

ers are accurate automatic word identifiers; however, the data from this study strongly refute this idea. Instead, the data show that readers make contextually influenced adjustments to the time devoted to viewing words based on the printed text and the oral text that they are producing as they read. There are instances in which the reader's oral text and the printed text conjoin and the reader predicts words without ever fixating them. Likewise, there are instances in which the reader's oral text and the printed text strongly diverge. The data in this study show that at such points, readers exhaustively examined the print and picture resources offered and consciously rejected what does not make sense or fit with the oral text that they were producing. In both cases, the contextual and textual constraints conjoined to support the dynamic emergence of text.

EMMA analyses found that the readers in this study exhibited the phenomenon of eye-voice span that has been historically reported in eye movement research. The concept of eye-voice span calls into question instructional practices that ask readers to match oral text to print. If flexible eye-voice span is the mark of proficient readers, then is it effective to ask readers to match voice to print? If so, under what conditions is this practice effective, for what purposes, and for how long? Additionally, teachers need to realize that the concept of eye-voice span challenges the idea that when readers' voices are producing an oral text, the point of oral production and the location of the eye in collecting information are not synonymous.

The data from this study also indicate that when readers pause in oral reading, they are sampling picture and print resources to make sense of the text. Traditionally, educators have been encouraged to consider oral pauses as a sign of readers' inactivity and a plea for help. However, the data from this study suggests this may not be the case. Instead of interrupting readers' thought processes during oral pauses, educators might wait to see what readers decide to do or to acknowledge that readers are working and then ask them what they want to do. An oral pause is a strategic learning opportunity in which readers integrate information from the three cuing systems in order to make sense of pictures and print. These are the moments at which readers make decisions regarding strategies that they can employ to make meaning. If educators interrupt to tell them the word, they may be taking away an important strategic learning opportunity.

The data in this study support a transactive socio-psycholinguistic model of reading (Goodman, 1996) because the model accounts for and explains reasons for readers' performances in this study including nonfixated words, words with multiple occurrences with varied fixation times ranging from zero to 8.99 seconds, textual influences on readers' production of miscues in one context and not another on words with multiple occurrences, regressions across large linguistic units, and readers' extended fixation times on words prior to miscue production.