each evening I ventured home to take a peek at the culture of tutoring that existed between Raymond and Sarah. I was always pleasantly surprised at the strength of the bond between them that allowed Raymond to take risks with his literacy learning. In the final section pertaining to tutoring dyad # 1, I have briefly summarized the overall findings of the ethnographic study.
Summary of Findings For Tutoring Dyad # 1

Over the course of a three and a half week period I witnessed a warm and caring tutoring relationship that had developed over a year’s time. This relationship seemed to exist on several levels: it was a relationship based on mutual respect and caring; it was a relationship based on need and willingness to give; it was a relationship based on mutual enjoyment and a desire to learn. It was a relationship that clearly defined the culture of tutoring that existed between Sarah, a university tutor, and Raymond, a fifth grade boy. The ethnographic videotape and subsequent analysis allowed me to delve into the cognitive processes associated with learning while also coming to understand the importance of the creation of a risk-free learning environment. Table 3, in Appendix D, provides a summary of each tutoring session.

Literacy Strategies

Figure 4 provides a graphic depicting the frequency of use of the strategy domains (Spradley, 1980), or practices that became a part of the culture of tutoring within tutoring dyad number one. The second table (Table 4) further divides these strategy domains into the specific strategies that made up each domain for tutoring dyad 1.
Figure 4. Data Chart of the Strategies Utilized by Each of the Tutoring Dyads Over the Course of Twelve Tutoring Sessions
Table 4  **Domain Analysis of the Instructional Strategies Utilized by Tutor # 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Terms</th>
<th>Semantic Relationship</th>
<th>Cultural Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* DRTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Questioning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Activation of prior knowledge</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Retelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Reading self-created writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Rereading old familiars</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Paired reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Oral reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Writing process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* LEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Have-a-Go- Spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Phonetic spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Scrabble Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hangman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Scrabble Junior Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Proximity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Promoting risk-taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Positive reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Listening/Responding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Extrinsic rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Terms</th>
<th>Semantic Relationship</th>
<th>Cultural Domains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Rereading a text to decode unknown words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Chunking words into syllables</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td>Word Attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Rereading to use context to decode unknown words</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Wait time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Collaborative learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see from Figure 4 and Table 4, Sarah utilized a variety of what I have called “positive learning environment” strategies on a daily basis. These strategies took many forms, but each was designed for the purpose of creating a learning environment conducive to the promotion of risk-taking on Raymond’s part. Generally these strategies were quite subtle (e.g., sitting in close proximity to the tutee, listening and responding appropriately, smiling and maintaining eye contact, etc.), while others were more overt (providing positive feedback and extrinsic rewards). In any case, each added a richness to
the tutoring sessions. Without the establishment of a warm and positive learning environment, it is my belief that the process of scaffolding would have been hindered greatly.

Aside from strategies promoting a positive learning environment, Sarah spent a tremendous amount of her instructional time on reading comprehension and word attack strategies, directly correlating with the literacy learning goals developed for Raymond. Within the reading comprehension domain, Sarah relied on the Directed Reading and Thinking Activity (DRTA), the use of various levels of questioning, activation of Raymond’s prior knowledge, and oral retellings. Each of these strategies enhanced Raymond’s understanding of the material he read.

The main word attack strategies I observed across the tutoring sessions were rereading a sentence or phrase in order to decode a word within the context of the sentence, chunking words into individual syllables, and blending the parts together to form a word. Not only were these strategies modeled for Raymond, but he was also seen implementing these strategies as he practiced reading during the tutoring sessions.

Sarah and Raymond also participated in several activities related to reading fluency and spelling. Sarah encouraged Raymond to read aloud during each tutoring session, at times
asking him to read his own writing or books written by his peers. Raymond played games such as Hangman and Scrabble Junior that related to spelling. Each of these games encouraged Raymond to spell and read aloud high frequency sight words.

Though I did not witness many authentic writing sessions taking place, several artifacts in Raymond’s work folder indicated that he and Sarah had spent time on this in the past. My summation was confirmed in subsequent interviews with Sarah. Sarah indicated that they had spent blocks of time writing throughout the school year. The type and frequency of their writing depended on the season, the books they were reading, and the interests of each tutee. Sarah stated that writing was not a regular part of each tutoring session unless it was selected as one of the tutee’s specific learning goals.

Again, in reviewing the strategies and practices observed over the course of three and one-half weeks, it was extremely important to situate the 12 sessions I viewed within the context of the ever-changing year-long tutoring relationship that developed between Sarah and Raymond. No one session could be understood completely on its own; the session had to be seen as one small frame as if taken from a full length movie created over the course of a year. With that understanding, I
will now delve into the process of knowledge co-construction that occurred throughout these sessions.

**Scaffolded Learning Experiences**

Sarah and Raymond frequently engaged in scaffolded learning experiences. Generally these interactions were short in duration, often lasting only one to two minutes. These scaffolded learning experiences took various forms and generally involved varying levels of tutor support depending on Raymond’s immediate learning needs. Sarah seemed to have developed a strong relationship with Raymond that permitted her to increase or decrease her level of instructional support quite rapidly. In fact, Sarah often appeared to know inherently when Raymond was capable of standing on his own versus when Raymond needed Sarah to step in and support him. After observing them at work and speaking with Sarah on several occasions, I came to understand that Sarah was able to assess and respond to situations quickly as they arose within the confines of their tutoring sessions. The strength of the relationship that developed between Sarah and Raymond over time was “the” factor that enabled Sarah to assess and respond to Raymond appropriately and rapidly. This discovery was an extremely important finding in this research study.

The focus of Chapter Four now shifts to tutoring dyad #2.
The chapter was organized in this way so that the research findings from tutoring dyad #1 could be compared and contrasted with a second tutoring dyad located at the same school site. Though the tutors participated in the same training cohort, some significant differences in their use of instructional strategies have been found to exist. Along with their differences, a clear picture of their similarities emerged within the first two tutoring sessions. This section of the study begins with a description of the participants who comprised tutoring dyad #2 along with information related to the context of their particular tutoring situation.

**Tutoring Dyad #2**

Tutoring dyad #2 was made up of one university tutor, Rachel, and one elementary school tutee, Jennifer. Rachel and Jennifer worked together for approximately five months. They met for 3-4 tutoring sessions every week, each lasting for thirty-minutes. Rachel and Jennifer always worked one-on-one, unlike tutoring dyad #1 that collaborated regularly with other tutoring dyads.

Rachel and Jennifer conducted their tutoring sessions in room number 51A. It was a small classroom set up to house no more than 20 students. This classroom was available for tutoring because the class was out on track break. Figure 5
provides a diagram of the arrangement of this classroom, designating the spot where each tutoring session took place. Rachel and Jennifer generally sat diagonally to each other so that they faced each other rather than working side-by-side. Rachel often kept some distance from Jennifer unless she needed to provide instruction or feedback to Jennifer.

Figure 5. Dyad #2's Learning Environment
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Tutor # 2- Rachel

Rachel is a 25 year old African-American female university student. At the time of the study, Rachel was in her final semester of course work prior to beginning her student teaching. Rachel was an early childhood/special education major whose primary area of interest involved working with children ages three to five. She often expressed concern with her ability to teach reading to primary level elementary school children. Because of her concerns in this area, Rachel completed two extra courses at the university focusing on the teaching of reading. These courses were above and beyond what was required in her degree program. Rachel often expressed a desire to “have someone just tell me how to teach children to read. Why can’t they (instructors) just give me a program that will teach kids how to read. I don’t understand it!” This theme of uncertainty did not lessen as the year progressed.

At the time of the study, Rachel was a mother of two school-aged children and as well as a university student. Her daughter attends kindergarten at PPDS while her fifth grade son attended a school across town. Several years ago her son was diagnosed with autism, which according to Rachel, had spurred her interest in working with special needs children. Rachel has
shown an intense desire to learn more about reading instruction and cognitive development in younger children. She often expressed frustration with her academic program and the schooling her own children received in the public school system.

Rachel had worked as an ARC tutor since January, 2000. She energetically completed the 20 hour training program and spent several hours shadowing an experienced tutor prior to beginning her tutoring at the PPDS.

**Tutee # 2- Jennifer**

Jennifer, a nine year old female student at the PPDS was in the third grade and had attended the PPDS since first grade. She lived in a house with her father, step-mother, and older sister. Jennifer was frequently absent from school, citing illness as the cause for her absences. Jennifer seems to have some fear of school as she expressed concern over the possibility of violence at school. Per an informal interview, Jennifer has not experienced any such violence first hand, but is scared because of what she has witnessed on television. In fact, one day she missed her tutoring session because it was the anniversary of the Oklahoma City bombing, and she believed that a bomb might explode at school.

Jennifer was referred to the ARC tutoring program by her
classroom teacher who expressed concern over Jennifer's school attendance and lack of motivation toward academic assignments. As a way to reward her for completing her tasks in class and as a way to improve her school attendance, Jennifer was allowed to work with Rachel each afternoon. Her teacher felt that it was important for her to bond with a female who would be available to her on a daily basis. Jennifer was seen as a high needs student because of her erratic attendance and her inability to complete assignments on time.

**Informal Literacy Assessment Results**

**Reading Interest and Attitude Survey**

On January 18, 2001, Rachel orally administered the ARC Reading and Writing Attitude Survey (Brantley, 2000) to Jennifer. Jennifer stated that she felt that reading was "sometimes fun" but that she did not read at home very often. When she did read, Jennifer stated that she like to read funny books like *Fudge-A-Mania* and Dr. Seuss books. Jennifer also said that she enjoyed reading books that were about cats, dogs, and other animals. When asked if she perceived herself as a reader, Jennifer said that she thought she was "always a good reader."

Jennifer indicated that she did not enjoy writing stories,
but she enjoyed playing word games and writing her spelling words. When she was asked to write in class, Jennifer stated that she liked to write about her friends, her dog, her birds, and ice skating. She said that she also enjoyed drawing and watching television.

The final portion of the survey delved into the word attack strategies that Jennifer utilized when independently reading a book or story. Jennifer indicated that when she came to a word she didn’t know that she would “try to sound it out.” If that didn’t work, then Jennifer would “ask her teacher who would then write it in her word study book for her.” At this point, Jennifer was unable to name any other word attack strategies that she found useful. During the following tutoring session, Rachel began to administer the informal reading inventory to Jennifer.

**Informal Reading Inventory Results**

In January, 2001, Rachel administered an informal reading inventory to Jennifer. She gave a small segment of the inventory each day, spending approximately three days to complete the entire assessment. On the first day of assessment, Jennifer was asked to read a graded word list. The word list was read as quickly as possible in order to ensure that the words were truly a part of the Jennifer’s sight word
vocabulary. Jennifer was able to read the preprimer, primer, and first grade level with no miscues. When she reached the second grade level, she missed a total of six words out of twenty, indicating that this was probably the appropriate level to begin testing her on the story passages.

Jennifer orally read the second grade passage at a 93% accuracy level. Then she was asked to retell the story which proved to be more difficult for her. Jennifer scored at the 80% accuracy level for reading comprehension. Because of the discrepancy between her oral reading and comprehension levels, Rachel decided to stop at this point and not test Jennifer on a higher reading level.

Overall the informal reading assessment indicated that Jennifer was reading approximately one year below grade level. This result did not agree with the classroom teacher’s assessment; Jennifer’s teacher felt that she was functioning at the third grade level but was experiencing difficulty in completing her assignments.

**Tutor Interview**

When I interviewed Rachel, I asked her about these discrepancies. Rachel stated that she realized after a few weeks of tutoring that Jennifer could read at a higher level but had a difficult time with comprehension due to her
inattentiveness. Rachel agreed with the teacher’s initial assessment results.

Writing Sample

I searched through Jennifer’s tutoring folder but was unable to find a writing sample. Rachel initially indicated that Jennifer was quite resistant to writing and would only write lists of words. Rarely was Rachel able to motivate Jennifer to write a complete sentence or story. In the beginning, Rachel would use the Language Experience Approach to motivate Jennifer in becoming interested in writing but gave up on this when Jennifer refused to write on her own. Rachel felt that Jennifer would receive the most benefit from tutoring by focusing on areas that interested Jennifer. As a result of her belief in the importance of building on Jennifer’s interests, Rachel asked Jennifer to collaborate on creating the following literacy learning goals.

1. To improve Jennifer’s sight word vocabulary.
2. To improve Jennifer’s spelling.
3. To improve Jennifer’s reading comprehension.
4. To improve Jennifer’s reading motivation.

Tutor Interview

When I interviewed Rachel during the data collection period, I asked her to elaborate on the process that she and
Jennifer went through to develop these goals. Did she feel that Jennifer provided input into the creation of the goals? Did she believe that Jennifer felt that these were truly her areas of need? Rachel described the day they created the goals as a very “verbal” day for Jennifer. Rachel initially believed that Jennifer did not need any help with her reading; this belief proved to be a barrier that had to work to overcome. Rachel decided to share her own strengths and weaknesses with Jennifer in the hope that Jennifer would begin to work with her to develop learning goals.

Rachel was able to help Jennifer create one goal based on the answers Jennifer had given on her reading and writing attitude survey. Rachel pointed out the fact that Jennifer stated that sometimes Jennifer had difficulty recalling what she had read. Jennifer agreed that this was difficult for her sometimes, and that she would like to “be better at remembering.” It took them an entire tutoring session to develop this one goal, so it was decided that Rachel would write the goals on her own and ask Jennifer to approve or modify them later. This method worked for both of them as they actually developed four learning goals rather than the original three goals.
Analysis and Commentary

When viewing the videotaped tutoring sessions, I was able to compare the activities that took place within the sessions to the learning goals that Rachel and Jennifer had developed. Overall, the lessons were appropriately matched to the four literacy learning goals. To elaborate on this further I have gone into great detail about each of the twelve tutoring sessions. At the end of the lesson descriptions, I created a domain analysis that identified and categorized the strategies implemented over the course of the twelve tutoring sessions. The graph reflects the types of strategies utilized as well as the frequency of their use. This information was then compared to the data collected from tutoring dyad #1 in order to compare and contrast the strategies each dyad employed and the degree to which they used each strategy.

Literacy Tutoring Sessions for Dyad # 2

Tutoring Session # 1

Session Description

Session #1 began with a discussion of the first chapter of the book Superfudge (Blume, 1991). Rachel asked Jennifer to recall the names of the characters introduced in chapter one along with any other information she could recall. Jennifer
spent three minutes discussing the chapter in great detail, often stopping to ask questions as she retold the story. Jennifer tended to be quite verbal throughout the entire session which would turn out to be a pattern displayed in each of her tutoring sessions.

As Jennifer began to read aloud from chapter two, Rachel moved closer to her so that she would be able to provide assistance and reinforcement to Jennifer as needed. Jennifer used a bookmark as a guide while reading; placing it under each line of text. I spoke to Rachel about the use of a bookmark, and Rachel stated that Jennifer seemed to need it when she read more complex texts. The bookmark provided a sense of security when reading challenging texts. I made a note to look for the bookmark as she progressed through Superfudge.

During the session, Jennifer exhibited knowledge of the chunking strategy to decode unknown words. In the following vignette (Speech Grid #7), Rachel used questioning to assist Jennifer when the chunking strategy proved unsuccessful for her. Rachel built on Jennifer’s prior experiences to help her decode the words.
Analysis and Commentary

Speech Grid 7: **Evidence of the Modeling of Questioning as a Comprehension Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>PPDS classroom, large rectangular table at the front of the classroom, Rachel and Jennifer are sitting diagonal to each other.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer’s Comments:</td>
<td>At first it seemed as if Rachel was too far away from Jennifer to be able to help her to decode unknown words. As the session progressed, Rachel moved closer to Jennifer whenever Jennifer needed extra support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tutor: Rachel (R), Tutee: Jennifer (J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends/Goals</td>
<td>To read chapter two of the book with fluency and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer and Rachel seemed to have a common understanding of the goals of the lesson.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
| Speech Act Sequence | J: How did the baby get inside you mom? So mom (.......)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(..) The number of periods within the brackets indicates the length of the pause. This example means that it was a 2 sec. pause.</td>
<td>J: /b/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer was reading a sentence from chapter two and became stuck on the word borrow.</td>
<td>Jennifer makes the initial sound which is a /b/. She then used her fingers to divide the word into syllables and tried to sound out the word again. As this is going on, Rachel moved in much closer to Jennifer and paid close attention to the look on Jennifer’s face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Broke?</td>
<td>Jennifer’s voice rose as if asking a question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: Close Jennifer! Do you have a sister? Do you have a sister?</td>
<td>Rachel’s voice raises as if she is asking a question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: Sometimes you want to use one of her clothes, so you (....)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Speech Act Sequence (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jennifer paused here and Rachel immediately moved closer. The next word was “he” but that wasn’t the word she was stuck on. Jennifer was actually reading ahead to the word straight but paused earlier in order to figure it out. Rachel pointed to the word “straight” on the page which prompted Jennifer to reread the sentence and fill in the correct word.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer looked to Rachel for affirmation when she read the word straight. Rachel nodded in the positive which prompted Jennifer to continue reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J: Borrow, she borrowed a copy of how babies are made and she read it to Fudge. As soon as (..) |

J: As soon as he had the facts (...) straight, straight (..), he was telling anybody and everybody. |

R: Exactly!

Key Instrumentalities

| Book Superfudge, paper bookmark. |

Norms and Interpretations/ Genre of Speech

| Interaction was based on an immediate need on Jennifer’s part, the need for alternate work attack strategies/ instructional speech event. |

| Most of this interaction involved non-verbal communication on the part of the tutor and tutee. Pointing, eye contact, nodding, and physical chunking of the words. The only question posed by the tutor was meant to provide a clue based on the tutee’s prior experiences. |

Tutoring dyad # 2 seemed to utilize many more non-verbal cues in their instructional interactions. Rachel learned to read
Jennifer’s signals as a way to know when to increase the level of assistance during the tutoring sessions. Though Jennifer is quite verbal, she often did not ask for help verbally; rather, she made eye contact with Rachel as a way to ask for assistance. When reading, Jennifer would also raise her voice at the end of a word to indicate that she was asking for help with the next word. I asked Rachel about what I was seeing, and she agreed that they had developed nonverbal signals that they utilized in a variety of ways. It had become a natural part of their interactions, and often Rachel and Jennifer were unaware of the signals they were sending to each other. I decided that it was necessary to identify these nonverbal signals in order to understand the scaffolded learning experiences that took place during their sessions.

Tutoring Interview

In an interview, I asked Rachel how she selected this particular text for Jennifer. Rachel stated that recently she had moved Jennifer up a level in her reading texts based on her oral reading scores and oral retellings of past texts. Rachel based these scores on running records she kept on Jennifer as well as on her ability to recall facts about the stories she had been reading. Together, Jennifer and Rachel selected Superfudge from a group of books that were at a similar reading level.
Jennifer chose this book based on the front cover and the information provided on the back of the book. Rachel stated that Jennifer was "a little hesitant" to start reading a chapter book, but Rachel reassured her that she would be there to help her whenever she needed it.

**Tutoring Session # 2**

**Session Description**

Session #2 began with a word study activity during which Rachel had Jennifer try to spell words correctly from the word list of the 300 most frequently used words in the English language. Because of Jennifer’s previous success with the list of 34 words, she asked to begin the session with this activity rather than ending with it.

Rachel sat next to Jennifer at a small rectangular table. Rachel sat back a little from the table in an attempt to conceal the list of words from Jennifer. After reading the word aloud, Rachel watched Jennifer write the word on her white board and offered different forms of assistance and praise as she deemed necessary. Rachel and Jennifer seemed to know each other quite well and have established a comfortable routine that they used each day. In fact, Jennifer seemed to enjoy the routine and structure of the sessions to the extent that she looked forward to the next time they worked together.
**Tutoring Interview**

During an informal interview with Rachel, I learned that she had spoken to Jennifer’s teacher about the process Jennifer was making in the tutoring sessions. Rachel felt that Jennifer had made significant progress, almost to the point that she questioned whether the tutoring was necessary for her. The teacher explained that Jennifer displayed a difficult time concentrating in class and, therefore, did not always get her work done. The tutoring sessions were something Jennifer enjoyed, and the teacher allowed her to go to the sessions as a form of reward for completing her work and behaving in class. The teacher also stated that the tutor was able to supplement her classroom instruction which allowed Jennifer to keep up with her peers. The concept of participating in the ARC Tutoring Program was presented to Jennifer as a reward for her hard work rather than as a remediation tool. This fact adds an interesting dimension to the culture of this particular tutoring dyad because it presents a different set of needs and a different reason for providing the tutoring service.

The following vignette taken from session #2, illustrates how Rachel scaffolded Jennifer’s instruction during a word
study activity (Speech Grid 8). This particular exchange occurred in the middle of the session.

I selected this particular speech event because of its relevance in subsequent lessons. Jennifer later demonstrated that she had internalized the concept being taught here by revisiting this conversation when she was presented again with the word pair.

After this interaction, Jennifer got up and walked in a circle as Rachel pulled out the book Superfudge for her to read. They began paired reading, alternating pages as they took turns reading the remainder of the chapter. At the end of the chapter, Rachel asked Jennifer to retell the chapter in her own words. Jennifer was able to do this without any prompting from Rachel. This ended session #2.
Analysis and Commentary

Speech Grid 8: Initial Teaching/Demonstration of a Word Attack Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>PPDS classroom, Rachel and Sarah were sitting diagonal to each other.</th>
<th>Observer’s Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tutor: Rachel (R), Tutee: Jennifer (J)</td>
<td>Jennifer and Sarah both seem to be in a relaxed mood today. They entered the room laughing and smiling though I was unable to hear their specific conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends/Goals</td>
<td>To increase Jennifer’s spelling and sight word vocabulary.</td>
<td>(Continued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Speech Act Sequence

| R: Present,       | Rachel read the words aloud as Jennifer spelled them on the white board. Jennifer was writing them all correctly. |
| R: Right.        | Rachel gave Jennifer a high five to congratulate her. Jennifer smiles and asks to continue. |
| R: Tall,         |                                                                                                               |
| R: Next,         |                                                                                                               |
| R: Whoa! Give me five! |                                                                                                               |
| J: Can I finish the page today? |                                                                                                               |
| R: You want to finish them? Ok, but it goes all the way to number 200. |                                                                                                               |
| J: Ok, let's do ten more. |                                                                                                               |
| R: Ok, here goes! Pair. |                                                                                                               |
| R: Hum, can you spell the word air? |                                                                                                               |
| J: Air, ya, it's a-i-r. |                                                                                                               |
| R: Right, now put a p in front of air and you'll have pair. |                                                                                                               |
| J: P-a-i-r, pair! |                                                                                                               |
| R: Yes! High five! |                                                                                                               |

### Key Instrumentalities

| Small white board, dry erase markers, list of high frequency words. |                                                                                                               |

### Norms and Interpretations/ Genre of Speech

| Instructional conversation based on the shared desire to reach a common goal of spelling all 300 of the high frequency sight words/ the conversation was informal but instructional. | This particular interaction didn’t seem to be overly significant at the time, but it did reappear in a later session which made it very significant. |

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Session Description

Initially, session #3 was supposed to begin with Jennifer reading chapter three in the book Superfudge. When Jennifer sat down at the tutoring table, she asked Rachel if they could begin the session with spelling rather than reading. Rachel agreed but said that they would have to read as well because that was the main reason they were working together. Jennifer was excited about the prospect of spelling, especially because she was allowed to write her spelling words on a white board. Jennifer and Rachel spent the entire session on spelling, never returning to the original lesson plan that focused on reading a chapter in the book Superfudge.

Speech Grid # 9 captured a scaffolded learning experience that occurred during the spelling segment of the lesson. The experience reflected the flexibility of the process of scaffolding based on the immediate learning needs Jennifer exhibited. The ability to scaffold Jennifer’s learning experiences developed over time as their relationship solidified. At this point in their tutoring relationship, Rachel provided more or less support to Jennifer as each activity or situation deemed necessary.
Analysis and Commentary

Speech Grid # 9: Evidence of Scaffolded Learning Within the Context of a Spelling Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>PPDS classroom, Rachel and Jennifer are sitting diagonally to each other when the lesson begins.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer Comments:</td>
<td>Rachel’s physical placement changes as she provides Jennifer with varying degrees of support throughout the lesson. She seems to physically move closer to Jennifer as she provides a higher level of support. It’s quite interesting to see her physically move as a part of the scaffolding process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tutor: Rachel (R), Tutee: Jennifer (J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends/Goals</td>
<td>To increase Jennifer’s reading and spelling sight word vocabulary; to provide activities she is comfortable with so she can experience academic success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A big part of this tutoring relationship focused on providing Jennifer with a stable routine, a mentor, and successful academic experiences in the hopes of keeping her in school in the long term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
### Speech Act Sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R: The next word is write. Spell write.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R: No, it's the kind of write like you are writing a letter to someone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: R-i-g-h-t, right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: Um (...), no that means you are right. You need to write the other one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are about midway through the spelling section of the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer begins to write the letter R on her board. Rachel leans in and realizes that she needs to place the word in a context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer looks at Rachel, erases her board, and then writes &quot;right.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel's clues are a little confusing to me, but they're not to Jennifer!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J: It starts with an R?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R: It starts with a W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: (...) Can I leave the i there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: Yep!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: W-r-i?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: I like to write.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Write, w-r-i-t-e?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: There you go! You got it Jennifer!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer then adds a W in front of the R forming the word Wright. She then poses a question to Rachel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer erases the ght.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer silently mouths the spelling of write as she writes it on her board. She then holds it up for Rachel's approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They immediately move on to the next word.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
### Key Instrumentalities

| White board, dry erase markers, list of high frequency words. |

### Norms and Interpretations/ Genre of Speech

| Interaction was based on the need to correctly spell a sight word without giving the tutee the answer/ It was a fragmented instructional speech event. |
| I’m not sure I always understand the interactions but the participants seem to! Rachel said that she provided minimal clues because she knew Jennifer could spell this word. This was based on previous experiences with this particular word. Rachel seemed to know that Jennifer could do it and she was going to lead her to find the answer for herself. |

---

**Tutor Interview**

If I had not questioned Rachel about this interaction, I would have felt that it was just a confusing event that didn’t seem to benefit Jennifer. Rachel had worked with Jennifer long enough to know what she can do with minimal assistance. Rachel also seemed to know intuitively when to increase the level of support. The question is then, how does a tutor know when to step in and when to step back? I posed this question during a later interview and Rachel had a difficult time.
articulating a response. She said that she based her instructional decisions on prior experiences with Jennifer as well as basing her decisions on the actions and body language exhibited by Jennifer during a session. It was not something Rachel could pinpoint; rather she believed it emerged as the tutoring relationship progressed.

Then I asked Rachel why Jennifer often requested to spend her time spelling words. Rachel said that Jennifer felt confident with her spelling abilities and enjoyed spelling words. Reading was more difficult for her, and she often tried to avoid it. Also they had established a routine during their sessions in which Jennifer would spell 30 words each day and then spend the rest of the time reading. Jennifer did not seem to adjust well to any changes in their routine, so Rachel generally let Jennifer begin the sessions with spelling.

Tutoring Session # 4

Session Description

Session #4 began with a discussion of what the goals were for the tutoring session. Rachel explained that she left her white board at home, and they would need to spend the time reading the next chapter in Superfudge. Jennifer was upset by this and asked if she could just practice writing 30 of her spelling words anyway. Jennifer also asked if it was possible
for Rachel to borrow a white board or to run home and get it. Jennifer knew that Rachel lived in an apartment located just outside the PPDS campus. Rachel informed her that she would have to use plain paper if she wanted to write her words which seemed to make Jennifer uncomfortable. Jennifer asked, “What if I write it wrong?” Rachel explained that she could either use pencil and erase it or write in pen and then scratch it out. Jennifer made several moaning sounds and made faces at the prospect of writing her words without a white board.

**Tutor Interview**

I was surprised at how much this simple event (Rachel forgetting the white board) caused Jennifer to become uncomfortable with an activity she truly enjoyed doing. I later asked Rachel about this incident and she stated that, “Jennifer doesn’t like change. She wants everyday to be the same. I don’t get it, but that’s the way she likes it.”

**Analysis and Commentary**

The entire session appeared to be thrown off because of the initial interaction regarding the spelling segment of the lesson. Jennifer seemed resistant to spelling and also refused to read aloud to Rachel. Rachel then took over the lesson and began to read aloud to Jennifer. Jennifer squirmed, climbed on the chair, crumpled up her spelling paper, and then stood up...
and tied her shoes. She seemed completely disinterested in the lesson. Only when Rachel gave Jennifer a piece of paper to draw on did Jennifer sit down and listen to the story. Surprisingly, Jennifer was able to retell the main ideas in the story. I would have thought that would have been impossible due to the Jennifer’s behavior during the session. Jennifer stood up at the end of the session, handed her drawing to Rachel and walked back to class. It was an unusual day.

_Tutoring Session # 5_

_Session Description_

Session five began with Jennifer discussing a guest speaker who had just visited her classroom. She said that the woman was going to leave snacks for the students, and Jennifer hoped that she wouldn’t be forgotten while she attended her tutoring session. Jennifer’s concern for missing out on the snack seemed to overshadow the entire tutoring session. To me it seemed as if she were misbehaving in the hopes of being sent back to her classroom.

Rachel handed Jennifer the white board and three colorful dry erase markers to start their spelling session. As Rachel read the list of words, Jennifer wrote them with increasing pressure placed on the dry erase pen. The harder Jennifer pressed on the pen, the louder the pen squeaked. Rachel tried to ignore
this behavior, as she often did with Jennifer, but Jennifer refused to be ignored. She pressed harder until Rachel stopped the lesson entirely. Rachel asked Jennifer to press lightly on the pen so it would stop squeaking. Then Rachel presented an ultimatum, stating that they would no longer use the white board if Jennifer couldn’t use it correctly. That seemed to quell this episode of misbehavior.

The second half of the lesson required Jennifer to read aloud a chapter from *Superfudge*. Jennifer was somewhat resistant to this, often reading so quickly that the words would become garbled. Rachel then took the book from Jennifer and modeled fluent reading for her stating that, “You want to read at a nice pace, but not so fast that no one can understand you. Try it like this.” Rachel proceeded to read a paragraph during which time Jennifer stepped in to correct Rachel’s mispronunciation of the word “above.” (Rachel said a-bove rather than above). At this point I could see the irritation on Rachel’s face. She handed the book back to Jennifer and had her read aloud for the rest of the session.

**Analysis and Commentary**

What I found quite interesting was that this somewhat negative interaction had a distinct effect on the level of instructional scaffolding that took place throughout this session.
As Jennifer read, Rachel kept a greater distance between herself and Jennifer than displayed at previous sessions. I would estimate it to have been three feet. When Jennifer would hesitate on a word, Rachel would move in close enough to see the word but would not ask any questions to guide Jennifer towards the answer. Instead, Rachel always pronounced the words for Jennifer. This was quite extraordinary for this tutoring dyad as Rachel rarely would just volunteer the answer without Jennifer first trying to decode it using one of the many strategies she had been taught.

Tutor Interview

In an interview the following day, Rachel and I discussed Jennifer’s previous tutoring session. Rachel stated that she was frustrated by Jennifer’s behavior and did not have the patience to teach her properly during the lesson. Rachel felt that Jennifer’s resistance led to the poor quality of the tutoring session. In fact, Rachel felt that their tutoring relationship had regressed during this session. It was interesting to watch the next few sessions checking to see if this was an enigma or if it happened on a regular basis.

Tutoring Session # 6

Session Description

Session #6 started off with Rachel reiterating the
behavioral expectations and procedures when using the white
board for spelling. Rachel reminded Jennifer that she needed to
press lightly to avoid squeaking the pens. It was apparent that
Rachel was still irritated by Jennifer’s behavior during the
previous day’s tutoring session. Jennifer responded
affirmatively and said she would “try really hard not to squeak
the pen.” It was my belief that Jennifer wanted to work hard
that day and make amends for the poor behavior previously
displayed.

It had been four sessions since Rachel had given Jennifer
the word “pair “to spell. If you remember session two, Jennifer
exhibited great difficulty with spelling that particular word. To
assist her, Rachel asked her if she could spell the word air and
Jennifer immediately said “a-i-r.” The original interaction lasted
over one minute. During this session, as soon as Jennifer was
given the word “air” to spell, a smile beamed across her face.
In Speech Grid 10, Jennifer provided insight into her internal
cognitive processes as she explained how she was able to spell
the word air correctly today and do so quickly. This particular
exchange reinforced Rachel’s and Jennifer’s tutoring
relationship, returning them to their prior congenial partnership.
Never again did I witness any significant misbehavior on
Jennifer’s part during the remaining six sessions.
Analysis and Commentary

Speech Grid 10: Evidence of the Internalization of a Spelling Concept First Taught in Session #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Classroom at PPDS, Rachel and Jennifer are sitting side-by-side with a distance of approximately three feet between them.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer’s Comments:</td>
<td>It was unusual for the session to begin with such a distance between Rachel and Jennifer. It seemed that Rachel continued to be bothered by the interactions during a previous tutoring session. By the end of this session, they were again sitting close to one another.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Tutor: Sarah (S), Tutee: Jennifer (J)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rachel appeared to be somewhat distant and removed from the session today. Jennifer seemed apologetic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ends/Goals</th>
<th>The overall learning goal was to increase Jennifer’s sight word and spelling vocabulary.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The interaction demonstrated that Jennifer had indeed internalized the concept of looking for small words inside of big words as a means of writing and decoding larger words. She was able to articulate how she remembered how to spell the word pair that had originally been too difficult for her to spell on her own.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Act Sequence</th>
<th>R: Spell the word pair.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J: P-a-i-r!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: Very good Jennifer!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J: I remembered it from when you said air the other day. I just had to put the p in front of it and I had the word pair!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer smiled as soon as Rachel said the word “pair” as if a light bulb had gone on inside of her head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer smiled and wiped her forehead as if to wipe sweat off of it. During this interaction, Rachel closed the gap, moving to within about 8 inches of Jennifer at the table.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Key Instrumentalities | White board, dry erase markers, list of high frequency sight words. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norms and Interpretations/ Genre of Speech</th>
<th>Jennifer demonstrated a level of metacognitive awareness when she was able to articulate how she used a strategy previously introduced to her during a tutoring session. It was an informal instructional conversation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel appeared to be quite pleased that Jennifer had learned what she had taught her in a previous lesson. It seemed to close the rift that had begun to develop as a result of Jennifer’s misbehavior over the last couple of sessions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fact, after they finished the spelling activity in session #6, Rachel began to read aloud from the book *Superfudge*, stopping at the end of each page to ask comprehension questions. Jennifer was allowed to draw as she listened because she had demonstrated in previous sessions that it “helped her to listen” to the story. In the next session, I found
that Rachel and Jennifer no longer sat diagonally to each other, instead choosing to sit side-by-side.

**Tutoring Session # 7**

**Session Description**

Session #7 began with Rachel and Jennifer sitting side-by-side at the rectangular table in room 51A. Jennifer quickly picked up the chapter book they had been reading and began to read orally from the next chapter in the book. Jennifer displayed difficulty decoding 3-4 words per page in the text showing that it was at an appropriate reading level for her. During this session when Jennifer became “stuck” on a word, Rachel quickly assessed the situation and assisted Jennifer in one of the following ways. Rachel helped her to decode the word by using chunking, questioning, context clues, or asking Jennifer to reread the sentence. If Rachel felt that these strategies would not be successful, she immediately gave Jennifer the word.

Rachel also spent time teaching Jennifer various strategies to improve her comprehension as demonstrated in the following vignette (Speech Grid 11). In this interaction, Rachel showed Jennifer how to reread sections of the text as a means to locate information.
**Analysis and Commentary**

**Speech Grid 11: Modeling of the Rereading of Text as a Comprehension Strategy for Retrieving Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>PPDS classroom, Rachel and Jennifer are seated side-by-side.</th>
<th>Their relationship seemed to have returned to normal at this point. They seem relaxed and comfortable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tutor: Rachel (R), Tutee: Jennifer (J)</td>
<td>Observer’s Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends/Goals</td>
<td>The instructional goal set for this lesson included reading for fluency and comprehension.</td>
<td>Rachel seemed to want to work on reading comprehension and listening comprehension by utilizing the DRTA and DLTA strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
| Speech Act Sequence | R: What happened in the story today?  
J: Fudge put stickers all over his sister.  
R: Right! Why’d he do that?  
J: (........) I don’t know. It didn’t say in the book.  
R: Yes, it did say it. Were you listening as I read the story?  
J: Yes, I just don’t remember them saying why Fudge put stickers on his sister.  
R: What should we do to find out?  
J: Read it again?  
R: Right, listen carefully as I read this page again.  
J: Oh! ’Cuz he wanted to trade her in for a two wheeler like and then the mom said she’s a human so you can’t trade her in.  
| This interaction occurred at the end of the session after Rachel and Jennifer had spent time partner reading from the book *Superfudge*.  
Jennifer paused and then told Rachel that she didn’t know the answer. She seemed a little defensive which Rachel seemed detect quickly. I think that’s why Rachel wanted to find out if Jennifer was listening.  
Rachel wanted to elicit the answer from Jennifer rather than giving her the answer. Rachel wants Jennifer to think things through when reading. Rachel reread the paragraph.  
This little bit of help seemed to get Jennifer jump-started and she retold the chapter. |
| Speech Act Sequence (cont.) | R: Ok, great summary Jennifer. We’re all done for today.  
<p>| Jennifer began to pack up her belongings but continued on with her retelling of the story. She wasn’t finished yet so she just kept on talking as they walked out the door and back to class. (Continued) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Instrumentalities</th>
<th>Book entitled <em>Superfudge</em>, plain paper and colored markers.</th>
<th>Jennifer drew as Rachel read aloud.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norms and Interpretations/ Genre of Speech</td>
<td>This was an informal instructional conversation in which Rachel demonstrated rereading a text for information retrieval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tutor Interview**

In a later interview I asked Rachel how she made the decision as to which strategy she would use with Jennifer at any given time. Rachel stated that it depended greatly on whether the word was within Jennifer’s instructional reading level. It also depended upon whether it was a phonetically regular or irregular word. Rachel made these decisions quickly because she had developed a good understanding of Jennifer’s strengths and areas of need. These skills took Jennifer several months to achieve proficiently but now it seemed to be second nature to her.

During this lesson, Rachel modeled a comprehension strategy that would benefit Jennifer as she progressed through her schooling. Rachel felt that this was an important strategy
for Jennifer because it also helped to focus her attention on her reading. At times, Rachel expressed concern for Jennifer because of her inabilities to sit still and to focus her attention on the task at hand. Rachel hoped that the strategies she modeled for Jennifer would become internalized and subsequently transfer into Jennifer’s classroom learning situations. Rachel feared that Jennifer often “spaced out” in class and that eventually she would fall behind her peers.

**Tutoring Session # 8**

**Session Description**

Session #8 was quite an interesting session. Though Rachel and Jennifer followed the same reading and spelling routine as usual, they seemed to focus on reading with feeling and excitement to make the reading more fun. I found out that Jennifer loved to hear Rachel speak in a funny little voice as she read Fudge’s dialogue in the book *Superfudge*. Jennifer read a funny line in which the main character talked to a woman at the ice cream store about his ice cream selection. After Jennifer read the dialogue, she passed the book to Rachel to read the same line to her except she wanted Rachel to read in her “Fudge” voice. Rachel happily complied and they both began to laugh. This type of exchange occurred throughout this day’s session making it one of the lighter and more relaxed sessions.
so far. I believe that the camera has inhibited this tutoring dyad somewhat, especially on the part of the tutor. When asked, Rachel admitted that she felt uncomfortable with the camera at first, but now she is learning to ignore it. It seemed to inhibit her ability to take risks with her teaching.

Jennifer read part of the story aloud when she came to a segment that completely confused her. As she worked to decode the sentence, Rachel sat back and allowed her to practice the various strategies Jennifer had learned throughout the tutoring sessions. A snippet of one segment is presented in Speech Grid 12, during which Jennifer articulated an understanding of the semantic cueing system within the discourse with herself.

This was an impressive piece of self-discourse in which Jennifer realized that the text, as read, didn’t make sense. In order to make sense of it she knew that she would have to reread it. Internalization of this comprehension strategy was evident in her actions as well as her words. Jennifer clearly articulated the problem and the solution with no prompting from Rachel. This was evidence of internalization of the rereading strategy as well as the understanding that the purpose of reading was to make sense and meaning of the text. What a revealing tutoring moment!
### Analysis and Commentary

**Speech Grid 12: Oral Articulation of the Semantic Cueing System in Relation to Reading a Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Classroom at PPDS, Rachel and Jennifer are sitting diagonally to each other at a rectangular table in the front of the room.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tutor: Rachel (R), Tutee: Jennifer (J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends/Goals</td>
<td>To read an instructional level text with fluency &amp; comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They spent time reading with feeling and making the reading fun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observer's Comments: Fun, relaxed tutoring atmosphere

(Continued)
| Speech Act Sequence | J: “Daddy, I’m off the wall,” said Fudge.  
  J: “Who told you that?” Dad asked.  
  J: “P (..), Pete the (..), didn’t you, didn’t you?” he asked them, her, me.  
  J: That didn’t make sense.  
  J: “Peter, didn’t you?” he asked me.  
  J: “I sure did,” said Peter. | Jennifer was reading the text orally, making sure to read it with flair. She was successful until she came to a sentence that didn’t make sense to her.  
  Jennifer gets a very puzzled look on her face as she tries to figure out what she just read. Rachel allows her some “wait time” in order to allow her to practice her word attack and comprehension strategies.  
  Jennifer laughs and looks at Rachel for confirmation. Rachel just smiles back at her.  
  Without any prompting, Jennifer went back and reread the text in order to make sense of what she had read. She then proceeded with the next line of text without any difficulty. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Instrumentalities</td>
<td>The book Superfudge, white board, and dry erase markers.</td>
<td>(Continued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tutoring Session # 9

Session Description

Session #9 began with Rachel reading aloud a chapter from *Superfudge* to Jennifer as she drew on the white board. As Rachel read, Jennifer made various sounds and facial expressions based on the content of the story. Occasionally Rachel would look over at Jennifer to ensure that she was paying attention to the story. Often Rachel commented on the pictures Jennifer drew because they related to the storyline of the book. At one point, Jennifer asked Rachel to stop and reread a section of the story where Fudge was speaking. She wanted...
to hear Jennifer imitate Fudge’s funny little voice. The more Jennifer laughed and smiled, the more animated Rachel became in her reading. They ended the chapter laughing about the funny adventures Fudge was experiencing in the book.

At the end of the chapter, Rachel asked Jennifer to retell the story. Jennifer was quite animated during her retelling, often imitating Rachel’s funny little Fudge voice. It became an established ritual to read the book using a variety of dialects and levels of speech.

**Tutoring Session # 10**

**Session Description**

Session #10 was the first time Rachel asked Jennifer to write authentically. Without being asked, Jennifer took out her pen and wrote the following sentence on her white board:

Cleo is a nice dog.

After writing her sentence, Rachel asked her to read it aloud. Jennifer read it and then asked Rachel to write the same sentence in cursive on the white board. She stated that she was learning to write in cursive in her third grade classroom, but she didn’t think she was very good at it. Jennifer handed the pen to Rachel and she proceeded to write the sentence in cursive. This small act allowed Rachel to demonstrate cursive writing for Jennifer. Jennifer then copied the sentence three
times in cursive on the large white board at the front of the classroom, each time asking for feedback from Rachel.

Rachel then asked Jennifer to write a short story in cursive about her dog Cleo on the big board. The following vignette illustrates the act of guided practice as a piece of the process of scaffolded learning (Speech Grid 13). In this interaction, Rachel again relied on the use of physical proximity to aid her in rendering assistance to Jennifer.

This interaction involved extensive amounts of shared responsibility. Sarah had a specific learning objective in mind which involved writing a short story that related to something of interest to Jennifer. Jennifer had her own instructional goal in mind which was to improve her cursive writing ability so that she would be able to write as well as Amber, a fellow student in her class. Rachel was able to model cursive writing for Jennifer and then guide her through the process of practicing her own cursive writing. It seemed to be a successful lesson for both of them.
Analysis and Commentary

Speech Grid 13: Evidence of Guided Practice as a Step in the Process of Scaffolded Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Classroom at PPDS, Rachel is seated at the rectangular table while Jennifer works at the large white board in the front of the class.</th>
<th>The setting fluctuated as the level of scaffolding increased and decreased throughout the activity. Rachel moves back and forth providing support as needed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tutor: Rachel (R), Tutee: Jennifer (J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends/Goals</td>
<td>The instructional goal was to write a short story about a pet dog using cursive handwriting.</td>
<td>Rachel’s goal was to help Jennifer to write a short story. Jennifer added the second goal which was to write the story in cursive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Act Sequence</th>
<th>Jennifer attempts to write this sentence on the board in cursive: Cleo is a furry dog.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J: My friend Amber can write in cursive really well. I can't do it as good as she can.</td>
<td>Rachel modeled the sentence on the board and then sat back down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Can you write it for me?</td>
<td>Jennifer looks at Rachel's sentence and questions her about the letter F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: That's an F? I thought it was a J.</td>
<td>Jennifer practiced it several times but still had difficulty with the letter F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: No, it's an F. Come here and I'll show you how to make an F.</td>
<td>Rachel smiles and curls her finger in a motion calling Jennifer over to the table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: See look, I went like this.</td>
<td>Jennifer shows Rachel how she made her F and then watches as Rachel models the correct way to make a cursive F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: How's this one?</td>
<td>Jennifer makes 5 F's before she invites Rachel to look at one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: Pretty good Jennifer.</td>
<td>(Continued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Speech Act Sequence (cont) | R: Here Jennifer, watch me.  
J: Do it again.  
R: Ok, watch this. I start here and then go up here and loop back down over here and then come back to the middle. Now you try it.  
J: How's this one? I think it looks like a B.  
R: No, that's pretty good. Just make it a little skinnier and you'll have it right.  
R: There you go. Now that's an F. | Rachel takes the pen and again models making a cursive F.  
Jennifer watches intently as Rachel models the letter F.  
Jennifer erases it and tries one more time making a letter "F" that she is satisfied with. She then moves onto something else. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Instrumentalities</td>
<td>Large white board that is a permanent fixture in the classroom, individual-sized white board, three dry erase pens, the book <em>Superfudge</em>.</td>
<td>Throughout this activity, Rachel and Jennifer continually moved back and forth from the large board to the rectangular table. It was one of the more active lessons I've witnessed so far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms and Interpretations/Genres of Speech</td>
<td>This was an instructional lesson that turned out to be student driven. Interpersonal and academic speech dominated the conversation.</td>
<td>Jennifer is an assertive young lady. She expressed concern about her ability to write in cursive and therefore pushed to have it included in her writing lesson. Rachel agreed with Jennifer and guided her through the process of writing in cursive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tutoring Session # 11  

Session Description  

Session #11 was different from all of the sessions I had viewed so far. In this session, Jennifer brought a book with her that was entitled, Can You Tell Me How to Get to Sesame Street? It was a predictable, rhyming book that was written at a first grade reading level. My curiosity was piqued when I saw the book because it seemed out of character for her to bring a book with her and especially a book that she would consider to be “too easy.” I learned an interesting lesson as the session progressed.  

Jennifer sat down and placed the book on the table without bringing any attention to the fact that she brought it with her. Picking up on this, Rachel asked her about the book and Jennifer went on to describe a book buddy program she was involved with in her classroom. Over the course of the school year, she and her classmates had been book buddies with a classroom of first grade students. Once every week or two the classes got together to read or work on a project. The next day her classmates were going to visit the first grade classroom and read a book to each of their book buddies. Jennifer selected the book she brought with her to read to her buddy. Rachel asked her if she would like to practice it before
reading it to her buddy. Jennifer acted as if she was disinterested in reading it, but immediately picked up the book and started to read it aloud. Later when I interviewed Rachel, she stated that she believed that Jennifer was embarrassed to ask if she could practice reading the book aloud and decided to make it look like it was Rachel’s idea.

As Jennifer read through the book she made a few oral reading miscues, at which point Rachel stepped in and provided her with assistance. Rachel asked if she would like to read it again but Jennifer said no. From here, they moved into their usual routine and Rachel read a small segment of the book Superfudge to Jennifer. The rest of the session was rather uneventful and it seemed to be just what Jennifer needed. Jennifer relaxed and listened to the story, drawing and responding as she saw fit. No clear evidence of scaffolded instruction was identified within this session.

Tutoring Session # 12

Session Description

Session #12 was the final session filmed in the present ethnographic study. In this tutoring session, Rachel and Jennifer were especially animated when reading from the book Superfudge. In fact, at one point in the book the character Fudge began to sing a song at which time Rachel also began to
After finishing the song, Jennifer asked to see the book and she began to sing as well. It was a revealing interaction that opened a window into the warm relationship that had developed between Rachel and Jennifer.

Rachel and Jennifer continued to partner read the chapter. When it became Jennifer’s turn to read, she excitedly grabbed the book and started to read right away. Within five sentences, Jennifer came upon the word “Colorado.” Prior to that she had decoded the words “outward bound” and “instructor” with relative ease, but the word “Colorado” seemed to stump her. In the following vignette depicted in Speech Grid 14, Rachel utilized questioning and drawing on prior knowledge to assist Jennifer in reading the word “Colorado.” As demonstrated, these strategies are ineffective and Jennifer tries to substitute a more effective word attack strategy.

**Tutor Interview**

After this interaction, I asked Rachel to read through my field notes for session #12 and comment on my findings. At the time Rachel was unaware of the fact that Jennifer was trying to give her subtle clues informing her that she didn’t know what a state was and that she didn’t want to openly admit to her lack of knowledge.
Analysis and Commentary

Speech Grid 14: Evidence of Scaffolded Instruction in Which Responsibility is Transferred to the Tutee Because the Tutor Fails to Pick Up on the Tutee’s Signals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>PPDS classroom, Rachel and Jennifer are seated side-by-side at a rectangular table.</th>
<th>Observer’s Comments: Jennifer and Rachel are very playful today.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tutor: Rachel (R), Tutee: Jennifer (J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends/Goals</td>
<td>The overall goal of the lesson was to improve Jennifer’s reading fluency and comprehension by utilizing various reading strategies.</td>
<td>Rachel and Jennifer quickly began their regular routine of partner reading the story adding animation and singing to enrich the story.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Act Sequence</th>
<th>J: “She was an outward bound instructor in Callado?”</th>
<th>Jennifer reads this sentence but realizes that something in it doesn’t make sense. She immediately looks to Rachel for confirmation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: It’s a state.</td>
<td>Jennifer didn’t seem to understand the clue she was given and decided she would be more successful if she sounded it out. She then physically chunked the word by using her fingers to bracket parts of the word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J: (.............), I’d rather figure it out by sounding it out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J: Cole-or/-u/-do, Coler/-u/-do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: Is that the name of a state that you’ve heard before?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J: Um (...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: Have you learned about states yet?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J: What do you mean?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Speech Act Sequence (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R: What state do you live in?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J: Las Vegas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Nevada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: Yes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Call-man-do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: Does that sound like a state you’ve heard of before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Um (....).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: I’ll give you the first part. It’s “call.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: Right, Colorado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Oh, that’s where my friend lives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this point Rachel still didn’t realize that Jennifer had no concept of the word state. Jennifer knew this earlier which is why she said that she would prefer to sound it out. Rachel didn’t pick up on this.

Jennifer went back to her initial strategy of sounding out the word taking responsibility for her own learning.

This was a very long (too long) interaction in which the tutor was not picking up on the clues being given by the tutee. Jennifer ended up taking on the responsibility for her own learning by trying to use a strategy with which she felt most comfortable. In the end, Rachel gave her most of the word.

Key Instrumentalities

| Book entitled Superfudge |

(Continued)
Norms and Interpretations/Genres of Speech

The instructional goal for this lesson was to increase the fluency and comprehension level of the tutee. The conversation attempted to build on the tutee's prior knowledge when in fact the tutee did not have sufficient prior knowledge to utilize that particular strategy.

Jennifer was quite aware that Rachel was trying to provide her with clues that would allow her to appropriately decode the word Colorado. Unfortunately, Jennifer did not have the content knowledge to use this strategy and therefore tried to shift the focus of the intervention to the use of a chunking strategy. Jennifer tried unsuccessfully to divert Rachel's assistance toward the chunking strategy but Rachel did not seem to pick up on her cues. Without becoming frustrated, Jennifer continued to try to decode the word via chunking. It was a telling interaction.

Rachel reread the discourse and was surprised that she hadn't picked up on Jennifer's signals. Generally Rachel was good at "reading" Jennifer so this seemed to be something of an aberration. It was quite revealing though when Jennifer automatically switched to a different word attack strategy without any prompting from Rachel and persisted on using it even when Rachel attempted to lead her in a different direction. I think both Rachel and I learned something quite valuable from Jennifer during this final session.
**Summary of Findings**

Over the course of 12 tutoring sessions, I became an invisible participant in tutoring dyad #2. Though I was unable to sit at the table with Rachel and Jennifer, I began to feel a part of their special group. They allowed me to peer into their daily meetings and delve into their thinking processes as I viewed and reviewed the activities and interactions that took place each day. An overview of their 12 tutoring sessions is presented in Table 5 which summarizes the activities that occurred in each tutoring session.
Table 5 Summary of Tutoring Dyad # 2's Tutoring Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutoring Sessions- Dyad # 2</th>
<th>Overview of Session Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session # 1</td>
<td>Oral reading of a high-interest text for fluency, enjoyment, and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 2</td>
<td>Spelling of high-frequency words utilizing a white board; paired reading of a high-interest text for fluency, enjoyment, and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 3</td>
<td>Spelling of high-frequency words utilizing a white board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 4</td>
<td>Spelling of high-frequency words utilizing plain paper; tutor read aloud to tutee for fluency modeling, comprehension, and enjoyment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 5</td>
<td>Spelling of high-frequency words utilizing a white board; oral reading of a high-interest text for fluency, enjoyment, and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 6</td>
<td>Spelling of high-frequency words utilizing a white board; tutor read aloud to tutee for fluency modeling, comprehension, and enjoyment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 7</td>
<td>Oral reading of a high-interest text for fluency, enjoyment, and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 8</td>
<td>Spelling of high-frequency words utilizing a white board; paired reading of a high-interest text for fluency, enjoyment, and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 9</td>
<td>Tutor read aloud to tutee for fluency modeling, comprehension, and enjoyment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 10</td>
<td>Paired reading of a high-interest text for fluency, enjoyment, and comprehension; use of writing as a comprehension strategy; cursive handwriting practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 11</td>
<td>Oral reading of a predictable, familiar text for fluency practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 12</td>
<td>Paired reading of a high-interest text for fluency, enjoyment, and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Literacy Strategies

Literacy Strategies: Dyads

As demonstrated in Figure 6, first and foremost, Rachel and Jennifer spent a tremendous amount of time developing and reinforcing their relationship through the use of several positive learning environment strategies. These strategies included the use of positive reinforcement, extrinsic rewards, modeling and responding, and the use of proximity as needed. Jennifer and Rachel also spent time repairing their relationship when a roadblock got in the way. The richness of their daily learning experiences was dependent on the strength of their relationship.

Second, Rachel used a large number of reading comprehension strategies when working with Jennifer. These strategies included the Directed Reading and Thinking Activity.
(DRTA), the Directed Listening and Thinking Activity (DLTA), various levels of questioning, the activation of prior tutee knowledge, predictable texts, and oral retellings. These strategies were demonstrated over the course of the 12 tutoring sessions, though each strategy was not observed during each tutoring session.

Third, Rachel utilized wait time as an “other” strategy. This strategy provided Jennifer with the necessary time for her to process the incoming information and then respond when she was ready without any interruption from Rachel. The use of wait time proved beneficial to creating an environment conducive to scaffolded learning experiences.

Fourth, Rachel demonstrated the use of such reading fluency strategies as rereading familiar texts, oral reading, and paired reading. During paired reading and oral reading experiences, Rachel often modeled fluent reading by varying her reading speed and intonation depending upon the circumstances presented in the text. Not only did these strategies help Jennifer to improve her reading fluency, they also seemed to increase her motivation to read.

Finally, Rachel modeled the use of writing, spelling, and word attack strategies, but on a much smaller scale than those strategies previously discussed. These strategies appeared
infrequently over the course of the tutoring sessions. The strategy domains and the types of strategies evidenced within each domain is presented in Table 6.

Table 6: **Domain Analysis of the Instructional Strategies Utilized by Tutor # 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Terms</th>
<th>Semantic Relationship</th>
<th>Cultural Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*DRTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*DLTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Questioning</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Activation of prior knowledge</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Use of predictable texts</td>
<td>Reading Fluency Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Oral Retellings</td>
<td>Writing Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Reading self-created texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rereading old familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Oral reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Paired reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sentence creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Writing process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Have-a-go-spelling</td>
<td>Spelling Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Phonetic spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Terms</th>
<th>Semantic Relationship</th>
<th>Cultural Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Proximity</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td>Positive Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Promoting risk-taking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Positive reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Listening/responding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Extrinsic rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Rereading to decode</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Other Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown words</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Chunking into syllables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Rereading to use context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to decode words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Wait time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scaffolded Learning Experiences**

Rachel and Jennifer generally demonstrated an ability to work together to construct knowledge within their tutoring sessions. On a few occasions, roadblocks hindered the scaffolding process thereby modifying the behavior of both the tutor and the tutee. These roadblocks were always behavior...
related and tended to distance Rachel and Jennifer from one another. Because these roadblocks negatively affected the tutoring relationship, scaffolding did not occur within these particular tutoring sessions. In fact, during these sessions Rachel seemed unable or unwilling to guide Jennifer in the appropriate direction; Rachel instead preferred to simply take the “easy” route and give Jennifer the answers. In each of these instances very little teaching, and subsequently, very little learning took place. This further supports the hypothesis that scaffolded learning experiences increase as the strength of the tutor/tutee relationship increases. It also makes sense that the frequency of scaffolded learning experiences would decrease as the strength of the tutor/tutee relationship decreased. This, in turn, provided further evidence of the necessity of creating a strong, positive relationship between the tutor and tutee as a means to improve the frequency and quality of the scaffolded learning experiences taking place between them.
Overall, as depicted in Figure 7, tutoring dyads #1 and #2 tended to spend the greatest amount of their tutoring time involved in strategies that promoted the creation of a positive
learning environment. Both tutors frequently demonstrated an increase or decrease in their physical proximity to their tutees as deemed necessary by the immediate situation. Both tutors provided their tutees with constant positive reinforcement and relevant feedback in relation to the learning task. When the tutees needed extra support, the tutors generally lead the tutees to the answers using hints, prompts, and questions, rather than providing them with the answers. One exception to this occurred as a result of a tutee’s misbehavior and the tutor’s withdrawal of her support.

Evidence of scaffolding was apparent on several occasions over the research study’s three and one-half week time period. Most often the scaffolded learning experiences were evident at the tutees’ point of need. Overwhelmingly, scaffolding manifested itself in a variety of verbal interactions aimed at leading the tutees to a correct response. Other times, tutors would model a particular skill or strategy and then prompt the tutees to attempt it on their own. As the sessions progressed, tutors were seen releasing the responsibility for learning by encouraging the tutees to use a particular strategy to decode a word or recall information. This demonstrates that scaffolding is a process that develops over time, ultimately leading to internalization on the part of the tutees.
The tutors also focused on reading comprehension, word attack, and fluency strategies on a regular basis. These strategies were woven together during their paired reading and oral reading experiences. Each dyad was involved in reading a chapter book based on the tutees’ reading levels and interests; the tutors instructed the tutees as they were engaged in reading the text.

Additionally, both of the tutors dedicated much of their tutoring time to spelling high frequency sight words. Both of the tutors also emphasized a need for the tutees to be able to fluently read these words as well. Though each of the dyads approached spelling differently, spelling consumed a vast amount of their tutoring time.

Additionally, each of the tutors developed and provided instruction related to the specific literacy learning goals set at the beginning of the tutoring relationship. Much of the instruction was intended to increase the tutees’ levels of reading and listening comprehension. However, the tutors tended to use low-level questioning strategies (Morrow, 1997) aimed at eliciting literal recall-type responses from the tutees. When the tutors asked the tutees to “read between the lines,” they often related the questions to the tutees’ own personal experiences, rather than delving into the possible underlying meanings.
expressed by the author. Both tutors often urged tutees to retell or summarize the stories in their own words, further building upon the tutees’ own textual meanings. The data suggests that the tutors placed a high value on the tutees’ own thoughts and interpretations, further validating the tutees’ abilities to comprehend and respond to texts.

While both tutors implemented several of the same learning strategies (DRTA, phonetic spelling, wait time, paired reading), they did maintain their own unique tutoring styles. Sarah seemed more comfortable in the role of a friend, mentor, and teacher; while Rachel often preferred to take on more of the role of a parent, mentor, and teacher. This was evidenced in the interactions taking place within many of the tutoring sessions. Sarah seemed more comfortable handing over the responsibility for the tutoring sessions to Raymond. Sarah placed the onus for arriving at the tutoring sessions into Raymond’s hands by allowing him to find her at the appropriate tutoring time. Sarah believed that it was Raymond’s duty come to her for tutoring at the appropriate time. Because Sarah was quite diligent about attending the sessions, she felt that Raymond should also be diligent about attending. Also, if he did not want to come to the tutoring sessions, Sarah did not feel it was her responsibility to force him to participate on any given day. Though Sarah felt a
deep sense of personal responsibility toward Raymond, she also held him equally accountable for their tutoring sessions.

Rachel, on the other hand, always accompanied Jennifer to and from her tutoring sessions. When asked about this, Rachel stated that “she wanted to make sure that Jennifer made it back to class okay.” Rachel felt a deep sense of responsibility for Jennifer during the tutoring sessions and did not feel it was appropriate to abdicate this responsibility. Rachel also stated that it provided time for them to have a more personal conversation without taking away time from their tutoring sessions. This proved to be a very subtle but distinct difference in their tutoring styles. Both tutors cared deeply about their tutees but viewed their roles as tutors somewhat differently.

In conclusion, both tutors provided their tutees with developmentally appropriate instruction aimed at the achievement of assessment-based learning goals. While each tutor approached their instruction differently, both maintained a warm and encouraging learning environment to promote risk-taking on the part of their tutees. Neither tutor spent much time teaching critical thinking skills, but generally the tutors focused on providing the tutees with useful comprehension, fluency, spelling, and word attack strategies they would be able to use when reading and writing independently. Both tutors seemed to
value their tutees and hoped to provide them with the skills necessary to be successful academically in the future.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to describe, compare, and contrast the practices and routines present in a one-on-one literacy tutoring situation and to provide evidence of scaffolded learning experiences across and within two tutoring dyads. In the following chapter, I will discuss the findings by revisiting the initial research questions guiding this study. Then I will consider the implications for developing tutor training that promotes scaffolded learning experiences. I will conclude the chapter with suggestions for future research.

What practices and routines are present in a one-on-one tutoring situation? What are the similarities and differences in these practices and routines across the two tutoring dyads?

Eight strategy domains were constructed based on analysis from videotaped data collected in this study. The strategy domains were consistent across both tutoring dyads.
although the frequency of their use varied. Each of the domains are characterized below:

- **Reading comprehension strategies** - Strategies intended to increase the tutees’ understanding of a text. Within this research study these strategies included DRTA, DLTA, questioning, activation of prior knowledge, oral retellings, and building upon the tutees’ interests.

- **Reading fluency strategies** - Strategies promoting oral reading fluency. As evidenced in this study, reading fluency strategies consisted of the oral and paired reading of a variety of texts deemed to be at the tutees’ instructional levels, rereading of familiar texts, and reading predictable texts.

- **Writing strategies** - Strategies used to improve the tutees’ ability to express thoughts and ideas in writing. Within this study, tutors demonstrated the use of the five steps of the writing process, the Language Experience Approach, and sentence construction.

- **Spelling strategies** - Strategies designed to improve a tutees’ ability to write using conventional spelling. Within this study the tutors’ modeled Have-a-Go-Spelling, phonetic spelling, and spelling games such as **Hangman** and **Scrabble Junior**.
• Positive learning environment strategies- Strategies whose sole purpose was to create and sustain a positive learning environment intended to promote risk-taking on the part of the tutees. These strategies included the use of extrinsic rewards, positive reinforcement in the form of verbal praise, facial expressions, body language and physical proximity, appropriate modeling, listening, and responding to tutees.

• Vocabulary enhancement strategies- Learning strategies intended to enhance the tutees’ instructional level reading vocabulary. Though this domain was identified in the study, its use was quite limited. The main vocabulary strategies were only visible during collaborative games of Hangman and Scrabble Junior.

• Word attack strategies- Word attack strategies relate to the decoding of unknown words within a text. Both tutors and tutees displayed three main word attack strategies during their tutoring sessions: rereading a text to use the context of the passage to decode an unknown word; chunking a word into individual syllables and blending them together to form a word; substituting a word with the correct beginning sound that makes sense within the sentence. These strategies mirror the three
cueing systems introduced to tutors during training: the semantic cueing system, the syntactic cueing system, and the graphophonemic cueing system (Clay, 1991).

- Other learning strategies- This category contains strategies that do not fit easily into one of the designated strategy domains. These strategies may be tutor created or based on prior tutoring experiences. Included in this category are the use of wait time and collaborative problem-solving between tutees.

Primarily, the tutors in this study focused on the use of strategies intended to promote a positive learning environment for their tutees. Because their tutors had created an environment conducive to risk-taking, the tutees were able to experiment with their learning without fear of failing. Tutors used positive reinforcement to encourage tutees to engage in activities that extended just outside of their comfort zones. This finding is consistent with Juel’s (1996) study of the level of tutoring success. Successful tutors modeled how a process worked, provided tutees with support and encouragement as they attempted the activity, and then spent time celebrating the tutees’ successes with them. Both tutors in the present study often followed this procedure when instructing their tutees.

The tutors’ abilities to increase and/or decrease the levels
of support given to the tutees also allowed risk-taking to occur. Because the tutors spent a tremendous amount of time developing relationships with the tutees based on trust and mutual respect, they often were able to transfer the responsibility for learning to the tutees. The tutees seemed to have an implicit understanding that the tutors would intercede when necessary. Often tutors observed the tutees for signs of frustration and increased tutorial support when appropriate. It was a subtle but extremely important dimension of the tutoring relationship, one that had to be developed over time. This proved to be the most powerful finding in the study.

Additionally, both tutors spent a majority of their tutoring time engaged in reading comprehension strategies which directly correlated to the goals set for each of the tutees. Tutors relied primarily on the use of oral retellings and questioning to elicit textual information from the tutees. Often tutors initiated the discussions by asking the tutees to summarize the main ideas of a text. When the tutees were unable to recall what they had read, the tutors would intervene by asking questions aimed at leading the tutees to the correct answers. A five-step collaborative dialogic pattern similar to those identified by Graesser, Person, and Magliano (1995) emerged in this study. Tutors generally posed questions and the tutees answered
them. Tutors then provided the tutees with relevant feedback. Together the tutors and tutees collaborated to improve the quality of the tutees’ initial responses. Tutors proceeded to informally assess the tutees’ understanding of the concept under study and either repeated the questioning process or advanced with the lessons. This collaborative dialogic pattern was evidenced most often within the framework of the scaffolded learning experiences.

While the tutors were adept at using questioning as a reading comprehension strategy, they often kept their questions at a literal recall or knowledge level (Bloom, 1984), rather than requiring the tutees to “read between the lines.” While literal questioning benefits struggling readers, a balance of low-level and high-level questions is optimal (Medley, 1977; Morrow, 1997; Rubin, 1997). The data validate the need for further training in the use of various questioning techniques intended to promote critical thinking.

Tutors provided ample time for the tutees to engage in “active reading” (Juel, 1998) enabling tutees to practice word attack strategies within many of the tutoring sessions. Tutors not only modeled strategy use but encouraged tutees to attempt these strategies when reading. Encouragement frequently was provided in the form of a prompt, hint, or
leading question. On rare occasions, tutors volunteered the correct word but generally only after the tutees attempted to read it on their own. Customarily, reading instruction occurred during the act of an authentic reading of a text. Weaver (1994) supports context-based reading instruction when she states that “parts are best learned in the context of the whole; in other words, skills are best learned with assistance at the point of need” (p. 360). The tutors proved to be quite effective at providing the necessary support at the tutees’ point of need.

Missing from the tutoring sessions were specifically designated times for the tutees to read texts silently. Readers benefit from repetition (Rasinski, 1989) or repeated readings of a text (Samuels, Schermer & Reinking, 1992), therefore, supporting the need for tutees to read and reread texts to foster fluency. Struggling readers often require three times as many exposures to a word before they are able to read it spontaneously (Gates, 1931). Allowing tutees time to read a text silently prior to asking them to read it aloud provides them with this much needed repetition. The absence of regular silent reading during the tutoring sessions may have inhibited the tutees’ reading fluency levels. From another perspective, the tutors may have felt that they were not teaching when the
tutees read silently accounting for their not including this practice in their lessons.

Both tutors provided longer wait times than normally found within the regular classroom. Overwhelmingly, teachers only allow children one second or less to formulate responses to questions within the classroom (Hyman, 1978). In the present study, both tutors used an extended wait time during their instructional interactions. Past research supports the use of a three to five second wait time for the following reasons:

- Increased level of response from lower-achieving children,
- Lengthier, more thoughtful responses,
- Fewer instances of no responses and "I don't knows",
- Greater number of correct responses,
- More support provided for the answers given,
- Increased number of alternative responses (Hyman, 1978; Lake, 1973; Rowe, 1969).

The data collected in this study substantiate and build upon the previous research findings by providing concrete evidence of extended wait time within the context of a scaffolded learning experience. Together increased wait time and increased tutor support seem to create a learning environment conducive to scaffolding.
Were tutors able to scaffold the tutees’ learning experiences? How does scaffolding manifest itself within the context of a one-on-one tutoring situation?

Within most sessions, evidence of scaffolded learning was present; however, it existed on differing levels depending upon the immediate situational context. Overwhelmingly, scaffolding manifested itself in the verbal interactions transpiring at the tutees’ points of need. In other words, when tutees were unable to complete tasks alone, tutors immediately increased their levels of tutoring support through the use of hints, prompts, and leading questions. Often tutors increased their physical proximity to the tutees as they increased their level of instructional support. Tutors were able to determine when to increase their support by listening to the tutees’ responses or lack of responses, observing the tutees’ non-verbal or verbal behaviors during the task, and through seemingly intuitive processes that emerged over time. Generally, the clues or signals given off by the tutees were subtle and difficult to “read” by an outsider. It took several viewings of the video tapes to ascertain the specific signals triggering the tutors’ increased levels of support. This proved to be the key to unlocking or making visible the processes involved in scaffolding.
When the tutoring relationships were hindered due to misbehavior on the part of the tutee, the number of scaffolded learning experiences dramatically decreased. This led me to surmise that the strength of the tutoring relationship factored into the tutors' abilities or desires to provide tutees with appropriately scaffolded learning experiences. If the strength of the relationship is a factor in the scaffolding process, how can tutors be taught to scaffold a tutees' learning experiences? This question is an important one and has several implications for future research.

**Implications and Suggestions for Future Research**

Juel (1996) suggested that the quality of a tutoring session was dependent upon tutors' abilities to scaffold the learning experiences of tutees. Not only does the current study support Juel's research, but these findings expound upon it by making visible the process of scaffolding within a one-on-one tutoring situation. This is important when developing a tutoring program for children of all ages. Thoughtful training becomes imperative to the success of a program (Wasik, 1998), and if a trainer can provide tutors with a variety of strategies that encourage and enhance scaffolding,
the tutors will have a much higher success rate with their tutees.

A second consideration relates to the length of the tutoring relationship. The present research supports the long-term use of tutoring as an early intervention for children in need of reading remediation. Tutors should meet with tutees two to four times per week for at least one semester (12-16 weeks). Because of the importance of the strength of the tutoring relationship to the ability to provide tutees with scaffolded learning experiences, sufficient time is needed to establish, promote, and solidify the tutoring relationship. It appears that tutors who do not meet with tutees on a consistent basis over an extended period of time would be limited in their abilities to scaffold the tutees’ learning experiences.

A third consideration involves the development of appropriate learning goals for tutees based on informal assessments conducted by tutors used to drive the tutees’ instructional plans. It is essential for tutors to be trained by knowledgeable individuals (Wasik, 1998) in the use of informal assessments that allow the tutors to determine their tutees’ strengths and areas of need. Without instruction in assessment techniques, tutors are unable to make informed instructional decisions. This consideration also emphasizes the need for
qualified trainers and on-site supervisors who are able to provide continued guidance and support to the tutors (Fitzgerald, 2001). In conclusion, this study underscores the importance of providing needy children with high quality tutoring experiences.

The findings of this study have immediate implications for the ARC program at UNLV. The present research supports the continued use of one-on-one tutoring as an early intervention for struggling readers in the local community. For a relatively minimal cost, UNLV students can provide hundreds of local elementary school children with this service on a daily basis. Outside funding sources could be sought to allow the program to reach a greater number of children in the area. Further collaboration with other literacy agencies would allow the program to expand without putting undue pressure on the university.

Also to ensure that the children receive quality tutoring, the tutors should be required to attend a more thorough initial training that includes information on how to provide children with scaffolded learning experiences. Because these experiences are often quite subtle, the tutors would benefit from viewing videotaped vignettes clearly depicting the process of scaffolding instruction with a child. The use of such tapes
would allow the trainer to stop the tapes and discuss the verbal and non-verbal communication occurring as the tutor scaffolds the child’s learning experiences. Also tutors could be advised to look for examples of scaffolding as they participate in the job shadowing component of their training program.

The training could be revised to include more detailed instruction on the use of questioning to promote critical thinking, as well as how to provide children with useful hints and prompts to lead them to the correct responses. Tutors also should be introduced to the eight strategy domains identified in this study. Once tutors are familiar with the domains, they could be instructed in the use of research-based strategies that detail each of the domains. This information would provide the tutors with a more balanced approach to their tutoring sessions and help them develop a repertoire of useful strategies to use with their children.

Conclusions

With the necessity to create early intervention programs for struggling readers, it is imperative to design programs that provide appropriate and quality instruction with the children’s Zone of Proximal Development. Further research into the processes involved in the co-construction of knowledge
between tutors and tutees is needed and will assist in this endeavor. This research would assist communities in designing tutoring programs that encourage tutors to get to know their tutees so that they will better understand how to provide them with scaffolded learning experiences. Without the ability to provide individualized instruction at an appropriate learning level, tutoring programs will not be as effective as they have the potential to be for children. Shanahan’s (1997) finding that poor quality tutoring can lead to lower academic gains being made by children receiving tutoring services than for similar children who are receiving no tutoring services at all further verifies these findings. The whole purpose for this research is to decrease the discrepancies that presently exist between low-achieving and high achieving readers, for it is these discrepancies that lead children to become “at-risk” of academic failure.
APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANT PERMISSION FORMS
I am Diane Brantley, a student at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

I am doing a project on the America Reads Tutoring Program. As part of the project, you will be video taped over a four week time period as you participate in your tutoring session. The researcher will be the only person that will be viewing the video tapes in order to maintain your anonymity.

You might feel uncomfortable sometimes during the research because of the video tape recorder. If you do so, please tell the tutor right away and we will stop the video recorder.

I hope that by your being in the project we will help children like you in other elementary school tutoring programs.

Before you agree to be in the project and sign below, I would like to talk about it with your parents or guardians so that they will know what you will be doing in the project. You do not have to be in the project if you do not want to. If you decide to be in the project, you can stop whenever you want.

Your parents/guardians will be asked if it is okay for you to be in the project.

I will be happy to answer all of your questions about the project.

By signing below, you are agreeing to be in this project.

______________________________  ________________________
Signature of Child            Date

______________________________  ________________________
Signature of Researcher        Date
Dear Parents,

I am a doctoral student at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. For my doctoral dissertation I am going to be studying how America Reads Challenge tutors teach children to read during a series of thirty minute tutoring sessions.

To perform this study, I will need your permission to video-tape and/or tape record your child during their regularly scheduled tutoring session. In order to maintain your child’s confidentiality, I will only use their first name. The video tapes and all research records will be locked in a cabinet in the Literacy Development Center and will be destroyed three years after the study is complete. Your child may withdraw from the study at any time if they feel uncomfortable. Your collaboration in this study is very important and I would like to thank you in advance for your help. Please fill out the bottom part of this letter and return it to school by

If you have any questions regarding your child’s rights in this study, please call the Office of Sponsored Programs at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (702) 895-2794. Thank you again for your support and consideration.

Sincerely,

Diane K. Brantley
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
(702) 895-3783

Yes, my child ____________________________ has my permission to participate in this study.

No, my child ____________________________ does not have my permission to participate in this study.

Parent signature ____________________________

Date ____________________________
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Department of Curriculum and Instruction: Informed Consent

I am Diane Brantley, a doctoral candidate in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I am asking your participation in a research project that will study the practices and routines that take place within a one-on-one literacy tutoring session between an America Reads Challenge tutor and a tutee from Paradise Professional Development School.

The purpose of this research is to describe the interactions, both social and academic, that take place between a tutor and a tutee within the context of a series of one-on-one literacy tutoring sessions. It will take approximately four weeks to complete the research. One tutoring session will be video taped each day over a four week time period. You might feel uncomfortable sometimes during the research because of the video tape recorder. If you do so, please let the researcher know right away and I will stop the video recorder. To ensure your anonymity, you will be referred to by your first name only. The video tapes and all research records will be kept in a locked cabinet in the Literacy Development Center, CEB 141. Three years after the study is complete, the video tapes and research materials will be destroyed.

The benefits of the research are as follows: 1) it will add to the body of knowledge related to the use of one-on-one tutoring as an early intervention for students in need of reading remediation, 2) it will provide a window into the dynamics of a tutoring session, clearly defining the practices and routines that are present, and 3) it will reinforce the need for a strong training program for individuals interested in becoming literacy tutors.

If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact Diane Brantley at 895-3783 or Dr. Maria Meyerson at the UNLV Department of Curriculum and Instruction at 895-3233. For questions involving the rights of human subjects, please contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 895-2794. Your participation is strictly voluntary and you may withdraw from participation at any time.

(Sign below and return to researcher)

I have read the above and my questions have been answered by the researcher. I agree to participate in this research.

______________________________  ________________________
Signature of Participant Date

______________________________  ________________________
Signature of Researcher Date
APPENDIX B

PILOT STUDY TUTORING TRANSCRIPT
Transcript of Tutoring Session  
Gene Ward Elementary School  
April 5, 2000  
10:15 am - 10:25 am

Shirley (S)  
Tutee (T)  

S: What would you like to write about?  
T: A kitten  
S: I can help you.  
T: (child looks in the book) Here's the kitten.  
S: Right, now what can the kitten do?  
T: Read  
S: (Good!) Now how can you say that in a sentence?  
T: The kitten can read.  
S: Wonderful! Write that in your reading log.  
T: (student writes the sentence unassisted)  
S: Can you read that to me?  
T: The kitten can read.  
S: Good! Let's put away your journal.  
T: I forgot the title.  
S: Oh, you're right.  
T: (student copies the title of the book into her reading log)  
S: That's wonderful. You remembered the title.

Strategies Utilized during the entire lesson:  
1. Worksheet- matching an animal with where the animal lives. Short answer section in which the tutee wrote a complete sentence.  
2. Read a story and wrote a sentence based on the story in a reading log. (See the above transcript).  
3. Utilized a word or vocabulary list brainstormed by the tutor and tutee to aid the student's writing.  
4. Reading list to keep track of the books read by the tutee.  
5. Questioning strategies (See above transcript).
APPENDIX C

RESEARCH TIMELINE
Research Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Kind of Data to be Collected</th>
<th>Process of Analysis</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Time of Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What practices and routines are present in a 1:1 tutoring situation?</td>
<td>Field notes, video recordings, artifact analysis, observations</td>
<td>Construction of event maps and timelines, transcripts, domain analysis</td>
<td>Schriffin, 1994; Putney 1996; Spradley, 1980</td>
<td>Full cycle of activity: 3 weeks-ongoing daily visits= 12 sessions total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are these practices and routines similar across tutoring dyads?</td>
<td>Field notes, video recordings, observations, interviews</td>
<td>Domain analysis</td>
<td>Spradley, 1980; LeCompte &amp; Preissle, 1993, 1984</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do the practices and routines vary across tutoring dyads?</td>
<td>Field notes, video recordings, observations, interviews</td>
<td>Domain analysis</td>
<td>Spradley, 1980; LeCompte &amp; Preissle, 1993, 1984</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are tutors able to appropriately scaffold the tutees’ literacy learning?</td>
<td>Field notes, video recordings, observations</td>
<td>Transcription of oral text, message units, discourse analysis</td>
<td>Schriffin, 1994; Spradley, 1980; Merriam, 1995</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does scaffolding manifest itself within the culture of tutoring?</td>
<td>Field notes, video recordings, observations, artifact analysis, interviews</td>
<td>Discourse analysis, artifact analysis, domain analysis, event maps</td>
<td>Schriffin, 1994; Spradley, 1980; Merriam, 1995</td>
<td>Ongoing, cumulative and culminating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

OVERVIEW OF TUTORING SESSIONS
### Summary of Tutoring Dyad # 1's Tutoring Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutoring Sessions- Dyad # 1</th>
<th>Overview of Session Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session # 1</td>
<td>Oral reading of tutee-selected texts for fluency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 2</td>
<td>Oral reading of student-created books for enjoyment, fluency, and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 3</td>
<td>Paired reading of a high-interest text for enjoyment, fluency, and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 4</td>
<td>Paired reading of a high-interest text for enjoyment, fluency, and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 5</td>
<td>Spelling and sight word recognition of high frequency words through the use of the game Hangman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 6</td>
<td>Spelling and sight word recognition of high frequency words through the use of the game Hangman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 7</td>
<td>Collaborative spelling and sight word recognition of tutee-created words through the use of the game Scrabble Junior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 8</td>
<td>Paired reading of a high-interest text for enjoyment, fluency, and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 9</td>
<td>Oral reading for comprehension utilizing a worksheet containing a non-fiction paragraph and comprehension crossword puzzle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 10</td>
<td>Collaborative spelling and sight word recognition of tutee-created words through the use of the game Scrabble Junior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 11</td>
<td>Paired reading of a high-interest text for enjoyment, fluency, and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session # 12</td>
<td>Interactive creation of a character cluster as the pre-writing stage of the writing process. Tutee-created rough draft based on the character cluster.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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