

Independent writing in current approaches to writing instruction: What have we overlooked?

CHRISTINA DAVIDSON
Central Queensland University

ABSTRACT: Independent writing is described as a time when students accomplish their own writing through the employment of knowledge and skills that have been the focus for previous instruction. Previous instruction is said to consist of modeling and guided activity where knowledge and skills required for independent writing are taught through social interaction with the teacher. Descriptions of independent writing emphasise the activity of individual students and give limited attention to the social interaction that occurs between young students when they write. This article uses Conversation Analysis to examine student-student interaction during an independent writing lesson. The analysis of sequences of talk delineates social activity that occurred and provides descriptions of the methods that students used to accomplish activity. The paper concludes that definitions of independent writing need to take account of its social accomplishment by students.

KEYWORDS: Conversation analysis; independent writing; interaction; social organisation.

INTRODUCTION

In Australia, many current approaches to writing instruction in the early years of schooling incorporate independent writing. During independent writing, students are thought to produce their own written texts by drawing on knowledge and skills that have been taught during previous teacher modeling and guided practice. The following descriptions of independent writing illustrate this conceptualization:

Independent writing is a time when children write by themselves. Texts that they write need to be familiar and clearly arise from what has been demonstrated in modelled writing and composed in guided writing. In independent writing situations teachers construct conditions for children to write, explore and respond to texts independently (Harris et al., 2003, p. 62).

Through independent writing, the children use the knowledge and skills they have developed about text types and the writing process to write for different purposes and audiences. They practise their writing skills and apply what they have learnt to new contexts. The teacher provides support through regular discussions or conferences with individuals and needs-based teaching as required. The teacher is able to provide specific feedback to each child and to focus their attention on particular aspects of writing and the text (Wing Jan, 2001, p. 26).

During Independent writing students use the knowledge and skills gained from demonstration and engagement in the writing process to write their own texts. This

includes adding to and revising pieces begun at an earlier time. The students take responsibility for problem solving the challenges within the writing process (Department of Education, Vic., 1998b, p. 39).

These descriptions of independent writing, while differing slightly, share in common an emphasis on the production of written texts that are the direct outcome of teacher instruction. Teacher instruction is intended to develop knowledge and skills specific to certain types of texts and to the writing process. Within approaches to writing instruction, teacher instruction is frequently described as support or scaffolding (Department of Education, Vic., 1998b; Harris et al., 2003; Mooney, 1991), and conceptualized in relation to the theoretical perspectives of Vygostky (1978; 1986) and Bruner (1978). Scaffolding is said to shift from the provision of maximum support during teacher modeling, to lesser support provided through guided instruction or joint activity with students, to minimal support when students write independently. When teachers provide scaffolding, either to the whole class, small groups or individual students, they are considered to be working within students' zones of proximal development (Department of Education, Vic., 1998b).

Descriptions of independent writing within current approaches are curiously silent about peer interaction during it. Yet numerous studies have established the integral role of student-student interaction during times when students undertake writing. For example, the following excerpt from the seminal work of Cambourne and Turbill (1987) illustrates how children seek and provide help in a process writing classroom.

- | | | |
|---|----------|---|
| 1 | Sarah: | Shelley, how do you spell "ski"? |
| 2 | Shelley: | S-E-Y. |
| 3 | Sarah: | No. S-C-E-Y. |
| 4 | Shelley: | No. S-C-E-Y-E. |
| 5 | Ross: | My sister wrote that word and it's got "K" in it. |
| 6 | Sarah: | S-K-Y-E. |
| 7 | Shelley: | No, S-K-E-Y. |
| 8 | Ross: | I think it's S-K-Y. |
- (Cambourne & Turbill, 1987, p. 21)

Similar studies have documented the ways that teachers encourage interaction between students when they write (Geekie, Cambourne & Fitzsimmons, 1999; Turbill, 1982, 1983). Talk between peers results in the sharing of personal experiences and knowledge that informs writing and establishes students as expert "others" in the classroom (Dyson, 2003). Microanalysis of classroom talk and interaction reveals specific ways that literacy knowledge is distributed socially amongst young children as they write (Larson, 1995, 1997); either through direct engagement with others or by "overhearing" talk that is relevant to their own writing and using it (Larson, 1995, p. 294).

The contrast between descriptions of independent writing and previous studies of interaction during student writing time suggests that current approaches to writing in the early years focus on teacher instruction and its relationship to individual problem-solving, and overlook the ways that independent writing is socially accomplished through interaction between children. The research that informed this paper sought to address this

through an analysis of the social organisation of independent writing. Conversation Analysis was used to examine sequences of talk recorded during independent writing in one, early-years classroom. In this paper, analysis of student-student interaction produces descriptions of methods that students' used to accomplish their activity during independent writing. It is concluded that descriptions of independent writing, within current approaches to writing instruction, need to encompass the social activities that constitute it, particularly through social interaction between peers.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis (CA) informed this examination of independent writing. These cognate sociological approaches share an interest in how people produce and interpret actions during interaction, a desire to treat "ordinary events as worthy of serious analytic attention" and a preference for analysing naturally occurring interactions (Pomerantz, 1988, pp. 360-361). According to ethnomethodology and CA perspectives, the site for sociological inquiry is the local, and it should give attention to everyday practices and the ways in which individuals accomplish their social worlds.

CA examines people's interaction in order to understand "how conduct, practice, or praxis, in whatever form, is accomplished" (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997, p. 65) during everyday activity. Central to understanding conduct is the explication of procedures or "shared methods interactants use to produce and recognize their own and other people's conduct" (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997, p. 69). These methods accomplish the course of social interaction and indicate how people orient to aspects of settings, including to specific social identities.

When applied to practices in classrooms, CA provides detailed descriptions of methods used by teachers and students in the mutual accomplishment of activity. The CA perspective on the relationship between theories and classroom practice has been formulated in this way:

That classroom teaching is relentlessly ad hoc should not be understood in opposition to more tidy formulations of professional practice. Instructional plans and curricular objectives are real enough. The greater point is that they owe their classroom lives to the practised production and negotiation of the moment-to-moment possibilities that every next enactment of classroom teaching and learning assures. Thus the ad hoc, rather than an oppositional formulation of professional practice is its praxiological life (Macbeth, 2003, p. 25).

This methodological perspective enables the explication of the "praxiological life" or day-to-day production of lessons, classroom events and activities (Macbeth, 2003, p. 25). Further it does this through the analysis of naturally occurring talk and interaction. For example, Heap's (2000) study of students' activity at a Writing Centre in an elementary classroom established that "others are in principle, and in practice, an unending source of salience" (Heap, 2000, p. 86) during writing. Therefore, Heap argued that the writing

process is not necessarily that of “a single solitary author” (Heap, 2000, p. 87) as it had been conceptualized in cognitive, writing process theory (Hayes & Flower, 1980).

The study that informed this paper examined an independent writing lesson in a Prep/Grade One classroom in Victoria, Australia. The classroom teacher’s approach to writing instruction was guided by a mandated approach to early literacy instruction in state schools. The Early Years Literacy Programme (EYLP) incorporates a view of writing instruction as the provision of scaffolding through teaching approaches. In this programme, independent writing by students is said to be informed by approaches such as modeled writing and guided writing which provide scaffolding (Department of Education, Vic., 1998a).

At the beginning of the independent writing lesson, the teacher asked some students to write individual recounts of a previous occasion when they had made peanut butter and “jelly” sandwiches in the classroom. The teacher had already produced a text about this during whole-class, shared writing (“Yesterday we made peanut butter and jam sandwiches. American people eat them all the time.”). The shared writing text was left at the front of the room during independent writing.

Audio and video recordings of the independent writing lesson focused on the naturally occurring talk and interactions of students seated at one table. For analytic purposes, the recordings were reviewed later many times. The focus for analysis in the study arose from the orientations of students to others during independent writing; numerous students sought information and help from others. A transcript was developed of the lesson using Jefferson notation (Atkinson & Heritage, 1999) and detailed analyses of sequences of interaction conducted using CA. These sequences were analysed on a turn-by-turn basis in order to detail the methods students employed to accomplish their everyday activity during the lesson.

ANALYSIS

The analysis examines sequences of interaction between Dominic, a Grade One student, and some of his peers. The focus on Dominic allows a cumulative picture of some of the activity that constituted independent writing for him, although each sequence also highlights aspects of activity that are representative of activity that other children completed during independent writing. The analysis considers independent writing as social activity and the management of social interaction with others during independent writing.

Social activities as independent writing

During independent writing, some children asked others for help or for information. In the first excerpt, Jamie initiates interaction with Dominic in order to record the word “peanut”. Jamie’s initial use of a question (1) both begins the interaction and works as a prequel to her request (Schegloff, 1990); once Dominic confirms that he has written the word, she asks him how to write it (5). Jamie’s use of “got” indicates her understanding

that Dominic is copying words from the teacher's shared writing that is placed at the front of the room.

Excerpt 1

- 1 → Jamie: have you already got pea*nut?,
 2 (0.2)
 3 → Dominic: yes
 4 Melodie: you have to write what [you liked*
 5 → Jamie: [how do you* write it?,
 6 ((Cathlyn looks at Jamie))
 7 Melodie: um[::
 8 → Dominic: ["p" ((looks at his page)) (1.8) "e"
 9 → ((Jamie writing))
 10 (0.6)
 11 → Jamie: yeah
 12 Melodie: you don't [copy* off other pe::ople ((arms across her book))
 13 → Dominic: ["a"* (0.8) ((looks to his writing))
 14 Teacher: ^hey Jaz (0.4)^
 15 Wayne: ohw ((tapping forehead with pencil))
 16 → Dominic: "n" (0.8) "u" "t" ((watching Jamie writing))¹

As they complete the spelling and recording of the word, the students' interaction shows the mutual accomplishment of spelling a word. Dominic names two letters and waits while Jamie writes (8-10). When Jamie is ready she indicates this to Dominic with the use of "yeah". Dominic then continues to name the letters, interspersed with gaps as he waits for Jamie to write individual letters and looks at his own writing. The latter action suggests that Dominic has copied the word from the shared writing text. While the activity of the students show that neither is able to spell the word, their actions indicate that they have understandings of the everyday practice of spelling a word for someone (Sacks, 1995) and the school practice of using the shared writing text to record difficult words.

The analysis of excerpt 2 considers interaction between Dominic and Mckiela, a Prep student who was seated beside Dominic during the lesson. Dominic initiates the interaction with a question (2) that relates to the task students had to complete – writing about the peanut butter sandwiches they made. When Mckiela does not answer Dominic directly (3), he returns to copying a word from the teacher's shared writing book (6).

Excerpt 2

- 1 → [((Mckiela folding page))
 2 → Dominic: [((looks at Mckiela)) do you like (0.2) them peanut butter
 3 ↑sandwiches (0.4) ((turns back to face his book))
 4 Wayne: Miss Anderson
 5 Ivan: like
 6 → ((Dominic looking at teacher's shared writing book))
 7 → Mckiela: I dunno

¹ Transcriptions symbols can be found in the Appendix.

- 8 Ivan: () how do you write ↑like
 9 → ((Dominic beginning to write “d”))
 10 (1.0)
 11 → Mckiela: so do I [take a copy of what* that is ((pointing pencil at
 12 Dominic’s page))
 13 Teacher: [like um* (0.8) these boys can help you write like
 14 → Dominic: list↓en (1.0)

Although Mckiela eventually answers his question (7), Dominic appears not to hear and continues to do his own writing (9). When Mckiela speaks again, her use of “so” connects to the previous utterances of both and prefaces a question specifically “designed” to clarify what she has to do (11). Mckiela’s use of “copy” formulates copying as the task and indicates her own understanding that Dominic is copying his words from the teacher’s shared writing. Dominic’s response in line 14, “list↓en (1.0)” requires Mckiela’s attention. It is a comment on her previous failure to answer his question adequately, and indicates that “something” is to come. Dominic waits for Mckiela to show that she is listening before he speaks again.

Again, Dominic seeks to determine what Mckiela should write. His question presents two positions to her; either she liked the sandwiches or she didn’t (17). When Mckiela doesn’t reply, Dominic provides an explanation by using one projected response; he tells Mckiela what they could write together if she didn’t like the sandwiches (28, 30, 32 and 35).

- 15 Teacher: (I protect)
 16 ((Mckiela looking at Dominic’s page))
 17 → Dominic: [I like (0.6) oh did (0.2) did you like em or not?
 18 [(Mckiela writes “I” then turns to look at Dominic’s book))
 19 Wayne: how do you write li:ke?,
 20 (0.2)
 21 Ivan: peanut butter
 22 ((Mckiela begins to write “”))
 23 Wayne: (0.2) p[eanut butter*
 24 → Dominic: [cos if you *didn’t like them we could go ((points
 25 page))
 26 ((Mckiela looks at Dominic’s book))
 27 Teacher: where you gonna find [it?*

 28 → Dominic: [↑I* (0.5)
 29 Teacher: peanut butter
 30 → Dominic: [/d/ (0.2) /i/ ((looks to teacher))
 31 Teacher: Linc[oln?
 32 → Dominic: [dn’t/ (1.0) didn’t [(1.0) like* (1.0)
 33 Teacher: [where else can you find peanut butter
 34 though ((walking away))*
 35 → Dominic: the (0.4) peanut (0.2) butter (0.2) sandwich
 36 ((Mckiela writing bottom of “I”))

While Dominic interacts with Mckiela he doesn’t appear to notice that she has begun to copy from his own writing. Mckiela synchronises her actions with Dominic’s so that she indicates she is listening to him as he speaks to her (for example, 17-18 and 24-26) by

looking in his direction, albeit towards his book. While the two children appear to interact collaboratively during their exchange, they are in fact doing different things.

Dominic provided help for others during independent writing but he sought help only from the teacher. The analysis of excerpt 3 illustrates the ways that Dominic and teacher interacted to accomplish working out a word, and how the teacher made clear what counted as independent writing. The teacher required that Dominic work out how to write words by listening to sounds, and naming and recording letters that represented sounds in words.

Although Dominic asks a question, the teacher's response is a question rather than an answer (2-3). Dominic names the letter (2) and records it. In line 9 the teacher again focuses on the sounds in "very" – she directs Dominic's attention to her mouth, forms the letter required (9) and says the word.

Excerpt 3

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1 | | ((Mckielia looking in Dominic's direction)) |
| 2 | → | Dominic: how do you spell very? |
| 3 | → | Teacher: (0.4) what does very start ↑ with (0.2) veah (1.0) |
| 4 | | ((Mckielia writing "a")) |
| 5 | → | Dominic: "v" ((begins to write)) |
| 6 | | (1.0) |
| 7 | → | Teacher: ((looking at Mckielia)) you're not just copying Dominic's are |
| 8 | | you?, ((laughing)) (1.0) Dominic can help you (2.0) D- |
| 9 | | Dominic look at me ((mouth forms /e/ position)) (1.0) ↓very |
| 10 | → | Dominic: (1.2) "e" ((looking at teacher)) |
| 11 | → | ((teacher nods/Dominic begins to write)) |

As the teacher is helping Dominic to record "very", she notices that Mckielia is copying from his writing (7). She works to stop this while Dominic is recording the letter "v". Her question to Mckielia indicates that she has seen Mckielia looking at Dominic's book, and her laughing works to take "the sting" out of what would otherwise be heard as an accusation – that she is copying from Dominic. The interaction between the teacher and Mckielia illustrates that not all activity in independent writing was positively sanctioned *as* independent writing. Further, there was a moral order (Freebody & Freiberg, 2000) attached to activities; copying from the shared writing text counted as independent writing but copying from another student was not.

Managing interaction with others during independent writing

Students were seated at tables during independent writing. This meant that they were in close proximity to each other and could see and hear the actions of others. Co-presence of this kind created opportunities for peer interaction but did not guarantee it. Some students avoided interaction with others during independent writing. The final excerpts illustrate methods they employed to do this.

After the teacher had indicated that Dominic could help, Mckiela frequently demanded that he do so. This resulted in him experiencing difficulty completing his own writing and so he managed his interaction with Mckiela in order to do his own writing and provide her with help. For example, in excerpt 4 Mckiela's first comment takes Dominic to task for not answering a previous request for help (1). Although Dominic responds and thus acknowledges her talk, he continues to write and does not look at her. These actions result in Mckiela increasing her demand by leaning closer to Dominic and requesting help emphatically (12). Dominic's response is also emphasised and is an agreement to help. However, it also appears to "buy him time" or delays help-giving, as he says it while looking at the shared writing. He then writes in his book before finally indicating that he is ready to help (20).

Excerpt 4

- 1 → Mckiela: Do::m
 2 → ((Dominic looking at shared writing book/ Mckiela pushes
 3 him on the shoulder))
 4 → Dominic: yes (0.6) what
 5 (1.0)
 6 → Mckiela: do you know your na:me?, ((taps Dominic with pencil))
 7 Ivan: excuse me Miss Anderson
 8 → Dominic: y[es*
 9 Cathlyn: [oo*hh!
 10 (0.4)
 11 → Dominic: yes ((writing))
 12 → Mckiela: (1.2) ((leaning over to Dominic)) so help me::
 13 (1.2)
 14 → Dominic: okay (0.2) I'll he[:lp you* ((looking at shared writing))
 15 Wayne: [help me* ↓Melodie ((looking ahead))
 16 (3.0)
 17 ((Dominic writes))
 18 Ivan: °yes we did ()°
 19 Wayne: ↑now (0.4) please help me ((moves closer to Melodie))
 20 → Dominic: now (0.4) what are you up to! ((pencil on page))

In this sequence, we see Mckiela indicate her own understanding that Dominic has to help her; that is, she takes it that the teacher's previous comment to her was also a directive that Dominic should help her and he has heard this. Mckiela's interaction with Dominic clearly requires that he help her, although he is completing his own writing. Dominic is also seen to manage his own activities – important since Mckiela continues to require that Dominic help her throughout independent writing.

The talk recorded in excerpt 4 also captures the ways that overheard talk becomes a resource for some children in their interaction with others. Between lines 12-14, Mckiela directs that Dominic should help her and Dominic agrees. Wayne, who is sitting across from the students, uses their words to initiate talk with Melodie and to try to get her help. Wayne's use of other children's words occurred on several occasions during independent writing.

Later, Dominic helped Wayne to record the word “eat”. The interaction between the two went for some time and so the analysis here considers only part of it. Initially Wayne has to get Dominic’s attention. He tries to do this through using his name as a summons (Schegloff, 1968) and by asking a direct question of Dominic (1-2). Wayne’s actions suggest that he takes account of the talk occurring at the table; he has previously covered his ears and now says Dominic’s name with some emphasis.

Excerpt 5

- 1 → Wayne: ((takes hands off ears and leans forward)) oh Dominic? (1.0)
 2 how do ya write eat?
 3 (0.5)
 4 → Dominic: I like the
 5 → Mckiela: ((leaning on the desk)) “e” (0.4) “i” (0.3) “a”
 6 (0.4)
 7 → Wayne: “e”
 8 → Mckiela: [“e” (0.2) “i” (0.2) (looking at Wayne)
 9 → Dominic: [“e”((leaning on the desk beside Mckiela))
 10 → Mckiela: “a”
 11 → Dominic: “a”
 12 Ivan: the rubber cos he

Dominic does not respond to Wayne’s summons or to his question. Rather, Dominic reads his writing out loud (3-4). Dominic’s reading fills the interactional space left by Wayne’s question, indicating that he is doing his own writing, a legitimate reason for not answering or for not hearing Wayne’s question. Mckiela does answer Wayne’s question; she spells out the letters of “e”, “i” and “a” (5). Her answer is incorrect but it provides “an ordered list of letters with properly placed pauses” (Sacks, 1992/95, p. 785) that sounds fluent. Although Wayne hesitates before replying, his response confirms his hearing of the first letter and accepts Mckiela’s information (7). The interchange between the two Prep students prompts a response from Dominic (9). Dominic’s entry into the conversation shows that he *had* heard Wayne’s previous question since he now provides the answer to it (9) and indicates his assessment of the talk between Mckiela and Wayne as trouble (Austin, Dwyer and Freebody, 2003), that is, Mckiela’s information is incorrect. At the same time, he intervenes without stating directly that Mckiela has provided incorrect information.

The interaction that follows shows the ways that Dominic and Wayne exclude Mckiela from the activity of recording “eat”. Their own talk is latched or closely connected (13-14), thus confirming their exchange. Wayne’s question in line 20 overlaps Mckiela’s utterance and does not acknowledge it (19-20). Minimal overlap in speakers’ turns is a common feature of interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998) and occurs because one speaker hears that another’s turn is finishing and begins talking. Minimal overlap of talk maintains continuity in talk rather than interrupts it. While Mckiela directs Wayne to write “e”, and her use of “do” affirms her understanding that this is what Dominic is telling Wayne to do, her talk is ignored.

- 13 → Dominic: “e”=e
 14 → Wayne: =“e”

- 15 Ivan: [he wro*te peanut but[ter*
 16 → Dominic: [yep*
 17 → Mckiela: [do a “e”*
 18 Ivan: and he done a mistake
 19 → Mckiela: “e” [“i”*
 20 → Wayne: [a “e”* like (0.2) ((moving pencil over page)) um*
 21 → Mckiela: “e” “I”
 22 → Wayne: (0.2) how do you do a “e”?
 23 ((Dominic begins to walk towards Wayne))

The ways in which Dominic and Wayne interact to exclude Mckiela from the interaction provide further insight into how students manage their own social activity during independent writing and, in the process, produce their activity *as* “independent writing”, at the same time as they produce their written texts.

WHAT HAVE WE OVERLOOKED IN CURRENT APPROACHES TO WRITING INSTRUCTION?

Current conceptualizations of independent writing cast it as independent problem-solving that is primarily informed by previous instruction. Instruction consists of modeled and guided instruction that is specifically intended to inform independent activity by students, evinced in the production of their own written texts. This view of writing instruction is evidently informed by aspects of Vygotskian theory, which provides the “social perspective” on writing instruction in some current approaches to early literacy instruction, for example, the Victorian Early Years Literacy Programme (Department of Education, Vic., 1998b). However, as Lave and Wenger (1991) have argued previously, the uptake of Vygotsky’s theory as scaffolding in the zone of proximal development frequently provides an “aura” of the social but focuses on the individual’s acquisition or internalization of cognitive activity. Descriptions of independent writing within current approaches to writing instruction provide an illustration of the phenomenon suggested by Lave and Wenger in their critique; social interaction with the teacher leads to independent problem-solving by individuals, and individual problem-solving constitutes independent writing in early years classrooms

While descriptions of independent writing construct the “lone student writer”, analysis of classroom talk and interaction displays its “social life”. In this study, analysis provides an account of independent writing that illustrates social activities that students initiated and jointly completed with others and the social nature of activities that individual students completed alone. Even when students were engaged in individual activity, their actions were thoroughly social and reflected understandings of their social world (Francis & Hester, 2004).

Interaction between students was particularly salient in the accomplishment of writing in this study and illustrates the social aspects of learning to write and writing, such as asking someone how to spell a word or asking for help. The evidence of students’ collaborative activity is consistent with previous research that established the important role that peer

interaction plays in the development of young children's writing (Dyson, 2003; Graves, 1983; Larson, 1995, 1997). This understanding suggests limits to the Vygotskian informed perspectives in classrooms that rest on scaffolding and "the disappearing other". (Dyson, 1995, p. 17), and reminds us that it is not only instructional interaction (Greenfield, 1984) that leads to learning in the classroom.

Descriptions of methods used by Dominic and his peers to accomplish their activity are descriptions of cultural "know-how" which students regularly employed throughout independent writing. Clearly, students interacted with others throughout independent writing and in ways that established the orderly conduct of their own activity, mostly in accordance with the teacher's version of what counted as independent writing, but sometimes not. Students were seen to manage their social interactions with others in a physical setting where close proximity provided on-going opportunities for interaction but did not ensure it; the on-going needs of some students required that others who could help needed to manage that. Descriptions of methods confirm children as competent social members (Hutchby & Moran-Ellis, 1998) who actively negotiate their social worlds (Danby & Davidson, 2006) through action during interaction (Schegloff, 2003).

In this study, accounts of students' social activity and their management of interaction with others establish independent writing as a social context in the classroom that requires students' understandings that go beyond the text and writing process to get their writing done. Further, while students' activity may or not be informed by understandings from previous instruction during independent writing, it is clearly a time when students employ understandings not encompassed within previous instruction to accomplish independent writing. In order to provide accounts of independent writing as it is accomplished in classrooms, descriptions of independent writing in current approaches to early writing instruction need to acknowledge peer interaction and the social activities that constitute independent writing. Otherwise, we have a model of instruction that bears little relation to the activities of students during independent writing, and descriptions of independent writing that appear to overlook its social accomplishment.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, J., & Heritage, J. (1999). Jefferson's transcript notation. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 158-166). London; New York: Routledge.
- Austin, H., Dwyer, B., & Freebody, P. (2003). *Schooling the child: The making of students in classrooms*. London; New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Bruner, J. (1978). The role of dialogue in language acquisition. In A. Sinclair, R. Varvella & W. Levelt (Eds.), *The child's conception of language* (pp. 241-256). Berlin; Heidelberg; NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Cambourne, B., & Turbill, J. (1987). *Coping with chaos*. Rozelle, NSW: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Danby, S., & Davidson, C. (2006). Young children using language to negotiate their social worlds. In L. Makin, C. Jones Diaz & C. McLachlan (Eds.), *Literacies in*

- childhood: Changing views, challenging practice*, 2nd ed. (pp. 118-132.). Port Melbourne, Vic: Elsevier.
- Department of Education. (1998a). *Teaching writers in the classroom: Stage 2 early years literacy programme*. South Melbourne, Vic: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Department of Education. (1998b). *Professional development for teachers: Writing: Stage 2 early years literacy programme*. South Melbourne: Longman.
- Dyson, A. (1995). Writing children: Reinventing the development of childhood literacy. *Written Communication*, 12, 4-46.
- Dyson, A. (2002). The drinking god factor: A writing development remix for “all” children. *Written Communication*, 19, 545-577.
- Dyson, A. (2003). Popular literacies and the “All” children: Rethinking literacy development for contemporary childhoods. *Language Arts*, 81, 100-109.
- Francis, D., & Hester, S. (2004). *An invitation to ethnomethodology: Language and society and interaction*. London; Thousand Oaks; Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Freebody, P., & Freiberg, J. (2000). Public and pedagogic morality: The local order of instructional and regulatory talk in classrooms. In S. Hester & D. Francis (Eds.), *Local educational order: Ethnomethodological studies of knowledge in action* (pp. 141-162). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Geekie, P., Cambourne, B., & Fitzsimmons, P. (1999). *Understanding literacy development*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Graves, D. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Greenfield, P. (1984). A theory of the teacher in the learning activities of everyday life. In B. Rogoff & J. Lave (Eds.), *Everyday cognition: Its development in social context* (pp. 117-138). Cambridge, Mass; London: Harvard University Press.
- Harris, P., McKenzie, B., Fitzsimmons, P., & Turbill, J. (2003). *Writing in the primary school years*. Tuggerah, NSW: Social Science Press.
- Hayes, J., & Flower, L. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32, 365-387.
- Heap, J. (2000). The boundaries of writing: Paying attention to the local educational order. In S. Hester & D. Francis (Eds.), *Local educational order: Ethnomethodological studies of knowledge in action* (pp. 73-90). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hutchby, I., & Moran-Ellis, J. (1998). *Children and social competence: Arenas of action*. London; Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices, and applications*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Larson, J. (1995). Talk matters: The role of pivot in the distribution of literacy knowledge among novice writers. *Linguistics and Education*, 7, 277-302.
- Larson, J. (1997). Indexing instruction: The social construction of the participation framework in kindergarten journal-writing activity. *Discourse and Society*, 8, 501-521.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Macbeth, D. (2003). Hugh Mehan's Learning Lessons reconsidered: On the differences between the naturalistic and critical analysis of classroom discourse. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40 (1), 239-280.
- Mooney, M. (1991). Early literacy development: Teaching children to read. In E. Furniss & P. Green (Eds.), *The literacy agenda: Issues for the nineties* (pp. 162-171). South Yarra, Vic: Eleanor Curtain.
- Pomerantz, A. (1988). Offering a candidate answer: An information seeking strategy. *Communication Monographs*, 55, 360-373.
- Pomerantz, A., & Fehr, B. (1997). Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social interaction as sense making practices. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 64-91). London: SAGE.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1995). *Lectures on conversation* (G. Jefferson, Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70, 1075-1095.
- Schegloff, E. (1990). On the organization of sequences as a source of "coherence" in talk-in-interaction. In B. Dorval (Ed.), *Conversational organization and its development* (pp. 51-77). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.
- Schegloff, E. (2001). Discourse as an interactional achievement III: The omnirelevance of action. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 229-249). Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Turbill, J. (Ed.). (1982). *No better way to teach writing*. Rozelle, NSW: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Turbill, J. (1983). *Now we want to write*. Rozelle: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language* (A. Kozulin, Trans.). Cambridge, MA; London: The MIT Press.
- Wing Jan, L. (2001). *Write ways: Modelling writing forms*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Manuscript received: March 24, 2007

Revision received: April 24, 2007

Accepted: May 10, 2007

APPENDIX**Transcription symbols**

[[Utterances that begin at the same time
[Overlap in speakers' talk
*	Indicates point where simultaneous talk finishes
=	Talk between speakers that latches or follows without a break between
()	Used to indicate length of silences, pauses and gaps, for example (0.2)
(.)	Indicates micro intervals
:::	Indicates that a prior sound is prolonged, for example, li::ke
-	Word is cut off, for example, "ta-"
?	Rising intonation
?,	Rising intonation that is weaker than ?
↑	Marked rising intonation
↓	Marked falling intonation
!	An animated tone
<u>un</u>	Emphasis with capitals indicating greater emphasis, for example, " <u>NO</u> "
:::~::~:	Emphasis and prolongation indicate pitch change, for example, " <u>stra::~:p</u> " indicates stress on word but no change in pitch; "stra::p" pitch rise
CA	Upper case indicates loudness
°	Indicates softness, for example, "It's a ° secret °"
.hhh	Indicates in-breath
(it)	Indicates that word within parentheses is uncertain
()	Empty parentheses indicates that word/s could not be worked out
(())	These are used to indicate verbal descriptions, for example, ((sits down))
→	Utterance of significance to discussion
^ ^	Marks talk by a speaker who cannot be seen on video recording

Notation adapted from Jefferson notation (Atkinson & Heritage, 1999).