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Abstract

As a practising classroom teacher with an academic interest in literacy acquisition, I was aware of the complex nature of literacy and the controversial debates around the teaching and learning of literacy. I was keen to closely examine literacy sessions in my classroom to identify factors that influenced literacy development. Having frequently witnessed and been intrigued by the idiosyncratic intricacies of literacy learning in my teaching and parenting, I was drawn towards theorists and educators who recognise literacy as a complex social practice (Cairney, 1995; Gee, 1990; Harste, Woodward & Burke, 1984; Heath, 1983; Luke, 1993; Solsken, 1993; Teale & Sulzby, 1986).

As classroom teacher and researcher, I set out with the broad aim of exploring sociocultural factors influencing the literacy development of students in the class I was teaching at the time. Using a qualitative research paradigm, data collection began at the beginning of the school year and proceeded until the end of the final term. Data collection techniques included participant observation, field notes, video and audio recordings, questionnaires, structured and unstructured interviews and artefact collection.

Initial analysis examined the data to identify factors that appeared to influence literacy development. As analysis proceeded, I became aware of intertextual incidents in the data (Jameson, 1998). Intertextuality was first defined by Kristeva (1967) and describes the process of interpreting one text by means of a previously composed text (Cairney, 1992). Research across a number of academic fields has since led to more complex definitions of intertextuality and text, and, in educational theory, its implications for learning.

The presence of intertextual events in this study and the implications they have for literacy teaching and learning, precipitated the eventual focus for the study, namely, intertextuality (Roache-Jameson, 2003; 2003a; 2005; 2005a). An exploration of the theory of intertextuality, its significance to literacy, analysis of intertextuality in this classroom data and the implications for literacy teaching in the kindergarten...
classroom became the central focus of the study.

Whilst a number of researchers have explored intertextuality in individual readers (Cairney 1988; Hartman 1990), Short (1992a) suggested the need to research intertextuality in collaborative learning environments to allow researchers to understand more about student learning and effective learning environments. This study responded to Short’s suggestion and examined intertextuality in a collaborative environment.

The study involved transcribing the intertextual incidents from the data and categorising them across three domains. The research has led to significant theoretical progress in understanding intertextuality and amongst other things has suggested a framework for describing intertextual incidents (Roache-Jameson, 2003). This provides evidence of originality and contribution to scholarly knowledge required for Doctoral research.

The final stage of the study also involved drawing together four themes from the literature on intertextuality with transcript examples from the kindergarten study (Roache-Jameson, 2005). This conclusive paper indicates the application of independent critical ability in synthesising the new data with the complex body of literature surrounding intertextuality.
Overarching Statement

1.1 Introduction

This portfolio of achievement meets the University of Western Sydney’s Doctorate of Education criteria by providing an overarching statement of the research undertaken in my professional field, copies of the required publications, evidence of the professional tertiary teaching, scholarly presentations and participation in on-campus events and conferences. In addition, the portfolio includes the contribution of scholarship to my profession as demonstrated by career promotion and development, honorary positions, writing commissions and representation at national and international conferences.

The study began in 1995 when I was a practising classroom teacher for the NSW Department of Education and Training. Following initial course work incorporating research studies, the doctoral study progressed to a major research project generating publications, national and international presentations, commissions for professional writing and requests to undertake professional teaching at the University of Western Sydney.

In keeping with the aims of a professional doctorate, the research was conducted in my professional field of education. The skills and expertise gained from the research experience integrated well with my professional development and were recognised within the Department, contributing to continued promotion to senior leadership positions. Honorary appointments to positions with national and state professional associations were further acknowledgement of the academic and professional expertise gained from this doctoral study.

The study examined intertextual connections in a kindergarten classroom (Jameson, 1998; Roache-Jameson, 2003; 2003a; 2005; 2005a). Research for the study comprised the collection of data from literacy sessions where I was both teacher and researcher. The data were initially analysed for factors influencing literacy development, leading to the focus of the study – intertextuality. Intertextuality describes the human phenomenon of making connections between texts (Roache-
The extensive scholarly history of intertextuality from a range of academic perspectives was examined and summarised (Roache-Jameson, 2003; 2005). The data from the year-long collection of literacy sessions provided evidence of intertextuality occurring between kindergarten students (Jameson, 1998). The intertextual connections were transcribed and analysed and resulted in the creation of a new classification system of three domains of intertextual connections (Roache-Jameson, 2003; 2005a). The transcripts revealed that students used intertextual connections to construct meaning. Practical implications for teachers to facilitate and use intertextuality to support the construction of meaning and to enhance collaboration in the classroom were identified and discussed (Roache-Jameson, 2003a). Four themes from a study of the intertextuality literature were described and transcripts from the data used to exemplify the links between the intertextual incidents in this kindergarten study with the identified themes from the literature (Roache-Jameson, 2005).

This doctoral study comprised an in-depth review of the literature, data collection, analysis and findings resulting in:

- The publication of four refereed research papers, including international and national journals, and four non-refereed research papers
- A range of papers published in conference proceedings and professional journals
- Two commissions for articles from an Australian state government department and national honorary association
- National and international conference presentations
- Participation in on-campus events
- Professional teaching in the area of research expertise
The study provides evidence of original scholarly knowledge by introducing new terminology and ways of classifying intertextual connections. The synthesis of new data with existing scholarly literature to describe themes of intertextuality meets the doctoral criterion for applying knowledge in new contexts. As well, the publications and conference presentations have informed researchers, educators, educational authorities and policy makers.

This portfolio begins with an overview of the research. Published papers generated from the research are provided in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 begins with an explanation of the contribution of the study to the profession, indicating how the various doctoral requirements were met through scholarly and professional achievements. It explains the interdependence and temporal sequence of academic and professional development throughout the study. The portfolio concludes with appendices of related documents.
1.2 Overview of Research

1.2.1 Introduction

In recent years the complex nature of literacy acquisition has been well documented (Cairney, 1995; Christie, 1990; Clay, 1979; Meek, 1991; Unsworth, 1993). The complexity of literacy attracts enormous interest and controversial debate. As a practising classroom teacher when the study began, I was interested in examining this complexity to identify factors which influenced literacy development. My classroom practice acknowledged the complex, sociocultural nature of literacy (Heath, 1983; Greene & Weade, 1987; Gee, 1990; Luke, 1993; Cairney, 1995). A sociocultural view of literacy recognises the complex, dynamic nature of literacy, the multiple forms of literacy, and the social enculturation of literary practices. Avoiding approaches to literacy with a narrow focus of skills acquisition, the design of the teaching program was framed by the significance of the social construction of literacy (Vygotsky, 1978) and hence, an emphasis on collaborative contexts (Short, 1992a), empowering students in their ‘meaning making’ (Wells, 1986) and incorporating characteristics of a ‘learning community’ (NSW Department of School Education, 1995). Recognition of the importance of scaffolding (Bruner, 1986; Cairney, 1995) and guided participation (Rogoff, 1990) to build bridges between current and new understandings in the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978) was also influential in the design and implementation of teaching and learning practices.

The research was also informed by research on emergent literacy with its foundations in the work of Clay (1966), Holdaway (1979), Wells (1986), Harste, Woodward and Burke (1984), Mason and Allen (1986), Teale and Sulzby (1986) and others1. One of the significant insights that this work provided was that the development of the alphabetic code had its foundations in children’s early experiences of print and language.

Another important development in literacy study was the advent of research in

---

real life settings (Bloome, 1987). Psycholinguists, such as Goodman and Goodman (1979) proclaimed the need to view reading and writing processes in the real world, not the laboratory. Educators expressed the need for research to be relevant to real classroom practices, rather than experimental settings. Stemming from anthropological and sociological traditions, ethnographic studies of literacy became more commonplace in education, and led to literacy practices being examined as they occur in homes, families, communities and classrooms.

The qualitative research paradigm, with its emphasis on natural settings, descriptive data, process-orientation, inductive analysis and a central concern with meaning (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982) was seen as the most effective means of gaining insights into literacy development in this classroom study.

The study began with a broad aim of examining factors that influenced literacy in the kindergarten classroom where the researcher was also classroom teacher. Recognition of the complexity of literacy and the sociocultural nature of learning provided a theoretical framework from which to begin observing and analysing literacy development in this classroom throughout the year (Jameson, 1996). (See Figure 1).

Data were collected from a variety of classroom literacy practices and initial analysis examined the data to identify any factors influencing literacy development. More and more frequently the researcher became aware of intertextual incidents in the data and intertextuality became the focus of the study.

---

Figure 1: Graphic Overview – Study of literary development in a kindergarten classroom.

---

2 In New South Wales Kindergarten is the first year of formal schooling and is for children who have reached a minimum age of 5 years.
Intertextuality refers to the human phenomenon of making connections between texts (Roache-Jameson, 2003). ‘Texts’ were broadly defined initially as anything from a book, movie or conversation, to a life experience or memory. As the study proceeded, the definition of text used by the NSW Department of Education and Training was formally used: any meaningful act of communication, of any length, whether written, spoken or visual (NSW Department of Education and Training, 2000).

Intertextuality has been studied from many academic perspectives (Worton & Still1990) and research has shown that increased understanding and learning can result from intertextual processes (Bloome 1992; Bloome & Egan-Robertson 1993; Cairney 1990b, 1992; Cairney & Langbien 1989; Harris & Trezise 1995, 1997; Hartman 1990; Oyler & Barry 1996; Short 1992). Fairclough (2003) noted the potential relevance of other texts and other voices to be intertextually incorporated in any particular new text.

The study revealed that kindergarten students used intertextual connections to construct meaning and enhance collaborative relationships in their classroom (Roache-Jameson, 2004). Fostering intertextuality has practical implications for the classroom teacher (Roache-Jameson, 2003a). The study explored the literature and data to generate a series of papers and presentations describing intertextuality in the kindergarten classroom and its implications for teaching and learning.

In addition, two publications on qualitative research for classroom teachers were commissioned (Jameson, 1999; 2004). The purpose of these publications was to translate the outcomes of the ongoing research into forms that were more accessible for teachers. In particular, the publications sought to equip teachers to be involved in evidence-based research and practice.

This chapter provides a summary of the relevant literature, an outline of the research design and methodology and a synopsis of the publications arising from the research.
1.2.2 From theory to practice

Several aspects of the literature on literacy teaching and learning shaped and influenced my professional beliefs and the literacy practices within the classroom. The following provides an outline of the theoretical framework guiding the kindergarten classroom practices and the scholarly perspective for research directions:

The sociocultural nature of literacy

The Australian Language and Literacy Policy defines literacy as:

*The ability to read and use written information and to write appropriately, in a range of contexts.*

*It is used to develop knowledge and understanding, to achieve personal growth and to function effectively in our society.*

*Literacy also includes the recognition of number and basic mathematical signs and symbols within text.*

*Literacy involves the integration of speaking, listening and critical thinking with reading and writing.*

*Effective literacy is intrinsically purposeful, flexible and dynamic and continues to develop throughout an individual's lifetime.*

*All Australians need to have effective literacy in English, not only for their personal benefit and welfare but also for Australia to reach its social and economic goals.*


This definition recognises the complex, dynamic nature of literacy and constitutes a movement away from simplistic definitions that traditionally defined literacy as 'being able to read and write'. Luke (1993, p. 4) refers to literacy as “a dynamic, evolving social and historical construction whose standards and practices are contingent upon the agendas and power relations of institutions and communities, governments and cultures”.
Meek (1991, p. 36) points out that “both language and literacy are in constant evolution – as language changes, as societies change, so what counts as literacy also changes”. The knowledge, skills and behaviour of a ‘literate’ Australian at the end of the twentieth century are vastly different to those of a person considered literate earlier this century. Christie (1990) concurs:

The contemporary world demands a level of sophistication in literacy greater than at any time in the past. It demands a people capable not only of handling the awesome range of print materials now a feature of a technologically advanced society, but also of creating and responding to new ones, for we do keep generating new kinds of writing, new kinds of genres, as a necessary part of generating new knowledge and new ways of thinking. (p.21)

Along with the knowledge that literacy cannot be simply defined because of its constantly evolving nature, there has been a growing recognition of the social construction of literacy.

Gee (1990) explains how we are socialised into certain literacy practices:

Every text is of a certain type (consider newspapers, political tracts, literature, lectures, political speeches, religious texts, comic books, school books and lessons, and so on through hundreds of varieties). Each type of text can be read in several different ways; meaning can be given to, or taken from, the text at a variety of levels. Types of texts and the various ways of reading them are the social and historical inventions of various groups of people. One always and only learns to interpret texts of a certain type in certain ways through having access to, and ample experience in, social settings where texts of that type are read in those ways. One is socialised or enculturated into a certain social practice... Thus the study of literacy ultimately requires us to study the social groups and institutions within which one is socialised to interpret certain types of words and certain sorts of worlds in certain ways. (pp. 45 – 46)
Heath’s ethnographic study (1983) of communities in the Piedmont Carolinas region of the United States exemplifies the implications of enculturation. She studied the language acquisition and literacy habits of children from the communities of Roadville, Trackton and mainstream townspeople. Roadville was a small community of white, working-class families who had been a part of mill-working life for four generations. Trackton was a black working class community whose older generations had been brought up on the land and now were employed by the mills. The ‘townspeople’ were blacks and whites, and were professionals who were seen as ‘mainstreamers’ (in common with the national mainstream middle-class presented in the public media), influential and wielding power. Heath found that the patterns of language use of the children of Roadville and Trackton contrasted sharply with those of the townspeople. The children of Roadville and Trackton frequently experienced failure at school while most townspeople children succeeded. The literacy practices valued at school were those that the townspeople had enculturated in their children. Heath’s research shows how the various literacy experiences of each culture prepared the children to differing degrees for school literacy success and failure and demonstrates the inextricable links between literacy and cultural practice.

The social construction of literacy has become a major focus of study in the past decade. Cairney (1995) explains that the shift from reading as a cognitive process, to reading as a complex cultural practice has been dependent on a number of differing influences from the research fields of psycholinguistics, psychology and sociolinguists. He points out that the need to study children in ‘real world’ contexts arose from psycholinguistic scholars such as Goodman (1965; 1967), Harste (Harste, Woodward & Burke, 1984) and Snow (1983). Haas Dyson (1992, 1999) called for educators to acknowledge sociocultural breadth and depth in order to weave together texts and lives to allow for a complex classroom world with widened discourse boundaries.

The work of psychologists such as Vygotsky (1978) and Bruner (1986) emphasised the importance of relationships that exist in classrooms (Cairney, 1995). Sociolinguistic theories of language, built upon the premise that “language is made
as people act and react to one another”, also played a crucial role in the move towards a sociocultural understanding of literacy (Cairney, 1995, p.1). Approaches to reading that focus primarily on skills acquisition, have led to a narrow view of reading that concentrates upon the intrapersonal context of reading, ignoring the interpersonal influences of instruction and classroom communication. A sociolinguistic perspective of literacy allows the interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects of literacy in educational settings to be explored (Greene & Weade, 1987).

Luke (1993) maintains:

To become literate, children must master conventionalised linguistic and symbolic codes for constructing and deconstructing meanings with and around written texts. They must develop both implicit and explicit, tacit and active knowledge of how written language works and its possibilities for access to and the representation of culturally significant ideas, concepts and beliefs. But to use literacy to realise sociocultural power, they also need to deploy language to conceptualise and realise goals and alternatives in specific social relationships and situations...Literacy is therefore as much about ideologies, identities and values as it is about codes and skills. (pp. 8 – 11)

Cairney (1995) agrees that literacy is not a single unitary skill. “There are many forms of literacy, each with specific purposes and contexts in which they are used...To understand literacy fully we need to understand the groups and institutions in which we are socialised into specific literacy practices (Bruner, 1986; Gee, 1990)” (p.11). Simplistic skills-based definitions of literacy have now given way to broader definitions of literacy. The new definitions of literacy acknowledge the multiple forms of literacy and the dynamic nature of literacy as a social and cultural process.

Cope & Kalantzis (2000) argue against the narrow view of literacy as 'reading and writing the standard form of a national language' and challenge educators to understand literacy more broadly as multiliteracies. Literacy should be viewed as a matter of design or transformation, that recognises the diverse resources for meaning the literacy learner draws on as well as the nature of hybrid redesigned meanings (p.234). This concept of design refers to the inseparable nature of individuals and
culture and highlights the way in which learners both inherit conventions for
meaning-making, as well as actively design new meanings.

However, this broadened outlook towards literacy has not empowered all learners.
Research shows that literacy achievement is influenced by social class, ethnicity and
and Luke (1993) highlight the inequity of classroom practices:

Even in the everyday functioning of the classroom it seems that critical decisions are
made which limit some children's opportunities for learning. (Cairney, 1995, 14.)

All literate practices are not of equivalent power in terms of the socioeconomic
benefits and cultural knowledges they yield. Nor do schools successfully impart to
all socially powerful or critical literacies. (Luke, 1993, p. 17.)

Teachers are faced with the dilemma of how to socialise students into the literacy
practices that will ultimately empower (Cairney, 1995). Luke (1993) has called for
critical social literacy in the classroom that recognises cultural, class and gender
differences and offers more inclusive literature and literacy curriculum. Cairney
(1995, p. 16) has advocated less concern with debates over methods, and more
concern with the interactions and relationships that are permitted and encouraged
in classrooms whilst reflecting on the extent to which individuals are empowered or
disempowered by our literacy practices.

Solsken (1993) adopts the underlying assumptions of the 'social construction of
literacy' perspective further to examine the learning and teaching of literacy as part
of status and dominance relations in the larger society. She calls this perspective
'literacy as social status and identity'. In her study of literacy, gender and work in
families and in school, Solsken found that “children, like adults, strive to be counted
as members of social groups and to be recognised as unique individuals”. The day-
to-day choices children make in classroom negotiations, are made within the
constraints of, and have consequences for, broader social processes. (p.9)

Bruner (1974, cited in Clay, 1979, p. 271) draws our attention to the complex
issues facing the classroom teacher:
How one manages to time the steps of pedagogy to match unfolding capacities, how one manages to instruct without making the learner dependent and how one manages to do both of these while keeping alive zest for further learning – these are very complicated questions that do not yield answers.

Harste, Woodward and Burke (1984) suggest a formula for literacy development whereby ‘experience’ transacts with ‘print settings’ leading to new levels of psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic activity’ (p.30). Harste et al. found distinct patterns in literacy learning in their study of young children which led them to stress the need for open-entry language activities in which constraints are allowed to evolve in a risk-free environment.

Unsworth (1993) warns that “there is no place in the classrooms of the 1990s and beyond for the sterile traditional teaching of the past with its mechanistic transmission of knowledge and passive, receptive learning” (p.x). Classroom teachers need to be mindful that children’s access to knowledge and literacy practices is dependent upon their social position (Cairney, 1995; Gee, 1990; Luke, 1993; Unsworth, 1993).

Lankshear & Noble (2003) emphasise the sociocultural nature of literacy practices noting the significance of the critical dimension (Green & Harker, 1988). In order to participate effectively and productively, individuals need to understand literacy’s social construction and selectivity, and know it can be acted on and transformed by the learner with a knowledge of culture, history and power. ‘Being literate involves much more than simply knowing how to operate the language system. The cultural and critical facets of knowledge integral to being literate are considerable’ (p.12)

The term ‘multiliteracies’, coined by the New London Group (2000) to describe the textual shift that has occurred for literacy learners today arises from the expanding global communication context with its easy access to an array of visual, electronic and digital multimodal texts. Multimodal texts, such as email, mobile phones and the internet merge the means of communication through more than one mode of expression. The concept of multimodality requires a rethinking of distinctions made
between communications and use (Kress, 2003) and raise critical issues in light of
the development of new literacies and the sociocultural implications. Further analysis
of these complex combinations of modes and the construction of meaning, is needed
to inform pedagogical research (Walsh, 2006).

**Developing Communities of Readers and Writers.**

The acknowledgment of literacy learning as a social and cultural process has
implications for the classroom environment. Cairney (1989) suggests:

Classrooms are living evidence of the complex social nature of literacy. The teacher
and the class are talking, listening, reading and writing as parts of a dynamic community.
Literacy is being learned as children relate to each other, meaning is being created within
a complex community of relationships (p. 561).

Teachers need to provide classroom environments where children value reading
and writing as natural extensions of their lives and where they can grow and share
as members of a literate community (Cairney, 1995, p. 17). There is a need to create
communities of learners (Cairney, 1989; Johnson, 1993).

Senge (1990) defines a learning community as “an organisation where people
continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new
and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set
free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together”.

Three significant features are evident in ‘communities of scholars’: self-
organisation, generative learners and self-sustenance (Johnson, 1993). Communities
are developed through vision, planning, preparation and hard work under the
leadership of a teacher. A community of scholars is not restricted to a certain grade
or age. “The differences between a Grade 3, Grade 7, Grade 10 or university level
community of scholars would rest more with the nature of the texts with which the
learners engage and the extent of the world knowledge that they bring to them rather
than a stage of development or any particular set of skills.” (p.4)
This concern for the development of communities of learners has been adopted by the NSW Department of Education (1995) and is demonstrated in their own professional development literature. At the State level teachers are being encouraged to develop learning communities where:

- students are empowered, self-directed and committed learners
- teachers and administrators are themselves committed learners with well developed habits of continuous inquiry and reflection; they are life long learners who recognise the complexities of teaching and recognise that they need continually to deepen their knowledge of teaching and learning processes
- the principal is the leading learner, who models lifelong learning and facilitates the learning of all members of the community
- parents are learning partners
- there is a learning-focused work environment in which both formal learning activities and informal, workplace learning are valued.

**Guided Participation**

An important element of learning communities in which children are involved is the level of support given by adults. Indeed, many writers have argued for the critical importance of ‘guided participation’ (Rogoff, 1990) or scaffolding (Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky’s work is foundational to the research described in this portfolio. He identified the ‘zone of proximal development’ (ZPD) in children as of critical importance in understanding how children learn. In essence he suggested that children learn within a zone where tasks to be performed or things to learn can be at or beyond their capabilities. With support from other learners possessing skill or knowledge beyond their own, they are able to learn things that would normally be beyond them. This zone he suggested shapes the development potential of a child. While there will be things that the child can achieve without assistance at their ‘actual’ developmental level, in contrast there are other things for which they need help and support because it is at their ‘potential development’ level. There is a difference
between these two forms of development that Vygotsky terms the ZPD. (p.86).
Vygotsky believed that teaching towards actual developmental levels is ineffective and that the zone of proximal development is critical for learning to occur (p.89).
Vygotsky's concept of ‘intersubjectivity’ describes the process humans engage in when collaborating in the zone of proximal development. It involves a sharing of focus and purpose between a child and another more skilled or knowledgeable person (Cairney, 1995, p. 37).

Bruner (1986) suggested the process of ‘scaffolding’ to guide children through the zone of proximal development. The process of scaffolding involves an enabling adult helping the child by guiding the learning task and segmenting the task into manageable components.

Cairney (1995) uses Bruner’s term ‘scaffolding’ to describe the behaviour of an enabling person helping a student engage in an aspect of learning beyond their current level of development (p.46).

Rogoff (1990) built upon the theories of Vygotsky and Bruner to develop the concept of guided participation:

Guided participation involves children and their caregivers in the collaborative processes of (1) building bridges from children’s present understanding and skills to reach new understanding and skills, and (2) arranging and structuring children’s participation in activities, with dynamic shifts over development in children’s responsibility. (p.8)

The Use of Literature.

Children’s earliest experiences of reading are typically in the company of adults supporting them as they encounter texts (Cairney, 2003). Although Cairney (1995) reminds us that literature-based instruction is not the only means of acquiring literacy, and stresses the need to recognise multiple pathways to literacy, it is one of the most common first encounters with complex literacy forms.

“The way children are taught to read tells them what adults think literacy is. If we want our children to read more competently and sensitively in order to live more
richly and to contribute to what is to be read, then we have to move beyond a utilitarian view of literacy...” (Meek, 1982, p. 18). The most important single lesson that children learn from texts is the nature and variety of written discourse – the different ways that language lets a writer tell and the many and different ways a reader reads (Meek, 1988, p.21).

Textual theories have also been important in informing the use of literature as a key text. Transactional theories of reading developed by scholars such as Rosenblatt (1976) and Eco (1979) have been significant. Rosenblatt proposed that “reading involves a transaction between a reader and a text which leads to the creation of a new text that is unique to each reader”. Transactional theory reflects the social constructivist notions of knowledge (Cairney, 1995, p.4) and recognises that readers construct meaning within social contexts as they relate to others.

Saxby (1993) states:

The most important factor in developing literary skills is early access to literature, in the first place to the oral literature of nursery rhymes and folk and fairy tales and then to books which will immediately capture interest, stir the imagination and absorb the listener into the world of story... True literature nourishes the mind, promotes sensory awareness, develops emotional sensitivity and provides a rich linguistic environment... A reader’s experience is constantly being enriched by language, and at the same time language is sharpening experience because it is providing the tool by which to recognise and name it (pp. 57 – 61).

Cairney (1995, pp 77 – 78) suggests that literature can fulfil many complex functions:

Literature is not just about story, it is about life and one’s world. It can act as a mirror to enable readers to reflect on life’s problems and circumstances; a source of knowledge; a means to peer into the past, and the future; a vehicle to other places; a means to reflect on inner struggles; an introduction to the realities of life and death; and a vehicle for the raising and discussion of social issues... Literature offers “endless possibilities” for readers to explore their world and learn from it, to enter “other worlds” and to engage in meaning making.
Bruner (1986, p. 37) uses the term ‘subjunctivize’ to describe how literature “renders the world less fixed, less banal, more susceptible to recreation...literature, in this spirit, is an instrument of freedom, lightness, imagination, and yes, reason. It is our only hope against the long gray night”.

Chambers (1991) describes what enabling adults (teachers) need to do to create the reading environment that will allow children to discover literature:

They (teachers) provide books and time to read them and an attractive environment where people want to read. They stimulate a desire to become a thoughtful reader. They demonstrate by reading aloud and by their own behaviour what a ‘good’ reader does. And they respond, and help others respond, to the individuality of everyone in the reading community they belong to. (p. 92)

The emphasis on literature in classrooms today has arisen from development in theoretical understandings of the reading process since the 1970s. Whilst there is still debate concerning the reading process itself, there is universal consensus that reading is a complex meaning-based process requiring the interaction of text and reader based factors (Cairney, 1990a, 1995).

1.2.3 The Research Setting

The study was undertaken in a kindergarten classroom in a government primary school situated in the Blue Mountains of New South Wales (NSW). The school has a total enrolment of approximately 330 students. In NSW, ‘kindergarten’ refers to the first year of formal schooling and the average age is five years.

The kindergarten class comprised twenty-three children, in which twelve students were female and eleven male. The class was observed by the researcher (who was also the classroom teacher) throughout the school year, to initially provide a rich description of literacy development and to examine what factors appeared to influence literacy. The study set out to examine the whole class generally, and specifically focused upon six children who were observed more intensively. The families of these
children participated in interviews and completed questionnaires relating to home literacy practices.

A range of data was collected during the school year and initial data analysis adducted the study towards a focus on intertextuality. Further data analysis proceeded and an in-depth literature review of intertextuality was undertaken, culminating in an examination of intertextuality theory in relation to the data, a description of intertextual events in this classroom and the implications for literacy teaching and learning practices.

A range of strategies was used throughout this study to ensure trustworthiness of the data. Strategies included checking for representativeness, weighting the evidence, following up surprises, looking for negative evidence, replicating a finding and triangulation. (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p.263)

Permission to carry out this research was obtained from the NSW Department of Education and Training prior to commencing the study. The purpose of the research was explained to all parents and consent was requested for each child’s participation in the project. Parents were also asked to indicate their willingness to participate in interviews concerning home literacy background and practices.

Any information or personal details gathered in the course of this research were treated as confidential. Parents were assured that no identifying information would be published without prior written permission from the parents.

1.2.4 Intertextuality

As the focus of the study shifted towards intertextuality, an extensive review of the literature was undertaken to trace the evolution of intertextuality theory and its significance to literacy learning.

Fundamental to any study of intertextuality is an understanding of what constitutes a text. Just as intertextuality evolved into increasingly complex definitions as it was studied, so too did the notion of ‘text.’ The following definitions illustrate this increasing complexity:
Pierce (1966) :

A text is any sign that communicates meaning.

Witte (1992) :

While a text can be something tangible, it need not be, it can also be those experiences and ideas that are remembered or constructed in the mind.

Hartman (1992) :

Although we usually think of the text as the object one reads – a textbook, a section of a passage, or the alphanumeric code printed on a page – it need not be confined to the boundaries of printed language. A text includes both linguistic and nonlinguistic signs. (p. 296)

Worton & Still (1990) :

‘Text’ is used both in the restricted academic sense to mean a ‘work of literature’ and in the wider sense to mean anything which can be perceived as ‘a signifying structure’ from the spectacle of nature to social codes. (p. viii)

Siegel (1984, cited in Short, 1987) :

Texts... should be defined as meaningful configurations of signs intended to communicate.

Bloome & Egan-Robertson (1993) :

A text is the product of textualising. People textualise experience and the world in which they live, making those phenomena part of a language system. The result of textualising experience can be a set of words, signs, representations, etc. But it might be other forms and products not usually associated with texts: architecture, rock formations, the stars in the sky, the wind, the ocean, emotion – these can all be texts, but their being texts depends on what people do. The stars in the sky are only a text if they have been made so, if they have been textualised. In brief, text is something done by people to experience. (p. 311)
Short (1992h):

A text is any chunk of meaning that has unity and can be shared with others. A song, dance, poem, oral story, mathematical equation, or sculpture are all texts from which learners can draw connections as they construct their understandings about a current evolving text.

Intertextuality has its roots in a variety of academic disciplines. Post-structuralist scholar, Julie Kristeva (1967, translated in 1980) was the first to attempt an explanation for the notion of intertextuality. She wrote “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another” (p.66). Barthes (1979, p. 77) stated that “every text is the intertext of another text”.

Following Kristeva’s initial description, there has been extensive research into intertextuality throughout various scholarly fields. Worton and Still (1990) allude to this in their definition:

Intertextuality – it should come as no surprise – is a promiscuous inter-discipline, or even a trans-discipline, certainly a transvestite discipline in that it constantly borrows its trappings now from psychoanalysis, now from political philosophy, now from economics and so on. Its practitioners enjoy playing with their own words (newly coined) and even more so with other people’s. (p. viii)

The relevance of intertextuality to literacy education is obvious. Saxby (1993, p.61) states that enrichment from reading is a spiralling process. “Each new book that is assimilated into the readers experience provides new insights that can be brought to bear on the next book read”. This describes the basic notion of intertextuality. Intertextuality can be defined as “the process of interpreting one text by means of a previously composed text” (Cairney, 1992, p. 502).

The pathway of intertextuality research through the academic disciplines of Literary Criticism, Semiotics, Cognitive Literacy Theory and the Social Construction of Literacy are of particular relevance to this study. In order to determine the patterns and importance of intertextuality in a kindergarten classroom, it is helpful to gain an understanding of the genesis of intertextuality in each of these various disciplines.
Literary Theory

Literary criticism is the home of intertextuality. The theory of intertextuality states that a text cannot exist as a hermetic whole for two important reasons. Firstly, because the writer is a reader of texts, the written text is always influenced by references of all kinds from the various texts experienced prior to writing. Secondly, the reader of the text brings with him or her a wealth of prior experiences which may lead the reader to an interpretation of the writing, different to that which the writer proposed. Conversely, a reference to a work by the writer, which is unknown to the reader, will have a passive effect during that particular reading. Worton and Still (1990) refer to these two fundamental aspects, texts entering via authors and texts entering via readers, as the ‘axes of intertextuality’ (p.2).

Whilst the term intertextuality was only used from the 1960s, the phenomenon itself occurred from the beginnings of human society whenever there has been discourse about texts. Worton and Still (1990), in their introductory chapter of an entire book devoted to intertextuality in literary criticism, trace the roots of intertextuality back to our earliest orators such as Plato and Aristotle. The twentieth century has seen the emergence of intertextuality theorists in literary criticism. One of the earliest influential theorists was Bakhtin who stated that “there is no utterance without relation to other utterances” (Todorov, 1984, p.60). Post-structuralists such as Roland Barthes began to assert that readers can freely connect text with any system of meaning to make sense of our lived experience – “The aim of literature, Barthes asserts is to put meaning into the world, but not a meaning” (Sontag, 1982, p. xi). In ‘The Pleasure of the Text’ (1975), Barthes states intertextuality is “the impossibility of living outside the infinite text – whether this text be Proust or the daily newspaper or the television screen: the book creates the meaning, the meaning creates life” (p.36). Reader response theorists such as Riffaterre (1990) define intertextuality as the “web of functions” that synchronise the relationships between text and intertext. Riffaterre states the importance of intertextuality for readers to gain understanding
when trying to ‘fill gaps’ in a text (pp. 56 – 57). The Reader Response movement located meaning within the reader’s interpretation rather than in the text.

Semiotics

The semiotic discipline arose from the work of Pierce (1966) and Saussure (1966). Semiotics, the study of signs, generated interest in a number of educational researchers who developed a semiotic perspective on reading comprehension (Eco, 1975; Harste Woodward & Burke, 1984; Short, 1987). Hartman (1990) sums up their collective wisdom thus: “...they examine how language, and thereby reality, is constructed. Semiotics examines how our reality is already constructed for us by the language and interpretations of our culture – an external reality is always interpreted because it is mediated by a system of cultural signs” (pp.8 – 12). Lemke (1992) sees semiotic intertextuality as the cornerstone of our understanding of how meanings are made: “The meanings we make through texts, and the ways we make them, always depend on the currency in our communities of other texts ... we can make meanings through the relations between two texts; meanings that cannot be made within any single text” (p.257).

Cognitive Literacy Theory

Literacy from a cognitive perspective is viewed as a body of cognitive knowledge about written language (prior knowledge) and a set of processes for using that knowledge (schema theory). This theory suggests that readers make use of visual information in the text to guide them in selecting and using their own knowledge to make sense of the text (Hartman, 1990, p5). By the use of prior knowledge and schema theory, meaning is constructed by connecting knowledge fragments into a particular configuration to fit a given context. Hartman (1990) used the cognitive tradition to examine the intertextual links made by able readers as they read multiple passages. His study found that readers do transpose texts into other texts, absorb one text into another, and build a mosaic of intersecting texts. He found two general types of
intertextual links occurring. Those between ideas, events and people; and those links made between the readers themselves to the passages in the form of a discourse stance (p.171). Hartman concludes that able readers use a variety of ways to read; reading is “an intertextual enterprise where readers transpose, absorb and intersect texts as they zig-zag their way through passages (iii).

**Social Construction of Literacy**

The basic tenets of sociocultural research are drawn from cultural anthropology and sociolinguistics theory. Literacy viewed from a sociocultural perspective is seen as “a community’s ways of using written language to serve social purposes” (Solsken, 1993, p.4). The social context is central to meaning making, as Cairney (1995) describes: “types of discourse and the way we read or write them are the social constructs of specific groups. Individuals are enculturated into these practices and these meanings” (p.2).

A number of intertextuality studies have been carried out from a sociocultural perspective. Cairney (1988, 1990, 1992, 1996) found that students link texts in diverse ways, and while intertextuality has idiosyncratic elements, it is also a rich, social phenomenon. Bloome & Egan-Robertson (1993) ground their study of intertextuality in the social construction of literacy. “People act and react to each other, and they do so primarily through language. Intertextuality describes one of the social (and cultural) processes involved in how people act and react to each other” (p.220). Bloome (1992) proposes that merely juxtaposing texts is insufficient for intertextuality to be present. He maintains that the juxtaposition must be proposed, interactionally recognised, acknowledged and have social significance (p.259).

Kathy Short (1992a) draws on Peirce’s abduction theory (1966) to explain complex intertextual connections that occur in the social environment of elementary classrooms. Short examined the use of ‘literature circles’ and ‘text sets’ in classrooms to explore the processes and strategies that occur in intertextuality, rather than just the types of connections. She calls for further research in classroom learning
environments which support collaborative social relationships to gain insights into how intertextuality assists meaning making.

Oyler & Barry (1996) examined what and how texts were juxtaposed, and the teacher’s role in the construction of intertextuality, in their study of a first-grade classroom. They found that “student connections were shared with the entire class and remembered texts became shared texts thus building intertextuality among a community of readers” (p.328).

Wolf and Heath (1992) allude to the social nature of intertextuality in their study of children and literature: “Children, at particular ages, moods and moments, will see and remember certain details that trigger the memory of a particular piece of speech, fragment of scene, gesture or facial expression and its connection to a recent event” (p.109).

What all of this related research shows is just how evident intertextuality is in the literacy practices of people. What was less clear when I embarked on this research, is how relevant the concept was for young beginning readers. As Harris and Trezise (1997) argued, in order to understand what shapes and mobilises reading instruction in early school years, there is a need for more in depth examination of the intertextual complexities that exist within it. This became the driving motivation for this research.

Previous research had contributed a theoretical foundation on which a number of key questions were to be explored. These questions reflected the theoretical perspectives examined and the tangible and practical questions that I faced as a classroom teacher when faced with a class of five year olds learning to read and write within a school context. Specifically, these early questions were formed around the desire to know more about the intertextual experiences of young children as they were learning to read and write. While I was interested in theoretical issues, I was also interested in the patterns of intertextuality evident in literacy practices observed in my kindergarten classroom; and the role it played in young children’s literacy development.

As the literature was read and synthesised what emerged was a conceptual
framework that began to give shape to the research. Drawing on the work of Miles & Huberman, (1994), a concept framework was constructed that included the contribution of previous research, the proposed methodology and the process of formulating research questions (See Figure 2). What can be seen from this overview is that the emerging focus for this work became intertextuality. This was reflected in a series of questions that were identified prior to the fieldwork:

- What is the theoretical history of intertextuality?
- In what ways do kindergarten students use intertextuality to construct meaning in classroom literacy practices?
- What patterns of intertextuality are evident in literacy practices observed in this kindergarten classroom?
- What role does intertextuality play in young children’s literacy development?

It was these questions that shaped my work and led to the need for appropriate methods to collect, analyse and describe data as I addressed these concerns.
Figure 2:

Concept Framework: A Study of Literacy Development in the Kindergarten Classroom

**Broad aim of study:**
Exploration of factors influencing literacy development in the kindergarten classroom

**Data Collection:**
- Literacy background
- Home literacy practices
- Classroom literacy practices
- Teaching program and methodology
- School and system requirements
- Classroom interaction

**Teacher/Researcher scholarly reading:**
- Sociocultural nature of learning
- Communities of Learners
- Guided participation
- Use of literature
- Intertextuality

**Data Analysis – stage 1**
- Compilation of literacy descriptions of focal students
- Examination of data
  - Video data
  - Interviews
  - Observations
  - Artefacts
- Transcripts of intertextual connections
- Finding the focus:
  - Intertextuality

**Focus - Intertextuality**

**Research Questions:**
- How is intertextuality used to construct meaning in this classroom?
- What patterns of intertextuality are evident?
- What role does intertextuality play in kindergarten students' literacy development?

**Data analysis – stage 2**
- Grounded theory
- Domain analysis

**Findings & Implications**

---

Figure 2. Concept Framework: A Study of Literacy Development in the Kindergarten Classroom (Roache-Jameson, 2002)
1.2.5 Data Management

Data Collection

A variety of ethnographic techniques were used for data collection (Jameson, 1999). Data were collected in five broad categories:

- Student home literacy background
- Analysis of classroom interaction
- Student literacy development
- Student school achievement
- Teaching methodology

Techniques for data collection included:

- Participant observation
- Field notes
- Video recordings
- Audio recordings
- Parent questionnaires
- Structured and unstructured student interviews
- Structured and unstructured parent interviews
- Student attitude surveys
- Artefact collection – teacher, student, school, and home contexts

A summary of data collection procedures is provided in Table 1.
The daily literacy session was video-recorded approximately three times per week. The literacy session took place each morning for approximately two hours and involved teaching and learning practices such as modelled reading, literary discussions, shared reading, small group work involving a variety of literacy tasks, individual student conferences with the teacher, graphological and phonemic awareness activities.

**Data Analysis**

The study began with the very general research question: ‘What factors influence literacy development in this classroom?’ to provide an initial path for exploring the collected data. The first stage of analysis entailed watching the video recordings of classroom literacy practices to identify factors related to literacy development. During this stage it became apparent that intertextual incidents were frequently occurring. It was decided to focus on these phenomena and examine them for links with literacy.

The video data, combined with field notes from participant observation (Glesne & Peshkin, 1991), audio recordings of conferences with students, and artefact
collection were initially analysed speculatively (Woods, 1986) to allow for tentative reflection by the researcher and emergence of patterns. QSR NUD*IST version 3.0 (Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing Searching and Theorising), a qualitative data management software package, was used to store and analyse the data.

Working definitions were used for data analysis purposes. Text was initially defined as ‘a textualised experience which may include a book, video, film, or a verbalised personal experience’. Intertextuality was defined as ‘the explicit connection of texts, which enhances meaning to the initiator, within a situational context’, in this case, the classroom.

The extensive video data yielded a rich source of classroom interaction from which examples of intertextual connections were transcribed and analysed. Sixteen three-hour video tapes were viewed and analysed. There were eighty eight interactive episodes involving intertextual connections. ‘Interactive episodes’ were excerpts from daily classroom communication between the students and teacher. A classroom intertextual connection was subsequently defined as connecting a classroom text to a textualised experience which may involve a book, video, film or verbalised personal experience. In 2000, the NSW Department of Education and Training provided a definition for text and this was adopted for the study: any meaningful act of communication, of any length, whether written, spoken or visual.

Further analysis involved the principles of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and inductive coding techniques described by Strauss and Corbin (1990). The intertextual connections were inductively analysed using open, axial and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Intertextual connections were coded according to the originating classroom source of the intertextuality, termed the intertextual initiator; and the text to which it was connected, termed the intertextual connective.

Using constant comparison (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and Spradley’s domain analysis (1980), categories were created to describe the types of intertextual connections in the data. Initial coding included categories such as people, books, movies, songs, discussions, and classroom activities.
Further analysis refined the categories revealing three core domains classifying the intertextual connections.

The **textual domain** refers to connections mostly concerned with concepts related to the more traditional definition of ‘text’ such as characters, plot and text structure. The **contextual domain** refers to connections concerned with the specific situational context, in this case, the classroom. The **personal domain** refers to intertextual connections concerned with the students’ personal milieu. Table 2 details the types of connections in the three domains.

Table 2: Domains of Intertextual Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intertextual Domains</th>
<th>Intertextual Initiators</th>
<th>Intertextuality Connectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textual Domain</strong></td>
<td>• plot</td>
<td>• previous class text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• illustrations</td>
<td>• plot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• character</td>
<td>• illustrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• text type or structure</td>
<td>• character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• action/event in a text</td>
<td>• home text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• setting</td>
<td>• text type or structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual Domain</strong></td>
<td>• graphological/phonological session</td>
<td>• spelling knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• alphabet letter</td>
<td>• known rhyme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• word</td>
<td>• previous class activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• dictionary picture</td>
<td>• previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• spelling knowledge</td>
<td>• graphological/phonological session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• wordbank</td>
<td>• class object or resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• wordcard</td>
<td>• song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• writing tasks</td>
<td>• video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• learning theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Domain</strong></td>
<td>• student talk</td>
<td>• student’s name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• student ‘news’</td>
<td>• student knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• student response</td>
<td>• student’s possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• peer talk</td>
<td>• student’s experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• teacher talk</td>
<td>• student’s family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• student’s pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• student’s dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• peer talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• peer writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• peer’s experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• peer’s name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• teacher talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• teacher’s writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• teacher’s family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Domains of Intertextual Connections (Roache-Jameson, 2003)
Whilst the domains provided a useful categorising mechanism to initially organise the data, there were many examples that were contiguous to more than one domain. The nature of intertextuality, by definition a tapestry of textual links, makes clear categorisation difficult. Where overlap occurred, the example was categorised in the domain from which the intertextual connection initiated most significantly. These findings have been reported in the refereed proceedings of the UWS Scholarship and Community Conference (2005). This classification system is seen as a seminal attempt to categorise types of intertextual connections by kindergarten students and provide a foundation for further examination and classification of intertextual connections and their implications for teaching and learning.

1.2.6 Findings

Over the life of this research, focussed inquiry and the dissemination of the findings of my work have led to many tangible outcomes. Intense analysis of the data has enabled a substantive theory of intertextuality to be constructed, relevant to this specific site but with generalisable implications for classroom teachers. The theory has resulted in:

- a seminal classification system for intertextual connections in a kindergarten classroom
- an explanation of the use of intertextual connections by the kindergarten students and teacher to construct meaning
- the propensity for intertextuality to enhance collaboration in this classroom and contribute towards a community of learners
- practical implications for fostering intertextual connections in classrooms
- the identification of four themes from the complex body of literature on intertextuality that were reflected in examples from the kindergarten data.
The study has generated four refereed publications describing the research design and methodology, the theory of intertextuality, the findings from this research, the implications for classroom teachings, and the links between the literature and the kindergarten data (Roache-Jameson, 2003; 2003a; 2005; 2005a). There have also been four non-refereed papers published (Jameson, 1997; 1998; Roache-Jameson, 2002; 2003b), in conjunction with a number of papers and presentations at conferences describing progress during the various stages of the study.

In addition, two publications were commissioned as a result of this study (Jameson, 1999; Roache-Jameson, 2004). (See Appendix 1). The Language Australia NSW Child ESL and Literacy Research centre was an organisation set up to promote literacy and language across all education systems in New South Wales. I was approached to write the second of a series of Research Monographs produced by the Centre. The monograph, Beyond Action Research – Conducting Teacher-Based Research was published in 1999.

The second commission came from the Tasmanian Department of Education. I was asked to contribute to a professional development document entitled Research into Action with an overview of the history of qualitative research, its value, and key strategies for ensuring rigor. The book was published in 2004.

Chapter two comprises complete versions of the four refereed research papers and two of the non-refereed papers. A summary of the refereed and commissioned publications follows.
Refereed Publications


**Summary:**

Using an example of intertextuality from the media, this paper explains the power of intertextuality to bond the reader and author as the reader recognises text within a text. A travel article from the *Sydney Morning Herald* newspaper uses intertextuality to introduce an article promoting a boating holiday:

*Judy Adamson hired a cruiser on the Hawkesbury, and discovered there really is nothing half so much worth doing as simply messing about in boats.*

Judy Adamson, the travel journalist, connects her travelogue with Kenneth Grahame’s classic novel ‘Wind in the Willows’ by using his words ‘simply messing about in boats’ to conjure the mood for her readers of tranquil boating on a river.

In this paper, the concept of intertextuality is introduced and explained using examples from the three domains of intertextual connections identified from the kindergarten data.


**Summary:**

The pathway of intertextuality research through the academic disciplines of Literary Criticism, Semiotics, Cognitive Literacy Theory and the Social Construction of Literacy reveals intertextuality plays a significant role in learning.

Drawing on the work of intertextuality theorist, Douglas Hartman, this paper focuses on the role of the teacher to foster intertextual connections in the kindergarten classroom to enhance collaborative relationships. Hartman (1992) used the Latin
word for a patchwork garment, ‘cento’, to evoke the ‘various discourses, motifs and images that together resemble an intertextual collage of voices’ in the classroom. He coins the term ‘centoist’ to describe the role of the teacher in weaving and assembling the ‘patchwork voices’ into a cohesive form without diminishing the unique learning potential within each individual utterance. As centoist, the teacher needs to be opportunistic to the idiosyncratic nature of intertextuality and its significance to learning.

Implications for fostering intertextuality are provided using the three domains of intertextual connections identified in the kindergarten classroom research.


**Summary**

Using transcripts from the kindergarten data, the three domains of intertextual connections identified in the study are introduced. The research design and methodology is described in this paper with an explanation of the classification system used to categorise the intertextual connections.

The contribution of intertextuality to the development of a ‘community of learners’ is discussed with practical examples of ways in which teachers can facilitate intertextual connections in the classroom to enhance collaborative learning.

Summary

Intertextuality has a rich, historic path through many scholarly fields. This paper identifies four themes from the complex theoretical context of intertextuality. The themes of text connection, the significance of the personal milieu, multiple meanings in texts, and, developing communities of learners are described with transcript examples from the kindergarten study.

Commissioned Publications

1. Beyond Action Research – Conducting Teacher-Based Research 1999
   Author: Sharyn Jameson
   Edited Trevor H Cairney & Eira Sproats
   NSW Child ESL and Literacy Research Centre
   Research Monograph Series
   Language Australia and University of Western Sydney, Kingswood.
   Summary:

   The second in a series of research monographs, this publication explains the origins of qualitative research and describes ways in which teachers can use qualitative research strategies for class and school research studies.

2. Research into Action 2004
   Sharyn Roache-Jameson
   Two chapters:
   • New ways of looking – Conducting teacher-based qualitative research (pp 5 – 9)
   • Child Watching Strategies – Processes, implications and contexts (pp 37 – 44)
   Tasmanian Department of Education, Hobart.
Summary

The chapters commissioned for this Tasmanian Department of Education professional development document provide a succinct overview of the history of qualitative research, its value and key strategies for ensuring rigor in classroom research.

List of Non-refereed publications


1.2.7 The learning journey and its relation to the education profession

The above findings and various achievements stemming from this study have provided a rich learning journey for me in both the scholarly and professional field, leading to academic and professional recognition. The interdependence between the doctoral scholarship and professional contribution to education can be seen through my professional career path, writing commissions and honorary appointments.
Professional growth has been recognised by way of promotions within the NSW Department of Education & Training from classroom teacher when I commenced the research, to that of my current position in the Professional Learning and Leadership Development unit, a position requiring highly developed research and analysis skills. Expertise with literacy pedagogy was acknowledged in my appointment as a Literacy Consultant (1999) and subsequent management positions, including one in which I was responsible for the NSW submission to the National Literacy Inquiry (2005). The interconnection between my academic study and professional career was evident throughout the study when I represented the NSW Department of Education and Training at national and international conferences presenting my doctoral research.

Various writing commissions resulted from my academic work and professional expertise. This involved writing and providing professional input for syllabus and curriculum support documents, writing a monograph for conducting educational qualitative research (Jameson, 1999) which was purchased by the NSW Department of Education and Training and distributed across the state, and a commission to write for the Tasmanian Department of Education (Roache-Jameson, 2004).

Honorary appointments resulted from the growing recognition of my study and work with literacy. I was appointed as NSW Director for the Australian Literacy Educators’ Association (ALEA) from 1998 to 2000. I also chaired the national ALEA special interest group 'Literacy for Gifted and Talented Students'. In 2002 I was invited to participate as a member of the National Advisory Committee for ALEA.

The knowledge, skills and expertise arising from this doctoral study led to progressive promotion within the education profession and enabled me to develop and implement research programs in professional organizations thus contributing to the Australian field of education with state and national research projects. See Chapter 3 for full details of the various commissions, promotions and honorary appointments arising from the doctoral scholarship.
Evidence of Sustained Scholarly Activity – Research Publications

The study has generated four refereed publications describing the research design and methodology, the theory of intertextuality, the findings from this research, the implications for classroom teachings, and the links between the literature and the kindergarten data (Roache-Jameson, 2003; 2003a; 2005; 2005a). There were four non-refereed papers published (Jameson, 1997; 1998; Roache-Jameson, 2002; 2003b), in conjunction with a number of papers and presentations at conferences describing progress during the various stages of the study. In addition, two publications were commissioned as a result of this study (Jameson, 1999; Roache-Jameson, 2004) by the Language Australia NSW Child ESL and Literacy Research centre and the Tasmanian Department of Education. (See Appendix 1).

This chapter includes a table listing all research papers published in accordance with the requirements of the Doctorate of Education (See Table 3).

Six of the published papers are provided in full, describing the research design and methodology, the progress and achievements at various stages of the study.

These publications provide evidence concerning how the study has provided original input through its new terminology, classification systems and the clarification of key dimensions to intertextuality as it relates to the beginning literacy learner.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of publication</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title of paper</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Simply Messing About In Texts

A Study of Intertextuality in the Kindergarten Classroom

Sharyn M. Roache-Jameson

Abstract

This paper provides an overview of the formation and progression of a qualitative research doctoral project. The study focused on the social construction of literacy in a NSW kindergarten where the teacher was also the researcher. The research began with the broad aim of examining factors that influenced literacy development in this classroom. As analysis proceeded, the study narrowed to focus upon an emerging theme – intertextuality; a term used to describe the connections made between texts. The method used for classifying intertextual connections is explained with examples of intertextuality occurring and the implications for using intertextuality to enhance collaborative learning in the classroom.

What is Intertextuality?

When I read the following introduction to a newspaper travel article promoting a boating holiday, I feel a sense of collusion with the author:

‘Judy Adamson hired a cruiser on the Hawkesbury, and discovered there really is nothing half so much worth doing as simply messing about in boats.’

I inwardly smile because the author, Judy Adamson, and I share a secret, rich knowledge of her text. We both know the author has 'borrowed' a line from Kenneth Grahame’s 'Wind in the Willows', and as I read it I am immediately transported to that English classic tale where Ratty solemnly tells Mole that 'there is nothing - absolutely nothing - half so much worth doing as simply messing about in boats' as he urges Mole to abandon his spring cleaning and join him for a tranquil day of boating on the river.

This human phenomenon of making connections between texts is called intertextuality. Intertextuality has been studied from many academic perspectives (Worton & Still 1990). The first explanation of intertextuality: 'any text is the absorption and transformation of another', by post-structuralist scholar Julie Kristeva (1967), led to its study across various academic disciplines and the finding that it plays a significant role in learning. Educational research has shown that increased understanding and learning can result from intertextual processes (Bloom 1992; Bloom & Egan-Robertson 1993; Cairney 1990b, 1992; Harris & Trezise 1997; Hartman 1990). Contemporary classroom research indicates that the
collaborative discussion arising from intertextuality enriches classroom relationships (Cairney & Langbien 1989; Oyler & Barry 1996; Short 1992).

Intertextuality can be simply defined as ‘the process of interpreting one text by means of a previously composed text’ (Cairney 1992). The text being ‘any meaningful act of communication, of any length, whether written, spoken or visual’ (NSW Department of Education and Training, 2000).

My own study of literacy in the kindergarten classroom (Jameson 1998) revealed kindergarten students frequently made intertextual connections, and the intertextual processes enhanced collaboration in the classroom, thus contributing to the development of a ‘community of learners’. The study was undertaken in a kindergarten classroom in a government primary school situated in the Blue Mountains of New South Wales (NSW), Australia. In NSW, ‘kindergarten’ refers to the first year of formal schooling and the average age is five years. The class comprised 22 students. The daily literacy session was video-taped approximately three times per week over the course of a school year by the classroom teacher/researcher. The daily literacy session involved shared reading, graphological and phonemic awareness, literary discussions, small group work and individual student conferences with the teacher. The extensive video data, combined with field notes from participant observation (Glesne & Peshkin, 1991), audio recordings of conferences with students, and artefact collection, yielded a rich source of classroom interaction from which examples of intertextual connections could be transcribed and analysed. QSR NUD*IST version 3.0, a qualitative data management software package, was used to store and analyse the data. Data were initially analysed speculatively (Woods 1986) to allow for tentative reflection by the researcher. Further analysis involved the principles of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss 1967) and inductive coding techniques described by Strauss and Corbin (1990). Using constant comparison (Glaser & Strauss 1967) and domain analysis (Spradley, 1980), categories were created to describe the types of intertextual connections in the data.

The intertextual connections articulated by the kindergarten students were classified across three domains: textual, contextual and personal (Roache-Jameson forthcoming). The textual domain referred to intertextuality that was concerned with textual elements such as characters, plot and genre. The contextual domain contained intertextual connections that were made during contexts that are unique to the classroom environment such as phonemic awareness sessions, writing tasks and alphabet learning. The personal domain comprised the many intertextual connections drawn from the students’ personal milieus. These connections often referred to students’ families, experiences and belongings. Table 1 details the types of connections in the three domains. The term ‘intertextuality initiator’ was devised to refer to the text stimulus in the classroom that prompted an intertextual incident. The term, ‘intertextuality connective’ is used to refer to the text to which the stimulus was linked. Text was operationally defined as any meaningful act of communication, of any length, whether written, spoken or visual (NSW Department of Education and Training, 2000).
Table 1
Types of Intertextuality Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intertextual Domains</th>
<th>Intertextual Initiators</th>
<th>Intertextuality Connectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textual Domain</td>
<td>plot</td>
<td>previous class text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>illustrations</td>
<td>plot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>character</td>
<td>illustrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>text type or structure</td>
<td>character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>action/event in a text</td>
<td>home text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>setting</td>
<td>text type or structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Domain</td>
<td>graphological/phonological</td>
<td>spelling knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>session</td>
<td>known rhyme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alphabet</td>
<td>previous class activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>word</td>
<td>graphological/phonological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dictionary picture</td>
<td>session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spelling knowledge</td>
<td>class object or resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wordbank</td>
<td>song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wordcard</td>
<td>video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>writing tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Domain</td>
<td>student talk</td>
<td>student's name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student 'news'</td>
<td>student knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student response</td>
<td>student's possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>peer talk</td>
<td>student's experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teacher talk</td>
<td>student's family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>student's pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>student's dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>peer talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>peer writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>peer's experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>peer's name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teacher talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teacher's writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teacher's family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of Intertextuality in the Kindergarten Classroom

Textual Domain

A typical example of textual intertextuality occurred when the students were gathered on the mat with the teacher to listen to the book 'Imagine'. This 'shared reading' session was part of an Alison Lester author study. They begin by discussing some common features of the cover pages of Alison Lester books they have been reading. They discuss the circles that often appear on the cover and the titles, then the teacher begins reading and comes to the page where the characters in the book imagine they are at the Arctic. This prompts Gareth to connect to a previous book by Alison Lester.

Gareth: In the Journey Home they went to a snow place.
Teacher: Yes they did go to a snowy place in The Journey Home.

Gareth is intertextually linking the illustrations of the Arctic in ‘Imagine’ with another Alison Lester book ‘The Journey Home’ and demonstrates his growing awareness of events in stories. In this instance, he uses a ‘remembered text’ to frame or understand the current class text.

Past or remembered texts can help us to understand current texts. Similarly, current texts can illuminate past texts for us by adding a new layer of meaning to prior understanding.

Examples of intertextuality from the textual domain revealed that articulating connections often indicated new literary understandings and greater knowledge of text. An important implication for teachers is to provide a wide variety of quality texts from which intertextual connections will be made. There needs to be a rich array of texts including factual, fiction, magazines, newspapers and multi-media. High quality texts that portray cultural diversity will precipitate thought and discussion about society, relationships and values. Texts, with multiple layers of meaning that lend themselves to open-ended classroom discussion and activities, will encourage collaborative responses.

This next textual example demonstrates more complex intertextuality when the class is reading the book ‘Farmer Duck’ by Martin Waddell. In this instance a character trait from a book is connected to a current playground game the students have made up, based on a popular television program.

Following the reading of the story, which was accompanied by literary strategies including ‘Hot Seat’ (Board of Studies, 1994) and ‘Sketch to Stretch’ (Cairney, 1995), the teacher and children have a literary discussion. They are discussing the last page where the duck is now the ‘boss’ and have agreed that the duck is a nicer boss than the farmer. William comments:

William: He’s being a nice one (boss).

Alanna: You’re nice to me when we play Blue Heelers aren’t you William?

Liam: Yeh, cause you’re the boss.

William: Yeh, I’m always the boss.

Interestingly, the students have used intertextuality to initially devise their playground game from a television show, an indication of the potency of popular culture in their lives. They then use their ‘Blue Heelers’ text to intertextually construct meaning about relationships when reading ‘Farmer Duck’ in the classroom. This demonstrates the capacity for intertextuality to provide collaborative discourse links that engender fellowship and build a sense of community.

Contextual Domain

The next example of intertextuality is from the contextual domain and occurred during a graphological/phonological session, a context quite distinctive to a classroom. The class is seated on the mat and the teacher is using a magnetic board to revise the letters that they have studied so far. They have revised the letter names, sounds and words that begin with these letters. The teacher then introduces the idea of blending. Firstly with vowel/consonant, as in ‘at’, ‘it’, ‘am’, and then
the word ‘mat’ is placed on the magnetic board. Several children identify it and call out ‘mat’. The teacher says ‘You can write that word because you know m-a-t!’ (pointing to each letter and spelling it out). This prompts Emma to say:

Emma: We’re sitting on a mat.

Jenna puts her hand up to say something, but the teacher goes on to make ‘is’ on the magnetic board and talk about it with the children. Jenna keeps her hand up most of the time, which is about one and a half minutes. Finally, the teacher says:

Teacher: Jenna?

Jenna: I’ve got a cousin called, umm, Mat.

Teacher: Mat? Have you? My son’s called Mathew.

About five minutes later, following performing the rhyme ‘I’m a little teapot’ and discussing a worksheet the children are going to complete, and then performing the finger rhyme ‘Six Little Indians’, James has his hand up. The teacher says:

Teacher: Yes, James?

James: Mats ... we sit on at little lunch when the grass is wet.

Teacher: Yes, mats, and you know how to write that word now.

In this example Emma has connected the isolated word ‘mat’ to a more meaningful context – ‘we’re sitting on a mat’ thereby shedding light on this new ‘text’ and possibly illuminating other students’ understanding. In turn, Jenna and James also connect the word ‘mat’ to a more meaningful context.

Interestingly, both Jenna and James tenaciously wait to make a statement on ‘mat’ even though in both instances the class discussion had moved on. This persistence or dwelling, was quite common and seems to indicate a need for students to actually articulate their connection despite a lapse.

Intertextual connections from the contextual domain highlighted the need for providing a classroom climate conducive to making connections between texts and articulating them. When students expect to connect and are given opportunities to express and share connections, new, and often unplanned, learnings take place.

The range of daily classroom events in which the students participated provided a framework of texts from which intertextual connections were made and new knowledge constructed. This suggests the importance of a classroom environment that encourages time and space to ponder and share connections in collaborative ways.

Personal Domain

The most frequent type of intertextuality in this study proved to be in the personal domain. Students made connections between content in class texts, with texts from their personal milieu such as family relationships, home-life, personal experiences, belongings, pets, friends and even dreams. The following example shows how a book in class primes a student to articulate knowledge of butterflies and a statement about her father prompts another student to connect to her ‘family’s expertise’.
The teacher and students are gathered on the mat for a new book. The teacher begins singing a familiar song about a caterpillar and the children join in. The teacher then holds up the book ‘The Very Hungry Caterpillar’ by Eric Carle. Emma begins to tell about how the circles on butterflies wings are called ‘eyes’ and they scare off predators. Samuel agrees with Emma saying ‘yes, that’s right’. Emma says she knows this because her father is an expert. Elizabeth says:

Elizabeth: David and my sister Sarah are experts at birds because David has a bird book and Sarah has binoculars and we have a huge back garden and it looks like a jungle and Dad has built us a cubby house there and it has little pools, um, little lily pads and...

Teacher: So lots of interesting things have happened there? Let’s see what interesting things happen in this book ...

In this domain, students often made connections between content in class texts with similar events in their personal lives. The above example demonstrates the social significance of intertextuality (Bloome 1992) when this occurs. We see that Emma proposes a connection that is acknowledged by Samuel and intertextually recognised by Elizabeth and the teacher. This interaction indicates the influence of intertextuality as a social construction. It enables the building of new shared texts that become a pool from which future intertextual connections will be drawn. This construction of shared texts enhances the collaborative nature of the classroom and helps to build relationships between class members.

Encouraging Intertextuality

Teachers can facilitate intertextuality by encouraging the sharing of connections through classroom strategies such as group work, literary discussions and contexts which require students to interact and support one another in their learning. Planning themes for units of work, author studies and using a variety of multimedia texts grouped around a topic, will elicit intertextuality and promote the building of new shared texts. Anecdote relating is an important part of everyday life and teachers can capitalise on its potency by sharing anecdotes with students during classroom talking and writing sessions. We usually choose to relate an anecdote because it has some significance to us as humans – either funny, wondrous, embarrassing, joyful, scary, sad or puzzling. Providing glimpses of our own personal lives as teachers can help students to begin to examine their own experiences. The teacher’s role in encouraging and valuing the sharing of texts and connections is seen as pivotal in developing collaborative learning.

This study has highlighted the potential for intertextuality to enhance collaboration in the classroom and contribute to the development of a community of learners. The increased learning and social benefits that arise from a classroom that facilitates intertextual connections certainly justify the planning and management of strategies to ensure effective collaboration.
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Editorial introduction

This first issue for the year, which is, of course, put together around Christmas time, looks a little like a Christmas box, full of varied and exciting possibilities.

We open with a challenging and thought-provoking dissertation by Guy Broadley on his perceptions of the state of literacy education in New Zealand. In Seeing forward looking back: the New Zealand literacy picture, Broadley moves us through the changes of the past forty years with the shifts between phonics and whole language, from decontextualised word analysis to meaning-making in linked reading and writing sessions.

As a teacher educator Broadley examines the contentious issue of the decreasing quality of the intake in universities as a factor affecting a perceived slide in literacy standards. He also takes note of the increasing proportion in schools of children from low socio-economic status and a lack of in-service courses for teachers. His conclusions offer a challenge to the way we view the progress of literacy learning, and some issues to consider in the ongoing debate on literacy standards.

Sylvia Pantaleo shares a delightful research project in Young children engage with the metafiction in picture books. Working with Grade 1 children in a Canadian school, Pantaleo used a range of postmodern picture books to stimulate awareness of metafictional devices employed by authors and illustrators. Through read aloud sessions the discussions developed children's abilities to deconstruct and analyse texts in the pursuit of meanings. Pantaleo provides a useful list of metafictional devices and children's books which use them, which could encourage classroom teachers to follow this example.

An interesting facet developed in these activities is the link to using web-based texts where the same skills of non-linear strategies and understanding of visual literacy are employed. Pervading the whole discussion is a real sense of the children's delight in discovering new ways to view and understand the texts through the discussion sessions.

At the other end of the education spectrum, Josephine Ryan looks at adolescent readers in Young people choose adolescents' text pleasures. This study revealed the very different texts which form the basis of adolescents' out of school reading. Ryan discusses these texts, from movies and music magazines, comics and gaming magazines to popular fiction, newspapers and the internet.

Gender and economic differences were seen to markedly influence the choice of texts, with a strong message given to teachers about valuing the choices young readers make. There is a rather humbling view by the students that their choices are not 'good enough' and are too far from the mainstream 'cultural heritage' tests valued in school to
have any inherent value. Ryan suggests directions teachers can take to
embrace students' interests and choices, and her survey must give some
teachers pause for thought in their text selections.

Sharyn Roache-Jameson offers a glimpse into the reading experiences
of kindergarten children in 'Kindergarten connections: a study of inter-
textuality and its links with literacy in the kindergarten classroom'. The
very young children in her study were aware of links between their liter-
ary experiences, between books and their school and home life and with
their own personal world views. The children's perceptions are a joy to
read and evoke that wonderful sense of discovery which makes teaching
the pleasure it can be. Jameson concludes by considering the important
role played by the teacher in building a classroom learning community
which enables and encourages children to make such links.

Our final article reviews three of the major oppositions confronted by
literacy teachers in the last fifty years: skills based versus whole language;
cultural heritage versus critical literacy; print versus multi-literacies.
Kathy Mills in 'Deconstructing binary oppositions in literacy discourse
and pedagogy' analyses the teaching strategies connected to each
approach and suggests the strengths and flaws. Her analysis provides an
interesting overview of the trends in teaching literacy and offers some
challenges for the future. Her extensive references provide further
reading for those who wish to explore some of the issues covered. For
many experienced teachers it will be a little like a guided tour through
their past teaching careers, for young teachers it provides salutary
reminders of where today's practices have come from, and the history
behind current approaches.

So, a very exciting and diverse selection for readers to select from,
and a great way to start the year. We wish you a challenging and
fulfilling 2005.

Susan Statkus, Mary Rohl, Judith Rivalland
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Kindergarten connections: A study of intertextuality and its links with literacy in the kindergarten classroom

Sheryl Roache-Jameson

"Any text is the absorption and transformation of another" (Kristeva, 1967).

This first explanation of intertextuality led to its study across many academic disciplines and the finding in educational research that it plays a significant role in learning. This paper reports on a study of intertextuality in a kindergarten classroom. The method used for classifying intertextual connections is explained with examples of intertextuality occurring and the implications for using intertextuality to enhance collaborative learning in the classroom.

Introduction

Intertextuality is the human phenomenon of making connections between texts. It has been studied from many academic perspectives (Wertsch & Stil, 1990). Increased understanding and learning can result from intertextual processes (Bloom, 1992; Bloom & Ferguson, 1993; Caine, 1990a, 1992; Caine & Caine, 1989; Harris & Trzesniewski, 1997; Hartman, 1990; Oyler & Barry, 1996; Short, 1992a/b).

While a number of researchers have explored intertextuality in individual readers (Caine, 1988; Hartman, 1990), Short (1992a) suggested the need to examine intertextuality in collaborative learning environments to allow researchers to understand more about student learning and effective learning environments. This study responded to Short’s suggestion and examined intertextuality in a collaborative kindergarten environment. The data from this year-long study of literacy sessions in a kindergarten classroom revealed evidence of frequent intertextual connections by the students. This paper describes the types of intertextual connections in this classroom and concludes with implications for using intertextuality to enhance collaborative learning in the classroom.

The daily classroom teaching and learning practices were framed by the significance of the social construction of literacy (Vygotsky, 1978) and emphasis was placed on planning collaborative teaching and learning contexts (Short, 1992a), empowering students in their ‘meaning making’ (Wells, 1988), and incorporating characteristics of a ‘learning community’
(NSW Department of School Education, 1995). Recognition of the importance of scaffolding (Bruner, 1966, Caimney, 1985) and guided participation (Rogoff, 1990) to build bridges between current and new understandings was also influential in the design and implementation of classroom interaction.

**Intertextuality**

Intertextuality describes the human phenomenon of making connections between texts. Historically, the concept of intertextuality has woven a complex path through many academic disciplines (Wertsch & Still, 1990). Literary criticism, however, is the home of intertextuality. Post-structuralist scholar, Walter Kristeva (1967, translated in 1980) was the first to attempt an explanation for the notion of intertextuality: “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another”. Intertextuality has been studied from various scholarly perspectives including structuralism, poststructuralism, semiotics, cognitive psychology, critical discourse, and social constructivism and continues to be studied in contemporary classrooms.

Intertextuality can be simply defined as “the process of interpreting one text by means of a previously composed text” (Caimney, 1992). Following extensive classroom research of intertextuality, Caimney (1986, 1990a, 1990b, 1992, 1993) found that students link texts in diverse ways, and while intertextuality has idiosyncratic elements, it is also a rich social phenomenon. He concluded that intertextuality is dependent on factors as diverse as text characteristics, learning purpose, and contextual influences; familiar to most readers and writers irrespective of age and ability; linked with many text features including genre, plot, characterisation, context, frequently linked by specific elements of content and plot, and socially constructed as extensions of human relationships.

Central to any study of intertextuality is the definition of text. The notion of text, like intertextuality, has evolved with increasing complexity from being a “written text” (de Beaugrande, 1980) to any chunk of meaning that has unity and can be shared with others – a song, dance, poem, oral story, mathematical equation, or sculpture are all texts from which learners can draw connections as they construct their understandings of text and meaning evolve (Short, 1982a). Thus, linguistic and non-linguistic signs can constitute text.

Saxby (1993) maintains that “enrichment from reading is a spiralling process”, whereby the assimilation of each new book provides new insights for the reader to bring into the next book read. Broaderening Saxby’s concept of text beyond the boundary of books, and thus viewing the assimilation of any “textualised experience” (Blomme & Egan-Robertson, 1993) as enrichment, literacy becomes “a ‘psychological and sociological partnership’” (Harste, Woodward & Burke, 1984) where the meaning-making process, learning, is enriched through connections.
across present and past texts (Short, 1992a). Every text is the intertext of another text (Barthes, 1975, 1979). Woll and Heath noted, ‘Children, at particular ages, moods and moments, will see and remember certain details that trigger the memory of a particular piece of speech, fragment of scene, gesture or facial expression and its connection to a recent event’ (1992, p. 109).

In addition to Carney’s extensive research, other contemporary classroom studies have found intertextuality to be a significant factor in students’ learning. Primarily drawing on the cognitive psychology tradition to examine the intertextual links made by able readers as they read multiple passages, Hartman (1990) concluded from his study that reading is ‘an intertextual enterprise where readers transpare, absorb and re-intersect texts as they zigzag their way through passages’. Bloome (1992) moved beyond cognitive explanations to consider intertextuality as a social construction and suggested that merely juxtaposing texts is insufficient for intertextuality to be present. The juxtaposition must be proposed, functionally recognised, acknowledged and have social significance.

Short’s (1992a) study examined the use of ‘literature endes’ and ‘text sets’ in classrooms to explore the processes and strategies that occur in intertextuality. Oyler and Barry (1996) examined what and how texts were juxtaposed in a first-grade classroom and concluded that student connections were shared with the entire class and remembered texts became shared texts thus building intertextuality among a community of readers. Carney and Langhien (1989) found that literacy learning in their study was indeed a social and collaborative process and that children responded quite differently to the same text, an indication of the individual construction of texts by readers, reflecting their sociocultural background. They argued that the teacher was creating a ‘learning community’ classroom where literary and literacy activities were recognised and valued as important contributors to the social nature of learning. In a year-long ethnographic study of a first-grade classroom, Dyson (1999) revealed the hybrid nature of text appropriation within a complex of overlapping social worlds, which themselves draw upon a diversity of cultural texts, including those of the popular media. Harris and Trelease (1997) also noted different kinds of intertextual links in their kindergarten study and highlighted the potential for confusion for learners arising from the implicature of the teacher’s intertextual agenda. In order to understand what shapes and mobilises reading instruction in early school years, they concluded, ‘there is a need for more in-depth examination of the intertextual complexities that exist within it.’

Hartman (1992) uses the word ‘cento’ as a term to describe the ‘various discourses, motifs, and images that together resemble an intertextual collage of voices – a patchwork intertext’ in its original Latin form ‘cento’ meant a patchwork garment. The many examples of intertextual connections in this study depict the classroom ‘cento’ and high-
light the need for the teacher to undertake the role of 'centrist'—responsible for weaving and assembling the 'patchwork voices' into a cohesive, balanced form without diminishing the unique learning potential within each individual utterance. As centrist, the teacher needs to be opportunistic to the unique, idiosyncratic ways in which connections and learning proceed. The idiosyncratic nature of intertextuality requires the teacher to be flexible, to pick up on utterances and to be the bridge builder of connections in new learnings. Many of the data examples in this study alert us to the fact that learning does not happen necessarily at times planned by the teacher and the 'centrist' needs to be aware of the potential learning at all times.

The Study

The qualitative study began with a broad aim of examining factors that influenced literacy in the kindergarten classroom where the researcher was also classroom teacher. The study was undertaken in a kindergarten classroom in a government primary school situated in the Blue Mountains of New South Wales (NSW). In NSW, 'kindergarten' refers to the first year of formal schooling and the average age is five years. The class comprised 23 students, of which twelve were girls and eleven boys, mostly from middle class socio-economic backgrounds. The daily literacy session was video-taped approximately three times per week over the course of a school year by the classroom teacher/researcher. The literacy session took place each morning for approximately two hours and involved teaching and learning practices such as shared reading, graphological and phonemic awareness, literacy discussions, small group work and individual student conferences with the teacher. Recognition of the complexity of literacy and the social nature of learning, including intertextuality, provided a theoretical framework from which to begin observing and analysing literacy development in this classroom throughout the year.

Data were collected from a variety of classroom literacy practices and initial analysis examined the data to identify factors that appeared to influence literacy development. Initially data were collected in five broad categories:

- Student home literacy background
- Analysis of classroom interaction
- Student literacy development
- Student school achievement
- Teaching methodology

A summary of data collection procedures is provided in Table 1. More and more frequently the researcher became aware of intertextual incidents in the data, precipitating the focal point for the study. An exploration of the theory of intertextuality, its significance to literacy, and
Table 1. Summary of data collection procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collected</th>
<th>Data collection technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student's home literacy background</td>
<td>- Structured and unstructured parent interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Questionnaires to parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of classroom interaction</td>
<td>- Participant observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Video recording of classroom literacy practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student literacy development</td>
<td>- Work samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher's assessment records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student attitude surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Audio recordings of student conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Field Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student school achievement</td>
<td>- Assessment using syllabus profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Standardised test results and criterion referenced checklists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methodology</td>
<td>- Teaching program and assessment records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Day book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NSW English Syllabus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of intertextuality in this kindergarten classroom became the central focus of this research.

The extensive video data yielded a rich source of classroom interaction. The video data provided the verbal interaction from which examples of intertextual connections were transcribed and analyzed. A total of sixteen video tapes were viewed and elicited eighty eight interactive episodes involving intertextual connections. 'Interactive episodes' were excerpts from daily classroom communication between the students and teacher. A classroom intertextual connection, for the purposes of this study, was defined as connecting a classroom text to a textualised experience which may involve a book, video, film or captured personal experience. The New South Wales Department of Education and Training's definition of text was used: any meaningful act of communication, of any length, whether written, spoken or visual (2000).

QSR NUD*IST version 5.0, a qualitative data management software package, was used to store and analyze the data. Data were initially analyzed speculatively (Woods, 1998) to allow for tentative reflection by the researcher to develop preliminary insights before any classification takes place. Further analysis involved the principles of grounded theory
(Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and inductive coding techniques described by Strauss and Corbin (1990). Using constant comparison (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and domain analysis (Spradley, 1980), categories were then created to describe the types of intertextual connections in the data. Intertextual connections were coded according to the originating classroom source of the intertextuality, later termed the *intertextual initiator*; and the text to which it was connected, termed the *intertextual connective*. Categories involving such diverse contexts as people, books, movies, discussions and different types of classroom activities were coded on each intertextual connection. Further refinement revealed three core categories to classify the connections. These three domains of intertextual connections were inductively analysed using open, axial and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Whilst the domains provided a useful categorising mechanism to initially organise the data, there were many examples that were contiguous to more than one domain. The nature of intertextuality, by definition a tapestry of textual links, makes clear categorisation difficult. Where overlap occurred, the example was categorised in the domain from which the intertextual connection initiated most significantly. This seminal attempt to classify types of intertextual connections by elementary students provides a foundation for further structural frameworks to examine intertextual connections and their implications for teaching and learning. These findings describe the three domains of intertextual connections and implications concerning the nature of intertextuality and its potential to enhance collaborative learning in classrooms.

**Findings and implications**

**Types of intertextual connections**

Constant comparative coding of the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) led to intertextual connections being categorised across three domains: textual, contextual and personal. The *textual domain* refers to connections mostly concerned with concepts related to the more traditional definition of "text" such as characters, plot and text structure. The *contextual domain* refers to connections concerned with the specific situational context, in this case, the classroom. The *personal domain* refers to intertextual connections concerned with the students' personal milieu. Table 2 details the types of connections in the three domains. The term 'intertextuality initiator' has been devised to refer to the text stimulus in the classroom that prompted an intertextual incident. The term, 'intertextuality connective' is used to refer to the text to which the stimulus was linked. Text was operationally defined as any meaningful act of communication, of any length, whether written, spoken or visual (NSW Department of Education and Training, 2000).
Table 2. Types of intertextual connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intertextual Domains</th>
<th>Interertextual Initiators</th>
<th>Connectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textual Domain</td>
<td>• plot</td>
<td>• previous class text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• illustrations</td>
<td>• plot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• character</td>
<td>• illustrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• text type or structure</td>
<td>• character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• action/event in a text</td>
<td>• home text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• setting</td>
<td>• text type or structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Domain</td>
<td>• graphological/phonological session</td>
<td>• spelling knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• alphabet letter</td>
<td>• known rhyme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• word</td>
<td>• previous class activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• dictionary picture</td>
<td>• previous graphological/phonological session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• spelling knowledge</td>
<td>• class object or resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• wordcard</td>
<td>• song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• writing tasks</td>
<td>• video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• learning theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Domain</td>
<td>• student talk</td>
<td>• student’s name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• student news</td>
<td>• student knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• student response</td>
<td>• student’s possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• peer talk</td>
<td>• student’s experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• teacher talk</td>
<td>• student’s family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The textual domain

The textual domain refers to intertextuality centered around the more conventional concept of ‘text’. Literary elements including plot, characters, illustrations, text structure, television, movies, videos and songs are grouped in this domain. There were many intertextual incidents initiating from the names of characters in books read in class and connected with names the students were personally familiar, such as their own names,
names of peers and names of family members. Students frequently connected classroom texts to television programs with which they were currently familiar. In particular, 'Play School' and 'Sesame Street'. Movies, videos and even songs also featured as common links. The following examples depict how textual connections were made by the students.

Author studies were a regular part of the classroom curriculum and a study of Pat Hutchins books had occurred early in the year. This example shows how Warren drew upon his knowledge of the story structure from Pat Hutchins' *The Wind Blows*. When, a few months later, the class read the classic tale of *The Gingerbread Man*, the teacher read the part where the old man, the old woman, the boy, the girl, the dog and the cat are all chasing after the gingerbread man. Warren called out:

W: Like the wind blow...
T: Pardon?
W: It's like the wind blow, with all the people chasing the things
T: *In The Wind Blows*? Yeah! (to class)... remember they all started chasing the things that the wind blow? This time they're all chasing...

Studentschorus: The Gingerbread Man!

Warren made a connection here between two texts. The chasing scene in *The Gingerbread Man* reminds him of a similar event in *The Wind Blows* where the host of characters in *The Wind Blows* chase after a variety of articles that have been blown away by the wind. Warren's verbal connection to a previous text demonstrates his growing awareness of events in stories. From a semiotic perspective, texts sign other texts (Harste, Woodward & Burke, 1984). Past or remembered texts help us to frame or understand current texts and, likewise, current texts can shed light on past texts by allowing us to construct another layer of meaning to our prior understanding. Meanings derived from texts depend substantially on the ways in which it is framed (Reid, 1992). Teachers are constantly framing texts in classrooms and students understanding will be influenced not only by the teacher's framing but also by their own framing from past texts. The following extracts depict several examples of 'inter-textual framing' from the data.

The class was involved in an author study of John Burningham. This example demonstrates the notion of a remembered text becoming the frame for current texts when this student drew on her knowledge of previous books by John Burningham during a literary discussion. The teacher was about to read *Come Away From the Water, Shirley* and began with an introductory comment about John Burningham, but her sentence was interrupted halfway by Ellie:

T: One of the things about John Burningham...
E: That he does lots of funny things in the book.
T: Like what, Ellie?
Ellie: Like in ‘Patrick John (sic) McHennessy’, umm, well, the teacher didn’t believe him, the writer, the author is making it up, little tricks in the book.

Teacher: (thoughtfully) The writer’s putting little tricks in...
Ellie: (confirming) putting little tricks in...
Teacher: I think you might find there’s some tricks in this one as well.

Ellie’s insightful comment about John Burningham’s ‘tricks’ refers to his skilful writing device of letting the illustrations tell one story while the often minimal, written text tells another story.

Both Warren and Ellie’s intertextuality demonstrate their emerging awareness of writing techniques and story structure, and possibly contribute to other students’ literary knowledge building.

Connections were frequently made to the students’ books from home. In this excerpt, Steven juxtaposed a home text with a class text he was discussing with the teacher during an individual reading conference:

Teacher: What have been your favourites (books) over the year?
Steven: ‘Umm, the Haunted House’.
Teacher: You liked that one did you?
Steven: ‘Yeah (laughs)’.
Teacher: Why did you like that?
Steven: ‘Cause it looks like a book we have at home… Umm… cause we have one of those umm books… umm it was probably by the same block… cause it was just like the Haunted House (referring to school book)… it says (referring to home book) in the dark, dark house, up some dark, dark stairs, there was a dark, dark room and in the dark, dark room there was a dark dark umm…’

Teacher: ‘Box?’
Steven: ‘Box, and in the dark, dark box there was a GHOST’.
Teacher: ‘Oh, you frightened me with that! I think I’ve read that too, it is a good one.’

In the next example, we see how a new text, in this case the teacher’s discussion of traditional tales, framed an old text of Emily’s from home:

The teacher and children were gathered on the mat and the teacher was reading a Golden Book version of The Little Red Hen brought in by Andrew. The teacher suggested they read it and talk about what is different between this book and the big book version they have already read in class. Following the reading, the teacher concluded with an explanation of how traditional folk tales often have some differences with pictures or words but basically tell the same story. Emily added to this:

Emily: ‘They might be little thin books, because I’ve got one called ‘Hansel and Gretel’ and it’s got colouring in on the back of it and also just a little story.’
Teacher: ‘That’s right, and if you read Hansel and Gretel in another book, it might be just a little bit different, but very similar.’
Both Emily and Steven intertextually use a previous text to frame a current text and deepen their literary understanding. Steven articulates that the similar story structure may indicate that it's written by the 'same-bloke'. Emily refers to her book from home to add to her understanding of traditional tales being published and told in different ways whilst retaining the same basic plot.

The examples of intertextuality from the textual domain highlight the ways in which intertextual connections resulted in new literary thoughts and understandings being expressed. Providing a classroom climate conducive to making connections between texts and sharing them, is an important role for the teacher. When students 'expect to connect' (Carney, 1994b; Short, 1992b) and are given the space to express and share connections, unplanned opportunities for learning take place.

A classroom rich with literary resources provides an abundant source of texts from which intertextual connections will be made. The teacher, as context, ensures there is a wide variety of quality texts available which includes factual texts, literature, everyday texts such as newspapers and magazines, and access to technological texts. Fortunately there is a multitude of quality literature easily obtainable today which has multiple layers of meaning. Texts that acknowledge and portray today's multicultural society and lend themselves to inquiry oriented discussions (Harman & Allison, 1996) and open-ended literary engagements in the classroom will encourage collaborative interaction. An awareness of the power of text framing allows the context to make students 'alert framers' (Reid, 1992) themselves.

The contextual domain

The contextual domain refers to intertextual incidents that occurred because of the situational context of the research. The distinctive research site, a kindergarten classroom, yielded intertextual links arising from specific classroom teaching and learning practices. This domain includes a variety of intertextual connections linked to graphophonological sessions, writing sessions, thematic units of work, classroom resources including word cards, dictionary picture cards, class word banks, rhymes and classroom charts.

A regular part of the class curriculum was alphabet study incorporating graphophonological activities. Students were involved in shared reading of alphabet books, studying commercial alphabet picture cards, making body shapes of the letters and jointly constructing a class alphabet book in addition to making their own personal alphabet books. The following example occurred during the joint construction of the class alphabet book for the 'P' page. The students were calling out words beginning with 'P' for the teacher to write at the case. Students had suggested pencil, peg, pig and then Amelia said:
Amelie: Peter Piper!

Carolin: On a sunny day Peter Piper ...

Amelie: Then Peter Piper picked a peck of Peter Piper Pepper.

Emily: Bird Piper! (Children laugh.)

In the above example we see how Amelie linked a word to a known rhyme that, in turn, caused Emily to link the rhyme to a story character. This indicates the power of intertextuality to provide collaborative discourse links that engender fellowship and fun in the classroom, thus enriching social relationships.

In the following example we see how Ellie connected a class discussion about the nightingale to a song she had heard in a video. The teacher and students were examining an alphabet picture card that contained pictures of words that begin with the letter 'N'. The students were precious over a picture of a bird on the 'N' card. One student called out 'bird'.

Teacher: Now listen, bird, rhyme, does it start with 'n'? Well, what do you think it might be? Maybe it's a special one that starts with 'n' ... I know a bird that starts with 'n' and is known for its singing ... notice the musical notes (pointing to picture) ... does anyone know a bird that's known for its singing? ... and starts with 'n'?

(Several hands go up, and children say things like 'nightingale', 'the falcon', ...)

Teacher: Nightingale ... has anybody heard of a nightingale?

Ellie: (Singing) Sing a sweet nightingale ...

Teacher: What's that, Ellie?

Ellie: It's in Cinderella ... (sings again) ... Sing a sweet nightingale.

Here, Ellie intertextually connected to a song from a movie to illuminate her understanding, and possibly other students' understanding during an alphabet study session. Similarly in this next example Jacob used his real world knowledge to intertextually connect to a movie name, demonstrating another layer of understanding during this classroom activity.

School testing policy required the teacher to engage the students in individual testing of letter-sound correspondence. The teacher was sitting side by side with Jacob and had a list of letters. Jacob had been asked to say the name of the letter, the sound of the letter and a word that starts with that letter as the teacher pointed to each one. Jacob had already answered for several letters and now the teacher has pointed to the letter 'D'.

Jacob: Ugh, 'D'?

Teacher: Yes, what sound does it make?

Jacob: 'D'.

Teacher: A word that it starts with?

Jacob: Dumb.

Teacher: Dumb?
The next example demonstrates how intertextual connections can be made to provide a link between new knowledge and something that is already meaningful.

During an alphabet session the teacher was using a magnetic board to revise letters that had been studied thus far before beginning to blend some of the letters to make consonant/vowel/consonant words. Collaboratively, the teacher and students had made 'em, 'mat' and 'fat'; then Lena suggested changing the 'a' to 'i'. Teacher led the children to sound out the new word /i/ /fi/ /fi/. The children call out 'fit'. Then...

Byron: Fitness (Teacher ignores Byron inadvertently)

Sally: Fitness

Teacher: Yes, fitness starts with that word...

Byron: I said fitness.

Teacher: Did you?

Interestingly, the children have connected the isolated word 'fit' with a classroom context that was meaningful to them — 'fitness'. The teacher and students engaged in a daily fifteen-minute fitness program which involved aerobic and stretching exercises to which they refer as 'fitness'.

The multitude of daily classroom events in which the students are involved, provides a framework of texts from which complex connections are made and new meanings constructed. This suggests the importance of a classroom climate in which individuals are provided time and mental 'space' for making, pondering and articulating these textual connections. Encouraging peer facilitation of intertextual connections through curricular strategies such as group work, text sets and literary discussions, assists students to support one another in their learning. Engaging students with themes for units of work, such as traditional tales, and author studies also elicits intertextual connections and promoted collaboration by providing topics of common interest. The everyday events in this community of learners provided experiences from which intertextual links were made and new meanings constructed.

The personal domain

The personal domain refers to intertextual incidents concerned with each student's personal milieu. The personal milieu of each student proved to be a vast well from which texts were drawn and to which other classroom texts were connected. Other studies have confirmed the high frequency of connections to personal lives and the importance of a collaborative classroom structure with interactive teaching/learning
contexts which enable students to construct meaning actively by articulating the connections to their personal lives (Cairney, 1995; 1996; Dyker & Barry, 1996; Short, 1992a, 1992b). Students regularly made connections between content in texts read in class and similar events from their personal world. Connections which drew on their own past living experiences proved to be a frequent type of intertextuality in this study. These included family relationships, friends, pets, dreams, and even seemingly imaginary experiences.

This common type of connection is exemplified here by Garrett’s comment about his father during shared reading of a factual text called *How Children Learn: A First Book of History* (Beg, 1995).

Teacher: (reading) ‘Growing Up in Mali Empire’ ... this is in Africa.
Garrett: (responding to text illustration) How my Dad rode a camel just like that...
Teacher: Yes in Africa they have lots of desert, and Garrett’s Dad has just been to the desert in Australia and rode a camel there.

In the following example, the students and teacher were jointly constructing the ‘N’ page for the class big alphabet book. One child has suggested ‘needlework’, and the teacher was drawing and writing it at the board. It is evident from the transcript how Andrew connected to a personal relationship: Ellie also connected to personal experience and the teacher acknowledged these connections by elaborating on a forthcoming classroom activity:

Andrew: My name does knitting and needlework
Ellie: I’m trying to do knitting... I’m trying to knit a scarf for myself
Teacher: We’re going to do some needlework ourselves, in class.

The preceding example illustrates the social significance of intertextuality (Bloom, 1992) when the connection is proposed, intertextually recognised and acknowledged. In this instance Andrew proposes an intertextuality connection between ‘needlework’ and his Nanna. Ellie intertextually recognises the connection by building upon it with her knitting comment and the teacher further acknowledges the connection. Thus, intertextuality is a social construction, a process of social interaction in this elementary school community.

In this example, the teacher and students were gathered on the mat for the introduction of a new letter for the alphabet books the children were making. Firstly they sang the alphabet song, and after looking at a commercial picture card for the letter ‘U’, the teacher asked the class what letter are we focusing on for this week. When the students choosed ‘U’, the teacher intertextually elaborated the lesson by making a tangible connection between the letter and the name of one of the students, Lana.

Teacher: How do you know U, Lana? (I emphasise U.) Tell us something special about it... for you... What’s special about ‘U’ for you, Lana?
Luna: (laughing) Luna.
Teacher: Yes, it starts the word Luna.

The teacher then reads the 14th page from *Lucy and Tom's Alphabet Book* by Shirley Hughes. The text describes 'lights' prompting Ellie to make the following connection to her personal experience.

Ellie: Mrs Jackson, every time I go home from tennis, on the same street there are fairy lights, you know. They're very small, little fairy lights, you can see...
Teacher: Yes, that's right...

Ellie is referring to shops in the local village with which most of the students are familiar. Interestingly, other students did not appear to view Ellie's comment as an 'interruption' to the text but instead, looked at her and listened intently. This building of shared classroom texts is an important factor in developing a community of learners (Carney & Langbien, 1999, Oyler & Barry, 1996). The shared texts became a pool from which to draw future intertextual connections.

By sharing intertextual connections in an empathetic environment, students are able to explore sensitive issues surrounding the complex world of relationships. In the following example the class is engaged in the unit study of John Burningham. On this particular afternoon, the teacher has read the book 'Grampa' and Byron begins the customary literary discussion following the reading, by saying he likes the page where it says 'That was not a nice thing to say to Grampa'. The teacher and other children begin discussing what the little girl might have said to Grampa to upset him. Onechild notes that the grandfather and the girl are not facing each other which means 'you're cross with someone'. Byron corrects, 'they're being divorcing'. The teacher explains that only people who are married get divorced, not a grandparent and granddaughter.

This prompts another student, Amelia, to say 'My Dad was going to marry Mum, but he didn't, because Mum didn't want to marry my Dad, but my Mum still had a baby because my Mum and Dad were ready going to get married but then they... with a broad sweeping gesture of the hands... just didn't'. At this point, Amelia folds her arms and says in a regretful, sombre tone 'It was a pity'. The other students and the teacher appreciate the poignancy of this to Amelia, and empathically.

This literary discussion allows Amelia to share with her peers an obviously significant family revelation. Amelia was able to use this trusting, collaborative classroom context to discuss a personal, momentous event. By intertextually connecting the John Burningham book, 'Grampa', being read to the class, a literary discussion and her own family situation, Amelia exemplifies the significance of intertextuality as a social process of how people act and react to each other (Broome, 1992).

The intertextual incidents in this domain exemplify the development of collaborative, social relationships within this classroom community.
As members articulated connections from their personal milieu, knowledge about one another increased and new, shared texts were created which provided a further pool of texts for future intertextual connections. The collaborative discourse links that arise from intertextuality help to build relationships between members of the class. The complex relationships that evolve from collaboration provide the best pattern of relationships needed for a community of learners (Short & Burke, 1991). Short's study (1992) found that students needed to share their personal responses before in-depth analysis of their assigned books took place. The teacher's role in facilitating intertextual interaction by allowing personal connections to be articulated, is seen as pivotal in developing collaborative learning.

**Conclusion**

This study of intertextuality has highlighted the potential for intertextual connections to enhance collaboration in the classroom, thus contributing to the development of a 'community of learners'. The complex social relationships of all members in a classroom provide opportunities for everyone to learn, develop and celebrate literacy. When meaning is collaboratively constructed it results in the generation of new 'shared texts' among its community of learners creating a rich pool of social experiences from which to continually draw and make connections. By encouraging and valuing the sharing of texts and connections between texts in the kindergarten classroom, students will learn from one another and construct meaning together. This study found that intertextuality is an enriching social process for constructing new meaning from the daily events in a community of kindergarten learners.

To maximise the use of intertextuality in the classroom the teacher becomes 'contextual', skillfully weaving the patchwork of voices, fostering the connections and facilitating meaning making. The kindergarten teacher, as 'contextual' can promote a rich literary environment by using a variety of texts and leading inquiry-oriented discussions. By enabling intertextual connections to be articulated and new 'shared texts' to be constructed and connected, a collaborative classroom context results and fosters the development of social relationships. The role of context can be likened to that of a tight rope walker as the teacher deftly walks the fine line between allowing connections to be articulated and not letting curriculum outcomes become lost in the discussion when intertextual links are made and need to be expressed. The articulated connections though are an indication of students' thought processes and provide a means of assessing students' understanding and guiding future learning experiences. The rich social benefits that result from a classroom climate that promotes and encourages the sharing of intertextual connections and collaborative learning, justify the delicate balancing of the necessary classroom planning and management required by teachers. A classroom
environment that promotes and facilitates intertextuality has the potential to enhance collaborative literate learning and meaning making.
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Abstract

This paper describes a qualitative study focussing on intertextual connections made by students in the first year of formal schooling, where the author was both classroom teacher and researcher. Intertextuality is a term used to describe the connections made between texts. Using the New South Wales Department of Education and Training's definition of text: any meaningful act of communication, of any length, whether written, spoken or visual (2000) to examine discourse in a kindergarten classroom, the study revealed that students used intertextual connections to construct meaning and enhance the collaborative relationships in their classroom. Fostering these connections has practical implications for the classroom teacher. The theory of intertextuality, the study, and implications for the teacher as facilitator are explained in this paper.

Introduction

Intertextuality refers to the phenomenon of making connections between texts (Roache-Jameson, 2003). This study of literacy in the kindergarten classroom revealed kindergarten students frequently made intertextual connections, and the intertextual processes enhanced collaboration in the classroom, thus contributing to the development of a 'community of learners'.
The first explanation of intertextuality, "any text is the absorption and transformation of another", by post-structuralist scholar Julie Kristeva (1967), led to its study across various academic disciplines. Educational research has shown that increased understanding and learning can result from intertextual processes and the finding that intertextuality plays a significant role in learning (Bloome 1992; Bloome & Egan-Robertson 1993; Cairney 1990b, 1992; Harris & Trezise 1997; Hartman 1990). Contemporary classroom research indicates that the collaborative discussion arising from intertextuality enriches classroom relationships (Cairney & Langbien 1989; Oyler & Barry 1996; Short 1992). The pool of intertextuality, from which connections are drawn and shared amongst members of any learning community, enhances the social fabric within the group.

**Intertextuality**

Intertextuality can be simply defined as 'the process of interpreting one text by means of a previously composed text' (Cairney 1992).

Fundamental to any study of intertextuality is an understanding of what constitutes a text. Just as intertextuality evolved into increasingly complex definitions as it was studied, so too has the notion of 'text'. Definitions of text have evolved with increasing complexity from being a 'written text' (de Beaugrande, 1980) to 'any meaningful act of communication, of any length, whether written, spoken or visual' (NSW Department of Education and Training, 2000). The following list of definitions illustrates this increasing complexity:
Pierce (1931):
A text is any sign that communicates meaning.

Witte (1992):
While a text can be something tangible, it need not be, it can also be those experiences and ideas that are remembered or constructed in the mind.

Hartman (1992):
Although we usually think of the text as the object one reads - a textbook, a section of a passage, or the alphanumeric code printed on a page - it need not be confined to the boundaries of printed language. A text includes both linguistic and non-linguistic signs. (p. 296)

Worton & Still (1990):
"Text" is used both in the restricted academic sense to mean a "work of literature" and in the wider sense to mean anything which can be perceived as "a signifying structure" from the spectacle of nature to social codes. (p. viii)

Texts...should be defined as meaningful configurations of signs intended to communicate.

Bloome & Egan-Robertson (1993):
A text is the product of textualising. People textualise experience and the
world in which they live, making those phenomena part of a language system. The result of textualising experience can be a set of words, signs, representations, etc. But it might be other forms and products not usually associated with texts: architecture, rock formations, the stars in the sky, the wind, the ocean, emotion - these can all be texts, but their being texts depends on what people do. The stars in the sky are only a text if they have been made so, if they have been textualised. In brief, text is something done by people to experience (broadly defined). (p. 311)

*Short (1992):*

A text is any chunk of meaning that has unity and can be shared with others. A song, dance, poem, oral story, mathematical equation, or sculpture are all texts from which learners can draw connections as they construct their understandings about a current evolving text.

The broader notion of text that both linguistic and non-linguistic signs can constitute text was used to examine discourse in this classroom. 'Textualised experiences' (Bloom & Egan-Robertson 1993) which may include a book, video, film, or verbalised personal experience, were analysed to determine the type of intertextual connection being made. Intertextuality in this study was viewed as the explicit connection of texts, which enhances meaning to the initiator, within a situational context, in this case, the kindergarten classroom.

The pathway of intertextuality research through the academic disciplines of Literary Criticism, Semiotics, Cognitive Literacy Theory and the Social Construction of
Literacy are of particular relevance to this study. In order to determine the patterns and importance of intertextuality in a kindergarten classroom, it is useful to gain an understanding of the genesis of intertextuality in each of these various disciplines.

**Literary Criticism**

Literary criticism is the home of intertextuality. The theory of intertextuality states that a text cannot exist as a hermetic whole for two important reasons. Firstly, because the writer is a reader of texts, the written text is always influenced by references of all kinds from the various texts experienced prior to writing. Secondly, the reader of the text brings with him or her a wealth of prior experiences which may lead the reader to an interpretation of the writing, different to that which the writer proposed. Conversely, a reference to a work by the writer, which is unknown to the reader, will have a passive effect during that particular reading. Worton and Still (1990) refer to these two fundamental aspects, texts entering via authors and texts entering via readers, as the ‘axes of intertextuality’ (p.2).

Whilst the term intertextuality was only used from the 1960s, the phenomenon itself occurred from the beginnings of human society whenever there has been discourse about texts. Worton and Still (1990), in their introductory chapter of an entire book devoted to intertextuality in literary criticism, trace the roots of intertextuality back to our earliest orators such as Plato and Aristotle. The twentieth century has seen the emergence of intertextuality theorists in literary criticism. One of the earliest influential theorists was Bakhtin who stated that “there is no utterance without relation to other utterances” (Todorov, 1984, p.60).
Post-structuralists such as Roland Barthes began to assert that readers can freely connect text with any system of meaning to make sense of our lived experience - "The aim of literature, Barthes asserts is to put meaning into the world, but not a meaning" (Sontag, 1982, p. xi). In "The Pleasure of the Text" (1975), Barthes states intertextuality is "the impossibility of living outside the infinite text - whether this text be Proust or the daily newspaper or the television screen: the book creates the meaning, the meaning creates life" (p.36). Reader response theorists such as Rifaterre (1990) define intertextuality as the "web of functions" that synchronise the relationships between text and intertext. Rifaterre states the importance of intertextuality for readers to gain understanding when trying to "fill gaps" in a text (pp. 56 - 57). Thus intertextuality viewed from a structuralist perspective in Literary Criticism was more concerned with traditional notions of text, postmodernist scholars viewed intertextuality as an act of making connections between life experiences and these experiences were referred to as texts. These broader notions of text led to an interest in what the reader brings to the text. The Reader Response movement located meaning within the reader's interpretation rather than in the text.

Semiotics

The semiotic discipline arose from the work of Pierce (1966) and Saussure (1966). Semiotics, the study of signs, generated interest in a number of educational researchers who developed a semiotic perspective on reading comprehension (Eco, 1975; Harste Woodward & Burke, 1984; Short, 1987). Hartman (1990) sums up their collective wisdom thus: "...they examine how language, and thereby reality, is constructed. Semiotics examines how our reality is already constructed
for us by the language and interpretations of our culture - an external reality is always interpreted because it is mediated by a system of cultural signs” (pp.8 - 12). Lemke (1992) sees semiotic intertextuality as the cornerstone of our understanding of how meanings are made: “Every text, the discourse of every occasion, makes its social meanings against the background of other texts, and the discourses of other occasions. This is the principle I have called general intertextuality” (p.257). Using a very broad definition of text as any sign in our social culture, semiotic intertextuality becomes a process of making meaning through relationships between texts – more meaning than can be made with any one text.

**Cognitive Literacy Theory**

Literacy from a cognitive perspective is viewed as a body of cognitive knowledge about written language (prior knowledge) and a set of processes for using that knowledge (schema theory). This theory suggests that readers make use of information in the text to guide them in selecting and using their own knowledge to make sense of the text (Hartman, 1990, p5). By the use of prior knowledge and schema theory, meaning is constructed by connecting knowledge fragments into a particular configuration to fit a given context. Hartman used the cognitive tradition to examine the intertextual links made by able readers as they read multiple passages. Hartman reports that readers do transpose texts into other texts, absorb one text into another, and build a mosaic of intersecting texts. He found two general types of intertextual links occurring. Those between ideas, events and people; and those links made between the readers themselves to the passages in the form of a discourse stance (p.171). Hartman concludes that able
readers use a variety of ways to read: reading is "an intertextual enterprise where readers transpose, absorb and intersect texts as they zig-zag their way through passages (iii).

Social Construction of Literacy

The basic tenets of sociocultural research are drawn from cultural anthropology and sociolinguistics theory. Literacy viewed from a sociocultural perspective is seen as "a community's ways of using language to serve social purposes" (Solsken, 1995, p.4). The social context is central to meaning making, as Cairney (1995) describes: "types of discourse and the way we read or write them are the social constructs of specific groups. Individuals are enculturated into these practices and these meanings" (p.2).

A number of intertextuality studies have been carried out from a sociocultural perspective. Following extensive classroom research of intertextuality, Cairney (1988,1990a, 1990b, 1992, 1996) found that students link texts in diverse ways, and while intertextuality has idiosyncratic elements, it is also a rich, social phenomenon. He concluded that intertextuality is dependent on factors as diverse as text characteristics, reading purpose, and contextual influences; familiar to most readers and writers irrespective of age and ability; linked with many text features including genre, plot, characterisation, and content; frequently primed by specific elements of content and plot; and socially constructed as extensions of human relationships.

Bloome & Egan-Robertson (1993) ground their study of intertextuality in the
social construction of literacy. “People act and react to each other, and they do so primarily through language. Intertextuality describes one of the social (and cultural) processes involved in how people act and react to each other” (p.220). Bloome (1991) proposes that merely juxtaposing texts is insufficient for intertextuality to be present. He maintains that the juxtaposition must be proposed, interactionally recognised, acknowledged and have social significance (p.259). Texts are constructed by people.

Short (1992a) draws on Bloome’s social theory of learning to explain complex intertextual connections that occur in the social environment of elementary classrooms. Short examined the use of ‘literature circles’ and ‘text sets’ in classrooms to explore the processes and strategies that occur in intertextuality, rather than just the types of connections. She calls for further research in classroom learning environments which support collaborative social relationships to gain insights into how intertextuality assists meaning making.

In their study of a first-grade classroom, Oyler & Barry (1996), examined what and how texts were juxtaposed, and the teacher’s role in the construction of intertextuality. They found that “student connections were shared with the entire class and remembered texts became shared texts thus building intertextuality among a community of readers” (p.328). In order to understand what shapes and mobilises reading instruction in early school years, there is a need for more in depth examination of the intertextual complexities that exist within it, conclude Harris and Trezise from their study of intertextuality in a kindergarten classroom (1997).
Saxby (1993) maintains that 'enrichment from reading is a spiralling process', whereby the assimilation of each new book provides new insights for the reader to bring to the next book read. Broadening Saxby's concept of text beyond the boundary of books, and thus viewing the assimilation of any 'textualised experience' (Bloome & Egan-Robertson 1993) as enrichment, literacy becomes a 'psychological and sociological partnership' (Harste, Woodward & Burke 1984) where the meaning-making process, learning, is enriched through connections across present and past texts (Short 1992b). Wolf and Heath noted 'Children, at particular ages, moods and moments, will see and remember certain details that trigger the memory of a particular piece of speech, fragment of scene, gesture or facial expression and its connection to a recent event' (1992, 109).

*Intertextuality...a never-ending story!*

The process of using intertextuality to understand meaning making, literacy and learning in a wide variety of academic disciplines results in intertextuality itself being re-interpreted. This is in keeping with the nature of intertextuality – a spiralling process of change as connections are made and meanings multiplied:

*Intertextuality is not an idea that remains pure, constant and idealised across time and context, but is mutable and reflects the context in which it is appropriated. It can manifest itself differently depending upon the conditions of its appropriation (Hartman 1992).*
The study of discourse in this kindergarten classroom reflects intertextuality from a social constructivist perspective and reveals that five year olds use intertextual processes in daily discourse.

The Study

The study was undertaken in a kindergarten classroom in a government primary school situated in the Blue Mountains of New South Wales (NSW). In NSW 'Kindergarten' refers to the first year of formal schooling and the average age is five years. The daily literacy session, in this class of twenty two students, was video-taped approximately three times per week over the course of a school year by the classroom teacher/researcher. The daily literacy session involved teaching and learning practices such as shared reading, graphological and phonemic awareness, alphabet study, literary discussions, small group work and individual student conferences with the teacher. The extensive video data, combined with field notes from participant observation (Glesne & Peshkin, 1991), audio recordings of conferences with students, and artefact collection, yielded a rich source of classroom interaction from which examples of intertextual connections could be transcribed and analysed. The video data provided the discourse from which examples of intertextual connections were transcribed and analysed. Sixteen three-hour videotapes were viewed and elicited eighty-eight episodes of discourse involving intertextual connections. 'Interactive episodes' were excerpts from daily classroom communication between the students and teacher. A classroom intertextual connection, for the purposes of this study, was defined as connecting a classroom text to a textualised experience which may involve
a book, video, film or verbalised personal experience. The New South Wales Department of Education and Training's definition of text was used: any meaningful act of communication, of any length, whether written, spoken or visual (2000).

QSR NUD*IST version 3.0, a qualitative data management software package, was used to store and analyse the data. Data were initially analysed speculatively (Woods 1986) to allow for tentative reflection by the researcher. Further analysis involved the principles of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss 1967) and inductive coding techniques described by Strauss and Corbin (1990). Using constant comparison (Glaser & Strauss 1967) and domain analysis (Spradley, 1980), categories were created to describe the types of intertextual connections in the data. The intertextual connections articulated by the kindergarten students were classified across three domains: textual, contextual and personal (Roache-Jameson, 2003). Table 1 details the types of connections in the three domains. The term ‘intertextuality initiator’ was devised to refer to the text stimulus in the classroom that prompted an intertextual incident. The term, ‘intertextuality connective’ is used to refer to the text to which the stimulus was linked.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intertextual Domains</th>
<th>Intertextual Initiators</th>
<th>Intertextuality Connectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textual Domain</strong></td>
<td>• plot</td>
<td>• previous class text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• illustrations</td>
<td>• plot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• character</td>
<td>• illustrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• text type or structure</td>
<td>• character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• action/event in a text</td>
<td>• home text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• setting</td>
<td>• text type or structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual Domain</strong></td>
<td>• graphological/phonologi-</td>
<td>• spelling knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cal session</td>
<td>• known rhyme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• alphabet letter</td>
<td>• previous class activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• word</td>
<td>• previous graphological/phonologi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• dictionary picture</td>
<td>cal session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• spelling knowledge</td>
<td>• class object or resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• wordbank</td>
<td>• song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• wordcard</td>
<td>• video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• writing tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• learning theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Domain</strong></td>
<td>• student talk</td>
<td>• student’s name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• student ‘news’</td>
<td>• student knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• student response</td>
<td>• student’s possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• peer talk</td>
<td>• student’s experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• teacher talk</td>
<td>• student’s family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• student’s pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• student’s dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• peer talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• peer writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• peer’s experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• peer’s name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• teacher talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• teacher’s writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• teacher’s family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The textual domain referred to intertextuality that was concerned with textual elements such as characters, plot and genre. The contextual domain contained intertextual connections that were made during contexts that are unique to the classroom environment such as phonemic awareness sessions, writing tasks and alphabet learning. The personal domain comprised the many intertextual connections drawn from the students' personal milieus. These connections often referred to students' families, experiences and belongings. The intertextual processes identified by this study indicated enhanced collaboration in the classroom.

'Cento' is a word used by Douglas Hartman (1992) as a term to describe the various discourses, motifs, and images that together resemble an intertextual collage of voices - a patchwork intertext. In its original Latin form 'cento' meant a patchwork garment. The many examples of intertextual connections in this study depict the classroom 'cento' and highlight the need for the teacher to undertake the role of 'centoist' - responsible for weaving and assembling the 'patchwork voices' into a cohesive balanced form without diminishing the unique learning potential within each individual utterance. As centoist, the teacher needs to be opportunistic to the unique, idiosyncratic ways in which connections and learning proceed. The idiosyncratic nature of intertextuality requires the teacher to be flexible, to pick up on utterances and to be the bridge builder of connections to new learnings. Many of the data examples in this study reveal that learning does not necessarily happen at times planned by the teacher, and the teacher needs to be aware of the potential learning at all times.
When the teacher, as centoist, promotes a rich literary environment, with inquiry-oriented discussions using multiple texts (Hartman & Allison 1996), enabling intertextual connections to be articulated and new ‘shared texts’ to be constructed and connected, a collaborative classroom context results and fosters the development of social relationships. The role of centoist can be likened to that of a tight rope walker as the teacher deftly walks the fine line between allowing connections to be articulated and not letting curriculum outcomes become lost in the discussion when intertextual links are made and need to be expressed. Teacher explicitness of planned teaching and learning outcomes with the class, can help to avoid the potential logistical problems of many voices articulating ‘all and sundry’ connections. The rich, social benefits that result from a classroom climate which promotes and encourages the sharing of intertextual connections and collaborative learning, justify the delicate balancing of the necessary classroom planning and management required by teachers.

Examples of intertextuality in the kindergarten classroom

Textual domain

A typical example of textual intertextuality occurred when the students were gathered on the mat with the teacher to listen to the book 'Imagine'. This 'shared reading' session was part of an Alison Lester author study. They begin by discussing some common features of the cover pages of Alison Lester books they have been reading. They discuss the circles that often appear on the cover and the titles, then the teacher begins reading and comes to the page where the characters in the book imagine they are at the Arctic. This prompts Gareth to connect to a
previous book by Alison Lester:

Gareth: In the Journey Home they went to a snowy place.

Teacher: Yes they did go to a snowy place in The Journey Home.

Gareth is intertextually linking the illustrations of the Arctic in 'Imagine' with another Alison Lester book 'The Journey Home' and demonstrates his growing awareness of events in stories. In this instance, he uses a 'remembered text' to frame or understand the current class text. Past or remembered texts can help us to understand current texts. Similarly, current texts can illuminate past texts for us by adding a new layer of meaning to prior understanding. Although Gareth's comment could be viewed as merely mentioning two similar events, when viewed from an intertextual perspective, it suggests an embryonic understanding of literary plot.

Examples of intertextuality from the textual domain revealed that articulating connections often indicated new literary understandings and greater knowledge of text. An important implication for teachers is to provide a wide variety of quality texts from which intertextual connections will be made. There needs to be a rich array of texts including factual, fiction, magazines, newspapers and multi-media. High quality texts that portray cultural diversity will precipitate thought and discussion about society, relationships and values. Texts, with multiple layers of meaning that lend themselves to open-ended classroom discussion and activities, will encourage collaborative responses.
This next textual example demonstrates more complex intertextuality when the class is reading the book 'Farmer Duck' by Martin Waddell. In this instance a character trait from a book is connected to a current playground game the students have made up, based on a popular television program.

Following the reading of the story, which was accompanied by literary strategies including 'Hot Seat' (Board of Studies, 1994) and 'Sketch to Stretch' (Cairney, 1995), the teacher and children have a literary discussion. They are discussing the last page where the duck is now the 'boss' and have agreed that the duck is a nicer boss than the farmer. William comments:

William: He's been a nice one (boss).

Alanna: You're nice to me when we play Blue Heelers aren't you William?

Lianne: Yeh, cause you're the boss

William: Yeh, I'm always the boss.

Interestingly, the students have used intertextuality to initially devise their playground game from a television show, an indication of the potency of popular culture in their lives. They then use their 'Blue Heelers' text to intertextually construct meaning about relationships when reading 'Farmer Duck' in the classroom. This demonstrates the capacity for intertextuality to provide discourse links that engender fellowship and increase a sense of community in the classroom.
Contextual domain

The next example of intertextuality is from the contextual domain and occurred during a phonemic awareness session, a context distinctive to a classroom. The class is seated on the mat and the teacher is using a magnetic board to revise the letters that they have studied so far. They have revised the letter names, sounds and words that begin with these letters. The teacher then introduces the idea of blending. Firstly with vowel/consonant, as in 'at', 'it', 'am', and then the word 'mat' is placed on the magnetic board. Several children identify it and call out 'mat'. The teacher says 'You can write that word because you know m-a-t!' (pointing to each letter and spelling it out). This prompts Emma to say:

Emma: We're sitting on a mat.

Jenna puts her hand up to say something, but the teacher goes on to make 'is' on the magnetic board and talk about it with the children. Jenna keeps her hand up most of the time, which is about one and a half minutes.

Finally, the teacher says:

Teacher: Jenna?

Jenna: I've got a cousin called, umm, Mat.

Teacher: Mat? Have you? My son's called Mat - it's short for Mathew.
About five minutes later, following performing the rhyme 'I'm a little teapot' and discussing a worksheet the children are going to complete, and then performing the finger rhyme 'Six Little Indians', James has his hand up. The teacher says

Teacher: Yes James?

James: Mats...... we sit on at little lunch when the grass is wet.

Teacher: Yes, mats, and you know how to write that word now.

In this example Emma has connected the isolated word 'mat' to a more meaningful context – 'we're sitting on a mat' thereby shedding light on this new 'text' and possibly illuminating other students' understanding. In turn, Jenna and James also connect the word 'mat' to a more meaningful context.

Interestingly, both Jenna and James tenaciously wait to make a statement on 'mat' even though in both instances the class discussion had moved on. This persistence or dwelling, was quite common and seems to indicate a need for students to actually articulate their connection despite a time lapse.

Intertextual connections from the contextual domain highlighted the need for providing a classroom climate conducive to making connections between texts and articulating them. When students expect to connect and are given opportunities to express and share connections, new, and often unplanned,
learnings take place.

In another example, the teacher and students are discussing a poster depicting the life cycle of a caterpillar. The teacher has spoken about the cocoon being a protective shelter for the caterpillar.

Alanna: Like a little hutch for bunnies

Teacher: That’s right

Alanna: I know all about caterpillars because my Nanna told me

Teacher: All right. Do you know what we call this? (referring to the life cycle poster)

Elizabeth: The circle of life

Teacher: That’s a lovely way to say – that was in the Lion King wasn’t it?

Elizabeth nods

Adrian: And I’ve got the whole tape of Lion King and the book of Lion King

Teacher: All right... we can call it the circle of life but we can also call it a life cycle...
In the above example the teacher is introducing the concept of a new text to the students, a life cycle. The students use various intertextual connections from previous texts to frame the new text knowledge. Alanna draws on previous knowledge of protective shelters and Elizabeth uses an intertextual image from another text, The Lion King to describe the concept of life cycles.

The range of daily classroom events in which the students participated provided a framework of texts from which intertextual connections were made and new knowledge constructed. This suggests the importance of a classroom environment that encourages time and space to ponder and share connections in collaborative ways.

**Personal Domain**

The most frequent type of intertextuality in this study proved to be in the personal domain. Students made connections between content in class texts, with texts from their personal milieu such as family relationships, home-life, personal experiences, belongings, pets, friends and even dreams. The following example shows how a book in class primes a student to articulate knowledge of butterflies and a statement about her father prompts another student to connect to her 'family's expertise'.

*The teacher and students are gathered on the mat for a new book. The teacher begins singing a familiar song about a caterpillar and the*
children join in. The teacher then holds up the book 'The Very Hungry Caterpillar' by Eric Carle.

Emma begins to tell about how the circles on butterflies wings are called 'eyes' and they scare off predators, Samuel agrees with Emma saying 'yes, that’s right'. Emma says she knows this because her father is an expert. Elizabeth says:

Elizabeth: David and my sister Sarah are experts at birds because David has a bird book and Sarah has binoculars and we have a huge back garden and it looks like a jungle and Dad has built us a cubby house there and it has little pools, um, little lily pads and.....

Teacher: So lots of interesting things have happened there? Let’s see what interesting things happen in this book....

In this domain, students often made connections between content in class texts with similar events or texts from their personal lives. The above example demonstrates the social significance of intertextuality (Bloome, 1992) when this occurs. We see that Emma proposes a connection that is acknowledged by Samuel and interactionally recognised by Elizabeth and the teacher. This interaction indicates the influence of intertextuality as a social construction. The intent of this connection exemplifies the significance of intertextuality as a social process of how people act and react to each other (Bloome 1992). It enables the building of new shared texts that become a pool from which future intertextual connections will be drawn. This construction of shared
texts assists in enhancing the collaborative nature of the classroom and helps to build relationships between class members.

**Teacher as centoist - encouraging intertextuality**

Teachers can facilitate intertextuality by encouraging the sharing of connections through classroom strategies such as group work, literary discussions and contexts which require students to interact and support one another in their learning. Planning themes for units of work, author studies and using a variety of multi-media texts grouped around a topic, will elicit intertextuality and promote the building of new shared texts. Anecdote relating is an important part of everyday life and teachers can capitalise on its potency by sharing anecdotes with students during classroom talking and writing sessions. We usually choose to relate an anecdote because it has some significance to us as humans – either funny, wondrous, embarrassing, joyful, scary, sad or puzzling. Providing glimpses of our own personal lives as teachers can help students to begin to examine their own experiences. The teacher’s role in encouraging and valuing the sharing of texts and connections is seen as pivotal in developing collaborative learning.

Providing a classroom climate conducive to making connections between texts and sharing them is another important role for the teacher as centoist. When students ‘expect to connect’ (Girney 1990b; Short 1992b) and are given the scope to express and share connections, unplanned opportunities for learning take place. A classroom rich with literary resources provides an abundant source of texts from which
inter textual connections will be made. The centoist ensures there is a wide variety of quality texts available which includes factual texts, literature, everyday texts such as newspapers and magazines, and access to technological texts. Fortunately there is a multitude of quality literature easily obtainable today which have multiple layers of meaning, acknowledge and portray today's multicultural society and lend themselves to inquiry oriented discussions (Hartman & Allison 1996) and open-ended literacy engagements in the classroom encouraging collaborative interaction. An awareness of the power of text framing allows the centoist to make students 'alert framers' themselves (Reid 1992). By ensuring a wide variety of texts are read and viewed in classrooms, the centoist can also ensure discussion of texts includes open-ended questioning, acceptance of different views and avoidance of orthodoxical notions.

This study indicates the potential for intertextuality to enhance collaboration in the classroom and contribute to the development of a community of learners. The increased learning and social benefits that arise from a classroom that facilitates intertextual connections certainly justify the planning and management of strategies to ensure effective collaboration. Awareness of the idiosyncratic nature of intertextuality, a willingness to be opportunistic towards students' connections, and the promotion of intertextual connections from everyday classroom events, assist teachers to be the 'centoist' for students' potential learning.
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ABSTRACT

Intertextuality refers to the phenomenon of making connections between texts (Roache-Jameson, 2003). Intertextuality has been studied from many academic perspectives (Worton & Suli, 1990). Educational research has shown that increased understanding and learning can result from intertextual processes (Bloome 1992; Bloome & Elgan-Robertson 1993; Catney 1990b, 1992; Harris & Trezise 1997; Hanman 1990). Contemporary classroom research indicates that the collaborative discussion arising from intertextuality enriches classroom relationships (Catney & Langhan 1989; Dyker & Barry 1996; Short 1992).

A study of literacy in a NSW kindergarten classroom revealed kindergarten students frequently made intertextual connections (Jameson, 1998). The intertextual connections articulated by the kindergarten students were classified across three domains: textual, contextual and personal (Roache-Jameson, 2003). The intertextual processes enhanced collaboration in the classroom and contributed to the development of a 'community of learners'.

This paper explores the complex theoretical context of intertextuality and describes four themes from the literature. The themes of text connection, the significance of the personal milieu, multiple meanings in texts and developing communities of learners are described with transcript examples from the kindergarten study.

[Keywords] Intertextuality; Kindergarten; Multiple Meanings; Communities of Learners.

1. INTRODUCTION

Intertextuality was first explained by Kristeva (1989) as: 'any text being the absorption and transformation of another text'. The term intertextuality describes the human phenomenon of making connections between texts (Roache-Jameson, 2002). Postmodermism and social constructivist theory have broadened definitions of text in educational research resulting in the term intertextuality being used to describe connections between texts of a more catholic nature than written texts (Blum 1999, Short 1992).

The New South Wales Department of Education and Training's definition of text in current syllabus documents is any meaningful act of communication, of any length, whether written, spoken or visual (2001). An examination of intertextuality in a kindergarten classroom, using this broader definition of text, revealed that students used intertextual connections to construct meaning and that these intertextual processes contributed to the collaborative relationships in their classroom (Roache-Jameson, 2002).

The study was undertaken in a kindergarten classroom in a government primary school situated in the Blue Mountains of New South Wales (NSW). In NSW Kindergarten refers to the first year of formal schooling and the average age is five years. The daily literacy session was video-taped approximately three times per week over the course of a school year by the classroom teacher/researcher. Transcripts from the data were analysed and revealed kindergarten students regularly used intertextual connections in their classroom interaction. The types of intertextual connections from this study were described and categorised into three domain: textual, contextual and personal (Roache-Jameson, 2003).
The concept of intertextuality has a rich, historic path through many scholarly perspectives (Worton & Still, 1990). This paper explores the theoretical context and draws together four themes of intertextuality that are reflected in intertextual connections from the kindergarten study (Roebe-Jameson, 2003). The themes included linking and framing texts, connecting to one's personal milieu, the multiple meanings in a text, and enhancing collaboration in a community of learners.

2. INTERTEXTUALITY

Synonymous with the winding nature of intertextuality, the history of intertextual study has meandered through various scholarly traditions including structuralism, poststructuralism, semiotics, critical discourse, cognitive psychology, social constructivism, and continues to be studied in contemporary educational research. Although the term intertextuality was only used from the 1960s, its occurrence was described and noted from the beginnings of human discourse about texts. Worton and Still (1990) trace the roots of intertextuality back to our earliest ancestors in the fourth century BC. Plato claimed that a 'poet' (creative writer) always copies an earlier set of creation, which is itself already a copy. Aristotle's theory of imitation held that "dramatic creation is the reduction, and hence intensification of a mass of texts known to the poet, and probably to the audience as well" (p. 3).

Whilst much of the exoteric, complex literary and linguistic theory of intertextuality may appear to be far removed from the everyday dialogue of classrooms, contemporary educational research has found that increased understanding can result from intertextual processes, and that intertextuality plays a significant role in learning (Blomme, 1992; Bloom & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Cairney, 1990a, 1992; Harris & Trezise, 1997; Hartman, 1990).

The interplay between intertextuality theory and contemporary classroom studies can be seen in these descriptions of language and reading by post-structuralist scholar Jacques Derrida (1976) and by a student from educational researcher Douglas Hartman's study of intertextuality (1992). Derrida developed a premise that "language is an interweaving movement between what is there and not there -- language is always an interweaving, a texture" (Collins & Mayblin, 1996 p. 70). Hartman (1992) focused on intertextuality in classroom reading. A student from his study provided this intertextual metaphor when asked to describe the way he thought whilst reading:

"It's like a whole sphere of jewels or a circle of jewels, and each jewel reflects every other jewel and every other jewel is reflected in it. It's about the effects of events on other events. It's a metaphor for the reverberations of lives on each other. Everything reflects everything else." (1992, p. 307)

Significant themes from the literature on intertextuality include the framing and linking of texts (Derrida, 1976), the multiple meanings inherent in any text (Barthes, 1975) and personal interpretation (Rosenblatt, 1978; Langer, 1995). Studies in contemporary classrooms have shown that the collaborative discussion arising from intertextuality enriches classroom relationships and encourages the development of learning communities (Cairney & Langton, 1989; Oyler & Barry, 1996; Short, 1992). These themes were reflected in the intertextual connections made by kindergarten students (Roebe-Jameson, 2003).

These four themes from the literature are described here with examples of intertextual connections from the kindergarten data.

(i) The Connection of Texts

The concept of intertextuality derives from post-structuralist perspectives that claim all texts exist in relation to other texts. Intertextuality has been described as the process of interpreting one text by means of a previously composed text (Cairney, 1992).

Renowned post-structuralist scholar and literary aesthete Roland Barthes, saw the importance of intertextuality to writing and literature: "every text, being itself the intertext of another text, belongs to the intertextual" (1975, p. 77). In his essay 'The Pleasure of the Text', Barthes ruminated on the way Proust influenced his own reading of other texts and introduced a broader notion of 'text'.

CHAPTER 2 PAGE 114
I recognize that Proust's work, for myself at least, is the reference work, the general _mimesis_, the mandate of the entire literary cosmography... Proust is what comes to me, to what I summon up, not an "authority", simply a _circular memory_. Which is what the inter-text is: the impossibility of fixing outside the infinite text - whether this text be Proust or the daily newspaper or the television screen: the book creates the meaning, the meaning creates life (Barthes, 1975, p.36).

From a semiotic perspective, texts sign other texts (Harste, Woodward & Burke, 1984). Past or remembered texts help us to frame or understand current texts, and likewise, current texts can shed light on past texts by allowing us to construct another layer of meaning to our prior understanding. Meanings derived from texts depend substantially on the ways in which they are framed (Reid, 1992). Teachers are constantly framing texts in classrooms and students' understanding will be influenced not only by the teacher's framing but also by their own framing from past texts. Enrichment from reading can be seen as a spiralling process - "[each new book that is assimilated into the readers' experience provides new insights that can be brought to bear on the next book read]" (Sandsby, 1983).

Hartman (1990) undertook an in-depth study of intertextuality to examine the intertextual links made by twelve able readers whilst reading multiple passages. Hartman was intrigued by the notion that good readers connect and relate ideas to their previous reading experiences over time. Analysis revealed that students made links to a broad range of textual resources including texts within the passage they were currently reading, links to previously read passages, links to films and to their general world knowledge. Hartman found that readers mentally transpose, absorb and interpret texts into other texts as they read. Importantly he noted the diversity of links: "Meaning making is truly an intertextual enterprise - transposing texts into other texts; absorbing one text into another, and building a mosaic of intersecting texts - as readers zig-zag their way through passages" (1995, 557).

Students in the kindergarten study articulated connections between current classroom texts and previously encountered texts. From an intertextual perspective, these connections suggest inchoative framing of text elements such as genre, plot and characters.

In this example the teacher was reading a book aloud to the class called *The Enchanted Wood* during a shared reading session. This book is a "lift-the-flap" book about well-known fairy tale characters. Alanna drew on her knowledge of a previous book read in class and said:

Alanna: It's like *The Jolly Postman*.

Teacher: Yes it is a bit like that, isn’t it?

_The Jolly Postman_ by Janet and Allan Ahlberg is a similar text that encourages intertextuality by incorporating well-known fairy tale characters into a new text. Alanna intertextually connected her knowledge of the structure of the "old text, The Jolly Postman, to frame her knowledge of the "new text" The Enchanted Wood.

When students make connections between "presented text" and "remembered text" the teacher has a vital role as a bridge-builder actively encouraging and facilitating these connections (Cyley & Barry, 1996). "Text sets" (Short, Harste & Burke, 1996) of conceptually-related books, provided a useful curricular strategy for teacher facilitation of intertextuality in the kindergarten classroom. For example, an overarching classroom theme at one stage was "Traditional Tales", but within that theme the teacher ensured that there were text sets available for small group work. As a whole class, the students had read _The Little Red Hen_ and were involved in literature discussions, and then, in small groups over the following week, the teacher guided a picnic session where students made their own sandwiches and explored some factual texts on bread, cooking and wheat before writing a recipe for their sandwich. The teacher thereby facilitated or elided intertextual connections by reading books conceptually-related, in the traditional tale, _The Little Red Hen_.

In addition to shared reading sessions with _The Little Red Hen_, the teacher read an intertextually contrived book from an educational
publisher called *The Little Yellow Chicken* which uses a similar narrative structure to the traditional tale of *The Little Red Hen*. It tells of the Little Red Hen's grandchild, the little yellow chicken, who is going to cook a meal and asks his friends to help him shop and prepare for the meal. His friends do not want to help with the work required but they do want to eat the meal. After the first two pages of *The Little Yellow Chicken*, Samuel noticed the similarities in plot:

Samuel: Huh... well... umm, well, that little red hen, umm, those other people wouldn't help her, like the bread and stuff, and those (points to the big book, *The Little Yellow Chicken*) people aren't helping her make, umm do things too.

Emma: That's why you chose them too. Cause you had a little read of them at the shop then you knew how they were, how the same (gestures with a scold hand action)

Jennifer: It's like the little red hen....

Ben: It's like, because they're both like the same.

Teacher: Yeah, in what way, Ben?

Ben: Um, the, in the... umm, the he's the little, that little chicken his friend the little pig and in the little red chicken...

Teacher: the little red hen...

Ben: (affirming) the little red hen, um, well she didn't get, no one helped her

Teacher: Yeah...

Although Ben struggles to articulate his thoughts with clarity, he is demonstrating an intertextual link between the plot and characters in both texts.

The intertextual lying of past and current texts can result in the creation of a new third text. Harste, Woodward & Burke (1984) proposed that this new 'synthesised text' is what learning is all about. In this next example from the study, Giles connects knowledge from an 'old text', *Mrs Wishy Washy*, previously read in class, to the 'new text' in the clone *Tuesday* and *Thursday* and thereby creates a new third text of growing spelling knowledge.

Following the reading of Eric Carle's *The Very Hungry Caterpillar*, Gareth and Amanda were collaboratively completing a written clone describing what happened to the caterpillar on each day of the week. The teacher overheard Giles making a connection between texts that, in turn, built a new third text - increased spelling knowledge.

Giles: Well, Thursday and Tuesday start with 't' and end with 'y', and Mrs Wishy Washy both start with 'w' and both end with 'y'.

Beach (1997) pointed out that whilst the intertextual links or connections made by students may be made about similarity in text or genre features, readers also connect on common subjective experiences. This leads to the second theme from the literature - the personal milieu.

(ii) The Personal Milieu

Rosenblatt (1978) and Eco (1979) proposed, “reading involves a transaction between a reader and a text which leads to the creation of a new text that is unique to each reader”. This transactional theory of reading derives from social constructivist notions of learning.

In *The Reader, The Text, The Poem*, Rosenblatt (1978) made an important distinction between ‘efficent’ and ‘aesthetic’ reading. ‘Efficient reading’, derived from the Latin word *efficere* meaning ‘to carry away’, refers to reading pragmatically in order to gain specific knowledge, or to ‘carry away’ the required information. ‘Aesthetic reading’, by contrast, is the ‘lived through’ experience of a text where the reader is primarily concerned with his or her own unique fascination with the text. Any text might be read both ways, but what is important in aesthetic reading is that the reader’s attention is centred directly on what he is living through during his relationship with that particular text” (1978, p.25).

Rosenblatt’s ‘transactional theory’ places emphasis on what the particular juxtaposition of words suits up within each reader.” (1978 p.137)
Judith Langer (1995) built upon Rosenblatt’s work to try to describe the text-worlds of readers when engaging in the literary experience. She uses the term ‘environment’ to refer to the world of understanding a person has at any point in time:

Environments are text-worlds in the mind, and they differ from individual to individual. They are a function of one’s personal and cultural experiences, one’s relationship to the group experience, what one knows, how one feels, and what one is about. Environments are dynamic sets of related ideas, images, questions, disagreements, anticipations, arguments, and analyses that fill the mind during every reading, writing, speaking, or other experience when one gains, expresses, and shares thoughts and understandings. An environment is always in a state of change or available for and open to change. Environment building is not just a literary activity; we build environments all the time when we make sense of ourselves, of others, and of the world. (p. 9)

Langer’s interpretive nature of reading aligns with Bakhtin’s social notion of the intertextual web of personal history and experience (Todorov, 1984) in which the reader’s mind is absorbed. Wolf and Heath (1992) described this type of intertextuality in their study of children and literature: “Children, at particular ages, modes and moments, will see and remember certain details that trigger the memory of a particular piece of speech, fragment of scene, gesture or facial expression and its connection to a recent event” (p. 109).

Experiencing emotions in texts prompts readers to recall certain autobiographical experiences. By reflecting on the nature of the feelings that link texts, readers are able to clarify the meaning of those feelings (Benedikt, 1997, p. 65). Stein (1989) found that responding to a text by re-experiencing an autobiographical experience could provide further insight into the text.

A classroom rich with literary resources provides an abundant source of texts from which intertextual connections will be made. In the kindergarten study, the teacher used open-ended, multi-layered texts followed by whole class discussion to encourage personal reflection and literary discussion. One text used in this way was part of a John Burningham author study. His poignant book Grampa, which describes, in delightfully humorous and sometimes sad ways, the relationship between a young girl and her grandfather, demonstrates the way in which a book can stimulate the discussion of personal experiences.

Crawford (1987) described the social significance of reader responses to John Burningham’s Grampa in one of his studies:

...”the differences evident in the reading of Grampa reflect the construction of individual texts within the reader’s heads, each shaped by many factors. Not the least of these factors is the unique social context and culture of which each reader has been a part. For each reader, the reading of Grampa involved a lived through experience of the text; an experience modeled and shaped by the sum total of all the relationships they had ever shared...each reading experience is a new event, deeply rooted in our social being and culture” (p.95)

Following the reading of Grampa in the kindergarten study, the teacher and children began their familiar literary discussion. Byron had said he liked the page where it says “That was not a nice thing to say to Grampa!” The teacher and children were discussing what the little girl might have said to Grampa. One student noticed that they were not facing one another and said it meant ‘you’re cross with someone’. Ben followed with ‘they’re being divorce’. The teacher explained that only people who are married get divorced, not a grandma and granddaughter. Amelia then put up her hand and said:

Amelia: My dad was going to marry Mum, but he didn’t, cause Mum didn’t want to marry my Dad, but my Mum still had a baby because my Mum and Dad were nearly going to get married but then they... (gestures by pushing out her hands in a sweeping motion) ...just didn’t... Amelia folds her arms and says in a somber tone:

CHAPTER 2 PAGE 117
Amelia: It was a pity...

In this example, Amelia used the collaborative class talk about a book to help an obviously significant personal experience. The teacher and other students recognised the sensitivity of this to Amelia and nodded empathetically. Amelia used this trusting, collaborative environment to intertextually share a personally sensitive event and develop insight into the complex world of relationships. The use of texts such as *Charlotte’s Web*, that lend themselves to reflective discussion, can help our understanding of complex social functions:

Literature is not just about story, it is about life and one’s world. It can act as a mirror to enable readers to reflect on life’s problems and circumstances; a source of knowledge; a means to peer into the past, and the future; a vehicle to other places; a means to reflect on inner struggles; an introduction to the realities of life and death; and a vehicle for the raising and discussion of social issues. Literature offers “endless possibilities” for readers to explore their world and learn from it, to enter “other worlds” and to engage in meaning making.

(Cairney, 1995, pp 77 - 78)

Other classroom studies of intertextuality confirm the high frequency of connections made between texts and students’ personal lives (Cairney, 1993, 1995a; Cytler & Barry, 1996; Short, 1992a, 1992b). The personal milieu of students in the kindergarten study provided a rich source from which texts were drawn and connected to classroom texts. Students frequently articulated connections between their families, pets, possessions, past experiences and outings with classroom texts involving reading, writing and discussion.

An example of this frequent occurrence follows with a connection made during an Allison Lector author study. The children were gathered on the mat with the teacher to read *Charlotte’s Web*. The children allowed the cover of the book and they began discussing some common features they noticed from cover pages of other Allison Lector books they had shared in class. They discussed the circles that often appear on the cover and the title, then Giles made this intertextual connection between an illustration and his family’s boat:

Giles: Do you know what those white birds are called?

Teacher: What?

Giles: They’re called albatrosses. Like my boat is called Albatross.

Teacher: Oh, is it? So it’s called after these white birds?

Giles: No, some different ones.

In this example, Giles draws on his personal milieu to intertextually construct meaning between the name of his boat ‘Albatross’ and the name of the white birds in this book.

Walks (1986) described learning as a search for meaning. An anomaly of some kind induces a learner to pause to consider and search for meaning. This process of learning from anomalies has been labelled “abduction” (Peirce, 1966) and is more likely to occur in environments that encourage opportunities for pursuing anomalies and making diverse connections. Short (1992a) drew on Peirce’s abduction theory (1966) to explain complex intertextual connections that occur in the social environment of elementary classrooms. Teaching and learning contexts in which students feel free to take risks in articulating their thoughts, allow them to construct meaning by expanding on anomalies or surprises.

The kindergarten students in this study made seemingly anomalous intertextual connections in their search for meaning between class texts and personal texts. The idiosyncratic nature of intertextuality (Cairney, 1992) became evident as students drew knowledge from their personal milieu to connect with new texts in the classroom.

The following example demonstrates this idiosyncratic search for meaning that occurred at times with the teacher not understanding or knowing the intertextual initiator or connective (Hodges-Bamess, 2000) to which the student was referring. However, the student inerrantly continued to articulate the connection. ‘Meagre offerings’ is a term used by Harris and Trelease.
(1995) to describe the type of anomalous intertextuality occurring when a student makes a connection between texts but does not elaborate sufficiently for the teacher to understand what connection is being made or what meaning is being constructed. This confusion of texts is often made more complex by the presence of competing intertextual agendas from students and teachers (Harris & Trease, 1997). In this example Byron provided a ‘meaning offering’ which was clearly imperative to him to articulate, but was not understood by the teacher.

During a grapho-phonological session the teacher was using a magnetic board to revise letters that had been studied so far before beginning to blend some of the letters to make consonant-vowel/consonant words. As a collaborative group the teacher and students had made 'am', 'mat' and 'fee', then Lara suggested changing the 'a' to 'i'. The teacher led the children to sound out the new word 'fit'. The children called out 'fit', then 'fitness', thereby changing the decontextualised word 'fit' with a more meaningful classroom context — 'fitness' is the word used by the class for their morning exercise program. Byron continued though with a very idiosyncratic intertextual connection. The teacher changed the magnetic letters again — firstly making 'y' then 'z'. Byron called out excitedly:

Byron: Isadorius rhyme's too!

(Teacher initially ignores Byron's remark and continues talking about 'fit'. Byron stands up and moves towards the teacher.)

Byron: Hey, isadorius rhyme
(The teacher asks him to sit down and then tell us please, and he does so.)

Byron: Isadorius rhyme!

Teacher (clarifying): Say that again, Byron?

Byron: Isadorius rhyme!

Teacher: Isadorius? What's that, Byron?

Byron: Oh, it's like, the, you know, it's, well, sometimes I change my name and I call it Isadorius.

Teacher: Do you? That's interesting.

In this example, Byron is making an intertextual connection to construct personal meaning in an idiosyncratic way. Although the teacher attempted to gain more information, it remained, in this case, a ‘meaning offering’. Cyler and Barry (1996) also found many examples of connections to seemingly dubious personal experiences and rather than evaluating veracity they viewed all students' comments as 'welcomed opportunities for making connections with the presented text'.

Reader Response theorists such as Riffee and Ervin (1993) define intertextuality as the “web of functions” that synchronise the relationships between text and intertext and noted the importance of intertextuality in gaining understanding when trying to ‘fill gaps’ in a text. The Reader Response movement located meaning within readers' interpretations rather than in the text. The notion of multiple interpretations of texts signals the next theme explored in the literature and revealed in the transcripts from the kindergarten study.

(iii) Multiple Meanings

In a criticism of structuralist notions of single, authoritative meanings in texts, Jacques Derrida (1976) introduced the term ‘deconstruction’ to describe peeling away the layers of meaning in a text to identify the frames of construction and the multiple views of reality (Englem and 1983; Selden, 1985; Stephens and Watson 1994.)

Rejecting the structuralist view of monological language, Bakhtin’s central concern was the complex nature of discourse (1919). His theory of language arose from the belief that any grammatical sentence has a multitude of potential meanings. Bakhtin used the term ‘dialogism’ to describe the interactive nature of language to generate multiple meanings: “there is no utterance without relation to other utterances” (Todorov, 1984, p.69). Kristeva (1969) built upon Bakhtin’s notion of dialogism and called it ‘intertextuality’.
Poststructuralists, such as Roland Barthes, asserted that readers can freely connect text with any system of meaning to make sense of our lived experience. "The aim of literature is to put meaning into the world, but not a meaning" (Sontag, 1982, p. 209). Barthes pointed out the plurality of meanings inherent in ‘text’ in his work ‘From Work to Text’.

The text is plural. This does not mean just that it has several meanings, but rather that it achieves plurality of meaning, an irreducible plurality. The Text is not existence of meanings but passage: traversal, the text’s plurality does not depend on the ambiguity of its contents, but rather on what could be called the stereographic plurality of the signifiers that weave it (etymologically the text is a cloth: texture, from which text derives, means “woven”) (1979, p. 76).

The next example from the data in the kindergarten study reveals the multiple meanings being made simultaneously during a shared reading session. This highlights the potential for confusion in a classroom context with a variety of intertextual connections occurring at the same time in our very brief classroom context. The following transcript shows a number of intertextual lines occurring by different participants and their eagerness to articulate the connections. It is also significant that this example depicts only the connections explicitly made. It is impossible to tell from this data what intertextual connections were tacitly made and not articulated.

The teacher and students were reading a factual text called How Children Lived. It describes what life was like for sixteen children living at different times in history and the toys with which they played. The teacher introduced the book by showing a page with a map of the world and pictures of the sixteen children.

Teacher: There are lots of little countries too we mustn’t forget, here is England and over here is New Zealand.

Jacob: My mummy lives in New Zealand.

Gareth (to Jacob): Yeah, you were born in New Zealand.

Teacher: (turning the page and reading the title)
Growing up in Ancient Egypt. Egypt!

Teacher is interrupted mid-way by Gareth saying:
Gareth: Did you know Jacob?

Teacher continues what she is saying but Gareth has knelt up and is trying to finish what he was saying...

Gareth: Do you know what...

Teacher: Egypt!

Amelia: ‘E’!

Teacher: We just talked about that Egyptian lady on our picture card. Egypt starts with?

Students chorus: ‘E’.

Gareth: Jacob.

Teacher: Yes, I know that ‘Gareth’ and (te class) capital ‘E’ starts ‘Egypt’ because it’s the name of a country.

Teacher continues showing the Egyptian page and saying how it was a long time ago and pointing out a picture of the Pyramids. She is interrupted by Jacob...

Jacob: You know what?

Teacher: Is it to do with Egypt, Jacob?

Jacob nods.

Jacob: You know what? I used to live in New Zealand.

During this brief dialogue, Jacob was connecting between the words New Zealand and his mummy. Gareth was dwelling on the fact that he knew Jacob was born in New Zealand and wanted to articulate it to the teacher, the teacher elicited intertextuality by emphasising the ‘E’ in Egypt and referring to the letter ‘E’ they had been discussing earlier during an alphabet session, and Amelia picked up on this reference to the letter ‘E’ and responded accordingly.

The simultaneous intertextual connections in this example highlight the need for the teacher to find the fine balance between trying to teach a specific curriculum outcome without diminishing the unique learning potential from the multiple meanings in texts.
Teacher explicitness of planned teaching and learning outcomes with the class can help to avoid the potential logistical problems of many voices trying to articulate their idiosyncratic connections. However, when students 'expect to connect' (Carney 1990b; Short 1992b) and are given the space to express and share connections, unplanned opportunities for learning take place. Other examples from the data (Rosche-Jamaican, 2002a) show that students will dwell on an intertextual connection until they are given the opportunity to articulate it, despite a lapse in time or change in classroom event. To assist students in their search for meanings between texts, the teacher needs to be prepared to stop, acknowledge, explain, change direction and/or simply listen.

Searching for connections across texts and life is a natural part of learning (Short 1992b) as we strive to construct meaning socially (Vygotsky 1978). The sharing of multiple intertextual links also exemplifies the development of collaborative, social relationships within the classroom community. When students share intertextual connections, knowledge about one another grows and new shared texts are built that become known and used by the community of learners. The complex relationships which evolve from intertextual collaboration provide the best pattern of relationships needed for a community of learners (Short & Burke 1991). The potential for intertextuality to develop a sense of community amongst learners is explored in the next theme.

(iv) Communities of Learners

As members of this kindergarten class articulated connections from their personal milieu, knowledge about one another increased and new, shared texts were created. This building of shared classroom texts is an important factor in developing a community of learners (Carney & Langbein 1989; Oyler & Barry 1996). The shared texts become a pool from which to draw future intertextual connections and foster collaborative relationships.

The work of psychologists such as Vygotsky (1978) and Bruner (1986) has emphasised the importance of relationships that exist in classrooms (Carney, 1995). A sociolinguistic perspective allows the interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects of literacy in educational settings to be explored (Greene & Wootk, 1987).

Semiotic theory underpins the sociolinguistic perspective and has been explored in many areas of educational research to examine its contribution to learning theory and literacy acquisition (Harste, Woodward & Burke, 1984; Short, 1984, 1986, 1987). In semiotics, text is defined as any sign that communicates meaning (Fiske 1981). The central tenet emerging from semiotics is that the message alone does not convey the meaning. Meaning is also derived from the context, code and the means of contact. Every message is made of signs that communicate meaning. Lemke (1992b) states that semiotic intertextuality is the cornerstone of understanding how meanings are made and used. If all social practices signify, then the meanings created in classrooms are shaped and transformed by the innumerable social contexts therein.

A number of intertextuality studies have been carried out from a sociocultural viewpoint. Carney (1988, 1990, 1992) found that students link texts in diverse ways, and while intertextuality has idiosyncratic elements, it is also a rich, social phenomenon. Bloomer & Egan-Robertson (1993) grounded their study of intertextuality in the social construction of identity. "People act and react to each other, and they do so primarily through language. Intertextuality describes one of the social (and cultural) processes involved in how people act and react to each other" (p.220).

Bloomer (1991) proposes that merely juxtaposing texts is insufficient for intertextuality to be present. He maintains that the juxtaposition must be proposed, internationally recognised, acknowledged and have social significance (p.289). Haak Dyson (1992) called for educators to acknowledge sociocultural breadth and depth in order to weave together texts and lives to allow for a complex classroom world with widened discourse boundaries. The teacher's ability to foster or hinder student interaction is a powerful influence on the building of students' intertextual meanings (Carney 1996). In their study of a first-grade classroom, Oyler & Barry (1996) examined what and how texts were juxtaposed, and the teacher's role in the construction of intertextuality. They found that when student connections were shared with the entire class, the remembered texts became shared texts thus building intertextuality among a community of readers" (p.320).
The sharing of intertextual connections in this kindergarten study helped to build a sense of community. Interestingly, the students did not view their peers’ connections as interruptions to texts; they invariably listened intently to one another, often building on the discourse. This next transcript shows how the teacher and students facilitated one another’s connections as they collaboratively constructed meaning about John Burningham’s books as part of the author study. The students’ comments display a growing knowledge of story structure through their intertextual connections.

This time the teacher was reading *Harvey’s Christmas Present* to the class, when Gareth said:

Gareth: In every page something happens (gestures with a look of his head), suggesting something happening repetitively and they can’t take Father Christmas any more.

Teacher: If you think about some of John Burningham’s other books that we’ve read you might have noticed a similar thing like that (Like Gareth, the teacher now gestures using a continuing motion with his hand).

Steven: Oh yeah, like ‘Oh Get Off Our Train’

Teacher: Yes, remember on ‘Oh Get Off Our Train’ somebody kept saying on each page (Teacher gestures again).

Several children begin chomping Patrick, John Norman...

Amelia: (sounding out over the top of the others, definitively) John Patrick Norman McHammonoy.

Teacher: That’s right, very similar - what else?

Amelia: (nods her head) You know that book that I was trying to look for the other day? Well that book was from John Burningham.

I think, I can’t remember, it was about a little girl who was late.

Steven: Yeah it was that one...I know what she uses.

The everyday events in this community of learners provided experiences from which intertextual links were made and new meanings constructed. The teacher’s role in facilitating intertextual interaction is pivotal to developing collaboration. The following transcript illustrates how a student’s intertextual connection between a class learning theme, a book from home and the daily ‘news’ ritual resulted in a new-found interest in class literary events.

This example took place when the class was studying books with special features such as ‘lift the flap’ pages, three dimensional devices, ‘peepholes’ and other kinaesthetic features. Jacob, a student who has had limited experience with books prior to school and pays little attention to print, connected the classroom theme to a book from home and brought it in to share with the class. This was seen as quite a breakthrough for this student, who until this time had shown a reluctance to contribute to any literary activities.

The class and teacher were seated in a circle for daily ‘news time’.

Jacob had earlier shown the teacher a book he wanted to talk about and he began to show it to the class:

Jacob: Well, I’ve got this book. My mum bought this from the supermarket and I don’t know what it’s called and my mum, my mum writes this all for me.

Teacher: What’s special about this book Jacob? Why did you bring it in?

Jacob: Because...because...

Teacher: You told me something earlier.

Jacob: It’s a lift the flap book.

Teacher: Yes, show us, it’s called ‘What’s behind the door at school’. Thank Jacob.

Amelia: Remember when I brought in... (begins singing) there were... (begins pointing) there were thing in the bed and the little one said, roll over, roll over?

Teacher: And that had...what did that have in it?

Amelia: ‘Flaps’.

Teacher: It had flaps (affirmatively).

Amelia: No, it didn’t have flaps. (She stands up) It had popups, it had arrows, (begins to move arms and legs excitedly). They went uuuuu-wooo, (uses arm swinging action to demonstrate). They had these arrows, popups, It had popups. (sits down).
The intertextual connection of a book with a classroom theme provided evidence of Jacob's growth in learning and desire to be a part of the community of readers which was rapidly developing in this classroom around the themes of class study. Jacob had previously paid little heed to class themes, choosing most frequently to play with blocks or other construction toys in the classroom. This was a catalyst for Jacob to begin sharing reading and writing tasks with peers and contributing to class discussion, allowing him to become part of the 'shared culture' (Clairney & Langhien 1989).

Amelia built upon Jacob's contribution to the discussion of 'books with special features' by connecting to a book she had brought in as part of the theme. This example also depicts Amelia moving and gestulating whilst talking about her book. Intertextual connections in this kindergarten room often involved physical movement to retrieve and demonstrate with a text and the use of gestures and movement to explain the connection. The students often needed to stand, move towards the teacher, physically retrieve the text to which they were referring, and articulating an intertextual connection. Oyler and Barry (1996) also found that students would get up from the group to retrieve other texts to which they were making reference.

Implications arise for the teacher to consider the physical classroom environment, ensuring students are able to physically move to articulate a connection. The need for space, accessibility to resources and freedom to move to resources appears to be important for some intertextual connections.

Providing a classroom climate which is conducive to making connections between texts and sharing them is an important role for the teacher. Encouraging and facilitating intertextual connections through curricular strategies such as group work, text sets and literary discussions assists students to support one another in their learning. Engaging students with themes for units of work and author studies also elicits intertextual connections and promotes collaboration by providing subjects for common interest which become the pool of texts from which learners draw and share their connections in their community.

3. CONCLUSION

The everyday events in this kindergarten classroom provided experiences from which intertextual links were made and new meanings constructed. The multitude of daily classroom events in which the kindergarten students were involved provided a framework of texts from which complex connections were made and new meanings constructed.

Themes from the literature on intertextuality provide a useful theoretical context for examining the connections made by the kindergarten students. These themes and examples suggest the importance of a classroom climate in which individuals are provided with time and mental 'space' for making, pondering and articulating intertextual connections from the everyday classroom events.

The teacher's role in facilitating intertextual interaction is an important enabling factor in developing collaboration. The teacher needs to be opportunistic to the unique idiosyncratic ways in which connections and learning proceed. The idiosyncratic nature of intertextuality requires the teacher to be flexible, to pick up on instances and to be the bridge builder of connections to new learning. Learning and connections do not necessarily happen at times or in ways planned by the teacher and thus the need to be aware of the potential learning at all times and the multiple meanings inherent in any text.

To encourage collaborative, intertextual discussion the teacher should ensure a wide variety of quality texts are available. There should be factual texts, literary texts, everyday texts such as newspapers and magazines, and access to technological texts. Quality texts which acknowledge and portray today's multicultural society, have multiple layers of meaning and lend themselves to inquiry oriented discussions (Harman & Allison 1996). Open-ended literacy engagements in the classroom will facilitate collaborative interaction.

The literature on intertextuality and these examples from a kindergarten study suggest that rich, social benefits can result from
a classroom climate in which the sharing of interdisciplinary connections and collaborative learning are encouraged and valued.
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Using intertextuality to enhance collaborative learning

Sharyn Roache-Jameson explains the nature of intertextuality with examples of intertextual connections from a study of kindergarten students. Ways of using intertextuality in the classroom to enhance collaboration are suggested.

When I read the following introduction to a newspaper travel article promoting a boating holiday, I feel a sense of collusion with the author:

'Judy Adamson hired a cruiser on the Hawkesbury, and discovered there really is nothing half so much worth doing as simply messing about in boats.'


I inwardly smile because the author, Judy Adamson, and I share a secret, rich knowledge of her text. We both know the author has 'borrowed' a line from Kenneth Grahame's Wind in the Willows, and as I read it I am immediately transported to that English classic tale where Ratty solemnly tells Mole that 'there is nothing—absolutely nothing—half so much worth doing as simply messing about in boats' as he urges Mole to abandon his spring cleaning and join him for a tranquil day of boating on the river.

This act of connecting one text to another text is called intertextuality. The first explanation of intertextuality — 'any text is the absorption and transformation of another' — by post-structuralist scholar Julie Kristeva (1967), led to its study across various academic disciplines and the finding that it plays a significant role in learning. Educational research has shown that increased understanding and learning can result from intertextual processes (Bloome 1992, Bloome & Egan-Robertson 1993, Cairney 1990b, 1992, Harris & Tresise 1997, Hartman 1990). Contemporary classroom research indicates that the collaborative discussion arising from intertextuality enriches classroom relationships (Cairney & Langbien 1989, Oyler & Barry 1996, Short 1992).

Intertextuality can be simply defined as 'the process of interpreting one text by means of a previously composed text' (Cairney 1992), the text being any meaningful act of communication, of any length, whether written, spoken or visual.

My own study of literacy in the kindergarten classroom (Jameson 1998) revealed kindergarten students frequently made intertextual connections, and the intertextual processes enhanced collaboration in the classroom, thus contributing to the development of a 'community of learners'.

In this study the intertextual connections articulated by the kindergarten students were classified across three domains: textual, contextual and personal (Roache-Jameson forthcoming). The textual domain referred to intertextuality that was concerned with textual elements such as characters, plot and genre. The contextual domain contained intertextual connections that were made during contexts that are unique to the classroom environment such as phonemic awareness sessions, writing tasks and alphabet learning. The personal domain comprised the many intertextual connections drawn from the students' personal milieux. These connections often referred to students' families, experiences and belongings.
Examples from the kindergarten classroom

1. Textual domain

A typical example of textual intertextuality occurred when the students were gathered on the mat with the teacher to listen to the book "Imaginative". This shared reading session was part of an Alison Lester author study. They begin by discussing some common features of the cover pages of Alison Lester books they have been reading. They discuss the circles that often appear on the cover and the titles, then the teacher begins reading and comes to the page where the characters in the book imagine they are at the Arctic. This prompts Gareth to connect to a previous book by Alison Lester:

Gareth: In The Journey Home they went to a snowy place.
Teacher: Yes they did go to a snowy place in The Journey Home.

Gareth is intertextually linking the illustrations of the Arctic in "Imaginative" with another Alison Lester book "The Journey Home" and demonstrates his growing awareness of events in stories. In this instance, he uses a 'remembered text' to frame or understand the current class text.

Past or remembered texts can help us to understand current texts. Similarly, current texts can illuminate past texts for us by adding a new layer of meaning to prior understanding.

Examples of intertextuality from the textual domain revealed that articulating connections often indicated new literary understandings and greater knowledge of text. An important implication for teachers is to provide a wide variety of quality texts from which intertextual connections will be made. There needs to be a rich array of texts including factual, fiction, magazines, newspapers and multi-media. High quality texts that portray cultural diversity will precipitate thought and discussion about society, relationships and values. Texts with multiple layers of meaning that lend themselves to open-ended classroom discussion and activities will encourage collaborative responses.

This next textual example demonstrates more complex intertextuality when the class is reading the book "Farmer Duck" by Martin Waddell. In this instance a character trait from a book is connected to a current playground game the students have made up, based on a popular television program.

Following the reading of the story, which was accompanied by literary strategies including 'Hot Seat' (Board of Studies, 1994) and 'Sketch to Stretch' (Cairney, 1995), the teacher and children have a literary discussion. They are discussing the last page where the duck is now the 'boss' and have agreed that the duck is a nicer boss than the farmer. William comments:

William: He's a nice boss.
Alanna: You're nice to me when we play Blue Heelers aren't you William?
Lianne: Yeah, cause you're the boss.
William: Yeah, I'm always the boss.

Interestingly, the students have used intertextuality to initially devise their playground game from a television show, an indication of the potency of popular culture in their lives. They then use their Blue Heelers text to intertextually construct meaning about relationships when reading "Farmer Duck" in the classroom. This demonstrates the capacity for intertextuality to provide collaborative discourse links that engender fellowship and build a sense of community.
2. Contextual domain
The next example of intertextuality is from the contextual domain and occurred during a phonemic awareness session, a context distinctive to a classroom. The class is seated on the mat and the teacher is using a magnetic board to revise the letters that they have studied so far. They have revisited the letter names, sounds and words that begin with these letters. The teacher then introduces the idea of blending. Firstly with vowel/consonant, as in 'at,' 'it,' 'am,' and then the word 'mat' is placed on the magnetic board. Several children identify it and call out 'mat.' The teacher says 'You can write that word because you know m-a-t' (pointing to each letter and spelling it out). This prompts Emma to say:

Emma: We’re sitting on a mat.

(Teacher: Jenna?
Jenna: I've got a cousin called, umm, Matt.
Teacher: Matt? Have you? My son's called Mat—it's short for Matthew.

(Overall five minutes later, following performing the rhyme 'I'm a little teapot' and discussing a worksheet the children are going to complete, and then performing the finger rhyme 'Six Little Indians', James has his hand up.)

Teacher: Yes James?
James: Matt... we sit on a little lunch when the grass is wet.
Teacher: Yes, mats, and you know how to write that word now.

In this example Emma has connected the isolated word 'mat' to a more meaningful context – 'we're sitting on a mat' thereby shedding light on this new 'text' and possibly illuminating other students' understanding. In turn, Jenna and James also connect the word 'mat' to a more meaningful context.

Interestingly, both Jenna and James tenaciously wait to make a statement on 'mat' even though in both instances the class discussion had moved on. This persistence or dwelling, was quite common and seems to indicate a need for students to actually articulate their connection despite a time lapse.

Intertextual connections from the contextual domain highlight the need for providing a classroom climate conducive to making connections between texts and articulating them. When students expect to connect and are given opportunities to express and share connections, new, and often unplanned, learnings take place.

The range of daily classroom events in which the students participated provided a framework of texts from which intertextual connections were made and new knowledge constructed. This suggests the importance of a classroom environment that encourages time and space to ponder and share connections in collaborative ways.

3. Personal domain
The most frequent type of intertextuality observed in this study proved to be in the personal domain. Students made connections between content in class texts, with texts from their personal milieu such as family relationships, home-life, personal experiences, belongings, pets, friends and even dreams. The following example shows how a book in class primes a student to articulate knowledge of butterflies and a statement about her father prompts another student to connect to her 'family's expertise'.

The teacher and students are gathered on the mat for a new book. The teacher begins singing a familiar song about a caterpillar and the children join in. The teacher then holds up the book The Very Hungry Caterpillar by Eric Carle. Emma begins to tell about how the circles on butterflies wings are called 'eyes' and they scare off predators, Samuel agrees with Emma saying 'yes, that's right'. Emma says she knows this because her father is an expert.

Elizabeth: David and my sister Sarah are experts at birds because David has a bird book and Sarah has binoculars and we have a huge back garden and it looks like a jungle and Dad has built us a cubby house there and it has little pools, um, little lily pads and...
Teacher: So lots of interesting things have happened there? Let's see what interesting things happen in this book...

In this example, students often made connections between content in class texts with similar events in their personal lives. The above example demonstrates the social significance of intertextuality when this occurs. We see that Emma proposes a connection that is acknowledged by Samuel and interactively recognised by Elizabeth and the teacher. This interaction indicates the influence of intertextuality as a social construction. It
enables the building of new shared texts that become a pool from which future intertextual connections will be drawn. This construction of shared texts enhances the collaborative nature of the classroom and helps to build relationships between class members.

Encouraging intertextuality
Teachers can facilitate intertextuality by encouraging the sharing of connections through classroom strategies such as group work, literary discussions and contexts which require students to interact and support one another in their learning. Planning themes for units of work, author studies and using a variety of multi-media texts grouped around a topic, will elicit intertextuality and promote the building of new shared texts. Anecdote relating is an important part of everyday life and teachers can capitalise on its potency by sharing anecdotes with students during classroom talking and writing sessions. We usually choose to relate an anecdote because it has some significance to us as humans — either funny, wondrous, embarrassing, joyful, scary, sad or puzzling. Providing glimpses of our own personal lives as teachers can help students to begin to examine their own experiences. The teacher’s role in encouraging and valuing the sharing of texts and connections is seen as pivotal in developing collaborative learning.

This study has highlighted the potential for intertextuality to enhance collaboration in the classroom and contribute to the development of a community of learners. The increased learning and social benefits that arise from a classroom that facilitates intertextual connections certainly justify the planning and management of strategies to ensure collaboration.
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A study of intertextuality and its links with literacy in a kindergarten classroom.

An overview of research in progress

Sharyn Jameson
District Literacy Consultant
NSW Department of Education & Training
Cnr Henry & Evan Streets,
Penrith. 2750

Introduction

This paper provides an overview of the formation and progression of a qualitative research project being undertaken to study intertextuality and its links with literacy development in a kindergarten classroom.

The study began with the rather broad aim of examining factors that influenced literacy in the kindergarten classroom where the researcher was also classroom teacher in 1995. Recognition of the complexity of literacy and the sociocultural nature of learning provided a theoretical framework from which to begin observing and analysing literacy development in this classroom throughout the year.

Data were collected from a variety of classroom literacy practices and initial analysis examined the data to identify any factors which appeared to influence literacy development. More and more frequently the researcher became aware of intertextual incidents in the data. Intertextuality was first defined by Kristeva (1969) and describes the process of interpreting one text by means of a previously composed text (Carney, 1992). Research across a number of academic fields has since led to more complex definitions of intertextuality and, in educational theory, its implications for learning.

The presence of intertextual events in this study and the implications they may have for literacy learning, precipitated the eventual focus for the study, namely, intertextuality. An exploration of the theory of intertextuality, its significance to literacy, and analysis of intertextuality in this kindergarten classroom, have become the central focus of this research.

This paper provides a summary of the relevant literature and outlines the research design and methodology. It describes some of the intertextual incidents emerging from the data and recounts the study progress to date.

This study will culminate in a thesis for a Master of Education (Honours) degree.

Review of the literature

Significant developments in the study of literacy learning during the past decade have had a strong influence on this researcher’s theoretical position. Classroom experiences, the observation of my own two children’s literacy development and my own literacy background have led me towards literature which acknowledges the complex, sociocultural nature of literacy and the implications for classroom practice.

In recent years the complex nature of literacy acquisition has been well documented (Carney, 1995; Christie, 1990; Clay, 1979; Medcalf, 1991; Unsworth, 1992). The complexity of literacy attracts enormous interest and controversial debate.
In 1995, as a practising classroom teacher with an avid interest in literacy and literature, I was interested in examining literacy to identify optimum conditions for promoting and developing literacy in the classroom.

There is an overwhelming amount of information available aimed at helping the classroom teacher foster literacy. Debates concerning various approaches to literacy can be bewildering to both teachers and parents. Having frequently witnessed and been intrigued by the idiosyncratic intricacies of the teacher's role, I was drawn towards teaching as a complex, social practice (Calder, 1995; Gee, 1996; Harste, Woodward & Burke, 1984; Heath, 1983; Luke, 1993; Salsken, 1993; Teale & Sulzby, 1986) rather than a code emphasised, linear process of skill acquisition.

An important development in the study of literacy, has been the advent of research in real life settings (Bloome, 1987). Psycholinguistics, such as Goodman and Goodman (1979) proclaimed the need to view reading and writing processes in the real world, not the laboratory. Educators expressed the need for research to be relevant to real classroom practices, rather than experimental settings. Stemming from anthropological and sociological traditions, ethnographic studies of literacy became more commonplace in education, and have led to literacy practices being examined as they occur in homes, families, communities and classrooms.

Several aspects of the literature have particularly influenced my beliefs concerning literacy learning, and hence, the literacy practices within the classroom. The following outlines the theoretical framework for classroom practices.

The sociocultural nature of literacy

The Australian Language and Literacy Policy defines literacy as:

The ability to read and use written information and to write appropriately, in a range of contexts.

It is used to develop knowledge and understanding to achieve personal growth and to function effectively in society.

Literacy also includes the recognition of number and basic mathematical signs and symbols within text.

Literacy involves the integration of speaking, listening and critical thinking with reading and writing.

Effective literacy is intrinsically purposeful, flexible and dynamic and continues to develop throughout an individual's lifetime.

All Australians need to have effective literacy in English, not only for their personal benefit and welfare but also for Australia to reach its social and economic goals.


This definition begins to recognise the complex, dynamic nature of literacy and constitutes a movement away from simplistic definitions that traditionally defined literacy as 'being able to read and write'. Luke (1993, p. 4) refers to literacy as "a dynamic, evolving social and historical construction whose standards and practices are contingent upon the agendas and power relations of institutions and communities, governments and cultures".

Meek (1991, p. 50) points out that "both language and literacy are in constant evolution - as language changes, as societies change, so what counts as literacy also changes". The knowledge, skills and behaviour of a 'literate' Australian in the 90's are vastly different to those of a person considered literate earlier this century. Christie (1990) concurs:

The contemporary world demands a level of sophistication in literacy greater than at any time in the past. It demands a people capable not only of handling the awesome range of print materials now a feature of a technologically advanced society, but also of creating and responding to new ones, for we do keep generating new kinds of writing, new kinds of genres, as a necessary part of generating new knowledge and new ways of thinking (p.21).

Along with the knowledge that literacy cannot be simply defined because of its constantly evolving nature, has been the growing recognition of the social construction of literacy.

Gee (1990) explains how we are socialised into certain literacy practices:

Every text is of a certain type (consider newspapers, political tracts, literature, lectures, political speeches, religious texts, comic books, school books and lessons, and so on through hundreds of varieties). Each type of text can be read in several different ways; meaning can be given to, or taken from, the text at a variety of levels.

Types of texts and the various ways of reading them are the social and historical inventions of various groups of people. One always and only learns to interpret texts of a certain type in certain ways through having access to, and ample experience in, social settings where texts of that type are read in those ways. One is socialised or enculturated into a certain social practice.... Thus the study of literacy ultimately requires us to study the social groups...
and institutions within which one is socialised to interpret certain types of words and certain sorts of worlds in certain ways. (pp. 45 - 46)

Heath's ethnographic study (1983) of communities in the Piedmont Carolinian region of the United States exemplifies the implications of enunciation. She studied the language acquisition and literacy habits of children from the communities of Roadville, Tracton and mainstream townspeople. Roadville was a small community of white, working-class families who had been a part of mill-working life for four generations. Tracton was a black working-class community whose older generations had been brought up on the land and now were employed by the mills. The 'townspeople' were blacks and whites, and were professionals who were seen as 'mainstream' (in common with the national mainstream middle-class presented in the public media), influential and yielding power. Heath found that the patterns of language use of the children of Roadville and Tracton illustrated sharply with those of the townspeople. The children of Roadville and Tracton frequently experienced failure at school while most townspeople children succeeded. The literacy practices valued in school were those that the townspeople had enunciated in their children.

Heath's research shows how the various literacy experiences of each culture prepared the children to differing degrees for school literacy success and failure and demonstrates the inextricable links between literacy and cultural practice.

The social construction of literacy has become a major focus of study in the past decade. Cairney (1995) explains that the shift from reading as a cognitive process, to reading as a complex cultural practice has been dependent on a number of differing influences from the research fields of psycholinguistics, psychology and sociolinguistics. He points out that the need to study children in 'real world' contexts arose from psycholinguistic scholars such as Goodman (1965, 1967), Harste (Harste, Woodward & Burke, 1983) and Snow (1983).

Hans Dyson (1992) called for educators to acknowledge sociocultural breadth and depth in order to weave together texts and lives for a complex classroom world with widened discourse boundaries.

The work of psychologists such as Vygotsky (1978) and Bruner (1986) has emphasised the importance of relationships that exist in classrooms (Cairney, 1995). Sociolinguistic theories of language, built upon the premise that "language is made as people act and react to one another" also played a crucial role in the move towards a sociocultural understanding of literacy (Cairney, 1995, p.11). Approaches to reading that focus primarily on skills acquisition, have led to a narrow view of reading that concentrates upon the intrapersonal context of reading, ignoring the interpersonal influences of instruction and classroom communication. A sociolinguistic perspective of literacy allows the interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects of literacy in educational settings to be explored (Greene & Weade, 1987).

Luke (1993) maintains:

To become literate, children must master conventionalised linguistic and symbolic codes for constructing and deconstructing meanings with and around written texts. They must develop both implicit and explicit, tacit and active knowledge of how written language works and its possibilities for access to and the representation of culturally significant ideas, concepts and beliefs. But to use literacy to realise sociocultural power, they also need to deploy language to conceptualise and realise goals and alternatives in specific social relationships and situations...Literacy is therefore much about ideology, identities and values as it is about codes and skills. (pp. 8 - 11)

Cairney (1995) agrees that literacy is not a single unitary skill. "There are many forms of literacy, each with specific purposes and contexts in which they are used...To understand literacy fully we need to understand the groups and institutions in which we are socialised into specific literacy practices (Bruner, 1986; Gee, 1990)" (p.11).

Simultaneous skills-based definitions of literacy have given way to broader definitions of literacy in the 90's. The new definitions of literacy acknowledge the multiple forms of literacy and the dynamic nature of literacy as a social and cultural process. However, this broadened outlook towards literacy has not empowered all learners.

Recent research shows that literacy achievement is influenced by social class, ethnicity and geographical location (Cairney, 1995; Gee, 1990; Luke, 1993). Cairney (1995) and Luke (1993) highlight the inequity of classroom practices:

Even in the everyday functioning of the classroom it seems that critical decisions are made which limit some children's opportunities for learning. (Cairney, 1995, 14) All literate practices are not of equivalent power in terms of the socio-educational benefits and cultural knowledge they yield. Nor do schools successfully impart to all socially powerful or critical literacies. (Luke, 1993, p. 17.)

Teachers are faced with the dilemma of how to socialise students into the literacy practices that will ultimately empower (Cairney, 1995; Luke, 1993)
calls for critical social literacy in the classroom which recognises cultural class and gender differences and offers more inclusive literature and literacy curriculum. Caimin (1985, p. 16) advocates less concern with debates over methods and more concern with the interactions and relationships that are permitted and encouraged in classrooms whilst reflecting on the extent to which individuals are empowered or disempowered by our literacy practices.

Solsken (1993) takes the underlying assumptions of the social construction of literacy perspective further to examine the learning and teaching of literacy as part of status and dominance relations in the larger society. She calls this perspective 'literacy as social status and identity'. In her study of literacy, gender and work in families and in school, Solsken found that children, like adults, strive to be counted as members of social groups and to be recognised as unique individuals. The day-to-day choices children make in classroom negotiations, are made within the constraints of and have consequences for, broader social processes. (p. 9)

Bruner (1974, cited in Cley, 1978, p. 271) draws our attention to the complex issues facing the classroom teacher:

How one manages to time the steps of pedagogy to match unfolding capacities, how one manages to instruct without making the learner dependent and how one manages to do both of these while keeping alive zest for further learning - these are very complicated questions that do not yield answers.

Hurstie, Woodward and Burke (1984) suggest a formula for literacy development whereby "experience" transacts with "print settings" leading to new levels of psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic activity. (p. 30) Hurstie et al found distinct patterns in literacy learning in their study of young children which lead them to stress the need for open-entry language activities in which constraints are allowed to evolve in a risk-free environment.

Unsworth (1993) warns that "there is no place in the classroom of the 1990s and beyond for the austere traditional teaching of the past with its mechanistic transmission of knowledge and passive, receptive learning." (p. 44)

Classroom teachers need to be mindful that children's access to knowledge and literacy practices is dependent upon their social position (Caimin, 1995; Gee, 1990; Luke, 1993; Unsworth, 1993).

DEVELOPING COMMUNITIES OF READERS AND WRITERS

The acknowledgment of literacy learning as a social and cultural process has implications for the classroom environment. Caimin (1989) suggests:

Classrooms are living evidence of the complex social nature of literacy. The teacher and the class are talking, learning, reading and writing as parts of a dynamic community. Literacy is being learned as children relate to each other, meaning is being created within a complex community of relationships. (p. 561)

Teachers need to provide classroom environments where children value reading and writing as natural extensions of their lives and where they can grow and share as members of a literate community (Caimin, 1995, p. 17). There is a need to create communities of learners (Hart, 1986; 1990; Caimin, 1989; Johnson, 1993).

Senge (1990) explains a learning community as "an organisation where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free and where people are continually learning how to learn together".

Three significant features are evident in 'communities of schoolers': self-organisation, generative learners and self-sustenance, states Johnson (1993). Communities are developed through vision, planning, preparation and hard work under the leadership of a teacher. A community of scholars is not restricted to a certain grade or age. "The differences between a Grade 3, Grade 7, Grade 10 or university level community of scholars would rest more with the nature of the texts with which the learners engage and the extent of the world knowledge that they bring to them rather than a stage of development or any particular set of skills." (p. 44)

In learning communities:

- students are empowered, self-directed and committed learners
- teachers and administrators are themselves committed learners with well developed habits of continuous inquiry and reflection; they are life long learners who recognise the complexities of teaching and recognise that they need continually to deepen their knowledge of teaching and learning processes
- the principal is the leading learner, who models lifelong learning and facilitates the learning of all members of the community
- parents are learning partners
- there is a learning-focused work environment in which both formal learning activities and informal, workplace learning are valued.
GUIDED PARTICIPATION

Vygotsky (1978) identified the 'zone of proximal development' in children. This zone refers to the development potential of a child when problem solving occurs with adult guidance or more capable peers, compared with the actual developmental level when involved in independent problem solving (p. 86). Vygotsky believed that teaching towards actual developmental levels is ineffective and that the zone of proximal development is critical for learning to occur (p. 87). Vygotsky's concept of 'inter-subjectivity' describes the process humans engage in when collaborating; it involves a sharing of focus and purpose between a child and another more skilled or knowledgeable person (Cairney, 1995, p. 37).

Bruner (1983, 1986) suggested the process of 'scaffolding' to guide children through the zone of proximal development. The process of scaffolding involves an enabling adult helping the child by guiding the learning task and segmenting the task into manageable components.

Cairney (1995) uses Bruner's term 'scaffolding' to describe the behaviour of an enabling person helping a student engage in an aspect of learning beyond their current level of development (p. 46). Rogoff (1990) built upon the theories of Vygotsky and Bruner to develop the concept of guided participation.

Guided participation involves children and their caregivers in the collaborative processes of (1) building bridges from children's present understanding and skills to reach new understanding and skills, and (2) arranging and structuring children's participation in activities, with dynamic shifts over development in children's responsibility (p. 8).

THE USE OF LITERATURE

Although Cairney (1995) reminds us that literature-based instruction is not the only means of acquiring literacy, and stresses the need to recognize multiple pathways to literacy, much has been written about using literature in the classroom.

"The way children are taught to read tells them what adults think literacy is. If we want our children to read more competently and sensitively in order to live more richly and to contribute to what is to be read, then we have to move beyond a utilitarian view of literacy..." (Meek, 1982, p. 18). The most important single lesson that children learn from texts is the nature and variety of written discourse - the different ways that language lets a writer tell and the many and different ways a reader reads (Meek, 1988, p. 21).

Sixby (1983) states:

The most important factor in developing literary skills is early access to literature, in the first place to the oral literature of nursery rhymes and folk and fairy tales and then to books which will immediately capture interest, stir the imagination and absorb the listener into the world of story... True literature nourishes the mind, promotes sensory awareness, develops emotional sensitivity and provides a rich linguistic environment... A reader's experience is constantly being enriched by language, and at the same time language is sharpening experience because it is providing the tool by which to recognise and name it (pp. 57 - 61).

The emphasis on literature in classrooms today has arisen from development in theoretical understandings of the reading process since the 1970s. Whilst there is still debate concerning the reading process itself, there is universal consensus that reading is a complex meaning-based process requiring the interaction of text and reader based factors (Cairney, 1995, p. 4).

This two-way interactive process of reading reflects the transactional theory of reading developed by scholars such as Rosenblatt (1978) and Eco (1979). They proposed that "reading involves a transaction between a reader and a text which leads to the creation of a new text that is unique to each reader". Transactional theory reflects the social constructivist notions of knowledge (Cairney, 1995, p. 4). Rosenblatt (1978) stresses the need for literary experiences which involved 'aesthetic reading' as opposed to 'efficient reading'.

Cairney (1995, pp. 77 - 78) suggests that literature can fulfill many complex functions:

Literature is not just about story, it is about life and one's world. It can act as a mirror to enable readers to reflect on life's problems and circumstances; a source of knowledge; a means to peer into the past, and the future; a vehicle to other places; a means to reflect on inner struggles; an introduction to the realities of life and death; and a vehicle for the raising and discussion of social issues... Literature offers "endless possibilities" for readers to explore their world and learn from it, to enter "other worlds" and to engage in meaning making.

Bruner (1986) uses the term 'subjectivity' to describe how literature "reads the world less fixed, less banal, more susceptible to recreation... literature, in this spirit, is an instrument of freedom, lightness, imagination, and yes, reason. It is our only hope against the long gray night".

Chambers (1981) describes what enabling adults...
(teachers) need to do to create the reading environment that will allow children to discover literature.

They (teachers) provide books and time to read them and an attractive environment where people want to read. They stimulate a desire to become a thoughtful reader. They demonstrate by reading aloud and by their own behavior what a "good" reader does. And they respond, and help others respond, to the individuality of everyone in the reading community they belong to. (p. 92)

Carney (1995, p.89) contends that it is the instructional model within which texts are embedded that is critical to the transformation of literacy in classrooms. Factual texts, technological and media approaches are other alternatives that should be present in classroom teaching and learning situations.

The foregoing provides an outline of the literacy theory underpinning the classroom teaching and learning practices in 1993. As the focus of the study has shifted towards intertextuality, an extensive review of the literature is seen as necessary to trace the evolution of intertextuality theory and its significance to literacy learning. For the purposes of this paper, a summary of this literature will be given.

**INTERTEXTUALITY**

Saxby (1993, p.61) states that enrichment from reading is a spiralling process. "Each new book that is assimilated into the reader's experience provides new insights that can be brought to bear on the next book read". This describes the basic notion of intertextuality. Intertextuality can be defined as "the process of interpreting one text by means of a previously composed text" (Carney, 1992, p. 502).

Intertextuality has woven a complex, labyrinthian path through various academic disciplines. This summary will attempt to explain some of the pathways - particularly those seen as relevant to this study.

Post-structuralist scholar, Julia Kristeva (1967, translated in 1980) was the first to attempt an explanation for the notion of intertextuality: "any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another" (p.66). Barthes (1979, p. 77) stated that "every text is the intertext of another text".

Following Kristeva's initial description, there has been extensive research into intertextuality throughout various scholarly fields. Wotton and Still (1990) allude to this in their definition:

Intertextuality - it should come as no surprise - is a promiscuous inter-discipline, or even a trans-discipline, certainly a transverse discipline in that it constantly borrows its trappings now from psychoanalysis, now from political philosophy, now from economics and so on. Its practitioners enjoy playing with their own words (newly coined) and even more so with other people's. (p. viii)

The pathway of intertextuality research through the academic disciplines of Literary Criticism, Semiotics, Cognitive Literacy Theory and the Social Construction of Literacy are of particular relevance to this study. In order to determine the patterns and importance of intertextuality in a kindergarten classroom, it is helpful to gain an understanding of the genesis of intertextuality in each of these various disciplines.

**Literary Theory**

Literary criticism is the home of intertextuality. The theory of intertextuality states that a text cannot exist as a hermetic whole for two important reasons. Firstly, because the writer is a reader of texts, the written text is always influenced by references of all kinds from the various texts experienced prior to writing. Secondly, the reader of the text brings with him or her a wealth of prior experiences which may lead the reader to an interpretation of the writing, different to that which the writer proposed. Conversely, a reference to a work by

the writer, which is unknown to the reader, will have a passive effect during that particular reading.

Wotton and Still (1990) refer to these two fundamental aspects, texts entering via authors and texts entering via readers, as the 'axes of intertextuality' (p.2).

Whilst the term intertextuality was only used from the 1960s, the phenomenon itself occurred from the beginnings of human society whenever there has been discourse about texts. Wotton and Still (1990), in their introductory chapter of an entire book devoted to intertextuality in literary criticism, trace the roots of intertextuality back to our earliest orators such as Plato and Aristotle. The twentieth century has seen the emergence of intertextuality theorists in literary criticism. One of the earliest influential theorists was Bakhtin who stated that "there is no utterance without relation to other utterances" (Todorov, 1984, p.60). Post-structuralists such as Roland Barthes began to assert that readers can freely connect text with any system of meaning to make sense of our lived experience - "The aim of literature, Barthes asserts is to put meaning into the world, but not a meaning" (Somlai, 1982, p. xi). In 'The Pleasure of the Text' (1975), Barthes states intertextuality is "the impossibility of living outside the infinite text - whether this text be Proust or the daily newspaper or the
television screen: the book creates the meaning, the meaning creates life" (p.36). Reader response theorists such as Rifkin (1990) define intertextuality as the "web of functions" that synchronise the relationships between text and intertext. Rifkin states the importance of intertextuality for readers to gain understanding when trying to "fill gaps" in a text (pp. 56 - 57). The Reader Response movement located meaning within the reader's interpretation rather than in the text.

Semiotics

The semiotic discipline arose from the work of Pierce (1931) and Saussure (1966). Semiotics, the study of signs, generated interest in a number of educational researchers who developed a semiotic perspective on reading comprehension (Eco, 1976; Harste Woodward & Burke, 1984; Short, 1987). Hartman (1990) sums up their collective wisdom thus: "...they examine how language, and thereby reality, is constructed. Semiotics examines how our reality is already constructed for us by the language and interpretations of our culture - an external reality is always interpreted because it is mediated by a system of cultural signs" (pp. 1 - 12). Lemke (1992) sees semiotic intertextuality as the cornerstone of our understanding of how meanings are made: "The meanings we make through texts, and the ways we make them, always depend on the currency in our communities of other texts ... we can make meanings through the relations between two texts: meanings that cannot be made within any single text" (p.257).

Cognitive Literacy Theory

Literacy from a cognitive perspective is viewed as a body of cognitive knowledge about written language (prior knowledge) and a set of processes for using that knowledge (schema theory). This theory suggests that readers make use of visual information in the text to guide them in selecting and using their own knowledge to make sense of the text (Hartman, 1990, p5). By the use of prior knowledge and schema theory, meaning is constructed by connecting knowledge fragments into a particular configuration to fit a given context. Hartman used the cognitive tradition to examine the intertextual links made by able readers as they read multiple passages. Hartman reports that readers do transpose texts into other texts, absorb one text into another, and build a mosaic of intersecting texts. He found two general types of intertextual links occurring. Those between ideas, events and people; and those links made between the readers themselves to the passages in the form of a discourse stance (p.171) Hartman concludes that able readers use a variety of ways to read; reading is "an intertextual enterprise where readers transpose, absorb and intersect texts as they zig-zag their way through passages (iii).

Social Construction of Literacy

The basic tenets of sociocultural research are drawn from cultural anthropology and sociolinguistics theory. Literacy viewed from a sociocultural perspective is seen as "a community's ways of using written language to serve social purposes" (Solsken, 1995, p.4). The social context is central to meaning making, as Carney (1995) describes, "types of discourse and the way we read or write them are the social constructs of specific groups. Individuals are enculturated into these practices and these meanings" (p.2).

A number of intertextuality studies have been carried out from a sociocultural perspective. Carney (1988, 1990, 1992) found that students link texts in diverse ways, and while intertextuality has idiosyncratic elements, it is also a rich, social phenomenon. Bloom & Egan-Robertson (1993) ground their study of intertextuality in the social construction of literacy. "People act and react to each other, and they do so primarily through language. Intertextuality describes one of the social (and cultural) processes involved in how people act and react to each other" (p.220). Bloom (1991) proposes that merely juxtaposing texts is insufficient for intertextuality to be present. He maintains that the juxtaposition must be proposed, intertextually recognised, acknowledged and have social significance (p.259).

Kathy Short (1992a) draws on Peirce’s abduction theory (1966) to explain complex intertextual connections that occur in the social environment of elementary classrooms. Short examined the use of ‘literature circles’ and ‘text sets’ in classrooms to explore the processes and strategies that occur in intertextuality, rather than just the types of connections. She calls for further research in classroom learning environments which support collaborative social relationships to gain insights into how intertextuality assists meaning making.

Oyler & Barry (1996) examined what and how texts were juxtaposed, and the teacher’s role in the construction of intertextuality, in their study of a first-grade classroom. They found that student connections were shared with the entire class and remembered texts became shared texts thus building intertextuality among a community of readers” (p.328).

In order to understand what shapes and mobilises reading instruction in early school years, there is a need for more in depth examination of the intertextual complexities that exist within it, conclude Harris and Treadie from their study of intertextuality in a kindergarten classroom (1997).

Wolf and Heath (1999) allude to intertextuality in their study of children and literature: "Children, at
particular ages, moods and moments, will see and remember certain details that trigger the memory of a particular piece of speech, fragment of scene, gesture or facial expression and its connection to a recent event" (p.109).

This outline provides a very brief introduction to the theoretical history of intertextuality and some of the educational research into this phenomenon. The literature will continue to be examined in and elaborated upon as the research project progresses.

THE RESEARCH SETTING

The study has been undertaken in a kindergarten classroom in a government primary school situated in the Blue Mountains of NSW. The school has a total enrolment of approximately 330 students.

The kindergarten class comprised 22 children, 21 of whom were in their first year of schooling and one student who was repeating kindergarten.

The class were observed by the researcher (who was also the classroom teacher) throughout the school year, in initially providing a rich description of literacy development and to examine what factors influenced literacy. The study examines the whole class generally, and specifically focuses upon six children who were observed more intensively. The families of these children participated in interviews and completed questionnaires relating to home literacy practices.

The researcher collected a variety of data throughout 1995 which are currently being analysed. Initial data analysis included the study towards a focus on intertextuality.

The data analysis and literature review will culminate in an examination of intertextuality theory, a description of intertextual events in this classroom and the implications for literacy teaching and learning practices.

Qualitative research was considered appropriate for examining literacy development in a kindergarten classroom as it enables the researcher, who was also the classroom teacher, to directly observe and record the dynamic, sociocultural nature of classroom life as it naturally occurs.

DATA MANAGEMENT

Data Collection

A variety of ethnographic techniques were used for data collection. Data were collected in five broad categories:

- Student school achievement
- Teaching methodology

A summary of data collection procedures is provided in Table 1.

Data Analysis

The study began with very general research question: 'What factors influence literacy development in this classroom?', to provide an initial path for exploring the collected data. As the focus of the study shifted to intertextuality, the following research questions were generated:

Research Questions:

- What is the theoretical history of intertextuality?
- In what ways do kindergarten students use intertextuality to construct meaning in classroom literacy practices?
- What patterns of intertextuality are evident in literacy practices observed in this kindergarten classroom?
- What role does intertextuality play in young children’s literacy development?

It is recognised that the formulation of research questions is an iterative process and may need re-formulating as the data analysis proceeds.

Data Analysis procedures

The first stage of analysis involved watching the video recordings of classroom literacy practices to identify any factors that appear to influence literacy. During this stage it became apparent that intertextual incidents were frequently occurring. It was decided to focus upon these phenomena and examine them for links with literacy.

The video recordings were observed and all intertextual events transcribed. The second stage of data analysis involves investigation of these intertextual events to determine implications for literacy learning.

Much of the data will be stored and analysed using a computer program designed for qualitative research analysis. NUDIST, (Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing, Searching and Theorising), assists in managing complex data efficiently and allows for coding and theory construction to be explored and carried out.

Initially the data will be analysed speculatively to allow for tentative reflection by the researcher and any emergence of patterns (Woods, 1986). Data analysis will be undertaken using the principles of grounded theory developed by Glaser and Strauss.
(1967) and incorporating the inductive coding techniques described by Strauss and Corbin (1990). "Grounded theory" involves the intense analysis of data using constant comparison and coding to produce a well constructed substantive theory, relevant to the specific site.

Spradley (1980) describes a "developmental research sequence" using domain analysis and taxonomic analysis which is also helpful for analysing intertextuality in this study.

**Trustworthiness**

A range of strategies will be used throughout this study to ensure trustworthiness of the data. Miles and Huberman (1994, p.263) suggest 13 tactics aimed at ensuring the quality of the data, examining findings and taking a skeptical look at emerging explanations. The major strategy employed for trustworthiness will be triangulation:

**Triangulation** is a term that has been used to refer to multiple sources of data, gathering information from three points of view and also to the use of multiple strategies for trustworthiness. (Burges, 1984)

**PRIVACY AND CONSENT**

Permission to carry out this research was obtained from the NSW Department of School Education prior to commencing the study.

The purpose of the research is explained to all parents and consent was requested for each child's participation in the project. Parents were also asked to indicate their willingness to participate in interviews concerning home literacy background and practices.

Any information or personal details gathered in the course of this research will be treated as confidential. No identifying information will be published without written permission from parents.

**TIMEFRAME**

This study began in 1995. Data collection was completed in December, 1995. Data management and analysis has been ongoing and will continue for some time. The study will culminate in a thesis for a Master of Education (Honours) degree.

---

**Table 1 - Data Collection Procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data to be collected</th>
<th>Data collection techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student's home literacy background</td>
<td>Interview, observation, literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student literacy development</td>
<td>Work samples, teacher's assessment records, student attitude surveys, audio recordings of student conferences, field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student school achievement</td>
<td>Assessment using English profiles, standardized test results and written reference profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methodology</td>
<td>Teaching program, assessment records, reading books, NSW English syllabus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**The Story So Far...**

The study began in February, 1995. After obtaining permission from the NSW Department of School Education to conduct this qualitative research project, I informed parents of the nature of the study and requested their consent for each child to participate.

I began collecting data from the very first days of the school year. Initially I wrote field notes and recorded children using video and audio cassette on very much an ad hoc basis. I soon found the need to be more methodical in my data collection and devised a timetable which ensured a more systematic variety of classroom literacy practices were recorded each week. I also set aside a specific weekly time for writing rich field notes in addition to the copious anecdotal notes written on the run during the busy school day. Table 2 outlines this data recording timetable.
Table 2 - Data Collection Timetable

Monday:
- Field Notes
- Video - Alphabet session
- Shared reading
- Independent Writing
- News
- Literature response
- U SSR
- Audio - Writing conference

Wednesday:
- Anecdotal notes
- Video - English Groups
- Guided writing
- Independent writing
- Shared reading
- U SSR
- Audio - Writing conference

Thursday:
- Anecdotal notes
- Audio - Writing conference

This timetable was adhered to for most of the year - although the inevitable interruptions to routines that occur so often in classrooms sometimes necessitated skipping some days! This was often made up for by the recording of special classroom events such as the Bookweek Parade, Family Silent Reading, etc.

By the end of the school year I had amassed a mountain of data! Hours of work lay ahead in transcribing the 50 hours of video tape and 15 or so hours of audio tape, not to mention: a year's collection of work samples, field notes, anecdotal records and all the teaching and assessment records to be waded through! Delamont's (1992) words haunted me: "the most important thing is not to allow material to pile up unanalysed, or even worse, unread. Unfortunately, my circumstances as fulltime teacher, fulltime participant researcher, fulltime mother, wife, daughter, sister, friend, etc., etc., precluded me from heeding Delamont's caution... so there I sat in December 1995 with material piling up - mostly unanalysed!

Firstly, I needed a starting point. My initial idea was to focus upon the whole class generally and then narrow the study to concentrate more fully on the 6 focal children. This would entail transcribing the video recordings (and 50 hours!) in chronological order - this seemed an insurmountable task to begin with.

I decided to change task and begin with the focal children. I saw three main components to the study at this stage:

- analysing the focal children's data
- reviewing the literature about literacy
- reviewing the literature about qualitative research

Devising a study plan in January 1996 that enabled me to begin the compilation of focal children profiles and continue with readings on literacy and qualitative research, provided a starting point for tackling the data.

As I began this initial analysis of the video recordings, I became aware of the frequent intertextual events occurring. I began reading the literature on intertextuality and became fascinated with its implications for learning. I also became aware of the importance of intertextuality in my own life and learning. At last, I had found the focus for my study!

During 1996 I undertook training in the use of NUDIST, a computer software program for qualitative analysis. I am now using NUDIST for my data storage, coding, searching and analysis.

In 1997 I became Literacy Consultant for the Penrith District of NSW Department of School Education. Consequently my time is very much at a premium. I try to work to a weekly study plan which includes a designated time for data analysis, reviewing the literature and increasing my knowledge of qualitative research methods. This is quite a gruelling task, being squeezed in with my other commitments. As a result some weeks go by with me despairing because my study has been neglected.

At these times I am consoled by Pollard's (1985) paper "Opportunities and difficulties of a teacher-ethographer" and the knowledge that someone has already been through it! Pollard concluded that "the research process as a full participant was often tiring, frustrating and difficult, and yet it was also fascinating and very rewarding to identify patterns in the data and to have the experience of step-by-step, attempt to construct a deeper understanding of the events and social relationships to the extent which I daily participated" (p.232)

The study is at an interesting stage as analysis of the intertextual incidents from the video recordings occurs. Fundamental to any study of intertextuality is an understanding of what constitutes a text. Just as intertextuality evolved into increasingly complex definitions as it was studied, so too has the notion of 'text'. The following definitions illustrate this increasing complexity:

Pierce (1931):

A text is any sign that communicates meaning.

Wright (1972):

While a text can be something tangible, it need not be, it can also be those experiences
and ideas that are remembered or constructed in the mind.

Hartman (1992)

Although we usually think of the text as the subject one reads - a textbook, a section of a passage, or the alphanumeric code printed on a page - it need not be confined to the boundaries of printed language. A text includes both linguistics and non-linguistics signs. (p. 296)

Worton & Still (1990)

'Text' is used both in the restricted academic sense to mean 'a work of literature' and in the wider sense to mean anything which can be perceived as 'a signifying structure' from the spectrum of nature to social codes. (p. viii)


Texts should be defined as meaningful configurations of signs intended to communicate.

Bloom & Egan-Robinson (1993)

A text is the product of textualising. People textualise experience and the world in which they live, making those phenomena part of a language system. The result of textualisation experience can be a set of words, signs, representations, etc. But it might be other forms and products not usually associated with texts: architecture, rock formations, the stars in the sky, the wind, the ocean, emotion - these can all be texts, but their being texts depends on what people do. The stars in the sky are only a text if they have been made so, if they have been textualised. In brief, text is something done by people to experience (broadly defined). (p. 311)

Short (1992)

A text is any chunk of meaning that has unity and can be shared with others. A song, dance, poem, oral story, mathematical equation, or sculpture are all texts from which learners can draw connections as they construct their understandings about a current evolving text.

For the purposes of this study, I am currently defining text as 'a textualised experience which may include a book, video, film, or a verbalised personal experience'. My working definition for intertextuality is 'the explicit connection of texts which enhances meaning to the initiator, within a situational context', in this case, the classroom.

The video recordings of the literacy practices in this kindergarten classroom throughout the year have now been observed and all intertextual incidents have been transcribed and stored on VHS. The intertextual incidents are currently being 'open coded' (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) and pattern searching has commenced.

INTERTEXTUAL INCIDENTS EXAM-...
Example 3

Inter-textual Connection - Book to Media

* Video 1 - 4
* 20/3/95

Shared Reading - Imagine

* Reading continues and they come to the page of dinosaurs:
  * Alanna: Well, I have a video at home all about dinosaurs and there’s a longneck and Sean lent it to me.
  * Teacher: Right, Elizabeth?
  * Elizabeth: Well, I’ve got a video called the Land Before Time and there’s a little dinosaur called Little Foot.
  * Adrian: Hey, I’ve seen that too.
  * Emma: I’ve got a video about dinosaurs.

* Several others mention videos about dinosaurs too.

The students are linking the Alison Lester book ‘Imagine’ to videos about dinosaurs.

Example 4

Inter-textual Connection - Phonemic Awareness to Student Knowledge

* Context - Teacher and students are discussing the letter ‘N’. T and chin are now jointly constructing the class big alphabet book for the ‘n’ page. One child has suggested ‘needlework’ and T is drawing and writing it on the board.

  * Adrian: My nanna does knitting and needlework.
  * Elizabeth: I’m trying to do knitting...I’m trying to knit a scarf for myself.
  * T: We’re going to do some needlework ourselves, in class.

Adrian is linking the word ‘needlework’ to a personal context and prompts Elizabeth to do so also.

Example 5

Inter-textual Connection - Phonemic awareness to Known Rhyme

* Video 9 - 6
* Alphabet
* 21/3/95

* Context - T and chin are studying the letter P. T reads ‘Lucy and Tom’s Alphabet book’ first then they look at alphabet cards, make body shapes of the letters and begin making the P page for the KS alphabet book.

* OC - When chin are calling out words for the KS alphabet book, these are good examples of background knowledge, not ITX, because no links are made, eg Alanna calls out pencil, Giles calls out peg. Ben N says pig, etc. BUT then Alanna says:
  * Alanna: Peter Piper!
  * Giles: (in a singsong voice) Peter Piper...
  * Alanna: Hey, Peter Piper picked a peck of Peter Piper pepper
  * Emma: Pied Piper
  * Chin laugh

  * Alanna continues saying the tongue twister to chin around her. T is drawing on the big alphabet book and is ignoring all of this.

Alanna is linking the word to a rhyme but then Emma links the rhyme to a story character - Pied Piper.

Example 6

Inter-textual Connection - Book to Personal Possession

* Video 1 - 4
* 20/3/95

Shared Reading - Imagine

* T and chin are still reading the page about the Arches:

  * Giles: Do you know what those white birds are called?
  * Teacher: What?
  * Giles: They’re called albatrosses. Like my boat is called albatross.
  * Teacher: Oh, is it? So it’s called after these white birds?
  * Giles: No, some different ones.

Giles is linking the illustration of albatrosses to his boat.

One of the dilemmas of this study is deciding what is an inter-textual incident and what is an expression of background knowledge. The following example illustrates the type of statement that is being identified as simply background knowledge in comparison to the richness of inter-textual examples:

Example 7

Background Knowledge

* Video 9 - 4

* Discussion about books with special features - lift the flap, etc.

* 21/3/95

* OC - Example of background knowledge - T shows a ‘Spot’ book and says “What do you know about these hunks?” Adrian says “They’re lift the flap books.” No link is explicitly made.

Some incidents are being coded as ‘questionable’ intertextuality - the categorisation of these types of incidents will become more definitive as the study proceeds and the definitions of ‘text’ and
‘interstextuality’ become more specific:

Example 8

Questionable Intertextuality

* Video 8 - 3
* Alphabet
* 31/7/95

* Context - T and chn are discussing the letter ‘N’ and looking at the ‘N’ picture card.

Earlier during this session, one student said ‘knuckle’ as an ‘n’ word. T discussed how some ‘n’ words are tricky because they have a silent letter... often a silent ‘k’. Now the T and chn are discussing a picture of a compass and T is leading the chn towards thinking about why ‘compass’ which starts with ‘c’ would be on an ‘n’ picture card.

* T: But a compass starts with ‘c’, doesn’t it? Why would it have a compass? Anyone got any ideas?
* Sophie: It’s tricky.
* T: It could be because it’s tricky...
* Alana: James knows...
* James: It’s got a silent letter at the beginning.
* T: (laughs) It could have, what it actually is doing... when you have a compass, it points either north, south, east or west and this one is pointing north...

James is linking the word ‘tricky’ and the teacher’s earlier explanation of silent letters to a new word - but does this type of ‘text’ count?

Example 9

Questionable Intertextuality

* Video 5.3
* 28/5/95

* Guided Writing
* Focus: Stephanie, Samuel, Ben B.

* Context: All three children are seated at desks. T is using overhead to write ‘Tessa shape snakes’, a book they have been reading in class and chn copy into their books.

Alana is off camera but her voice is heard in this incident. Teacher is discussing the word ‘snake’ as it is being written and says:

* Teacher: Okay, there’s a silent ‘e’ on the end of snake. So we need a silent ‘e’ there. We don’t hear that.
* Alana: A silent ‘e’ doesn’t make a sound at the end, what’s in lamb is ‘a’ after the end but it’s a silent ‘b’ so it doesn’t make the ‘/b’ sound.
* Teacher: That’s right and the silent ‘e’ doesn’t make the ‘/e’ sound - it just makes ‘snake’.

In this incident, Alana is linking the teacher’s talk about silent ‘e’ to her own spelling knowledge of lamb with a silent ‘b’. Do they count as ‘texts’?

The following examples reflect some of the themes that have been identified in the intertextual incidents.

Example 10

Meagre Offerings

‘Meagre offering’ describes incidents where a student makes a connection between texts, but does not elaborate sufficiently, for the teacher to understand what connection is being made or what meaning is being constructed (Harris & Trezise, 1997).

* Video 10 - 6

* Alphabet
* 28/8/95

* Context - T and chn are gathered on mat for the letter E. T reads Lucy and Tom’s Alphabet book page about E which says that Tom and Lucy sometime trick their Dad by putting an empty eggshell upside down in the eggcup, when he taps it it’s an empty shell.

* James: Hey, you know what Mrs Janesom.

* T: What was there?

Jamie frequently makes statements that link the classroom context to a personal experience. This example also demonstrates this ‘meagre offering’ which the teacher did not probe further to elicit more information.

Example 11

Meagre Offerings

Video 2.3

* 28/3/95

* Phonemic Awareness - blending

* Context: Teacher is holding small magnetic board and reviewing the letters that have been studied so far. Teacher shows how we can blend the letters to make words. They have made ‘am, hat,’ ‘hit’, then Lani suggests changing the ‘a’ to ‘i’. Teacher and children sound out the new word ‘it’ /i/ - and children call out ‘fit’.

* Ben B.: Fitness
* T ignores Ben
* Emma: Fitness
* Stephanie: Fitness
* Teacher: Fitness starts with that word...
* Ben B.: I said fitness
* T: Did you?
* OC: Children have connected the isolated word ‘fit’ with a context that is meaningful to
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*T changes word again - making 'if then' is*
*Ben B: Isadorus rhyme tool*
*T ignores Ben's remark and continues talking about IS*
*Ben stands up and moves toward T saying, They, Isadorus rhyme. T says to him to sit down and tell us please, and he does so saying*
*Ben B: Isadorus rhyme!*
*T: Say that again, Ben.
*Ben B: Isadorus rhyme.
*T: Isadorus? What's that, Ben?
*Ben B: Oh, it's like, the, you know, it's, well, sometimes I change my name and I call it Isadorus.
*T: Do you? That's interesting.
*OC - What is Ben B referring to I wonder?

Again, a student is making a connection and obviously constructing meaning. Although the teacher attempts to gain more information, it remains a ‘meagre offering’.

Example 12

Physical

This describes incidents where the students physically move during the intertextual incident.

*Video 9 - 4

*Discussion about books with special features - lift the flaps.*

*21/9/95

*Context - T and chu are gathered on the mat. T is showing chu a variety of books with special features such as pop-ups, popholes and lift the flaps. They talk about ‘The Jolly Postman’. T then shows them ‘The Magic Toyshop’.*

*Alanna: Remember when I brought in... (begins singing) I was in the bed and the little one said, roll over, roll over?*
*Teacher: And that had... what did that have in it?*
*Alanna: Flaps*
*Teacher: It had flaps (affirming)*
*Alanna: No, it didn't have flaps. It had pop-ups, it had arrows, (stands up) they went wooooo - woooooo, (tosa arm swinging action to demonstrate). They had these arrows, pop-ups, it had pop-ups, (sits down).*
*T is now ignoring Alanna and showing features of the book she is holding up.*
*TTX Link - Class book to home book.*

Example 13

Dwelling

It has been noticed that students will often ‘dwell’ on an intertextual event until they are given the opportunity to articulate it.

*Video 1-6

*22/3/95

*Phonemic Awareness*

*CONTEXT: Class are seated on the mat. T is out the front. T is showing class the magnetic board and letters that they have studied so far. They have revised the letter names, sounds and words that begin with those letters. T has introduced the idea of blending. Firstly with vowel/consonant, as in 'at', 'it', 'am'. T now demonstrates the word 'mat' on the magnetic board. Several children guess it and call out 'mat'. T says 'You can write that word because you know mat!*

*Emma: We're sitting on a mat.

*Jenna: She put her hand up to say something but T goes on to make 'is' on the magnetic board and talk about it with the children. Jenna keeps her hand up most of the time which is about one and a half minutes. Finally T says 'Jenna?*

*Jenna: I've got a cousin called, umm, Mat.*
*T: Mat? Have you? My son's called Mat - it's short for Matthew.

*About 5 minutes later, following performing the rhyme T's a little teapot and discussing the worksheet the children are going to complete and then performing the finger rhyme 'Six little Indians', James has his hand up. Teacher says 'Yes James?*

*James: Mat. We sit on a little lunch when the grass is wet.*
*T: Yes, mate, and you know how to write that word now. (OC: Interesting that both Jenna and James wanted so doggedly to make a statement on 'mat' even though in both instances the class discussion had moved on. Also, mat represented something meaningful to them possibly while the other VC words did not?)*

Example 14

Multiple Links Simultaneously

This example illustrates how many intertextual links can be occurring by different participants in one classroom context.

*Video 10 - 8

*Shared Reading - Toys: Textual Text - History of Toys*

*28/3/95

*Context: T begins discussion about toys, stating that we're going to have a book at toys, but not just the toys that we play with. We'll have a book at*
different toys that children play with all over the world.

*T: There are lots of little countries too we mustn't forget, here is England and over here is New Zealand.

*Jamie: My nanna lives in New Zealand.

*Giles: Yeah, you were born in New Zealand.

*Teacher turns the page and reads the title "Growing up in Ancient Egypt". Egypt.

*Teacher is interrupted mid way by Giles saying:

*Giles: Did you know Jamie...

*Teacher continues what she is saying but Giles has knelt up and is trying to finish what he was saying;

*Giles: Do you know what...

*Teacher: Egypt?

*Alana: "E!"

*T: We just talked about that Egyptian lady on our picture card. Egypt starts with...?

*Students chorus: 'E'

*Giles: Jamie...

*T: Yes, I know that Giles, and Capital E starts Egypt because it's the name of a country.

*T continues showing the Egyptian page and saying how it was a long time ago - when the Pyramids were built. She is interrupted by Jamie

*Jamie: You know what?

*T: Is it to do with Egypt Jamie?

*Jamie nods

*Jamie: You know what I used to live in New Zealand.

During this episode, Jamie is connecting between New Zealand and his Nanna, Giles is dwelling on the fact that Jamie was born in New Zealand, the teacher elicits intertextuality by emphasising the 'E' in Egypt, alluding to the letter 'E' they had been discussing in phonemic awareness earlier, and Alana picks up on the reference to the letter 'E' and responds.

Figure 2 graphically depicts the links occurring simultaneously in this segment:

These examples represent the types of intertextual incidents that are being analysed. It is too early to speculate about the significance of these incidents to literacy development. Indeed, it is felt that this study will actually provide more questions than answers as it proceeds. One of the major limitations of the study is the detection that the analysis was unable to be done as the data were collected to enable follow-up questioning of the students to some of these incidents. However, the data are still providing interesting examples of intertextuality in the kindergarten classroom.

And so the analysis process continues... slowly, often laboriously but hopefully with some interesting stories that will explain why and how they're all the same... but different.
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Contribution of Doctoral scholarship to the Education profession

The contribution of this doctoral scholarship to the education profession has been demonstrated in ways that included promotion and career development, representation at conferences, distribution of a publication written by me throughout the NSW Department of Education and Training, and the holding of state and national honorary positions.

There has been a distinct interdependence between my academic scholarship and professional career path with the NSW Department of Education and Training, indicated by the progressive promotion within the Department, and professional recognition intrastate, interstate, nationally and internationally.

The following description of my career path development during the study provides evidence of the professional growth recognised by the incremental promotions within the NSW Department of Education and Training. My Doctorate of Education studies have been a key factor in advancing my career, culminating in my current position in Professional Learning and Leadership Development requiring highly developed research and analysis skills.

3.1 Professional Development 1995 – 2006

At the beginning of this study (1995) I was employed by the New South Wales Department of Education and Training as an Advanced Skills Classroom Teacher. I was based at Leura Public School and in 1995 was assigned to a kindergarten class. Kindergarten in NSW refers to the first year of formal schooling and students are usually turning five years of age during the year.

I had recognised expertise in literacy teaching within the local district of schools and at state office. There were frequent requests for me to provide literacy teaching demonstrations and presentations at professional development forums. I was a member of the Regional English Group and led an English Interest Group in the local district. The Department’s State office invited and commissioned me to contribute writing and professional input for syllabus and curriculum support documents.
In January 1997, I was seconded by Penrith District Office to the position of *Literacy Consultant*. This role involved providing support with literacy teaching and learning to over sixty primary and secondary schools. My professional support involved strategies such as:

- Presenting a series of teacher workshops on literacy teaching and learning
- Presentations for parents
- Principal seminars such as *Developing and Leading a Whole School Approach to Literacy*
- Mentoring programs with individual and small groups of teachers
- Innovative professional development programs

In 1999, I was promoted to the position of *Training & Development/Curriculum Coordinator* at Penrith District. In this role I led the team of curriculum consultants in their support to all primary and secondary schools in the district. This role involved:

- Leading and managing a team of curriculum consultants that included literacy, maths, science, creative arts and technology consultants, and literacy specialists such as Reading Recovery tutors.
- Coordinating a strategic district plan of curriculum support
- Developing a software program to manage the complex information in curriculum support to over sixty schools

During 2000, my husband was tragically killed in a car accident. I took leave during the latter half of 2000 and 2001 and returned to the position of Literacy Consultant at the beginning of 2002 until the end of 2003.

In 2004 the Department restructured into ten regions and I was again promoted, this time to the position of *Professional Support Officer* to the North Coast Regional Director in Coffs Harbour. In this role I was researching, briefing and writing ministerial correspondence, briefings, speeches and presentations for the Regional Director.
In 2005 I succeeded in being promoted to two contracted project positions at Chief Education Officer level in our State Offices in Sydney.

In the position of Manager, Schools Policy I was responsible for the NSW submission to the National Literacy Inquiry.

My second role, Manager, Strategic Initiatives, located at the Centre for Learning Innovation, involved coordinating a state-wide strategy called ‘Connected Learning’.

In 2006 I was appointed as Principal Education Officer – Executive Leadership Development in State Office to provide leadership in designing, implementing and evaluating senior executive leadership programs for our Department. The role requires a high level capacity to provide strategic policy advice on leadership development, undertake research, analyse complex issues and manage projects.

Table 4 provides an overview of my professional development with the NSW Department of Education and Training.
Table 4: Professional Development – New South Wales Department of Education and Training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Duties and Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Advanced Skills Teacher – Leura Public School</td>
<td>Exemplary teaching and learning practice identified at regional and district levels with requests for advice, writing, consultancy and committee membership to State, regional and district projects and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Literacy Consultant – Penrith District (Senior Education Officer I)</td>
<td>Guide and support the implementation of the NSW State Literacy Strategy to over sixty primary and secondary schools. Provide effective professional development for all schools in literacy, pedagogy and the teaching and learning of English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Training and Development / Curriculum Coordinator – Penrith District (Senior Education Officer II)</td>
<td>Lead and coordinate professional development and curriculum support for school executives, teaching staff, ancillary and administrative staff, parents and the wider school community. Lead the Penrith District team of curriculum consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager – Management Development (Senior Education Officer II)</td>
<td>Research, advise and coordinate state projects including System Evaluation, Customer Service, Work Able, Implications from the Ramsey Review of Teacher Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Professional Support Officer to Regional Director (Principal Education Officer)</td>
<td>Provide executive, organisational and policy support and assist in regional coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Manager, School Policy – External Relations (Chief Education Officer)</td>
<td>Produce high level strategic policy advice on state and national schooling issues and coordinating the negotiation of schools funding agreements. Coordinated and wrote the NSW submission to the National Literacy Inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager Strategic Initiatives – Centre for Learning Innovation (Chief Education Officer)</td>
<td>Develop, organise and manage strategic education forums. Research and initiate policy writing for ‘Connected Learning’. Strategic analysis, planning and advisory skills for innovative strategies, solutions and recommendations for the use of ICT in education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Principal Education Officer – Executive Leadership Development</td>
<td>Design, implement and evaluate senior executive Leadership Development programs. Undertake research and analysis to inform policies and practices associated with leadership capabilities to support leadership development strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Contribution of research to personal, professional and academic development

The combination of my academic work and my professional expertise led to a number of professional and scholarly achievements in areas that included writing commissions, honorary appointments, presentations and participation in scholarly events, and professional tertiary teaching.

3.2.1 Writing Commissions

As Literacy Consultant for the NSW Department of Education and Training I was asked to join the committee of the NSW Child ESL and Literacy Research Centre. Whilst serving on this committee my experience with qualitative research methods was acknowledged with a commission to write a monograph to assist teachers with an accessible guide to classroom research. The monograph was entitled: ‘Beyond Action Research: Conducting Teacher-Based Research’ (Jameson, 1999). (See Appendix 1).

The NSW Department of Education purchased copies of the monograph from the NSW Child ESL and Literacy Research Centre and distributed them to the Departments’ forty District Offices. District Office staff were able to use the monograph for encouraging schools to engage in authentic classroom research.

Universities also found the monograph useful for students. The following emails provided pleasing feedback from two universities recognising the monograph as a succinct overview of qualitative research and useful for tertiary teaching:

*Just a quick email to say thanks for the publication ‘Beyond Action Research’. It was a wonderful read and I am going to use the section on interviewing with my B Ed VocEd students next session.*

Ros Brennan
Lecturer in Vocational Education and Training
Charles Sturt University
I have (also) sent seventy copies to the Child ESL and Research Centre in South Australia who were also very impressed.

Eira Sproats
Administrative Assistant
NSW Child ESL and Literacy Research Centre

Following a presentation at a National Literacy Conference in Perth during 2003, I was invited to the Tasmanian Department of Education's head office in Hobart to present two seminars. The first presentation was to an audience of their Literacy Consultants on the topic of Qualitative Research Methods. The second was to a group of Early Childhood teachers, from across the state of Tasmania, presenting my study of intertextuality and the importance of fostering connections with students. I was approached to present to the Tasmanian Department through my professional employment in the NSW Department of Education and Training but the content of the presentations were generated from my study. This provides an apt example of the interdependence of my study and professional position.

Subsequent to the presentations, the Tasmanian Department of Education commissioned me to write two chapters for a book they were publishing entitled Research into Action (Roache-Jameson, 2004a). (See Appendix 1).

3.2.2 Honorary appointments

In 1998 I was asked to stand for election as the NSW Director for the Australian Literacy Educators’ Association. I was successfully elected to this position and served as NSW Director for a period of two years. During my term of office, I formed and led a State Executive Committee to restructure organisation of local councils in NSW, organised a range of professional development sessions state-wide and increased NSW membership by 12% during a difficult period for professional associations. I also chaired the national special interest group ‘Literacy for Gifted and Talented Students’.

In 2002 I was invited to participate as a member of the National Advisory
Committee for ALEA. This position required the provision of advice and mentoring support to the National Council of ALEA. (See Appendix 2).

Table 5 provides a summary of honorary appointments.

Table 5: Honorary Positions in Professional Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Key Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998 – 1999</td>
<td>NSW Advisory Committee for the National Languages and Literacy Institute of</td>
<td>Committee member</td>
<td>Provide advice to policy makers of international developments in literacy Providing advice on classroom research Disseminating information and reviews of research and resources relevant to classroom teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia’s Child ESL and Research Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 – 2000</td>
<td>Australian Literacy Educators’ Association</td>
<td>NSW Director</td>
<td>Led and coordinated a State Executive Committee to provide a range of professional development activities state-wide. Managed budget and statewide administration of ALEA policy and implementation of national strategic plan Increased NSW membership by 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 – 2004</td>
<td>Literacy Educators’ Association</td>
<td>National Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Provide advice and support to National Council in respect of policy and position statements, and mentor projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3 Presentations and participation in scholarly events

Throughout the study, I represented the NSW Department of Education and Training at national and international conferences by presenting my doctoral research, again demonstrating the interconnection between scholarship and profession. (See Appendix 4). The Department recognised my expertise in educational research and supported my attendance at a variety of conferences. Table 6 details the various conferences where presentations of research progress and findings were given.
Table 6 – Conference presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Title of Presentation</th>
<th>Type of Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td><strong>Scholarship &amp; Community</strong>&lt;br&gt; Inaugural Research Conference&lt;br&gt; University of Western Sydney&lt;br&gt; College of Arts, Education and Social Sciences&lt;br&gt; Sydney, NSW</td>
<td>Intertextuality – themes of theory and practice...in kindergarten.&lt;br&gt; (Sharyn Roache-Jameson)</td>
<td>Seminar/paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><strong>(Re)-visioning Education</strong>&lt;br&gt; University of Western Sydney&lt;br&gt; Education Research Conference&lt;br&gt; Parramatta, NSW</td>
<td>Teacher as 'centoist': Characteristics of intertextuality in the kindergarten classroom and the implications for teaching.&lt;br&gt; (Sharyn Roache-Jameson)</td>
<td>Paper presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td><strong>E-volving Literacies</strong>&lt;br&gt; Joint National Conference – Australian Literacy Educators’ Association (ALEA) &amp; Australian Association for the Teaching of English (AATE) Perthe, Western Australia</td>
<td>'Kindergarten Connections: a study of intertextuality and its links with literacy in the kindergarten classroom.'&lt;br&gt; (Sharyn Roache-Jameson)</td>
<td>Workshop/paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td><strong>Research Students' Conference</strong>&lt;br&gt; University of Western Sydney&lt;br&gt; Katoomba, NSW</td>
<td>Types of intertextual connections in kindergarten&lt;br&gt; (Sharyn Jameson)</td>
<td>Paper presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td><strong>Education Research Students' Conference</strong>&lt;br&gt; University of Western Sydney&lt;br&gt; Katoomba, NSW</td>
<td>'They're all the same... but different': A Study of intertextuality and its links with literacy in the kindergarten classroom.&lt;br&gt; (Sharyn Jameson)</td>
<td>Full paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td><strong>Global Citizenship – Languages and Literacies</strong>&lt;br&gt; Joint National Conference: Australian Literacy Educators’ Association (ALEA) &amp; Australian Association for the Teaching of English (AATE) Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers Association Adelaide, South Australia</td>
<td>'Beyond Methodology - the importance of relationships to literacy learning'&lt;br&gt; (Sharyn Jameson)</td>
<td>Workshop/paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Title of Presentation</td>
<td>Type of Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td><strong>Literacy for All</strong>&lt;br&gt;Joint National Conference: Australian Literacy Educators’ Association (ALEA) and Australian Association for the Teaching of English (AATE) Canberra, ACT</td>
<td>“They're all the same... but different!” A study of intertextuality and its links with literacy in a kindergarten classroom. (Sharyn Jameson)</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td><strong>Researching Education in New Times</strong>&lt;br&gt;Australian Association for Research in Education National Conference. Brisbane</td>
<td>“They're all the same... but different!” A study of intertextuality and its links with literacy in a kindergarten classroom. (Sharyn Jameson)</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td><strong>Rejoicing in Literacy Voices of Australia</strong>&lt;br&gt;Australian Literacy Educators’ Association National Conference (ALEA) Brisbane, Queensland</td>
<td>‘A study of literacy development in a kindergarten classroom: Research in progress.’ (Sharyn Jameson)</td>
<td>Roundtable Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td><strong>Annual Postgraduate Conference</strong>&lt;br&gt;University of Western Sydney UWS Nepean Sydney, NSW</td>
<td>‘A study of literacy development in a kindergarten classroom: Research in progress.’ (Sharyn Jameson)</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td><strong>Literacy Research Forum</strong>&lt;br&gt;NSW Children’s Literacy and ESL Research Network UWS, Westmead. Sydney, NSW</td>
<td>‘A study of literacy development in a kindergarten classroom. An overview of research in progress.’ (Sharyn Jameson)</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td><strong>Annual Postgraduate Seminar</strong>&lt;br&gt;University of Western Sydney UWS Nepean. Sydney, NSW</td>
<td>‘Literacy Development in a Kindergarten Classroom’. (Sharyn Jameson)</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.4 Professional tertiary teaching

During the course of my study I was invited to design and teach a range of subjects at the University of Western Sydney (UWS) to students in the School of Education (or equivalent).

In addition, I was successful in my applications for placement on UWS Part-time (Casual) Lecturers/Tutors eligibility lists.

At various times, I was invited as guest lecturer to provide input related to my professional position and/or my research. (See Appendix 4).

Table 7 summarises the professional teaching undertaken during the study.

Table 7: University of Western Sydney (UWS) Professional Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Visiting Lecturer</td>
<td>UWS Research Methods &amp; Design, Postgraduate Class Lecture series: ‘Qualitative Data Collection Methods’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Lecturer/Tutor Part-time</td>
<td>UWS English/Literacy Postgraduate class Course title: Children’s Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Lecturer/Tutor Part-time</td>
<td>UWS School of Education and Early Childhood Studies Bachelor of Education Primary/ Graduate Diploma Course title: English Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Visiting Lecturer UWS</td>
<td>Bachelor of Teaching Graduate Entry Program Lecture series Course: Contextual and Professional Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 - current</td>
<td>Part-time (Casual) Lecturer/Tutor Eligibility List</td>
<td>UWS • School of Teaching &amp; Educational Studies • School of Lifelong Learning and Educational Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Conclusion

The scholarship and research output from this study significantly contributed to my professional expertise and my role in the educational workplace.

The knowledge gained from my scholarly research enabled me to develop and implement research programs in my professional organisation, contributing to the Australian field of education with state and national research projects.

The skills and expertise developed throughout the components of the Doctorate of Education degree have greatly contributed to my position of leadership within the education profession.
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Beyond Action Research
Conducting Teacher-Based Research

Sharyn Jameson

Every day, in every classroom, teachers conduct research. In countless daily incidents, classroom teachers, often unwittingly, become naturalistic inquirers - carrying out tasks and implementing strategies that traditionally belong to the "researcher".

When a teacher wonders why a certain student suddenly isn't achieving in class and takes steps to find out why, the teacher is using the tools of the qualitative researcher. The teacher's research tools include interviewing the student and parents, making anecdotal observation notes, discussing the situation with a colleague, examining and comparing work samples. Armed with new information as a result of this "data collection", the teacher begins planning strategies for improvement.

When a teacher begins to consciously incorporate this qualitative research perspective into the everyday life of the classroom, new insights are revealed into day-to-day classroom happenings, and a revitalised outlook to his or her profession begins. When two or more teachers at a school begin to explore events and situations in their school using an inquiry approach together, the possibilities for innovation and improvement across the school are manifold. When teachers are researchers they begin to look at teaching and learning in ways that transform them as educators.

This monograph explains how you can take the daily inquiry that you are often already engaged in, a step further. Daily inquiry can be strengthened into qualitative research that is both useful to you and your school, and is of a calibre respected academically.

Firstly let's take a look at how the term "action research" has evolved as part of a general shift towards qualitative research methods in education. A description of each of the stages involved in a qualitative research project will follow.

The application of these procedures to research in your own school community will ensure the quality of your research project reaches a standard recognised by academic institutions. Conducting research using these steps will provide genuine information for school improvement.

The Qualitative Shift

The term "action research" originated from a worldwide movement towards qualitative research. Qualitative research methods originally developed within the scholarly fields of anthropology and sociology, but in the 1960s began to seep into areas which had been more familiar with
traditional scientific research - often termed "quantitative". The 1970s saw a marked increase in qualitative research in education, as teachers, researchers and academics began to recognise that the clinical, objective, controlled methods of the quantitative approach were not providing adequate solutions to the complex problems associated with the real-life, messy world of the classroom. The qualitative research approach, with its emphasis on research in natural settings and the use of descriptive data, offers educational communities a way of gaining deeper insight into the complex, idiosyncratic nature of school life.

Quantitative and qualitative approaches have each generated their own complicated theories of classifications, methods and rules which fill library shelves in universities all over the world. It is not possible in a monograph of this size to give an elaborate explanation of the difference between the two approaches, however Table 1 sets out a brief guide to the different characteristics of the two approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Approach</th>
<th>Quantitative Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The key instrument is the researcher.</td>
<td>The key instrument is the measurement device.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research is conducted in the natural setting using observation, interviews and artifact collection and recognises the subjective nature of human environments</td>
<td>The research is administered in an &quot;objective&quot;, standardised, controlled way using test items, survey questions or other measurement tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The research gathers data to examine and then develops theory to explain phenomena</td>
<td>An hypothesis is created and subjected to empirical test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductive data analysis is carried out which enables the theory to emerge from patterns and themes.</td>
<td>Deductive data analysis takes place by assuming cause and effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness arises from prolonged engagement in the research site, persistent observation, triangulation of techniques, member checks and audit trails.</td>
<td>Reliability and validity are ensured by precise, controlled measures to eliminate the influence of variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher is involved and displays empathy to the participants.</td>
<td>Research attempts to remain detached and &quot;objective&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative and quantitative methods both have advantages and disadvantages and are not mutually exclusive. Quantitative approaches enable statistical analysis of data collected from vast numbers of people across many locations, which can provide reliable findings representative of a large sample of the population. Qualitative approaches, on the other hand, can provide detailed information about a smaller number of people which can increase our understanding of a complex situation at a local level, but the findings may not be as generalisable. For large scale research, a combination of both approaches is often used. Qualitative methods, however, provide an excellent solution to enable research to be conducted on a small scale in school communities with authentic results, thus empowering schools to make informed decisions for school improvement and change.

Qualitative research is an umbrella term referring to many different ways of carrying out research which share some of the characteristics described in Table 1. Other terms you might hear include phenomenology, symbolic interactionism, case studies, ethnography, naturalistic inquiry and, particularly in school settings, action research.

Action research is defined as a process of systematically collecting research data about an ongoing system (Barton-Cunningham, 1993). Basically, action research is about "action" to explain a phenomenon or solve a problem or question about a system's operation with a view to improvement or change. It is a term which has become popular in schools as it describes a qualitative research process which is manageable and effective for school-based inquiry.

In the past, qualitative approaches to educational research have been criticised for many reasons. Some of the most common are that the data are seen as too subjective or unstructured, the researcher is biased or there was inadequate reliability and validity. Hence the emergence of a plethora of instruction manuals and guides to qualitative research, which provide explicit, systematic methodology for all stages of qualitative research and include measures which ensure trustworthiness of the data.

The following procedures provide a simple guide to qualitative research which will enable your "action research" to be authentic and trustworthy. If you require more detail, any of the references provided in the bibliography will help you to gain greater understanding of the basics of qualitative research.
Finding your focus

In order to design and plan your research you need to carefully consider the focus of your study. The focus may emerge from a question you have pondered, a situation that you are dissatisfied with and would like to improve, or an area that you are uncertain or concerned about and would like to understand better.

Once your focal area is established, building a “conceptual framework” (Miles & Huberman, 1994), helps to clarify your thoughts. A conceptual framework explains, either graphically or in narrative form, the key factors to be studied and the relationships between them. Research questions can be clearly articulated from your conceptual framework, and the information you will need to collect and analyse will become evident.

Literature Review

To broaden your knowledge about the area of investigation, it helps to read as widely as possible the work of others. This will aid your own study by alerting you to important data for collection and enhance the analysis of these observations. You will be able to identify important theoretical issues and perspectives and often glean practical ideas for managing your data effectively.

If you are planning to write an academic report of your study then the “Literature Review” forms a necessary component of the paper. However, even if you are not writing for an academic audience, the knowledge gained from reading about and then writing the major findings in the area of investigation will provide a substantive basis to your study.

A cautionary word here - It is important to read widely on your topic to ensure you do not become locked into concepts or ideas which could narrow your thinking about your own data. Wide reading will keep you stimulated and informed, and help you to expand on the ideas of others.

Data Collection

“Data” refers to any materials you can collect to provide clues and evidence of what you are studying. There are no rigid rules for qualitative data collection methods, rather, the rule is to consider carefully the specific situation you are researching, define the information you will need to answer your research questions, and then develop strategies to best obtain that information.

Most qualitative researchers use a variety of data collection methods to enrich and validate their study. The best collection methods though are carefully planned and systematically collected.

There are three major sources of data collection:
- observation
- interviews
- documents/artefacts

Let’s look at them in turn.

Observation

The role of the observer can vary from the extreme of complete observer, who remains detached and removed from interaction with those being studied, to the other extreme of complete participant, where the observer is barely discernible from those being observed. Researchers use this continuum to determine the degree of participation that will best suit their particular study. The type and degree of participation may alter throughout the course of a study. As a classroom teacher conducting research on your own class, there may be times when you are a participant observer and other times when you are complete observer.

Observation may be carried out by using your five senses, or by devices such as videocorders, audiorecorders and cameras. Transcribing information from videos and audiotapes can be very time consuming, but they provide the opportunity to “relive” the experience.

Novice observers are sometimes unsure of what to observe. A helpful framework for observing is one we often give to children for writing a recount:
- Who?
- What?
- When?
- Where?
- How?
- Why?

It is important to capture your observations in the form of field notes either during the observations or as soon as possible after their occurrence.

Field notes are the written account of what you have seen and heard whilst observing. Not only are they descriptive but can also be reflective -
they provide a place for you to record thoughts, ideas, reflections and any patterns or trends that you begin to notice.

To ensure the quality of your field notes:

- record them systematically
- be descriptive and reflective
- establish a format that suits your project
- use wide margins and well spaced paragraphs to facilitate coding (see analysis)
- write up your notes as soon as possible whilst the observations are fresh in your mind
- always make a copy of your field notes for filing

*Interviews*

Interviews are an excellent device for data gathering in school communities. Interviews enable information to be gained from students, teachers, principals and community members in both formal and informal ways. Depending on the purpose, qualitative interviews can vary in the degree to which they are structured:

Completely *unstructured interviews* allow the researcher and subject to engage in free conversation around the area of interest, with the researcher probing issues that arise and keeping the conversation centred on the area being researched. This type of interview allows the subject to feel at ease, and to talk and relate freely in language which is natural to him or her.

*Semi-structured interviews* usually incorporate an interview guide with some general topic areas or questions. This type of interview is useful if you intend interviewing a number of subjects and require comparable data. The semi-structured interview still allows the subject to personally tell his or her story within the confines of the interview guide.

*Structured interviews* often incorporate attitude surveys or questionnaires with a set of questions which are asked in the same order and with the same wording. Structured interviews allow the interviewer to control the content more rigidly but are more constraining for the interviewee. They are used in both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

When interviewing it is important to ask questions which require the subject to explore the issue and provide you with an accurate perspective. Questions that require more than a “yes” or “no” response will more readily yield richer data.

The quality of the interview is often dependent on the listening skills of the interviewer. It is important to be an “active listener” - carefully listen to the words and the feelings behind them, ask for clarification if you’re unsure, convey respect and trust, be flexible and non-judgmental. Ensure the accuracy of your listening by “member checking” - for example, by summarising what has been told to you, clarifying any inconsistencies, and checking your notes with the interviewee.

Focus group interviews are a useful technique in allowing you to bring together a group of subjects to discuss the topic of interest. Subjects can often stimulate each other to talk about topics that may not arise on an individual basis. Transcribing group interviews can present extra difficulties though in recognising who was speaking and trying to decipher the common occurrence of several people speaking at once.

*Documents/Artefacts*

A rich source of information can be found from documents and records related to the research site. Documents and artefacts provide valuable background information and also can provide stimulus for guiding future observations and interviewing.

Documents and artefacts that are typically useful in educational research include:

- school histories
- school newsletters and magazines
- students newspapers
- information booklets about the school
- minutes of meetings
- school letters to parents (eg regarding discipline, homework, hygiene)
- school memos to staff
- student records
- teacher programs and assessment records
- student journals and diaries
- student work samples
- school photographs
- school posters

Recording reflective field notes during, or soon after viewing and reading documents and artefacts is necessary to gain the maximum value from this data collection.
Whilst there is no one way to collect to qualitative data, giving thought and careful planning to the type of information you require and the best means for obtaining it will benefit you as researcher and the quality of your study.

Data Analysis

Data analysis describes the process of searching and systematising the data you have collected in ways that enable you to:

- understand and make sense of the data
- reduce and display the data
- explain your findings to others

Data analysis should be an ongoing part of the research project. Qualitative research, with its emphasis on “thick description” can often lead to mountains of data piling up. Delamont (1992) cautions researchers that “the most important thing is not to allow material to pile up unanalysed, or even worse unread!” Analysing your data as you go also allows you to identify emerging patterns and respond to new leads.

Qualitative research can be likened to a funnel (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). Data collection and analysis begin very widely while the researcher gains a broad understanding of the situation. As this understanding increases, the data collection and analysis narrows, allowing the researcher to gain deeper insights into the focal area and to identify emerging trends. Initially the data is analysed speculatively to allow for tentative emergence of patterns. Techniques such as “theoretical sampling”, “snowball sampling” and “searching for exceptions” can help to guide your data collection. Theoretical sampling involves controlling your data collection according to the developing theory emerging from the data. Snowball sampling involves looking for another example of a particular incident that has been recorded. Exception searching, as the name implies, involves looking for situations where the identified pattern or trend is not occurring.

“Peer debriefing” or “eventing” is another strategy for analysing your data as you proceed with data collection. Talking about your data with “critical friends” or colleagues with expertise in your area of interest, is an exhilarating way of reflecting on your data and discovering key issues or trends.

Whilst tentative analysis is taking place during the data collection phase, formal analysis in the form of coding needs to occur to ensure your developing theory is “grounded” in your data. The principles of grounded theory were developed by Glaser and Strauss in 1967 to enable well constructed substantive theory to emerge through intense analysis of data using coding techniques. “Coding” is the name given to the process of assigning a tag or identifying label to chunks or units of information from your data. Basically, coding is a means of organising your data by classifying the information into common categories. As you examine your field notes and interview transcripts you assign a code (eg number or letter name) to sort the data into manageable “piles”.

Coding will often begin in a general way - assigning a label to each concept and then beginning to group similar concepts. As you examine the data further you will begin to make connections between concepts and will develop new categories and sub-categories. As patterns and trends emerge from this deeper analysis, re-coding occurs until a core category, a central phenomenon, becomes apparent which reflects your evolving theory.

Data analysis is an exciting phase of the research project. However it can be a daunting experience - venturing into the murky, unknown depths of your collected data. Again, discussing the process with a critical friend is helpful for keeping your thoughts and findings “on track”. Writing memos or “observer’s comments” to keep track of ideas and thoughts you have as you examine the data is also a crucial part of the process. These memos become an important augmentation to the original data.

Finding ways of mechanically managing your data can be tricky. Researchers use methods such as filing cards systems, manila folders and large pieces of “butcher’s paper”! The last decade has seen the rapid development of computer programs for qualitative data analysis. These programs are able to efficiently handle complex qualitative data, reducing drudgery, and are able to retrieve information in seconds that would take a manual researcher days to find. In Australia, programs such as NUD.IST (Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing, Searching and Theorising) and Hyperqual are proving popular and effective.

Ensuring Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness is the qualitative term for reliability and validity in research projects. Two major strategies in qualitative research for ensuring trustworthiness of the data are respondent validation and triangulation. Respondent validation refers to incorporating the strategies of
member checking and informant feedback. Using a variety of data collection and analysis methods is called triangulation. Triangulation allows the researcher to cross check evidence by observing what is happening from a variety of angles, from different sources and multiple perspectives.

Displaying and presenting your findings

There is an obvious need to reduce the amount of data you collect to a format that is comprehensible to others. Miles and Huberman (1994) have written an excellent source book full of examples of ways to reduce and display your data. They make particularly good suggestions for using matrix displays and network formats to present your information in a meaningful way.

Writing a report of your research project is a time-honoured way of explaining your findings. A well written report will enable you to seek accreditation for your research from some academic institutions and lends credibility to your project if you present it to your school. Some professional educational organisations, such as ALEA (Australian Literacy Educators’ Association) will allow you to submit your report for inclusion in their professional journals.

Whilst there is no specific format for writing a qualitative research report, they should include the following information:

- Introduction
  - focus of the study
  - aim and rationale
- Literature Review
- Methodology
  - description of the research setting and participants
  - data collection techniques
  - data analysis procedures
  - trustworthiness strategies
  - time line
- Findings
- Conclusion
  - implications
  - recommendations
  - links to Literature Review

Ethical Considerations and Permission to Undertake Research

Universities and other research institutions are required to review the ethics of research projects involving humans and animals. Universities can provide written guidelines for their ethics approval requirements. The major considerations for human research are that the participants are kept well informed of their involvement in the research and any likely consequences, informed consent to participate is obtained prior to commencing the research, and confidentiality is respected with no identifying information being published without written approval from participants.

The NSW Department of Education and Training has regulations governing research in schools. A principal may approve research in his/her school providing the research is confined to that school and conducted by a teacher from the school. If research is to be carried out across a number of schools, the researcher needs to seek permission from the Department. Regulations governing research in the Catholic Education system and private schools, should be obtained by contacting the relevant authorities.

Help!

Organisations such as the Child ESL and Research Network - NSW Node have been set up to encourage and support research in schools.

You may contact the Node to get further information about mentors, funding support and to be put in touch with other teachers who are conducting research.

The Node also publishes newsletters and would welcome contributions from teachers describing their research experiences or to publish their reports.

Please contact Mrs Eira Sproats on 0247-360274 for further information.
Research into Action

Tasmania
School Education Division
Department of Education

APPENDICES: PAGE 186
Introduction

Research into Action is a package of materials designed to assist professionals engaging in research in their own educational settings.

‘Action research’ or ‘practitioner research’ has long been recognised as a powerful tool for building reflective practice. When, as in the cases described here, the research involves professionals from different sectors researching together, it also contributes significantly to a collaborative culture and a growing respect for each other’s knowledge and expertise.

Two papers were commissioned from academic colleagues to provide a theoretical and practical frame for the discussion: Sharyn Roache-Jameson, gives a succinct overview of the history of qualitative research, its value and key strategies for ensuring rigour; and Dr Glenda MacNaughton contributes a set of processes to guide prospective researchers in establishing a clear focus and investigable questions.

These two papers are integrated with reports from three Tasmanian research projects. The projects were developed as a suite and were conducted in a sequence so that researchers could build on each other’s work. For example, the first project, Partnerships in Literacy, offered valuable lessons in how to maximise the value of parent participation in the research and reflection. The second, the Literacy Journey, provided a tentative map of children’s literacy acquisition that was trialled and modified in the different settings represented in the third – Assessing Emerging Literacy. All three were funded under the Initiatives Based in Schools program (IBIS) and were conducted in 2000–2002. While these projects focused on literacy, the comments and findings of the researchers can be applied to any topic or question for research in an educational setting.
New ways of looking

Conducting teacher-based qualitative research*

by Sharyn Roache-Jameson

Every day, in every classroom, teachers conduct research. In countless daily incidents, classroom teachers, often unwittingly, become naturalistic inquirers – carrying out tasks and implementing strategies that traditionally belong to the ‘researcher’.

When a teacher wonders why a certain student suddenly isn’t achieving in class and takes steps to find out why – for example, interviewing the student and parents, making anecdotal observation notes, discussing the situation with a colleague, examining and comparing work samples, and then, armed with new information as a result of this ‘data collection’, begins planning strategies for improvement with the student – the teacher is using the tools of the qualitative researcher.

When a teacher begins to consciously incorporate this qualitative research perspective into the everyday life of the classroom, wondrous insights into day-to-day classroom happenings are revealed, and a revitalised outlook to his or her profession begins. When two or more teachers begin to explore events and situations in their school using an inquiry approach together, the possibilities for innovation and improvement across the school are manifold. When teachers are researchers they begin to look at teaching and learning in ways that transform them as educators.

This paper explains how you can advance the daily inquiry in which you are often already engaged, strengthening it into recognised qualitative research that is both useful to you and your school, and is of a calibre respected academically.

First, we look at how a general shift towards qualitative research methods has evolved in education, then each of the stages involved in a qualitative research project are described.

*While Sharyn Roache-Jameson refers here to ‘teachers’, educators in other settings such as children’s services, are engaged in the same processes with a view to enhancing children’s learning.
The qualitative shift

Qualitative research methods originally developed within the scholarly fields of anthropology and sociology, but in the 1960s began to seep into areas that had been more familiar with traditional scientific research – often termed ‘quantitative’. The 1970s saw a marked increase in qualitative research in education, as teachers, researchers and academics began to recognise that the clinical, objective, controlled methods of the quantitative approach were not providing adequate solutions to the complex problems associated with the real-life, messy world of the classroom. The qualitative research approach, with its emphasis on research in natural settings and the use of descriptive data, offers educational communities a way of gaining deeper insight into the complex, idiosyncratic nature of school life.

Quantitative and qualitative approaches have each generated their own complicated theories of classifications, methods and rules that fill library shelves in universities all over the world. Table 1 sets out a simple guide to the different characteristics of the two approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: General characteristics of qualitative and quantitative research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The key instrument is the researcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research is conducted in the natural setting using observation, interviews and artefact collection and recognises the subjective nature of human environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The researcher gathers data to examine and then develops theory to explain phenomena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductive data analysis is carried out which enables the theory to emerge from patterns and themes – a posteriori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness arises from prolonged engagement in the research site, persistent observation, triangulation of techniques, member checks and audit trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher is involved and may display empathy to the participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative and quantitative methods both have advantages and disadvantages and are not mutually exclusive. Quantitative approaches enable statistical analysis of data collected from vast numbers of people across many locations, which can provide reliable findings representative of a large sample of the population. Qualitative approaches, on the other hand, can provide deep, detailed information about a smaller number of people that can increase our understanding of a complex situation at a local level, but the findings may not be
as generalisable. For large-scale research, a combination of both approaches is often used.

Among the terms you will hear in relation to qualitative research is 'action research'. In conventional research, the role of the researcher or investigator is detached from the phenomena being investigated. In action research, however, the research role is involved, so that research is joined with action that might, for example, be in the form of planning or implementing and monitoring change. The researchers therefore become participants, using their knowledge in the service of the client organisation (Abercrombie, Hill & Turner 1994).

The following procedures provide a simple guide to qualitative research, which will enable your action research to be authentic and trustworthy. If you require more detail, any of the references provided in the bibliography will help you to gain greater understanding of the basics of qualitative research.

**Finding your focus**

In order to design and plan your research you need to carefully consider the focus of your study. Ideally, the focus emanates from curious or puzzling occurrences, experiences or events in your real world – enabling authentic research and results to take place. The focus may emerge from a question you have pondered, a situation that you are dissatisfied with and would like to improve, or an area that you are uncertain or concerned about and would like to understand better. Your focus may be quite broad to begin with, allowing you to remain open and unconstrained in the initial stages. As your data build and your knowledge of the situation grows, the focus often becomes narrower, allowing you to hone in more closely on emerging themes.

Once your focal area is established, building a conceptual framework (Miles & Huberman 1994) helps to clarify your thoughts. A conceptual framework visually explains the key factors to be studied and the relationships between them. To build your conceptual framework, begin by naming the ‘chunks’, or categories, of information, events, settings, people or behaviours that make up the context of your research. Visually represent them on a page and map how they relate to one another. Let this be an iterative process that engenders deep thought and insight of the total context. Consider what data can be collected and analysed from each chunk. Research questions can be clearly articulated from your conceptual framework, and the data you will need to collect in order to answer those questions are able to be identified. An example of a conceptual framework used for a study of literacy learning in a kindergarten classroom is provided in Figure 1. From this example you can see that the chunks of parents, students and other influences provide categories for questions in this study.
Figure 1: Conceptual Framework for a study of literacy development in a kindergarten classroom

- Departmental Syllabus and Curriculum
- School Policy
- Kindergarten Class
  - Parents
    - Literacy background
    - Home literacy practices
  - Focal Children
    - Descriptions
    - Observations
    - Interviews
- Classroom Literacy Practices
- Literacy Development Descriptions
- Literacy Theory
- Teacher/Researcher
  - Teaching program
  - Planning and assessment
  - Participant observer
  - Interviewer
Research questions help to clarify your thoughts and provide a lens through which you will begin to observe and gather data. Imagine a microscope being used on your research area – initially the lens is wound up high enabling a wide view of the whole field, but as familiarity with the total terrain develops, the lens is lowered to examine the detail or complexity more closely. The tentative, general questions you begin with as you initially explore the terrain, will become more specific and help to refine your research as you proceed.

**Review the literature**

It is important to read widely on your topic to ensure you do not become locked into concepts or ideas that could narrow your thinking about your own data. Wide reading keeps you stimulated and informed, and helps you to expand on the ideas of others.

Critically analyse relevant research. This will aid your own study by alerting you to important data for collection and enhancing the analysis of your data. You will be able to identify important theoretical issues and perspectives and often glean practical ideas for managing your data effectively.

Sharyn's article, 'Process, implications and contexts', continues on p.37.

*Sharyn Roache-Jameson is a Professional Support Officer with the NSW Department of Education and Training. She is a past NSW Director of the Australian Literacy Educators' Association (1998-2000) and a part-time lecturer at the University of Western Sydney. Sharyn is in the final stages of a Doctorate of Education.*

Email: sharyn.jameson@det.nsw.edu.au
Child-watching strategies

Processes, implications and contexts

Sharyn Roache-Jameson's essay continues from page 9 with advice on qualitative data collection methods

Data Collection

Data refers to any material you can collect to provide clues and evidence of what you are studying.

Consider carefully the specific situation being researched, define the information needed to answer the research questions, and then develop strategies to best obtain that information.

There are no rigid rules for qualitative data collection methods, rather, the rule is to consider carefully the specific situation you are researching, define the information you will need to answer your research questions, and then develop strategies to best obtain that information.

Most qualitative researchers use a variety of data collection methods to enrich and validate their study. The best methods though are carefully planned and systematically collected. There are three major sources of data collection which we will look at in turn. They include observation, interviews and documents or artefacts.

Observation

The role of the observer can vary from the extreme stance of complete observer, who remains detached and removed from interaction with those being studied, to the other extreme of complete participant, where the observer is barely discernible from those being observed. Researchers use this continuum to determine the degree of participation that will best suit their particular study. The type and degree of participation may alter throughout the course of a study. As a classroom teacher conducting research on your own class, there may be times when you are a participant observer and other times when you are a complete observer.
RESEARCH into Action

Observation may be carried out by using your five senses, or by devices such as video recorders, audio recorders and cameras. Transcribing information from videos and audiotapes can be very time consuming, but they provide the opportunity to authentically ‘relive’ the experience.

Novice observers are sometimes unsure of what to observe. A helpful framework for observing is one we often give to children for writing a recount:

- Who?
- What?
- When?
- Where?
- How?
- Why?

It is important to capture your observations in the form of field notes either during the observations or as soon as possible after their occurrence. Field notes are the written account of what you have seen and heard while observing. Not only are they descriptive but can also be reflective – they provide a place for you to record thoughts, ideas, reflections and any patterns or trends that you begin to notice.

To ensure the quality of your field note:

- Record them systematically.
- Be descriptive and reflective.
- Establish a format that suits your project.
- Use wide margins and well spaced paragraphs to facilitate note-taking during analysis.
- Write up your notes as soon as possible whilst the observations are fresh in your mind.
- Always make a copy of your field notes for filing.

**Figure 4 – Field note format**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Observer’s Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviews

Interviews are an excellent device for data-gathering in school communities. Interviews enable information to be gained from students, teachers, principals and community members in both formal and informal ways. Depending on the purpose, qualitative interviews can vary in the degree to which they are structured.

Completely unstructured interviews allow the researcher and subject to engage in free conversation around the area of interest, with the researcher probing issues that arise and keeping the conversation centred on the area being researched. This type of interview allows the subject to feel at ease, and to talk and relate freely in language that is natural to him or her.

Semi-structured interviews usually incorporate an interview guide with some general topic areas or questions. This type of interview is useful if you intend interviewing a number of subjects and require comparable data. The semi-structured interview still allows the subject to personally tell his or her story within the confines of the interview guide.

Structured interviews often incorporate attitude surveys or questionnaires with a set of questions that are asked in the same order and with the same wording. Structured interviews allow the interviewer to control the content more rigidly but are more constraining for the interviewee. They are used in both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

When interviewing, it is important to ask questions that require the subject to explore the issue and provide you with an accurate perspective. Questions that require more than a 'yes' or 'no' response will more readily yield richer data.

The quality of the interview is often dependent on the listening skills of the interviewer. It is important to be an 'active' listener – carefully listen to the words and the feelings behind them, ask for clarification if you’re unsure, be empathetic and accepting, convey respect and trust, be flexible and non-judgmental. Ensure the accuracy of your listening by member checking – summarising what has been told to you, clarifying any inconsistencies, and checking your notes with the interviewee.

Focal group interviews are a useful technique that allows you to bring together a group of subjects to discuss the topic of interest. Subjects can often stimulate each other to talk about topics that may not arise on an individual basis. Transcribing group interviews can present extra difficulties though in recognising who was speaking and trying to decipher the common occurrence of several people speaking at once.

Documents/artefacts

A rich source of information can be found from documents and records related to the research site. Documents and artefacts provide valuable background information and also can provide stimulus for guiding future observations and interviewing.
Documents and artefacts that are typically useful in educational research include:

- school histories
- school newsletters and magazines
- student newspapers
- information booklets about the school
- minutes of meetings
- school letters to parents
- school memos to staff
- student records
- teacher programs and assessment records
- student journals and diaries
- student work samples
- school photographs
- school posters

Recording reflective field notes during, or soon after viewing and reading documents and artefacts is necessary to gain the maximum value from this data collection.

While there are no hard and fast rules to qualitative data collection, giving thought and careful planning to the type of information you require and the best means for obtaining it will benefit you as a researcher and the quality of your study. Table 3 provides an example of procedures used for data gathering in a study of student literacy development.

**Table 3 – Data collection procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collected</th>
<th>Data collection technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student's home literacy background</td>
<td>• Structured and unstructured parent interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Questionnaires to parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of classroom interaction</td>
<td>• Participant observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Video recording of classroom literacy practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student literacy development</td>
<td>• Work samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher’s assessment records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student attitude surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audio recordings of student conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student school achievement</td>
<td>• Assessment using syllabus profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Standardised test results and criterion referenced checklists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methodology</td>
<td>• Teaching program and assessment records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lesson note book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NSW English Syllabus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data analysis

Data analysis describes the process of searching and systematising the data you have collected in ways that enable you to:

- understand and make sense of the data
- perceive patterns and relationships
- reduce and display the data
- explain your findings to others
- develop theory

Data analysis should be an ongoing part of the research project. Qualitative research, with its emphasis on *thick description* can often lead to mountains of data piling up. Delamont (1992) cautions researchers that ‘the most important thing is not to allow material to pile up unanalysed, or even worse unread!’ Analysing your data as you go allows you to identify emerging patterns and respond to new leads.

Using the microscope analogy again, data analysis begins very widely while the researcher gains a broad understanding of the situation. As this understanding increases, the analysis lens closes in, allowing the researcher to gain deeper insights into the focal area and to identify emerging trends. Initially the data is analysed speculatively to allow for tentative emergence of patterns. Techniques such as *theoretical sampling*, *snowball sampling* and *searching for exceptions* can help to guide your data collection. *Theoretical sampling* involves controlling your data collection according to the developing theory emerging from the data. Snowball sampling involves looking for another example of a particular incident that has been recorded. *Exception searching*, as the name implies, involves looking for situations where the identified pattern or trend is not occurring.

*Peer debriefing* or *venting* is another strategy for analysing your data as you proceed with data collection. Talking about your data with critical friends or colleagues with expertise in your area of interest is an exhilarating way of reflecting on your data and discovering key issues or trends.

While tentative analysis is taking place during the data collection phase, formal analysis in the form of coding needs to occur to ensure your developing theory is *grounded* in your data. The principles of *grounded theory* were developed by Glaser and Strauss in 1967 to enable well-constructed substantive theory to emerge through intense analysis of data using coding techniques. *Coding* is the name given to the process of assigning a tag or identifying label to chunks or units of information from your data. Basically, coding is a means of organising your data by classifying the information into common categories. As you examine your field notes and interview transcripts you assign a code (for example, a word, number or letter name) to sort the data into more manageable formats.

Coding will often begin in a general way – assigning a label to each concept and then beginning to group similar concepts. Figure 3 provides an example of beginning coding techniques of indicators of literacy knowledge and teacher behaviours in a literacy development study. *Clustering* is a process of grouping and conceptualising information with similar patterns or traits. As you examine the data further you will begin to make connections between concepts and will
develop new categories and sub-categories. As patterns and trends emerge from this deeper analysis, re-coding occurs until a core category, a central phenomenon, becomes apparent that reflects your evolving theory. Making contrasts and comparisons between data helps to test emerging ideas and formulate finding.

Data analysis is an exciting phase of the research project. It can be a daunting experience – venturing into the murky, unknown depths of your collected data. Again, discussing the process with a critical friend is helpful for keeping your thoughts and findings ‘on track’. Writing memos or observer’s comments to keep track of ideas and thoughts you have as you examine the data is also a crucial part of the process. These memos become an important augmentation to the original data.

Finding ways of mechanically managing your data can be tricky. Researchers use methods such as filing cards systems, manila folders and large pieces of ‘butcher’s paper’! The development of computer programs for qualitative research has certainly facilitated data analysis. These programs are able to efficiently handle complex text data, reducing drudgery, and are able to retrieve information in seconds that would take a manual researcher days to find. In Australia, programs such as NUD.IST (Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing Searching and Theorising) and Hyperqual are proving popular and effective.

Ensuring Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness is the qualitative term for reliability and validity in research projects. Two major strategies in qualitative research for ensuring trustworthiness of the data are respondent validation and triangulation. Respondent validation refers to incorporating the strategies of member checking and informant feedback. Using a variety of data collection and analysis methods for cross-validating information is called triangulation. Triangulation allows the researcher to cross check evidence by observing what is happening from a variety of angles, from different sources and multiple perspectives. Checking for representativeness of happenings and conclusions; awareness of researcher effects and bias; and ensuring a comprehensive audit trail are all recognised processes for increasing the trustworthiness of qualitative research. Figure 4 shows how multiple strategies can be used as part of the data collection and analysis process to triangulate the findings.
Displaying and presenting your findings

There is an obvious need to reduce the amount of data you collect to a format that is comprehensible to others. Miles and Huberman (1994) have written an excellent source book full of examples of ways to reduce and display your data. They make particularly good suggestions for using matrix displays and network formats to present your information in a meaningful way.

Network analyses, domain analyses or the use of matrices are all useful ways to display data and represent themes that emerge. Essentially, these involve visual formats to represent information in a systematic way. Node structures that show interrelationships of categories through a series of links are called networks. Matrices are defined rows and columns to represent crossings between data. These descriptive representations of the data allow distilled, condensed findings to display coherent conclusions of the research.

Writing a report of your research project is a time-honoured way of explaining your findings. A well written report will enable you to seek accreditation for your research from some academic institutions and lends credibility to your project if you present it to your school. Professional educational organisations encourage the submission of practitioners' research reports for inclusion in their journals.

While there is no specific format for writing a qualitative research report, usually the following information is included:
Introduction
Focus of the study
Aim and rationale

Literature review

Methodology
Description of the research setting and participants
Data collection techniques
Data analysis procedures
Trustworthiness strategies
Time line

Findings

Conclusion
Implications
Recommendations
Links to literature review

Ethical considerations and permission to undertake research

Universities and other research institutions are required to review the ethics of research projects involving humans and animals. Universities provide written guidelines for ethics approval requirements. The major considerations for human research are that the participants are kept well informed of their involvement in the research and any likely consequences, informed consent to participate is obtained prior to commencement of the research, and confidentiality is respected with no identifying information being published without written approval from participants.

State education departments have regulations governing research in schools. Usually a principal may approve research in his/her school providing the research is confined to that school and conducted by a teacher from the school. If research is to be carried out across a number of schools, the researcher needs to seek permission from a higher body. Contact relevant authorities for specific guidelines in your state or organisation.
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What is ALEA?
The Australian Literacy Educators' Association is an organisation committed to providing leadership and support for teachers in understanding the complex range of literacies. ALEA provides opportunity for professional development and promotes research and resources which support teachers in the classroom. ALEA supports care givers and assists the community to understand the complexity of literacy learning.

ALEA has a network of Local Councils all over Australia. Local Councils work as teams to provide professional development in language and literacy across the country.

ALEA uses the expertise of its members to convey to the public and to the different departments of education the latest ideas and opinions on major issues in literacy education.

Basic Membership of ALEA gives you:
- 3 issues of the Australian Journal of Language and Literacy which is a leading peer reviewed publication in Australia
- 3 issues of ALEA Today which is an up to date newsletter for members
- 3 issues of Practically Primary which provide practical classroom strategies and ideas to help you immediately

OR
- 2 issues of Literacy Learning: The Middle Years which present to teachers of the middle years a combination of practical classroom strategies and sound educational theory.

All memberships give you:
- Discounts on registration fees at International, National, State and Local Conferences

Networking through automatic membership of your nearest Local Council of ALEA.

Comprehensive membership gives you all of the above. Family/Institutional Members are entitled to 2 registrations at ALEA activities.
2000-2001
Membership of the Australian Literacy Educators' Association (ALEA)
(http://www.alea.edu.au)

Please enrol me as a New Member □ Please renew my ALEA Membership □

Type of Membership Required (Please tick)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Membership □</th>
<th>Comprehensive Membership □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes AJLL, ALEA Today, plus your preferred option of Practically Primary or Literacy Learning: Middle Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual $ 75.00 + GST $ 7.50 = $ 82.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family $ 85.00 + GST $ 8.50 = $ 93.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student $ 35.00 + GST $ 3.50 = $ 38.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional $120.00 + GST $12.00 = $132.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tick your preference Practically Primary or Literacy Learning: The Middle Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes AJLL, ALEA Today, Practically Primary and Literacy Learning: Middle Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual $ 95.00 + GST $ 9.50 = $104.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family $105.00 + GST $10.50 = $115.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student $ 50.00 + GST $ 5.00 = $ 55.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional $140.00 + GST $14.00 = $154.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes all journals listed above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAX INVOICE/ABN for Tax purposes: ____________________________

Please send me the concise Annual Report □ Please do not send me the Annual Reports □

Special Interest Groups $8.00 each + .80c GST = $8.80 (Please tick those you wish to join)

☐ Technology in Literacy  ☐ Gifted & Talented Education  ☐ Indigenous Education
☐ Teachers Applying Whole Language  ☐ Literacy Research  ☐ Learning Difficulties
☐ Language in Mathematics  ☐ Gender & Literacy  ☐ Early Childhood

Membership Details (Individual details or Contact Person for Institution Membership)

Surname ___________________________________________ Given Name ___________________________________________
School/Institution ___________________________________________
Postal Address ___________________________________________
Residential Address (if different) ___________________________________________
State or Country Postcode ___________________________________________
Email Address ___________________________________________ Phone ___________________________________________ Fax ___________________________________________
Student Number ___________________________________________ Authorised by (signature) ____________________________

Payment Details (Overseas cheques must be in Australian dollars) Send this form with cheque or credit card authorisation to:
ALEA, PO Box 3203, Norwood, South Australia 5067 or Phone: (08) 8332 2845 Fax: (08) 8333 0394 Email: aleamail@nexus.edu.au
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Membership Fee: $________
Special Interest Groups: $________
Airmail (Overseas): $ 40.00
TOTAL (Including GST) $________
Sharyn Jameson
“Karana”, 61 Alexander Ave
Hazelbrook, NSW, 2779

1st March 2002

Dear Sharyn,

Recently there has been much discussion at the ALEA National Council level about ALEA’s future directions, particularly about how National Council might both sustain and increase membership, and determine the association’s future direction as the nation’s leading literacy education professional association.

As part of these discussions, National Council has made an important decision to establish a Special Sub-Committee of National Council comprising selected ALEA past committee members who have demonstrated their continuing interest in ALEA administration and professional activities. National Council is pleased to invite you to become a part of this sub-committee.

The purpose of the Sub-Committee is to help National Council through these current, sometimes challenging times. For example, there is a need for a strategic drive to maintain and increase membership and to set clear directions for the Association. The Sub-committee could also provide advice in respect of policy and position statements of the Association and act as mentors to ALEA projects.

It is proposed that the Sub-Committee will be named ‘ALEA NC Consultative Sub-Committee’. Members will not meet face to face except in circumstances where there is a natural gathering of its members. However, from time to time, certain members could be invited to attend a National Council meeting to act as a rapporteur.

Members will be appointed for a two-year period and we anticipate having a maximum of seven members at any time. In return for their services, members will be offered a reduced ALEA membership fee for the period of their appointment.

National Council believes that this is an important step in maintaining the vitality of our Association and look forward to your response. Please contact me if you would like to become involved in this subcommittee. I can be contacted by phone: 07 49516900, fax: 0749516924 or email: grant.webb@qed.qld.gov.au

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards

Grant Webb
Acting President Elect
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Presentations and Participation in Scholarly Events
College of Arts, Education, and Social Sciences
Inaugural Research Conference

Scholarship and Community

University of Western Sydney
Bankstown Campus

7 to 9 October 2005
**DAY 1: FRIDAY 7 October**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>Welcome: Associate Dean (Research), Professor Michael Atherton, Room: Lecture Theatre 1, Building 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>Indigenous welcome to country: Mrs Norma Shelley, Gandangara LALC elder, Room: Lecture Theatre 1, Building 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9.00  | Keynote Address, Room: Lecture Theatre 1, Building 1  
*Associate Professor Margaret Somerville: Pedagogies of Emergence*

**FP1 Convenor:** Prof Denis Burnham  
Room: Lecture Theatre 1, Building 1

**FP2 Convenor:** Mr David Mutton  
Room: Conference Room 1, Building 23

**FP3 Chair:** A/Prof Steven Wilson  
Room: Conference Room 2, Building 23

**FP4 Chair:** Prof Jane Goodall  
Room: Lecture Room LG1, Building 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10.00 | Symposium  
*Our Ears have Foreign Accents: Speech Perception Development Within and Between Cultures.*  
**Prof Denis Burnham**  
Our ears have foreign accents: Speech perception development within and between cultures.  
**Prof Catherine Best**  
Cross-language and non-native speech perception: The Perceptual Assimilation Model.  
**Ms Barbara Schwanhäußer**  
Lexical tone and pitch perception in tone and non-tone language speakers.  
**Ms Lidija Krebs-Lazendic, Dr Heather Winkel, Best and Burnham:** Perception and production of nonnative vowels by native speakers of Serbian.  
**Dr Michael Tyler**  
No cause for destress: French listeners can benefit from stress cues in an artificial language.  
**Prof Denis Burnham:** Visual speech.  
**Mr Dogu Erdener and Burnham:** Language specific factors in the development of auditory - visual speech perception: Children and Adults. |
| 10.45 | Symposium  
*Forensic Psychology*  
**Mr David Mutton**  
Introduction to the area of Forensic Psychology.  
**Mr James Brown**  
**Ms Jane Hastie**  
Assessing Rapist Typologies.  
**Ms Naomi Prince**  
Combating Police Stress: Identifying the influence of experienced stress, help seeking and coping skills.  
**Ms Rachel Terry**  
The non-criminal psychopath: mean differences in psychopathic attitudes between male and female business, law and psychology students. |
| 11.20 | Ms Corrina Bonshek  
Reflections of Music, Architecture and the Uncanny in Shadows & Dreams at the Female Orphan School.  
**Mr Stephen Sheehan**  
Make it new: the concept of the “new” in relation to early twentieth century functionalist architecture.  
**Ms Toni Anne Critchlow**  
A Teacher’s use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT).  
**Ms Janet Starr**  
**Mr Brendan Smyly**  
Looking for Heidegger’s “setting up of a world and setting forth of earth” in the work of Sun Ra and His Intergalactic Research Arkestra’s "Out of Space".  
**Ms Cathy O’Callaghan**  
What do you mean by Culture? Understandings of culture in health care. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>Morning tea: Served in Conference Room 3, Building 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FP5</strong> Room: Lecture Theatre 1, Building 1, Ms Ngaire McCubben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symposium cont. Ms Mireille Astorre On Representing the Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FP6 Chair: A/Prof Rhonda Craven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Ngaire McCubben Tourism and the Discourse of Multiculturalism: The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regional centre of Griffith, NSW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Mireille Astorre On Representing the Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FP7 Room: Conference Room 1, Building 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symposium cont. Ms Sharyn Roache-Jameson Intertextuality –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>themes of theory and practice ... in kindergarten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FP8 Chair: A/Prof Peter Hutchings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Jon Callow Show me: Assessing student's visual metalanguage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FP9 Chair: A/Prof Beth Southwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intertextuality – themes of theory and practice ... in kindergarten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room: Conference Room 5, Building 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FP10 Chair: A/Prof Chris Halse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Linda Finger Is Categorisation Best Practice for School Bully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research? An Investigation into the Process of Dichotomisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miss Isabella Petrinic Mediation in the Courtroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Lunch: Served in Foyer, Building 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Workshops</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture theatre 1, Building 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Prof Jane Goodall, How not to start a chapter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Ivor Indyk, Scholarship and Publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Prof Jane Ussher/ Dr Janette Peru, Mixing research methodologies: Beyond the qualitative/quantitative divide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30</td>
<td><strong>Presentations on research activity during secondment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture Room 41, Building 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>A/Prof Chris Halse, Do I need ethics and how do I get it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Dr Alison Smith: Psyhealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Dr Carol Reid: Green Wired Safe Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>Dr Garth Paine: MARCS Auditory Laboratories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Dr George Morgan: Centre for Cultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>Dr Heather Winskel: MARCS Auditory Laboratories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>Dr Megan Watkins: Narrative, Discourse and Pedagogy Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Dr Zoe Sofoulis: Centre for Cultural Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education Research Conference

(re) visioning education

UWS Parramatta Campus

11 – 12 October 2003
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.30am</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH – See included agenda for times and names. Feedback from Professor Margaret Vickers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAPER PRESENTATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15pm</td>
<td>Panel A</td>
<td>Feedback from Professor Carl James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Brodie</td>
<td>A Model of Success in Geometry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panel B</td>
<td>Feedback from Professor Brownyn Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katarzyna Wieczorek-Ghisso</td>
<td>Investigating pedagogies to challenge traditional teacher interaction styles with children engaged in visual art activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly Foster</td>
<td>An investigation into how the negative societal views surrounding early childhood impact on early childhood educator’s practice: A Progress Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miriam Giugni</td>
<td>Conceptualising ‘Goodies’ and ‘Baddie’ through narratives of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharyn Roache-Jameson</td>
<td>Feedback from Professor Bob Lingard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corinne</td>
<td>The Adult’s Role in Facilitating Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharyn Roache-Jameson</td>
<td>Teacher as ‘centoist’: Characteristics for intertextuality in the kindergarten classroom and the implications for teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shiona Shiu</td>
<td>Impact of Chronic Illness on a Child’s Schooling – a parents perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panel D</td>
<td>Feedback from Professor Michael Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Watson</td>
<td>The Uses of the Postmodern Picture Book in the Secondary English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Conference
Institute of Education, University of London
15-18 July 2003

PAPER & WORKSHOP ABSTRACTS

Mary Michel Abdoney
Reference/Science Librarian and Assistant Professor,
Reference Department Eckerd College Library
Eckerd College, USA

Approaches to Information Literacy: Accommodating Student Cultures in Institutions of Higher Education

Abstract:
Information Literacy, or 'IL', has been one of the most researched topics in library science for over three decades. However, as the concept of IL has changed its structure due to various technological advances, related disciplines such as educational psychology, higher education administration, and even instructional technology have discovered the significance of teaching students how to seek out and evaluate quality information. Institutions of higher education share the common goal of creating scholars who are prepared and eager to seek new horizons with their research. One would think that with the plethora of information available via the Internet that scholarly research would greatly improve, but just the opposite is true. Rather than a "great wealth of information", many students and professors perceive this boom as a "great burden of information". Thus, the previously popular bibliographic instruction (also known as library instruction or library orientation) has morphed into IL, moving away from library tours and catalog orientations and toward search strategies and search tools.

Presentation Format:
Virtual Presentation

****

Steve Acklam
Chief Executive
School Governors' One-Stop Shop, United Kingdom

Why School Governance is Good for you and your Organisation: The Developmental Benefits Available to Individuals and Organisations through Involvement in School Governance

Abstract:
Skills learnt in the workplace can add real value to school governing bodies. Volunteers with an external, work based perspective who are willing to challenge assumptions and promote innovation will be increasingly important as schools deal with major issues such as the expansion of knowledge and resource, the pace and type of change, the implications of faith, race and language, and the influence of new technology. Encouraging and supporting staff to become school governors offers organisations and individuals many benefits. For the organisation opportunities range from positive public perception to the development of employee skills. For the individual there is the personal satisfaction of making a difference while developing themselves and helping to create an environment where children can realise their aspirations and expectations.

Presentation Format:
30 min Conference Paper

****

Associ. Prof. Dr Norhayati Abdul Mukti
Lecturer in IT/Multimedia, Faculty of Technology and Information Science, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

Siew Pie Hwa
Faculty of Technology and Information Science
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

Learning Moral Values Through Malay Literature Multimedia Package: CITRA

Abstract:
The technological applications and especially the use of multimedia courseware have become more common in today's education, stimulating innovative approaches to teaching and learning. The use of interactive storybooks in the primary classroom may facilitate children's reading with minimal teacher intervention. This paper reports on a research project conducted to develop multimedia based interactive storybook for moral and values education using traditional Malay Literature called CITRA. CITRA is a pedagogical tool created for the teaching and learning of good moral values via traditional Malay Literature, which is presented and described herein. The tool, which uses the CD-ROM and computer as the means of dissemination, is didactic software made up of four learning modules. These modules are Storytelling, Reading, Word Enrichment and Mind Test/Games. The design of the tool was made using the experience from other systems and from education and Malay literature specialists. The tool's most important features lie with its user interaction. The principle objective of this project is to create a pedagogical tool that combine on-screen text, graphics, animations, audio and video in an enticing environment that allows the positive images of stories to be projected and can foster good moral sense in children. This project is to be carried out taking advantage of new and emerging information technologies.

Presentation Format:
30 min Conference Paper

****

Christian Medeiros Adriano
Brazil

Matthias Rudolf Brust
Christian Medeiros Department of Computer Science
University of Trier, Germany

Proposing an Epistemology for Evaluation in Designing Computer-based Learning Systems

Abstract:
Evaluation, as a human activity conceived from a diversity of epistemologies, is a complex and multidisciplinary process for classifying and giving feedback. Since evaluation is inherent to any learning and teaching initiative, it is of vital importance that its principles, techniques, and uses be understood under an ample basis. From the design point-of-view, we have a growing mismatch between designer and
Troy Richardson
Doctoral Candidate, Department of Education, Culture and Society, University of Utah, USA

The Language of Multiculturalism—A First Nations Response to the Language of Transparency: Between Teaching Method and Social Process

Abstract:
This paper will focus and reflect on the concept of a transparent multicultural language in teacher education. More specifically this work will consider the implications of a transparent multicultural language as it works to describe and characterize indigenous peoples of North America. For example, when teachers employ the language of multiculturalism regarding Aboriginal peoples, are they students learning how tribal peoples arrange knowledge and understand their worlds? Or are teachers simply reinforcing dominant modes of transparent commonsensical categorizations of knowledge, peoples and relationships?
This paper employs Anishinaabeg literacy scholar Gerald Vizenors postindian sensibility to articulate several elements of an Aboriginal philosophy of language, and bring them into a critical relationship to the continental philosophical traditions of semiotics, structuralism and post-structuralism. It is through such work that the hegemony of a single philosophy of language can be both exposed as such and the language of multiculturalism can itself begin to be more reflective of multilingual and multicultural perspectives.

Presentation Format:
30 min Conference Paper

---

Sharyn M. Roache-Jameson
Senior Education Officer, Curriculum
NSW Department of Education and Training, Australia

Presentations Format:
30 min Conference Paper

---

Dr Rigoberto Rincones-Gomez
Evaluation Manager, Evaluation
Phillips Wyatt-Knowlton, USA

Compressed Video Technology vs. Traditional Instruction: An Evaluation

Abstract:
This paper provides information for guiding distance education decision-makers in identifying effective strategies for improving distance education courses. In a report released on December 2000 by the National Center of Education Statistics, it was shown that from 1995 to 1998, the number of distance education programs increased by 72 percent. With universities’ increasing interest in distance education graduate programs that use interactive video technology, the variables related to successful distance education experiences needed to be examined.
To address this need, an evaluation of a distance education and a traditional method of instruction was performed to assess students’ knowledge, attitudes and behaviors associated with a graduate course delivered via distance education using compressed video technology.
The results of this study offer insights regarding human and technological interactions. This formative study has both theoretical and practical implications for evaluation theory and practice, in general, and educational evaluation, in particular. The theoretical implications lie in its integrative approach and innovative criteria and

---

Sharyn M. Roache-Jameson
Senior Education Officer, Curriculum
NSW Department of Education and Training, Australia

Kindergarten Connections: A Study of Intertextuality and its Links with Literacy in the Kindergarten Classroom

Abstract:
This presentation will provide an overview of the formation and progression of a qualitative research project undertaken to study literacy development in a kindergarten classroom. The study focused on the social construction of literacy in a NSW kindergarten classroom where Sharyn was both teacher and researcher.

The study began with the broad aim of examining factors that influenced literacy development in this classroom. As analysis proceeded, the study focused upon an emerging theme—intertextuality—a term used to describe the connections made between texts. The presentation will describe the progress of the study, the methodology, and the findings with implications for teaching and learning.

Presentation Format:
60 min Workshop

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Plenary Session</th>
<th>Morning Tea</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Afternoon Tea</th>
<th>Conference Dinner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.45 - 10.00</td>
<td>Ballroom North</td>
<td>Jamie McKenzie (USA)</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td>Plaza 3</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td>ALEA AGM – Freshwater Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conference Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 - 10.30</td>
<td>Terrace Ballroom</td>
<td>Jamie McKenzie (USA)</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td>Plaza 3</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td>Conference Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 - 12.00</td>
<td>Balloon North</td>
<td>Jamie McKenzie (USA)</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td>Plaza 3</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 - 1.30</td>
<td>Terrace Ballroom</td>
<td>Jamie McKenzie (USA)</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td>Plaza 3</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 - 2.15</td>
<td>Balloon North</td>
<td>Jamie McKenzie (USA)</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td>Plaza 3</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15 - 3.00</td>
<td>Balloon North</td>
<td>Jamie McKenzie (USA)</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td>Plaza 3</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 3.45</td>
<td>Ballroom North</td>
<td>Jamie McKenzie (USA)</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td>Plaza 3</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45 - 4.30</td>
<td>Ballroom North</td>
<td>Jamie McKenzie (USA)</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td>Plaza 3</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30 - 5.30</td>
<td>Ballroom North</td>
<td>Jamie McKenzie (USA)</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td>Plaza 3</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00 - late</td>
<td>Ballroom North</td>
<td>Jamie McKenzie (USA)</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td>Plaza 3</td>
<td>Freshwater Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 October 2001

Mr David Phipps
District Superintendent
NSW Department of Education & Training
51 Henry Street
PENRITH 2750

Dear Mr Phipps

Re: Presentation by Sharyn Jameson, Literacy Consultant

At the Literacy Conference in Perth, WA I was fortunate to hear a session conducted by Sharyn Jameson on her research on Intertextuality in early childhood classrooms. The presentation was excellent in every respect, combining a rigorous theoretical basis with practical implications for classroom teachers.

In Tasmania, we have a number of early childhood action research projects operating across child care and the early years of school. Practitioners engaged in these studies would benefit greatly from interacting with Sharyn. Both her research methodology and her literacy findings would be pertinent to our work.

In collaboration with professional associations – Australian Literacy Educator’s Association (ALEA), Early Childhood Educators’ of Tasmania (ECET) and Tasmanian Association of Children’s Services (TACS) – we would like to arrange with you for Sharyn to present a one day workshop, perhaps in late November this year.

We will of course pay travel, accommodation, the cost of Sharyn’s release and a fee to be negotiated if required.

Please advise me of your response to this proposal.

Yours sincerely

Jenni Connor
Principal Project Officer
CC: Mr Rob Randall
Director
Professional Support & Curriculum
NSW Department of Education & Training
GPO Box 33
SYDNEY 2001

From: Phipps, David
To: Jameson, Sharyn
Date: 10/21/02 5:55PM
Subject: TASMANIAN PRESENTATION

Sharyn,

I am happy to approve your attendance and participation in the one day workshop in Tasmania as outlined in the letter to me from Jenni Connor PPO. I understand that you have discussed dates with Suzanne and found a suitable time that will not detract from your work in PD. This is an exciting and commendable opportunity and you are to be congratulated on being requested to present and on your knowledge and research that has prompted this request. This is also a valuable professional opportunity for you and will I am sure add to your experience and work in our district.

Could you please complete a standard Conference Application form for my recommendation and forwarding to state office. If you could do this ASAP we can move this forward quickly.

I will email Jenni to let her know and follow up with my request for a fee (relief days) and confirming the details.

Well done.

Regards
David

CC: Laird. Suzanne
University of Western Sydney
School of Education and Early Childhood Studies
School of Social Ecology and Lifelong Learning

2001
Research Students’ Conference

13th – 14th September
at
The Carrington Hotel
15 – 47 Katoomba Street, Katoomba
## CONFERENCE PROGRAM

**Friday 14 September, 2001.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>BALLROOM</th>
<th>LIBRARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00am-9.40am</td>
<td><strong>Jon Callow</strong> - Hypermedia in Space - a visual analysis of student produced hypermedia texts</td>
<td><strong>Victoria McGahey</strong> - Establishing moral community: sensing the spirit within school leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45am-10.25am</td>
<td><strong>Paul Glew</strong> - Delivering english language intensive courses for overseas students in an independent school context</td>
<td><strong>Julie Lancaster</strong> - Kite Flying Paper Assessment of Children with Intellectual disabilities aged 0-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.25am-10.55am</td>
<td><strong>MORNING TEA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00am-11.40am</td>
<td><strong>Sharon Mifsud</strong> - Kite Flying Paper Vocabulary instruction and student word acquisition</td>
<td><strong>Kevin Watson</strong> - Intercultural Understanding and Environmental Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45am-12.25pm</td>
<td><strong>Keynote Address - Mick Dunkin</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.25pm-1.25pm</td>
<td><strong>Sharyn Jameson</strong> - Kindergarten connections a study of intertextuality and its links with literacy in the kindergarten classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30pm-2.10pm.</td>
<td><strong>Jennifer Miggins</strong> - How do boys learn? A case study of boys in Junior High School</td>
<td><strong>Catherine Harrison</strong> - Giftedness in Early Childhood. A search for complexity and connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15pm-2.55pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.55pm-3.25pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30pm-4.10pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Of Western Sydney Nepean
School of Learning, Development and Early Education
School of Lifelong Learning and Educational Change
School of Teaching and Educational Studies

2000

Education Research Students' Conference

20th - 22nd July 2000
at
The Carrington Hotel
15 - 47 Katoomba Street, Katoomba
Friday 21st July

9.00 - 10.30 am  **PAPER SESSION 2**

**BALLROOM** (data projector available)

9.00 am  Mr David Mulford
Kite-flying paper
"Middle management in Secondary Schools - Professional Development Initiative"

9.30 am  Mr John Collier
Kite-flying paper
"The Work and Leadership Style of the Head of Department"

10.00 am  Mr Christopher Kelen
Full paper
"Teaching the Ethics of Writing: Prolegomena for an Intercultural Exploration"

**LIBRARY**

9.00 am  Ms Jennifer Miggins
Full paper
"Who REALLY Cares About Boys' Achievement at School?"

9.30 am  Ms Gabrielle Leigh
Full paper
"Intertextuality and its links with literacy in the kindergarten classroom"

10.00 am  Ms Sharyn Jameson
Full paper
"They're all the same ... but different!" A study of intertextuality and its links with literacy in the kindergarten classroom"

10.30 - 11.00 am  Morning tea
Program & Registration

Joint National Conference 1999
Adelaide Convention Centre,
North Terrace, Adelaide.

6th—9th July, 1999

Australian Association for the Teaching of English
Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers Associations
Australian Literacy Educators' Association
25. Bedtime story readings: what goes on? There's more to the role of the bedtime story than meets the eye - analyses of dialogue taken from case studies of bedtime story reading research

Paper Nola Oliver

Venue HA/GO50/ANU

Audience all groups

It is well accepted that the bedtime story is a significant factor in early literacy for many children. Researchers have demonstrated repeatedly that children who are immersed in literature through the bedtime story typically construct literacy early and readily.

In recent years, the success story of the bedtime story in early literacy has become a focus, separated from its cultural context. The bedtime story has become divorced from the total context of the home literacy orientation in which the bedtime story is embedded. The bedtime story has become a popular dogma which assumes that the reading of bedtime stories to children will virtually guarantee a quick and painless transition from oracy to literacy.

This presentation draws on case study research into the role of the bedtime story reading practices of eight families within the fabric of family life and literacy. Dialogue excerpts are used to demonstrate that the bedtime story is only one piece in the complex jigsaw of early literacy.

Biography

Nola Oliver lectures in language and literacy units in pre-service and higher degree programs in the Faculty of Education at the Northern Territory University. After gaining a Dip T as a mature age student, Nola taught in Victorian primary schools for many years, and then moved to Darwin in 1987 to take up her current position. She has since completed a B Ed and an M Ed which addressed early literacy issues. Research interests include language and literacy, particularly early literacy, children’s literature and teacher professional development. Nola is currently working on a PhD through Monash University with collaborative research into teacher professional development through the study of teacher constructions of literature teaching practices and the influences on these constructions.

26. “They’re all the same...but different!” - a study of intertextuality and its links with literacy in the kindergarten classroom

Paper Sharyn Jameson

Venue HA/GO40/ANU

Audience lower primary researchers

This paper will provide an overview of the formation and progression of a qualitative research project being undertaken to study literacy development in a kindergarten classroom. The study focuses upon the social construction of literacy in a NSW kindergarten classroom where Sharyn was both teacher and researcher in 1995. The study began with the broad aim of examining factors that influenced literacy development in this classroom. Data collection began at the beginning of the school year in 1995 and was completed at the end of the same year. The data is currently being analysed using a qualitative research computer program. As the analysis proceeded, the study narrowed to focus upon 'intertextuality' - a term used to describe the connections made between texts. The study is exploring the intertextuality that occurred frequently in this classroom, and its links with literacy learning. This presentation will describe the progress of this study from its broad beginning to its current status of focussing on intertextuality in the kindergarten classroom. The seminar will comprise: introduction and description of the study, research methodology, intertextuality - definition, theory and other studies, intertextuality in this current study, and study progress and future directions.
PROGRAM
AUSTRALIAN ASSOCIATION FOR RESEARCH IN EDUCATION
1997 ANNUAL CONFERENCE
'RESEARCHING EDUCATION IN NEW TIMES'
BRISBANE 30 NOVEMBER - 4 DECEMBER 1997
**Wednesday**  
3rd December, 1997  
10.30am – 12.30pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme: Language and Literacy: Literacy, contexts, and intertextuality – classroom studies.</th>
<th>Room: 8th Floor Area</th>
<th>Topic:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSTH97.090</strong> Assessing and producing the 'child-student'. The enactment of double incumbrance in the classroom. Helena Austin and Peter Freebody, Griffith University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBRIT97.307</strong> The social construction of the speller: A study of the good reader but poor speller. Terry O'Brien, University of Ballarat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JAMES97.009</strong> 'They're all the same ... but different!' - A study of intertextuality and its links with literacy in the kindergarten classroom. Sharyn Jameson, University of Western Sydney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HERSP97.402</strong> Does bus start with 'CH'?: Dealing with randomly focused learning in the classroom. Christine Ludwig, Education Queensland and Paul Herschell, Queensland University of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NSW Children's Literacy & ESL Research Network

1996 Literacy Research Forum

Saturday October 19, 1996
University of Western Sydney, Nepean Westmead Campus
12.30pm - 1.30pm  Lunch  
(Room J121)

1.30pm - 3.00pm  Research Presentation

ROOM A  What Counts as Reading in Middle Primary Classrooms  
Christine Groves

Literacy and Gender  
Melissa Razey

"They're All the Same ... But Different". Literacy development in a Kindergarten classroom  
Sharyn Jameson

ROOM B  Language Intervention Program: LIP for mainstream and support teachers of children with language difficulties  
Carol Bagnell

Community Literacy Practices and Schooling  
Trevor Cairney

Effective Early Literacy Strategies for Kindergarten  
Jan McClelland

3.00pm - 3.30pm  "Where are we Now!"  
Presentation by Ms Kris Hudswell and Marion Koo from the St Clair Public School TIGER KS group

3.30pm  Closing of the 1996 Literacy Research Forum  
- Trevor Cairney
1996 Annual Postgraduate Conference

26 OCTOBER 1996
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ROOM BB/106</th>
<th>ROOM BB/107</th>
<th>ROOM BB/108</th>
<th>ROOM BB/109</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LUNCH - INCLUDING POSTER SESSION BETWEEN 1:30-2:30pm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ROOM BB/106</th>
<th>SYMPOSIUM</th>
<th>ROOM BB/108</th>
<th>ROOM BB/109</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:30 - 3:00</td>
<td>Zhao Fang (PhD) Diversification of Funding Base: A critical analysis of current patterns of financing higher education in China.</td>
<td>Sharyn Jameson (MEd Hons) &quot;They're all the same...but different!&quot; A study of literacy development in a kindergarten classroom.</td>
<td>Rabindra Nath (EdD) Student Selection and Admission to UWS Nepean.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rosemary Irons

ROUND TABLE - Table 4

11.30 a.m. - 1.00 p.m. Monday 1 July 1996

Linking language - mathematics to develop concepts

ABSTRACT

Language as part of mathematics is important for children to learn in a natural way. Language makes gaining mathematical understanding appropriate for their developmental levels. Language is also the connection for each child to establish understandings which relate new knowledge to past experiences. This round table discussion will present the language stages - children's language, material language, mathematical language and symbolic language. It will illustrate through stories how to help teachers and parents enhance mathematical concept development. Participants will have the opportunity to share ideas to provide a practical approach to connecting language and mathematics in the early years of school.

Rosemary Irons is a lecturer in early childhood mathematics education at the Queensland University of Technology. She has written many stories for mathematical concepts. She is the author of Level 0 Rigby Maths 2000 which is used in many Australian schools. Rosemary conducts inservice workshops for teachers in Australia, the United States and Singapore. She is currently working on a Doctor of Education degree.

Sharyn Jameson

ROUND TABLE - Table 5

11.30 a.m. - 1.00 p.m. Monday 1 July 1996

Literacy Development in a Kindergarten Classroom

ABSTRACT

The purpose of my round table is to describe and share research in progress for my Master of Education (Honours) degree. I am enrolled at University of Western Sydney and my supervisor is Professor Trevor Cairney.

My study focuses upon the social construction of literacy in a kindergarten class where I am both teacher and researcher. During 1995 I have been collecting data and in 1996 will begin in-depth analysis. My presentation would describe the process of this qualitative study, the research design and methods, any emerging themes and implications for classroom practice.
This qualitative case study of a kindergarten classroom will identify factors that influence literacy and its development.

The study will seek answers to the following broad questions:

- What indications of literacy knowledge are evident at the beginning of the school year?
- How does literacy development become apparent in some children throughout the school year?
- What factors influence literacy knowledge in these children?
- How can literacy development be promoted and supported in kindergarten?

As the study progresses more specific questions will arise and provide direction to the focus of the study.

Sharyn Jameson is a practising classroom teacher in New South Wales, undertaking research to complete a Master of Education (Honours) degree. She has an avid interest in literacy and literature; and identifying ideal classroom practices for literacy.

Gillian Leuckenhausen

ROUND TABLE - Table 6

11.30 a.m. - 1.00 p.m. Monday 1 July 1996

The acquisition of discourse in literacy education: do we teach the discourse 'rules'?

ABSTRACT

The debate about the teaching of writing continues to rage in Australia, particularly between educators committed to whole language programs, and those favouring the explicit teaching of 'genres', with opponents positioned at extreme ends of a tacit/explicit learning and teaching continuum. People learn language within a social world of action and interaction, and within a culture. The social practices within the culture create natural settings for the acquisition of written discourse. I will attempt to reframe the explicit/tacit teaching debate in terms of my understanding of human learning.

During this round table discussion I intend to examine the nature and extent of explicit teaching necessary to develop writing skills for different purposes. I will explore the implications for literacy education of a theory of human learning involving the study of neural network (brain behaviour). Using artificial intelligence systems call 'connectionist systems', which mimic the most obvious features of brain behaviour, it is possible to observe learning that is not based on the input of explicated rules, or governed by an innate set of rules. This observation suggests a possibility that the
Appendix 4

*Professional Tertiary Teaching Letters of Appointment*
Ms Sharyn Jameson  
Consultant  
Department of Education and Training  
Penrith District Office  
Penrith

Dear Sharyn  

Thank you most sincerely for agreeing to be part of the lecture series in the subject 100180 Contextual and Professional Studies in the Bachelor of Teaching Graduate Entry Program. The students have benefited enormously from your expertise and your professional experience.

You bring to the lecture a wealth of practical and relevant knowledge so important to our beginning teachers. Your skill in clearly articulating the key issues to the students gives them much food for thought as well as clear constructs upon which to build their discussions.

Making pre-teacher education relevant and practical for beginner teachers is one of the key aims of this program and I am assured that you have made an invaluable contribution to our student’s lifelong learning in education.

Once again sincere gratitude and I hope you will continue to be a valuable professional educator involved in the program.

Janice M Hall PhD.  
Course Coordinator  
BTch and MTch (Graduate Entry Program).
20 February 2001

Sharyn Jamieson
61 Alexander Street
HAZELBROOK NSW 2779

Dear Sharyn,

The School's English/Literacy Teaching Term has recommended that you be invited to teach 42041 English: Literacy this semester. Would you please consider accepting this Part-Time Casual Teaching position as detailed below and in the attached contract. As Semester commences on Monday, 5 March, 2001, we would appreciate your decision as soon as possible.

**42041 English: Literacy**

Course: Bachelor of Education Primary/Graduate Diploma – Primary Education

**Teaching Hours**
Monday, 10.00-11.30 a.m. Room KG 08
Monday, 1.00-2.30 p.m. Room KG 12

Two tutorial groups only, maximum of up to 30 students each.
1 x one and a half hour tutorial each week for 9 weeks
1 x one and a half hour repeat tutorial each week for 9 weeks

You will be required to mark 2 tutorial tasks for both of your tutorial groups. The maximum time allowed for this work is ten (10) hours calculated as follows.

- two groups
  - 3 hours per week
  - 9 week session
  - 20 minutes of assessment for every hour employed
thus, 60 minutes x 9 = 9 hours maximum for marking over the semester.

Immediate Supervisor: Dr Kaye Lowe

Should you agree to present 42041 English: Literacy according to the above arrangement (and as shown in the attached contract), please sign and return the enclosed copy of this letter no later than Friday, 3 March, 2001.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Beth Southwell (Dr)
Director, Staffing and Work Loads
School of Education and Early Childhood Studies
University of Western Sydney (Penrith Campus)

Encl: S. Jamieson

Copy to: Dr Toni Downes

I agree to present subjects 42041 English: Literacy according to the above arrangement (and as shown in the attached contract).

Sharyn Jamieson

Date:
9 July 1998

Ms Sharyn Jameson
"Karana"
61 Alexander Avenue
HAZELBROOK 2779

Dear Ms Jameson,

Subject: P/T (Casual) Lecturers/Tutors in English/Literacy Eligibility List
        Vacancy Ref: 100/98

It is my pleasure to inform you that you have been selected to be placed on UWS Nepean's eligibility list for the above position. An eligibility list is a pool of suitably qualified people, whose expertise can be called upon in response to the School's needs to undertake casual teaching duties. Inclusion on an eligibility list does not guarantee employment with UWS Nepean.

If there is a need to employ Part-time (Casual) Lecturers/Tutors in this area, you may be contacted by the School of Teaching & Educational Studies, who will discuss course content, lecture/tutorial times, course reading requirements and any other associated details with you.

If you have any enquiries in regard to this matter, please call the Recruitment Officer on (0247) 360 317.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Margaret Smith
Human Resources Officer
22 December 1999

Ms Sharyn Jameson
61 Alexander Avenue
HAZELBROOK NSW 2779

Dear Ms Jameson,

VACANCY REFERENCE No 132/99: PART-TIME (CASUAL) LECTURERS/TUTORS IN TEACHING STUDIES (SCHOOL OF LIFELONG LEARNING AND EDUCATIONAL CHANGE)

It is my pleasure to inform you that you have been selected to be placed on UWS Nepean’s Eligibility List for the above position.

An Eligibility List is a pool of suitably qualified people, whose expertise can be called upon in response to the School’s needs to undertake casual teaching duties. Inclusion on this list does not guarantee employment with UWS Nepean.

If there is a need to employ Part-time (Casual) Lecturers/Tutors in this area, you may be contacted by the School, who will discuss course content, tutorial times, course reading requirements and any other associated details with you.

If you have any enquiries in regard to this matter, please call me on 02-47360956.

Yours sincerely,

Paula McKenna
for
Linda Watson
HEAD, HUMAN RESOURCES GROUP
CAMPUS SERVICE CENTRE, PENRITH