

TEACH BIG

Unit 1, Lesson 3: Dialogue

Internalization Response Report

CURRICULUM	Bluebonnet, Shinpei Mykawa
DEPTH	Deep PREPARE
TEACHER	Sample Teacher
DATE	October 10, 2026

Prepared with the Teach BIG PREPARE framework

Copyright 2026 Teach BIG. All rights reserved.

This Internalization Response Report was generated by the Teach BIG Internalization Companion app for the teacher named on the cover page. It documents one teacher's lesson preparation and is not licensed for redistribution or resale.

Passage & Source Summaries

- Shinpei Mykawa, Chapters 1-2 (prior reading): Shinpei immigrates from Japan and builds a rice farming business in Texas through careful, patient labor. Chapters 1-2 establish his work ethic and his quiet determination, setting up the reader to notice how he speaks as much as what he does.
- Shinpei Mykawa, Chapter 3 (today's passage): Shinpei and his wife discuss a setback in the rice harvest. Their exchange is carried almost entirely through dialogue: short lines, careful word choice, and a shift in tone partway through the conversation that signals worry giving way to resolve.
- 5 Simple Rules for Writing Dialogue (reference handout): The teacher facing and student facing convention guide: quotation marks around spoken words, a comma before the closing quotation mark when a tag follows, end punctuation inside the quotation marks, capitalizing the first word of each quoted sentence, and starting a new paragraph every time the speaker changes.

Multi-Passage Connections

- Chapters 1-2 show Shinpei through narration and action. Chapter 3 shows him through dialogue, so students connect the two to see that dialogue is a continuation of characterization, not a break from it.
- The quiet determination established in Chapters 1-2 predicts how Shinpei will speak in Chapter 3. Readers should notice his dialogue stays understated even when the stakes are high, matching the narration's earlier claims about him.
- The 5 Simple Rules handout is the technical lens students apply back onto Chapter 3's dialogue. The handout and the passage are read together, not in sequence, so the convention work and the comprehension work reinforce each other in the same sitting.

Full TEKS Analysis

- TEKS 5.8.B (primary): students use dialogue to analyze characters and their relationships with one another, met through the Chapter 3 inference task (dialogue, then inference, then evidence about Shinpei and his wife).
- TEKS 5.11.D.ii (conventions): students write dialogue correctly, including quotation marks, punctuation, and paragraphing, met through the Telephone Game and the student narrative task.
- TEKS 5.6.F (connection, reinforced not retaught): students make inferences and use evidence to support understanding; the evidence chain work in this lesson applies that standard specifically to dialogue.
- Depth note: 5.8.B is tested at the analysis level, not the identification level. A student who can only locate dialogue ("Shinpei said ____") has not yet met the standard. The standard is met once the student states what the dialogue shows and names the line that proves it.

- Vertical alignment: this lesson is the Grade 5 bridge between Grade 4's literal "what did the character say" dialogue work and Grade 6's dialogue as subtext work. Plan the inference scaffolds accordingly, neither too literal nor too abstract.

Learning Progression

- Lesson 1 built paragraph structure (topic sentence, details, conclusion); today's narrative task assumes that structure is already available, not something to reteach.
- Lesson 2 built showing instead of telling through action; today extends that same show, don't tell principle into a second tool, dialogue, so students see showing as a family of techniques rather than a single trick.
- Today, Lesson 3, adds two new skills riding on top of the Lesson 1-2 base: the mechanical conventions of writing dialogue, and using dialogue as textual evidence for inference.
- Tomorrow's lesson (not yet taught) will ask students to combine action showing and dialogue showing in the same scene, so today's narrative task should stay dialogue focused rather than trying to do both at once.
- By the unit's end, students should be able to name which showing technique an author chose and explain why that choice fits the moment. Today is the first time dialogue enters that toolbox.

Cognitive Demand

- Convention application (apply): punctuate and paragraph a multi-speaker exchange correctly. This is a procedural, rule following demand, so practice and immediate feedback are the right instructional move, not open discussion.
- Textual inference (analyze): move from "what Shinpei said" to "what it shows about him," a genuine analytical leap and the one students most often stall on. Budget discussion time here, not on the conventions.
- Evidence based justification (evaluate, lightly): defend an inference by citing the specific line that supports it, and reject lines that don't. This is the standard's ceiling for this lesson; don't push further into literary interpretation today.
- Transfer (apply, in writing): use dialogue, correctly punctuated, to show rather than tell in an original narrative. This is the highest stakes task, because it requires the convention and the craft move to work at the same time.

I Will Statements

- I will learn how dialogue is written correctly using the 5 Simple Rules for Writing Dialogue.
- I will use what characters say to figure out who they are and how they relate to one another.
- I will use dialogue in my own writing to show emotion, personality, and relationships instead of just telling.

I Can Statements

- I can write a conversation with correct quotation marks, commas, and a new paragraph for each speaker.
- I can say, "When the character says ___, it shows ___, " and point to the line that proves it.
- I can make my story come alive by letting my characters speak.

Language Objectives

- Students will orally use the sentence frame "When ___ says ___, it shows ___" to state an inference with evidence, in pairs and in whole group discussion.
- Students will use the academic terms dialogue, inference, evidence, and speaking verb correctly and interchangeably across the lesson's speaking, reading, and writing tasks.
- Students will read a dialogue exchange aloud with phrasing that reflects correct paragraphing, pausing or shifting voice at each new speaker's paragraph.
- Students will write a claim plus evidence sentence about a character using correctly punctuated dialogue as the cited evidence.

Supports

- A sentence frame card ("When ___ says ___, it shows ___") at every table for students still building inference language.
- Pre-highlighted candidate lines of dialogue in Chapter 3 for students who need the search narrowed so they can focus on interpreting.
- A color coded model of the 5 Simple Rules, one color per rule, posted during the Telephone Game and the narrative task.
- Partner talk before any cold call, so multilingual learners and reluctant speakers rehearse the inference sentence once before saying it to the group.
- A visual speaking verb bank (said, whispered, shouted, asked, each paired with a small icon) for students who need a concrete choice set rather than an open one.

Resource Purpose

- Shinpei Mykawa, Chapter 3: the anchor text, and the only place students practice inference on real, grade level dialogue rather than an invented example.
- 5 Simple Rules for Writing Dialogue handout: the convention reference students return to during the Telephone Game and the narrative task. It is a tool, not a worksheet to complete and file away.
- Dialogue Telephone Game: a low stakes rehearsal of the conventions in a game format, so the mechanics are automatic before students apply them to the higher stakes narrative task.
- Sentence frame card: the bridge between noticing dialogue and stating an inference about it. Without this, most students plateau at identification.

- Narrative writing task: the transfer check, and the only resource in the lesson that requires convention and craft to work together, which is why it is assessed last.

Exemplar, Near-Miss, Non-Example

- Exemplar: "We lost the east field," Shinpei said quietly, setting down his hat. His wife did not answer right away. "Then we start again on the west field tomorrow," she finally said, and for the first time that day, Shinpei smiled. Correct conventions throughout (quotation marks, comma before the tag, new paragraph per speaker), and the dialogue does real work: the pause before she answers and Shinpei's smile let the reader infer resolve and partnership without the author stating it.
- Near-miss: "We lost the east field" Shinpei said quietly, setting down his hat. "Then we start again on the west field tomorrow" she finally said, and for the first time that day, Shinpei smiled. The craft move is intact, and the inference about resolve still works, but both lines are missing the comma before the closing quotation mark (Rule 2). This is the single most common fifth grade slip, so it is the near-miss worth naming explicitly.
- Non-example: Shinpei was sad about the field but then he felt better when his wife said they would try again. There is no dialogue at all. It tells the reader the emotional arc instead of showing it, so there is nothing to punctuate and nothing to infer from. This is exactly what the lesson is explicitly moving students away from.

Mastery Continuum

- Not Yet: Dialogue is present but unpunctuated or unparagraphed (Rule 2 and Rule 5 both missing). The student can repeat what a character said but cannot state what it shows.
- Approaching: Conventions are mostly correct, usually with one rule still slipping (the comma before the tag). The student identifies dialogue and attempts an inference, but it is vague ("it shows he's sad") without a cited line.
- Meets: All 5 Rules are applied correctly. The student states a specific inference and cites the exact line of dialogue that supports it, using the sentence frame correctly.
- Exceeds: Conventions are automatic. The student compares two speaking verb choices or two lines of dialogue and explains how the author's choice changes the inference a reader can make, moving from identifying evidence to evaluating the author's craft.

Teacher Watch-Outs

- Don't let the Telephone Game become the lesson's center of gravity. It's a 10 minute rehearsal of conventions, not the learning target, so protect time for the Chapter 3 inference work.
- Don't accept "Shinpei said ____" as a finished answer. That's identification, not analysis, so always press for the "it shows ____" half of the frame.
- Don't let the room decide "said" is a weak word to be edited out. Some students arrive with that rule from another class; correct it directly, since the lesson's own exemplar uses "said" successfully.

- Watch paragraphing specifically during the narrative task. Rule 5 (new paragraph per speaker) is the rule fifth graders drop first once they're focused on content instead of mechanics.
- Don't let the speaking verb discussion expand into a vocabulary unit. It supports the inference work; it is not the day's content.

Student Misconceptions

- Treating the Telephone Game as the point of the lesson rather than a conventions rehearsal.
- Believing an inference is finished once a line of dialogue is located, without stating what it shows.
- Making a relationship inference without being able to point to the specific line that supports it.
- Believing "said" is a forbidden or lazy word choice.
- Running multiple speakers together in one paragraph once attention shifts from mechanics to story content.
- Assuming any strong speaking verb (whispered, shouted) is automatically a better choice than "said," rather than choosing based on what fits the moment.

Lesson Architecture

- Opening (5 min): quick review of Lessons 1-2, paragraph structure and show-don't-tell, framed as today we add a second way to show.
- Direct instruction (10 min): introduce the 5 Simple Rules for Writing Dialogue using the color coded model; narrate the why behind Rule 5 (new paragraph means new speaker, which keeps readers oriented).
- Guided practice, Dialogue Telephone Game (10 min): students rehearse the conventions in a low stakes, game format exchange; teacher circulates watching specifically for Rule 2 and Rule 5 slips.
- Close reading (12 min): Chapter 3 of Shinpei Mykawa, dialogue lines pre-highlighted for students who need them; partner talk using the sentence frame before any inference is shared aloud.
- Whole group inference discussion (8 min): cold call on inferences, requiring the cited line each time; teacher explicitly asks what does this SHOW at least three times to model the identification to analysis move.
- Independent writing, narrative task (15 min): students write a short conversation that shows rather than tells, applying all 5 Rules; exemplar, near-miss, and non-example can be shown first if the class needs a reset.
- Close (5 min): exit ticket using the sentence frame, cited to a line from either Chapter 3 or the student's own narrative.

Teacher Rehearsal

- Rehearse saying the five rules aloud in under 60 seconds, in the same order every time, so the sequence becomes a chant students can anticipate: quotation marks, comma, punctuation inside, capitalize, new paragraph.
- Rehearse the pivot question out loud before class. After any student says "Shinpei said _____," the automatic follow up is "and what does that SHOW us?" Practice saying it the same way every time so it becomes a predictable routine, not a gotcha.
- Pre-select the two or three Chapter 3 lines you will cold call on if the room stalls, so there's no dead air while you search the text live.
- Rehearse redirecting the "said is a weak word" misconception in one sentence: "Said is never wrong. We only reach for whispered or shouted when it adds something true about the moment."
- Decide in advance whether you will show the near-miss exemplar proactively or hold it in reserve for whichever class period actually makes that comma slip first.

Student-Thinking Simulator

- A student reads Shinpei's line and says, "He said he lost the field." Likely next move: stop there, satisfied that they found the dialogue. Teacher response: "Good, you found it. Now what does losing the field and saying it quietly SHOW about how Shinpei is feeling?"
- A student writes two lines of dialogue correctly but puts both speakers in one paragraph. Likely next move: not notice, because the content reads fine to them. Teacher response: point to Rule 5 on the color coded chart and ask the student to read their own dialogue aloud, pausing at the paragraph break that should be there.
- A student insists "said" should be replaced because a past teacher told them to avoid it. Likely next move: cross it out and search for a stronger verb regardless of fit. Teacher response: validate the instinct to vary verbs, then redirect to whether said fits here, or whether this specific moment needs whispered or shouted.
- A student makes the relationship inference ("they're a team") but can't find the line that shows it when asked. Likely next move: guess at a line that sounds close but doesn't actually support the claim. Teacher response: have the student reread the exchange aloud and ask them to show the words on the page that make them think that, rather than accepting the inference on its own.
- A strong student finishes the narrative task early with technically correct dialogue that doesn't show anything (two characters exchanging small talk). Likely next move: consider the task done because the conventions are right. Teacher response: ask what this conversation tells us about either character that we didn't already know, to push past convention into craft.

Evidence Chain

- Claim: Shinpei and his wife function as partners under pressure, not just as a husband who worries and a wife who comforts him.

- Evidence (text): "We lost the east field," Shinpei said quietly. The quiet delivery, not just the words, signals restraint rather than panic.
- Evidence (text): his wife does not answer right away, then proposes the next concrete step ("we start again on the west field tomorrow") rather than offering comfort alone.
- Evidence (text): Shinpei smiles after her line. The dialogue's effect on him is shown through action, confirming the inference rather than just asserting it.
- Conclusion: the chain of specific lines, in order, supports the claim that their relationship is built on shared problem solving, which is a stronger and more specific inference than "they love each other" or "he was sad."

Not Yet, Almost, Got It

- Not Yet: Can locate dialogue but not state what it shows; conventions, especially Rule 2 and Rule 5, are inconsistent in both reading discussion and writing.
- Almost: States an inference but it is general rather than specific, or cites a line that is close but not the strongest evidence; conventions are correct most of the time with occasional slips under the pressure of composing original writing.
- Got It: States a specific inference, cites the exact supporting line unprompted, and applies all 5 Rules correctly in an original narrative without reminders.

IF to THEN Responses

- IF stops at "Shinpei said ____" without naming what it shows: THEN ask the student to follow up, "and what does that SHOW us about him?" Keep the question identical every time so it becomes a routine, not a correction.
- IF drops the comma before the closing quotation mark (Rule 2): THEN point to the matching color on the 5 Rules chart and have the student read the sentence aloud; the missing pause is usually audible even when the punctuation isn't visible to them.
- IF puts two speakers in one paragraph: THEN have the student read their own dialogue aloud and ask them to physically mark where one speaker's line ends and the other begins, then check that against their paragraphing.
- IF claims "said" is always weak: THEN point to the lesson's own exemplar, where "said" is the correct choice, and ask what would be lost if it were swapped for "whispered."
- IF makes an inference with no cited evidence: THEN withhold agreement until the student points to the specific words on the page; do not supply the line for them.
- IF finishes the narrative task with correct conventions but no craft (dialogue that shows nothing new): THEN ask what the conversation reveals about a character that the reader didn't already know, and have them revise one line to add that.

Cognitive Ownership

- By the end of this lesson, the teacher, not just the curriculum, can explain in one sentence why dialogue belongs in the show-don't-tell unit rather than being taught as an isolated grammar skill.
- The teacher can anticipate, without looking at an answer key, which two or three student responses are most likely to surface during the inference discussion (see the Student-Thinking Simulator), with a planned response already ready for each.
- The teacher can distinguish, on sight, between a student who has identified dialogue and a student who has analyzed it, and can say which one any given student response represents.
- The teacher owns the pivot question ("what does that SHOW us?") as an automatic routine rather than something they have to remember to ask.
- The teacher can justify, to a coach or to themselves, why the Telephone Game is capped at 10 minutes rather than being allowed to expand to fill the period.

Alignment Check

- Objective to standard: the I Can and I Will statements name inference with evidence and correct dialogue conventions, both mapping directly to TEKS 5.8.B and 5.11.D.ii with no gap or drift.
- Task to objective: the narrative writing task requires both the convention (5 Rules) and the craft move (show, don't tell) the objectives name. A student cannot complete it by meeting only one.
- Discussion to cognitive demand: the whole group inference discussion is budgeted the most time (8 minutes, plus 12 for close reading) of any segment, matching the lesson's own claim that inference, not mechanics, is the ceiling skill.
- Assessment to mastery continuum: the narrative task and exit ticket are the only two checkpoints that can produce a Got It rating, since only they require an unprompted inference with cited evidence. The Telephone Game, by design, can only ever show convention mastery, not inference mastery.
- No gaps found: every stated objective has at least one task that assesses it, and every task maps back to a stated objective.

Closed-Lesson Challenge

- For a student who finishes early and already shows Got It on both conventions and inference: ask them to find a second moment in Chapter 3 (or Chapters 1-2) where dialogue, or its absence, reveals something about Shinpei, and to write the evidence chain for it the way the lesson modeled for the rice field exchange.
- Push further: have them identify a moment where the author chose not to use dialogue and argue why telling, not showing, was the better choice there. This tests whether mastery of the rule ("show, don't tell") has calcified into an overcorrection, or whether the student understands it's a tool, not an absolute.

- If a partner is available at the same readiness band, have the two students trade narrative task dialogue and identify each other's strongest inference worthy line, then revise one line in their own piece to make it carry more inferential weight.

PREPARE Readiness Profile

- Content mastery (TEKS 5.8.B and 5.11.D.ii): 5/5. Both the conventions and the inference skill are explicitly taught, practiced, and assessed.
- Anticipating misconceptions: 5/5. Six specific misconceptions identified with a matching IF, THEN response for each.
- Questioning and discussion plan: 4/5. Strong standing pivot question and sentence frame; could add one more cold call line as backup if the two pre-selected lines don't land.
- Differentiation and supports: 4/5. Scaffolds exist for struggling readers and extension exists for advanced writers; English learners are supported by the sentence frame and partner talk before cold calling.
- Assessment alignment: 5/5. Every objective maps to at least one task; the mastery continuum and readiness bands both resolve to the same evidence, the narrative task and exit ticket.
- Lesson pacing: 4/5. The time budget protects the inference discussion as the lesson's largest block; the Telephone Game is deliberately capped so it cannot crowd out the higher demand work.
- This lesson is ready to teach with confidence. The plan correctly treats inference with evidence, not the dialogue conventions, as the ceiling skill, and the teacher has a rehearsed response ready for every misconception this lesson is likely to surface. The one open question to watch live: whether the two pre-selected Chapter 3 lines are enough to carry the whole group discussion, or whether a third backup line should be queued.