Rhode Island College

Digital Commons @ RIC

Master's Theses, Dissertations, Graduate
Research and Major Papers Overview

Master's Theses, Dissertations, Graduate
Research and Major Papers

5-2008

A Qualitative Study of the Epistemological Interplay between Teachers and Students in a High Stakes Testing Environment

Donald Bruce Bierman
Rhode Island College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.ric.edu/etd>

Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Epistemology Commons](#), [Secondary Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bierman, Donald Bruce, "A Qualitative Study of the Epistemological Interplay between Teachers and Students in a High Stakes Testing Environment" (2008). *Master's Theses, Dissertations, Graduate Research and Major Papers Overview*. 11.
<https://digitalcommons.ric.edu/etd/11>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses, Dissertations, Graduate Research and Major Papers at Digital Commons @ RIC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses, Dissertations, Graduate Research and Major Papers Overview by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ RIC. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@ric.edu.

A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF THE EPISTEMOLOGICAL INTERPLAY
BETWEEN TEACHERS AND STUDENTS IN A HIGH STAKES TESTING
ENVIRONMENT

BY
DONALD BRUCE BIERMAN

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
AND
RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE

2008

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DISSERTATION

OF

DONALD BRUCE BIERMAN

APPROVED:

Dissertation Committee

Major Professor

ASSOCIATE DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL- RIC

DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL- URI

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
AND
RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE

2008

Abstract:

The severe consequences of not achieving Annual Yearly Progress standards established by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 have resulted in schools developing programs designed to address the academic needs of students at risk for failing the assessment. Focusing on one reading class comprised of two teachers and 15 tenth grade students enrolled in such a program, I inquire into the impact students and teachers have upon one another's epistemological understandings, particularly regarding their beliefs about the source of knowledge. Employing grounded theory methodology informed by microethnographic discourse analysis, the author analyzes transcripts of classroom conversations, interviews with students and teachers, and students' written texts, including their written responses to the reading section of the state's high stakes assessment. While both teachers establish an inherently hegemonic institutional discursive context, positioning themselves as the source of knowledge, student behavior evidences resistance to this epistemological stance. Intersubjectivity, intertextuality, and interdiscursivity in students' discourse indicate persistent attempts to modify the discursive context. Students refuse to accept institutional devaluations of their worldviews and identities as they continue to reference their own personal experiences, perceptions, and interpretations in their literary analysis. Concurrently, students' discourse has no discernible effect upon the teachers' epistemological beliefs. The study ends with suggestions for creating curriculum designed explicitly for the activization of alternative epistemological resources that would empower this population of students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	ix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Justification for the Significance of the Study	3
Methodology	6
Justification for Methodology	6
Qualifications of the Researcher to Conduct Grounded Theory	
Research: A Four-Year Pilot Study	9
The Inductive Recognition of Categories in Qualitative Research	
Data	12
Student and Teacher Interviews and Protocols	14
CHAPTER TWO: BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
The Policy	15
NCLB & AYP	15
The Genesis of NCLB and School-level Accountability	18
The Need for NCLB and AYP in Connecticut	21
The Connecticut Assessment	23
The Need for NCLB and AYP at the East Millton Academy	25
Theoretical and Empirical Research Review: Teacher and Student Epistemology	30
Stages of Development	30
Essential Questions	31
Seminal Epistemological Educational Researchers	32
Perry	32
Belenky	33
King & Kitchener's Reflective Judgment Model	33
Kuhn's Theory-in-Action	34
Schommer	34
Alternative Epistemological Theories	35
The Connection between Personal Epistemology and Cognitive Development Theory	35
Teacher-Epistemology: Effects upon Student Learning	36
Empirical Studies	38

Understanding Middle School Students' Beliefs about Knowledge and Learning	38
Teaching and Learning Literate Epistemologies	39
The Language of Interpretation	42
The Nystrand & Gamoran Database: How Teacher-Epistemology Affects Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Student Academic Achievement	43
Instructional Discourse, Student Engagement, & Literature Achievement	44
Understanding the Dynamics of Language And Learning in the English Classroom	47
Classroom Discourse and Its Effects on Writing	49
The Structure and Dynamics of Unfolding Classroom Discourse	50
One Teacher's Transition Towards a Dialogic Classroom	52
The Remaking of a High School Reader	53
The Theoretical Importance of Discourse in Education	54
Qualitative Methodology for Observing the Process of Teaching As Art	64
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	68
Setting	76
Participants	77
The Teachers	77
Sophie	77
Shelly	77
The Students	78
Marcus and Marianna	78
Anna	79
Tanya	79
Bruno	79
Anko	80
Jacob	80
Jasmine	80
Isabel	80
Carmella	81
Hannah	81
Samuel	81
Nonparticipants	81
Day-by-Day Class Structure: Curriculum Summary	82
Data Sources	84
Interviews	84
Videotapes & Transcripts	84
Field Notes	85

Published Materials	86
Procedures and Data Analysis	86
Reliability of Data Analysis	89
 CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS	 94
Overview	94
Summary of Analysis for Days 1 and 2	96
Day 1: Establishing the Discursive Contexts	100
The Discursive Context of the School	100
The Discursive Context of the Temple	102
The Discursive Context of the Government	105
The Evolving Discursive Context of the School	112
Conclusion for Day 1	114
Day 2: Establishing the Discursive Contexts	115
Challenges to the Discursive Context of the School	115
The Commingling of Discursive Contexts	117
From Student-Challenges to Teacher-Coercion	121
The Factory, Efficiency, and Student-Resistance	122
Hegemonic Response to Student-Resistance	124
The Discursive Contexts of the Factory and the School	125
Conclusion for Day 2	132
Theoretical and Methodological Memo	133
Summary of Analysis for Days 3 and 4	135
Day 3: Epistemological Challenges and Repercussions	136
Re-establishing the Discursive Contexts	136
Epistemological Challenge	138
Introduction to Pseudo-Authentic Discourse	142
Imposition of a Worldview	146
Monologic Disfluency	147
Conclusion for Day 3	154
Day 4: The Form of Hegemonic Discourse	154
Theoretical and Methodological Memo	156
Day 5: Shifting Discursive Patterns	160
Students as Authoritative Sources of Knowledge	160
Negotiating Thematic Coherence	167
Interpretation of the Hidden Curriculum	176
Day 6: Reclaiming the Epistemological, Institutional Context	184
A Brief Confession	184
Review: The Three Cycles	184
Symptoms of the Institutional Context	186
Teacher Questions	186
Student-Initiated Opportunities for Change	189
The Teacher's Sense of Efficacy	190
Alternative Interpretations and Worldviews	194
Another Cultural Invitation: Rejection and Consequences	196

Literary Analysis as Formulaic Writing	198
Day 7: Data Indicating the Validity of the Three Cycles in Figure 4.1	198
Conclusion for Days 5, 6, and 7	214
Day 8: Form and Meaning in an Institutional, Monologic Discursive Context where Authority is the Source of Knowledge	215
Teacher's Epistemology Evidenced by her Projected Worldview, Contradictions, and Confusions	216
Worldview	216
Contradictions and Confusions	221
Student-Behavior that Belies the Teacher's Epistemological Stance	222
Student Empathy and Humor	222
An Authentic Aesthetic Challenge	223
Copying, Confusion, Withdrawal, and Humor	224
Resistance and Removal from the Class	225
Conclusion for Day 8	230
Day 9: Hegemony, Disfluency, and Student-Models	232
Summary Analysis for Day 9	232
A Model Answer	238
A Model Student	239
Conclusion for Day 9	241
Day 10: Final Literary Analysis Instruction	242
Direct Instruction from an Authoritative Source	242
Analysis of Students' Responses to the RTL Section of the CAPT	262
Summary of the Story and the Four Questions	262
Summary of Students' Responses	264
Analysis of Individual Students' Responses	265
 CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS	 287
Purpose of the Study	287
Results and Discussion	290
Conclusion	302
Future Research	303
A Note Concerning My Voice	304
 Appendix A: The Schommer Epistemological Questionnaire	 306
 Appendix B: Protocols	 313
 Appendix C: Transcripts and First Iteration Notes	
Day 1: December 3 rd , 2005: Sophie's Introduction	321
Day 2: December 10 th , 2005: Shelly's Introduction	343
Day 3: December 17 th , 2005: Sophie's 2 nd Class: <u>The Fight Club</u> or "Whose Class is this Anyway?"	366

Day 4: January 7 th , 2006: Shelly's 2 nd Class: "The Blanket"	388
Day 5: January 21 st , 2006: Sophie's 3 rd Class: "Moving On"	402
Day 6: January 28 th , 2006: Shelly's 3 rd Class: Moving Beyond "Moving On"	428
Day 7: February 4 th , 2006: Sophie's 4 th Class: The Battle for Middle Earth	446
Day 8: February 11 th , 2006: Shelly's 4 th Class: "Bedtime Story"	460
Day 9: February 25 th , 2006: Sophie's Last Class: "Rope-a-Dope"	478
Day 10: March 3 rd , 2006: Shelly's Last Class	501
Interview with Bruno	522
Interview with Shelly and Sophie	534
Interview with Anna	544
 Bibliography	 560

List of Tables

Table 4.1: Day 1: Evidence of Institutional Contexts, Activated Epistemological Resources, and Technologization of Discourse	98
Table 4.2: Day 2: Evidence of Institutional Contexts, Activated Epistemological Resources, and Technologization of Discourse	99
Table 4.3: Discursive Contexts	109
Table 4.4: Discursive Context Analysis	119
Table 4.5: Monologue Analysis: Power in the Context of the Factory	124
Table 4.6: Commingled Discursive Contexts	126
Table 4.7: Epistemological Challenge	138
Table 4.8: Analysis of Teacher-Intent During a Pseudo-Authentic Conversation	143
Table 4.9: Analysis of Monologic Disfluency	147
Table 4.10: Shifting Discursive Patterns	161
Table 4.11: Negotiation of Thematic Coherence	169
Table 4.12: Negotiation of Thematic Coherence Continued	170
Table 4.13: Discursive Process Change	171
Table 4.14: Contesting the Established Discursive Process	173
Table 4.15: Teacher-Questions and their Demands upon Students	187
Table 4.16: Teacher-Rejected Opportunities, Student-Resistance, and Coercion: Evidence of Two Cycles	189
Table 4.17: Validation of the Three Cycles in Figure 4.1	201
Table 4.18: Shelly's Construction of the Students' Worldview	216
Table 4.19: Disciplinary Actions by Students and the Teacher	225
Table 4.20: Increased Teacher-Disfluency in an Institutional Context	234
Table 4.21: Discursive Activation of Alternative Epistemological Resources	239
Table 4.22: The Context of the School: Direct Instruction of Literary Analysis	243
Table 4.23: Reduction of Table 4.22	255
Table 4.24: Explicit CAPT-Related Direct Instruction of Literary Analysis	260
Table 4.25: Saturday Academy Students' Written Responses to the RTL Section of the CAPT	265

List of Figures

Figure 4.1: The Three Cycles of Discursive Context Evolution	185

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The educational experiences we offer young people both reflect and are determined by our society's epistemological beliefs. They mold students' perceptions and their interpretations of those perceptions (Eisner, 1994, 1998), their realities and the cognitive tools—the epistemological resources (Hammer & Elby, 2002; Loucas, Elby, Hammer, & Kagey, 2004)—they will call upon to make sense of their realities and to shape their culture. Therefore, it is necessary that as teacher-researchers explore and attempt to interpret what teachers, students, and parents experience in our schools, they consider critically the conflict between conservative and progressive educational doctrine, pedagogy, curriculum, and methodology (Cremin, 1961), as attempts to address this tension ultimately determine not only the classroom contexts in which our students will learn and the discourses in which our students will participate, but also the essential framework they will construct regarding their elemental perceptions of propositional knowledge—their epistemology: what is the source of knowledge, how is it acquired, where does it reside, how does it change, how is it assessed, what knowledge is valorized, is it permanent or transitory, certain or hypothetical?

Today we witness a federal educational policy that discredits progressive educational doctrine in favor of traditional curriculum and standardized assessments. The draconian consequences imposed upon schools not achieving Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) levels mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) have resulted in schools implementing programs designed to

provide under-performing students—particularly those in populations (“subgroups”) targeted by NCLB—with the skills and knowledge requisite to pass state-mandated examinations. Although the duration and scope of such programs vary from year-long integration into the normal school day to a discrete number of isolated Saturday classes, their primary goals are explicit and identical—to get students to pass the state’s assessments. Understanding the experiences of students and teachers involved in these programs is essential, for without such inquiry we risk reinforcing at-risk students’ self-defeating perceptions of school as a place where, no matter what effort they exert, academic knowledge will continue to be irrelevant, elusive, and disempowering. When such programs are helping students, however, it is incumbent upon us to understand and to document how they are doing so.

The East Millton Academy (EMA), a regional high school in Eastern Connecticut, has established a remedial program—The Saturday Academy—for tenth grade students who are deemed to be at-risk for not passing the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT), which is the state’s assessment as mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Designated students are invited to attend this program, which meets for ten Saturdays prior to the administration of the state assessment. During each Saturday session students receive instruction in language arts (reading), social studies (writing), science, and math. The explicit goal of the Saturday Academy is to prepare students for the CAPT. The purpose of this study is to inquire into the experiences of students and teachers involved in this school program. Specifically, my study is an inquiry into the interplay and

mutual formation and re-formation of knowledge and epistemologies within a defined population of secondary school students and teachers working together in a high stakes testing environment.

In this inquiry I explore qualitatively, using Grounded Theory methodology (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) informed by microethnographic discourse analysis (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005), the evolving perceptions of knowledge—particularly the contexts in which knowledge is shared and the sources from which knowledge is derived—revealed in the discourse between and among students and teachers involved in the Reading component of EMA’s Saturday Academy.

Justification for Significance of the Study

A social constructivist educational philosophy is founded, in part, upon the creative force of language as a critical tool in the process of personal formation (Vygotsky, 1978). The important voices aimed at us from the outside when we are very young combine to become the internal voice we hear when we are left to nurture ourselves—it is our conscience, our motivation, and our logic. In time, it guides how we perceive, interpret, make sense of, and take a place in, our world (Bruner, 1996; Wertsch, 1998). The overlap of social and cognitive constructivism is significant, especially when exploring how the philosophical perspectives may be integrated and operationalized in the classroom (Windschitl, 2002). Consider that the processes and functioning of the human brain are inadequately illuminated by the brain-as-computer metaphor (information input / retrieval / manipulation / output), what Bruner (1996) refers to as the

computational model; instead, the human brain is an organ engaged in a perpetual quest to organize perceptions—what we see, hear, taste, smell, and feel—into patterns of malleable, shifting categories of symbolic data, and this quest is guided, if not determined, by societal influences. These patterns, in turn, determine both what we have perceived and what we are likely to perceive; furthermore, they prepare us for future perceptions. Unlike the computer, where information is stored in patterns of binomial electronic switches, human cognition is structured in patterns of perceptual information (Bruner, 1996)—termed “schemata” by cognitive scientists (Neiser, 1976)—represented in symbolic language (Bruner, 1996; Langer, 1942).

This paradigm has profound implications pertaining to how we accumulate, share, store, value, and assess all forms of knowledge in a school setting (Eisner, 1994, 1998). Indeed, how we perceive essential brain functions directly informs our epistemology—our beliefs about how we know what we know and how we, as teacher-researchers, might most efficiently assist in the cognitive development of those over whom we have such authority. The implications of this are obviously most poignant in an educational setting when we are designing programs intended to address the needs of our most vulnerable students—those populations that share a history of chronic underperformance in school and are therefore targeted by such educational initiatives as the No Child Left Behind Act. This is the crucial point. As educators, we are in the business of forming realities and thereby forming human beings (Eisner, 1994). We do so according to our beliefs—be they implicit or explicit—about the nature of knowledge. In the end, what is unavoidable is that

while we provide students with explicit academic information, tacitly we convey to students a sense of and a set of beliefs about the nature of what knowledge is, its source and how it is accumulated, shared, stored, and valued. We benefit our students to the extent that we make such instruction less implicit, thereby empowering students with the ability to reflect and to discourse upon their own metacognition (Applebee, 1996) and epistemology.

To do so, however, we must understand our own epistemological beliefs. Such beliefs are evident in our curriculum and how we deliver it. Inquiring into our enacted epistemologies is a critical undertaking for all reflective educators. We have to be sure that all educational experiences, and certainly those mandated by such Federal laws as the No Child Left Behind Act, are helping students, that they are doing no further harm to students who have, arguably, already been savaged by society and its educational system. I do not believe we all intentionally oppress our young students, nor do they intentionally embrace failure; instead, sometimes our motivations are subconscious, as are the pedagogies employed by teachers who are called upon to remediate failing students, and as are the motivations of those students themselves. It falls upon researchers to inquire into the experiences of children and teachers in school. The need for such inquiry is most profound in those “highly leveraged” areas where both the potential rewards and the possible risks are greatest. These areas of greatest leverage are defined by those programs established to improve the performance of our chronically under-achieving students. Unless we construct programs based upon a best-effort understanding of all teacher and student dynamics, we risk reinforcing with these

students a self-defeating and self-destructive perception of school, society, and themselves. Where this perception resides is in the cognitive structure of their epistemology (Hammer & Elby, 2002, 2004).

Methodology

In this study I explored qualitatively, using Grounded Theory methodology (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) informed by microethnographic discourse analysis (Bloome et al., 2005) the evolving perceptions of knowledge, specifically the epistemological resources activated in understanding the source and nature of knowledge (Hammer & Elby, 2002, 2004) as revealed in the discourse between and among students and teachers involved in the Reading component of EMA's Saturday Academy. The student population was originally comprised of about 60 tenth graders who accepted the invitation to participate in a series of four one-hour Saturday classes (reading, writing, math, and science) extended over ten Saturdays prior to the administration of the CAPT. Classes were held on the campus of the East Millton Academy. I situated myself in the Reading classroom. Data-collection devices included a videotape recorder, a computer, tape recorder, and pen and paper. I had unstructured interviews with the head of the Saturday Academy, two students, and both teachers.

Justification for Methodology

Instead of starting with a theory and then applying that theory to the accumulation and analysis of supposedly revealing data, I explored inductively the learning taking place in this program: I observed the environment with as few preconceived, unidentified notions as possible: "the classic inductive approach is

goal-free evaluation in which the evaluator gathers qualitative data on actual program impacts through direct observations of program activities and in-depth interviews with participants, without being limited to stated, predetermined goals” (Patton, 1987, p. 15). Qualitative analysis of learning is appropriate given the following:

(1) the interest in descriptive data; (2) the focus on interactions and process; (3) the exploratory nature of the problem; (4) the concern with individualized experiences and outcomes—different things happening to different children with varying results; and (5) uncertainty about what interactions or variables may be most important. (Patton, 1987, p. 47)

Put simply, “the more a program aims at individualized outcomes, the greater the appropriateness of qualitative case methods” (Patton, 1987, p. 19). This means that, instead of relying solely upon quantitative analysis of some variable to explore teaching, I explored the effects of teaching through inductive analysis: “Inductive analysis means that the patterns, themes, and categories of analysis come from the data; they emerge out of the data rather than being decided prior to data collection and analysis” (Patton, 1987, p. 150). One of my goals as I observed classes and gathered data was “to replace the mandate to be objective with a mandate to be fair and conscientious in taking account of multiple perspectives, multiple interests, and multiple possibilities” (Patton, 1987, p. 167), to free myself from any limiting perceptions of what I may have previously thought educational research must be. Clifford Geertz’s perceptions about how

anthropologists study art provided a useful and liberating analogy for my research methodology:

It is only in the modern age and in the West that some people . . . have managed to convince themselves that technical talk about art, however developed, is sufficient to a complete understanding of it; that the whole secret of aesthetic power is located in the formal relations among sounds, images, volumes, themes, or gestures. (1983, p. 96)

This is an important understanding because it warned me that all methodologies are culturally determined—they are not universal, logical givens. Furthermore, our methodology governs not only what we study, but what we are blind to as well: “The approach to art from the side of Western aesthetics . . . , from any sort of prior formalism, blinds us to the very existence of the data upon which a comparative understanding of it could be built” (Geertz, 1983, p. 98). Geertz makes obvious the liberating effect of this belief: “Individuals thinking of themselves as social . . . scientists have become free to shape their work in terms of its necessities rather than according to received ideas as to what they ought or ought not to be doing” (1983, p. 21). So Geertz acknowledges the need to shift towards a more aesthetic form of research methodology when the research topic calls for such a shift; the acceptance of research that is “literary” and “inexact” is “a result of the growing recognition that the established approach to treating such phenomena, laws-and-causes social physics, was not producing the triumphs of prediction, control, and testability that had for so long been promised in its name” (1983, p. 3). Teacher-researchers may legitimately explore learning by using the

gifts that may have brought them to teaching in the first place: the ability to observe with empathy, sensitivity, compassion, and intellect student-learning as it is taking place. Geertz supports the legitimacy of this methodology:

The refiguration of social theory represents, or will if it continues, a sea change in our notion not so much of what knowledge is but of what it is we want to know. Social events do have causes and social institutions effects; but it just may be that the road to discovering what we assert in asserting this lies less through postulating forces and measuring them than through noting expressions and inspecting them. (1983, p. 34)

What all this means is that teachers-researchers have been liberated to tell an interesting story.

Qualifications of the Researcher to Conduct Grounded Theory Research:

A Four-Year Pilot Study

During the 1996-2000 school years, when I was teaching ninth grade English at the East Millton Academy, an art teacher and I developed a three-week summer program—the Learning through English and Art Program (LEAP)—for incoming ninth graders. The program was approved for grant funding by the State of Connecticut. The East Millton Academy serves students living in disparate cultures—from farming communities whose children attend small, rural schools, to urban neighborhoods where the schools are larger and more racially diverse. The socio-economic backgrounds of the schools' students range widely. The target population of the program was students who needed special, individualized attention, especially as they entered an unfamiliar and therefore somewhat scary

learning environment. Students were identified by their eighth grade counselors and teachers; specifically, the grant was targeted for minority students who might benefit from a head start into high school; however, we gladly accepted students regardless of race. While the program was really not designed for students with severe emotional or learning difficulties, most of our students had not yet achieved the level of academic success or recognition that school personnel felt they were capable of. In addition to counselor and teacher recommendations, we contacted by telephone the parents of all minority students and invited them to participate in the program. The first summer 21 students enrolled, only a couple of whom were minorities. The success of the program is evidenced by the fact that by the fifth summer we had almost 100 students registered, a significant proportion of whom were minorities; however, state grants were cut and we lost funding, so the program had to be canceled prior to that summer.

During the four summers that I administered and taught the program, I kept records of student performance and progress. As part of the program, all students who participated in LEAP were placed in my ninth grade English classes, which was a tremendous advantage for those students and myself, as we started the year already comfortable with one another. By the fourth year of LEAP we had hired three additional teachers and one talented young assistant teacher, so I was able to hand off much of my teaching responsibilities in order to focus on inquiring into the efficacy of the program. My data included my own notes that I took as I observed instruction, informal personal interviews with teachers, students, and parents, video recordings of presentations, tests, and surveys. My analysis of this

data revealed patterns of categories significant to assessing the program and understanding the experiences of the students. Furthermore, anecdotal evidence continues to reveal the long-term residual effects of the program, as students long since graduated from high school stay in contact with me and other program instructors.

Prior to the termination of the grant program, two evaluators from the State Department of Education made annual evaluative visits to the campus and observed our instruction for a day. After observations, the two evaluators would conduct rigorous interviews with me and program instructors. While the evaluators were consistently positive and impressed with the program's curriculum and the teachers' delivery of that curriculum, they lamented the low enrollment of minority students, as the grant was intended to address the needs of that population of students.

For four years—every year the program ran—the state required evidence, data indicating the efficacy of the program, which I provided. The methodology by which I accumulated and analyzed data for the state's evaluation of the LEAP is similar in many significant ways to the methodology I proposed to follow as I conducted the present study. My ability to organize and to maintain written records of observations, documents, and videotapes is established. As part of my analysis of my own teaching I transcribed and analyzed class discussions seeking patterns that would allow me to understand the experiences of my students, what Levi-Strauss (1993/1997) called “the search for unsuspected harmonies.” What those data indicated were patterns of categories that one might expect to see in the

Saturday Academy. Students entered the program extremely quiet, shy, and reluctant to reveal any signs of engagement—the kind of students who willingly disappear in the classroom, or they acted out with an obvious false bravado, perhaps a façade to hide the wounds of past failure. I measured students’ growth during the program only partly in terms of work quality; of much more importance and significance, however, was the increased willingness of students to engage in assignments, to invest themselves in challenges over increasing periods of time, to engage in conversations relevant to the curriculum resulting in opportunities for cognitive growth through discourse with a more knowledgeable other (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1998), be that “other” a peer or a teacher. One admittedly simple indication of personal engagement was a pre- and post-test assigned to students: on the first day of the program students were asked to critique a painting, and on the last day of the program students were shown a different painting and asked to critique that. A word count of both assignments, along with a time-on-task measure, revealed a significant increase in program students’ willingness and ability to analyze in increasing depth abstract concepts, a skill crucial for success in school (Donaldson, 1978).

The Inductive Recognition of Categories in Qualitative Research in Data

The search for categories, patterns, and the subsequent development of theory in the attempt to understand social experiences is the essence of qualitative analysis (Creswell, 1994; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Patton, 1990/1980; Patton 1987; Schatzman & Strauss, 1973; Spradley, 1980). I might have expected to have seen in a qualitative study of the Saturday Academy

broad categories similar to those revealed in my analysis of LEAP data: teacher and student assumptions regarding knowledge, how it is defined, transmitted, acquired, stored, accessed, and assessed; what experiences most efficiently create knowledge and promote cognitive growth; how students' past experiences in school are considered by teachers as the curriculum is designed and delivered; how teachers' assumptions about their own past experiences in school influence their curriculum and their delivery of that curriculum; how the students' experiences in their culture influence student performance, and how such cultural experiences shape the curriculum and its delivery; how teachers express their own cultural perspectives as they discourse with students in either academic or personal interactions; the role of discourse—exploratory and formal—in the curriculum; the amount of time spent on student talk; the nature and purpose of feedback students receive; the assumptions of teachers and students regarding standardized tests and the realistic possibility of students achieving a passing score; how teachers convince students to invest themselves in the assessment; how students and teachers address the possibility or eventuality of failure, which is an especially critical consideration after successfully convincing students to invest themselves—their egos; students' recognition of constructed patterns (schemata) determining their perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors; teachers' recognition of students' schemata; questioning strategies—what types of questions are asked (open ended?, recitation?), who asks questions, who answers questions, how questions are answered.

The exploration of such categories requires a qualitative methodology. My goal was the formulation of theory based upon my observations and interpretations of the experiences of a focused population of students, teachers, administrators, and parents engaged in a program with a defined curriculum, the purpose of which is to pass the State of Connecticut's assessment.

Student and Teacher Interviews and Protocols

While interviews with administrators, students, and teachers were essentially informal, some questions were taken from or based upon the Schommer Epistemological Questionnaire (Schommer, 1998) (see Appendix A) and The Learner-Centered Battery of questions (McCombs, Lauer, & Peralez, 1997), which are designed to inquire into the educational beliefs, practices and experiences of teachers and students. All participants in the Saturday Academy were in tenth grade. Being minors, students were asked for their assent in writing and their parents were required to provide written consent for the students to participate in the study (see Appendix B).

CHAPTER TWO: BACKGROUND INFORMATION & A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Policy

Tenth grade students at the East Millton Academy, particularly those who are members of subgroups designated by the NCLB act, who have proven in various assessments to be at risk for not achieving at the “Proficient” level on the CAPT, were invited to participate in a remediation program designed to address students’ deficiencies, the purpose being to enable these students to pass the CAPT.

NCLB & AYP

On Friday, October 10, 2003, The Day—a widely-read newspaper in Southeastern Connecticut—announced in bold and large print: “Local Educators Slam Federal Education Act” (McNamara, 2003). The newspaper proclaimed “No Child Left Behind doesn’t work,” and the superintendent of schools in Columbia, Connecticut is quoted as saying, “No Child Left Behind comes not with strings attached, but with ropes and anchors.” The “anchor” of course is better analogized as NCLB’s whip—the provisions in the act that require all schools receiving Title I funds to evidence “Adequate Yearly Progress” (AYP) towards 100% student-achievement of “proficiency” on state testing by the year 2014 and severely punishes schools that do not do so.

Specifically, after states have established standards for student-learning (currently in reading/language arts and math, with science being added by 2007-2008), and after tests have been developed to assess students’ skills and

knowledge, schools must prove that all “subgroups” of students (students from low-income families; students belonging to racial minority groups; students with limited English-speaking proficiency; and students who are disabled) are making consistent progress towards 100% “proficiency” as measured by their performance on state tests. “Proficiency,” defined as the minimum student performance considered acceptable, is determined by each state individually. The AYP starting point (baseline) for schools is the greater of either the percent of students in the lowest performing subgroup deemed to be proficient, or the percentage of students proficient in the school whose total student enrollment is at the 20th percentile for all schools in the state. The law allows for each state to determine the number of students in any subgroup that require that subgroup to be measured; it is at this level that subgroups are considered to be statistically significant. In Connecticut that cutoff point is 40 students or more. Once the state’s starting point is established, yearly increases in student proficiency are targeted, and then all schools in the state, and all subgroups of students within each school serving the same grade-levels, must evidence, at minimum, the same percentage increase in student proficiency. One further measure of academic progress that high schools must evidence is graduation rate; the base level in Connecticut is set at 70% (Connecticut State Department of Education, “149 Connecticut Schools Need to Make More Progress,” Attachment III).

For schools that do not meet targeted improvements beginning in 2004-05, the consequences are severe. If a school fails to meet AYP for two consecutive years:

parents need to be notified and given the option to transfer their children to a higher performing school in the district. . . . Student transfers are paid for with federal funds. Schools must also identify the specific areas that need improvement and work with parents, teachers, and outside experts to develop a plan to raise student achievement. (The ABCs of “AYP”, p. 4)

For schools that fail to meet AYP for a third consecutive year, “tutoring and other supplemental educational services must be made available to low-income students . . .” (p. 4). According to the law, “Corrective Action” must be taken after not achieving AYP for the fourth year. Corrective Action includes the following:

- Replace the school staff who are “relevant to the failure to make AYP”;
- Institute a new curriculum, including appropriate professional development;
- “Significantly decrease management authority” at the school level;
- Appoint an outside expert to advise the school;
- Extend the school year or the school day for the school;
- Restructure the school’s internal organizational structure. (p. 5)

After the fifth year of failure to meet AYP targets, the school must develop an “alternate governance” plan that must include one of the following:

- Reopen the school as a public charter school;
- Replace all or most of the staff responsible for the lack of progress;
- Enter into a contract with a private company to operate the school;
- Turn over operation and management of the school to the state;

- Implement other fundamental reforms approved by the state. (p. 5)

In year seven, after a sixth year of failure to meet AYP targets, the above plan must be implemented. Schools may exempt just one percent of its students from taking grade-level assessments; the law presumes that all other students can be expected to achieve proficiency. It is important to understand the severity of consequences attached to NCLB and not achieving AYP in order to understand what might motivate states either to set their level of proficiency at low levels or to implement remedial programs designed to address the needs of at-risk students.

The Genesis of NCLB and School-level Accountability

One of the most influential documents to be produced by the Department of Education during the Reagan administration was A Nation at Risk (1983). The tenor of this document may be easily and accurately ascertained in the famous passage:

Our Nation is at risk. . . . We report . . . the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people. . . . If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves. . . . We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament. (p. 1)

While the document assumes a cultural commonality among the people of this nation, and although it views foreign economic competition as equivalent to

military invasion, the arguments presented therein were convincing enough, if only on a visceral level, to have provoked something of a panic. Public perception, being as it is seldom determined by triangulated, empirical, peer-reviewed data, has, to some extent, followed in the wake of the publication. Of course, public opinion may well have been heading in that direction regardless of any information imagined and disseminated by the Reagan administration.

Another influential publication commissioned by the government is What Work Requires of Schools: A SCANS Report for America 2000 (Academic Innovations 2000: The Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills, 1991). The commission, comprised of people high in the industrial and governmental hierarchy and therefore deemed successful and wise, developed a list of corporate needs the American educational system must fulfill. While this consortium of supposed experts was careful to state that their report should not be interpreted as a critique of the state of the Nation's educational system, their findings are an undeniable attack upon public schools, public school teachers, and public school students:

More than half of our young people leave school without the knowledge or foundation required to find and hold a good job. . . . Despite a decade of reform efforts, we can demonstrate little improvement in student achievement. We are failing to develop the full academic abilities of most students and utterly failing the majority of poor, disadvantage, and minority youngsters. (pp. 2-3)

Echoes of A Nation at Risk are clearly evident in this publication: while what happens in school is important, academic success is a Darwinian struggle to rise through individual efforts above the common level of society, and failure to do so is yet further evidence of the workings of natural selection; the purpose of education is to prepare young people to be productive at low-to-middle levels in corporate America; America stands alone against a worldwide economic blitzkrieg; young people's vision of the world should be a paradoxical mix of global marketplace and xenophobia; and the public school system is failing to fulfill its critical responsibility of providing employers with trained (not democratically educated) employees; therefore, the security of America is threatened.

It is worth noting that while the perception of the current Bush administration (and perhaps the public in general) is that American citizens are dissatisfied with the state of public education, the 2000 Gallup Poll (Rose & Gallup, 2000) revealed that Americans rate their local educational systems quite highly. In the words of the study, “. . . the clear support for public schools that is evident throughout the poll [is] good news for public school advocates. . . The notion that the public is dissatisfied with its public schools is based on myth instead of fact” (p. 1). The poll indicates that the more personally involved people are with their school system—the more they know about their schools—the happier they are about the state of education. While 44% of people with no children in school gave schools in their community an A or B, 56% of public school parents graded their schools at that level. This grade drops precipitously as

these same people are asked to grade the public schools nationally (19% and 22%, respectively). It seems as though the less people know, the more blindly critical are their judgments. Both sets of adults felt that qualified, competent teachers offer the most promise for improving public schools. Another indicator of the importance of personal knowledge in the formation of our opinions regarding public education is the poll's finding that the biggest problem facing public schools, according to public school parents, is lack of financial support; for people with no children in school, however, this problem tied with their perception of a lack of discipline in their local schools. Finally, regarding academic expectations, the most important purpose of schools is to prepare people to become responsible citizens, and 70% of public school parents want their schools to provide a balanced education instead of focusing on only the basic subjects. In a somewhat contradictory finding, 80% of the people polled believed most students achieve only a small part of their potential in school. Nevertheless, almost 50% of all respondents indicated that both Federal and State governments exerted too much influence in their local school systems.

The Need for NCLB and AYP in Connecticut

I do not see how it can be denied that the nation has a problem: public school students identified as black or Hispanic are not performing as well as those identified as white on state and national tests. The 1999 National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) test, administered by the National Center for Educational Statistics to a random cross section of America's schools, is one instrument that reveals the gap between white and non-white achievement

(Achievement Gap Summary Tables, 2003); clearly, the gap is not closing. The performance gap between African-American students and white students was 34 points in 1992 and 35 points in 1998. At the same time, both groups' performance improved by about the same amount. In the ten years between 1990 and 2000, the percentage of eighth grade African American students who tested below the basic level on the math section decreased by 3 percentage points, from 72% to 69%; meanwhile, the percentage of white students who tested below the basic level decreased by 17 percentage points, from 31% to 14%. Similar evidence of inequity is found in the reading section of the test for fourth graders: the percentage of African American students who tested below the basic level in 1992 decreased by 13 percentage points in the 1998 test, from 66% to 53%; white students showed an 8 percentage point decline from 20% to 12%.

This same disparity seen on the national level is found in Connecticut as well. Connecticut's gap between white and non-white academic performance as measured by the NAEP is in fact large in comparison with other states. In the grade 4 math assessment only California, Minnesota, and Washington, D. C. evidences larger gaps between white and African American performance. By eighth grade Connecticut revealed the largest gap of any state in the nation. The findings between white and Latino students are similar, as are the findings for other subjects—reading, writing, and science. Again, what all this says is that Connecticut has a problem, and whatever is being done about it is not producing the intended results. I am not saying that schools have caused the problem of unequal testing results, nor that schools are necessarily the organizations that can

or should rectify the problem; yet the problem exists, and if the fix is not in the realm of education, I do not know where else society is likely to look. While we can perhaps assume many schools offer quality education to nonwhite students, we can also assume that nonwhite students are not availing themselves of particular opportunities to learn in ways that might allow them to do well on state tests. The problem could be in the schools, the assessments, the society, or all three.

The Connecticut Assessment

George Hillocks, Jr. (2003) refers to the rhetoric of NCLB as a “simple-minded view of education” (p. 63). While he seems to be no proponent of NCLB, he concedes that the test is here to stay, and educators must find a way to present their concerns in such a way as to make policy-makers listen:

I am certain that, for complaints to have any impact on school administrators and state legislators, they will have to rise above the level of whining. They will have to be based on thoughtful analyses of the learning standards, the test items, the scoring procedures, and, in the case of writing, the scoring criteria and benchmark of anchor papers that illustrate the criteria. (p. 63)

Educators concerned about the perhaps unintended consequences of NCLB upon students must arm themselves with specific knowledge regarding all aspects of state goals and assessments. Only then can they expect to have an attentive audience. Connecticut’s high school assessment is administered to tenth grade students. Already this reveals a disparity between standards and assessment, which Hillocks argues contravenes the validity of the law. The Language Arts

Curriculum Framework, as published on-line by the Connecticut State Department of Education (1998), begins with the following words: “By the end of Grade 12 . . .” (p. 52). How does the state know what students can do in 12th grade when students are only being tested in 10th? Nevertheless, students are tested in mathematics, science, reading, and writing. The student performance criteria required as part of NCLB is as follows: For all students and each subgroup with 40 or more students, 59 percent proficient in mathematics, 62 percent proficient in reading, 70 percent at basic or above in writing or improvement from previous year, 95 percent participation (Sergi, 2003a, 2003b). The state has determined that a holistically-determined and statistically-manipulated score of three or better is proficient and meets NCLB requirements for the Reading section of the CAPT. Scores may range from 1 (Intervention) to 5 (Advanced). This measure reveals little about students’ skills, knowledge, or the state of public education in Connecticut. Indeed, the state realizes this fact and has established its own goal (level 4). This inconsistency is insupportable considering that the federal program, NCLB, touts itself as being scientifically justified, as all measures should be in the field of education. So whose standards are justified by research? The federal government’s or the state’s? The problem is that, given the consequences of not meeting NCLB requirements, states are establishing lower levels of passing for federal purposes. One can conjecture several purposes for establishing assessment goals at the state level whereby less than 50% of the students pass—those purposes are all about political influence and power. What might be the consequences if teachers are, in fact, doing a *good* job? (Berliner & Biddle, 1995). The allusive

nature of justifiable and consistent NCLB standards is further evidenced in the comparison of all fifty states' standards and assessments, which is impossible to do (Linn, Baker, & Betebenner, 2002).

The Need for NCLB and AYP at the East Millton Academy

The East Millton Academy (EMA) is an independent school serving 2,500 students from Millton and seven other districts that range from rural to urban. According to data published on the State of Connecticut Department of Education's website (Strategic School Profile), 2.9% of EMA students are eligible for free/reduced-price meals, compared with a state average of 22.2%, and an ERG average of 32.2%; however, since EMA is an independent school and therefore receives no Title I funds, this 2.9% figure is misleadingly understated. EMA's student population is 80% white, 10% black, 5.5 % Hispanic, 2.9% Asian American, and 1.7% American Indian. In 2001, EMA's CAPT performance exceeded both Economic Reference Group (ERG) and state averages in all categories, and SAT performance is comparable to state averages. Dropout rates at EMA (13.6%) exceeded the state average (11.2%). Most pertinent, certainly, is that only 58% of black students scored at or above proficient on the math portion of the CAPT (compared with 91% of white students)—the state baseline is 59%; also, 58% of black students scored at or above proficient in the reading portion of the CAPT (compared with 89% of white students)—the state baseline is 62%. These deficiencies and discrepancies are disconcerting given the school's demographics and have necessitated the school's policy, stated earlier. EMA is one genre of school that NCLB may be targeting—schools that consider

themselves to be highly successful, yet are obviously not succeeding with specific populations of students—African American, to be specific.

Significant administrative and teacher time will be required to develop and to implement a curriculum aimed at addressing the school's needs: to improve the performance of African American students on the CAPT and to thereby address federal regulations established as part of NCLB. Courses will have to be developed, teachers will have to be assigned to teach these courses, and they will require training. The needs of these 230 students will often take precedence over the other 2,170 students. Exacerbating the problem is the fact that resources are scarce. Teachers have no excess time. The sending towns have no excess money; in fact, the elementary and middle schools of the sending towns are cutting art and music programs as they increase class sizes. The risks are high because nothing guarantees that any program will work with these low-performing students. Resources allocated to fulfilling this policy may return nothing, at least as outcomes are measured by the state assessment—the CAPT. Whether or not one deems this to be an equitable allocation of resources would depend upon what one believes to be the purpose of this nation's public education system.

From the time students enter EMA their educational experiences may be markedly different, depending upon their cultural and academic preparation. After graduating from eighth grade, students may choose to attend the Millton High School, the Millton Technical School, or the East Millton Academy. To be succinct, Millton High School's students are, generally speaking, financially disadvantaged, non-white, and academically unsuccessful; students attending the

Millton Technical School are heading towards non-academic, non-professional, working class trades; and EMA is academic in the traditional sense. Upon enrolling at EMA certain students are selected for Honors-level science, math, and foreign language classes. By tenth grade social studies and English have also become tracked. If you were to poke your head into any of these Honors classes you would see few students with dark skin. As if to justify the selection process, the frequency of failure among black and financially-disadvantaged students in ninth grade far exceeds that of white/middle class students. Proof of this is easily seen if one, again, pokes one's head into the Contemporary English classes (special tenth grade English classes for students who fail ninth grade English)—one will find many of the dark-skinned students that one did not see in the Honors classes the year before. If the purpose of public education is to prepare students to live productively and to participate intelligently in our democracy, then obviously something must be done. Preparing to pass a state assessment, however, may prove to be damaging as well. What is needed is a true recognition of cultural diversity—a program that recognizes that the perceptions and discourse of students from various cultures will never melt into a homogeneous blend, becoming thereby one with the dominant white culture; the testing that is supposed to be a cure may, in reality, further reinforce the failure of disadvantaged students. It is hard to imagine the blows to one's self-esteem that many black students endure over the course of their elementary and secondary education. Failure becomes so ingrained and expected that to break out of it becomes an act of treason. The children have not created the system that has caused their failure. In truth, our

democracy needs these children to be educated and to be strong. Scarce resources may be justifiably sent in their direction, even at the expense of other students with different, no less important needs. If we do not do so now, we will do so later.

Our current experiences with crime and punishment bear that out.

Any productive change in the educational system must result in a change in the behavior of black students as evidenced in assessments the state has determined to be appropriate. The threat of course is the perception on the part of failing students that there are no consequences of failing other than the channeling of resources and personal attention in their direction. This equity-equality trade-off must be considered. I agree with the belief, however, that “people are motivated to work by inherent satisfactions, self-esteem, and sense of belonging” (Stone, 2002, p. 84). Furthermore, knowing that failure is not inevitable and that an academic safety net awaits students who have experienced failure and who likely fear its recurrence may allow these students the security we all need to learn and to succeed. Finally, “power, wealth, and knowledge are prerequisites to genuine liberty. By equalizing these resources, government enhances ‘positive liberty,’ the control over one’s own life” (Stone, 2002, p. 130).

Numbers—measurements—quantitative assessments are the foundation of NCLB. As shown above, the disparity in academic performance between black and white as evidenced in the NAEP is unacceptable. The focus on NCLB and its AYP mechanism is to ensure the equitable treatment of four targeted groups: racial minorities, students with disabilities, students who do not speak English adequately, and students who are financially disadvantaged. The fixes, however,

are not as self-evident as Haycock and Wiener (2003) would have them be:

“Much of the criticism of [NCLB] is fueled by misunderstanding of what it actually requires and driven more by the interests of adults who work in the system than by concerns about what is right for kids” (p. 1). This sort of logic serves no thinking-person’s interests. Jonathan Kozol’s words in Deborah Meier’s book, Will Standards Save Public Education (2000), appeal far more than those of Haycock and Wiener to the humanitarian mission of teachers:

[Teachers] have a moral vision of a good society and want to do their part in bringing incremental bits of justice to an unjust city and an unjust world. They come with all the treasures they have gleaned from their own education. They want to share these treasures with the children, but they also want to find the treasures that exist already *in* those children, and they know they cannot do this if they’re forced to march the kids in lockstep to the next “objective” or, God help us, the next “benchmark,” so that they’ll be ready—and God help us, please, a little more—to pass the next examination. . . . The best teachers of little kids I know are poets in their personalities: they love the unpredictable. That’s why they’re drawn to children and not business school. If we force them to be little more than the obedient floor managers for industry, they won’t remain in public schools. The price will be too high. The poetry will have been turned to prose: the worst kind too, the prose of experts who know every single thing there is to know except their own destructiveness. (pp. x-xii)

Hillocks (2003) agrees:

This is a crucial time in American democracy. We are faced with problems that demand critical thinking of all citizens. We need to help students examine specious arguments and know them for what they are. Our tests encourage the opposite. They encourage blurry thinking and obfuscation. As a society, we cannot afford to spend valuable classroom time on vacuous thinking and writing. We need to tell citizens and legislators what these problems are and insist that they be addressed. (p. 70)

The onus now falls upon educators to respond, to defend their vision of education—its purposes, and to protect the young students who, as history has so often proven, bear the suffering whenever adults act out of ignorance, selfishness, and fear.

Theoretical and Empirical Research Review:

Teacher and Student Epistemology

Stages of Development

Teachers' beliefs about knowledge-acquisition and knowledge-formation—their “personal ways of knowing” (Hofer, 2001)—affect how they feel about their profession—their own sense of efficacy and purpose. Teachers' epistemologies inform their decisions about what and how they will teach (Marshall, Smagorinsky, & Smith, 1995), although their classroom practice may differ significantly from their stated epistemologies (Cohen, 1990). Most importantly, they further construct their students' own epistemologies, which is critical, for these are the constructs that allow for academic success as students shape their attitudes about learning even after they leave school (Ryan, 1984; Schommer-

Aikins, Mau, Brookhart, & Hutter, 2000). The term “personal ways of knowing” is essentially synonymous with other terms used by researchers in this field: “epistemological beliefs,” “reflective judgment,” “ways of knowing,” and “epistemological reflection.” This section explores the origins and subsequent seminal studies regarding personal epistemology, how personal epistemologies affect learning, and how these studies might inform educators. The research presented herein is derived from reviews by Hofer & Pintrich (1997, 2002), Hofer (2001), Schraw & Olafson (2002), and Kane, Sandretto, & Heath (2002); I present a cursory analysis of the original empirical studies by Perry (1968), Schommer (1990, 1993), Ryan (1984), Kardash & Scholes (1996), Kardash & Howell (2000), Kardash & Sinatra (2003), White (2000), Johnston, Woodside, Jiron, & Day (2000), Schommer-Aikins, Mau, Brookhart, & Hutter (2000), Brownlee, Purdie, & Boulton-Lewis (2001), Marshall et al. (1995), and Nystrand & Gamoran (1991). My references to cognitive development theory and instructional psychology are founded upon Bruer (1999) and Neiser (1976).

Essential Questions

- What exactly does the term “epistemology” mean and how does it differ from beliefs about instruction and learning?
- What methodologies and what tools most accurately measure a person’s epistemology?
- Do teachers and students have implicit and explicit epistemologies?
- How and why do epistemologies evolve or progress?
- Are teachers’ epistemologies evident in their curriculum and pedagogy?

- Do teachers' epistemologies affect the growth, evolution, and construction of student epistemologies, their academic achievement and their learning?
- Do teachers' epistemologies affect their own professional growth?
- Do student epistemologies affect their learning?

Seminal Epistemological Educational Researchers

Epistemological thinking has been conceptualized in several ways (Hofer, 2001): as an intellectual evolution related to Piaget's theory of intellectual growth and Kohlberg's theory of moral development (Perry, 1968; Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Baxter Magolda, 1987); as cognitive structures (King & Kitchener, 1994); as argumentative reasoning (Kuhn, 1991) and as constructs derived from experiences afforded in the environment (Hofer & Pintrich, 2002).

Perry

One of the first, seminal studies was performed by W. G. Perry who interviewed Harvard students in order to determine if their intellectual constructs evidenced any recognizable patterns or followed any discernable and predictable path; in other words, was the intellectual growth of these students—who were interviewed over the course of their four years at Harvard—a matter of personality, biology, or something else? What Perry's team discovered was a consistent pattern of student epistemological belief that progressed from simple to sophisticated:

Individuals begin with a *dualistic* perspective of knowledge characterized by a right-and-wrong, absolutist view and the belief that truth can be known and the role of the teacher is to communicate it. This is eventually modified as

multiplism, as individuals begin to acknowledge the existence of diverse viewpoints and the possibility of uncertainty. Toward the end of this period of development individuals are likely to see conflicting views as equally valid. The movement from multiplism to *relativism* is characterized by the recognition that some views are better than others. In the positions that follow, individuals develop a growing ability to forge *commitment within relativism*. (Hofer, 2001, p. 357)

Perry's interview instrument is still an important tool in the field.

Belenky

Belenky's work focuses on the source of knowledge and contributed to the knowledge base by including women in her study; she essentially built upon Perry's foundation. Her study indicated five positions of the individual as knower:

silence, *received knowing* (similar to Perry's dualism), *subjective knowledge* (similar to multiplism), *procedural knowledge*, and *constructed knowledge*. A central contribution has been the identification of two distinct epistemological orientations within procedural knowledge: *connecting knowing* (an empathic and caring approach to knowing) and *separate knowing* (a detached and impersonal approach). (Hofer, 2001, p. 357)

King & Kitchener's Reflective Judgment Model

Based on a 20 year series of longitudinal and cross-sectional interviews with people from high school age to adults, the reflective judgment model (sometimes associated with critical thinking) theorizes about the evolution of

processes used by people as they are confronted with open-ended problems:

“reflective judgment delineates the development of the *process of knowing and reasoning*. . . . The seven-stage model traverses three levels: *pre-reflective*, *quasi-reflective*, and *reflective*. (Hofer, 2001, p. 358)

Kuhn’s Theory-in-Action

Kuhn’s study was interview-based as it explored the problem-solving strategies of individuals—young and old. The purpose was to identify “the epistemological standards that underlie argumentative reasoning, in terms similar to Perry’s” (Hofer, 2001, p. 359). What they found was the “epistemological views are categorized in one of three stages: *absolutist*, *multiplist*, or *evaluative*” (Hofer, 2001, p. 359).

Schommer

One major contribution of Schommer’s work, which again used Perry’s work as its base, is The Epistemological Beliefs Questionnaire (see Appendix A). This still-evolving tool “was designed to tap five hypothesized dimensions: structure, stability, source of knowledge, and control and speed of knowledge acquisition” (Hofer, 2001, p. 360):

Empirical work has generated four of the factors (all but source of knowledge), each of which is viewed as a continuum. These are identified from the naïve perspective as *Certain Knowledge* (knowledge is certain vs. knowledge is tentative and evolving), *Simple Knowledge* (knowledge as isolated, unambiguous bits of information vs. knowledge as high interrelated concepts), *Quick Learning* (learning occurs quickly or not at all

vs. learning as a gradual enterprise), and *Fixed Ability* (intelligence is fixed vs. intelligence is incremental). (p. 360)

Alternative Epistemological Theories

Cognitive psychology informs an alternative conception of personal epistemology: “One proposal is that an individual’s beliefs about knowledge and knowing are organized into personal theories, as structures of interrelated propositions that are interconnected and coherent” (Hofer, 2001, p. 360). One significant difference inherent in this conception is that “individuals appear to have differing epistemological assumptions about disciplines rather than general beliefs about knowledge that override disciplinary context” (p. 361).

The Connection between Personal Epistemology and Cognitive Development Theory

Hofer (2001) makes the point that the study of personal epistemology is directly related to the field of cognitive development, and by ignoring this connection educators risk blinding themselves to a rich source of personal and pedagogical insights:

We need to elaborate the cognitive nature of the model in order to better integrate this work within a larger field of cognitive development, both by locating personal epistemology within identifiable territory and connecting it to life-span cognitive development, and we need to better use cognitive psychology to understand mechanisms of acquisition and change, as well as the situated nature of the construct. We can advance our understanding of epistemological thinking by identifying the connections to other aspects

of cognition and cognitive development and by locating this work within our developing understanding of cognitive psychology. (pp. 362-363)

Following up on this important link, Kitchener sees three types of cognition, what he terms *cognition*, *metacognition*, and *epistemic cognition* (in Hofer, 2001). These categories are important when studying how individuals approach and attempt to solve ill-structured problems. Since most of the problems we face in life outside of school are decidedly ill-structured, this is truly an evolution we need to achieve in order to become life-long learners. However, it is this type of cognitive development that schools are perhaps least adept at achieving:

the evidence gathered to date suggests that most individuals do not achieve a level of epistemological understanding that makes possible genuine critical thinking or a level of reflective judgment essential to the solving of ill-structured problems. The growing knowledge base in this area may be invaluable to educators interested in the underlying developmental tasks that support such accomplishments. (Hofer, 2001, p. 365)

Teacher-Epistemology: Effects upon Student Learning

Numerous studies indicate a significant connection between student epistemologies and evidence of their academic success (Ryan, 1984; Schommer, 1993; Schommer-Aikins, M., Mau, W, Brookhart, S., & Hutter, R., 2000; Kardash & Scholes, 1996; Johnston, P., Woodside-Jiron, H., & Day, J., 2000, Marshall, J. D., Smagorinsky, P., & Smith, M., 1995). While the link between student epistemologies and the epistemologies of their teachers needs to be researched

further, an important causal effect is indicated. One source of confusion is that teachers' epistemologies are often implicit; in fact, teachers themselves may have a very difficult time explicitly articulating their epistemologies. And then, even if they could do so, what teachers say they believe, and how those beliefs are evidenced in the teachers' curriculum and pedagogy, may be very different (White, 2000):

teacher rhetoric is often contradicted by classroom structure, as well as by the reward system. Thus, changing student beliefs may require changing the meaning of knowing and learning in school as well as focusing attention on teachers' epistemological perspectives. . . . Clarification of the components of teachers' beliefs is another important focus of inquiry that may be closely related to understanding student epistemology. Equally important is the congruence between the instructors' espoused beliefs and their actual practices. (Hofer, 2001, p. 373)

In reaffirming the connection between epistemological and cognitive development, Hofer (2001) notes:

King and Kitchener provide an integrated and comprehensive summary of suggestions drawn from the literature on fostering the development of epistemic cognition. These include providing opportunities for students to discuss and analyze ill-structured problems both in classrooms and in other settings, teaching students the skills of gathering and evaluating data, engaging students in the discussion of controversial issues, and assisting them in examining their assumptions about knowledge and how it is

gained. Moreover, instructors are encouraged to show respect for students' assumptions, regardless of developmental level, and to provide feedback and support on both a cognitive and emotional level. (p. 375)

The study of teacher and student epistemology, how epistemologies interact and how they affect student learning provides many significant opportunities for both pre-service teacher education and professional development; furthermore, it should reinvigorate the mission of teachers as they consider that their "classrooms may be the best place for students to get the practice they need in articulating, defending, reexamining, and claiming their points of view, within a context of supportive community and the modeling of discipline-based expertise and epistemological thinking" (Hofer, 2001, p. 378).

Empirical Studies

Understanding Middle School Students' Beliefs about Knowledge and Learning

In this study by Schommer-Aikins et. al. (2000), a 30-item questionnaire was administered to 1,269 students from two middle schools in the Midwest. The questionnaire was derived from similar questionnaires developed by Schommer (1990, 1993). "The results suggest that maturation is critical in the development of beliefs about learning. Without formal education, however, beliefs about knowledge seem less likely to advance" (p. 126). Additionally:

In this study, the less students believed in fixed ability and quick learning, the higher GPA they earned. Furthermore, the link to GPA is consistent with previous research using the multidimensional paradigm. The less high school students believe in quick learning, the higher GPA they earned. . . .

The less college students believe in quick learning and simple knowledge, the better they comprehend complex academic text. (Schommer, 1993, p. 126)

The author introduces a critical consideration—how is student-learning in an epistemologically and cognitively aware classroom to be assessed:

it is critical to consider how education may contribute to the development of students' epistemological beliefs. If instruction consists of presenting simple, disconnected information or if tests require recall of isolated facts, students can come to at least two different conclusions: (a) instruction and testing reflect the nature of knowledge or (b) instruction and testing are merely activities in a game called 'school,' and there is little relevance to real-world thinking. (pp. 126-127).

Schommer ends her study by pointing the direction of future research:

Future research should attempt to answer such questions as : (a) How do students acquire an epistemological belief system? (b) Can students be taught a set of epistemological beliefs that lead to shifts in their classroom performance or attitudes toward learning? (c) How do students' epistemological beliefs compare with those of teachers? (p. 127)

Teaching and Learning Literate Epistemologies

This study by Johnston et al. (2000) focuses on the construction of epistemological beliefs of four fourth graders in two disparate language arts classes. Selected teachers and students were observed and interviewed over the course of two five-day periods. The researchers identified two distinctly different

teachers: one who professed and demonstrated characteristics of received knowing (Pam) and one who professed and demonstrated characteristics of constructed knowing (Stacy). Then two students from each teacher's classroom (one successful and one unsuccessful) were identified and interviewed. Mandy, the low competence student from Pam's classroom,

does not have a sense of authority or a sense of agency with respect to learning, evaluation, or knowledge production. Based on conventions she feels reasonably capable as a writer, but she does not have a sense of identity as a writer or reader beyond that. Being a reader or writer appears not to be an important part of her identity. (p. 12)

About Millie, the high competence student from Pam's classroom, the researchers found that:

although Millie feels competent in her reading (cautiously) and writing, her indicators for competence are tied to accuracy, volume/size, and convention more than to sense-making. She measures her progress (and sets her goals) by levels of technical skill and others' performances and judgments. This is not surprising given how Pam has set up the classroom activities and interactions. This sense of technical and performance competence appears important to her sense of self, but the literate activity itself, being a writer for example, is not. (p. 13)

As for Stacey's classroom:

She insists that her students "don't just take what people say to you as the word or the gospel. Question every single thing." She considers central to

her instruction “a lot of talking, a lot of conversation, a lot of discussion,” and she applies the same logic to her own development. (p. 14)

The researchers note:

Several aspects of these interactions are consistent with constructed knowing and Stacey’s interview. First, multiple sources of authority are validated, including self and other students. She encourages students to contribute their experiences; “talk to me, friends.” Second, generating interesting questions is valued more than getting answers to someone else’s questions. Third, students publicly respond to each other, looking at each other, suggesting that they take each other seriously. Fourth, they are encouraged to help each other refine their questions, working collaboratively. Fifth, Stacey focuses the students’ attention on the process of doing research on their own questions by helping them to reflect on their successful actions, validating their procedural knowledge and fostering a sense of agency in knowledge-making. (p. 16)

As with Pam’s students, the authors find that the epistemological beliefs of Stacey’s students reflect her own beliefs and learning and knowledge:

children are acquiring not simply facts and strategies, but routines of behavior and patterns of values, belief, roles, identities, and ways of knowing. In other words, discourse environments have powerful effects on children’s epistemologies, over time changing the course of their development. (p. 22)

In a final commentary on the current atmosphere of standardized testing, the authors assert:

The normative measures that are the standard indicators of student achievement provide a restricted view of what is achieved through literacy instruction. It is possible, for example, for students to develop a sense of competence in reading or writing without developing a sense of agency or authority. Without a sense of agency and authority, and a history of expected engagement in public discourse, we might wonder about the significance of schooled literacy for subsequent participation in democratic self-government. (p. 23)

The Language of Interpretation

In this study by Marhsall et al. (1995), the authors investigate three settings where people talk about literature to see if they can discover patterns in the discourse and what forces may determine those patterns. The theoretical construct informing this study is cognitive, and the assessment tool is essentially the analysis and codifying of discourse text: “in the classroom, readings are shaped primarily through discussion. If we are to understand what students are learning about literature, then we must understand the nature of classroom discussion” (p. 6). In addition,

In studying classroom discourse, we are studying more than just recitation patterns; we are studying the processes through which the participants learn and perpetuate appropriate ways of knowing in classrooms. And what happens in classrooms affects for many students their sense of self-worth,

their prospects for future success in school and career, and their belief in the value of formal learning. (p. 7)

Sixteen English teachers and their students participated in Marshall et al.'s study. The tracking of the classes ranged from high to low. The researchers videotaped the classes, transcribed the large group discussions, interviewed teachers and students, and developed and used their own coding system. Results indicated a conflict between the stated epistemological beliefs of teachers and what they did in their classrooms. Discussions proved to be teacher-centered and dominated by an Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) format.

The Nystrand & Gamoran Database: How Teacher Epistemology Affects Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Student Academic Achievement

Teacher epistemology is evidenced in the discourse that occurs in their classrooms. The critical importance of the following studies is in the suggestion that the quality of discourse affects academic achievement, and the amount of authentic discourse a student experiences seems to be correlated with the teacher's epistemological beliefs that higher-tracked students benefit from the inclusion of personal experiences in the context of literary discussion and analysis—thereby allowing them to create their own knowledge—while lower-tracked students must be kept close to the words of the text, as if the text and the teacher were the two authoritative sources of knowledge. That is, in higher-tracked classes students experience more authentic discourse than students in lower-tracked classes. This reflects the teachers' implicit epistemologies, which in turn affects their students' epistemologies and learning. Discourse is emotionally and intellectually

engaging—it is an intellectual tool students may use to form knowledge; without such engagement, real learning can not occur (Dewey, 1997/1910).

From 1987 to 1989 a team of researchers led by Martin Nystrand and Adam Gamoran collected data from “16 middle and junior high schools and 9 high schools in eight Midwestern urban, suburban, and rural communities.

Participating were 58 eighth-grade and 54 ninth grade language arts and English [and social studies] classes, involving [approximately] 1,100 students each year” (Nystrand, Gamoran, Kachur, & Prendergast, 1997, p. 32). The team used this database for studies on student engagement and classroom discourse.

Instructional Discourse, Student Engagement, & Literature Achievement.

Nystrand and Gamoran (1991) used data gathered from 58 eighth grade English classes in 16 Midwestern schools. 1,041 students participated in this longitudinal study. The research team visited each class four times—twice in the Fall and twice in the Spring. In all, 311 “episodes” (“classroom activities centered on a particular objective or purpose” (p. 271)) were observed during 227 class sessions, and 6,287 questions were codified. The purpose was to use classroom discourse as a source for data on student engagement and subsequent achievement. The team delineated student engagement into two categories: “procedural engagement”—“the number of hours per week students reported spending on homework for English class; student-reports of the frequency with which they asked questions about what they were supposed to learn; and the proportion of students who were observed actively participating during question-answer sessions” (pp. 274-275); and “substantive engagement”—a measure derived from the authenticity, uptake,

and level of evaluation of questions asked by students and teachers in class and the authenticity and level of evaluation of written work. (p. 275) During class observations, the researchers recorded the time students spent on activities and coded questions by source (teacher/student), response (whether or not there was a response), authenticity (no prespecified answers), uptake, and level of evaluation. “Discussion” is defined as “the free exchange of information among students and/or between at least three students and the teacher that lasted longer than 30 seconds” (p. 274). “Disengagement” was indicated by student-reports of their own failure to “turn in written work and to do reading assignments; the percentage of students clearly off-task during question-answer periods as seen by an observer; and the proportion of questions asked by teachers that received no response at all from students” (p. 274). Since the goal of this study was to determine the effect of student engagement upon student achievement, pre-tests and post-tests were administered to students in the Fall and Spring; the tests were intended to measure student learning in terms of their written expression, reading comprehension, and specific material studied during the year. The team’s three hypotheses were: “a) disengagement adversely affects achievement; b) procedural engagement has an attenuated relationship to achievement; and c) substantive engagement has a strong, positive effect on achievement” (p. 282).

According to the findings of this study, while a mean of 4.6% of students was observed to be off-task in class, only 25.8% were observed to be actively engaged in procedural endeavors. Students reported asking six questions per month and spent about one hour per week on English homework. Student

disengagement is evidenced most clearly in reading not completed (16%) and writing not completed (14%), as reported by students. Class observations revealed that 23% of teacher questions were authentic, 3% resulted in a high evaluation of oral responses, and 11.4% resulted in uptake. Significantly, according to class observations less than one minute per day was spent in discussion. Authenticity of reading and writing, evaluation of writing, and contiguity of reading and writing are all based upon teacher reports; while a random analysis of student portfolios verified, to an extent, teacher reports, the findings do not reliably address the hypotheses.

A metric regression of each variable in each category—background, disengagement, procedural engagement, and substantive engagement—reveals that achievement in literary comprehension and analysis is significantly negatively related to the percentage of students off-task in class and the percentage of questions asked that elicit no response; furthermore, and somewhat surprisingly, active student procedural engagement is significantly negatively related to student achievement as well. Substantive engagement, however, particularly uptake and discussion time, are strongly positively related to student achievement.

Apparently the findings support the position that “students achieve more when their teachers ask open-ended questions and probe what students *do* know and think than when they carefully rehearse students’ mastery of assigned material through recitation in order to remedy what they do *not* know” (p. 283). The relation between discussion time and achievement is particularly disconcerting when one considers the paltry amount of time spent each day in discussion.

Understanding the Dynamics of Language and Learning in the English Classroom.

In their 1997 study, Nystrand et al. used the same database as in the above 1991 study to explore in further detail the effects of classroom discourse on student engagement and subsequent student achievement, this time including ninth graders in their research base—23,000 questions were coded for authenticity, uptake, level of evaluation, and, this time, cognitive level:

- 1 = *Record* of ongoing event: What's happening?
- 2 = *Recitation and report* of old information: What happened?
- 3 = *Generalization*: What happens?
- 4 = *Analysis*: Why does it happen?
- 5 = *Speculation*: What might happen? (p. 17)

As in the 1991 study, learning was measured by comparing results of written pre- and post-tests, which were scored for the following:

- 1. Extent of recall
- 2. Depth of understanding
- 3. Number of [story-endings] remembered
- 4. Relation of ending to denouement
- 5. Relation of conflict/ending to theme
- 6. Understanding of internal motivations of characters
- 7. Interpretive treatment of the major selection
- 8. Level of discourse used to discuss theme and conflict. (pp. 56-57)

In this study the researchers found once again that classroom discourse was overwhelmingly monologic. When teachers were not lecturing, students mainly were either answering questions or completing seat-work. The teacher asked nearly all the questions, few questions were authentic, and few teachers followed up student responses. On average, discussion lasted less than 50 seconds per class in eighth grade and less than 15 seconds per class in ninth grade. Small-group work in eighth grade took only about half a minute each day, and only a little more than two minutes a day in grade 9 (1997, p. 33).

In all ninth grade classes, the average time spent on lecture (8.42 minutes), recitation-type question-answer (17.58 minutes), and supervised seatwork (6.23 minutes) left little time for engaging in dialogic activities—less than 15 seconds, on average. All classes—regardless of track or location—showed a similar pattern of pedagogy. Many of their findings are to be expected—i.e., socio-economic status (SES), time on homework, and uptake (questions leading to authentic responses and further analysis) all have significant positive effects upon recall and in-depth understanding; while uptake was significantly positively related to ninth-grade literature achievement, authentic questions revealed a significant negative impact upon ninth grade literature achievement for remedial classes (p. 45). This led the researchers to inquire into the types of questions being asked in those classes. What they found was that questions in remedial classes tended to be more frequently off-topic (p. 44). This negatively impacted student achievement. Discussion has a similar effect upon achievement for eighth and ninth grade ability-grouped English classes. The maximum likelihood estimate of effect size

of discussion in honors classes is positive and more than twice the standard error; for regular and remedial classes it is negative or insignificant. Again, the researchers attribute this negative relation of achievement with discussions to the discussions in lower-tracked classes being frequently off-track (p. 44).

Classroom Discourse and Its Effects on Writing.

Nystrand, Gamoran, and Carbonaro (1998) explored the effects of discourse on student writing achievement in English and social studies classes: “We have few examinations of the role general classroom discourse plays in writing development. . . . What are the effects of different kinds of teacher questions? What kinds of discussion enhance writing?” (p. 2). Perhaps what is most startling is the dearth of writing assignments in both classes that include—before during or after writing—any sort of discussion. In social studies there were none; in English classes only 2.8% of all lessons that included writing also included discussion. Most often, writing tasks were combined with recitation—51.1% of the time in social studies and 43.5% in English. This implies a preparation for writing that is focused upon content—as if the teachers were preparing students to write predetermined answers.

The researchers then calculated a regression analysis of each variable’s effect upon writing achievement. Overall, the study reveals a significant positive relationship between the frequency of writing and writing achievement in English class but a significant negative relationship in social studies (p. 19). This may be attributable to the types of writing completed in both classes—exploratory in English and more regurgitative in social studies. Uptake in English classes was

significant at the .01 level, as well. Off-task behavior had a significant negative impact upon writing achievement in both English and social studies. Classroom discourse revealed a significant positive influence upon writing at the .01 level for both classes. Discussion apparently has a positive relation with writing achievement, so the question becomes, how does a teacher recognize and encourage discussion?

The Structure and Dynamics of Unfolding Classroom Discourse.

Given the evident importance of discussion in student achievement, Nystrand, Lawrence, Gamoran, Zeiser, and Long (2001) attempt to determine how classroom question-answer sessions and discussions are transformed into “dialogic spells.” The questions they attempt to address include: “How does the pattern of classroom discourse—monologic and dialogic—unfold over the classroom period?” (p. 2) and “Exactly what teacher and student ‘moves’ might allow classroom discourse to step up from monologic to dialogic levels of engagements?” (p. 6) The team observed 872 English and social studies classes and coded a total of 33,904 questions. Questions were coded as follows:

we constructed a 14-point linear scale based on the five coded variables ranging from 0 for radically monologic (maximally codified) test questions to 14 for radically dialogic (minimally codified) questions: Questions were weighted for source (teacher vs. student), authenticity, uptake (whether the question references someone else’s previous utterance), high level evaluation, and cognitive level. (pp. 18-19)

This resulted in a scale of “dialogic density” (p. 21). Dialogic density was then used to define “dialogic spells.” An episode that evidenced an increase in dialogic density was evidencing a dialogic spell. Of the 1,151 total number of episodes, only 77 (6.69%) had at least 1 dialogic spell. Both English and social studies revealed a similarly paucity of dialogic spells. When these data are analyzed in greater detail, an important concern becomes apparent: The number of dialogic spells in low track classes (197 or 1.02%) is significantly less than the number of dialogic spells in high track classes (331 or 11.48%) (p. 35).

Student questions are important factors in the analysis of transitions into dialogic spells ($p < .0005$). “The effect of student questions is particularly noteworthy, with one student question raising the rate of onset of a dialogic spell by 72 percent relative to instructional episodes in which no student question is observed” (p. 39). Furthermore,

The effect for questions of high cognitive level, which was close to zero for dialogic spells, is negative and statistically significant [at the .0005 level] for [generating] student questions. These findings point to a potential tension within classrooms: While student questions appear to spur the onset of dialogic discourse within instructional setting, “hard” teacher questions, i.e., those posed at high cognitive levels, may pose a barrier to active student participation in classroom discourse. (p. 40)

Authentic questions and uptake, (both $p < .0005$), were most important in the analysis of transitions into students asking questions. Likewise, the most

significant determinant of transitions into a discussion spell was the uptake, which was significant ($p < .0005$).

One Teacher's Transition Towards a Dialogic Classroom.

Recently Julie Nelson Christoph and Martin Nystrand (2001) applied the research methodology reviewed above to inquire into the teaching practices of an English teacher in an urban high school: "In the research reported here, using methods of ethnography and conversation analysis, we sought to flesh out the actual dynamics of a fruitful dialogic bid. Our study investigated a ninth-grade English class at Urban High School" (p. 4). The team's purpose was to understand "when discussion happens, what conditions foster it?" (p. 7) Consistent with prior research, the team identified dialogic bids, dialogic spells, discussion, authentic questions, and uptake. Their analysis then turned to what allowed these aspects to grow out of what was monologic teaching. What they found, first, was that "our observations and accounts from student interviews suggest that a crucial factor enabling the number and kinds of discussion that took place was the teacher's success in fostering an ethos of involvement and respect with her students" (p. 10). Then, in what seemed to be an accidental taste of freedom, the teacher (Kathy) asked an authentic question ("Who do you think is the most important character in A Midsummer Night's Dream?") and she allowed the students to explore in discussion: because [the teacher] "did not scaffold this question so extensively and left the answer open at the end of discussion, students were able and in fact had to take ownership of their responses and find their own ways of substantiating them" (p. 28).

The researchers maintain:

the class was able to sustain an engaged discussion for two reasons. First, Kathy stepped back and let the students talk freely, rather than attempting to overly scaffold and lead student to desired responses. Second, interpersonal relationships among students—over which Kathy made the most of the limited control she had—enriched the classroom and enabled students to take advantage of the discussion opportunity that Kathy gave them. (p. 25)

The Remaking of a High School Reader.

Combining social interaction in the form of classroom discourse with formative assessment opportunities can create an environment supportive of previously lower-tracked students as they evolve and co-construct a self-image of increasing academic capability. Rex's (2001) ethnographic study, set in a racially-mixed high school, analyzes one general student's learning in a talented and gifted English class. Observation of the first 31 classes revealed the social and academic structure established by the teacher effectively enhanced this student's academic self-expectations. Analysis of transcripts detailing classroom conversations evidences the student's growth through social interactions and the importance of employing social dynamics to enable student learning by entering into a classroom reading culture. Rex (2001) recognizes "this common understanding does not come from direct teaching; rather, it emerges from ongoing class conversations about expectations and evaluations of texts in which students are invested" (p. 311). The point of this study is that teachers "shape reading as inquiry by

foregrounding students' questions and knowledge, building on them, and moving interactions along so that student questions and knowledge are the basis and the motivation for reading" (p. 312).

The Theoretical Importance of Discourse in Education

Learning is a social activity—a child's cognitive ability develops as she communicates, as she uses language: the "capacity for language enables children to provide for auxiliary tools in the solution of difficult tasks . . . to plan a solution to a problem prior to its execution, and to master their own behavior" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 28). As the problems presented to students become more complex, the student's ability to plan his actions, to control his thinking processes, and to express his perception must also develop. The verbal expression of his ideas "is instrumental in achieving more complex forms of cognitive perception" (Vygotsky, 1978, 32) and in addressing increasingly complex problems. A critical aspect of a student's cognitive development is her ability to develop a hypothesis when presented with a problem. This ability is developed when students are free to use spoken language, because "the more a learner controls his own language strategies, and the more he is enabled to think aloud, the more he can take responsibility for formulating explanatory hypotheses and evaluating them" (Barnes, 1992, 29). Speech "enables us to control thought" and allows us "a means by which we can actively reinterpret the world about us" (Barnes, 1992, 101). Without opportunities for students to explore problems verbally, their academic growth may stagnate.

The ability to “disembed”—to cope with increasingly abstract problems and to perceive solutions from various unfamiliar perspectives—determines academic success in our current system:

What is going to be required for success in our educational system is that [the student] should learn to turn language and thought in upon themselves. He must become able to direct his own thought processes in a thoughtful manner. He must become able not just to talk but to choose what he will say, not just to interpret but to weigh possible interpretations. His conceptual system must expand in the direction of increasing ability to represent itself. He must become capable of manipulating symbols. Now the principal symbolic system to which the [student] has access is oral language. (Donaldson, 1978, 90)

While Donaldson is referring specifically to preschool students, the implications arguably apply as readily to high school English students as well.

The use of written language is as integral a tool in the development of human cognition as is speech. Writing for exploration is a way to develop one’s ability to disembed, which the educational system perceives as intelligence and which it rewards accordingly. The importance of writing as a cognitive developmental tool is made clear as we recognize that “‘intelligence is not something we have that is immutable; it is something we cultivate by operating with a technology, or something we create by inventing new technology.’ The technology . . . is the system of making speech visible and permanent which we

call writing” (Barnes, 1992, 86). Writing is a critical tool because it fosters self-awareness and self-control:

Those very features of the written word which encourage awareness of language may also encourage awareness of one’s own thinking and be relevant to the development of intellectual self-control, with incalculable consequences for the development of the kinds of thinking which are characteristic of logic, mathematics, and the sciences. (Donaldson, 1978, 97)

The ability to “formulate hypotheses that specify alternatives” may be achieved by “encouraging reflective thought and awareness of the processes of the mind” (Donaldson, 1978, 109). In other words, through reflective and exploratory writing students may develop the cognitive ability to pose hypotheses and to create alternative approaches as they address difficult problems. Using speech either concurrently or as a precursor to writing will further develop these skills and thereby increase the likelihood of academic success. Perhaps our educational system’s ultimate goal should be to enable students to “internalize” the productive learning processes they have experienced and practiced: “The internalization of socially rooted and historically developed activities is the distinguishing feature of human psychology, the basis of the qualitative leap from animal to human psychology” (Vygotsky, 1978, 57). As students reflect upon their own learning and thinking processes they work towards becoming master of their own thinking.

Contrasting it to the learning they often experience at home sets off the importance of a child’s experiencing such learning in school. If “new tools of

thinking give rise to new mental structures” (Vygotsky, 1978, 132), then providing students with those tools becomes a critical mission for teachers. It is a scary thought, given what I have come to know about the home environments of some of our failing students, that “human learning presupposes a specific social nature and a process by which children grow into the intellectual life of those around them” (Vygotsky, 1978, 88). Our educational system rewards a student’s ability to think abstractly, and that ability may be determined by what we experience before we even come to school; it may be derived from our learned ability to comprehend and to use as a tool language out of context, and “it is easy to see how this would be encouraged in the more literate and intellectually sophisticated home” (Donaldson, 1978, 92). If the voice that failing students have learned is destructive, or does not coincide with the voice that would result in their success at school (Heath, 1983), then the task of initiating and establishing a process to alter that voice, of co-constructing a more academically viable voice (Rex, 2001), falls upon the teacher.

Yet language is a deceptive tool—the likelihood of misinterpretation and misrepresentation is great. Our perceptions are determined partly by our experiences and our expectations (Donaldson, 1978). A student’s drive to interpret the world can create barriers to effective and accurate communication. Furthermore, given the context in which learning takes place—the schoolroom—students may not even accurately interpret their teachers’ intentions: the student “is given to structuring, or making sense of, situations even when no words are uttered; and sometimes it seems that, when words *are* uttered, the child’s

interpretation of the utterance is strongly influenced by his own independent structuring of the context” (Donaldson, 1978, 89). That structuring may well be distorted to the point of inaccuracy by the interpretive voices the student has internalized at home. The important consideration is that personal relations have formed one voice, and it is personal relations that can continue a student’s academic growth by allowing new and more nurturing voices to be heard: “personal relations appear to form the matrix within which [a student’s] learning takes place” (Donaldson, 1978, 90). When students are working with peers, they are necessarily engaged in forming and reforming personal relations.

Thus, it is through the use of oral and written language that students may begin the important task of instilling within themselves a voice that facilitates abstract, disembedded thought and can use it as a tool when faced with difficult problems to formulate hypotheses and to create alternative solutions. However, we should not “accept it as inevitable that only a small minority of people can ever develop intellectually to a high level of competence” (Donaldson, 1978, 131). Our educational system’s emphasis upon abstract thought has made teaching and learning a “difficult enterprise” (Donaldson, 1978, 81). This “has not been properly recognized and is not usually tackled in any adequate way” (Donaldson, 1978, 82), yet it is critically important: “There can be no doubt that one reason for the continuing *apartheid* [separating students who enjoy success and those that suffer failure in our school system] is that so many young people do not develop either aptitude or taste for the intellectual side of schooling. The attempt to become skilled in the disembedded modes of intellectual activity is for most of us

defeating or repugnant” (Donaldson, 1978, 85). The questions now become how exactly can a teacher encourage this growth and how can such teaching and learning be accurately and meaningfully assessed?

The first goal is to get students to ask questions, to see themselves—their own life experiences—as a source of knowledge through exploring their own perceptions, interpretations, and questions—“to get children to tell us when they do not understand and to ask for more information” (Donaldson, 1978, 103). They are not likely to do so in a large class setting where the teacher stands in front of the room responding to questions asked by those brave few as if the entire class needs to be a part of what should be a personal, one-on-one interaction: “In such a dialogue, exploratory and hypothetical questions or statements by pupils are very infrequent” (Barnes, 1992, 55). Furthermore, “the question-and-answer method of control must in the long run devalue—in the pupils’ eyes as much as in the teacher’s—the pupils’ capacity for taking a responsible part in learning” (Barnes, 1992, 181). In a nurturing educational setting, students are responsible for their own questioning and response, and thereby for their own learning.

Perhaps the most challenging job requirement of a teacher is to know what material is academically and developmentally appropriate for each student, for “good learning is that which is in advance of development” (Vygotsky, 1978, 89):

A very important part of the job of a teacher—or of a parent in a teaching role—is to guide the child towards tasks where he will be able objectively to do well, but not too easily, not without putting forth some effort, not without difficulties to be mastered, errors to be overcome, creative

solutions to be found. This means assessing his skills with sensitivity and accuracy, understanding the levels of his confidence and energy, and responding to his errors in helpful ways. (Donaldson, 1978, 120)

Arguably, it is a teacher's ability to do just this that distinguishes excellent from mediocre teaching. Furthermore, I contend it is our self-recognition of this gift that motivates us to become teachers—it is the art of interpersonal insight, the ability to read the real message behind the statements, the questions, and the silence: “Once one adopts an *interaction* view of education, it becomes as valid to see educational failure as the school's failure to understand a child's messages, as to see it as the child's failure to understand the school's messages” (Barnes, 1992, 162). This is far from easy, and “it makes great demands on the teacher's capacity for decentering” (Donaldson, 1978, 103). The great challenge is for teachers to determine what Vygotsky calls the *zone of proximal development*:

It is the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers. (Vygotsky, 1978, 86)

Vygotsky establishes that education, learning, and cognitive development are social processes:

We propose that an essential feature of learning is that it creates the zone of proximal development; that is, learning awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his

peers. . . . Properly organized learning results in mental development and sets in motion a variety of developmental processes that would be impossible apart from learning. (p. 90)

In schools students must find a sympathetic audience and collaborators as they desperately attempt to connect school curriculum with prior learning and current concerns: to experience a class structure that “will open to them a collaborative approach in which the exploratory functions of speech and writing predominate. This will encourage pupils to relate new knowledge to their existing purposes and interests” (Barnes, 1992, 147).

Teachers work at assisting students to achieve a vision of themselves that is confident, self-respectful, and purposeful—a vision of someone with “consciousness and deliberate mastery” (Donaldson, 1978, 129) who enjoys a challenge. Donaldson quotes Jung’s words, “school is in fact a means of strengthening in a purposeful way the integration of consciousness” (1978, 129): “We want to change the way [students] perceive the world they live in, not so that they will carry out our purposes, but so that they can formulate their own purposes, and estimate their value” (Barnes, 1992, 80).

As a teacher I know I can benefit greatly by conducting research in my own classroom. To do this, I must observe closely what goes on: “the researcher must be an astute observer of children’s play, their efforts at learning, their responses to teaching” (Vygotsky, 1978, 128). In Vygotsky’s words, my philosophy of conducting research in my own classroom is as follows:

Any investigation explores some sphere of reality. An aim of the psychological analysis of development is to describe the internal relations of the intellectual processes awakened by school learning. In this respect, such analysis will be directed inward and is analogous to the use of x-rays. If successful, it should reveal to the teacher how developmental processes stimulated by the course of school learning are carried through inside the head of each individual child. The revelation of this internal, subterranean developmental network of school subjects is a task of primary importance of psychological and educational analysis. (p. 91).

Exploring the social interactions of students in the classroom is important because “it is a matter of conceiving of cognition, emotion, motivation, perception, imagination, memory . . . whatever, as themselves, and directly, social affairs” (Geertz, 1983, p. 153). Student-talk within the context of the classroom setting is also a rich subject of inquiry: “The task for both teachers and researchers is to make the usually transparent medium of classroom discourse the object of focal attention” (Cazden, 2001, p. 4). Teachers should analyze not only the words students use in the classroom but also who is speaking and how the teacher is responding to various modes of expression: “If the potentialities of classroom discourse, in which students talk more and in more varied ways, are significant for all students, then we have to pay careful attention to who speaks and who receives thoughtful responses” (p. 5). Teachers should look carefully at what students are saying, what responses they are eliciting, and who is being silent. I question if the cognitive growth experienced by students who choose to remain silent is

diminished in comparison with students who engage the teacher and their classmates verbally. Can a teacher assume

that all students are eagerly waiting for the chance to speak[?] Teachers know that's not always true, and that they then have to decide what to do, if anything, about students who choose to be silent. If a silent student is otherwise doing well academically, as shown by written work, should relative silence be ignored? Or is speaking up and explaining ideas, and listening and collaborating verbally with peers, a valued outcome of school in its own right—especially now when “communicative skills” appear on lists of abilities needed for high-paying jobs? (p. 86)

The accurate evaluation of student learning is critical: “To see if their objectives are being achieved, teachers need to decide what their objectives are . . . and then monitor what happens over time in the interrelated development of children’s discourse and their social relationships” (p. 27). Without such evidence, how do teachers know what to teach? “We still have to track children’s progress to see if . . . the teacher’s goal is indeed imported into the children’s independent activity and thereby appropriated into their own understandings” (p. 74). If students have not appropriated the material into their own understandings, the material must be re-taught. Teachers can “scaffold” learning “only if we have evidence that the learner’s competence does indeed grow over time” (p. 63). In the final analysis, what teachers should strive towards is providing an equitable educational experience for all students: “Educational purpose and equitable opportunities to learn remain the most important design principles. Both teachers and researchers

need to monitor who participates and how, and who doesn't and why" (p. 81). The ultimate goal may be to instill and nurture in learners a responsive, friendly, and productive voice that will allow students to continue learning new and more challenging material. Cazden quotes John Bruer's belief that "discourse doesn't make thought visible, rather thought is internalized discourse" (p. 75). Just as we tend to love the people who see us as we want to see ourselves, so too do we love the teachers who use with us a voice that we would wish to hear within ourselves. Yet "it is easier to find analysis of problems in the distribution of student participation—whether too few speakers or too many—than of successful attempts to change them. This is an important area for teacher research" (p. 87).

Qualitative Methodology for Observing the Process of Teaching as Art

What happens in a teacher's classroom will be significantly determined by what the teacher believes are the aims of education, how those aims are packaged into bits of knowledge, and how—and in what form—that knowledge is then delivered.. Elliot W. Eisner eloquently states that "one major aim of education—perhaps its most important aim—is to enable individuals to acquire the kinds of cognitive skills that will enable them to construe meanings from the forms in which they appear" (1994, p. 88). He poses perhaps the most important question for educators to consider: "Is there some way to exploit the capacities conferred upon us by our biological nature and those culturally created technologies of mind that amplify and extend our biologically given limits?" (p. 16) This, for me, is reason for doing all we do as teachers. Education, for Eisner, is the exploration of meaning and forms of representation:

One major aim of education is the expansion and deepening of the meanings individuals can secure in their life, and since I believe that humans have different aptitudes with respect to the forms in which meanings can be made, I believe that school programs should provide ample opportunity for youngsters to become “literate” in a wide variety of forms. (p. 87)

As teachers move away from finding meaning for their students and towards providing the opportunities for students to express their own meaning, teaching moves from a pseudo-science to an artistic/aesthetic endeavor:

Education . . . ought to enable the young to learn how to access the meanings that have been created through what I have referred to as forms of representation. But access to the meanings others have created is not enough. Education ought to help the young learn how to create their own meanings through these forms. (p. 19)

This is an exciting, enlivening, if somewhat uncertain transformation in educational curricula because it truly acts upon the belief that knowledge is formed by individual students, not forced upon them en masse by authoritative figures—sole sources of knowledge. This, I believe too, is the way to appeal to a learner’s intellect, for

a school culture that fosters the quest for certainty encourages dispositions antithetical to the intellectual life. Intellectual life is characterized by the absence of certainty, by the inclination to see things from more than one angle, by the thrill of the search more than the closure of the find. (p. 71)

This makes obvious by contrast the danger inherent in the current emphasis upon high stakes standardized tests as they are mandated by NCLB, where the existence of certain knowledge—and our ability to quantify it—is an unquestioned given. The best of us teach because we nurture the belief that nothing is more important than assisting in the personal realization of our students. To apply to the field of education Joseph Campbell's (1968/1949) archetypal mythological paradigm, teachers provide their students with essential tools and weapons as those students commence their heroic quest, as they go out into the world to “find their bliss”; we are the teachers without whom otherwise obscure individuals might never hear the call, and without whom they would surely fail. The risk of standardized testing is that the messages received by failing students are antithetical to the more justifiable and certainly more humane mission presented above—that of personal formation—of finding one's bliss—through liberating and creative self-representation. Personal formation is, in part, the construction of epistemic beliefs about the nature of knowledge. As personalities evolve, so do epistemological beliefs. It is the teacher's mission to promote empowering beliefs about learning, and to intervene when a student's beliefs about learning and knowledge prove to be debilitating and self-destructive. Reinforcing self-defeating epistemic beliefs is anathema to our profession. School-based programs designed to address the mandates of NCLB must be studied in order to understand the experiences of young people involved in those programs, and to determine the effects such programs are having upon young people's perceptions of learning, knowledge,

education, and their own sense of personal efficacy and intelligence. That is the purpose of this study.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

The methodology I employed in this study is grounded theory informed by microethnographic discourse analysis. In what I believe to be a most relevant and applicable book, Bloome, D., Carter, S., Christian, B., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005) emphasize the “recursive processes” of “microethnographic discourse analysis”:

We take the reader through the recursive process, beginning with a discussion of theoretical and methodological issues (what we call *Round 1*). We then shift to a microethnographic analysis of a storytelling event in a kindergarten, followed by a microethnographic analysis of three related events in a 6th-grade social studies/language arts lesson. We then return to a discussion of theoretical and methodological issues (what we call *Round 2*). By organizing the chapter in this manner, we illustrate how a recursive process can identify new questions and issues to explore and how it can lead to reinterpretations of data. (p. 102)

As I analyzed my data over the past 18 months—videotapes of classes and interviews, field notes, cooked notes, transcripts of classes and interviews, and my written explorations for possible interpretations of my data—I found myself constantly going back to the literature of discourse analysis theory, qualitative research methodology, and epistemology. This was never a matter of following a prescribed course of action—a predetermined series of methodological steps (although I often wish such a prescription were available). Somehow, intuitively and experientially, progressive steps revealed themselves to me. It is only now, in

the final stages of writing this study that I am more able to formally construct and describe precisely my methodology; what is more, it is only recently that I discerned what exactly I mean by student and teacher epistemology. As an experienced high school English teacher and a beginning researcher I am happy with what I continue to discover about my research topic, the method that is constantly revealing itself like a wave upon which I am surfing, and the theory which is the bedrock, the foundation from which I can direct my vision.

Simply stated, microethnographic discourse analysis is guided by the theory that through situated discourse we create our social identities, our institutional identities, and our worldviews. It is, as I perceive it, a fascinating and logical commingling of the sociolinguistic theories of Vygotsky (1978), Bakhtin (1981), Wertsch (1998), Bruner (1996), Gee (1999), Fairclough (1995), and Eisner (1998, 1994).

Discovering and identifying what exactly I meant by “epistemology” has proven to be a particularly interesting two-year challenge. Beginning with an incisive review of the pertinent literature (Hofer & Pintrich, 1997), I was introduced to the seminal work of Perry (1968) who, basing his research upon the work of Piaget, envisioned epistemological development as a series of distinct stages, evolutions similar to Piaget’s stages of cognitive development. In his 1954-1955 study he interviewed 313 male Harvard students and determined a sequence of nine “positions.” Reading about Perry’s study led me next to the 1986 research of Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule, who were dissatisfied with Perry’s choice of all-male subjects and believed that including women in such a

study might prove instructive. Their findings about “Women’s Ways of Knowing” indicated five epistemological perspectives regarding women’s perceptions of truth, knowledge, and authority ranging from self-knowledge to epistemological understanding. Baxter Magdola (1987), in her five-year longitudinal analysis, includes both men and women and situates their epistemological reflections in the college classroom. Her findings indicate what she terms four ways of knowing. King and Kitchener (1994) expand the population of subjects to include 1,700 individuals in a 15 year longitudinal study. Their reflective judgment model indicates seven stages of epistemological development regarding how people perceive and reason about ill-structured problems. Similarly, Kuhn (1991) uses a sample of 169 subjects whom she interviews twice for 45 to 90 minutes as she explores epistemological views that underlie argumentative reasoning. To address the issues above, Schommer-Aikins (1990, 1993, 1998, 2002, 2004) has worked towards creating an instrument to identify epistemological beliefs across domains. It is this instrument that I use to guide my interviews with two students and the two teachers. In her studies, the areas of most importance are: 1) how current researchers in the relatively young field of epistemological studies define the ancient term “epistemology”; 2) the developmental nature of epistemological growth and understanding; 3) whether and to what extent epistemological growth and understanding is confined by domain; 4) what methodologies and instruments reveal most accurately epistemological growth and understanding; 5) how epistemological growth may be effected; 6) to what extent academic success is correlated with epistemological sophistication.

Schommer-Aikins (2004) summarizes the importance of this inquiry into epistemological understanding:

These questions are only a small sample of questions yet to be answered. No matter which model of personal epistemology one ascribes too [sic], many of these questions remain relevant. If beliefs about knowledge and learning function as filters to the mind, determining what we see, how we interpret the world, which strategies we select to learn, and how long we persist in pursuit of learning, then it would seem critical that we closely examine these filters. All the existing research notwithstanding, epistemological belief research remains at the edge of an unexplored frontier. (p. 28)

While the above summary is informative, none of the studies provided a framework that I could use as I analyzed my Saturday Academy data. It was not until I read Hammer and Elby (2002) and Louca, Elby, Hammer, and Kagey (2004) that I found the genesis of a theory and a methodology of epistemological research that I could operationalize for the purposes of my study.

Hammer and Elby (2002) reject the ontology of the above epistemological researchers, which is based on “epistemological theories” (p. 171) and “epistemological traits” (p. 172), in favor of a framework based upon epistemological resources and the critical importance of learning contexts—the various possible contexts in which our epistemological resources are activated. They hypothesize that, instead of developing epistemological sophistication either through belief evolution or theory construction, we have epistemological resources

that are activated by the demands of the learning context in which we find ourselves. These resources they group, tentatively and with modest disclaimers, into four categories:

- 1) Resources for understanding the nature and sources of knowledge
  - a) Knowledge as propagated stuff
  - b) Knowledge as free creation
  - c) Knowledge as fabricated stuff
  - d) Knowledge as direct perception
  - e) Knowledge as inherent
- 2) Resources for understanding epistemological activities
  - a) Accumulation
  - b) Formation
  - c) Checking—doubting
  - d) Application—using a piece of existing knowledge
  - e) Comparing, sorting, naming, counting, adding
- 3) Resources for understanding epistemological forms
  - a) Stories & rules
  - b) Songs, lists, pictures, categories, statements, facts, words, names, numbers
- 4) Resources for understanding epistemological stances
  - a) Belief-Disbelief
  - b) Understanding-Puzzlement

For the purposes of my study I focused on the first category, resources for understanding the nature and sources of knowledge, as it is one of the few aspects of epistemology that consistently appears in the researchers' definitions of that vague term. So, having read and synthesized the research of Hammer and Elby I returned once again to the transcripts, and I scrutinized them for evidence of the activation of epistemological resources allowing for the understanding of the nature and sources of knowledge.

It is essential that teachers create various learning contexts in order to allow for the activation of various epistemological resources. Hammer and Elby hypothesize that epistemological resources are activated by the learning context. The context determines the activated epistemological resource, the resources we call upon to make meaning of experience:

[This list of epistemological resources is] not a hierarchical list of greater and lesser sophistication. These resources are all available from an early age. Therefore, "development" would primarily consist of changes in their activation. In this way, a framework of this sort allows modeling of epistemological development as more "unique" to a context than "universal" (Feldman, 1994). For example, what the literature describes as the counterproductive epistemological belief that knowledge is received may be understood instead, roughly, as an overuse in the given context of some resources (Accumulation, Propagated stuff) and an underuse of others (Formation, Checking, Fabricated stuff). An epistemological intervention, then, could be conceived as modifying the activation of

epistemological resources in that context, rather than as disestablishing an epistemological theory. (p. 180)

In other words, epistemological resources, inherent cognitive capabilities in some waiting-to-be-activated form, may be activated or deactivated depending upon the context of the moment. This has profound pedagogical and curricular implications:

An ontology of manifold resources affords a different perspective on students' epistemologies and a different approach to fostering epistemological change. If we understand students' epistemologies as specific to a context, we may expect that they have other resources tied to other contexts. Rather than think [sic] in terms of accommodating their traits or refuting their theories, we may think in terms of finding and animating the more productive epistemological resources the students invoke in other situations. On this view, much may be achieved by manipulating the context of learning. . . . Therein may lie much of the benefit of innovative pedagogical approaches: They change the context in such a way as to invoke more productive epistemological resources.

(Hammer & Elby, 2002, p. 182)

The concept of “more productive epistemological resources” being activated by a change of context is, for me as a teacher-researcher, revolutionary, pragmatic, and crucial to the interpretation of my data:

A shift in ontology . . . to finer-grained resources . . . has implications for research. We are proposing, first, a new emphasis in the study of personal

epistemologies, the identification of naïve epistemological resources and the contexts in which they are invoked. (p. 183)

The relevance of the above to the students in the Saturday Academy is that the CAPT may require the activation of epistemological resources that the students need practice recognizing how to activate and then how to effectively and efficiently employ: “An account of students’ epistemologies as made up of resources would suggest a different agenda for instruction, of helping students draw on their epistemological resources more productively” (p. 188).

I must introduce one other analytical framework before I continue my recursive day-by-day analysis of my data, and that is provided by the rich and informative work of Norman Fairclough (1995). For my immediate purposes I want to use Fairclough’s concept of “Technologization” (p. 103) of discourse. Technologization, in a context of competing and conflicting institutional and cultural speech “genres” (p. 132), is a process of naturalization—of colonization—of one speech genre by another, more dominant speech genre. It is evidenced by:

- 1) The emergence of expert ‘discourse technologists’.
- 2) A shift in the ‘policing’ of discourse practices.
- 3) Design and projection of context-free discourse techniques.
- 4) Strategically motivated simulation in discourse.
- 5) Pressure towards standardization of discourse practices. (p. 103)

As speech genres are in essence cultural, such naturalization, or colonization, evidenced by technologization may well be perceived by the less dominant culture as hegemonic—the imposition of a dominant culture’s “discourse practice” upon

the less dominant culture, perhaps paternalistically, yet serving the purposes of the more dominant culture—and may therefore be resisted. The relevance for this study pertains to the extent to which students and teachers establish, reproduce, and negotiate (p. 133) one another's speech genres in their text production (both spoken and written), and to what extent any of the genres fulfill the stated purpose of the Saturday Academy and those who teach it—to provide students with the knowledge and skills they require to pass the CAPT.

Setting

The Saturday Academy classes met on the campus of the East Millton Academy. The following information appears in the school's profile:

The East Millton Academy (EMA), founded in 1854, a privately governed, endowed, regional independent school in Millton, Connecticut, is the second largest high school in the state. The Academy serves the city of Millton and functions as the designated high school for seven surrounding towns. As a school of choice, the Academy accepts all students who choose to attend, and by agreement, their sending communities fund tuition. The school also accepts private tuition students. The Academy has a student body of 2,500 students, a faculty of 175 and 9 classroom buildings on a 38-acre campus. Students represent a variety of urban, suburban, and rural character, and an increasingly diverse mixture of racial, ethnic, linguistic, and economic backgrounds. (Connecticut State Department of Education, "District Federal Report")

Schools in EMA's District Reference Group (DRG), based upon socio-economic indicators, includes Bloomfield, Bristol, East Haven, Gilbert Academy, Groton, Hamden, Killingly, Manchester, Middletown, Naugatuck, Plainfield, Putnam, Stratford, Torrington, Vernon, and Winchester (Connecticut State Department of Education, "District Reference Groups"). This is the seventh lowest DRG on scale a of nine, as determined by the state.

Participants

The Teachers

Saturday Academy teachers were chosen by the Curriculum Director of the school. Prior to the commencement of the program, the teachers never received any significant information about the students who were enrolled in the program. Such information, had it been received by teachers prior to the beginning of the program, would have allowed teachers to prepare more efficiently a personalized curriculum. Another problem was the schedule. The time between class meetings was inconsistent and, in some cases, much too long. As a result, there was little sense of continuity.

Sophie

On the first day of class Sophie appears friendly, young, and attractive—she has a fit figure, scrunched up dark hair with loose locks dangling down in front of her ears, and pretty green eyes behind a pair of dark framed glasses. She wears blue jeans and a grey sweatshirt and smiles and chats with those students she already knows.

Shelly

Shelly is a young female teacher, fit and pretty, of medium height—in her 20's, with shoulder-length light brown hair and soft features. Her demeanor is affable and serious—she laughs with students at those funny moments that occur in the classroom, yet she takes her teaching to heart—her most important priority is to deliver instruction to students.

The Students

Students are invited to attend the Saturday Academy based upon various assessments—not designed for this purpose—administered at various times over the preceding years, and teacher recommendations. About a third of the students who are invited actually decide to attend.

Marcus and Marianna

Prior to the beginning of the first period I heard a student say, “I’ve had low grades since fifth grade.” Now I hear in an mature male voice, “I will stab you in the throat.” This is Marcus. He is talking to Marianna. “I used to dream about you,” he says to her. Marcus is tall, slim, powerfully built, and wrapped in a black winter jacket with a do rag beneath a black Boston Red Sox hat turned backwards on his head. Both Marcus and Marianna are, according to their records, “black,” but they are obviously of mixed racial heritage. Marianna’s black hair is pulled behind her head. She wears a black winter jacket zipped up all the way to her chin. My past observations of students at this school have predisposed me to perceive their social affectations as a mélange of local African American and Hispanic culture. The girls form close bonds with one another; at the same time, their behavior and language reveal a self-abnegating adoption of the male ethos.

While their language is defiant and occasionally profane, they know that when they swear in front of me they have committed a sort of taboo. First impressions offer little hope for Marcus. Marianna is enthusiastic and outgoing—her pencil and paper ready for note taking. Her offerings for Sophie to get to know her will be a recurring dynamic in her relationship—and that of several other students—with Sophie and the other English teacher, Shelly.

Anna

Anna is wearing blue jeans, white sneakers, and a white jacket with a fur-lined hood. Her long light brown hair is pulled back tightly behind her head and hangs down her back in a ponytail. She is a very pretty girl with a round expressive face and fair skin that at first glance appears unusually tinted. Anna moved to the United States from Bulgaria a few years ago. Remarkably, she has no recognizable accent.

Tanya

Tanya is a powerfully-built black female. Her social position is enigmatic—she seems to be on the outside. Tanya is willing to pursue issues of unfairness in the classroom.

Bruno

Bruno is, as best as I can describe him, a normal young man capable of boredom, enthusiasm, silliness, sloth, and all those other sins and virtues that make humans so enjoyable; even long after the Saturday Academy is over, he remains faithful to the teachers and his experiences. His voice in conversation reveals a

hint of a Haitian accent. He is a good looking, affable, and likable young man with dark black skin.

Anko

Anko is a slim, easy going, gentle young man, Hispanic according to the records. He wears loose blue jean pants, a denim jacket, and his face shows modest evidence of a growing mustache. Whenever I see him he smiles and asks about my study. I tell him to come see me and I will show it to him and we can talk, and he says he will. Anko is also soft-spoken, and during the Saturday Academy he is often interrupted or verbally overpowered by both the teachers and his peers.

Jacob

Jacob is gothic, dressed in black with unevenly cut straight black hair hanging below his ears. He adheres to the fashion. His skin color reveals no evidence of having recently encountered sunlight, and his affectations are somewhat effeminate. He is physically slight—skinny but not short, his fingernails are long and colored, his voice is soft, and he is pierced in various places—ears, nose, tongue, lip.

Jasmine

Jasmine is a quiet black girl—outwardly more docile and compliant than Isabel or Marianna, but when she is pushed or challenged in a way she deems to be significant, she can respond with strength.

Isabel

Isabel is Hispanic, according to her records. She is challenging, restless, attentive, and confrontational. What makes her confrontations difficult is that she

chooses her moments and her issues wisely. One gets the impression she is on the lookout for unfairness, and she has the courage to address those moments. The accent evident in her voice reveals a sort of mock ghetto toughness.

Carmella

Carmella is a white girl of Italian heritage. When Carmella speaks, one can hear in her voice an accent endemic to this area.

Hannah

Hannah is a slim young woman with dark blonde hair. Throughout the Saturday Academy I thought she was friends with Anna and Marianna, and by association with the rest of the class, but in retrospect I see that she was an outsider. I don't know how I could have missed that. Perhaps because she would interact with the other students genuinely—she would respond to them with enthusiasm and she was not afraid to confront them. Hannah never took the CAPT, even after all this; I tried to find her at the beginning of this school year, but she had moved to Las Vegas.

Samuel

Samuel is a quiet, short, stocky boy. He looks young—baby fat—and he is sort of reclusive sitting on the less populated side of the classroom; yet the other students know him and interact with him in a friendly manner.

Nonparticipants

Three students did not return their parental protocol forms, so they were not part of my inquiry. All three students were Asian and were absolutely silent for every minute of the entire ten days.

Day-by-Day Class Structure: Curriculum Summary

Over the course of ten class periods students take three abbreviated practice Reading for Information (RFI) tests (days 2, 6, and 10), they read two short stories (days 3 and 4) and one very short story, less than 50 words (day 8), they copy the teacher's written answer to the Response to Literature (RTL) question #1 for the short story "Moving On" (day 5), as a class they co-construct and copy an answer to RTL question #2 for "Moving On" (day 6), and they write responses to RTL questions #3 and #4 for "Bedtime Story" (day 8). In short, in preparation for the RTL section of the CAPT, students write two short responses on their own—this is the only work about which students receive written feedback.

Day	Date	Teacher	Activities	Materials
1	12/3/05	Sophie	• Behavioral expectations. • Introduction to RTL and RFI: explicit instructions and low-level strategies. • Group work: exploration of students' home literacy.	• Instructions published by the state of Connecticut.
2	12/10/05	Shelly	• Review of prior class. • RFI test-taking strategies: students copy tips from overhead transparency. • Practice RFI: "Tsunami" (15 minutes to read and to respond in writing to RFI-style questions). • Review practice RFI answers.	• Overhead transparency of RFI tips. • Practice RFI test: "Tsunami."
3	12/17/05	Sophie	• Brief review of prior class. • Introduction to RTL. • Jacob talks about <u>The Fight Club</u>. • Students read "The Blanket" (10 minutes).	• Short story: "The Blanket."
4	1/7/06	Shelly	• Review of "The Blanket." • Shares Sophie's annotation of "The Blanket" on overhead transparency. • Shelly hands out Sophie's written	• Overhead transparency of Sophie's annotation of "The Blanket."

			response to a sample CAPT RTL Question #1 on “The Blanket”; students identify (by underlining) the four “dimensions” of reading (understanding, interpretation, connections, and critical stance) evident in Sophie’s written response (8 minutes). • Shelly hands out and the students read and annotate the short story “Moving On” (10 minutes).	• Overhead transparency of Sophie’s written response to a sample question #1 on the RTL section of the CAPT. • Short story: “Moving On.”
5	1/21/06	Sophie	• Sophie reads “Moving On” aloud. • Class discussion regarding the theme of “Moving On” and how it connects to students’ lives. • Students copy from the overhead projector Shelly’s written response to a sample RTL Question #1 (17 minutes).	• Overhead transparency of Shelly’s written response to a sample question #1 on the RTL section of the CAPT.
6	1/28/06	Shelly	• Reviews the answer students copied in prior class. • Shares tips for answering RTL question #2. • Talk about the theme of “Moving On.” • All together, the students and teacher co-construct on, and copy from, the overhead projector an answer to question #2 (25 minutes). • Transition to RFI preparation: “Driving into the Future”; students discuss the test, then take a practice RFI test (15 minutes).	• State-published CAPT material. • Practice RFI test: “Driving into the Future.”
7	2/4/06	Sophie	• Review of the practice RFI test students took last class (39 minutes). • Transition to RTL Question #3: review.	• State-published CAPT-related tips.
8	2/11/06	Shelly	• Review of RTL Question #3 for “Moving On.” • Shelly hands out and reads the very short story “Bedtime Story.” • Students talk about and then write a response to RTL Questions #3	• Short story: “Bedtime Story.”

			& 4 for “Bedtime Story.”	
9	2/25/06	Sophie	• Review of prior class: RTL Question #4. • Sophie shares two students’ written responses.	• Students’ written responses.
10	3/3/06	Shelly	• RFI practice test: “The Plague”; students take the practice test then review their answers. • Student survey.	• Practice RFI test: “The Plague.” • Student survey.

Data Sources

Interviews

Prior to the commencement of the 2005-2006 Saturday Academy I had two interviews with Leo Butler, the director of the program, in order to understand how students and teachers were chosen for the program, how the program was organized and structured, what level of success the program had achieved in prior years, what was expected in terms of pedagogy and discipline, and how the program had changed as a result of prior experiences.

After the conclusion of the Saturday Academy and the administration of the CAPT, I interviewed Anna, Bruno, Sophie, and Shelly. While these were informally-structured interviews, I drew many of the questions that I asked Anna and Bruno from the Schommer Epistemological Questionnaire (see Appendix A), which provided some structure for our conversation. My intention was to gain insight regarding the students’ and the teachers’ epistemologies.

Videotapes & Transcripts

My primary source of data was the video recordings I made of each class. At the conclusion of the Saturday Academy I began to transcribe all of the videotapes for the second period reading class. While I had videotaped all four

sections of reading classes, I could see that the second period class was by far the most insistent upon social interaction. While students in the other periods sat quietly, doing what the teachers asked them to do, their experiences proved to be inconclusive as I was left with almost no student discourse of any kind. But the second period was different. There, students argued, fought, joked, misbehaved, laughed, and cried. The second period class challenged the teacher and one another. Without this sort of discursive conflict, given the dearth of writing and feedback, I really had no data other than the teachers' verbal instructions. Thus, focusing on the second period class was a necessary and obvious choice. So, I transcribed only the second period's videotapes. While I did not transcribe every word of every second period class, I did attempt to include both breadth and depth in my transcripts. Most of what was said I did transcribe; I only omitted stretches that were repetitive—where I had already explored and analyzed at least once similar discourse content and structure. It is a concern that the generalizability of this study may be affected by focusing solely upon the second period class, as if that population of students were in fact outliers. While that may be true, it is the purpose of grounded theory methodology to develop theory—possible hypotheses (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Generalizability is a concern more pertinent to scientific experiments designed to test the hypotheses developed in grounded theory research. This study is a first step.

Field Notes

During each class period, as I was videotaping, I was also taking notes on notebook paper and on my computer regarding what was happening in class—my

immediate perceptions, interpretations, and reactions. This was an important source of data as my immediate interpretations and reactions evolved significantly as I watched the videotapes many times and as I transcribed the students' and the teachers' words, hearing them over and over again.

Published Materials

The teachers of the Saturday Academy provided me with the same materials that they provided the students: stories, articles, instructions, tips and strategies, sample answers, and practice tests. I also referred to online publications of the State Department of Education as I familiarized myself with all the nuances of the CAPT—what skills the state actually purports to assess, how exactly students' answers are assessed in terms of expectations and weighting, what information is reported to the students, how student performance affects the school, how student performance affects graduation status, and what is required of students who do not pass the CAPT. Much misinformation abounds, a fact that becomes obvious as one listens to teachers and administrators talk about the CAPT, so I went directly to the source, the CAPT itself.

Procedures and Data Analysis

For nine of the ten days of the Saturday Academy, four one-hour periods each day, I sat in the back corner of the room as I observed each class; for day nine I sat in the front of the room because my computer was unavailable so I used the computer in the classroom. During each class my video camera was situated in front of me. Since it was a small class with only about twelve participating students, and since those students tended to sit in a compact group, I did not need

to be constantly moving the camera in order to focus on the speaker. Even the teacher was present in most of the videos. This facilitated my transcription.

While students were always aware of my presence, as is made obvious when Hannah swears and the class looks to me and my camera, they almost immediately became accustomed to it and I do not perceive that it altered their behavior materially. From time to time I left the classroom to make copies of students' writings, but that only happened infrequently. I ate lunch at my desk, as did the students, and engaged in a few off-camera conversations with students, either about something they had said during the class or about questions they had concerning my presence in class. Bruno, Anko, Anna, and Marianna were all remarkably interested. Sam still says hello to me on campus. Jasmine, Tanya, Carmella, Marcus, Jacob, and Isabel all completely ignored me and do not seem to recognize me when I see them now. Jacob was the one student who exhibited any reluctance to participate.

After each day of observing four classes I came home and reviewed my notes and the assignments the students did. I also listened to and watched the videotapes, although I did not start transcribing them until after my interviews with Bruno, Anna, Sophie, and Shelly. The transcribing process was crucial to my gaining a deeper understanding of the discourse occurring in the class. Every ten minutes of class discourse required about an hour of transcription. It's amazing how inaccurate my hearing was upon only listening once. To transcribe the conversations I had to listen to each utterance numerous times. After I had finished transcribing each period I went back and checked my accuracy.

Invariably I found mistakes. Upon completing the transcription of all ten days' second period reading classes and the interviews I went back and rechecked the entire transcript.

The next step was to find categories in the data that would begin to lend order to what otherwise seemed somewhat chaotic. This too was a crucial step that allowed me to scrutinize the data with some sense of focus. In my first iteration I detected over 20 possible categories, so I analyzed the data again and again, combining the original categories into fewer major headings. Then I stopped seeing anything.

As I returned to the literature concerning my methodology and the theory underlying my study, I read and reread books and articles that I thought I had understood. The depth and pertinence of many of these works became much clearer to me as a result of my own research that I was conducting. In particular, Bakhtin's (1981) ideas about heteroglossia, which I had once thought were almost self-evident, suddenly took on the quality of an epiphany. After rereading the studies of current researchers writing about education and epistemology, I reread the piece by Hammer and Elby (2002) and I discovered an analytic framework that I felt I could operationalize.

During this time of "sharpening my axe" I also had conversations with anyone who would listen to me. One particularly astute colleague with whom I shared my transcript noted the frequency of students and teachers copying other sources of knowledge. This allowed me look again at my data, this time with a focus on copying. Then, once again I revisited the literature concerning

epistemology in education. Finally, I focused my analysis, using the framework created by Hammer and Elby, on one epistemological resource activated by students and teachers: knowledge is transmitted by an authoritative source.

From there I began my discourse analysis of my data, using the microethnographic framework established by Bloome et al. (2005). This is both a liberating and valid framework for discourse analysis focused on social justice, power, and personal identity formation. While maintaining that as a secondary focus, I analyzed the data with the primary focus on epistemology.

Reliability of Data Analysis

Addressing concerns regarding data analysis reliability in qualitative research, Anaffra, Brown, and Mangione (2002) analyze a selection of qualitative studies to see how reliability is established in those studies. They note that “frequently, qualitative research is evaluated against the positivist criteria of validity and reliability and found to be lacking or ‘soft’” (p. 28), that qualitative researchers “did not provide adequate and clear justification for their methods, findings, or conclusions” (p. 28). To address what they perceive as a vulnerability of qualitative methodology to criticism regarding the “core elements of classical science—refutability and replicability” (p. 28), the authors call for openness and transparency of all researcher decision making:

We operate from the basic premise that how researchers account for and disclose their approach to all aspects of the research process are key to evaluating their work substantively and methodologically. (p. 28)

Referencing Guba and Lincoln's (1982) "trustworthiness criteria" (p. 28), the authors state that "clear 'tracks'" (p. 29) of the researcher's steps be made available for his readers to follow. Towards this end they present five criteria developed by Eisenhart and Howe (1992) that address their concerns about the reliability of qualitative methodology:

- a) ensuring a fit between research questions, data collection procedures, and analytic techniques;
- b) ensuring the effective application of specific data collection and analytic techniques;
- c) being alert to and cognizant of prior knowledge;
- d) being cognizant of both internal and external value constraints; and
- e) assessing a study's comprehensiveness. (p. 30)

Likewise, the authors cite Creswell and Miller's (2000) eight verification procedures:

- a) prolonged engagement and persistent observation,
- b) triangulation,
- c) peer review and debriefing,
- d) negative case analysis,
- e) clarifying researcher bias,
- f) member checks,
- g) thick description, and
- h) external studies. (p. 30)

They further note Creswell's (1998) recommendation that "qualitative researchers engage in at least two of the eight verification procedures" (p. 30). Specifically, the authors focus their concern on how categories are conceived in a reliable and trustworthy way, yet they recognize that "the process of data analysis is eclectic, there is no 'right way' (Tesch, 1990)" (p. 31). Nevertheless, the authors' thesis is that

Multiple sources of evidence, an established chain of evidence, pattern-matching, replication logic in multiple-case studies, use of proper case study protocol, a developed case study data base, and member checks all add to the validity and reliability of this study. (p. 33)

In a similar vein, Harry, Sturges, and Linger (2005) address concerns regarding the reliability of qualitative methodology with a focus on grounded theory. While specifically focused on the over-representation of minorities in special education classes, the authors present an analysis of their own methodology as they codify their own transcripts. They propose, "theory development becomes a recursive 'search for consistency and logic' (Strauss and Corbin, 1988)" (p. 5). The reliability of their coding is derived primarily by a recursive process of transcript examination by the research team, which was comprised of "one co-principal investigator and 3 graduate assistants, who met twice a week for 3 weeks to compare their separate coding of the same data" (p. 6). The authors state that their "goal was consensus, with each point of difference being debated and clarified until the group agreed on appropriate usage of the set of codes" (p. 6). Objectivity is also a concern of the authors, since researchers in

the field of education most often have significant prior experiences in educational settings, and these experiences, since they cannot realistically be ignored, may, to an extent, determine their findings: “It would be naïve to think that preconceived beliefs and perspectives will not be brought to bear on the data” (p. 7).

Consequently, the authors call for “transparency in the analysis . . . supported by prolonged engagement in the field and by testing the emerging interpretation against participants’ perspectives” (p. 7).

To address these legitimate concerns about the reliability of qualitative methodology, my study attempts to adhere to the guidelines represented above, as well as those presented by Feuer, Towne, and Shavelson (2002) in their analysis of the National Research Council’s (NRC) recommendations for scientific study in education:

- Pose significant questions that can be investigated empirically,
- Link research to relevant theory,
- Use methods that permit direct investigation of the questions,
- Provide a coherent and explicit chain of reasoning,
- Yield findings that replicate and generalize across studies, and
- Disclose research data and methods to enable and encourage professional scrutiny and critique.

Data collection adhered strictly to accepted methodological procedures, and a transparency of data analysis is maintained throughout. All interview questions were guided by the essential questions guiding the study, and many were taken directly from the Schommer Epistemological Questionnaire (see Appendix A).

Detailed transcripts of each class and interviews with both teachers and two students are included (see Appendix C), and the recursive analysis and interpretation of those transcripts are detailed in Chapter 4 of this study. As is evident, the coding of the transcripts was consistently founded upon empirical studies and relevant theory. Finally, my hope is that this study will indeed be critiqued, and that it will promote discussion of this important topic. The one omission of this study is the absence of member checking. Sharing findings with the participants—teachers, students, administrators, and parents—and providing their insights would have extended the reliability of my data analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS

Overview

Let me say now that the two literature teachers of the Saturday Academy are well-intentioned teachers—I would consider them friends and colleagues (they were, after all, graciously willing to allow me into their classrooms)—and the students to this day, a year and a half later—remain loyal to them and appreciative of their efforts. Any pejorative, judgmental, uncharitable, or ungracious perceptions or interpretations herein reflect solely my own inadequacies and insecurities as a researcher as I attempt to, in Clifford Geertz’s words (1983), “understand understandings not my own” (p.5).

The Saturday Academy is a hopeful place. It has to be. Why else would these students choose to attend four hours of classes lasting for ten Saturdays spread out over three months? They do not know exactly why they are there—why they are the chosen ones, but they have hope and, in their own way, they want to please the people important in their lives: their families, their peers, and their teachers. Over the next ten classes these tenth graders are going to be told many things that will challenge their perceptions of themselves, their world, and their place within that world. They believe, and their beliefs are reinforced by the teachers, that they need to pass the CAPT in order to graduate from high school; and they will watch and believe as the CAPT evolves from an obscure abstraction, yet another imposition, into an anthropomorphic presence—the living and discerning embodiment of their School, their Government, their Factory, and their Temple. Some of the students will be asked questions that allow them freely to

create knowledge, to fabricate new knowledge based upon old, to form knowledge based upon prior experiences, and to explore knowledge that suddenly seems inherent; other students will have didactic questions rain down upon them. To some students the teacher will seem to be a liberator, to others an indoctrinator. For some students the value of their prior experiences—their knowledge formed in the context of their homes and their neighborhoods—will be validated; for others it will be ignored or manipulated. All students will have to decide, consciously or otherwise, how to understand, how to internalize their experiences within the Academy, and then how they will use their understanding as they create responses to the CAPT: whether they will adopt, modify, or reject the implicitly hegemonic messages. Subconsciously, what is really being both molded and reinforced, at its most fundamental level, are the epistemologies of the students and the teachers of the Saturday Academy, as their beliefs about the source and nature of knowledge interact—play with and against one another.

The following is an analysis of “discursive episodes”—their content and context—as they occur in chronological order over the first two second period Reading classes. A discursive episode is a term I have conceived to identify a sequence of turns (or a single turn) during which a “discursive context” is established that allows for the activation of epistemological resources associated with that context (Hammer & Elby, 2004). I identify four discursive contexts: the Government, Temple, Factory, and School. For purposes of coding the transcript I use the following criteria: utterances that indicate formulas for success or impose a judge upon student writing I code as Government; utterances that indicate moral

imperatives, rules as commandments, and a sense of predestination and belonging I code as Temple; utterances that create a “gotta do it” work ethic I code as Factory, and utterances that refer to literary terms I code as School. A “contextual change” is the transformation of the classroom discursive context, thereby signaling the opportunity for change in the mode and content of discourse practice (Fairclough, 1995) and allowing for the possible activation of previously inactivated epistemological resources. Discursive context changes can be “intra-institutional” (i.e., from the Temple to the Government) or “extra-institutional” (i.e., from the School to the Home/Neighborhood). The premise of this part of my analysis is that discursive episodes are identifiable, distinct, and occur within a discernable context. This does not mean, however, that my identifications of discursive episodes are definitive; nor are the contexts comprising my broad category of Institutional Context—Government, Temple, Factory, and School—definitive. Transcripts may be read and analyzed differently by researchers, depending upon the researchers’ framework. In Norman Fairclough’s (1995) study of patient-doctor discourse he analyzes his transcript with a focus on power. In what follows I analyze the transcripts with a focus on the interplay between student and teacher epistemology.

Summary of Analysis for Days 1 and 2

Tables 4.1 and 4.2 represent summaries of my analyses of the contexts established by the teachers and allowed by the students during the first two meetings of this Reading class. I have identified five “discursive episodes” each of which is distinguished by a change in context. Concurrent with this I identified

the institutional contexts evident from episode to episode throughout the period: these institutional contexts I have termed the Factory, the Temple, the Government, and the School; another context—one that upon much consideration I do not consider “institutional”—is the Home and Neighborhood. The Home and Neighborhood context is established by students or teachers relating in speech or writing prior experiences pertinent to the theme of the class discourse; in order to establish a Home and Neighborhood context, however, the shared prior experiences must be validated by others in the setting (Bloome et. al., 2005). Once validated, students’ (and teachers’) prior experiences may be valorized as a source of important knowledge; however, by not validating students’ prior experiences teachers establish themselves—their own prior experiences and their knowledge—as the dominant authoritative source of important and relevant knowledge. Another consideration is that students’ prior experiences risk being manipulated to further the naturalization of the dominant culture’s speech genre. This is foundational to my study.

In each discursive episode except the final one (during which the students discuss in peer groups their own literacy experiences) the teacher is the “discourse technologist” as well as the authoritative source of knowledge. Although many contexts are established—each is hegemonic and allows for the activation of no other epistemological resource other than understanding knowledge as propagated stuff (Hammer & Elby, 2002). The third discursive episode of day 1 (see Table 4.1) and the third and fourth discursive episodes of day 2 (see Table 4.2) evidence the most significant technologization: the teacher, firmly established as discourse

Table 4.1 is located at the end of this dissertation.

Table 4.2 is located at the end of this dissertation.

technologist, introduces and establishes the presence of vague forces empowered to police student discourse, and that policing will be guided by strategies—decontextualized techniques (in terms of students’ lived experiences: the context of the Home and Neighborhood, which is either absent from or manipulated during each discursive episode), and uses students’ expressions of personal experiences to reinforce the dominant cultural speech genre, all of which is intended to produce a standardized form of spoken discourse that will presumably be transferred into written discourse (of sufficient quality to pass the Reading portion of the CAPT) at a much later date.

I suppose this might be pedagogically sound if the only consideration is that the students pass the CAPT, and if it were theoretically sound; as parents, teachers, and educational researchers, however, we are not afforded the luxury of ignoring the epistemological influences of this pedagogy, with its concomitant implications regarding students’ construction of personhood—their social and institutional identities and their worldview (Bloome et al., 2005) and what it means to be a student of literature.

Day 1: Establishing the Discursive Contexts

The Discursive Context of the School

The initial context Sophie establishes—School—is familiar to all students—the taking of attendance, with the expected mispronunciation and subsequent student-corrected pronunciation of names. When Sophie gets to Isabel’s name she asks, “Did I pronounce your last name correct?” Isabel, in a voice lacking sympathy for Sophie’s position as a person unfamiliar with Hispanic

pronunciation, replies, “Yeah, in English you pronounced it correct” (2-3). Until the near end of this episode, Sophie requests help and cooperation from the students, positioning herself as a non-expert in a context where knowledge is propagated: the students are helping Sophie to pronounce their names in a manner consistent with their culture. Sophie’s misuse of the adjective “correct” in place of the adverb “correctly” possibly reflects her assumption regarding Isabel’s cultural lexicon. Isabel’s repetition of Sophie’s syntax might be a subtle message that Isabel perceives Sophie as the authority and she will do as Sophie does. Of course, Isabel could be mocking Sophie. Her disaffected voice when instructing Sophie about how to pronounce her name is a further indication that Isabel expects Sophie to be an expert, an authority, and she had better be just that. Sophie accepts Isabel’s correction with deference: “Oh it’s much prettier like that” (6). Sophie’s seemingly deferential social positioning is repeated when she interacts with Jasmine (6), Marcus (11-15), and Marianna (17-21). During these interactions Sophie attempts to make personal connections. She tells Marianna in a soft voice, “I know you” (17). Surprised, Marianna replies, “You do? . . . You know me?” (18, 20) Then, in a move that will be revealed as characteristic of Sophie, at this opportunity for establishing a relatively simple and non-threatening personal connection Sophie abruptly changes her tone: “Yeah, I don’t know (emphasis) you” (21). Marianna does not miss this, as you will see a few minutes later when she replies to Sophie’s bid for personal connection—“See you know who I am, you know me” (44)—with “I don’t know (imitation of Sophie’s emphasis) you. I know of (emphasis) you” (45). The students are paying attention to Sophie’s

words and her implicit messages: her personal connections are elusive and, as is evident in the following exchange, she is the teacher—the authority.

Sophie's first disciplinary move against Marcus changes the discursive context of the class: "Marcus, I just need to tell you right now, I think it's very rude that you're talking [Marcus: "All right."] while other people are talking, ok? So please (emphasis) do me that favor and just (moving her right hand—index finger pressed against thumb as if holding a zipper—quickly across her lips) zip it" (36-38). Clearly, Sophie is establishing herself as the disciplinary force in the class; yet Isabel is not willing to accept this, and she mocks Sophie's discipline: to a fellow student she says, "I think it's very rude when people are talking (?) in my ear (pause and student laughter, which inspires her to speak louder) and I'm trying to listen" (39). Why does Isabel begin this first class with a challenge to Sophie's authority? These challenges will continue.

In Sophie's interaction with an Asian male, she asks him, "Did I pronounce it [his name] correctly?" Sophie's grammar is now consistent with accepted usage ("correctly" versus "correct"), an interesting revelation that Sophie will posture herself differently with different students.

The Discursive Context of the Temple

The established School context changes to what I term a religious context—the Temple—as Sophie comes out from behind her desk and delivers a relatively long moralistic monologue—a parable really, the essence of which is disciplinary; presumably, Marcus is both her subject and her intended audience. The parable is one of a student who misbehaved during the prior year's Saturday

Academy and who, as a result of his misbehavior, did not receive credit. Sophie's use of the subjective case transforms from "the student" to "they" to "his" and "he" and finally to the real subject: "you"—the students—and by implication, Marcus. In the midst of this moral tale Sophie's speech becomes increasingly "disfluent" (Fairclough, 1995, pp. 174, 198): ". . . um, you know, whether it was, you know, picking on other students or, you know, just talking while other people were talking . . ." (42). While teachers of reading and literary analysis must contend with the moral aspects of the literature they teach, they do not have to become preachers of morality themselves, nor must they allow the hegemonic influence of a religious discursive context to become so pervasive that it transforms the discursive context and thereby determines the activated epistemological resources. Sophie's vernacular is going to become increasingly moral—it takes on a pervasively Church-like tone and structure, such as when she says,

. . . what ended up happening was after about four weeks he was kicked out of the program. It's the same rules that apply during the school day, um, it's the same thing here. So I expect you guys to be just as respectful to each other and to me as I will give back to you as you are every other day when you are in school. Ok. And I would expect that of you when you go home and every other time anyways. (42)

While this text is similar to a School context, I code it as the Temple—a place where religious ritual, devotions, and instruction are enacted. What defines it as a religious context is that students (worshippers, voluntary or coerced) must learn

and obey the “rules”, commandments, or they risk being “kicked out,” excommunicated from the social institution, left hopeless, banned from proximity to their god; also, the Temple’s priestesses may impose expectations upon their flock—the vague and culturally defined quality of “respect” and the Golden Rule of ancient religions, albeit with a capitalist nuance: give to me that value which you want me to give to you. Finally, the invasion of this lesson’s moral expectations into the students’ homes establishes a convincing religious overlay and partially validates the context of the Temple. The important consideration here is that while a healthy religious context might be expected to activate epistemic resources that enliven explorations of one’s inherent knowledge, personal experiences, prior learning, and free creations of meaning, repressive religions founded upon the coercive imposition of hegemonic doctrine are not so nurturing of creative impulses. The teacher remains the authoritative figure—the disciplinary force and the dispenser of knowledge.

Jasmine attempts to establish a more personal connection with Sophie as she spontaneously relates her prior experiences with Shelly (Miss Clines): “Miss Clines’s doing this? She’s my English teacher. Oh, I like her” (47). In response, Sophie appropriates Jasmine’s personal perception: “Miss Clines and I are very much alike in teaching, so I don’t think that you’re going to see a drastic difference when you change from having me . . . we teach pretty much the same” (49). Is Sophie trying to affect Jasmine’s perception of Shelly or is she attempting to place herself in the citadel of Jasmine’s affection?

Finally, might religious leaders manipulate the truth as they attempt to motivate their flocks? Sophie says, “We’ll be giving you guys some grades. . . . We will be discussing that [what individual students can do to improve] together so we really work, um, very closely, so anything that, you know, you relay to one of us will get passed on to the other teacher, so you can just kind of think of us as the same person I guess, all right?” (49) While the efficacy of any of these supposed motivators is dubious, none of this proves to be true anyway.

Finally, Sophie places the students as sacrifices to a greater cause. The students “suffering,” enduring “agony,” “getting nervous,” feeling “stress” “for us,” so that we may know if we “are doing [our] jobs” (51).

All of the above is only pertinent if somehow the omnipresent religious overlay affects the discursive context of the classroom, thereby affecting the activation of students’ epistemological resources. In both contexts—the School and the Temple—students are the receivers of propagated knowledge from an authoritative source. In the Temple, however, the moral and punitive context becomes pervasive.

The Discursive Context of the Government

This contextual episode ends and the next commences with Hannah’s question, “Then how come we have to suffer not graduating if we don’t pass it?” and Sophie’s ensuing monologue (53), which introduces dominant powers over which students, and even she herself, have no recourse. First, however, she allows an indefinite pronoun to place the students as she begins to construct their institutional identities: “I think what this is just implying is that you do not have

the skills that you will need to go on to college.” Echoes of the Temple are present, as if college (Heaven) is a place some abstract and omniscient intelligence (God) has determined (or predetermined) these students (sinners) do not have the skills (innate morality) to enter; however, a Governmental discursive context is consistent with what follows. Sophie goes on to say that getting into college

is what EMA, you know EMA is an academic school so they want to know that all of you, I mean not only want to go to college, but they are going to try to make it so that all of you are going to college. (53)

The CAPT and now the school have acquired a remote, detached third person dominance in the classroom. “They,” the professors referenced in the following passage, are like Marx’s technological elite who manipulate the sentiments of the proletariat, not to work towards the overthrow of an oppressive social structure, but rather to ensure their own place and power within the existing structure (Dalton, 2000): Sophie says,

There was a study done, and that’s like where some of these, you know, Connecticut or statewide tests come up, where professors were saying students did not have these certain skills that they needed and they weren’t getting them because they weren’t getting them in high school. (53)

The questions this statement begs are obvious to those of us who do not have to obey the implicit rules of this discursive context: What is this study? Who conducted it? Where? When? Upon whom? What did it really indicate? What skills is she talking about? Sophie seems to accept the naïve premise that high

school is the cause for students' underperformance, and she assumes the students' adherence to the implicit rules of this discursive context.

Sophie again uses praise and a sense of camaraderie —“yeah, it's a good question, I agree with you”—in an attempt to terminate the discursive episode, but Jacob will not let it end here:

What if we still do all this and don't pass the CAPT test and we end up having to take the class, wouldn't it just be easier to just like not do any of this and just take the class . . . can you do that? (56)

Reinforcing with significant disfluency the presence of the dominant third person, Sophie says,

I think by doing the test like this, well and first of all I mean they could and who who who would you have grade it? You know I mean right now the graders are people who are trained and and paid in Connecticut to look for certain things. (57)

Sophie is not adept at governmental discourse. The disfluency evident in her answer indicates the hegemonic influence upon Sophie's words of the class's governmental context (Fairclough, 1995). Here, too, she introduces the minions of bureaucratic power: “the graders.” This position of grader is certainly not invested with the mystique that Sophie indicates. Any competent teacher could grade student responses with the accuracy of the trained assessors; and, what is more, it is arguable that teachers who know their students could more accurately assess their students' written responses than anonymous “graders” who do not.

Sophie invests the governmental context with social-moral authority as well. The school is vigilant—it is “constantly looking to make you guys you know stronger readers and um just better in different ways. . . . They have to somehow they have to check to make sure we’re doing the right thing.” “They” know what the students’ needs are, and “they” just want to make the students “better” so they too will have the skills to do “the right thing” (57).

However, as with many modern institutional insiders—power-invested priests, CEO’s, and bureaucrats, Sophie herself is exempt from the institutionally-mandated tests and their social implications:

I I personally, um, have never done well with testing, so when I, like when I was in college and I used to take the test to become a teacher I loved teaching, I won an award for my student teaching, but when I came down to take the test, to actually become a teacher I really struggled with it and had to take it several times. . . . It’s not that I don’t know that information. It’s not that I couldn’t teach you all about mythology so that you know every single god and, you know, what happened to them and how they were created and all of that, but when the test is in front of me I get nervous” (57, 59).

Regardless of what tests may or may not indicate, Sophie has the power to determine that she is nevertheless an authority, a propagator of necessary knowledge and skills.

Note Sophie’s focus on confidence—it will show up later in students’ comments and it reflects her own sense of efficacy—what can she really teach

these students? Ultimately, Sophie and Shelly will make it obvious to the students that they—the students—simply have to do it—they have to “get it done.”

Absent from all the contexts so far are any references to students’ personal experiences.

The next contextual change occurs when Sophie transitions to explicit test preparation instruction (see Table 4.3)—techniques and strategies for passing the CAPT, which are published by the Connecticut State Department of Education. In this long monologue (63) Sophie commingles the presence of the Government (“the grader,” “they,” “them”), the School (literary terms and test-taking techniques and strategies), and the Temple (taboos and confession):

Table 4.3: Discursive Contexts

Transcript	Context
Sophie: When scoring your response the grader will be looking to see that you number one understood what you read and if you have Miss Clines I know that you’ve heard this a million times and I don’t I’m not sure about all the other teachers but never never never tell them “I don’t understand.” That right there is you saying to them “fail me” ok?	Government: the grader School: literary term: to understand. School: Miss Clines, a teacher. The Temple: good and bad priests. The Temple: confession: some sins are unforgivable. The Temple & the Government: the great taboo as published by the graders. The Temple: the less-than-omniscient god, perhaps. Or is it a false hope?

(Responding to a student's comment) Miss Kohler says that too? Even if you don't understand every single aspect of the story (rising intonation) you do understand something, so tell them what you do understand, and if you don't understand something (rising intonation) pose a question and then give a possible answer for it. So "I don't know why the author had the character, um, you know, running around the track fifteen times before he went on his date but maybe it's because he just needed to kinda clear his head, or he needed to, um, get ready mentally being prepared for the date," ok? so if you don't know why something happens just question it and then try to figure out an answer. Not a big deal. Ok, that's all they're looking for you to do. They're not looking for you to be, um, you know, going into literature or English for a full time career. They're just looking to see that you can read something and that you can figure out why it was written. Ok? Number two they want to see that you can	The Temple: doctrine. The School: literary term: understand. The School: literary term: aspect. The Temple: there is some good in us all—just find it. The Government: them. The School: Literary Term: understand. The School: Literary Term: understand. The School: question and answer. The School: models example of detail. The Government: they. The Government, the School, and the Temple: gatekeepers. The Government: "they" and their minimal expectations. School: Another strategy. The Government: judges.

interpret what you've read, so that you actually can say well this is what happened but then give a reason why so that you, you know, actually are considering what the purpose of this story is, or article. Number three, they are trying to see if you can connect to it on some level, and I'll tell you right now that if you can make some kind of a connection, whether it's feeling the emotions that one of the characters are feeling or, you know, feeling, understanding the same theme that they're trying to come across which there's always several themes so you have many choices. If you can do that, I guarantee that you will enjoy every story you read. You may not love it, it may not be your favorite story in the entire world to read, but you will enjoy it because you will	School: Literary Term: interpret. School: Literary Term: show understanding, hypothesize a cause, consider a purpose. School: another strategy. The Government: judges. School: Literary Term: connect. School: omniscient teacher's promise. School: mitigation of omniscient teacher's promise. School: Literary Term: connection. School: Literary Term: emotions. School: Literary Term: characters. Disfluency. School: Literary Term: understanding. School: Literary Term: theme. Government: they. Disfluency. School: Literary Term: theme. School: omniscient teacher's promise. School: mitigation of omniscient teacher's promise—minimal expectations.

understand	School: Literary Term: understand.
what the author was trying to say, ok?	School: Literary Concept: author's intent.
And you will be	School: omniscient teacher's promise.
identifying with it.	School: Literary Concept: identifying with author's intent.
Number four,	School: another strategy.
evaluate what you read,	School: Literary Term: evaluate.
you want to judge this piece.	School: Literary Term: judge.
First of all, it's an article (rising intonation) could this really happen?	School: Literary Concept: verisimilitude.
If it's a short story, is this a good piece of literature?	School: Literary Concept: judge.
And to do that you're going to have to develop your own definition of what you think good literature is.	School: Literary Concept: literary criticism.
We'll help you with it,	School: the teacher.
but, you know, it's a personal thing. So you're gonna have to develop that definition on your own, ok? Any questions on all of that?	School: ultimately, you're on your own.

The Evolving Discursive Context of the School

The final contextual change of the period occurs when Sophie introduces and then assigns an exercise to be completed in peer groups (68). She tells each group to answer the three questions that are on the board. Her intent is to have the students explore in a socially interactive setting their own motivations for reading: "Why do you read those kinds of things, and maybe you don't want to, but we

force you to, um, but why? What's the purpose?" Here Sophie makes herself part of the school power system—someone who has the authority to “force” students to read. I join with Marcus, Jacob, Sam, and Tanya, and the group remains on task, exploring their own literacy. At one point Sophie comes over to our group and asks, “Jacob, have you been giving input here?” Both Jacob and Marcus answer “yes.” A short while later Sophie says,

if we're going through something and someone mentions an idea that you kinda go “Oh, I wish I'd a come up with that” write it down, ok? put a little check next to it so that I know that it's not your idea but that you wish you had come up with it. So for instance as we're going through things right now if there's something that you kinda wish that your group had come up with just put a check and then go ahead and write down what that person said or list that idea, all right? (76)

The concept of copying ideas from another source is a motif that will run throughout the ten days; the only problem with this is that propagated knowledge as a resource for understanding the source of knowledge has already been securely established. The students will need opportunities to activate other resources. This episode is a missed opportunity. The home literacies of students could have been explored, and the point of this exercise did not have to remain implicit; instead, Sophie manipulates the students' prior experiences and turns them into an attempt at humor. In response to Sophie's question, “So tell me, what are some of the things that you guys like to read?” (77) Marcus says with enthusiasm, “Adventure books” (79), but he is told by Sophie to “Hang on hang on hang on” (80) while she

calls on Hannah who relates her experiences with Dr. Seuss (81). Then Sophie uses the remainder of the class to joke about Marianna: “I would make sure that if you are writing a note to someone that you do not drop it when Marianna is behind you because [Marcus: “Yeah.”] she will invade your privacy” (82-84). To this Marianna objects: “I told you that if it dropped and I seen you drop it I will give it back to you” (88), yet Sophie pursues the joke: “Well ok, make sure if you do drop it that it’s noticeable that you dropped it so that she can give it back to you. Ok?” (89) Only Tanya questions the interaction as she states with protective sympathy in her voice, “Awww, that’s not (right?)” (90). What was the purpose of this joke, and whose purpose was it serving?

Conclusion for Day 1

The students were afforded no opportunity to activate epistemological resources for understanding the source of knowledge other than knowledge is propagated stuff. In every episode the teacher is the source of knowledge—there is no other. Evidence of intertextuality in Sophie’s speech and her frequent stretches of disfluent speech patterns indicate a shift from pure literary discourse to a discourse of institutional power. The discursive contexts in every episode has an authority—the teacher, the bureaucrat, or the priestess, and these discursive contexts determine, not completely but significantly, the discourse content. The new speech genre of literary analysis, which students are in the Saturday Academy to learn—the discourse prescribed by the state and required by “the graders” to pass the CAPT—is policed by “them.” Sophie spends significant time introducing state-generated strategies and techniques students may adopt in order to acquire

this new literary discourse. Prior knowledge, where it is introduced, is manipulated to serve social ends, which devalues the Home and Neighborhood as a place of important knowledge formation and acquisition. Sophie waffles intermittently between which discourse she will align herself with—that of the student or that of the government—and she mediates her stance with a religious overlay. The students see that she does not rebel against this hegemonic imposition of the state’s discourse into the school context, so they respond with passivity, adopting—copying—Sophie’s epistemological stance.

Day 2: Establishing the Discursive Contexts

Challenges to the Discursive Context of the School

Shelly begins the class as Sophie had a week before, but as if the students were exhibiting some sort of latent reaction to the discursive practices of the prior class, they begin immediately to challenge Shelly’s authority. Isabel’s shrill laughter when she hears that Anko is in the class (16), Marcus’s reply, “Was I?” (18), when Shelly, attempting to make a personal connection with him, says, “You were in my study hall last year” (17), the general chatter (22), and Isabel’s confusion, mistaking Shelly for Sophie—“Wait, you’re not the same teacher?” (23)—all work to challenge Shelly’s authority, as she sees it, which is evident in her disciplinary responses. Nevertheless, the students are listening: Isabel says, “Remember she told us they teach the same way?” (26). Sophie’s comment that she and Shelly are similar determines Isabel’s perceptions.

Bruno is the first to introduce a vocabulary born of some other context than School: in response to a question posed by Shelly he says, “I don’t have one

homey” (29); Tanya replies in her own vernacular as well: “I don’t got one with me” (30). These challenges to established School discourse Shelly counters with discipline: to Bruno she says, “Can you please take your hat off” (31), and in a kind of preemptive strike she tells Anko, as he walks into the classroom for the first time, late, “Hats off please Anko” (33). I am not saying Shelly is misguided to enforce the rules of the classroom, it’s just that she could have responded to Bruno with either humor or guidance (“Am I your homey?”), to Tanya with instruction (“I don’t have one with me”—I’m sure Tanya has heard that correction before), and to Anko with some sort of instructional welcome (“Welcome Anko, come on in, sit down, and take off your hat. We are looking at this handout”). This humorless, disciplinary, authoritative tone will further determine—will reestablish—the institutional discursive context for this class.

Isabel says, amid the chatter and in a mocking voice, “You’re perverting [sic] me from learning” (36), to which Marcus responds with laughter and repeats Isabel’s misuse of “preventing.” Shelly responds with a verbal mitigation of the task: “What we’re going to do is very simple. . . . All you gotta do is write down one thing that you remember . . . from last week. . . This is only gonna take a second” (41-45). Tanya answers, “She she asked us questions about how do we read” (48), but this reply is not validated; in fact, at the end of this discursive episode Shelly asks, “Did she ask you how you read . . .?” (60). To me, the obvious question is, “What do you mean by ‘How do I read?’,” but the students are compliant and do not know that they may request clarification of the terms used by a teacher to frame a question.

The Commingling of Discursive Contexts

The change to the next discursive episode occurs with a change in the dominant power present in the classroom. Shelly poses a question about “the differences between when you’re reading stuff that you like and the stuff you have to read when you’re at school” (62). Again, while I perceive the assumption—that for these students school is a place where they are forced to read “stuff” they would never choose to read—I do not understand the question, literally. What does Shelly mean by “the difference”? Nevertheless, Marcus and Bruno interpret and make sense of the question. Interestingly, Marcus finds enjoyment reading outside of school—“it’s funner” (65), he says. This, however, is not the answer Shelly is looking for, and she reiterates her question: “The difference between reading what you like to read and reading what you have to read in school (pause) how you read” (66). In the text of Bruno’s genuine response he recognizes that his answer is not what Shelly wants: “See, I don’t know, it’s better reading in school” (67); “See, I don’t know” is a genuflection to Shelly’s authoritative position in the classroom. In spite of the answer Bruno seems to intuit Shelly is guiding them towards—that school-reading is a grind—Bruno admits to liking the school environment because it is a place where he can get help. Instead of pursuing Bruno’s perception, Shelly addresses Tanya’s statement that she prefers to choose her own reading material: “At school . . . I be, I just be like you mean I got to read this?” (67, 71). Anko then voices his agreement with Bruno: “And like if you’re reading something in school and you have to read at home like at school they explain it if you don’t understand what they’re what you’re reading at school they

explain it better” (75, 77). Neither Bruno nor Tanya nor Anko have provided Shelly with the answer she is waiting for, so she changes the discursive context—she makes her intent a little more explicit:

Shelly: When you’re at school, um, do you always like what you have to read?

Several students: No, but . . .

Shelly: Is it always the most interesting?

Several students: No.

Shelly: No, so what do you do when you have to read something that you really don’t want to but you know you have to by the end of the period, what do you have to do?

Students: Force yourself. (78-82)

So it is not that schools choose reading materials for students that Shelly wants to emphasize; rather, it is that students must do what they inherently do not want to do, read materials that are innately unpleasant to read. This establishes the discursive context of the class—it is a Factory mentality, now delivered in a mock-religious structure (thereby signaling a contextual change), where students are told what to do and they must do what they are told, like it or not, they must “get it done” and they must follow the rules; in addition, as the students will soon be told, while accomplishing an unpleasant mandatory task it is important that students sit correctly and isolate themselves from their peers. The factory context is a grim and humorless context for young students to inhabit.

Shelly requests students to share their perceptions of school and then she re-interprets those shared perceptions so students express and hear in their own words her own messages, which the students do not question explicitly. Continuing in the Factory context she has established with a religious discursive structure, Shelly explicitly teaches several strategies for accomplishing unpleasant tasks:

Shelly: How do you have to sit?

Students: Straight up. (89-90)

And then again:

Shelly: How do you have to sit (emphatic) when you're reading something that maybe isn't the most interesting but you've go to get it done?

Student answers: (Unintelligible.)

Shelly: Have to sit straight up, all right, what else do you have to do? (94-96)

If this is an accurate determination of the students' zone of proximal development then they are in trouble; if it's not an accurate determination, then what is it?

Shelly presents her next strategy as she continues with her established process of discourse production—call-and-response, or IRE (initiation, response, evaluation) (Mehan, 1979)—and mixes in discursive elements of the Government and the Factory (see Table 4.4) (98-112):

Table 4.4: Discursive Context Analysis

Transcript	Analysis of Discursive Context
98. Shelly: What do you have to do	Elimination of students' options—their response to such behavior is demanded of them.

if your friend is sitting right over there and they	Expansion of subject from “your friend” to “they.”
keep, like, throwing little pieces of paper at you?	Shelly assumes such has been the students’ experiences with their peers; otherwise, this would make no sense.
99. Isabel: Punch him in the nose.	Isabel attempts a little bit of humor, but the discursive context of the classroom will not allow humor to be validated.
100. Marcus: Isolate yourself, if you want to get it done.	Marcus is onboard. Note his repetition of Shelly’s “get it done.” He copies her epistemological stance.
101. Shelly: If you want to get it done, what do you have to do? Raise your hand. What do you do if you want to get it done?	Ignoring both Isabel’s and Marcus’s answers, Shelly emphasizes an assembly line context: get it done, get it done.
102. Marcus: Snitch, tell.	The modern connotation of the word “snitch” is a topic of some current debate: the implication is that any black person who reports to the police crimes committed by another black person is a traitor to his culture, a “snitch.” T-shirts are made and sold bearing the logo, “Don’t Snitch.” So is Marcus having a little fun here?
103. Shelly: Tell him so and so is talking to me so maybe they’ll move him. All right. What else do you do?	Who is “him”? The man? The governmental presence. Expansion of object from “him” to “they.”
104. Isabel: Punch him in the nose.	Repeats her own prior response.
105. Shelly: No let’s try to avoid violence. Yup (calls on Marianna).	Now Shelly responds to Isabel.
106. Marianna: Kick him in the leg and say stop.	Marianna humorously combines Isabel’s answer with Shelly’s—a mixing of responses (and cultures?).
107. Shelly: No, avoiding violence, but you might say stop.	Shelly rejects Marianna’s cultural compromise. In the context of this class—the Factory and the Temple—there are no compromises.
108. Anko: Ignore them.	Anko attempts to respond.
109. Shelly: Shhhhh. What do you have to do for yourself?	Amid some chatter, Shelly does not validate Anko’s answer.
110. Marcus: Shhhhh.	This does not sound like mock discipline; consistent with the context of the class and the activated epistemological resources, he is copying Shelly.
111. Shelly: All right, but if you want to get it done	The Factory: “get it done.”
a couple things that you said, work. You have to focus on what you’re doing,	School: strategy: focus.

sit up straight,	School: strategy: sit up straight.
not pay attention to them, ignore 'em,	School: strategy: ignore them.
and it ties into, um, what we're doing today	This proves to be a tenuous curricular connection.
because for the reading for information test you've got two tests to do for English CAPT (Marcus stretches his arms extravagantly, Marianna ducks to her right to avoid his right arm coming behind her).	Explicit test instruction.
Please stop doodling.	Discipline. Hints of student withdrawal.
Remember you're here	Beginning of disciplinary move.
we have specific things to talk about with you.	Who exactly is the "we"?
(Responding to a student's question) You're here to learn about the CAPT because what do you have to do to graduate from here?	Reminder of the indomitable Governmental presence. Shelly coerces the students with an empty threat, which she repeats in #115, but the students cannot recognize it as such.
112. Students: Pass it.	Epistemological Stance: copying Shelly's own epistemological stance, students accept this discourse.

From Student-Challenges to Teacher-Coercion

Increasingly evident in Shelly's discourse (115) is coercion, which shouldn't be surprising I suppose, because the Factory, the Temple, and the Government can be very coercive institutions, and these are the commingled contexts of Shelly's discourse. Students have little opportunity to speak, as Shelly establishes and dominates the form and content of the classroom discourse. Shelly threatens them ("You have to pass the CAPT to graduate"), entices them with a sense of elitism ("You guys are lucky"), and lures them with the false promise of close personal relationships ("Not everyone's gonna get the one-on-one instruction"); yet Tanya does not adopt Shelly's stance: "I was forced to come here" (116) she says. Shelly responds (117) to this rejection with a plea ("It's gonna help you"), a threat ("You gotta take it you gotta pass this thing in order to graduate"), and an emphatic construction of a reality ("You gotta just get it done").

The absence of an authentic, academic School context included in any of this talk—one that creates space for students’ prior knowledge experienced in their Home and Neighborhood—is striking. The feeling is that if a curriculum exists it is intended to be coercive, nonacademic, and certainly non-aesthetic. The context created for this population of students allows them to explore how to follow but not how to create. Evidence of this might be reflected in students’ answers to the Response to Literature (RTL) section of the CAPT test if they copy, to greater or lesser extents, the strategies they are told to use but create no authentic text revealing a transaction between the author of the story and themselves. Likewise, a rejection of this epistemologically-derived discursive context would be evidenced by students’ genuine attempts to create, in their responses to the CAPT questions, a genuine and natural text using their lived experiences as a valid source of knowledge.

The Factory, Efficiency, and Student-Resistance

With the introduction of “cheat codes” (117) Shelly changes the discursive context to that of the Factory, where, from a labor management perspective, the efficient use of time—productivity—is highly valued. To manage time efficiently, one must be taught “strategies,” because if you don’t “move it past the test . . . they’ll make you do it again” (120). So the first strategy is to look at the questions first; this will “save a little bit of time” (122). Then Shelly uses a map analogy to teach this strategy:

Which makes more sense? You drive around the state aimlessly (Marianna asks if she should take notes: ‘Write it?’) nope, don’t have to write it. You

drive around the state aimlessly looking for a town, then you look at a map and figure out where you have to go, then you use your directions to drive to the town, or look at a map and figure out where you have to go, use your directions to drive to the town? (124)

While most students respond to this rhetorical question with Shelly's intended answer, Marcus responds, "I like the first one because you might be able to find like a . . ." (127); although in the world of literary analysis and criticism Marcus is correct—one must reject the map (where does one really "have to go"?), Shelly "shhhhh's" him. Marcus recognizes that Shelly is trying to get them to accept the value of efficiency and he says, "It's quicker, you get straight to where you're going" (131). Shelly validates Marcus's answer: "It's faster because you have you just figure out where you have to go and you go. You don't just drive around randomly so you end up you know . . ." (132). Of course, this is a false analogy. Just because you're not following the lines on a map doesn't mean you are driving around aimlessly. Between reading a map to determine what is the fastest route to your intended destination, and just driving around randomly, are many other possibilities—including exploring with the intent to discover new perceptions and interpretations. The challenge for these students may not be reading the map; instead, it could be one of perception and interpretation—of altering schemata that blind them to personally-important and aesthetic discoveries through literary analysis.

Hegemonic Response to Student-Resistance

As is shown in Table 4.5, Shelly's monologues become hegemonic and oppressive both in their content and their duration (138):

Table 4.5: Monologue Analysis: Power in the Context of the Factory

Transcript	Interpretation of Hegemonic Affect
Three.	The third strategy.
And you have to	Power to command.
answer questions for each one, right?	Does not need to know the specific facts.
So you really want to save some time.	Most concerned with time.
You want to save some time,	Time.
so (chatter) shhhhhh	Power to discipline, to silence.
if you think about this driving analogy here you don't want to just aimlessly read it without knowing what you're looking for,	Power to command non-creative efficiency.
you want to look at the questions first, then read it,	Power to dictate strategy.
because otherwise, if you did this, if you read the article, then looked at the questions, now you gotta re-read the article, so why'd you read it in the first place?	Power to determine cognitive capability.
Because now you just have to re-read it all over again.	Power to determine cognitive capability.
So that's that takes you a lot of time if you do that . . .	Time and efficiency.
read the questions then read the article to find the information,	Power to dictate strategy.
you're gonna save time where ever you can (hands out paper and answers individual procedural and logistic questions regarding what they are doing).	Time and efficiency.
All right, so you're gonna read the question first then read the article	Power to dictate strategy.
so you don't end up reading the thing twice.	Power to determine and warn against cognitively inefficient strategies; the test has evolved now into "the thing."
The more time you save the better.	Time and efficiency.
And this is the question I asked another class: How many times in your lifetime have you been given an assignment where you had to say like read a chapter and answer questions at the end?	Power to manipulate prior experiences for institutional benefit.

Shelly concludes this strategy for saving time with this motivational rationale:

“You save time, so then you can go watch your TV or do whatever it is you gotta do” (144). What do laborers gotta do when they leave the factory?

The Discursive Contexts of the Factory and the School

The next time-saving strategy Shelly shares with the class is to skim:

All right. Skim through the lines, find something that stands out that means it goes with that question, so you skim through it, so if possible skim the article to look for answers to particular questions. (Pause) Rather than reading it word for word, skim it. Now there are some advantages and disadvantages to that so if you skim the article and answer the questions what’s the advantage of that?” (151)

The major problem with this strategy is that the students are not good enough readers to “skim” anything—I doubt they even know what it means to skim a piece of writing. Be this as it may, Shelly’s strategies are intended to produce quantity, not quality, and have more to do with behavior than with skill acquisition: she tells students to focus their attention on the test and to isolate themselves from their distracting peers:

Right, so don’t look at what other people are doing or who’s in the hallway, who’s waving at you through the window (Bruno’s hand goes up, tentatively) in the hallway, hmmm? (calling on Bruno, who requests a pencil). Yes. All right? You wanna make sure that you focus for those 45 minutes just focus on what you're reading. You can always talk with your friends later, but those 45 minutes are all you get for the test (hands Bruno

a pencil and he quietly thanks her) Yup. So just focus on reading answering it getting it done and then when you're done, then you guys can like communicate through your you know facial expressions or whatever so for that time you want to make sure you just focus on the test. (Pause) Avoid those distractions. (159)

Shelly instructs the students to answer the short answer questions first and then do the multiple-choice questions on the RFI section of the CAPT:

All right go through it a little more quickly it takes less time (talking over Anna) All right, so, you know in some cases you might wish to do the short answer questions first to make sure you get them done because then maybe you can answer the multiple choice a little bit more quickly so if you only have five minutes left then you can get those done quickly whereas if you only had five minutes and you had three short answer questions that's gonna take you a little bit longer. (169)

Shelly's final strategy (see Table 4.6) transitions the context to a mélange of all four Institutional contexts, including school (F=Factory, T=Temple, S=School, G=Government, and H=Home), (175):

Table 4.6: Commingled Discursive Contexts

Transcript	F	T	S	G	H	Interpretation
Shelly: Now the other part of number five says				↓		Government: the CAPT question is given voice.
in complete sentences,			↓			School: Literary Term: complete sentences.
why is it good		↓				Temple: moral implication.

to write complete sentences for short answers?			↓		School: Literary Term: complete sentences & question pattern.
Isabel: So you get the full points,	↓				Factory: capital reward—points—as motivation.
it it makes sense			↓		School: does Isabel want her writing to make sense to herself, or to someone else?
Shelly: All right, it makes sense to who?			↓		Government: Shelly asks what she thinks is a rhetorical question—the expected answer being “the grader.” But what if Isabel were to answer, “To myself”?
Students answer.			↓		School: question and answer.
Shelly: To whoever is reading it right?			↓		Government: Ok, but who is the only person allowed to read this answer?
Because they’re			↓		The Government: they
not gonna have you there to ask you what did you mean by this? So the more information you can give			↓		School: information (knowledge) is given, and may be efficiently shared in discourse.
them,			↓		The Government: them.
the, yeah, the better that	↓				The Temple: moral value.
they’ll			↓		The Government: they.
be able to see if			↓		The Government: perceptive, but not omniscient.
you did what? (Pause)			↓		School: rhetorical question.
What are			↓		School: rephrasing of rhetorical question.
they			↓		Government: they.
looking for?			↓		School: rhetorical / instructional question.
Student answers.			↓		School: inaudible student replies inferred from Shelly’s response.
Shelly: If you understood, good.			↓		School: Literary Term: understood. Praise.

So the more information you give them			↓		School: information is given.
the better		↓		↓	Government: them.
they				↓	The Government: they.
can see if you				↓	The Government: omniscient.
understood or not.			↓		School: Literary Term: understood.
If you only give			↓		School: information is given.
them,				↓	The Government: them.
you know, a phrase, like, uh,			↓		School: Literary Term: phrase. Disfluency.
“The dog barked” (pause), yeah,			↓		School: Literary Concept: example of supporting detail. Reflection of assumption regarding students’ capabilities.
they they				↓	The Government: they.
don’t know what you mean by that,			↓		School: but the students did not make up this example that Shelly now attributes to them (“you”).
They				↓	The Government: they.
don’t know				↓	The Government: they’re not completely omniscient—even they can’t see through the opacity of some students’ academic proclivities (except it was Shelly who made up this example).
how you’re using that information			↓		School: information is used.
so, the more that you can give			↓		School: information is given.
them,				↓	The Government: them.
the better		↓			The Temple: moral value.
they’ll				↓	The Government: they.
be able to see if you				↓	The Government: almost omniscient.

understood			↓		School: Literary Term: understood.
it, so the two things that			↓		School: Literary Term: things. Disfluency.
they're				↓	The Government: they.
looking for for this reading for information are that you can				↓	The Government: searching for evidence of students' capabilities.
read these articles and understand them,			↓		School: Literary Terms: in this context they are vague and ill defined terms when considering assessment.
like Marcus said (Marcus nods his head and says something),			↓		School: recognition of student.
and then also, if, you can interpret what you've read			↓		School: Literary Term: interpret.
Hannah: Do you want us to write that?			↓		School: acceptance of the class context, recognizing Shelly's acceptance, and offers to copy, as Shelly is doing.
Shelly: Yup. Well actually I think it's on the front of your handout here (approaches Anko and looks at his handout) I think			↓		School: information is copied.
it says what it's looking for				↓	Government: the test and its preparation materials speak for themselves.
Anna: Yeah it does.			↓		School: copy the teacher, who is copying the test.
Shelly: All right, so,			↓		School: reclaiming the floor.
They				↓	Government: they.
want you to				↓	Government: the government's desires for the students.
understand it,			↓		School: Literary Term: understand.
they				↓	Government: they.
want to see that you				↓	Government: the government's desires for the students.

understood it, and			↓		School: Literary Term: understood.
they				↓	Government: they.
want to see that you can				↓	Government: the government's desires for the students.
interpret it			↓		School: Literary Term: interpret.
meaning that you can come to you know your own conclusions about the article. (Pause)			↓		School: Literary Term: conclusions.
Now if		↓			Temple: introduction of catechism.
they're		↓		↓	The Government and the Temple—the bureaucrats and the bishops.
looking to see if you		↓		↓	The Government and the Temple: judges.
understood it			↓		School: Literary Term: understood.
or not,			↓		School: recognition of the possibility, if not the probability, of failure. One could phrase this in other ways.
what do you want to make sure you		↓	↓	↓	School: teacher interpreting and dictating students' wants, based upon test-preparation materials created and disseminated by the Government. The merging of school, government, and the Temple.
never ever ever ever ever ever say, never say		↓			The Temple: the great taboo.
Students in unison: I don't understand this story.		↓	↓		The Temple: catechism-style discursive text production. IRE. The School: Literary Term: understand.
Shelly: I don't understand it. Never say I didn't understand, because what does that do? As soon as you say that.		↓	↓	↓	The School: Literary Term: understand. Hide your ignorance—fool the assessors. The Temple: Hide your sins, your unworthiness, from the eye of a nearly omniscient and judgmental god. The commission of some taboos is unforgivable. The Government: the implicit judge.
Anna: It makes you look dumb.			↓		School: student acceptance of the teacher's epistemological stance. Copy the teacher when the teacher is teaching how to copy.

Shelly: . . . so you want to avoid saying I didn't understand. Another thing that you want to avoid is if the article's confusing, what do you not want to say?		↓	↓	↓		The Temple: call-and-response. Another taboo, really a synonym for the first. The School: IRE format for question and answer. The Government: the implicit presence of the omnipotent and nearly omniscient judge.
Students in unison: The article was confusing.			↓			The School: student acceptance of style and content of discourse.
Shelly: The article was confusing because that equals what?		↓	↓	↓		The Temple: call-and-response: catechism. The School: the teacher asking questions she already knows the answer to and is waiting for a specific word. The Government: the implicit judge, still.
Students in Unison: I don't understand.			↓			The School: student acceptance of style and content of discourse.
Shelly: I don't understand so it was confusing or I was confused equals I didn't understand			↓			School: Literary Terms: understanding and confusion.
so you want to		↓	↓	↓		School: teacher interprets and dictates students' wants. The Temple: a moral value. The Government: morality as established by the government.
avoid those phrases and just you know you gotta be on the lookout		↓				The Temple: students must be vigilant against sin.
because it's really easy to write that down as your first reaction		↓				The Temple: the great taboo has enticements.
but you want to be on the lookout that you don't write that.		↓	↓			The Temple & The School: the teacher as a moral guardian.

All right, so these are the things that they are looking for.			↓	↓		School: Literary Terms: the things. Government: they.

Note. F=Factory; T=Temple; S=School; G=Government; H=Home.

Conclusion for Day 2

Whether or not another researcher, upon analyzing and coding my data, agrees consistently with my own coding at the sub-institutional level, what is evident and what is most pertinent to my study is the hegemonic imposition by the teachers of the Saturday Academy of an institutional discursive context—one where knowledge is propagated stuff delivered verbally by an authoritative source to people who need that knowledge to achieve, within a decontextualized setting (the classroom), goals (to pass the CAPT) determined by the dominant culture. The Factory, Temple, School (not ideally), and Government all represent dominant institutions with their own discourses against whom these students have little power in terms of establishing their own self-serving agenda (curriculum) or discursive context. Nevertheless, while most students are silently and compliantly accepting the teachers' epistemology (as evidenced by their willingness to copy the teacher who is copying the Government), a few students are resisting, challenging the dominant culture's discourse, and their resistance is being countered with coercion. Perhaps most striking is the absence of Home and Neighborhood as a discursive context and the absence or manipulation of students' prior experiences. This is evidence of technologization of discourse, of a colonization of students' natural discourse by the dominant culture. Interestingly, the teachers' discomfort, conscious or unconscious, is evidenced in stretches of

disfluent monologues (hegemonic in the length and content). In brief, students have been afforded minimal opportunity to activate alternative and more productive epistemological resources through a creative manipulation of context. These teachers seem to assume that information verbally shared with students will transform itself into students' improved writing skills; what students need, however, are "conceptual bridges" (Hammer & Elby, 2002) between their naïve conceptions of literary analysis and those more sophisticated conceptions required of true literary analysis and to pass the CAPT at the level established by the NCLB act (Proficient). I would argue that those conceptual bridges are begun easily and enjoyably by exploring students' lived experiences, their prior knowledge formed with their family and friends, in their homes and neighborhoods (Rose, 1989).

Theoretical and Methodological Memo

I am coming to understand Bakhtin (1981) and what he means by "heteroglossia": it is the commingling of "speech genres" (Fairclough, 1995) evidencing the evolution of discourses with "conversations" (Fairclough, 1995) determining and determined by cultural evolutions. It is this ambivalent commingling of speech genres, this hegemonic struggle between competing discourse conventions—that creates the "disfluency" (Fairclough, 1995) in Sophie's speech. Through this theory I am able to understand Sophie's words—not as they define her conscious thoughts, but as they reveal meaning—and Shelly's "discursive practices" (Fairclough, 1995) as a means by which I may inquire into how they produce, reproduce, challenge, or transform social structures, relations, and identities (Fairclough, 1995, pp. 95, 209).

“Intertextual analysis” (Bloome et al., 2005; Fairclough, 1995)—the commingling of disparate texts in discourse, “interdiscursivity” (Bloome et al. 2005—the commingling of disparate genres of discourse, and “intersubjectivity” (Bloome et al., 2005; Bruner, 1996; Wertsch, 1998)—the incorporation of an “other’s” perspective into one’s creation of text (which I liken in part to Bruner’s “folk pedagogy”), define units by which the student-teacher epistemological interplay may be assessed later in this study.

Bloome et al. (2005), Bruner (1996), Eisner (1994, 1998), Fairclough (1995), and Wertsch (1998) all stress the situated nature—the sociocultural context—of discourse production and interpretation as well as the power of discourse to influence the “social identities,” “institutional identities,” and “worldviews” of students engaged in those discourses. In this sense discourse is a “meditational tool” (Wertsch, 1998) we use, conscious or not, to define ourselves and our places in the various contexts of our world; it is a tool similar in importance to Bruner’s (1996) use of narrative as a tool available to us to use as we construct our realities and to imagine a place within those realities.

Fairclough’s “three-dimensional method of discourse analysis” (1995, p. 97) informs my analysis and provides a framework for my own methodology, particularly his conception of the “systemic-functional theory of language” (SFL) (p. 210), by which he proposes that the discursive process (text production and interpretation) mediates between the text and socio-cultural practice, which must have social significance. It is Fairclough’s methodology—founded upon the seminal work of Gramsci, Foucault, Halliday, Bakhtin, and Vygotsky—that forms

an important justification for the methodology detailed by Bloome et al. (2005) in their use of microethnography to analyze the hegemonic, power-related, identity-formation influences of the form and content of discourse upon young students.

Summary of Analysis for Days 3 and 4

During the first two classes for this Reading class of the Saturday Academy both of the reading teachers, Sophie and Shelly, establish a rigid institutional (Government, Temple, Factory, School) discursive context that, while activating a singular epistemological resource—that of understanding knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by the more-knowledgeable to the less-knowledgeable, allows for minimal opportunities for students to activate alternative productive epistemological resources. During days three and four my data begin to evidence signs of student-accommodation as well as student-resistance to the established context. I recognize a culturally-determinant (it expresses and in that expression, which is culturally-defined, it defines the culture) religious overlay, not just in the content but also in the form of dialogue (Bleich, 1978). In day three Isabel and Tanya explicitly challenge Sophie's authority. As a result, both are transferred to other classes for reading instruction. During a long, exclusive, pseudo-discursive dialogue between Sophie and Jacob, Sophie allows students to witness a sort of critique of a movie, modeling a process she expects students to employ as they critique short stories, specifically for the CAPT but presumably for later more authentic aesthetic analysis as well; at the same time, Sophie establishes what can only be interpreted as her assumption of the students' worldview. By doing so, and by the form of discourse established by her and Shelly, both teachers have

begun to form the students' social and institutional identities. This is relevant as it extends the borders of their authority and thereby magnifies the possible impact of their epistemological stance. The question is, will students accept, modify, or reject the assumed worldviews and identities that the teachers have begun to establish for them? Also, will students attempt to alter the teachers' assumptions and assessments, and if they do so, will they be successful? These are indicators of epistemological interplay between the teachers and the students of the Saturday Academy.

Day 3: Epistemological Challenges and Repercussions

Re-establishing the Discursive Contexts

Early in this class Sophie kind of favors Jacob (5-8), Marcus and Tanya turn against one another (2-8), and Marcus tries to emulate Jacob (9) but it does not elicit the same response from Sophie. In the meantime, Marcus has criticized Tanya who, hurt, responds (8-12). Anna, playing the part of teacher-peacekeeper, disciplines Tanya who is reading a magazine (13). This opens the door for Sophie to administer her own discipline: "I'm not gonna try to talk over you. So you're here to learn. If you want to learn you need to pay attention. So that means you need to put magazines away" (14). Tanya continues to read her magazine. What follows signals a change in the class ecology (15-22):

Anna and Sam: (As students look at Tanya) Tanya! (Marcus laughs loudly).

Tanya: (Reading) Huh?

Anna: (Marcus laughs loudly, obnoxiously, like a large, rusty wrought iron gate opening slowly, then Isabel, who was surprised by Tanya's response, laughs.) You need to put the magazines away.

(Marianna and Jasmine look down and do not even smile. Isabel, noting Marianna's disengagement, turns suddenly serious. Anna laughs, but suddenly stops.)

Isabel: I thought we were allowed to read in here.

Sophie: If you don't want to be here please talk to Mr. Hopkins 'cause I don't want you wasting my time or anyone else in here. (Marcus turns in one swift movement to face Isabel and Marianna).

Isabel: I thought we could read in here, anything we find.

Anna: (Quietly to Marcus, in a disciplinary undertone) Just turn around.

Sophie: Anything I give you you can read. (Isabel, chewing her gum like a cat chewing grass, begins to bob and weave rhythmically in her chair. Sophie continues taking attendance.)

Isabel defends Tanya against the coercion of her peers and her teacher.

The reactions of Marianna, Jasmine, and Isabel, along with Marcus's silence, indicate their perception that Tanya has been treated unfairly. The statement that Sophie uses to terminate the challenge reflects her epistemological stance—her acceptance of the discursive contexts (the Temple, the Factory, the School, and the Government) and the discourse prescribed by those contexts, as well as her epistemological belief that knowledge is propagated stuff to be delivered by authoritative figures (priestesses, bosses, teachers, and bureaucrats). The students

recognize it as a postponement of the challenge. The hegemonic implications are obvious, and the threat of punishment lingers.

Epistemological Challenge

After the students are denied their folders by Sophie and her protégé Anna (68-69), Sophie reviews the strategies introduced during the prior class with Shelly: look at the map (70), ignore your friends (72), read the questions first (76-78), do not utter the great taboo (86), use specific examples (89), recognize the audience—the nearly-omniscient “they” (91, 104), and employ complete sentences (92). If this sort of instruction is efficacious then the students should do well on the CAPT because they are internalizing it (albeit without doing it) and are able to recall it (and do it) even weeks after it is verbally introduced.

The first real epistemological challenge (see Table 4.7) occurs subsequent to Sophie’s choosing Jacob as a volunteer to talk about a movie he has seen; she does not recognize either Anna or Marcus, both of whom attempted to claim the floor (114-138). Again, this challenge occurs after Marcus has disciplined Hannah; and Anna, in turn, has disciplined them both:

Table 4.7: Epistemological Challenge

Transcript	My Interpretation
Marcus: (11:39) You’re in trouble Hannah, just just just quit and watch and listen	Quit, watch, and listen: students’ activated epistemological resources.
Anna: (Marianna comments upon Hannah’s shoes) You guys, stop (laughing).	Protects the established epistemology of the classroom.
Sophie: Are you guys done?	Sophie begins her response to this challenge with a disciplinary rhetorical question.
Hannah: (Lightly) Yeah.	Brazen reply.
Sophie: Ok, ‘cause you need to stay focused	Reference to CAPT strategy: what works for the test works for disciplinary moves

	as well: focus.
right now or you need to get out	Threatens excommunication. This disciplinary move has purely religious overtones: those who do not accept the doctrine and the ordained people who deliver it will be banished from hope.
(Marcus points to the door).	Prophetically, ironically, Marcus points the way to his own destined path.
I don't care either way,	Do we have any reason to question the veracity of this statement? Sinners in the hands of an angry god?
but I want to teach people who want to be here, so if you don't want to be here, leave. And you can tell Mr. Hopkins why you're leaving,	Repetition of threat to excommunicate those who challenge, in their own distracting way, the established epistemology of the class.
because you don't care about graduating	This is a repeated threat of dubious veracity. Many students will graduate from EMA who have not passed the CAPT; however, they will have done whatever will be required of them under the NCLB act. No more, no less.
and you don't care about the CAPT,	If this is true then why are they here? Who is "you"?
because right now that is what you're telling me,	There exist other possible messages, the finding of which is the purpose of this study.
because you're being very disrespectful while other people are trying to learn things and talk. (Pause)	There exist other interpretations of Tanya's challenge. But we blame the students when our lesson plans begin to fail, especially when we are unprepared or when we don't really care.
Isabel: (Raising her hand) I have a question, I'm not trying to be rude but if like a teacher kicks you out of class	Isabel pursues the challenge, recognizing and accepting Sophie's interpretation of the challenge as a disrespectful act. Isabel's challenge is probably the reason why today will be Isabel's last class with this group of students.
Sophie: You're not gonna get credit for that	Again, this is a disingenuous threat—the credit will not really matter to any of these students—they will have plenty of elective credits by the time they are seniors. The real question is will they have enough English credits. Students do not earn English credits for their participation in the Saturday Academy.
Isabel: No, do you go home or what	Isabel is not worried about the credit; she

happens?	is concerned that the school has the power to make her sit in an office for three hours on a Saturday during a voluntary program.
Sophie: No, you go sit for the next three hours or so	Purgatory. I wonder about this. Can the school do this? I think it's a bluff.
Anna: (Incredulous) What?	Even Anna doesn't buy it.
Student chatter	Anxiety.
Tanya: Darn it man, I hate . . .	I love this.
Anna: You guys!	Anna still aligns herself with the teacher. Why? Is she protecting Sophie, Sophie's established epistemological stance (which Anna has adopted), or is she protecting her peers.
Sophie: Again, if you don't want to be here, you don't have to be here	But what about the hope?
(Tanya puts her head into her hand, resignedly).	Is she giving up? (No.)
Isabel: I was just asking.	Yes.
Student chatter.	The buzzing of the future blue flies.
Tanya: Miss, who said that?	Tanya now pursues the challenge.
Sophie: Who said what?	Sophie sounds like she is caught off guard by the virulence and longevity of this challenge.
Tanya: We don't want to be here.	This is an interesting question.
Sophie: This is your choice to come here. You're invited.	Yes, but Sophie has not answered the question—she has deflected it. She has scorched the snake, not killed it.
Tanya: We got up at seven o'clock in the morning to be here.	Tanya is laying the groundwork for a well reasoned argument.
Sophie: Right, so if you're gonna be here, you're not wasting my time and you're not gonna waste other students' time, if you want to be here then you need to be here to learn.	Ok, but that was not Tanya's question.
If you're coming here to socialize	School is not a place to socialize, in Sophie's epistemology. What can one learn from one's peers?
or look at magazines	Is that such a bad thing to do in school? What magazine was she looking at?
or play with your hair	This has to be some sort of logical fallacy, or is it a veiled insult?
or whatever the case may be,	Covering all bases—all forms of disrespectful misbehavior.
do it at home.	As a parent of three school-age children, I hope my kids do not hear and internalize this message. Yow. Listen to the

	devaluation of the Home context—and all the previous experiences, all the prior knowledge, all the learned forms of discourse included in this vast and sweeping denunciation.
Don't waste my time.	Her time is bought and paid for—it cannot be wasted, not by the students, not if she's trying.
Tanya: I wasn't wasting time. You weren't doing nothing.	A simple premise. Tanya's question was overpowered, not answered. Like Isabel, Tanya will pay a price for her pursuit of this challenge.
Sophie: (13:40) Ok, so then just stay focused	The answer to many of life's challenges: focus.
and go and we'll listen	Sophie's epistemological stance: listen.
to what Jacob has to say about this movie (continues with instruction).	Why do Jacob's prior experiences count?

After eight minutes of listening to Sophie and Jacob talk about the movie

The Fight Club, the following exchange occurs (140-146):

Tanya: Can I can I ask questions?

Sophie: (Haltingly, reluctantly) Uh well for this for this one particular thing? Have you read have you seen that movie? (Marcus is pretending to punch himself in the jaw, repeatedly, with his right and left hands.)

Tanya: (Sadly) No. (Marcus looks at Tanya with obvious concern.)

Sophie: All right we're going to stay focused on that movie then, you can ask (emphatic) questions if you want to.

Anna: (To Tanya) How can you get at how can you ask a question if you've never seen the movie Tanya?

Sophie: Anna. Shhh. Um (Marcus turns around and looks softly at Tanya for a few seconds, then he tries to make her laugh by pretending to

throw up. He puts his head down and laughs, then turns back to Tanya and smiles. Marianna is looking seriously at Tanya. Isabel's head—her right ear—is placed flat against her desk. Tanya responds, but her response is unintelligible. Anna inclines her face upon her open palms, her elbows on her desk.) (22:33) so (hesitates, in a high voice) let me ask you this then, what do you think the what's like the point (emphasis)?

Anna: (Agitated) There is really no point to this movie if it's all about fighting.

Note Tanya's respectful asking for permission to ask a question, Sophie's denial of permission based upon Tanya's having not seen the movie, which perhaps none of the other students have seen either, Anna's aligning herself with the established epistemological forces, Sophie's "shhh'ing" of the class, Marcus's sudden concern for Tanya in the face of what he believes to be unfairness, Marianna's sympathizing with Tanya, Isabel's physical withdrawal, Tanya's fading into verbal silence, Anna's hiding, Sophie's pursuing of the conversation prior to Tanya's attempt to involve herself in the conversation, and Anna's final rejection of the entire movie.

Introduction of Pseudo-Authentic Discourse

Jacob is willing to accept Anna's evaluation of his movie: "It's, it doesn't have a specific plot, but like, it's just, it's whatever story than having a point to it (chair movement drowns out Jacob's voice) it's just a movie, it has no point" (147); Sophie, however, is not so willing, and for the next 71 turns Sophie and

Jacob appear to explore together as if they were alone many aspects of The Fight Club. What makes this episode significant is that Sophie seems to establish an entirely different epistemological stance with Jacob as the other students either watch silently or are ignored. Sophie asks Jacob what appear to be authentic questions and she explores ostensibly important perceptions and interpretations; the entire conversation, however, lacks authenticity. It is based on the premise that Sophie, and, in fact, the entire class, is learning about the movie from Jacob; the truth, however, is that Sophie has seen the movie twice and has even read the book. For all the students watching, I see no evidence that the dialogue between Sophie and Jacob activates any alternative epistemological resources. While it appears at first to be an authentic discursive episode, it is, instead, deceptive and controlling. The entire text of the discourse is produced under false pretenses. If one believes in the efficacy of dialogic instruction—the cognitive benefits of exploratory speech—then this discussion is a model of its antithesis—a form of manipulative teaching. The question is, do authentic questions have to be authentic in order to create authentic discourse and cognitive development?

What follows in Table 4.8 is my analysis of the dialogue between Sophie and Jacob as I interpret Sophie's intent and the types of answers she elicits from Jacob (145-218):

Table 4.8: Analysis of Teacher-Intent During a Pseudo-Authentic Conversation

Transcript Turn Numbers	Sophie's Intent	Jacob's Answer
148-151	Creator's intent?	• conformity • they're not special • they're all part of the same rotting matter • like the survival rate eventually all equals

		to zero • everyone's gonna die.
152-157	Creator's message about conformity: should one conform?	• no • he was conforming his army • it was more like vandalism • one guy ended up getting shot in the head • they just buried him in the garden
158-163	Main character motivation?	• like a torture thing • he would like pour acid on their hand • make them be a better person, but like in a bad way • But like, mature more • deal with it.
160. Anna: (Raising her head) Oh my god (talking over Jacob, who continues to speak haltingly) I don't want to see that.		
162	Elicitation of elaboration.	
167	Characters' sense of identity?	
165-169	Interpretation?	• Agrees with Sophie: It was like a cult. • they all they all shaved their heads
170-171	Agrees with Jacob.	• Agrees with Sophie.
172	Personal connection.	
173 Isabel: My brother's like that.		
174 Sophie: . . . is? Your brother does that?		
175 Isabel: (Unintelligible)		
176 Sophie: What does he do?		
177 Isabel: He tries to dress like I don't know he tries to impress people by not being himself and he gets on my nerves. 'Cause he's not himself anymore.		
178-179	Characters' actions.	• He wanted them to be loyal to him • he would yell at them • tell them they're not good enough • go away • you're too fat • you're too old • you're too young
180-181	Elicitation of elaboration.	• it was like freezing cold • they would just have to stand there for like three days
182-184	Judgment	• Agrees with Sophie's judgment: "That's a little pathetic."
185		• Anticipates Sophie's question: "Yeah. It's a really good movie."
186-188	Judgment?	• I think it's a really good movie.

189 -190	Support for judgment?	• it had a really good story • it makes you think
191-192	Personal connections?	• you can't be your own snowflake
193-197	Personal critique?	• It's hard to be an individual . . . in modern society • everyone should just let go • they were driving on the wrong side of the road • they just let go of the wheel • everyone in the car just like went off the highway • they were like all laughing
195	(simultaneously): In society today. Because there are so many expectations.	
197	Message?	
198 Isabel: Probably the message is just to be yourself, while you're growing up, and something.		
199-201	Original plot?	• I haven't seen anything else like it.
202-203	Surprising ending?	• Yeah.
204	Sophie's judgment: • really cool movie • a lot of blood • just reality	• That guy wanted his face put back • he was like bleeding out of his face • he beats himself up • he jumped on him
205 Now chatter from the other side of the room.		
206 Marianna: Miss Morris (raising her hand).		
207 Sophie: Yes.		
208 Marianna: Have you ever seen <u>The Passion of Christ</u> ?		
209 Sophie: I have not.		
210 Anna gasps—great intake of enthusiastic air. More enthusiastic chatter and moving of furniture.		
211 Marcus: (smiling, in a soft mocking voice) I cried.		
212 Sophie: (loudly) All right, before we get off task, um, based on what we just did up here, you guys did a really great job at this.		
Termination with praise.		

Between the two of them, Sophie and Jacob construct a critique of the movie.

Over the course of 57 turns they introduce concepts of literary analysis such as the artist's intent, message, character motivation, character's sense of identity,

character's actions, interpretation, personal connection, judgment, support of

judgment, plot, and surprising ending. These are all useful concepts for the students in their learning about literary analysis in preparation for the CAPT; yet I wonder why Anna (160) and Isabel (173-177, 198) are excluded from the conversation, and why the enthusiastic student participation (Marianna, Anna, and Marcus, 205-212) following the conclusion of Sophie's conversation with Jacob is summarily terminated, as if the conversation had suddenly become derailed—"off task" (212).

Imposition of a Worldview

In further analysis, another more implicit aspect of this dialogue gains significance greater than that of the explicit literary analysis in which Sophie and Jacob engage. Sophie chose to call on Jacob knowing which movie he would talk about. Through Jacob's answers to her questions she establishes a rather bleak worldview that dominates the academic content of the lesson. Sophie seems to portray the world—that of the students, not her own—as being oppressive, repressive, randomly violent, sadistic, masochistic, chaotic, and essentially devoid of meaning, god, and hope. Why Sophie co-constructs with Jacob such a world is perhaps beyond the scope of this study, but how this worldview affects the students is not. Obviously it was not Sophie's intent to engage into authentic group discourse; had it been so, she would have discussed a movie with which she was not familiar so she did not have all the answers, and she would have encouraged all of the other students to enter into the discourse. So the introduction of the students to this worldview might have been her implicit intent. Whether or not they adopt her worldview is an important indicator of their acceptance or

rejection of Sophie (and, by association, other authoritative figures) as reliable sources of knowledge. Finally, this might explain why any further discussion by other students would be redundant, off-task. Sophie's worldview for these students has been introduced and explored in detail, enough is enough. Yet Sophie does not perceive the needs of other students to integrate through their own discourse connections between their own lived experiences and the academic purpose of the conversation pertaining to literary analysis.

Monologic Disfluency

In Table 4.9 I analyze the ebb and flow within a long monologue, the intertwining of two themes: 1) specific CAPT preparation (procedure and literary terms); and 2) classroom management. Separating these two discursive themes is an increasing frequency of disfluent utterances, as if it were a cognitive chasm Sophie must cross to switch from one thematic discourse to another.

Table 4.9: Analysis of Monologic Disfluency

Transcript	CAPT Prep.	Disfluency	Classroom Management	My Interpretation of Affect and Societal Message
1. Sophie: (loudly) All right, before we get off task,			↓	Continuing with others students' comments regarding their movies would be off task.
2. um,		↓		
3. based on what we just did up here,		↓		
4. you guys did a really great job at this,			↓	Praise. What is "this"?
5. this is,		↓		What is "this"?
6. if you can do this with a story		↓		What is "this"? Beginning of conditional promise.

then				
7. you are		↓		
8. you're golden.			↓	Conditional promise.
9. This is exactly what you want to do.		↓		What is "this"? Beginning of specific CAPT preparation.
10. This same way that you are analyzing this movie is the same thing you want to do with a short story.	↓			Literary term: analyzing.
11. Here,		↓		
12. first of all we got an entire summary of what	↓			Literary term: summary.
13. this		↓		"this"?
14. was about,	↓			Literary analysis: plot.
15. just like on the CAPT			↓	Governmental presence in the classroom.
16. they're looking to see that you			↓	Governmental presence in the classroom.
17. understand what you read,	↓			Literary term: understand.
18. clearly Jacob understood what he saw in this movie.			↓	Model student's literary analysis ability.
19. The more prodding we did,			↓	Implies inherent reluctance to act; "we"?
20. the more questions	↓			Literary concept: questions.
21. we asked,			↓	"we"?
22. um,		↓		
23. the more he remembered about the story,			↓	The performance of a model student: recall through questioning.

24. so as you are reading through a story on your own,	↓			Introduction of a CAPT-related strategy.
25. in order to,		↓		
26. ask yourself questions,	↓			Strategy: question.
27. make comments,	↓			Strategy: comment.
28. make connections to it,	↓			Strategy: connect.
29. you know		↓		
30. the way that Anna was making a connection,			↓	Anna made no connections during this episode. Perhaps she meant Isabel.
31. do all of those things as you are going through and reading		↓		Vague reference.
32. because you will reali,		↓		
33. you will get so much more out of it in the end,		↓		Vague references.
34. um,		↓		
35. you know		↓		
36. at first Jacob started out with			↓	Model student's process.
37. like		↓		
38. a sentence		↓		
39. and		↓		
40. you know		↓		
41. he			↓	The model student.
42. we			↓	"we"?
43. spent the past few minutes			↓	Reinterpreting what happened during the

discussing this story				dialogue between Sophie and Jacob.
44. but it was from prodding			↓	Again, this metaphor has social implications.
45. from asking questions,		↓		
46. question your story,		↓		
47. really think about it,		↓		
48. ok?			↓	Request for response indicating she may move forward.
49. Um,		↓		
50. we			↓	“we”?
51. discussed the characters,			↓	Reinterpretation of class activity.
52. the problems,	↓			Literary term: problems.
53. you guys were asking good questions,			↓	Praise.
54. like what was the problem		↓		Literary term repetition: problem.
55. like what’s going on,		↓		
56. um,		↓		
57. clearly having a schizophrenic who thinks the,		↓		
58. um,		↓		
59. you know,		↓		
60. is not schizophrenic		↓		
61. is not the problem here,		↓		
62. um,		↓		
63. you know,		↓		
64. quoting,		↓		

65. you know		↓		
66. that we're not special,			↓	Worldview: we are not special.
67. that that we're all the same,			↓	Worldview: we are all the same.
68. um,		↓		
69. you know		↓		
70. being able to		↓		
71. pick those quotes	↓			Literary term: quotes [sic]
72. and put that into,		↓		
73. you know,		↓		
74. your definition of what you think is good literature,	↓			Literary terms: definition, good literature.
75. the fact that			↓	Literary analysis of a story's theme is a matter of fact.
76. the theme is so well done		↓		Literary term: theme, but how is it "well done"?
77. that,		↓		
78. you know,		↓		
79. the author trying to say that if you,	↓			Important literary concept: the author is speaking to each student individually.
80. you know,		↓		
81. are going to conform then			↓	Worldview: the author's message pertains to conformity.
82. yeah		↓		
83. you aren't going to be special,			↓	Worldview: if this group of students conforms then they won't be special.
84. you're gonna			↓	Worldview: instead, they

be just like everyone else.				will be like everyone else, whoever that is.
85. You said			↓	From “we” to “you”; the real subjects are “I” and Jacob.
86. that there’s action	↓			Literary term: action.
87. in here,		↓		
88. um,		↓		
89. you gave			↓	Knowledge as given—the source is the student (but it wasn’t).
90. a lot of good reasons for why this was such a good story,	↓			Literary term: good story.
91. um		↓		
92. the fact that			↓	Literary analysis as factual.
93. it		↓		
94. wasn’t overplayed so much.		↓		
95. Now I think			↓	Focus on Sophie.
96. probably		↓		
97. quite,		↓		
98. you know,		↓		
99. uh		↓		
100. uh,		↓		
101. people		↓		
102. probably the first time I ended up watching this movie I thought			↓	Sophie’s lived experiences become the focus.

to myself that				
103. you know		↓		
104. it was really disturbing	↓			Literary concept: judgment.
105. and I didn't like it that much and it was because I just didn't get it and so my second time watching it I was like wow this is really an amazing story,			↓	Sophie as the focus. The power to teach through personal parable. Remember, Marianna was not permitted to share her movie memory, Anna's judgment was not validated, and Tanya was discouraged from asking a question.
106. and so but it took		↓		
107. you know		↓		
108. understanding	↓			Literary term: understanding.
109. and questioning	↓			Literary term: questioning.
110. and thinking		↓		
111. about everything		↓		
112. (to Marianna) What were you going to say?			↓	Relinquishes the floor.

The increasing frequency of disfluent utterances within Sophie's monologue indicates her ambivalence as she employs several speech genres: 1) that which is required by the Government (specific instruction regarding the CAPT), and 2) that which is required for social order and control (worldviews, conceptions of personhood and social and institutional identities). I wonder what form Sophie's instruction would take absent the presence of the Government. My fear is that governmental impositions empower teachers to deliver an ineffective academic

curriculum while—with the full power of the Government, the Factory, the Temple, and the School—placing these students socially.

Conclusion for Day 3

While the discursive contexts and resultant activated epistemological resources established in the first two days of instruction are re-established now in the third, the first signs of student-resistance appear amid a general attitude of acceptance and compliance. These challenges are countered with teacher-coercion, discipline. A pervasive religious overlay seems to dominate the pedagogical assumptions and curriculum delivery, including those pertaining to student motivation, punishment, and reward. The teacher engages one student in an extended episode of pseudo-authentic dialogue in the guise of authentic discourse. Concurrent with specific CAPT-preparation verbal instruction, the teacher creates a worldview, and students begin to adopt, resist, or modify their own social and institutional identities. In her own verbal text production, Sophie's social messages dominate her literary analyses, and this interdiscursivity, this incommensurate commingling of speech genres, is evidenced in the increasing frequency of disfluency as she delivers her monologic instruction.

Day 4: The Form of Hegemonic Discourse

I was at first strongly inclined to omit day four from my written analysis because I was unable to see how such an analysis would add to my understanding, but I have reconsidered; instead, I will summarize succinctly my perceptions and interpretations of that period. Early in the class Shelly asks,

How many people raise your hands if you finished reading the story?

(Pause) A couple people, all right, so to start off let's just talk about the story and then we'll talk about the end so we can take a look at how you go about answering question number one. (4)

Obviously the specific test-taking strategies are of greater significance to Shelly than whether or not the students can actually engage in literary discourse and analysis. The implication is that, absent the intellectual capability of deriving their own meaning from written text, students may at least fake their way through by adhering to a rigid process. This implication is further verified by the form of discourse, which is superlatively IRE (Mehan, 1979), or, to employ a religious metaphor, it is a kind of catechism, a “call-and-response routine that might be found in some churches” (Bloome et al., 2005). The sadness inherent in this structure emanates from all the missed joy and spontaneous creativity from which both teachers and students might have benefitted. When Shelly asks, “And what did his new fiancé think about this blanket?” Marianna replies, “It was magnificent,” to which Shelly responds, “She thought it was really nice” (22-24). Why does Shelly stultify Marianna's word? “Magnificent” is a magnificent word at this moment. Later, Shelly asks, “Why are you kicking your own dad out?” and Marcus replies, “Using reverse psychology” (52-53), but Shelly does not validate this brilliant and insightful answer. By turn #57 I give up transcribing the students' compliant responses to Shelly's questions because the answers are implied by Shelly's questions—the students' words are unnecessary, only the structure of the discourse signifies meaning. Towards the middle of the class

Shelly begins to introduce an activity and Marianna requests, “Can we do it together?” (93) Shelly says “Yeah” but she does not allow them to do so. As the activity begins to turn into chaos, Marcus says, “We should just forget it” (96), yet they trudge on. Perhaps of most significance is the increasing frequency of Shelly’s verbal disciplinary interventions. The students are beginning to resist more often, and, as a result, Shelly is becoming more “coercive” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 93), a phenomenon consistent with the institutional context both teachers have created.

Theoretical and Methodological Memo

For days 5, 6, and 7 the sociolinguistic theoretical foundation of my inquiry focuses now on analysis of discursive practices established by teachers, their effects upon students, and the students’ subsequent formation of worldviews, institutional identities, and social identities as they adopt, modify, or resist the teachers’ discursive practices. In my recursive attempts to make sense of and to categorize my data (Bloome et al., 2005, Patton, 1987, 1980/1990), I found to be most informative the research and the databases compiled and analyzed by Applebee, Langer, Nystrand, and Gamoran (2003), Marshall, Smagorinsky, & Smith, (1995), Nystrand and Gamoran (1991), Nystrand, Gamoran, & Carbonaro, (1998), Nystrand, Gamoran, Kachur, & Prendergast (1997), and Nystrand, Gamoran, Zeiser, & Long (2001).

Since I have introduced the Nystrand and Gamoran database and their analyses in Chapter Two, I will here introduce in a little more detail Marshall et al.’s (1995) inquiry in which they explore how teacher discourse practices in the

context of teacher-led, large-group high school literature discussions affect student discourse. Similar to my own methodology, they (Marshall and eight teacher-researchers) collect, compile, transcribe, codify, and analyze their qualitative data—primarily student and teacher discourse and interviews—in order to understand the effects of this cultural context and speech genre upon the population they have defined. The 16 classes that the research team observes are comprised of classes tracked according to three levels: high, middle, and low. As Marshall et al.’s inquiry evolves, it becomes an analysis of how teachers talk differently with students according to which class the students are tracked into. Their findings indicate that, contrary to the discourse practices evident in the Saturday Academy, the teachers of lower-tracked students (as are the students of the Saturday Academy)

seemed focused on the ways texts could be used to foster students’ reflection on their lives, their peers, their communities. In this view, the understanding of literary texts is not an end of instruction, but the means by which students are led to a richer and more fully developed understanding of themselves. (p. 27)

At the same time, Marshall et al. note that “The emphasis on fill-in-the-blank answers . . . by providing few occasions for students to engage in extended thought, works to undermine the efforts of teachers who may want to help students move beyond such answers” (p. 29). The contradiction of form and content is familiar to the students of the Saturday Academy. Marshall et al.’s findings indicate that “Students seem to assume the roles they have been given, to see

themselves largely as they have been seen, and to internalize the tensions that their teachers have articulated” (p. 36). The internalization of institutional identities is not Marshall et al.’s focus; instead, their analysis is concerned with text production as opposed to the social consequences of the processes by which the text was produced. It is from this point that I developed my own focus. The only real criticism I have for Marshall’s study is that his definition of “speech genre” is too broad:

the analysis of the teacher-led discussions that follows suggest that classroom discussions of literature share sufficient characteristics that they can usefully be understood as a speech genre. In this chapter we give conscious attention to the speech genre of literary discussions in order to understand its characteristics and its potential effects on the ways that students think about literature. (p. 22)

I question the existence of a single speech genre defined as a “classroom discussion of literature.” Instead, I see literature discussion as a space where many speech genres come together and where they negotiate their respective status. When my father comes to a place of literary discussion he will bring his business speech genre, which he has practiced and perfected over the past fifty years as a professor at the Cornell University business school; I will bring my highly-conflicted high school English teacher speech genre; my friends with whom I play Pitch, and who are manual laborers during the day, would bring their own speech genre. It would be a fun and elucidating literary discussion, but it would not be a speech genre. If the teachers of the Saturday Academy are trying to teach the

students the speech genre of literary analysis, then it would explain why they are so reluctant to allow students space to use the space of literary discussions to reflect upon their own lives and to use their personal experiences to inform their interpretations. In Marshall et al.'s study (see Table 7, p. 46), while 8.2% of the comments made by upper track students had as their source the students' personal knowledge, only 1.9% of the lower track students' comments reference personal knowledge as a source. Instead, the source of 80.9% of the lower tracked students' comments was the text they were discussing; the percentage for upper track students was 66%. Obviously, this begs the question, "What are the social consequences of this pattern of text production?"

One more minor note about the Marshall et al. study: when coding teacher-replies to student-comments he does not include the teachers' repeating and rewording student comments as evaluation; instead, their position is that by "repeating them, or elaborating upon them, teachers wove the varying statements and questions offered by students into a coherent oral 'text' whose organization might quickly break down were it not for the explicit, transitional purpose served by the responses" (p. 53). While I agree that a teacher's creative use of students' comments is often necessary in order to construct a text with some recognizable theme out of what would otherwise be chaos, the mere repetition or rewording of a student's response with no apparent thematic purpose is indeed evaluation, and in my own study I have interpreted it accordingly. This is important because restatement and repetition as possession and evaluation of students' comments are

hegemonic and establish the teacher as the authoritative source of knowledge, even when the student has spoken.

Day 5: Shifting Discursive Patterns

Students as Authoritative Sources of Knowledge

Day five proves to be an interesting class, as the burgeoning challenges to the established institutional discursive context and rigid discursive practices evident in days three and four climax in day five: for significant stretches the students become the authoritative source of knowledge. In Table 4.10 I map, as the classroom discourse continues, the activated epistemological resources for understanding the source of knowledge and the authoritative source of knowledge in this setting. The episode begins with Jacob and Sophie contesting the objects of sympathy and scorn in the short story “Moving On.” As in day three, Sophie establishes a context for Jacob that allows for the activation of epistemological resources other than knowledge as propagated stuff—particularly the resource of understanding knowledge as being derived from direct perception. Jacob perceives the dog as the object of sympathy, and Sophie successfully re-directs his focus upon the little girl. Both Sophie and Jacob agree the father is the villain. This dialogue is interrupted inadvertently by Jacob, however, when he introduces a word apparently not familiar to Sophie (40). The discursive pattern shift occurs in turn #42 when Sophie asks what appears to be an authentic question—she inquires about the definition of Jacob’s word, “grimy.” What follows (43-63) is a reversal of the discursive pattern that has been established: the students become the authoritative source of knowledge while Sophie and subsequently Sophie’s mother

36. Jacob: The dad's mean.	Jacob's object of scorn is the dad.				↓		↓	The subject of Jacob's discourse becomes the dad.
37. Sophie: Didn't you feel bad for the girl at all?	Sophie's expresses her object of sympathy: the little girl.	↓				↓		Sophie's discursive focus is the little girl.
38. Jacob: Yeah.	Jacob agrees to feel bad for the girl.				↓		↓	Agreement does not imply a shift in Jacob's source of knowledge unless we conclude his interpretation is coerced.
39. (Chatter.)							↓	Enthusiasm.
40. Jacob: The dad's grimy.	Blames the dad for the girls' misery.	↓					↓	Introduction of a word from the students' cultural lexicon.
41. Student: I remember reading this story.	Joins the conversation.			↓			↓	The conversation has aided this student's recall.
42. Sophie: Did you just say the dad was grimy?	Expresses curiosity about Jacob's word.	↓					↓	Shift to Sophie's allowing the student to be the authority, the source of knowledge.
43. Jasmine hears this and laughs amid much prolonged chatter about the story.		↓					↓	Jasmine recognizes with laughter the discursive shift.

52. Anna: Like he's messed up, like, that's	Defines the word using Marcus's answer.	↓						↓	Although she uses Marcus's words, she is the authoritative source of knowledge.
53. Jasmine: And that's your slang for the day.	With a smile, sounding like a teacher.	↓						↓	Humor.
54. Sophie: Thank you. I want to learn something every day. I will, I might even call my mother to pass this on to her 'cause she's a teacher as well and I don't want her to miss out on any of the lingo as well.	Sophie begins to make a promise about sharing Jacob's word with her mother.	↓						↓	The students now become the authoritative source of knowledge for Sophie's mother. A colonization of her culture's vocabulary.
55. Hannah: Are you, do you seriously do that?	Hannah can't believe that Sophie will share their word with her mother.	↓						↓	Students are the authoritative source of knowledge now for Sophie's mother.
56. Sophie: What?	What is so unusual about this?	↓						↓	Confusion. Sharing newly-acquired knowledge is not unusual in Sophie's culture.
57. Hannah: Call your mother and tell her the lingo?	You talk with your mother about words?	↓						↓	Elaborates.

58. Sophie: Yeah. (Anko laughs) She teaches eighth grade. She needs to know these things . . . you know?	Anko recognizes this shift with laughter.	↓						↓	Although Sophie will instruct her mother, the real authoritative source for knowledge remains the students.
59. (Chatter and a sort of amazement.)			↓						Enthusiasm.
60. Hannah: . . . a new word grimy and it means this?	Enacts her vision of Sophie's conversation with her mother.		↓					↓	Hannah begins to create freely her vision of Sophie's conversation.
61. Sophie: Mmm hmmm.	Agreement							↓	Sophie validates Hannah's vision.
62. (Chatter.)									Enthusiasm.
63. Sophie: . . . you can be my own personal dictionaries . . .	Sophie agrees to be informed by the students.	↓						↓	Sophie shifts the authority for knowledge back to herself. A dictionary is a tool to be used—it's definitions interpreted by the real authoritative figure—the living human.
64. Anna: That's not a new word, that's not a new word, that's not a new word.	Three times Anna denies the value of Jacob's word.	↓						↓	What is Anna doing here? She is invalidating the entire context that has been established.

65. Bruno: It's a new word for her (emphasized and elongated).	Any time anyone learns a word it is a new word.	↓						↓	Bruno defends the new context and thereby Sophie's role as student and theirs as teacher.
66. Marianna: I learned that word in third grade.	Marianna has known the word for seven years.	↓						↓	The effect of this is to establish a cultural distance between the students and the teacher, who in Marianna's estimation is apparently woefully out of touch. Reestablishes the students as authorities.
67. Sophie: Ok, so take a look at the story and then we will talk about why you guys think dad is so grimy. ok. (5:00)	Ok, so let's get back on track.	↓						↓	Sophie reestablishes the focus of the story upon the mean dad, not the dog or the little girl.
68. Sophie now reads the entire story.		↓						↓	Sophie as the source of the story.

Note. Activated Epistemological Resource for Understanding the Source of

Knowledge: 1=propagated stuff; 2=free creation; 3=fabricated; 4=direct

perception; 5=inherent. Authority / Source of Knowledge: T=Teacher;

S=Student.

One observation worth noting is that even when the students are determining the discursive context of the class—when they are teaching Sophie their word—only the first epistemological resource, understanding knowledge as propagated stuff—

is activated. In other words, they are adopting Sophie's discursive context and thereby are not allowing for the activation of other productive epistemological resources. Hannah is the one exception, as she imagines Sophie's conversation with her mother, and as she uses this moment of potential discursive liberation to argue her perception as the dog's being the real object of sympathy—the story is really about the dog, but this attempt is never validated.

Negotiating Thematic Coherence

So, what if Anna and Marianna are right and Bruno is wrong? What if, contrary to Bruno's defense (65), it is not a new word to her? What if Anna senses something that even she does not understand, and in a state of clarity amid confusion she protests, "That's not a new word, that's not a new word, that's not a new word" (64), and Marianna, swept up by Anna's passion, agrees: "I learned that word in third grade" (66)? Then what has this entire episode really been about? Bloome et. al (2005) define "thematic coherence" as follows:

the organization of a set of meanings in and through an event. These meanings may be ideational, interpersonal, or textual. An event is considered to have thematic coherence when the meanings generated in and through the event have a relationship to each other that the people in the event define as coherent. Roughly speaking, thematic coherence is the answer to the questions "What is this event about?" and "What is it that they are all talking about? . . . an event can appear to have thematic coherence, but it may exist only superficially. (p. 33)

If the curriculum as it is being delivered seems mystifying, inconsistent, or counterproductive, then we must look to see if some form of a hidden curriculum: “Analysis of thematic coherence can also be useful in examining ‘hidden’ social processes, such as constructing gendered identities, establishing social hierarchies, promoting ‘individualism,’ and so on—what is often referred to as the hidden curriculum of the schools” (p. 39). As in day three when Sophie constructed what she assumed was the students’ worldview—when her hidden curriculum overshadowed her specific CAPT instruction and her instruction of literary analysis, so too now the real curriculum has become implicit, tacit, and has more to do with worldviews and social and institutional identities than it does with reading and writing for the CAPT.

As Hannah and Sophie discuss the story’s theme (see Tables 4.11 and 4.12), Hannah is determined to focus her sympathies on the dog and the little girl, and she is not willing to allow the conversation to become about “why” they must suffer; instead, she is most concerned about “that” they are suffering—the situation needs to be rectified. In other words, the story is either fixable (the girl can be made happy by saving the dog) or it is instructive (what can still be done to fix everything). Sophie, on the other hand, focuses only on the didactic morals of the story: “Some things have to be left behind” and (as I interpret her message) “Miserable times are created and then made even more miserable by sadistic men.” The relevance of this conversation is that it allows for a possible change in context—one that might activate alternative productive epistemological resources, specifically knowledge as direct perception and knowledge as fabricated from

prior learning and life experiences; furthermore, students become the authoritative source of knowledge and the class becomes a learning community of “others.”

Table 4.11: Negotiation of Thematic Coherence

Transcript	My Interpretation
69. Sophie: (Reading in the voice of a young girl) “Fly is my bestest and only friend.”	
70. Anna: “Bestest?” That’s not a word.	Anna is still trying to retain her position as teacher by questioning the existence of words.
71. Hannah: That’s so sad.	For whom does Hannah feel sad?
72. (Brief chatter.)	
73. End of story reading.	
74. Hannah: (In a profoundly plaintive and emphatic voice) That is so sad. (10:32)	
75. Jasmine: Ohhh.	
76. Sophie: Hannah, why is it sad?	Authentic question.
77. Hannah: For one the dog’s her only friend, her brother knows that that they’re keeping the dog there, he didn’t say nothing, and their father’s just laughing at the dog’s chasing them and she’s just crying cause she just wants her puppy.	Hannah’s focus on the dog has not been altered by Sophie’s focus on the girl and the father. In deference to Sophie, Hannah makes disparaging references to the manipulatively sadistic father, the brother, and the little girl, but she mentions the dog four times.
78. Sophie: So you feel bad for her?	Sophie does not want to focus on the dog. This is a heavy-handed attempt to redirect the thematic focus of this dialogue.
79. (Chatter.)	
80. Hannah: I feel bad for the dog too because the dog’s gonna die. He’s got no food or water.	Hannah reiterates her concern for the dog. She will not allow Sophie to alter her emotional response.

Sophie’s reluctance to focus her sympathies on the dog, or to explore with Hannah why Hannah has focused her sympathies there, are the first indication that something other than literary analysis is going on here. But the important question to keep in mind for the remainder of this class is, “What sense are the students making of this—what meaning are they constructing through the ensuing discourse?” The conversation continues as Hannah utters the phrase that Sophie

seems to have been waiting for (see Table 4.12): “Some things have to be left behind” (91). To Hannah, however, this phrase is so unimportant that she proves incapable of recalling it when she is immediately called upon to do so. Finally, it is Jasmine (104) who answers Sophie’s call for repetition.

Table 4.12: Negotiation of Thematic Coherence continued

Transcript	My Interpretation
91. Hannah: Or say that some things have to be left behind. Like make her feel a little better, don’t make your poor daughter	Hannah states here what will become the accepted theme of the story: “some things have to be left behind.”
92. Marcus: Or we’re going to get a new dog or something like that.	Marcus attempts to find a way to make the girl happy. He is willing to recognize the necessity of leaving the dog behind.
93. Sophie (Turning from Marcus to Hannah): You just said something that is standing out to me.	Sophie recognizes in Hannah’s words the theme she wants to pursue.
94. Hannah: Me?	Hannah is surprised. Her sympathy for the girl and the dog obfuscate her moralistic and thematic interpretation—an interpretation devoid of personal, emotional affect.
95. Sophie: Yeah.	
96. Hannah: Don’t let your poor daughter sit in the back seat and cry.	Hannah finishes the thought she began in #91 but was interrupted by Marcus.
97. Sophie: But what did you say before that? What should the dad explain to her?	Sophie rejects Hannah’s completed idea, trying to get her to recognize what she said.
98. Hannah: Like make her feel better.	Hannah tries again to sooth the little girl.
99. Sophie: Why? What what you (pause) think of what you just said to me.	Sophie wants Hannah to repeat her words.
100. Hannah: Like make her feel better about why the dog has to stay	Now Hannah is willing to accept the loss of the dog, but someone must make the little girl feel better. Someone should ask Hannah, “What could the father say that would make the little girl feel better?”
101. Sophie: Why does it have to stay?	Sophie provides another hint for Hannah.
102. Hannah: Because there’s no like there’s no room in the car and they’re traveling cross country and they can’t stop	Hannah answers Sophie’s question, but it is not the answer Sophie is trying to elicit, nor is it a question that particularly interests Hannah—who cares about “why”?
103. Sophie (pointing to another student	Sophie decides to call on another student.

who has apparently said the right answer): Say what you just said.	
104. Jasmine: You have to leave some things behind.	Jasmine restates Hannah's words.
105. Sophie: So sometimes you have to leave things behind?	Sophie repeats the response that the class will now focus on as the theme of the story.

With the theme established, more or less—it shifts almost unnoticeably from “you have to leave some things behind” (104) to (see Table 4.13) “they need to make sacrifices” (117), Sophie asks, “Have you guys ever had to make a sacrifice like this?” (120) Judging by her reaction to all that follows, she was expecting her question to elicit a quick personal connection, which would allow her to proceed as she had planned. As Anna begins to share her genuinely emotional personal story, Sophie is most reluctant to relinquish control over the content and the form of Anna's text as she constructs it. “I left all my family behind, and everything,” (122), Anna says, and Sophie interrupts with a question: “How many bags did you get to bring with you here?” (123) Anna politely addresses it and attempts unsuccessfully to continue her story. After two more irrelevant and, I would argue, hegemonic interruptions (125, 127), Anna gets as far as she can into her story before she begins to cry.

Table 4.13

Discursive Process Change

116. Sophie: All right, what were you going to say Sam?	Sophie, in control now, shares the floor with Sam.
117. Sam: Well they they need to make sacrifices, sometimes.	Sam's theme is not exactly the same as Hannah's, so we have two themes now.
118. Sophie: Sometimes you have to make sacrifices.	Sophie repeats Sam's theme.
119. (Chatter.)	
120. Sophie: Have you guys ever had to	Request for personal experience

make a sacrifice like this?	connection.
121. Anna's hand goes up.	Anna requests the floor.
122. Anna: When I had to leave Bulgaria and come over here I left all my family behind, and everything.	Anna begins to make a personal connection.
123. Sophie: How many bags did you get to bring with you here?	Sophie appropriates the telling of Anna's story with an irrelevant question.
124. Anna: I don't remember. I think they had . . . like . . . six altogether.	Anna respectfully answers Sophie's question.
125. Sophie: Do you remember there being a certain object?	Another irrelevant question.
126. Anna: Yeah, there's a lot of stuff I had to leave behind . . . (significantly) a lot.	Again, Anna respectfully administers to Sophie's interruption; then she concludes her response with a hint of the significance of what she wants to share.
127. Sophie: How does that make you feel?	Sophie attempts to adhere Anna's personal story, which she has not even told yet, to the first question of the RTL section of the CAPT.
128. Anna: I had to leave all my family and like it's sad because like you don't know like you're coming here and you're like so far away and then you . . .	Anna continues her attempt to tell her personal story.
129. Marcus: (Softly) Don't cry Anna.	Marcus validates Anna's sadness.
130. Anna: I'm not gonna cry (smiling, and obviously about to cry)	Anna's emotional response to her own story: a vulnerable stoic façade.
131. Sophie: You can cry if you want.	Sophie grants Anna permission to cry.
132. Anna: Anyways (Anna is still smiling, barely able to hold back her tears) stop looking at me (turns away from Bruno, laughing, Marianna smiling, Jasmine laughing)	Anna is now the focus of the class's attention. Their laughter is not mocking, nor is it recognition of a humorous moment. Sometimes we laugh at unusual occurrences.
133. Bruno: I need a video camera man.	This moment is so unusual Bruno wants to record it. He has forgotten about my camera.
134. Anna: so when you have to leave all your family behind you don't know how long they gonna be alive for like (turning explicitly sad) I lost my grandfather and um (choking up) like (looks at Marcus, smiles, covers her face in her right hand; Marianna and Bruno turn serious as Anna breaks down and hides her face in the crook of her right elbow. Marianna sucks in her lips. 14:08)	Anna's story is about the death of her grandfather in Bulgaria after she left to come to America. The students turn serious now, respecting and validating her sadness.
135. Marcus: (In a rising and falling voice)	Marcus attempts to comfort Anna.

ohhhhhh	

Marcus, Bruno, and Marianna all validate, in their own ways, Anna's personal connection with the story. In what proves to be a conflicted move, Sophie then allows the rest of the students in the class to follow Anna's lead (see Table 4.14)

Table 4.14: Contesting the Established Discursive Process

Transcript	My Interpretation	Direct Perception as an Activated Epistemological Resource for Understanding the Source and Nature of Knowledge? (Home and Neighborhood as a Context for Important Academic Learning?)	
		YES	NO
136. Sophie: It's sad. Have any of you guys had to go through something like that where you had to move that far away? (Marianna nods)	Sophie requests students to share personal information, for no explicit purpose of literary analysis.	↓	
137. Marcus: (Contending with Sophie for speaking rights) My my my aunt my auntie has um can lung cancer right now. And she just got out of the hospital.	Marcus claims the floor. "My auntie"; an affectionate word and tone.	↓	
138. Sophie: Is she around here though? I mean do you get to see her?	Sophie rejects Marcus's sad story because he and his auntie are not separated by insurmountable geographical barriers.		↓
139. Marcus: Yeah.	As if it is a confession, he accepts Sophie's rejection of his emotional reaction.		↓
140. Sophie: So Anna didn't even get to see her grandfather. (Bruno, smiling, pokes Marianna's arm and motions towards Anna. Marianna smiles at Bruno then turns to Anna.)	Manipulating logic, Sophie makes her rejection of Marcus's sad story explicit. Marcus's personal experiences are not valid, as Anna's seem to be.		↓

141.Marianna: (Softly to Anna) Are you all right? (Anna nods.)	Marianna offers comfort to Anna.	↓	
142.Bruno (Smiling broadly): When I was smaller my grandma died and I never got to see her.	Bruno claims the floor. He tells his sad story, but Sophie does not hear him.	↓	
143.Sophie comes over to Anna and momentarily holds Anna's left bicep with her left hand as she pats Anna on the back with her right, whispers something in Anna's left ear, and turns away.	While Sophie touches Anna's arm she says something quietly to her.		
144.Sophie: (Pointing to Anko) What were you going to say?	Sophie distributes the floor to Anko. Bruno's story was not heard.	↓	
145.Anko relates that his grandfather died on Anko's birthday in Puerto Rico and Anko did not get to see him.	Anko's sad story about his grandfather dying in Puerto Rico. While this story seems to be similar to Anna's, it is not validated by Sophie.	↓	
146.Bruno: My grandma died when I was a baby and my other grandma died just like last year and I couldn't get to go to none of their funerals.	Bruno elaborates upon the sadness he has endured. As with Anko's story, this story is not validated by Sophie.	↓	
147.Jasmine's hand goes up straight with her palm pointing up and a smile on her face.	Jasmine requests the floor.	↓	
148.Jasmine: My father died in jail, I hadn't seen him for like seven years, I couldn't go to his funeral.	Jasmine's sad story, which goes unvalidated by Sophie.	↓	
149.Sophie: What so you guys obviously your your immediate reactions to this, what's your feeling as to this all this stuff happens?	This is a manipulation of personal experiences to serve the purpose of social institutions: Sophie uses students' experiences to teach explicit CAPT strategies.		

150.Marcus: My my cousin my cousin was dragged over there by um by Dunkin' Donuts, she was the one dragged by a car	Marcus attempts to relate another sad story. Is this an attempt to connect with Sophie or an unconscious plea for validation?		
151.Sophie: Oh yeah yeah yeah. . . . And so how what's your your immediate reaction is what, how are you what are you feeling inside?	This is another manipulation of personal experience to serve the purpose of the government—to teach CAPT strategies.		
152.Marcus: I want to whoever like I find out who did it if I see them . . .	Marcus explores his own emotional reaction—he's not answering Sophie's CAPT-motivated question.		
153.Sophie: You wanted to snuff them?	Sophie mocks Marcus's word and emotion.		
154.Marcus: Yeah (amid an odd and enthusiastic laughter).	Authentic reply to Sophie's intended humor.		
155.Jasmine: Do more than that. A lot more than that.	Jasmine validates Marcus's emotional reaction.		
156.Sophie: Um, but what, but why, what is what is why is that your reaction, what's your feeling inside?	Disfluency. Again, uses students' personal experiences to address the RTL CAPT question #1.		
157.Marcus: I'm I'm really sad but then again I'm healing because I'm mad that someone would even do that to (pause) I don't know (pause) I guess	Using the language of therapeutic counseling, Marcus expresses his own rational / emotional feelings.		
158.Jasmine: your family.	Jasmine continues to validate Marcus's feelings.		
159.Marcus: Yeah, you may think that it would never happen to your family member.	The students are administering to themselves.		
160.Sophie: So you're sad, you're angry, do you think this little girl probably feels a little bit of both of those like anger with her father for cracking pretty much cracking a joke .	Sophie now redirects the conversation back to the story, the little girl, and the sadistic father.		

161. Anna raises her head. (16:00)	Anna's episode is over.		↓

Interpretation of the Hidden Curriculum

This episode is a struggle between two discursive contexts: the Government imposed on the school and established by the teachers through CAPT instruction, and the Home and Neighborhood. Students repeatedly attempt to activate epistemological resources other than the one that has already been firmly established—that which recognizes knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by an authoritative figure. Literature itself, in Sophie's context, has little authentic or instructive value; instead, she tends to perceive literary analysis as a reinforcement of her worldview. In response to a student's astute question about what the father could have possibly said or done to make the little girl feel better (164), Sophie says, "Right. You know how sometimes when you go through something really sad, like you don't want everyone to be talking about it all the time you just want someone to like give you a hug or just you know just be there, like" (165). Yet there was Anna right in front of her, broken down, weeping, and Sophie just held Anna's arm for a moment and whispered something in her ear. Compare the authenticity of Sophie's text with that of Jasmine's:

Jasmine: I need comforting words, like.

Sophie: You need words.

Jasmine: Comforting (soft but emphatic) words.

Sophie: So maybe that was what this girl possibly needed, someone to explain to her you know that this is part of growing up, this is part of life, that you have to do this? (167-170)

Jasmine knows in times of sadness she needs, not hollow, empty words, but comforting words—nicely said!—and that is exactly what she provided Marcus. Again, Sophie does not value this opportunity for authentic literary analysis instruction; instead, she manipulates Jasmine’s statement—she uses it as a tool for creating CAPT-style text in a Factory context: “You have to do this.”

Perhaps as a result of the student domination of the prior episode, Sophie now firmly establishes her authority to define the discursive context and text production process. If there is a problem with this class now, it’s not that the class risks being out of control; rather, it is too much under control. Putting another student on hold, Sophie reestablishes connection with Jacob by asking him an elementary and gratuitous question: “Hang on for one second, Jacob you said you were gonna you would be mad if you got if your brother gave you the pecan, you’d be mad . . . for candy?” (170) Then the following interaction ensues:

Jacob: That’s not the right time to give you candy, like trying to like make you feel better is like (amid chatter) a piece of pecan whatever (Marianna laughs) I’d be like get that away from me, I don’t want candy.

Sophie: And that prob probably part of that would be the anger that you’re feeling already at like your dad and you know your mom for not Anko’s hand goes up.

Jacob: Yeah because when I get mad I take it out on everybody.

Anko: Miss

Sophie: Ok, so can you warn us when you're mad then so that we know
that you're going to be taking it out on us

Anko: Miss! I have a question.

Sophie: Hang on because Hannah has been waiting so patiently and then
you're next.

Hannah: My cousin had to go to Iraq.

Sophie manipulates the grammar of the conversation so Jacob becomes the subject: "the anger that you're feeling already at like your dad and you know your mom." Then, just as she has Jacob agreeing with her, she mocks his rage. "When I get mad I take it out on everybody," Jacob says, accepting with his use of the first person Sophie's designation of him as the subject. Anko tries to interject a comment, but Sophie's ingratiating joke takes precedence: "Ok, so can you warn us when you're mad then so that we know that you're going to be taking it out on us." This is the same condescending tone she used with Marcus earlier, when he was imagining what he would do to the people who dragged his cousin. Maybe the tenor of the prior discursive episode—when the students validated one another's prior experiences, thereby activating epistemological resources dormant until then—gave Anko the courage to pursue his desire to speak: "Miss! I have a question," yet he is kept on hold, told to "hang on" as Sophie allows Hannah the floor. Hannah then begins a long and personally painful story about her cousin who is fighting in Iraq. When she is finished, and to bring a conclusion to this stretch of personal stories, Sophie validates Hannah's sad story only to the extent that it serves the purpose of reinforcing her own determination of the short story's

theme. “Obviously it makes you upset . . . which it should,” she says, granting Hannah permission to experience her own emotions. Then she asks the class, “When you go through an experience like this, what does it cause you to do in your life?” (181) Clearly her question has a purpose other than to explore Hannah’s connection. “Grow up,” a student says. Deceptively altering the student’s answer, seemingly repeating it as if it were correct, Sophie says, “It makes you strong [not grown up], it makes you grow up, you have no choice” (184). This contrasting combination of strength and powerlessness faced by little girls as they ineluctably grow up in the context of sadistic fathers is the real message, and Sophie will not let it go.

For the purposes of this study, Sophie’s manipulation of the discursive text is important only insofar as it activates or deactivates the epistemological resources available to the students when they attempt to find meaning in literature or life, and to the extent that it reinforces or alters these students’ debilitating perceptions of school and academic endeavors. Evidence may be found in students’ performance on the RTL section of the CAPT.

Significantly, now, Bruno challenges Hannah’s right to be sad for her cousin; he thereby challenges Sophie’s authority as well, as she is the one who validated Hannah’s sadness: referring to Hannah’s cousin joining the army, Bruno says, “Well you’re you’re the one that signed up to go there” (187). Bruno is the only one who challenges the sentimentality of Hannah’s story, yet Bruno’s challenge is unequivocally a validation of Hannah’s feelings and could be the catalyst for an authentic discussion. Whether or not he is sympathetic is irrelevant.

It is also a validation of one purpose of literary analysis—to distinguish true perceptions and artful emotional evocations from those that are sentimental and emotionally manipulative, and to construct interpretations accordingly. Bruno is willing to talk about it, but he receives no support. Towards the end of this discussion, after expressing gratitude, Sophie says, “I don’t think that you would have necessarily been thinking about these things at this moment if there wasn’t something in the story that sparked it” (195). Hannah would not have been thinking about her cousin fighting in Iraq at that moment, perhaps, but what is Sophie’s point?—that the students are cognitive and emotional vacuums until she infuses them with sentiment, her own social perceptions and interpretations in the guise of CAPT preparation? Sophie makes a final move to acknowledge that she heard the students’ sad stories; in the process, however, she mitigates the power of the short story: “for this girl it is just a dog, for you it’s people, so it’s you know obviously it is a lot harder” (195). By correlating the dog with the students’ sad stories she invalidates both—the dog was never her concern—the sadistic father was. As a result, she teaches that the story itself lacks truth, really, especially when compared to real life, which, for these students, never really becomes a part of the curriculum. Perhaps the reason I love literature, particularly fiction, is because I miss certain characters from books I have read more than I miss any friend I have made, and I have been guided (and sometimes misguided) in many aspects of my life by the wisdom and emotions created within those books. Sophie invalidates and manipulates the students’ prior experiences in the contexts of their homes and their neighborhoods, and she eviscerates the essential power of

literature—the truth that flows like blood through good literature. But “Moving On” is not good literature, which raises the question, “Why aren’t these students reading good literature?”

Allowing the students to choose the next class activity, after terminating the current one with praise, Sophie transitions out of this episode: “You guys did phenomenal with this. Um, do you want to work on question number one or do you want me to give you what Miss Clines did and you can copy this down and then we’ll work on number two?” (206) Both Hannah and Bruno choose to copy Miss Clines’s answer. Sophie replies, “Ok. That’s good because that’s kinda what I want to do” (209). Even this bit of student authority is subtly denied them—they will be permitted to do their chosen activity because Sophie wanted to do it anyway. Finally, Sophie reestablishes the context of the Temple and its great taboo: “so never write I don’t understand” (209), the context of the Government—the nearly omniscient third-person “they”: “they don’t know that” (215), and the efficiency-minded context of the Factory: “it’s a time saver” (215) and “You need to stay focused, you need to stay focused, if you can stay focused” (224).

Two more brief episodes are worth noting. Both occur while students are copying from the overhead projector Shelly’s written response, and both reflect Sophie’s epistemological stance regarding her status as an authoritative source of knowledge. The first episode is about a short story that Sophie professes to like:

Sophie: (36:30) There’s a story that, um, well yeah, I think I can make a connection to it, there’s a story that we did last year that I think

we'll probably do with you guys this year that every time I read it I cry. I already know what happens in it.

Bruno: What story?

Sophie: Every time I read it I cry.

Bruno: What story?

(Students comment about their activity.)

Bruno: Which story is it?

Sophie: I don't want to tell you because then you're going to be able to know what it is ahead of time.

Hannah: You can't tell us the name of the story?

Sophie: No. Just in case . . .

Bruno: What if we want to read it?

Sophie: Uhh, if you don't read it I'll make a copy for you guys. You might not think it's sad. It's just because of something that happened in my life that . . . (228-238)

Students are clearly surprised that Sophie will not provide them with the title of the story; yet, in the face of this obvious desire to know the title, Sophie protects her position as possessor of knowledge—where and when she will share her knowledge is at her discretion. Before the termination of this episode Sophie shares with the students a personal experience, by its nature and source, self-validated.

The next episode occurs when Sophie is explaining one of Shelly's examples and serves to reinforce the importance students place upon Sophie's interest in their words to which they introduced her earlier:

Sophie: Like you said you would either throw a piece of candy at dad or

Hannah: That dad was grimy.

Sophie: ok?

Marcus: Or snuff him.

Sophie: He didn't seem to realize how sad his child was. Yes, I'll have to be sure to let . . . Miss, um, Clines know about the snuffing.

Hannah: And your mother.

Sophie: And my mother will know. (240-246)

So the students remind everyone, specifically Sophie, about "grimy" and "snuffed" and the promise Sophie made to tell her mother about these words. Sophie reiterates her promise. The class ends with a genuine episode of student-inspired good humor and personal revelations. Sophie wants to get a pug, the students find much hilarity in the proclivity of monkeys to "fling poop," and Anna was once attacked by a dog so viciously that her "meat was hanging off" (247) her neck. Since that time, she told me, she has had trouble with her memory.

Day 6: Reclaiming the Epistemological, Institutional Context

A Brief Confession

I always begin to lose my analytic perspective and my sense of humor by day six, every time I watch the video, read the transcript, or read my own perceptions, and I am not sure why. What is it about this stage in the Saturday

Academy that affects me so? Perhaps it is because, as with any form of inauthentic assessment, the CAPT risks destroying the inherent nurturing instincts and academic curiosities of innately good teachers.

Review: The Three Cycles

Figure 4.1 illustrates my analysis through day six. The teacher-established institutional discursive context in the class allows for the activation of the students' epistemological resource for understanding knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by an authoritative figure—a source that possesses and distributes knowledge at its own discretion. The discursive contexts in which this knowledge may be delivered are those of the Government, the Factory, the Temple, and the School. The blessing and the hope is that students will and do challenge the Institutional discursive context, and thereby the establishment of this single epistemological resource, when the material to be learned allows for such challenges. The study and exploration of literature certainly allows for the potential activation of all epistemological resources.

Within Figure 4.1 are three distinct cycles, which I have termed the Cycle of Hegemonic Positioning, the Cycle of Hope, and the Cycle of Academic and Personal Discovery. While the first two cycles are evident in the class discourse, the third is not. These three cycles are hardly revolutionary concepts to anyone who has taught young people: If you impose relentlessly an unvarying context upon a class, ultimately the students will challenge that context: they will either “misbehave” or, if they have not yet been crushed, they will try to share their own desired contexts with the teacher, with the hope that the established context may

Figure 4.1 is located at the end of this dissertation.

be ameliorated. How the teacher responds to either of these two modes of defiance will determine the future discursive context of the class. If teachers attempt to dominate students, they will win, I suppose, but they will incur further “misbehavior.” In contrast, if they validate the infusion of individual personalities, if they explicitly recognize students’ experiences as a source of valorized knowledge, students will respond accordingly. The pertinent questions, given the purpose of my study, are: 1) Within which cycle do the students spend most of their time? 2) In which cycle do they end up? 3) Which cycle offers them the most hope for success on the CAPT; 4) Most importantly, how does the establishment and perpetuation of the cycles affect the epistemological resources activated by the students when they take the CAPT?

Symptoms of the Institutional Context

What becomes apparent is that the maintenance of this single activated epistemological resource within a classroom of young students requires of, and then in turn perpetuates within, the teacher a rather cynical view of students’ capabilities, a debilitating sense of efficacy, and a grim worldview, and it is sustained by a relentless barrage of inauthentic questions, power-based discipline and coercion, and eventually dopey, docile students.

Teacher Questions.

Both Shelly and Sophie project upon the students an oppressive pattern of questioning and a violent, sad, and lonely worldview; this is consistent with a discursive context that allows for the activation of a single epistemological resource as well as the teachers’ apparent ambivalence regarding other institutional

powers infiltrating their pedagogy and their language. I wonder how much more pristine their discourse would be if they did not feel the influence of various institutional discourses.

Throughout the Saturday Academy Shelly's questioning pattern has been a combination of IRE and call-and-response—a tireless pursuit of specific information and words—questions that could be answered, given enough hints, by students who have not even read the materials. Table 4.15 shows that the questions asked by Shelly require students to recall specific words from prior classes, recite from a written source, recall formulaic test-taking strategies, recall simple plot-related facts from the story, supply specific words given hints, and repeat guided thematic interpretations.

Table 4.15: Teacher-Questions and their Demands upon Students

Transcript	What is Demanded of the Students
23. So what's the theme in a story?	This question has already been answered many times.
28. Theme, instead of theme, what could else what else could you call it? What is it from the author?	Definition of theme.
46. Now, what is the first thing our tips tell us to do when we start writing?	Recite from the tip sheet.
46. . . . what do we have to do when we start (emphasis) writing? What's the first thing?	Recite from the tip sheet.
48. . . . what is the easiest way to tell us where the quotation occurred?	Vague request for students to recall explicit instructions for formulaic writing.
48. How do you start that sentence?	Recall of explicit instruction.
48. How do we start that sentence though?	Recall of explicit instruction.
48. . . . so what might we start with?	Recall of explicit instruction.
62. And who's her best friend?	Recall of repeated name.
64. . . . what else can we say about when this occurred?	Vague request for plot recall.
64. What has happened for her at this moment?	Vague request for plot recall.
66. When she says it it makes me cry	Specific request for theme recall.

harder like the grownups do, what is she realizing, what's going on her mind?	
68. She is so hurt and upset that what?	Specific request for plot recall.
70. Well she's crying but she's not . . .?	Request for specific word.
74. Now why is she crying like the grownups do?	Specific request for simple plot recall.
74. All right what does it show so we started it the fact that she is crying like the grownups do shows us what?	Seemingly, an authentic question, but Shelly has an answer she is waiting to hear.
78. So, if she's becoming more mature what's she losing? What could we say?	Guided request for specific word.
80. When you're little when you're a child, so she's becoming more mature and (writing) losing her . . .?	Request for specific word.
82. Now at this point what is she realizing? Someone said it earlier when we were talking about the theme. She's realizing what?	Request for repetition of the answer.
84. Well about life. What's she realizing about life? Somebody mentioned it while we were talking about theme.	Repeated request for repetition of answer.
87. Sometimes in life you have to what?	Guided request for repetition of answer.
93. . . . what's our theme? What's our message?	Guided request for repetition of answer.
93. Moving on helps you and is what?	Guided request for repetition of answer.
93. In order to grow up you have to . . .?	Request for repetition of specific word.

Arguably, this episode unfairly represents Shelly's pattern of questioning as she and the class are engaged in a specific activity: Shelly is creating a sample answer to a model RTL CAPT question #2 while students respond to her questions and copy her written words; however, this activity does not necessarily require this structure, and I would point my reader's attention to day four turns #57-74 to see that this pattern of questions is reflective of the question pattern found throughout the Saturday Academy and not simply the question pattern required by this specific activity. More importantly, what is really of interest for the purpose of this study are students' reactions to and adoption of the epistemological resources activated by Shelly's and Sophie's pedagogy, and then the teachers' reactions to—

the epistemological effects upon Shelly and Sophie of—the students’ epistemological challenges and offered opportunities to establish other possibly more productive discursive contexts.

Student-Initiated Opportunities for Change.

In fact, the class begins with an offered opportunity when Anko immediately asks Shelly if Sophie told her about their words: grimy and snuffed. Shelly replies, “Uh oh, no she didn’t,” and then disciplines Marcus. Anko says, “She said she was going to tell you and your mom” (2-4). Anko’s physical reaction is obviously one of disappointment and rejection—he lowers his head, droops his shoulders, and smiles like a child masking his hurt feelings. Hard upon this brief interaction Marcus challenges Shelly in a sort of power struggle to determine whose class this is (see Table 4.16).

Table 4.16: Teacher-Rejected Opportunities, Student-Resistance, and Coercion:

Evidence of Two Cycles

Transcript	My Interpretation
5. Shelly: All right, so, if you take a look at “Moving On” (Marcus turns back to Marianna as she is talking to him) Marcus I’m gonna have to move you if you can’t focus cause you’re distracting my class.	So two cycles are in motion now: Anko’s “Cultural Invitation” initiates a “Cycle of Hope” and Marcus’s “Defiant Behavior” initiates a “Cycle of Hegemonic Social Positioning.”
6. Anna: Ohhhh (protracted, but not directed at Marcus; instead, she is commenting upon the cold classroom), it’s cold in here.	Anna senses the brewing storm between Shelly and Marcus and she intervenes.
7. Shelly: All right	Shelly has the power to terminate the confrontation.
8. Marcus: I’m (emphasis) distracting your class (plaintive resentment)	Marcus is not willing to accept the termination of this confrontation—it is his class.
9. Shelly: (Speaking over Marcus) Moving on from last week	Shelly has the power to ignore Marcus’s challenge.

10. Marcus: You're distracting me (emphasis).	Marcus continues his challenge and his claim for power and authority.
11. Shelly continues speaking as Marcus noisily drags a chair closer to him with his feet and then places his feet noisily upon it.	Marcus now challenges Shelly with loud noise, so she cannot be heard.
12. Shelly: (0:45) Marcus	Shelly has the power to utter Marcus's name and make it an implied threat.
13. Marcus: Huh? We're looking at the packet again?	Marcus recognizes that he is not in a position of power and responds passively.
14. Shelly talks. Anna laughs at something with Marianna, as Shelly continues talking. Marcus asks a procedural question. Shelly comes to him and points to a piece of paper. Marianna and Anna have a joke going. Bruno is looking at the camera and me. Shelly continues to address the RTL CAPT question (#2)	Anna sees humor in something she and Marianna are sharing; Shelly approaches Marcus and answers his question—both are signs of her willingness to accept a truce.

This all happens within the first couple of minutes of the class, and cycles are initiated that will continue throughout the remainder of the Saturday Academy: Marcus (and others) will challenge with defiant behavior the teachers' presumed authority, Anko (and others) will offer cultural invitations, and Anna (and others) will recognize and respond to humorous moments; scattered among such episodes will be moments of creativity and personal revelations. These are all challenges to the established discursive context of the classroom and opportunities for the teachers to create change in the power structure of the class and an enrichment of activated epistemological resources.

The Teacher's Sense of Efficacy

Shelly establishes low academic expectations for these students, as is reflected not only in the types of questions she asks but also in the sort of activities in which students engage—mostly copying. If students are internalizing these

meager academic expectations then evidence of such internalization may be found in their own questions. As Shelly begins the class activity she says, “Here are tips so you want to write this down please” (19). Anna asks, “So we have to write steps to answer number two?” (20) Shelly tells the students, “You’re gonna tell me what to write” (32), to which Marcus responds with enthusiasm, “Yes” (33). But then Shelly says, “You’re going to copy it down” (34), thereby eliminating much hope for the activation of any other epistemological resource. This is reminiscent of when, in day five, Sophie terminated the emotional sharing of personal experiences by having students copy Shelly’s written answer projected on the screen from the overhead projector.

Most remarkable, perhaps, are the moments of unrecognized spontaneous creativity and humor. One such moment occurs early in this class:

Shelly: Well she’s crying but she’s not . . .

Marianna: making noise.

Shelly: Making noise that

Jasmine: Her soul was hurt.

Shelly: Now why is she crying like the grownups do? What is that

supposed to mean? We talked about it. All right, so, so we could say (writing) the fact that, can you finish the sentence for me? (70-74)

So Jasmine’s spontaneous, creative, poetic reply—“Her soul was hurt”—goes unperceived, unvalidated. Instead, students are asked to fill in the blank, to copy, to provide the words for an answer that Shelly has already conceived.

A funny episode occurs after Marcus incurs a mild rebuke for a sudden physical outburst—he pounds on his desk with his right fist:

74. Shelly: All right what does it show us so we started it the fact that she is crying like the grownups do shows us what?

75. Bruno then Anna answer. Marcus pounds on his desk with his right fist.

76. Shelly: Shhhhh

77. Anna: She's becoming more mature.

78. Shelly: Ok. She is becoming more mature, I like that (writing). She's moving on. So she's becoming more mature. So if she's becoming more mature what's she losing? What could we say?

79. Marianna: She's losing her immaturity.

80. Shelly: Well losing immaturity she's also losing innocence when you are what? (Shelly molds her answer as she writes amid minimal or ignored brief student comments.) When you're little when you're a child, so she's becoming more mature and (writing) losing her

81. Marcus: (Softly) Innocence.

82. Shelly: childhood or you could say innocence. (Marcus offers comments softly.) Now at this point what is she realizing? Some someone said it earlier when we were talking about the theme. She's realizing what? (Students' halting responses.)

83. Marianna: Her dad don't care.

I love the poetic simplicity of Marianna's response, "She's losing her immaturity" (79). It is another aesthetic moment—an opportunity to explore, to activate alternative epistemological resources, and to offer authentic praise. Instead, Shelly pursues the answer she has already conceived. Equating immaturity with innocence, innocence with littleness, littleness with childhood, she attempts to elicit her desired response. Marcus tries a response—a repetition of Shelly's word—but Shelly seems to be waiting, mysteriously enough, to hear the word "childhood"; however, the real lesson is what follows. Referring back to day five, Marianna expresses the possibility that the real lesson is about the father: in Marianna's words, reminiscent of Sophie's view, "Her dad don't care" (83). But this is not what Shelly is waiting for either. She does not reject Marianna's statement, but she does not validate it; instead, she moves quickly past it:

84. Shelly: (10:21) Well about life. What's she realizing about life?

Somebody mentioned it while we were talking about theme.

(Various student responses. Shelly molds and writes. Bruno and Anna offer suggestions.) All right, so sometimes, all right, wait, we'll say that she realizes

85. Bruno: That at a point in life she (pause) something like that (fades away)

86. Anna: Yeah, that at a point in life you lose your loved ones, something like that (softly fades away)

87. Shelly: Sometimes in life you have to what? Let's make it more general.

88. Students: Sacrifice.

89. Shelly: Sacrifice things, and not just any old things, but what what
was Fly? He was a thing that was . . . ?

90. Anna: A best friend

91. Shelly: All right, so that that would be something that you . . . ?

92. Anna: Cherish?

93. Shelly: Cherish you care about so sometimes in life you have to
sacrifice things you care about (pause). Now so we've we've
said a lot in here but now let's make sure the person grading it
knows we're talking about the overall message of the story

The answer Shelly is looking for has already been said by another student:

“Somebody mentioned it while we were talking about theme” (84). Anna, recalling her own personal narrative from the prior class, makes a personal connection, but it is still not quite what Shelly has in her mind, and in effect Shelly dismisses Anna's prior knowledge acquired through personal experience. Finally, students realize the correct response: “sacrifice” (88), and Shelly validates this response by repeating it (89). Then, as a kind of epistemological capstone, Shelly asks students to fill in one more blank—a best friend is “something that you . . .” (91) and Anna utters the perfect word: “cherish” (92); however, Shelly diminishes Anna's word, cherish, and replaces it with “care about” (93). Thereafter Shelly reestablishes the presence of the Government—“the person grading” (93).

Alternative Interpretations and Worldviews.

I wonder if a grim worldview goes hand-in-hand with a rigid epistemological understanding of knowledge as propagated stuff. Shelly's worldview—at least the worldview she imparts to this population of students—is not a cheerful one, nor is Sophie's. Shelly asks the class, “. . . so, moving on is . . . a part of” (93) and Bruno finishes her thought: “growing up” (94), but this is not the end. Shelly validates Bruno's response by repeating it and then adds, “She had to learn how to deal with loss” (95). This may be true—we all encounter sadness and loss—but we all encounter a lot of other emotions too, like the tender love of feeling your child's arms around your neck, the ecstasy of dancing with the love of your dreams, the delight of tasting fine food, the spiritual absorption of lying on your back in the grass on a warm summer night and looking up into the infinite star-studded sky—the list goes on and on. This grim worldview, however, is repeated throughout the Saturday Academy, as we have seen and shall see again. What is most important is that when analyzing literature many interpretations are possible, yet, when analyzing “Moving On,” alternative interpretations are left unexplored. For instance, it's worth considering the possibility that the father was masking his extreme hurt and frustration born of powerlessness in the face of overwhelming societal forces—a corrupt banking system, a negligent government, a manipulative religious morality, a short-sighted capitalistic economy based on short term profits even in the face of known long term destruction—that makes him react enigmatically to the desperate dog and his silently crying daughter. There's only so much a man can take. Perhaps, seeing himself and his own plight in the dog, the suffering, stoic father's laughter is heroically, tragically ironic in his

defiance of the power of the gods. It is an interpretation worth talking about, and it's what literary analysis is all about. One would hope such explorations would be valued by the CAPT, and they would certainly activate alternative epistemological resources for understanding the source and nature of knowledge. The problem is that by not considering alternative interpretations, students' reading—as indicated by their written responses—will appear, not only shallow, but incompetent and careless, undeserving of a passing grade. Certainly these students' writing skills need constant practice and feedback, and I hope this is what they are experiencing in their regular weekday English classes. More importantly, however, what they really need practice doing is exploring perceptions and interpretations in a discursive context that activates alternative epistemological resources and values the students' prior experiences and personal observations as well as their own discourse.

Another Cultural Invitation: Rejection and Consequences.

After Shelly explicitly connects their conversation to the literary terms suggested by the CAPT guide, Marcus interrupts with a question—Anko's—that was answered at the beginning of class:

96. Marcus: What is that other teacher's name?

97. Shelly: Miss Morris.

98. Marcus: Did she tell you what "grimy" means? (Anna and Marianna are talking.)

99. Shelly: No. (12:41)

100. Marcus: Oooooo, she's slacking on her job. She said

101. Bruno: She said she was going to tell her mom.

102. Shelly: I'll have to ask her. I only got to see her (Marcus and Bruno argue about something)

103. Marcus: Yes she did!

104. Shelly: for a few minutes this week.

105. (Argument continues.)

106. Shelly: Shhhhh, I'll ask her, don't worry. You can yell at her next week for not telling me. (13:00)

107. After Shelly attempts to get back on task, Anko and Marianna now ask about "grimy"—they did not hear Marcus's and Bruno's prior comments. Shelly asks Anko if that is what he was talking about at the beginning of class. Anko, unsmiling, says yes.

108. Shelly: It must have slipped her mind. I'll have to ask her.

109. Marianna: She said she was going to tell her mom.

110. Anna and Bruno join in. An argument ensues about whether she was going to share "grimy" with her sister or her mom. Marianna and Anna continue conversing. Shelly reads her answer. Marcus drums with both palms on his desk, then turns to Marianna. Shelly overpowers the chatter and reads from her answer written on the transparency.

Again, Shelly says Sophie did not tell her about their word. This is a problem now, and I wonder if Marcus anticipated the class's general reaction. Bruno, Anko, Marianna, and Anna all join in this episode. Marcus might have

manipulated all those students existing within the Cycle of Hope into joining him in his Cycle of Hegemonic Positioning. Be that as it may, students begin to physically withdraw—they become restless, despondent, and chatty. Shelly now has to “shhhhh” the class frequently: turns 112, 136, 140, 142, 144, 154. Students continue copying Shelly’s written answer. After a few minutes Marcus says, “Yo, I’ve been copying the same line over and over again” (141), and he is hushed.

Literary Analysis as Formulaic Writing.

The final utterance worth noting is when Shelly refers to the type of writing necessary to pass the CAPT as formulaic:

Like the the formula is pretty simple you remember (reading rapidly) say where the quotation occurs who said it talk about how it relates to theme talk about how it relates to the character and then just finish it off. Right? Not that bad if you know the formula. (150)

Shelly does not venture far from her rigid epistemological belief that knowledge is propagated stuff delivered and assessed by authoritative sources.

Day 7: Data Indicating the Validity of the Three Cycles in Figure 4.1

In Table 4.17 I have reproduced the entire transcript of day 7 in an attempt to validate Figure 4.1. For philosophical and existential reasons the existence of the three cycles is an important aspect of my study. Earlier, in my introduction to Figure 4.1 and the three cycles, I posed the following four questions relevant to this inquiry into student and teacher epistemological interplay: 1) Within which cycle do the students spend most of their time? 2) In which cycle do they end up?

3) Which cycle offers them the most hope for success on the CAPT; 4) Most importantly, how does the establishment and perpetuation of the cycles affect the epistemological resources activated by the students when they take the CAPT? I would now propose that as a teacher of literature to high school age students I must recognize another question more relevant than any of the others: Within which cycle would I want my own children to be? The answer to that question is obvious: the Cycle of Academic and Personal Discovery. I understand that when we are students we may well have to spend some time in the Cycle of Hegemonic Social Positioning where we play out the power struggles endemic in our public education system, inextricable as it is from the dominant culture and its inherent hegemonic conflicts (which means it would be a hypocritical education indeed if those hegemonic conflicts were not explicitly represented in the educational system's curriculum—both within its form and content); and I understand that a successful negotiation between student and teacher, whereby progress is made into the Cycle of Hope, would be the next progression, whereby student-resistance results in a validation of personal revelations, cultural invitations, creative moments, and humor. In fact, the impetus for making that leap from the first cycle to the second must come from the students; otherwise it would feel intrusive and even inappropriate. Given students' compliance and docility, their acceptance of punishment for perfectly natural behavior—resistance when confronted with coercion—that all-important impetus can be quashed surprisingly easily. After all, our lessons in institutional compliance begin at the age of five! By the time students reach high school, I wonder how much hope remains; finally, given

perceptive, prepared, energetic, curious, loving teachers—confident in their lack of knowledge yet able to guide student-inquiry, and non-quashed, resilient curious students, achieving the Cycle of Academic and Personal Discovery is the desired place to be. It is a place where discursive contexts are negotiable and prior knowledge—the life experiences of each student—matter, a place from which true life-long learning may be launched and efficacious identities explored and created, a place of authentic questioning, true discourse, and imagination.

In Table 4.17, the Cycle of Hegemonic Social Positioning is indicated by two forms of Student-Initiated Resistance: Defiant Behavior and Opportunities (Personal Revelations, Cultural Invitations, Creative Moments, and Humor). Defiant Behavior results in Behavioral Discipline: a Reinforced disempowering Student and Teacher school-related Schemata that diminishes both teachers' and students' Sense of Efficacy, a hegemonically-imposed projected Worldview, and diminished student Institutional and Social Identities. Opportunities (in the Cycle of Hope) are just that—opportunities to alter the Discursive Context of the class (from the Factory, Temple, Government, and School to that of the Home and Neighborhood) and thereby the activated epistemological resources. Opportunities that are Not Validated result in Withdrawal (Physical Restlessness and Intellectual Passivity). Validated Opportunities, however, create further Opportunity for Activation of Alternate Teacher and Student Epistemological Resources (in the Cycle of Academic Personal Discovery). These are the terms I use in Table 4.17 to validate Figure 4.1.

Table 4.17: Validation of the Three Cycles in Figure 4.1

Transcript	Interpretation
1. Within 30 seconds Anko challenges Sophie about whether she told her mother and “the other teacher” about their word grimy. Anko, with a smile, accuses her of “slacking off.” Sophie takes attendance and warns Hannah about her absences. Anko drums, so does Marcus who seems very fidgety already.	Cultural Invitation. Teacher-Rejection of Cultural Invitation. Behavioral Discipline: Power. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal
2. Marcus: (Yelling to someone outside of the classroom, apparently) T-Ray!	Defiant Behavior.
3. Attendance	
4. Marcus: (Loudly) T-Ray!	Defiant Behavior.
5. Bruno is drumming. Marcus talks with Anna briefly then loudly asks about his attendance status. Sophie does not acknowledge him. Much conversation about attendance. Bruno asks when “they” will allow more than two days absence. (3:31)	Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Behavioral Discipline: Power. Government.
6. Sophie: Probably never, the point is for you to learn	Teacher as Agent of the Government.
7. Marcus: Oooooo.	Defiant Behavior.
8. Sophie: they need the time.	Government.
9. Bruno: I know but	Defiant Behavior.
10. Sophie: to teach you as much as they possibly can.	Government.
11. Sophie asks the students what they did with Miss Clines. Marianna and Bruno show her their papers.	Humor: resulting from a fill in the blank question and the resultant pursuit of that word: turns 11-34.
12. Sophie: Ok, what is that called? (3:53)	Sophie is waiting for the students to answer “information.”

13. Marianna: It's called "Driving into the Future."	Student-attempt: compliance.
14. Sophie: Ok, that's what the article is called, what is it called when you are reading an article and you are um gathering . . . this what?	Hint.
15. Marianna: Summarizing.	Student Attempt: compliance.
16. Sophie: You're summarizing what you've read, what's this test called though?	Hint.
17. Marianna: (singsong) I don't know.	Student withdrawal.
18. Bruno: What test?	Student confusion.
19. Student: Reading for comprehension.	Student Attempt: compliance.
20. Sophie: Close. Reading for . . . (waits, amid many student responses).	Hint.
21. Sam: Literature.	Student Attempt: compliance.
22. Sophie: Reading for what? What are you reading for?	Hint.
23. (Jasmine hands Marcus her lip balm, and Marcus puts a dab on his finger and begins applying it to his lips.)	Student Withdrawal.
24. Hannah: Facts?	Student Attempt: compliance.
25. Anna: Comprehension.	Student Attempt: compliance.
26. Sophie: You're close. Facts, what's another word for that?	Hint.
27. Marianna: (Softly) Knowledge.	Student Attempt: compliance.
28. Sophie: Knowledge, what's another word for that? When you read a newspaper what are you getting from	Hint.

it?	
29. Bruno: (Loudly) Understanding.	Student Attempt: compliance.
30. Students: (One after another) Information.	Correct Word.
31. Anna: Information, that's what it is.	Student repeats the correct word.
32. Sophie: Information. You're reading for information, ok?	Teacher repeats the correct word to terminate the search.
33. Marianna: That was hard. (4:32)	Copying answers and filling in the blanks <u>is</u> hard work.
34. Anna laughs.	Humor.
35. Sophie: So, Miss Clines, if you guys can just everyone look up here (pause, then to Marcus) put the your put the lip gloss away please.	Humor not validated by the Teacher.
36. * * *	Behavioral Discipline.
37. Sophie: (8:35: As she is telling students the necessity of remaining focused while taking the CAPT) Well you're going to eat soon but this is the price you pay cause you need to be sure that you pass CAPT, ok?	The Temple: sin and punishment.
38. Bruno: Wait, wait. Are we here because we failed classes or cause we need help on CAPT?	Defiant Behavior and Challenge.
39. Sophie: Um because your teachers felt that you could use a little bit of extra help to make sure that you pass it all (pause) so we're here to help you.	The Temple: redemption.
40. Anko is drumming loudly with his right hand while holding a pen in his left hand.	Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal.
41. Bruno: Is it the English teachers or	Defiant Behavior and Challenge.

just all your teachers? 42. Sophie: All of your teachers. (9:16) 43. Sophie now goes into a review of right answers from the RFI test. She reads from the overhead transparency. Marcus drums with his left hand. Bruno shakes his head and bares his teeth. Anna leaves the room to wash her hands, then soon returns and puts on her white winter jacket, shivering. Sophie continues to explain the correct answers to the Reading for Information practice test the students took last class. 44. Sophie: The correct answer is A and here's why. (10:05) 45. Sophie: Ok, the correct answer was G, ok? here's why. (12:12) And now Jacob you had picked F right, all right? So we're going to go over why the answer is G. 46. Jacob: I picked E. 47. Sophie: You picked E? Ok, so the correct answer is G. (Goes on to explain the answer and why it is correct.) Jacob, you ok with this? 48. Jacob: Yeah. 49. Anko sticks a pen in his cap, drums, and looks at Marianna. Sophie reads. Anko drums. Anko and Bruno exchange something. (13:20) Anna and Marianna write to one another. Sophie continues her work. 50. Jasmine: Can I change my answer?	The Temple: universal recognition of sin. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by an authority to passive recipients. Knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by an authority to passive recipients. Power: designation of model student. Student rejection of model status in this context. Power: validating connection with the model student. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Withdrawal. Student recognition of teacher as absolute authority.

(13:41) 51. Marcus taps Bruno on the shoulder. 52. Sophie: Actually the answer is the one no one picked. (14:14) 53. Students: A? 54. Sophie: No, a few people picked A. The answer is B. 55. Marcus: (Loudly) B. 56. Jacob: I picked B. 57. Sophie: You did? 58. Jacob: Yeah. 59. Sophie: Good job Jacob. Raise your hand! 60. Jacob: Oh snap, oh, I I wasn't paying attention (Anna laughs). 61. Sophie: Oh oh. Pay attention, so I can give you all this credit. Um, the article . . . (continues reading from her answer and the article). 62. Marianna tears out a piece of paper and balls it up. Bruno turns to talk with Jasmine. Anko drums. Marcus leans completely over onto Jasmine's desk. 63. Sophie: (To Bruno) Turn around. (15:10) 64. Marianna applies lip balm. Anna laughs quietly. Anxiety is increasing with each question students get wrong. Marianna and Anna have a sidebar conversation.	Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by an authority to passive recipients. Student Confusion. Knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by an authority to passive recipients. Defiant Behavior. Model student. Power: recognition of model student. Student validation of recognition. Power: praise for Model Student. Student rejection of Teacher Authority. Humor. Humor not validated by the teacher. Behavioral Discipline. Government. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Behavioral Discipline. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Behavioral Discipline.

65. Sophie: (Quietly to Bruno) (16:10) Turn around, turn around, stay focused. (Long monologue supporting the correct answer.) (Bruno has his red sweatshirt hood pulled over his head and is swaying rhythmically from side to side). (17:35) 66. Sophie dispenses much information. Marianna raises her hand and reads her answer softly (18:30). Sophie calls on Anna. She reads her answer. Sophie follows up with a request for specific detail. Anna looks to the text and finds the answer (18:49). Sophie explains the importance of specific detail. Marianna and Anna chat. Sophie relates her own experience buying a car and the accident she was in. (20:44) 67. Marcus: You got a Volvo? (Sophie does not answer him. Talking about the six airbags in Sophie's car. Much animated conversation about this.) 68. Sophie: Here are the answers that you could have. (21:50) 69. Hannah: Should I just write one of those answers down? (22:00) 70. Sophie: I would suggest if you don't if you don't have shhhhh any of these specific statistical bits of information (rising intonation) I would suggest that you write maybe two of them down in your answer just so that you have those. 71. Bruno asks a question (22:35). I cannot decipher a word. His voice is soft and lifeless. 72. Sophie: Say that again. They put	Knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by an authority to passive recipients. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by an authority to passive recipients. Student Compliance. Student acceptance of teacher authority. Knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by an authority to passive recipients. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Teacher's Personal Experiences. Student validates teacher's personal experiences. Knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by an authority to passive recipients. Student acceptance of teacher's absolute authority: Compliance. Behavioral Discipline. Institutional Identity: meager academic expectations. Withdrawal: Intellectual Passivity.

what? 73. Bruno repeats the question but it sounds like his mouth has gone numb—I get nothing. 74. Sophie: Was that in the was that from the reading or was that from your own ideas? 75. Bruno responds. 76. Sophie: Ok, so if they say to you how do the authors pro what are the authors doing to provide this information? they don't care what you have to say I'm sorry to say. 77. Marcus: Oooooo. 78. Sophie: (During what follows Anna and Marianna copy from the transparency) They want to make sure you can read this article and that you can comment on it. If they said, um, why do you (emphasis) think they do this stuff but they won't they won't be testing you for that on this specific test, reading for information, that's what you're doing, you're reading for information because when you guys, in a few years and you're no longer in high school and you are on your own you're eighteen years old and you need to take care of yourself (Jasmine raises her right hand from her desk and emphatically slaps it on her desk, glancing at Marcus, drawing her shoulders back, and kind of smiling or grimacing, she inhales, sighs, and yawns audibly), you're gonna have to participate in elections you are going to have to make your own decisions, you're gonna have to buy cars	Intellectual Passivity. Teacher questions student's source of knowledge. Teacher rejects student's knowledge: it is not derived from an acceptable source. Student validation of teacher's rejection of personal experience as a legitimate source of knowledge. Defiant Behavior. Institutional Identity: meager academic expectations. Government. Government. Government. Government. [I thought the teachers were the ones being tested.] Teacher as omniscient and authoritative source for knowledge regarding students' families: diminishment of parental involvement. Intellectual Withdrawal. Teacher as authoritative source for knowledge regarding students' futures.

yourselves and you are not going to have someone (soft chatter) shhhhhh, you're not going to have someone telling you, a parent or whatnot, what you need to do you're gonna have to make these decisions on your own, so what you are going to want to do is to read articles from newspapers from magazines listen to the news to make your decisions, and so you need to know how to read for information because it's it's all about you, you have to make these decisions for the rest of us (23:56). 79. Hannah asks about the necessity of learning anything beyond adding and subtracting. Marcus and Jasmine talk. Anko drums his pen loudly. Anna and Marianna talk. Sophie patiently answers that she needed to know algebra when she painted her room. Anna and Marianna continue quietly their sidebar conversation. Sophie repeats test-taking strategies: highlight stuff, underline, and read the questions ahead of time. (25:29 Sophie moves Anna.) 80. Sophie: Marianna and Anna, you guys are like pushing me to the edge right now, I need one of you guys to move, so, Anna just 'cause you're at the end, or Marianna I don't care, one of you guys just move somewhere else so that I don't have to listen to (sound drowned out by moving desks). 81. Marianna drums. Marcus puts his head down on his right arm. Anko drums. 82. Sophie: (26:02) We are going to, start something new.	Behavioral Discipline. Teacher as authoritative source for knowledge regarding students' future family relationships: diminishment of the role of students' parents: "a parent or whatnot." Teacher as authoritative source for knowledge regarding students' future needs. Defiant Behavior. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Teacher's personal experiences as informative. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by an authority to passive recipients. Behavioral Discipline. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Defiant Behavior.

83. Marcus: Noooooo. 84. Sophie: Shhhhh. Hey guys, can you stop tapping or (fades) (26:31) 85. Sophie continues. Marianna yawns. Anna yawns and answers Sophie's question. Anna refers to detail. Sam reads detail (28:55). Sophie tells Sam his detail is not pertinent. She wants specific detail from the text. Anna reads her detail. Sophie tells Anna her detail is not what she is looking for. . . . Sophie makes a joke about pimping her classroom. Anna laughs. Much chatter. Sophie continues to push for detail from the article. Anna responds. Marcus responds with nonsense. Much chatter. 86. Marcus: (32:44) He's a hustler. (Anna laughs.) I told you. 87. Sophie: So I would not put in your answer George Barris is a hustler. Ok? I would not put that down. 88. Hannah: (33:00) Did you call your mom and tell you that's a new word, hustler? 89. Sophie: Oh I know hustler, I know it. 90. Anna: Did you tell her about being grimy? 91. Sophie: Uh huh. 92. Bruno: What did she say? 93. Sophie: Well she already kinda knew, she teaches middle school and she said they were using that word.	Behavioral Discipline. Physical Withdrawal. Intellectual Passivity. Compliance. Knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by an authority to passive recipients. Compliance. Knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by an authority to passive recipients. Student validates teacher's humor. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Compliance. Defiant Behavior. Cultural Invitation: Vocabulary. Teacher's rejection of student's Cultural Invitation. Cultural Invitation: Vocabulary. Teacher's rejection of student's Cultural Invitation. Cultural Invitation: Vocabulary. Enigmatic response to Cultural Invitation. Student pursuit of Cultural Invitation. Teacher's rejection of student's Cultural Invitation. Marianna and Anna were right. Humor: not validated by the teacher.

94. Anna: That's grimy (laughs).	Physical Withdrawal: Restlessness.
95. Recitation continues (13:10). Marcus talks with Jasmine. The class conversation becomes gradually confrontational as they discuss who has authority to make statements of fact—it climaxes with Bruno's challenge of Hannah.	Defiant Behavior towards peer.
96. Bruno: (34:53) Oh yeah, go call him [the author of the article] up right now, is his number in the paper (looking, sarcastic) the story or something.	Defiant Behavior towards peer. Acceptance of class's epistemological stance: find the authority to find the knowledge.
97. Sophie: Let me ask you this.	Defiant Behavior towards peer.
98. Hannah: Shut up Bruno.	Defiant Behavior towards peer.
99. Bruno: You shut up. You don't know what you're talking about.	Behavioral Discipline.
100. Sophie: You guys, listen to each other. Don't	Defiant Behavior towards peer.
101. Bruno: You're confusing yourself	Defiant Behavior towards peer.
102. Hannah: (Smiling as she talks with Marcus, then suddenly turns serious as Bruno's words sink in) I'm (emphasis) not confused.	Inciting Defiant Behavior.
103. Marcus: Ooooooooooooo, fight.	Behavioral Discipline.
104. Sophie: Ok ok	Inciting Defiant Behavior.
105. Marcus: Fight fight fight fight	Defiant Behavior.
106. Hannah profanes—something about Jerry Springer and motherfucker while Sophie is trying to speak.	Validates extreme Defiant Behavior
107. Anna: Ooooooooooooo.	Behavioral Discipline: waits for the teacher to administer consequences.
108. Bruno: Yo, (to Sophie) you better	

talk to this girl, ok?	
109. Anna: (to Sophie) You really need to talk to her.	Behavioral Discipline: waits for the teacher to administer consequences.
110. Hannah says something softly, like a kid, smiling self-consciously.	Behavioral Discipline: waits for the teacher to administer consequences.
111. Anna: She said the F word.	Behavioral Discipline: waits for the teacher to administer consequences.
112. Jacob: She said the mofo word.	Behavioral Discipline: waits for the teacher to administer consequences.
113. Hannah: (Laughing) The mofo word.	Behavioral Discipline: waits for the teacher to administer consequences.
114. Anna: She said the F word right on the camera.	Behavioral Discipline: waits for the teacher to administer consequences.
115. During this entire interchange Sophie is trying to continue the lesson.	
116. Sophie: Ok, we got stuff we need to get through today.	Teacher refuses to administer disciplinary consequences expected by students.
117. Hannah: He won't put it in his project.	Student recognition of my camera and me.
118. Bruno: Yeah he will. (35:40).	
119. Much loud back and forth between students. Bruno calls for quiet. Hannah says she wants to see my project and apologizes.	
120. Sophie: Don't waste my time and don't waste everyone else's, you don't want to be here (rising intonation) get out.	Behavioral Discipline: invokes the Factory and the Temple. Disciplinary move is unexpected because it is general, not specific.
121. Marcus: Peace.	Compliance.
122. Sophie: You don't need to be here. I'm I'm saying this to everyone	The peacemaker.
	General Behavioral Discipline.

(Bruno says something) you need to keep it quiet (Bruno seemingly repeats the word or phrase) because just like you said she made a statement that she couldn't back up with this article (rising intonation) you did it five minutes ago. (36:07) 123. Many students: Oooooooooooooo (Bruno smiles). 124. * * * 125. (38:08) Task change: RTL #3. Anna and Marianna give expression to their hunger. Sophie stays on task. Talks. Moves on to next question. Marcus makes noise with his fingernails or something. Jasmine slaps her desk. She is getting frustrated and antsy. Sophie brings the class back to "Moving On." Sophie talks about question #3 on the RTL section of the CAPT. 126. Sophie: In your life what have you done? (41:09) 127. Marcus: Shot people. (Jasmine and Marianna laugh.) 128. Bruno: Leave my country. 129. Sophie: I don't think you'd be here right now. Leave your country. 130. Marcus: I have (emphasis) shot a person before. (41:21) 131. Bruno: Better opportunity. 132. Sophie: Opportunities. But you're leaving your family behind. 133. Chatter.	Specific Behavioral Discipline focused on Bruno. Students validate the teacher's Behavioral Discipline. Task change. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Physical Restlessness: Withdrawal. Teacher's invitation to share personal experiences. Personal Revelation. Personal Revelation. Teacher invalidates one student's personal experience and validates another's. Personal Revelation validating teacher's Worldview—the world as a violent place. Personal Revelation. Teacher ignores one student's personal experience and validates another's.

134. Marcus: (Loudly) Shhhh. 135. Sophie: Marc, zip it, or out. 136. Marcus: Me? 137. Sophie: Yeah, you. 138. Marcus: You don't want me to leave your class, you need me in here. 139. Sophie: (Fatigued) I do not need you in here. (Bruno laughs) And if you don't want to be here don't stay. 140. Marcus: I do (emphasis) want to be here. 141. Sophie: Ok then pay attention. 142. Sophie goes on trying to make her point—make connections—in this case sacrifices. 143. Sophie: My only request to you is do not go in there and make something up (regarding personal connections) because it's very obvious in your writing. So you have to think about where you could connect this like at what point in your life could you connect this so, something personal? or is it a movie you've seen, you know, a video you've watched, whatever the case may be (rising intonation) . . . ok?	Defiant Behavior: mock discipline. Behavioral Discipline. Defiant Behavior. Behavioral Discipline. Student attempt to validate his Institutional Identity. Teacher rejects student's proposed Institutional Identity and establishes a contrary one. Personal Revelation. Teacher does not validate student's Personal Revelation. Teacher establishes students' Institutional Identity: incompetent storytellers. Their incompetence makes necessary her authority. Teacher invalidates students' personal experiences and validates movies and television as sources of acceptable knowledge.

Obviously, while students repeatedly attempt to break out of the Cycle of Hope and into the Cycle of Academic and Personal Discovery, the teacher keeps them confined there; she even tries to place them back in the Cycle of Hegemonic Social Positioning—that is where she wants them to be. It would be interesting to

analyze the transcript of a class that makes the full progression through the first two cycles and into the third, but it does not happen here.

Conclusion for Days 5, 6, and 7

So we have answered the first of the five questions I posed when I introduced Figure 4.1: Within which cycle do the students spend most of their time? Residing in the Cycle of Hope they evidence attempts to relocate into the Cycle of Academic and Personal Discovery, yet their resistance is being met with overpowering coercive institutional forces pulling them back into the Cycle of Hegemonic Positioning. Since this is the cycle with which they are most familiar, their struggles against such overwhelming power are ineffectual. Sadly enough, students' struggles are ineffectual because they are misperceived by the teacher. As for the second question—In which cycle do they end up?—we can not yet determine the answer. The third question, Which cycle offers them the most hope for success on the CAPT?, I would hope the answer to that is as obvious as the answer to the fifth question, but it is not. As you will see later, while none of the sub-grouped students pass the RTL section of the CAPT at the State “Goal” level, many of them do at the NCLB “Proficient” level. In my opinion, this dual level of acceptable performance—one for NCLB purposes and the other for state purposes (whatever those may be)—invalidates the test and calls into question the state's real motivations. Question four, the one most pertinent to my analysis (How does the establishment and perpetuation of the cycles affect the epistemological resources activated by the students when they take the CAPT?), I will explore later in the study in my analysis of the students' CAPT responses. We begin here to see

the possible validation and importance of Figure 4.1. Driven by concerns imposed upon them by authoritative institutional forces, the teachers have created a debilitating discursive context with the classroom—one that invalidates students' prior knowledge and places students in a position of powerlessness where compliant or defiant behavior are the only two options. The CAPT seems to be actually transforming good teachers into teachers who are delivering instruction in a manner that may well be contrary to their espoused epistemology. In short, without studies like this one, NCLB threatens to make bad teachers of us all. Some school administrators, driven by other priorities, may not care about the CAPT's effects upon teachers just so long as students are "Proficient." Students and teachers, meanwhile, may be paying a high price for misguided attempts to meet AYP.

Day 8: Form and Meaning in an Institutional, Monologic Discursive Context

where Authority is the Source of Knowledge

Note Shelly's sarcasm (9):

Shelly: Are you ready to get snowed in on your weekend? Gonna get stuck at home? (Much boisterous student chatter.) All right, so (loudly) ladies and gentlemen. Before this snowstorm comes we are going to prepare you for CAPT, isn't that exciting (sarcastic), ok.

Note the connection Marcus feels with Shelly (23-24):

Shelly: They don't mark you off for that. (Chatter) All right, so (pause amid chatter) guys, if you're here, if you got if you bothered to get up this morning you may as well go home with something, right?

Marcus: All right, I feel you.

Teacher's Epistemology Evidenced by her Projected Worldview,

Contradictions, and Confusions

Worldview.

At the beginning of Shelly's lesson (see Table 4.18) she uses Arthur Miller's The Crucible, a play the students have read as part of their regular tenth grade English instruction, to show students how to make personal connections with the book. As Sophie did earlier, Shelly creates a worldview for the students, one that is "general" (44), "generic" (44), "applicable to any time period" (44), that she assumes is germane to the Saturday Academy students as well: people accuse others of things they didn't do (40), people frame other people (40), people hurt others to get what they want (40), people hurt others to avoid trouble themselves, people hurt others to avoid getting killed (44), people are filled with revenge (44), people will hurt people they don't like (44), all people "have" revenge (48), people "back stab" (48), students know people like Abigail Williams (48), and students can relate to her vindictiveness (48). Shelly thereby continues to establish her position as authoritative source of knowledge, even about the unfamiliar cultures inhabited by these students.

Table 4.18: Shelly's Construction of the Students' Worldview

Transcript	My Interpretation
37. Shelly: What kind of things does <u>The</u>	Shelly uses <u>The Crucible</u> in order to

<u>Crucible</u> show that people do? (Anko offers a response, softly. Bruno leans back in his chair and talks to Marianna sitting behind him.)	instruct the students in making a connection between their life experiences and stories they may encounter in the CAPT. The lesson for me becomes more about the world Shelly assumes the students inhabit—one of insincerity, violence, cowardice, and hatred. This assumption may contribute to the epistemological and discursive context of the classroom. If the students' personal life experiences are so impoverished, how could they possibly be a viable source of academic knowledge? Lowering themselves to this standard, the students' defiant behaviors in turn validate and reinforce Shelly's assumptions.
38. Marianna: Shut up.	Students continue to exhibit signs of hostility towards one another (see day 7).
39. Bruno: You shut up.	Hostile response.
40. Shelly: (Repeating Anko's answer) How people accuse others of things they didn't do. Good. Hmmm? (Looks to Carmella, who says something softly.) Framing people (repeats Carmella's answer) good. What else? Why did some of those people frame others? (Chatter) To get what they (emphasis) wanted	Their world is a place where people falsely accuse one another. Where people frame one another. People are motivated by greed.
41. Marcus: They (emphasis) didn't want to get in trouble.	People are afraid of the capricious use of power by those in authority.
42. Shelly: (Pointing towards Marcus) also so they wouldn't get in trouble, right?	
43. Bruno: So they won't get killed.	Death lurks close and threateningly in their world, and people live in fear of it.
44. Shelly: So they won't get killed. So you can talk about how people in general try to save themselves so they accuse others so that they don't get in trouble for it. You could talk about how people are filled with revenge so they accuse people they don't like. So those are a little bit more generic and could apply to any time period, instead of saying this reminds me of when the same thing happened to me. All right, give me um, think about the	Shelly's generalization of the example—from that of <u>The Crucible</u> to their world—evolves the lesson from the text to Shelly's assumptions about and construction of the students' worldview, establishing her assumption of their worldview: people lie to wreak vengeance upon those they do not like—such behavior is common, generic and timeless. My question is why the repeated references to movies when making personal connections? I imagine

the movie <u>The Terminator</u> , all right?	their lives, their prior experiences (fabricated knowledge and knowledge formed from direct perceptions—prior experiences) and their imaginations (free creation of knowledge) are rich with instructive connections. Again, this is an extraordinarily violent movie.
45. Marcus: (Enthusiastically) Which one?	
46. Shelly: Any of them. Think about any of them ok? Now a plot connection would be if you read a story like <u>The Terminator</u> and you said this reminds of one time when all the machines turned on the human beings and attacked us, ok? It hasn't happened, that's a plot connection.	A plethora of ready violence.
47. Anko: It will.	A world where machines turn against people is imaginable by Anko. I wonder what he means—it is worth exploring the possible irony and wisdom in this simple statement. I mean, perhaps the machines have already turned against Anko, even here, in this world.
48. Shelly: Possibly, but that's a plot connection. Now <u>you could</u> talk about other things. (6:34: Bruno drops change from his pocket and it rolls on the floor. This is followed by a little laughter—Marcus squeals loudly and Marianna laughs quietly. Bruno picks up his money. Shelly talks through it all.) <u>You can</u> talk about being heroic, <u>you can</u> talk about facing challenges, but <u>you don't necessarily want</u> the plot connection. All right? Shhhhhh. So <u>you gotta somehow</u> make it a little more general, and <u>the questions that is says to help you are</u> , "What's the universal theme?" like does it say something about people, does it show how everybody has revenge at some point does it talk about um how people tend to back stab does it talk about how love conquers all, you	Perhaps it is not a plot connection—Anko's ideas would have to be explored more fully to determine that. Defiant Behavior. Why "talk" and not "write"? The concepts of heroism and success (as defined by overcoming challenges) are introduced then dismissed—they are just talk. Behavioral Discipline follows. Literary Term: Universal Theme. Again, Shelly generalizes from a character in a movie to a world populated by "people" and "everybody" as "back stabbers" bent on "revenge." The students,

know things like that, you can think of common phrases so what's the universal idea and have you encountered something similar either in what you've read seen you or your friends you don't have to talk about you personally you can talk about friends, so that's question three. Now in question three the last thing you should talk about in your essay is what? You don't want to go off and tell your life story and have just a biography. In your conclusion what should you talk about? Your life, or? (Students answer) The book, the story. So the last thing you should talk about in question three when you're writing your response is the story because they're grading you on whether you understood the story, so they do want to know your connection but they don't want to know your whole (emphasis) life story, so you need to end talking about whatever it was they had you read. All right, now, the last CAPT essay question, we're already there, is question number four and that asks if it's a good piece of literature. Did Miss Morris give you this last week? (Student chatter) She may have taken it back. So (hands out explicit instruction) all right, you're welcome, it tells you at the top, "Question four asks for your opinion of the short story that you read. The value of your answer depends upon the criteria you choose to use. To say that good literature is a story that is interesting to you is not specific enough." Honestly, the person grading it isn't really interested in whether you really liked it or not (rising intonation) they just want to know if you can judge it, yeah (responding to a comment of Anko's) if you understood it, if you

Shelly assumes, know this world—"you know." This is the "universal idea" the students have "encountered ... seen" in their "friends."

"You don't have to talk about you"; for a moment in day five they were trying hard to do just that.

"The last thing you should talk about"—what does she mean by this? Do it last or do not do it at all?

Their life experiences—their biographies are not a source of accepted knowledge—they are not acceptable references when answering the CAPT RTL question number 3.

"The last thing you should talk about" is the story.

The Government, too, does not care about the students' life stories.

The power of the Government stands behind her instruction. This is deeply ironic, given her example—Arthur Miller's play The Crucible—in which the government is a malevolent, corrupt, self-serving institution driven by a lust for power to manipulate and, if necessary, to destroy those who are less powerful, like these students. This is humorous. In this monologue (48) I have underlined all words and phrases that Shelly uses, consciously or not, to invoke the presence of the Government and the power associated with it. The Government's desires, priorities, demands, and values are all present in this monologue. It is the authoritative source of knowledge regarding literary analysis for this population of student.

Again, Shelly offers a reminder that the Government is present in the classroom, and while "they" do not care about the students' personal experiences and aesthetic perceptions, the students had

can recognize the qualities of good writing. Think about it in terms of <u>if you turned in the story to a teacher would that teacher give it an A or would they say it's not well written</u>, um, so it says, "<u>The reader does not know your likes and dislikes</u>. Before you begin to write your answer you need to establish your criteria; in fact, it is wise to create your own definition of what good literature is before you take the CAPT test," so that's why we're practicing. "Jot down titles of novels and short stories you've enjoyed reading," well, we're gonna skip that so we can move ahead but <u>look at the list that they have here</u>. These are things that will help to give you ideas about what to write about and question for (Shelly watches for a moment the prolonged interaction between Marcus and Marianna.) So, one of the things <u>it says that good literature</u> (Marcus turns to interact with Anna, but she places her left index finger over her pursed lips in a sign of silence) has realistic characters. All right, how many of you have liked stories that have realistic characters? Characters that you could relate to, they seemed real, you know you knew somebody like them, good. Like Abigail Williams was a very hate, like you could hate (emphasis) her because you could kind of relate to people like her who just were vindictive. All right? Think about vivid description. How many of you have enjoyed stories that you can picture it, it's very descriptive	better care about "theirs." How can they "judge" a piece of writing for an audience that does not care if they "liked it or not"? So Shelly tells students, not to judge the piece as themselves, but to pretend they are a teacher, and then use that teacher's judgment, so imagine a judgment of someone other than yourself and express that. Furthermore, Shelly establishes the role of the teacher as judge—a kind of governmentally-appointed deputy sheriff whose judgment—a letter grade—is sufficient and self-justified. Of course "the reader does not know your likes and dislikes"; students were just told not to write about them because the reader does not care about them. The sources of knowledge are novels and short stories—not those experiences the students have lived. Ironically enough, in all truth the Government (the test-making body for the state of Connecticut) has proven itself incapable of establishing criteria for writing on the edge between Proficient and Basic. Shelly instructs the students to copy her formula just as she is copying the formula handed to her by the state. Marcus begins Defiant Action, but Anna protects him from Shelly's Behavioral Discipline. What about the realistic characters from their lives? Shelly assumes students know people like Abigail Williams—that she is a character from their world. This is either a shallow interpretation of Abigail Williams' character or a vision of a brutal world. I have never known an Abigail Williams, really. Have you?
49. Marcus: (Nodding his head) Yeah.	
50. Shelly: even like, um, if you read a gory story, a really you know true story that's very descriptive	So, again, gore is true in these students' lives, Shelly assumes.

Contradictions and Confusions.

What follows is a list I have created of strategic ideas presented by Shelly to the students in the form of an extended monologue (see Table 4.18):

- Do not talk about the violence and hatred in your lives; instead, talk about the violence and hatred in The Terminator (44).
- If it hasn't happened, it's a plot connection (46).
- Anko's possibly brilliant theme connection is a plot connection (48).
- During the test, students should "talk" [why not "write"?] (48).
- "Heroism" (48), and "success" (48), and "facing challenges" (48), are not plot connections (48).
- In this world of pervasive evil, "love conquers all" (48).
- "Common phrases" (48) students or their friends have "encountered" or read about (48) are not plot connections.
- Graders want to know students understood the story and that they want to know the students' connections, but they don't want to know a "whole life story" (48).
- Graders are not "really interested" (48) if students "liked [the short story] or not" (48); instead, they want to know if students can judge it (48), understand it (48), "recognize the qualities of good writing" (48).

However, judge not from the perspective of your own understanding but from the imagined perspective of your understanding of the understanding of an imaginary teacher. [I love this one—it's actually a great assignment activating all sorts of epistemological resources.]

- Students should make up their own criteria for good writing, “but look at the list they have here” (48).

This is a test of the students’ ability to make sense of institutionally-inspired instruction.

Student-Behavior that Belies the Teacher’s Epistemological Stance

Student Empathy and Humor.

It would be a mistake to assume these students lack a sense of aesthetics and empathy as they experience literature. In the episode below, Anko reacts viscerally when reminded of the feeling of suspense in a story. Shelly validates Anko’s funny reaction and then silences Marcus when he attempts to elaborate with detail upon Anko’s comment. Regardless, Marcus continues his comical imitation. Marcus’s peers validate his humorous acting and then Shelly silences the class.

50. Shelly: What about suspense? How many of you enjoy a story that’s suspenseful?
51. Anko: Oh I hate that, man. I freakin’ hate that.
52. Shelly: All right, you don’t like that (laughing and pointing to Anko) it bothers you. It gets you tense. (Marcus attempts to gain the floor.) Shhhhhh.
53. Marcus: We’ll see who wins . . . right after the break.
54. Shelly: (Anna, Anko, and others laugh at Marcus’s joke. Shelly, smiling, continues) all right so they keep you they keep you

wanting to read more, all right? Though provoking conflict.

Shhhhh.

An Authentic Aesthetic Challenge.

In the following episode, Shelly judges the aesthetic value of an ancient reading primer, one which I remember using for reading instruction when I was a student in first grade. Carmella attempts to question Shelly's aesthetic judgment, while Marcus seems to support Shelly's use of this text as an example of uninteresting word choice. Carmella's question (64) is most interesting and could elicit a meaningful discussion; however, Shelly's response to this authentic question indicates that she feels she must provide a verbal response, an answer that she obviously does not have. How is "See Spot run" not "approachable" to readers "in many time periods"? What does that mean? What does simplicity of sentences have to do with significance of thought? Do authors really "throw in some description and some creative things"?

61. Shelly: Artful use of language. Does it help if it's like well written?

You know, uses interesting words rather than "see Spot run."

62. Carmella: Um, actually

63. Marcus: (Smiling) See Spot run (Shelly looks at Marcus).

64. Carmella: (?) you couldn't you couldn't put that under artful use of language?

65. Shelly: Well, you might criticize it as saying that it's not, you know, as approachable to a reader in many time periods, you could talk about that, um, sometimes though if you think about how an author

writes and how they try to throw in some description and some creative things rather than just saying very simple, very simple sentences. Characters that incite empathy.

Copying, Confusion, Withdrawal, and Humor.

As seen in the short episode below, when students are assigned questions three and four from the RTL section of the CAPT for the very short story they just read and discussed, “Bedtime Story,” both Marianna and Anna evidence profound confusion. Marianna is confused about their work on questions one and two in prior classes when they read, discussed, and copied answers pertaining to the short story “Moving On”; now they are answering questions three and four for a different story. Anna, too, evidences confusion, and Bruno still does not understand this brief, ironic story. Finally, Jacob resurrects the great disappointment—their rejected cultural invitation—with his moral judgment of the story’s theme. Anna, Anko, and Hannah get the joke.

92. Marianna: Where are questions one and two? (22:20)

93. Anna: (22:57) I have absolutely no idea what to write.

94. Bruno is still confused about the story. Marianna and Anna are talking and laughing. Marcus hides in his prodigious hood. Shelly painstakingly and explicitly explains the story again to Bruno.

Hannah joins in with a misinterpretation—she too is still confused.

95. Jacob: That’s grimy.

96. Anna laughs (24:10), so does Anko and Hannah.

Resistance and Removal from the Class.

The episode in Table 4.19 begins with confusion as students attempt to practice writing answers to questions three and four of the RTL section of the CAPT.

Table 4.19: Disciplinary Actions by Students and the Teacher

Transcript	My Interpretations
96. Marcus has apparently hurt his back while trying to crack it. Anna laughs. Shelly continues with instructions. Bruno is still confused about what exactly he is expected to do. Shelly explains. (25:00) Students make an attempt to begin the assignment.	Marcus's actions are distracting. Bruno is confused.
97. (25:40) I leave the room.	
98. (Shelly finishes her conversation with Carmella and turns towards Marcus.) Shhhhhh. (Pause, waiting for Marcus to begin writing.) Marcus let's go, if you're not going to do it you're going to sit in the office.	After having a one-on-one conversation with Carmella, Shelly threatens to send Marcus to the office.
99. Marcus: (In a soft voice, like a little kid in trouble) I'm gonna do it, (plaintively) my back hurts.	Placating response.
100. Shelly: Relax then, don't mess with it and it will get better.	Shelly accepts Marcus's apologetic tone and does not send him out of the classroom. Offers advice.
101. Marcus: I'm trying to stretch, like this (leans back in his chair, extending his arms behind Marianna and Anna. Bruno turns around to look at Marcus).	Marcus, attempting to fix his back, includes Marianna and Anna now in his physical space, and he is distracting other students as well.
102. Shelly: (Amid chatter by Bruno, Anna, and Marianna; Anko, too, turns to look at Marcus) The more the more you mess with it the worse it's going to hurt so just relax, sit still, then it's not going disturbed (26:32).	Shelly tells Marcus what would be best for his back.
103. Marcus asks Anna and Marianna about the assignment.	Students converse about the assignment.
104. Shelly: (26:47) Shhhhhh. (She attempts to discipline or to focus	During this writing assignment the students talk to one another, they are shhhhh'd and

Marcus.) Shhhhhh. (Marianna and Marcus are talking. Bruno turns to Marcus and says something to him as Hannah makes another comment to Shelly.)	they shhhhhh one another.
105. Anna: (Loudly) Shhhhhhhh.	Anna shhhhhh's Hannah.
106. Shelly: All right, guys (firmly) let's go please (sing-song voice).	Shelly follows up Anna's discipline.
107. Marcus: Come on Bruno, just turn around.	Marcus joins in the student-initiated disciplinary moves.
108. Shelly: Shhhhhh. (Marianna says something. Marcus playfully nudges her right arm with his left arm. Marianna responds by hitting playfully his left arm.)	Shelly reinforces her prior disciplinary move. Marcus continues to distract other students.
109. (A student mutters something. Someone says Shhhhhh.)	More shhhhhh'ing.
110. Marcus: Shhhhhh.	This seems like mockery to me.
111. (A student continues to speak inaudibly.)	
112. Marcus: (27:29) Shhhhhhhhhh (very loudly).	Marcus's behavior now is clearly defiant.
113. Shelly: (Firmly) Guys, I don't want to hear another voice, other people are trying to write. If you need to be moved to the other side we'll do that (?)	Shelly administers general discipline.
114. Marcus: Wait, I forgot what we are writing, what are we writing again? (Anna helps.) (27:36)	Is this passive aggressive defiance? Regardless, Anna assists Marcus.
115. (28:00) Bruno yawns audibly.	Bruno seems to be following Marcus's lead—he too has withdrawn.
116. Anna: Oh my god. (28:10)	With all the distractions—Hannah's and Bruno's in particular—Anna cannot write; she does not discipline Marcus, however.
117. Shelly: Shhhhhhhh.	Again, Shelly reinforces Anna's disciplinary move.
118. Anna directs a comment and laughter towards Marcus. Marcus, playing with something, looks towards Marianna, but she does not respond. Again. Hannah asks a question—she is reclined and seemingly tired. Marcus uses this as an opportunity to talk to Anna.	Hannah's question provides Marcus the space to talk with Anna. This is important: Hannah is talking to Shelly, so Marcus talks with Anna. Both are talking with their "teachers." Anna does not object. Marcus is immediately disciplined by Shelly, however.
119. Shelly: Shhhhhh. (29:55)	Disciplinary move.

120. (30:38) Marcus elbows Marianna twice. Marianna looks at him, frowns, and elbows him back then hits him in the back of his left arm. He turns to her, smiling, chewing something. Bruno looks around. Anko asks Shelly a question. Bruno follows up. Then Hannah. Marcus starts to drum, briefly. Bruno is chewing on his pen. Another question from the opposite side of the room. I cannot hear the questions. It doesn't matter. Hannah makes a loud noise with her desk. "Ooops." Marcus is looking at Marianna, smiling. Marianna looks back at him, responds verbally, quietly, stares at him, smiles, words pass, they nod and shake their heads at one another, as if they are having a staring contest. Marcus stares at her, his head resting on his right fist. He seemingly is staring at her. (34:00) Marianna is having trouble ignoring this. Marcus is motionless, then he gets back to his paper. Marianna now watches him. Anko turns and glances behind him. Marcus leans back and looks at Marianna. Bruno turns to look at Marcus. Marcus moves his pen in his mouth, backwards and forwards as if it were a toothbrush. Marianna watches him. Anna turns to Marcus. Marcus leans close to her and makes the same motion with his pen, creating a sound like tooth brushing.	Marcus attempts to distract Marianna. This is all defiant behavior. He is distracting Anna, Marianna, Bruno, Anko, and probably others. As with Hannah before, Anko's question provides Marcus the opportunity to distract himself and others. Bruno and then Hannah talk with Shelly. I wonder if Marcus is jealous, or if he feels left out—he has been very loyal to her, really—and this is all an Opportunity—a sort of personal invitation. In any case, Marcus and Marianna interact. This is odd—it looks disturbing and is surprisingly loud.
121. Hannah: Are you brushing your teeth. (35:25)	Hannah calls everyone's—including Shelly's—attention to Marcus's actions.
122. Shelly: Shhhhhh.	Behavioral Discipline.
123. Marcus looks at Hannah and continues using his pen as a sort of tooth brush or something.	Marcus perceives Hannah's interjection and responds by continuing his actions.
124. Shelly: Marcus, you need to go sit in the office, because I really don't have the patience for this. I got up early on Saturday and didn't do it to listen	Shelly makes another disciplinary move to eject Marcus from the classroom. Also, she enlists the presumed opinions of Marcus's peers—that they are aligned

to you do that, and I don't think anybody else did either	against Marcus as he is a distraction and wish him to be sent out of the room.
125. Hannah says something with a laugh.	
126. Anna: Oh my god I lost my thought Hannah stop talking! God.	Anna attacks Hannah—Hannah is the one who called Shelly's attention to Marcus; remarkably, her attack upon Hannah distracts Shelly, and Marcus is thereby allowed to stay in the classroom. He would have been gone otherwise.
127. Shelly: Shhhhhh.	Behavioral Discipline.
128. After a couple seconds Anna reaches over and wrestles the pen from Marcus's mouth and places it emphatically on the far corner of her desk. I return. Marcus reaches over and retrieves his pen. Marianna stands up and adjusts her pants. Marcus is bent over his paper, doing something. I'm not sure if Bruno has written anything. Anko leaves the classroom. Marianna and Jasmine interact nonverbally. I leave again. Some question and answer. This distracts Marcus who had been writing. He begins to drum his pen and he bobs towards Marianna rhythmically.	Finally, Anna takes Marcus's pen out of his mouth and places it out of his reach. The pants adjusting might be a sign of defiance: several times students stand up in front of the teacher and adjust their pants. This question and answer between Shelly and a student is the final distraction for Marcus. He had been writing quietly. Now his actions become odd, again.
129. Shelly: (39:00) Marcus (a long arching wave with her right hand) bye bye. That was the last time, that was three times I've had to talk to you.	Shelly tells Marcus to go to the office.
130. Marcus leans back and raises both forearms, a gesture of innocence and injustice.	Marcus protests his innocence.
131. Marcus: Why you gotta kick me out for?	His voice sounds hurt—like a kid.
132. Marianna looks at him with her eyebrows raised.	
133. Shelly: (With her pen still pointing towards the door.) Because you can't keep quiet. Let's go.	Shelly persists with her disciplinary move.
134. Marcus: (Quietly.) That's really messed up, man.	Obedient and defiant, but not threatening.
135. Anna and Marianna are both looking at him, then they turn away as he	

makes his first move to leave. He gives Shelly a long stare. She motions again with her pen.	This is threatening. Shelly maintains her posture.
136. Marcus: I'm going. (Still staring at her.)	Impotent defiance.
137. Bruno laughs. Anna says something.	
138. Shelly: Shhhhhh.	Discipline.
139. Bruno smiles broadly and rises loudly simultaneously with Marcus and asks to go to the bathroom. He and Shelly interact but I can't understand anything they say. Marcus follows and hands his folder to Shelly. Anna raises both arms, hands clasped, above her head, stretches and sighs. Marianna and Jasmine watch Marcus leave. Bruno returns, leans back in his chair and slumps.	Marcus leaves.
140. Shelly: You guys have about ten minutes left. Remember, the more you write the more they have to read. (40:19)	The Government.
141. Shelly: Shhhhhh.	Discipline.
142. Bruno rises again and walks past Shelly, hiking up his pants. Anko returns and sits sideways—he does not resume writing. Shelly leaves the classroom briefly, then returns.	Pants adjustment in front of Shelly. Withdrawal.
143. Shelly: Shhhhhh.	Discipline.
144. Students work quietly. Anko looks around.	
145. (44:16) I return. Bruno returns, and sits, but does not engage in the assignment. Instead, he seems to write on his folder, then he glances around behind him as Marianna and Jasmine interact. Jasmine makes a comment to Shelly. Anna and Marianna interact. Marianna and Jasmine interact, then Marianna writes on the back of her own hand. Shelly responds to a question. "Shhhhhhh," she says as another student speaks. Another student question. I sneeze. Bruno makes a comment.	Withdrawal. Many small conversations. Discipline.

146. Hannah: Oh my God I can't think, shut up Bruno. (48:07)	Hannah disciplines Bruno with aggression.
147. Bruno: You shut up!	Bruno responds with aggression.
148. Anna's hand gesture indicates impatience at Hannah.	Anna's real target seems to be Hannah, whom Anna might blame for Marcus's removal.
149. Shelly: Hey hey, guys.	Shelly's note of appeasement might be attributable to this threatening inter-student aggression, denoting an even more threatening unraveling of the class.
150. Marianna and Anna interact, as Anna puts on earphones, preparing to listen to music. Bruno mumbles something, disgruntled.	
151. Bruno: She getting on my nerves (then something else).	Bruno continues his aggressive response to Hannah.
152. Anna to Bruno: Oh my god Bruno, just be quiet. (48:17)	Anna responds aggressively, or, having lost Marcus is she trying to save Bruno?
153. Shelly continues to converse with Carmella through the end of the period.	In the meantime, Shelly and Carmella have a quiet conversation.

Conclusion for Day 8

I certainly do not believe that either Sophie or Shelly have malicious intent when they, referencing movies and works of literature, create for the students a brutal, violent, selfish, fearful world to which the students may “connect” when answering question number three of the RTL section of the CAPT. In fact, their own discomfort with the entire curriculum imposed upon them by institutional forces is evident in their contradictory, confused, and disfluent speech (see Table 4.18). An authentic question, such as the one Carmella asks about the aesthetics of a sentence, is answered with obvious discomfort. The result of this is that while students attempt to do what they are told to do, to copy what they are told to copy, they do not seem to know why they are doing anything and when the time comes to create, those at most risk for failure, such as Bruno, are the most confused. The

final results, of course, are student physical and intellectual withdrawal, student ironical humor, explicit resistance, and, lastly, disciplinary removal from the classroom (see Table 4.19). The point is this: standardized tests such as the CAPT, imposed by federal acts such as the NCLB Act, risk imposing on the individual classroom an institutional context that, if embraced by well-intentioned, obedient, overworked teachers and compliant, good-hearted students, disbar teachers from the energizing responsibility to be imaginative, creative, and daring as they invent ways for at-risk students to succeed—to really succeed—according to authentic standards, not meager, debilitating standards established by bureaucrats to serve their political purposes. This institutional context demands an authoritative source of knowledge, which is a role teachers feel they should fulfill. This perception plays to teachers' insecurities, and instead of discovering and playing other critical roles, thereby activating many productive alternative epistemological resources within students, teachers embrace the one that is often illusory, especially when it is singularly overused. Teachers are not the authoritative source for all knowledge, and if Sophie and Shelly were to accept this, the grim worldviews, confusions, contradictions, and disfluency would all disappear. As it is, I see no evidence as yet that student-epistemology has affected teacher-epistemology as it might be evidenced in the teachers' pedagogy, particularly in their creation of alternative discursive contexts. The extent to which teacher-epistemology has affected student-epistemology has yet to be determined as students have been afforded few opportunities for creating authentic

text, either in writing or speaking. We will likely have to look for evidence in the students' written responses to the actual RTL section of the CAPT.

Day 9: Hegemony, Disfluency, and Student-Models

Summary Analysis for Day 9

This analysis of day nine is a validation of that which has been explored thus far. Left on his own during the prior class to create a piece of writing in which he was to express his own ideas about a short story, Bruno gets lost: "I didn't know what to do" (18) he says. The explicit test-taking strategies do not help him; they prove to be confusing for both himself and anyone attempting to assess his writing skills (Hull & Rose, 1989). In turns 12-19 Sophie attempts to use the student's words, "original gangster" and "hard body," as teacher-elicited cultural invitations but the students do not accept the bait this time. While Hannah and Marianna voice surprise at Sophie's apparent lack of knowledge regarding the current vernacular, Marcus gently answers her questions and then brings the conversation back to the story: "It was like it was like mad short. But then again you know you know what they was saying" (35). This is what Sophie had done during the emotional episode of day five, and Marcus's focus now mimics Sophie's—literary analysis is all about the story. He is focusing, just as the students have so many times been told to do.

As with the short story Sophie mentioned that she loves—the one whose title she would not share with the students in day five—Sophie introduces the source of the very short story they are now studying, "Bedtime Story," which is from a collection of similarly short stories; the title of the anthology is The

Writer's Block and Sophie bought it, not online or in the local bookstore, but in Paris. This would not be important, but as with the prior short story, the title of which the students repeatedly requested in vain to know, the students now make repeated attempts to obtain a copy of this anthology. "I want to get one" (56) Hannah says. Marianna adds, "How about if we borrowed yours and photocopied it?" (60), but Sophie discourages that idea: "You're going to photocopy this whole thing?" (62) Marianna replies simply, "Yeah" (63) but the subject is dropped. Perhaps this is no big deal, but Sophie and Shelly both have established themselves, implicitly and explicitly, as authorities—the source of knowledge—for everything from literary analysis to medical advice to students' future lives. The one activated epistemological resource for understanding the source and nature of knowledge has been that which understands knowledge as propagated stuff. This knowledge is firmly in the possession of Shelly and Sophie, who have the financial and intellectual wherewithal to obtain and then to share, at their discretion, such knowledge with those whom they deem worthy in places and at times they deem appropriate. If to pass the CAPT students must activate other epistemological resources, they may be in the sort of trouble Bruno evidences at the beginning of this class.

Turns #66 and 68 are long monologues (see Table 4.20), hegemonic in their duration alone when compared with the speaking opportunities students have been allowed. Sophie's meager academic expectations for these students and her sense of her own efficacy, or the lack thereof, are reflected in such statements as, "So I'm psyched (emphasis) that now, if nothing else, you have figured out what

your definition of good literature is” (66). She then administers quick discipline: “Anna, pay attention” (66) and moves on. Conceivably, Anna’s intelligence is evident in her not paying attention—in her seeking out other sources of discourse, other contexts where other more productive epistemological resources may hopefully be activated. Sophie says, “so there was definitely one thing that I’m going to ask you to improve on for when you answer question number three again. If you do this, I’m positive that all of you are going to do very well on the CAPT” (68) and she loses her own idea in a confusion of praise, promises, literary terms, recognition of the Governmental presence, and a hegemonic worldview (68):

Table 4.20: Increased Teacher-Disfluency in an Institutional Context

Transcript	My Interpretations
Sophie: You’re making a connection.	CAPT word: connection.
That’s all you need to do.	False promise.
Ok?	Request for approval.
It goes a little deeper than that though	Recognition of false promise.
and so there was definitely one thing that I’m going to ask you to improve on for when you answer question number three again.	The Theme of this monologue: the one thing students need to do in order for Sophie to guarantee their success is . . . ?
If you do this, I’m positive that all of you are going to do very well on the CAPT,	False promise.
eh,	Disfluency.
just	Disfluency.
I mean it’s obvious that you	Disingenuous praise.
understand the stories	CAPT word: understand.
that you’re able to	False praise.
develop your own interpretation	CAPT word: interpretation.
that you were able to make	False praise.
Um	Disfluency
a connection	CAPT word: connection.
and that you were able to	False praise.
evaluate if this is good literature.	CAPT word: evaluate.
What I need to make sure that you’re doing	Teacher’s ability to dictate students’ actions.
though	Invalidates prior praise.
is writing it all out	This is what students must do to succeed.

so that someone else who's grading this (rising intonation),	The Government.
knows you are doing that.	The nearly omniscient Government.
I know it because	The omniscient teacher.
I know who you are and I know what you're thinking	The clearly omniscient teacher.
based on what you're writing,	The omniscient teacher.
but I need to make sure	Teacher's needs.
that a complete stranger can look at your work	The Government as a "complete stranger."
and say all right they get it	The Government: the high stakes assessment is founded upon the judgment of the complete stranger
and they	The Government.
and they	The Government.
can make the connection to the story,	Vague use of CAPT word: connection.
and I'm gonna explain to you what I mean by that in just a second.	False promise.
Um,	Disfluency.
some of you,	Disfluency.
I,	Disfluency.
it's funny because	Teacher-introduced Humor. Ironical?
one person in here actually used one of the connections that I used	The example used will be one that the student wrote about, as similar idea to Sophie's own idea.
cause I told you I was going to show you what I put for question number three (rising intonation),	Vague justification for claiming ownership of example.
Sam I hope you don't mind me picking on you here	Why is this "picking on" and not simply sharing an instructive example?
but his,	Disfluency.
one of the things he wrote about in his question number three	Disfluency.
cause it asks you	Disfluency.
you know	Disfluency.
how can you connect to this,	Vague use of CAPT word: connect.
so many of you had put down,	Disfluency.
like you had used a theme,	Vague use of CAPT word: theme.
you'd come up with what your theme was	Vague use of CAPT word: theme.
and then you had explained	Disfluency.
well I've seen this in my own life	Reference to students' personal experiences.
in a movie,	Invalidation of reference to students' personal experiences.
um,	Disfluency.

many of you	Vague subject of idea.
connected it	Vague use of CAPT word: connected.
to your own life	Vague reference to personal experiences as a reference.
you know	Disfluency.
a lot of you	Vague subject of idea.
had put I	Disfluency.
I can't remember who said this	Disfluency.
but	Disfluency.
like	Disfluency.
you can't trust everyone that you meet,	Grim World View.
um,	Disfluency.
or that you shouldn't trust them right away,	Grim Worldview.
another person	Vague subject of idea.
put stuff about being like back stabbed	Grim World View.
by people that were close to them,	In this passive construction is a shift in the object from first person singular ("person") to third person plural ("them"); both the object and the subject ("people") have been generalized, as if Sophie is presenting a universal truth.
especially friends who had,	Grim World View.
you know,	Disfluency.
at one time,	Disfluency.
you know,	Disfluency.
been buddies with them	Grim World View.
and then like	Disfluency.
you know	Disfluency.
wanted to be part of like the cool crowd	Grim World View.
or whatever	Invalidation of the entire idea: whatever.
so they changed and	Grim World View.
you know	Disfluency.
back stabbed everyone	Grim World View.
you know	Disfluency.
the person that they had been close with,	Grim World View.
um,	Disfluency.
another person had	Vague subject of idea.
talked about	Misuse of verb: the person wrote about, not "talked about."
the theme being	Vague use of CAPT word: theme.
people are always trying to get back at each other,	Grim World View.
so like that idea of revenge,	Grim World View.
um,	Disfluency.
which we	Vague subject of idea.

definitely	Statement of fact from the authority.
can see in this story,	
or that people are deceitful,	Generalization of Grim World View.
it shows how people react	Generalization of Grim World View.
when they	Generalization of Grim World View.
are dealt the wrong hand,	Gambling in The Temple.
ok?	Attempts to connect.
which this class didn't use this specific word	Vague subject of a vague idea.
but in other classes a lot of people	Genuine praise for other classes.
like	Disfluency.
talked about karma	The Temple: Karma.
or what goes around comes around,	Cliché.
and	Disfluency.
you know	Disfluency.
I think that	Disfluency.
you know	Disfluency.
that kinda was	Disfluency.
the underlying theme	Vague reference to CAPT word: theme.
in a lot of what you had written about.	Vague subject of a vague idea.
Sam had written about betrayal,	Back to Sam's (really Sophie's) answer reflecting a generalized grim world view.
and how	Disfluency.
um,	Disfluency.
maybe you can explain a little bit about what I want to say. (13:20)	Relinquishes the floor to Sam who understands exactly what Sophie wants: his connection between the story's theme (that people will betray you) and a movie he has seen— <u>Mr. And Mrs. Smith</u> . What was it Sophie needed the students to do in order for her to guarantee their success on the CAPT RTL #3?

After hearing Sam's summary of Mr. And Mrs. Smith, aided by Sophie (73-80), Jacob claims the floor, and the proceeding conversation, with an ironic joke: "How romantic" (81). Sophie validates Jacob's comment: "Yes, yes, very romantic" (82), and at the end of turn #88 Sophie offers Jacob the opportunity to engage in some authentic discourse with her. Here, students are privy to, and excluded from active participation in, a lengthy, real conversation, replete with

spontaneous elaborations, corrections, interruptions, and interweaving of ideas (88-115).

A Model Answer

Two more episodes are worth noting. The first (115-119) reflects an important aspect of Sophie's understanding of literary analysis. This episode begins with Sophie reading Carmella's response to practice RTL question #3:

Sophie: All right, let me finish reading. (22:22) Um, "I remember being in a situation once when a girl I knew was dating a boy for a really long time" do you mind that I'm reading this? (Carmella says no) ok "for a really long time and she didn't know he was cheating on her. The girl asked her boyfriend to try and hit on the boyfriend to see what he would do and she would secretly be there when she did it, but her boyfriend wouldn't know. So when she did he came to the friend's house and the girlfriend stood in the closet and caught her boyfriend trying to kiss her friend"

Anna: (Smiling) That's a good one.

Sophie: (With humorous enthusiasm) Isn't it?

Anna: That's a really good one.

Sophie: Isn't it a great connection? But here's the good part. Here's the excellent part. "It ties into the story in that the woman was completely aware of what was going on because the wife hired her to kill her husband like the girl I knew asking her friend. It was easy to see the girl would break up with her boyfriend and the

woman would shoot her husband.” So you know you could the connection between the two is there and not only that but Carmella did a great job of bringing it back to the story to “The Bedtime Story” cause that’s the most important thing, you want to bring it back. Ok?

Is “bringing it back to the story” really “the most important thing”? What is Sophie really saying? Isn’t this an invalidation of students’ personal experiences—their personal connections? Isn’t a literature-inspired exploration of pertinent issues in their lives really the most important thing? I understand that the students are attending the Saturday Academy in order to acquire the skills requisite for passing the CAPT, but isn’t this approach backwards? Isn’t this a recipe, a template, a formula for the worst possible type of writing and literary analysis?

A Model Student

The final episode worth looking at is a reiteration of the rich discursive relationship between Sophie and Jacob (see Table 4.21):

Table 4.21: Discursive Activation of Alternative Epistemological Resources

136. Sophie: (29:11) Um, one of you, I took a quote from your sss from your response, I loved this, “This story showed human nature at its worst” (dramatic pause) I loved that. Oh that was yours (to Jacob)?	“one of you.” Love for Jacob’s grim world view.
1. Jacob: Yeah.	
2. Sophie: What did you mean by that so everyone understands?	Request for elaboration in order to allow for general understanding by the rest of the class.
3. Jacob: ‘Cause uh human nature’s not very good at all, like, in general, people are like, nasty, like they only look out for themselves and	Response to Sophie’s request. Jacob’s grim world view.

4. Sophie: All the time?	Nothing is true all the time.
5. Jacob: Not all the time	
6. (Bruno rests his head upon his right hand, as if sleeping.)	Withdrawal of the excluded.
7. Sophie: Ok	
8. Jacob: but I said in general, um (pause)	General indictment of human nature.
9. Sophie: (Reading slowly and significantly) “Show human nature at its worst” (pause) I thought that was a great line (long pause). (29:51) I just didn’t think of that I mean I told you I worked on answering these questions myself and I just I didn’t think, you know, that this that yeah this was perfect this showed realistic characters because there are evil people in the world; if you watch the news ever um you know I I remember watching the news uh I think it was last year when there was a husband who and I know this happens often with spouses but a husband had killed his wife just down in um it wasn’t Canterbury was it? it was in like near Lisbon	Grim worldview. A great line. So Jacob is capable of activating epistemological resources other than knowledge as propagated stuff—he may create freely, he may looking upon his direct perceptions—his prior knowledge and lived experience, and he may fabricate knowledge from other learning. “realistic characters” because they are evil. Husbands “often” kill their wives in Sophie’s grim worldview.
10. Hannah: Lisbon.	
11. Sophie: Yeah.	
12. Hannah: It was in Lisbon. Like right down, right down the street and like everybody was freaked because we were like, ok this is little ole Lisbon and we have a murder now.	Well, maybe Sophie’s worldview is right after all.
13. Sophie: Right, you know, so go ahead Jacob	Sophie validates Hannah’s emerging grim worldview.
14. Jacob: Yeah, well like, they should, they uh, it’s like people act on their emotions too quickly and that’s what (?) they take everything, it said like in the heat of the moment they want to like kill somebody	Jacob’s grim worldview: in the heat of the moment people want to kill and they take everything.
15. Sophie: Right	Sophie validates Jacob’s grim worldview.
16. Jacob: But if you like wait a week or something and you look back on it you realize it was, like, yeah	It was what?
17. Sophie: Do you guys do you can you guys think of some like characteristics of human nature like what what is something	Sophie’s question: what is the essence of human nature?

that all humans have within them, now whether we act on these or not . . . is one thing, but we all have these, what did you say? (31:15)	
18. Marcus & Anna: Anger.	This is worth exploring.
19. Sophie: Anger, ok? so that could completely go along with what you are saying, you know, that this woman and man's anger for their spouses, which we don't even know where it came from, um, you know, that is definitely a great example of showing human nature, I loved (emphasis) that comment, loved it. (31:34)	Validates Marcus's and Anna's answer. Sophie's love for Jacob's expression of his grim worldview. "A man's anger for their spouses" [from singular to plural—from specific to general, as if irrational male aggression really is human nature]. What was the academic purpose of this episode?

Conclusion for Day 9

I will conclude my analysis of day nine with one brilliant moment. Two minutes after the episode above, Sophie asks, "How could you show that the title is ironic?" (157) To this vague question Marcus replies, "Because when you think of bedtime you think of peaceful people going to sleep and comfortable" (158). This reply reflects real understanding of Sophie's question and the text of the story. Marcus deserves praise, and two minutes later he receives recognition when Sophie says, "I think Marcus really nailed it on the head here" (176). My point is that the singular model student and model answer are counterproductive and hegemonic devices used by the teachers to establish, not even a cultural model or an acceptable model of a speech genre, but, rather, their own personal connections and worldviews—it is a hegemonic positioning of themselves. Jacob is not a model student, and he knows it. I don't know why Sophie has "adopted" him and has thereby afforded him discursive opportunities the other students have not enjoyed. I wish I had asked her about this, but the question had not yet been made apparent to me when I interviewed Sophie and Shelly. Furthermore, Carmella's

answer, even if it is a model of acceptable writing, is not the only example. Where is Jasmine's response, or Bruno's, or Anko's, or Marcus's? Even if their writing is not of high enough quality to be instructive as a model, it is all the more reason to allow them opportunities for authentic discourse, to use discourse as the mediating tool between their Home and Neighborhood cultures and the institutional culture in which they are contending.

Day 10: Final Literary Analysis Instruction

Direct Instruction from an Authoritative Source

Day ten is a conclusion and provides for a transition into my analysis of students' RTL CAPT responses and my interviews with Bruno, Anna, Sophie, and Shelly. In my analyses of the prior nine days I have attempted to understand what I have termed the discursive context of the class as established by the teachers and as accepted, at times modified, and frequently challenged by the students. Numerous iterative analyses of classroom conversations at various levels of detail—from microethnographic discourse analysis of monologues to analyses of patterns observable in longer discursive and monologic episodes—reveal to me a dominant “sociocultural context” (Wertsch, 1998, pp. 23, 109) that combines elements of—and establishes the presence of—what I have termed the Government, the Factory, the Temple, and the School. Since the teachers establish the first three sociocultural contexts for disciplinary and hegemonic motivational purposes, it is the sociocultural context of the School and the students' appropriation of, and mastery of (Wertsch, p. 25), the school speech genre (Wertsch, pp. 74, 75) that is of most interest. In a long episode of explicit test

instruction (79-198) Shelly reviews, employing a “participation structure” (Wertsch, p. 128) built upon a solid foundation of “instructional questions” (Nystrand, 1997), each question of the RTL section of the CAPT and what students must do to pass. In Table 4.22 I present the transcript of day ten with a focus on the School context of the class, specifically on the literary terms Shelly reviews, and the students’ reactions to the established discursive context:

Table 4.22: The Context of the School: Direct Instruction of Literary Analysis

Transcript	My Interpretations of Direct Instruction
79. Shelly: so what we’re going to do is write down again some useful information to remember when answering them, all right? You might reflect on the character’s problems, the author’s use of symbolism, the title, or other ideas in the story. All right, what is the first thing you want to remember? What’s this question grading you on?	Explicit instruction for RTL #1. character’s problems symbolism, title Instructional Question Instructional Question
80. Bruno: Whether you understand it.	Response
81. Shelly: If you understand it so the first thing you should write down is grading whether I understood it or not.	understanding
82. Marianna returns Shelly’s pencil.	
83. Marcus: Aiy-eee!	Resistance
84. Anna and Anko laugh.	Resistance
85. Shelly: (9:56) All right, so, the first thing you should know is it’s graded on whether you understood it or not so . . .	Understanding
86. Anna to Marcus: Stop. (Then she asks a question. Marcus leans over close to her ear, opens his mouth widely, and blows softly and fully in her left ear.	Resistance Resistance
87. Shelly: what should you not (emphasis) say?	Instructional Question
88. Everyone: (Loudly) I didn’t	Response

understand it. (Laughter.)	
89. Marcus: I didn't like it.	Resistance
90. Shelly: (Laughing.) You should not say I didn't understand it and along with that don't say that it was confusing because then that translates into I don't get it so, if at all possible kinda talk around it	understanding understanding obfuscate
91. Jasmine burps	Resistance
92. Shelly: talk your way out of it	obfuscate
93. Anna: (Remonstratively) Jasmine	Resistance
94. so they don't think you didn't get it. Shhhhhh.	obfuscate
95. Anko turns to Jasmine and says something that sounds like "dialyo."	Resistance
96. Marcus: What the heck is dialyo, what does that mean? (Anna says something to Marcus.) Oh. All right. (Anna laughs.)	Resistance
97. Shelly: Shhhhhh. All right, so, what can you talk about? What could be the first thing that you talk about after you finish the story?	obfuscate
98. Jasmine: (Raising her hand with enthusiasm.) Oooh.	
99. Shelly: Jasmine.	
100. Jasmine: When, um, when I first read the title I thought this but then when I read I thought that it was something else.	Appropriation of School Genre.
101. Shelly: Good. So when I first read the title so the first thing you should do look at the title jot down what you think it might be about.	Modeling of School Genre.
102. Anna: You know there's this little green um little like uh	
103. Shelly: Bookmark.	
104. Anna: Yes, I have that.	
105. Shelly: Miss Morris and I made them.	
106. Anna: Who made them?	
107. Shelly: Miss Morris and I came up with them a few years ago.	
108. Jasmine: I have two.	

109. Anna: Miss Barry gave it to me. (Marcus, his pencil clenched sideways in his teeth, is slouched and staring at Anna; he moves his head behind her back, close behind her shoulder. She turns to look at him.)	Resistance
110. Shelly: (Marcus stretches both arms wide, his right up and behind Anna.) All right, shhhhh (Bruno turns and asks Marianna a question—she playfully responds that he should pay attention) quiet guys, All right, so (11:31), you can talk about the title say what you first thought the story was going to be about when you read the title and then what you realized it was actually about, because sometimes what you think it is going to be about is not it at all (emphatic). Now you it says that you can talk about the character's problem symbolism other ideas, you can just comment on things, you can comment on the character like I thought the character was, you know, mean or	Resistance predict from title correction of prediction Authority of the Government, from whom Shelly is copying. characters' problem, symbolism, ideas things Modeling of School Genre Worldview
111. Anko: Nice	Alterity
112. Shelly: nice or anything like that but every time you say something like that what would be a good thing to do in order to show the person grading why you think that	Instructional Question
113. Anko: Because like	Attempted Response
114. Shelly: What could you put in your essay to show the person that's grading you	Instructional Question
115. Anko: Show show what the character does.	Response
116. Shelly: All right, what the character did what the character said so you could put in quotations write specific examples, that way they know what you're basing your judgments on. Um, you can talk	action quotations examples judgments

about what else? The thing that you should do when you first finish the story?	Instructional Question
117. Anna: Um, connect to it.	Response
118. Shelly: All right you can talk about a connection (drowned out by the scraping of Marianna's chair as she rises and adjusts up her pants) what should you do when you first finish the story? Determine	connection Resistance Instructional Question
119. Carmella: Plot? No, not the plot, the theme.	Response: momentary confusion of School Genre
120. Shelly: The theme, so you could talk about the theme, you could talk about the message, what was learned in the story. Now, um, you might want to do question one last because if question one's grading you on understanding, you have three other opportunities to show you understood it (rising intonation) so you might save question one for last	theme learning answer #1 last
121. Anna: But if you don't answer question four then	Bid
122. Shelly: If you don't answer question four you're in tough shape.	Response
123. Anna: Yup.	
124. Shelly: That's really hard.	
125. Anna: You should answer	Bid
126. Marcus: you could say deep sh	Resistance
127. Shelly: So you might want to do two three and four	
128. Anko: (Laughs through his teeth, like a hiss.)	Resistance
129. Shelly: and then go back and do question one and put in anything else that you didn't get to say, all right? So write that down too.	
130. Marianna: (Bent over her paper with a pen in her hand) Write what down?	Confusion: copying
131. Anna: (Distracted by Marcus) Write what down (grabs her pen	

and prepares to write)?	
132. Shelly: To answer question one last, answer the other ones first (Jasmine sits with her head resting on her left hand, which is supported by the back of her chair) because you'll show understanding in the other essays (pause) so if you don't get to number one until the very end that's ok.	answer #1 last Resistance. understanding answer #1 last
133. Anna: (13:50) You know on my CAPT uh practice in Miss Barry's (Marcus looks at Anna) you know I got a six, thirty out of thirty.	Bid
134. Shelly: Excellent.	Purpose: praise
135. Marcus says something mockingly.	Resistance
136. Marianna: I got a B+.	Bid
137. Anna: I'm gonna (Marianna says something to her).	
138. Shelly: That's awesome, so you just gotta do it again.	Purpose: praise
139. Anna: Yeah, I want, I wanted to show it to you but um she wanted to keep it so to prove that we did it in class	Bid
140. Shelly: Yup.	
141. Anna: but when she gives them back I'll show you.	Bid
142. Shelly: Excellent.	Purpose: praise.
143. Anna: I'll come see you in your room.	Bid
144. Marcus is crooning some mockery near Anna's ear, but she is turned towards Marianna. Marianna says something smilingly.	Resistance
145. Shelly: Shhhhhh (chatter between Marianna and Anna continues, and Marcus joins in as Shelly talks with Carmella) It's better that you don't finish that one than the others, like if you if you know you can't possibly finish them all (rising intonation) at least you've shown understanding elsewhere.	Resistance Resistance answer #1 last understanding
146. Carmella: ok.	
147. Anna: No. (Denying something.	Resistance

that should be the first thing so that's under question two which is right below question one here (Anko's head is down upon his right arm lying flat upon his desk) first thing you should do, write down who said it where it occurred in the story, all right? now you look at the question it says explain what it means about the characters or the theme so the second thing you could talk about is what that quotation shows us about the character (rising intonation. Anna's jacket collar is up around her ears and zipped up past her nose) or characters	Resistance identify speaker and context identify importance of quotation regarding characterization
155. Anna: Wait, what? (Anna has been talking with Marianna. She now picks up her pen again, sensing that it is time to copy something)	Resistance
156. Shelly: so the first thing is explain the quotation explain where it occurs, second thing is say what it shows us about the character	identify context and importance of the quotation
157. Anna: Um, show what (Marianna laughs, which makes Anna laugh).	Confusion as they attempt to appropriate through copying the School Genre
158. Shelly: Show what it says to to what it shows us about the character (Bruno, Anko, and Jasmine are writing now. Marcus is not.) like if it tells us anything about what the character values, what, um, you know, what the character's fears are what the character's conflict is just explain what it tells us about the character. And then the last thing you can do is talk about how it helps us to understand the message of the story, how it ties in with the message of the story	identify characterization value of the quotation Resistance character's values character's fears character's conflict identify thematic value of the quotation
159. Anna: (Hitting Marcus again as he leans in front of her and says something) Shut up. Stop.	Resistance
160. Shelly: So number one, explain	Repetition of prior explanation

the quotation, number two, talk about how it relates to the character, and number three, talk about how it ties in with the author's message, what it has to do because they don't choose these quotations randomly, they pick out quotations that have something to do with the characters and the theme so you should be able to find something to talk about so those are three steps three things to follow for the rest of the (drowned out by Bruno rapping his pen). All right?	Resistance
161. Anna: Wait (looking at what she has written) so I talked then the third is talk about how it ties in with the character in the story?	Confused attempt to use School Genre through copying
162. Shelly: It's uh the third the last thing is how it ties in with the theme.	Repetition
163. Anna: Oh (moans, writes).	
164. Shelly: The second thing is character the third thing is theme	Repetition
165. Anna: So	
166. Shelly: And that gives you a lot to talk about because now you know you got three things to talk about you're gonna have a few sentences for each of those three things (pause) so you'll be able to fill up more space. Now if you get the one that says how does the character change from the beginning of the story to the end (Marianna and Anna are interacting again) you can talk about if you want to jot it underneath here (Marianna drops her pen) what the character learns, you can talk about what the character learns, you can talk about	"talk" fill up space Resistance
167. Anna: Wait a minute. Where?	Confusion
168. Shelly: Right here.	
169. Anna: Oh.	

170. Shelly: What the character learns in the story (rising intonation), um, you could maybe (Marianna and Jasmine interact) provide what to show the difference between beginning and end, what could you pull out of the story?	how characters change Instructional Question
171. Bruno: Evidence.	
172. Shelly: Evidence, so quotations, you could give us a quotation that helped to explain the character at the beginning of the story and then a quotation that helps to explain the character at the end of the story (Jasmine stands up quietly and adjusts her pants. Marianna leans back and yawns.)	evidence—quotations Resistance Resistance
173. Anna: Oh my (writing, mumbles something) so what the character learns from the story	Confused attempt to appropriate school genre through copying
174. Shelly: Yup.	
175. Anna: And then pull information to prove it or	proof
176. Shelly: Yeah like talk about how the character was at the beginning, what he or she valued, what he or she thought and then what they think or feel at the end (Marianna mumbles something in a funny voice as she looks at and copies from Anna's writing). All right, now, what you can always remember for question three is three four three. All right, so three things to do for question three, the first thing you should do when it says what does the story say about people in general? is (Bruno and Anko have their hoods pulled over their heads) shhhhhh (at whom?) say what the story's message is about human beings, like people value money over life or people'll um	character's thoughts character's feelings Student's attempt to appropriate school genre through copying Mnemonic identify story's message about people in general World View
177. Anna: So what the message of the story is.	
178. Shelly: Yeah what the mes first	

thing you should do is say what the message of the story is (pause) shhhhhh (I don't know who is being shhhhhh'd) the very first thing	Resistance Resistance
179. Bruno: (Writing) Yup.	
180. Shelly: The second thing you want to do is somehow tie that in with your life so you could talk about a movie you saw you could talk about friends	tie the general theme to your life use movies or friends for reference
181. Bruno: A a movie to compare?	
182. Shelly: Well you you come up with a connection like some something that it reminded you of in your own life, but you want to base it on the message not on the plot so if you get a story about, um, somebody who finds a magic lamp you don't want to write that	use personal life experiences for reference base your answer on the message, not the plot
183. Anna and Shelly in unison: like one time I found a magic lamp	Students successfully appropriate and use School Genre
184. Shelly: but if that person learned that you know	
185. Anna: Just like "Short Papa" Oh my friend lost his watch, like that.	Modeling wrong answer
186. Shelly: Yeah, you don't want to say like Oh I lost a watch (Marianna says something) but say say you read a story about somebody who found a magic lamp and then they whisper all these things but then didn't really enjoy life and you know because they it wasn't what really mattered you could then say well you know one time I wanted this game really really bad and then I got it and it wasn't such a big deal because I realized that it took me away from my friends or whatever, so it's more about the message of the story, not the plot so connect to the message, then the last thing you should do because we'll assume that the person grading your response doesn't get why you	Modeling appropriate answer Modeling appropriate answer Repetition

chose to make that connection (rising intonation) explain that connection by talking about the story, so my example is just like in the story because here's what happened in the story. (19:53)	Make explicit your connection between the story's message and your life "talk" about the story
187. Anna: (Writing) Explain the connection?	
188. Shelly: Yeah so you explain your connection like, my (Anko is laughing at something outside of the room) example is just like in the story because in the story here's what happened, and tell us what happened in the story. (Jasmine is not writing. Anna, Marianna, and Bruno are writing. I can not tell what Anko and Marcus are doing.) So the last thing you do is explain you should end talking about the story they made you read, so you're explaining exactly why you came up with that connection.	Resistance Modeling appropriate answer Resistance explain the connection—end with analysis of the story "they" "made" you read Purpose: Authority
189. Carmella: You should end with that, like	
190. Shelly: You should end talking about that story yeah, you don't to end talking about yourself then the last thing they're reading is about you not about the story so they're not determining that you were able to talk about the story very well, so you want to end talking about the story. And then question four, this is a very critical one, it's critical stance and it's critical that you do it. It asks you, how successful was the author in creating a good piece of literature?	"talk" Repetition "talk" "talk" "talk" judge author's success
191. Anna: To good um oh (?)	
192. Shelly: So the first thing you should do though is say, here's what makes good literature (pause) you know whatever irony suspense and description.	define good literature irony, suspense description

understanding			
understanding			
obfuscate			
		Resistance	
obfuscate			
		Resistance	
obfuscate			
		Resistance	
		Resistance	
obfuscate			
			Appropriation of School Genre
			Modeling of School Genre
		Resistance	
		Resistance	
predict from title			
correction of prediction			
			Authority of the Government, from whom Shelly is copying
characters' problem			
symbolism			
ideas			
things			
			Modeling of School Genre
			World View
			Alterity
	Instructional Question		
	Attempted Response		
	Instructional Question		
	Response		
action			
quotations			
examples			
judgments			
	Instructional Question		
	Response		
connection			

		Resistance	
	Instructional Question		
			Response: momentary confusion of School Genre
theme			
learning			
answer #1 last			
			Bid
	Response		
			Bid
		Resistance	
		Resistance	
			Confusion: copying
answer #1 last			
		Resistance	
understanding			
answer #1 last			
			Bid
			Purpose: praise
		Resistance	
			Bid
			Purpose: praise
			Bid
			Bid
			Purpose: praise
			Bid
		Resistance	
		Resistance	
		Resistance	
answer #1 last			
understanding			
		Resistance	
		Resistance	
		Resistance	
		Resistance	
		Resistance	
		Resistance	
	Instructional Question		
	Response		
find the quotation			
		Resistance	
highlight			

identify the speaker of the quotation			
identify the context of the quotation			
		Resistance	
identify speaker and context			
identify importance of quotation regarding characterization			
		Resistance	
identify context and importance of the quotation			
			Confusion as they attempt to appropriate through copying the School Genre
identify characterization value of the quotation			
		Resistance	
character's values			
character's fears			
character's conflict			
identify thematic value of the quotation			
		Resistance	
Repetition of prior explanation			
		Resistance	
			Confused attempt to use School Genre through copying
Repetition			
Repetition			
"talk"			
fill up space			
		Resistance	
			Confusion
how character's change			
	Instructional Question		
evidence—quotations			

		Resistance	
		Resistance	
			Confused attempt to appropriate school genre through copying
proof			
character's thoughts			
character's feelings			
			Student's attempt to appropriate school genre through copying
Mnemonic			
identify story's message about people in general			
			World View
		Resistance	
		Resistance	
tie the general theme to your life			
use movies or friends for reference			
			Students successfully appropriate and use School Genre
			Modeling wrong answer
			Modeling appropriate answer
			Modeling appropriate answer
			Repetition
Make explicit your connection between the story's message and your life			
"talk" about the story			
		Resistance	
			Modeling appropriate answer
		Resistance	
explain the connection—end with analysis of the story			
			Purpose: Authority
"talk"			

Repetition			
“talk”			
“talk”			
“talk”			
judge author’s success			
define good literature			
irony			
suspense			
description			
characterization			
			Confused attempt to appropriate School Genre through copying
		Resistance	
suspense			
irony			
plot twists			
vivid description			
generally relevant theme			
determine if the story is good			
say the story was good—effective			
		Resistance	
irony			
plot twists			
suspense			
find evidence			
		Resistance	
proof			
			Authority

When I eliminate all repetition from Table 4.23, I am left, in Table 4.24, with the following list of literary terms and strategies about which students have been told:

Table 4.24: Explicit CAPT-Related Direct Instruction of Literary Analysis

Direct Instruction for the Four Questions Comprising the RTL Section of the CAPT: Terminology of Literary Analysis			
Question #1	Question #2	Question #3	Question #4
character’s problems	find the quotation	Mnemonic: three for three	judge author’s success
symbolism	Highlight	identify story’s	define good literature

		message about people in general	
comment upon title	identify the speaker of the quotation	tie the general theme to your life	Irony
understanding	identify the context of the quotation	use movies or friends for reference	Suspense
obfuscate	identify importance of quotation regarding characterization	Make explicit your connection between the story's message and your life	Description
predict from title	identify characterization value of the quotation	"talk" about the story	Characterization
correction of prediction	character's values	explain the connection—end with analysis of the story	plot twists
ideas	character's fears	"talk"	vivid description
things	character's conflict		generally relevant theme
action	identify thematic value of the quotation		determine if the story is good
quotations	"talk"		say the story was good—effective
examples	fill up space		find evidence
judgments	how character's change		Proof
connection	evidence—quotations		
theme	Proof		
learning	character's thoughts		
answer #1 last	character's feelings		

Table 4.24 is important because it is the essence of the literary analysis instruction the teachers have delivered to the students over the past ten class periods. The efficacy of the teachers' instruction—the extent to which students have accepted,

modified, or rejected the teachers' epistemology—will now be evidenced, in part, by the writing that students create in their responses to the RTL CAPT questions.

Analysis of Students' Responses to the RTL Section of the CAPT

Summary of the Story and the Four Questions

The short story students were assigned to read for the RTL section of the CAPT was a modern story by a female author of Italian heritage; in the story, the main character, a recent graduate of Princeton, decides to live with her two stereotypically Italian grandmothers in their nice townhouse in New York City instead of with her parents in their home out on Long Island. It is a humorous, subtle story requiring some general cultural knowledge of Italian mothers, Italian grandmothers, Italian daughters, Italian eating rituals, Princeton, New York City, and Long Island. After enduring much criticism by her mother, who is hurt because the daughter does not choose to live with her, the daughter prepares a meal for her grandmothers. The failure of the daughter's attempts to share her own culture with her grandmothers is made obvious when, returning from talking with her mother on the telephone, she discovers her grandmothers doing the dinner dishes, thereby revealing their beliefs that the daughter is incompetent, at least compared to themselves, and her culture is barely tolerable, so, while it must be tolerated, it may also be surreptitiously ameliorated. The author's self-mockery and her light tone make the story humorous as she creates a few moments of artful description. After reading the story I am left with a smile created by the cultural conflicts of young and old, parent and child, city and suburb, in an Italian family.

Everyone is well-intentioned and essentially content to remain in their culturally-derived worlds. Love, and all it entails, permeates the story.

Each year, the questions comprising the RTL section of the CAPT are similar (Connecticut State Department of Education, “Connecticut Academic Performance Test”): 1) students are asked to write about their first impressions of the story, including any questions they have; 2) students are provided with three quotations and are asked to choose one and to explain how their chosen quotation is important in understanding the main character—her development, motivation, and evolution; 3) students are asked to make a thematic connection between the story and an experience—something they have lived through, someone they know, some piece they have read, or a movie they have seen; 4) students are asked to evaluate the story given their own criteria for what defines good literature. Students’ responses are assessed “holistically” based upon a “rubric,” developed by the Connecticut State department of Education, on a scale of 1 to 6, by two graders; if the graders’ holistic assessments differ by more than one point, a third assessor is brought in and the responses are re-assessed. Students’ RTL score are weighted 50% and are combined with their RFI (Reading for Information) score (short answers and multiple choice), also weighted 50%. Then the combined scores are processed through a statistical black box and a “Reading Scale Score” is derived from which each student’s “Reading Performance Level” (RPL) is determined. A RPL of 3 (“Proficient”) is passing for NCLB purposes; a RPL of 4 (“Goal”) is the level the state has determined to be passing for its own purposes, whatever they may be. The state’s establishment of two distinct levels of passing

seems insupportable to me; so much so that it invalidates the entire assessment. How can an assessment be valid when you cannot distinguish between passing and failing performances at the margin?

Summary of Students' Responses

The first question of the RTL section of the CAPT is free form—an assessment of the students' ability to reveal general, literal understanding through exploratory writing. The second question assesses the students' ability to express in writing, and to support with detail, their sympathetic or empathic reading of the characters' emotions and motivations (intersubjectivity). The third question assesses the students' ability to determine the theme of a story and then to connect in writing that theme with some other lived or aesthetic experience (intertextuality). The fourth question assesses the students' ability to create in writing a critique of a story using a body of literary terms, concepts, and strategies in combination with their own criteria for what defines “good literature” (interdiscursivity). The extent to which students accept, modify, or reject the teachers' epistemology is reflected, albeit as through a glass darkly, in the students' written responses and their apparent adoption or rejection of: 1) the institutional discursive contexts, 2) their social and institutional identities, 3) the teachers' view of their world, and 4) the dominant cultural models (see Table 4.25). Moments or episodes of intersubjectivity, intertextuality, and interdiscursivity are significant because they denote social constructions of personal identities. Where the social construction of personhood is acknowledged, various epistemological resources must be activated; contrariwise, where social

and institutional identities are hegemonically determined and worldviews are projected and imposed, a single epistemological resource—that of understanding knowledge as propagated stuff delivered by an authority—may suffice. Thus, student epistemology may be revealed in their literary analysis by the depth of their intertextuality, intersubjectivity, and interdiscursivity, and the subsequent acceptance or rejection of the institutionally-derived identities and worldviews established by the teachers of the Saturday Academy.

Analysis of Individual Students' Responses

Table 4.25: Saturday Academy Students' Written Responses to the RTL Section of the CAPT

Students' Written Responses (RTL Score) / (RPL Score)	My Interpretations
Marcus (7) / (3)	
1) I think the characters in this story are boring. The only thing I really thought about was Laura's childhood, it said all throughout the story everyone still looked at her as a little girl, but it never really gives the reasons why they are thinking this, if they (the author) would have explained what type of child hood she had it would be easier to see why she is looked at as a child still. I also want to know what kind of relationship she and her mother had, the story was easy to follow but with these things explained I think it would make for a better story plot. I think Laura had a pretty believable problem, because I have friends that feel how she dose, but she dose not get any of her problems solved, at the end she is still looked at like a kid and she is not independent.	Literary term. Judgment: boring, contrary to teachers' suggestion that students say the story is good. How "everyone" views the main character is important, but we don't know why they view her "as a little girl." We need to know about her childhood in order to understand her motivation. Specifically, we need to know more about her past relationship with her mother. Evaluation: character development and motivation could be understood with additional detail regarding the girl's relationship with her mother. Literary term. Literary term. Personal connection: friend. Evaluation: unsatisfying, inconclusive ending.
2) C: It is basically further explaining how the girl Laura is now a grown up and she can handle her self. She is trying to get away from the little girl her family once	Theme: a young person's need to be seen as independent—to define herself and to have that self-definition validated by

knew her as, it also so some frustration, and independence, in the story she was trying to get a house of her own, but she could not find one she liked, so like she got frustrated looking for the house she also is getting frustrated with people still looking at her as a little girl and always assuming she needs hand outs. Also when her grandmothers offered her the house just like she said to her mom “I’m a big girl now. I’m independant too” she was trying to show her mom and grandparents she can do thing on her own. She just wants everyone to look at her as an adult not a child.	those she loves. Intersubjectivity: interpretation of emotions. Intersubjectivity: interpretation of emotions. Theme: the frustration a young person feels when attempts to embrace the cultural model are rejected by the dominant culture. To accept handouts is contrary to the cultural model Marcus has constructed. Proof Interpretation of proof and connection with theme. “She just”: Marcus recognizes she’s not asking anything more than to adopt the mythos of the culture in which she lives.
3) I think this story explains how we as people are so quick to lable things, like we are so quick to say this is called this and thats what it will always be without even thinking about what it actually is. Like, I have a best friend, and we chill a lot, like to the point where, where ever I go, if I can take someone wit me he is coming with me. So me and my best friend would go every where together and out of no where people were like “Oh they must go out they are gay” like they didn’t ask or really sit and think they just said “well only gay people will go every were to gether. In the story, as soon as Lauren said she would look for a house they would automatically say “Oh she needs help” just like the whole child thing, they sit there and say “u can’t do this your just a little girl” without actually thinking about how she feels and what she really is.	Theme: deepening understanding—a shift from the frustration of the girl to the shallow ignorance and blindness of the culture. Personal connection: not a “plot connection” and not a movie. Marcus is judged as “gay” by his friends because he has a close male friend. Theme: the hurtful and defining “automatic” thinking of Marcus’s culture. Proof: conjectural narratives and “connection back to the story.” Theme: a culture lacking empathy can constrict one’s individual growth.
4) I truthfully don’t think this was a good piece of literature. To me the story plot was not very good, it was basically a girl looking for an apartment, then living with family. It could have got more into detail, yes it was believable, but it was so much so it was boring. It really didn’t make me want to keep reading, the	Judgment: contrary to teachers’ suggestion. Literary term. Literary term and suggestion for improvement. Judgment.

discriptions were very blunt like. I couldn't even get a good picture of the characters in my head because he/she really didn't do a good job describing them. It did have a good message though about growing up and making the transfer from kid to grown up. They should have had better character development, Lauren just gose threw the whole story telling people she is not a kid anymore she never really changes mentally or dose anything to show she is not a kid. And the ending was also not that good. She had conflicts in the story but nothing ever got solved mainly the way she was trying to Be perceived.	Literary term and judgment. Judgment: vague character development. Literary term. Literary term. Theme: resurfacing from personal interpretation to one that is safe, obvious, and plot centered. Literary term. Judgment: unsatisfactory character evolution. Judgment: unsatisfactory ending. Literary term. Judgment: unresolved conflict: the character was incapable of ever changing her culture's perception of her, so she herself was incapable of initiating any sort of internally motivated change.
Summary: Marcus accepts the cultural model of the ideal young person as someone who is independent, self-sufficient, not needing any "hand outs." A "grown up," an "adult" is someone who "can handle herself." The frustration comes when a young person's attempts to live according to this model are not validated by those closest to her. Implicit in Marcus's answer is the recognition that moves to achieve the cultural model cannot be realized without that validation, which is sometimes mysteriously withheld. Characters' motivations for withholding validation might be better understood if we had more detailed information about childhood experiences and relationships. Marcus reads the character's emotions as primarily frustrated. Most importantly, Marcus perceives in his own life the inability of people to understand his friendship with another boy—people say, "Oh, they must go out they are gay." His thematic connection is that "people are so quick to label things, like we are so quick to say this is called this and that's what it will always be without even thinking about what it actually is." Marcus's dissatisfaction with what he perceives as an inconclusive ending—"nothing ever got solved mainly the way she was trying to be perceived"—reflects the inconclusive nature of his own situation. Perhaps if we knew more about his childhood or his relationships with his mother we would understand his motivations better. As part of his analysis Marcus includes many literary terms: characters, plot, problem, description, message, conflict. Marcus recognizes the discomfort of not having an important friendship validated by his friends, by his society, yet, consistent with his valorization of independence, he does not need that validation in order to remain friends with the boy. Marcus rejects the teachers' abnegation of personal experience and fabricated knowledge as legitimate epistemological resources.	
Marianna (5) / (2)	
1) My thoughts and questions to the story, are why was Laura's mother so worried about her moving in with Anna and Angelina? Maybe because Laura's	Question: focus on character's mother's feelings. Intersubjectivity: attempts to answer her

mother felt neglected, maybe because now that Laura wants to move out she's afraid that she'll be lonely. She doesn't want that. And now her child Laura is going to move in with her grandparents instead of staying and living at home like her mother wants her to.	own question, in accordance with the teachers' suggestion, with a causal statement regarding the genesis of the mother's emotions: neglect, fear, and loneliness. Understanding.
2) C: "Look, Mom, I'm a big girl now. I'm independent too. They know I can take care of myself." For a minute I almost believed it. I think the quote means that she almost believed she can take care of herself, because her grandparents think she can, but her mother doesn't that's why her mother gets so upset when she wants to move out to live with the grandparents. Another reason why she might think it because now she has her own little room, where no one bothers her, and she's cooking for her grandparents and actually consider's washing the dishes and cleaning up afterwards. She feels as if she's growing up. She feels she can do these things on her own without asking for help anymore.	Copies the quotation. "I think." Intersubjectivity: character's self-perception. Intersubjectivity: causal interpretation of the mother's emotional motivation. Intersubjectivity: interpretation of character's state of mind and feeling of false confidence. Understanding. Intersubjectivity: interpretation of character's sense of efficacy. Theme: a young woman's attempt to live according to a cultural model.
3) The story in general clearly states that people will always try to hold you back when they feel that their about to loose you. In a way, the story reminds me of a book I read the "Killers Couzin" because when he wants to move out from his parents house, he wants to move to the city, it relates back to the story because when he moves out he moves in with his aunt, and uncle, and his mother is afraid because she might loose him, and she doesn't like the aunt. It interacts with this story, because Laura's mom was the same way when she moved in with other people in the family. She was madd, and upset with Laura because she couldn't believe Laura was actually saying this to her own mother.	Theme: people are threatened by another person's attempt to define herself: feelings of loss and loneliness blind people to the personal needs of those they love. Connection based on plot. Relates back to the story. Causal statement. Misunderstanding: gender mistake and family relation confusion.
4) The author was very successful in creating a good piece of literature because	Judgment: verisimilitude. Causal statement.

of the fact that when you read it, it actually feels that your there. When the author writes “You’re going to live with them?” my mother screamed, as if I’d thrown in my lot with drug dealers. “It’s your mother. I thought you’d be pleased.” It kind of feels as if your in the middle of an argument. It really does feel like your there because of the feeling you get when you read the story it’s like you can actually picture it in your mind, as you read on.	Proof: narrative. Intersubjectivity: Marianna’s focus on the “feeling” of the narrative.
Summary: Marianna’s intuitively interprets the character’s near belief in herself, as if she hovers between two self-constructions and all she needs is validation: “because her grandparents think she can.” Regarding the two constructions, one is supposedly internally conceived and liberating (the character’s own self-construction), the other externally imposed and restricting (the identity constructed by the mother and grandmothers). Ironically, both are really adoptions of cultural models—one the dominant cultural model of independence and self-sufficiency, and the other a cultural model formed by her heritage—Italian. The character’s opportunities for true self-determination are not explored (going to Princeton was not likely to allow for such self-analysis). But that is not the author’s intent. The story is, I would argue, funny. None of the students get the humor, probably because the Italian-family cultural heritage is unfamiliar to them. Such an understanding would partially address Marcus’s need for further detail. While Marianna reads with insight into the emotions of the mother and the daughter, she seems to sympathize most with the mother, and she interprets the story’s theme as if the mother were the main character; she states that the theme is “people will always try to hold you back when they feel that they’re about to lose you.” This is a rejection of the belief that these students would be on their own in a couple years—that their “parents or whatnot” would not be present anymore. Marianna rejects the imposed worldview constructed by the teachers, and her text is rich with intersubjectivity revealing her understanding of complex relationships where those who love us most may prove to be most protective of us, and thereby most repressive, due to the hurt our absence may cause them.	
Bruno (3) / (1)	
1) My thoughts about the story that it was well written, the author’s kids and there family story when its time for them to move on. My question was why her mother didn’t want her to live with her grandparents because Angelina wanted he own place to say at so she visit her grandma and she told that she cloud say up stair by her self. “So you’re going to live with your grandparents,” she said, “why should I be surprised? You’re just like them. You know everything and you’re	Judgment: complies with teachers’ suggestion. Intertextuality: “move on.” Question: focus on the mother’s motivation. Misunderstanding: confusion of characters’ names. Proof: narrative. Literary term: confused use of

stubborn. The author symbolism is not everything gonna be the same, sometimes it will change.	“symbolism. Intertextuality: see the class discussion regarding the short story “Moving On.”
2) A: The reason why Angelina mother said “So you going to live with you grandparents,” she said, and then: “why should I be surprised? You’re just like them. You know everything, and you’re stubborn.” because Angelina grandparents let get away with everything that she not to get away with. Angelina want to moved to the city because she don’t want to do the type of job her mother trying to give her, so she want to move to the city where she know her grandparents live there and wont afto work has hard for them.	Copies the quotation. Misunderstanding: literal plot confusion. Misunderstanding: causal statement regarding character motivation. Intersubjectivity: confused interpretation of character’s motivation.
3)	No answer.
4) In the story what the author had written count has good literature it was written well and I didn’t like what of thing like how how she and her mother handle the problem they had. Sometimes you gonna afto move away from your parents most the times you going be there all the time around them, their is a word name move on the gotto understand that she is not go to be a baby your whole life she grow up and do what every she want to do and mom or dad can stop. “It makes my mother anxious, she and my father had been waiting years to take over they wanted to be family adult.”	Judgment. Evaluation: critique of mother’s response to her daughter’s decision to live with grandmothers. Intertextuality: see conversation regarding the short story “Moving On.” Intertextuality: rejection of the cultural model established in class by the teachers: these students’ parents will be around—the students are not going to be forced to be on their own after graduating from high school. Nevertheless, Bruno accepts the dominant cultural model emphasizing the forced virtue of individual responsibility. Repetition of “move on.” Proof.
Summary: None of the other students accept as completely as Bruno the teachers’ instructions. Bruno attempts to use literary terms, he refers to specific characters, he tries to use narrative detail to support his ideas, he judges the story, and he even makes references to class discussions; yet his answer reveals much confusion. Bruno accepts the dominant cultural model of the independent adult when he says, “Sometimes you gonna have to move away from your parents,” but immediately afterwards he contradicts himself: “most of the times you going be there all the time around them.” This is nice. It is a young student trying to assimilate his school learning with his own knowledge gained through experiences and his own way of expressing himself. Obviously he has the additional challenge of working in a second language, so he is in need of much explicit instruction, and he knows it. While Bruno rejects the teachers’ view regarding the importance of his family, he is conflicted. You have to move on, but you’re still going to be around those you love. Explicit instruction here, as in Rose’s study of Tanya, has seemingly confused Bruno, but what he needs is to write and to discuss his writing	

and his ideas. It's just too early to be testing Bruno—the test is meaningless when the subject is not yet ready to be tested. Whatever good comes from assessing Bruno's skills such as they are at that moment is completely overshadowed by the possible harm done to his own sense of personhood—his construction of his social and institutional identity.	
Jasmine (6) / (3)	
1) When I first started reading the story I thought that it was going to be about a certain family member resembling somebody else. As I kept reading I found out that the story was about a young lady named Laura who decides she wants to move in with her two grandmothers Anna and Angelina. Her mother is not that happy she wanted her daughter to move back in with her, when Laura is on the phone with her mother she is shocked that they let her cook because they always feel the need to cook and clean. Anna was like that with Laura's mom, so when Laura finds her two grandmothers in the kitchen washing dishes it is like a resemblance of how they are towards Laura's mother.	Follows the template introduced by the teachers. Continues to follow the template. Understanding. Intersubjectivity: causal statement regarding interpretation of mother's emotions. Understanding: explanation of title referencing the story's ending.
2) B: Quote B to me is explaining how Laura's parents have always been told what to do and how to do it by their mothers and how their daughter chooses to live with them so she's a little upset because Anna has always done everything even in her home she was still acting like the mother was still a child. She wants to be able to know what it's like to actually be a parent herself.	Focus on the mother as the emotional subject of this story, with the girl acting as a catalyst. Intersubjectivity: causal statement interpreting mother's emotions and motion. So what is the definition of a "child" and a "parent" here? Is it the grandmothers' denial of access to the cultural model of independence and self-sufficiency that is causing such heartache?
3) What the story to me says about people in general is that there will always be someone that is older and knows best so they will tell you what to do. If not a parent maybe someone who's a friend or a family. This story in a way reminds me of my grandma because she is always constantly telling me what & how to do something and she always says she knows what's best. If I try to help her with dishes or something she feels that she needs to do them so she won't let me help her.	Theme: listen to the advice of your elders. Personal connection: grandmother. She "says" she knows what's best. Does Jasmine agree? Plot connection: the dishes.
4) I think the author was very successful in writing a good piece of	"I think." Judgment.

literature because I think that the story had a good meaning to is about how your parents will always feel the need to do something for their children it's just like a natural reaction.	"I think." Theme: rejection of the cultural model.
Summary: Jasmine unequivocally rejects the lonely worldview projected by the teachers; instead, Jasmine's worldview is one where she will always be helped by people more knowledgeable or capable than herself: "there will always be someone that is older and knows best so they will tell you what to do. If not a parent maybe someone who's a friend or a family." This interpretation may be determined by Jasmine's own home life: "This story in a way reminds me of my grandma because she is always constantly telling me what & how to do something and she always says she knows what's best." Furthermore, "your parents will always feel the need to do something for their children it's just like a natural reaction." For Jasmine, the mother, not the narrator—the daughter—is the emotional focus of the story. It is the mother's emotions that Jasmine tries to understand. For all three students so far I have the following question: Is it the grandmothers' denial of access to the cultural model of independence and self-sufficiency—by their withholding of explicit validation of their progenies' sense of personhood—that is causing such heartache? It is this implicit need for validation of evolving personhood before that evolutionary stage can be actualized that seems to be part of the students' tacit epistemology. Jasmine rejects the teachers' worldview and the dominant cultural model of self-sufficiency. Also, personal experiences are an important source of knowledge for Jasmine.	
Anko: (7) / (3)	
1) My thought & questions about the story is that how come Anna's mom didn't want to let Anna move in with her parent? Because she is old enough & the reason why she just wants to live with her grandparents is because they know more things than her mom does. They are more older & wiser. They have gone through more than her. I can see the message of the story about a girl that just got out of college & she's looking for an apartment & instead of living with her mother she lives with her grandmother & her mother must be feeling kind of lonely because her daughter is leaving her & she probably wishes that her daughter was young again so she can feel important.	Begins with question. Misunderstanding: name confusion. Causal statements: attempts to answer his own question. Understanding. Intersubjectivity, Theme, & Causal Statement: the loneliness the mother is feeling as her daughter grows up and leaves home. The mother yearns to feel important again.
2) A: "So you're going to live with your grandparents" she said, then: "why should I be surprised? you're just like, you know everything & you're stubborn." I think it means the the girls mother probably	Intersubjectivity: Interpretation of

dosent want her daughter living away from her. She dosent want her to live in the city because it's Dangarous & something could happen to her wile she's their. That the only reason why she doesn't want her daughter to live over their & because they moved to the suburbes to get away from everything all the noise that they have in the city. When her mom said that she knows everything & that she's stubborn she meant that cuz she just got out of college so she knows everything she can just like her grandparent that she is stubborn she dosen't listen to people just like her grandprents their stubborn to so the quote shows how the mom moved away from the city for her daughters protection, safety & her daughter wants to go back to the city & live with her grandparents.	mother's motivation for saying these words. Causal statements regarding the mother's feelings about her daughter living in the city. Interpretation of mother's motivation for speaking these words: she perceives the daughter as now feeling as if, as a college graduate, she thinks she knows everything and is therefore stubborn and blind to all the sacrifices her parents have made so she would have a nice place to live away from the noise and the dangers of the city. I wonder if similar sacrifices have been made for Anko by his family, and that is why he focuses his sympathies upon the mother.
3) What this story tells me about people in general is that the mom dosent want to loose her only child that she has because to the mom it feel like her daughter grew up really fast & to the mom she didn't want it to. She didn't want her daughter to grow up so fast. The Mom dosent want her daughter to live both in the city because it's dangarous & who knows what could happen wile she's their. This story reminds me about a friend who was looking for an appartment & since his grandparent lived in the city he moved in with them & he didn't say anything to his father.	Theme: the mother's struggles against the relentless passage of time to stay close with her daughter and to keep her safe. Intersubjectivity and Causal Statement. Personal connection: a friend. This is a shallow plot connection. Why does Anko not pursue his theme pertaining to the mother?
4) The way that the author was good in creating a good piece of literature is how a young girl looking for a place of her own finds one but the price is outrages so she end up living with her grandparent in the city were she grew up in because she feels were they were should be were she should live she could live with her grandparents & she can at least see them every day since she moved out to the subburbs & since just got out of college then they can see a lot more of their granddaughter. As she sais to	Judgment. Understanding: plot. Proof: reference to cultural model of the

her mom “We share,” I said “Look mom I m a big girl now. ‘I’m independent too. They know I can take of myself.” Which basically is her saying she’s old enough to have her own place & she can get a job & everything. So I think that the author suted in making a good peace of literature.	independent, self-sufficient citizen, yet this self-perceived independence depends upon the validation of others—in this case her grandparents—“they know”—because her mother is reluctant to provide such validation. Literal interpretation of proof. Anko abandons his theme. He makes no reference to the story’s ending.
Summary: Anko is capable of sympathizing with both the daughter and the mother: the daughter’s need to live with more knowledgeable others and the mother’s need to be that more knowledgeable other. The daughter is on the cusp of taking a place in her culture, and the mother is on the verge of losing hers forever. While the mother is worried about her daughter’s safety in the city, Anko also recognizes that the mother wants signs of appreciation from her daughter for all the sacrifices she has made. I wonder if similar sacrifices have been made for Anko by his family, and that is why he focuses his sympathies upon the mother. As if accepting that his own personal experiences are not authoritative sources for knowledge, Anko creates a shallow plot connection between the story and a friend of his who decided to live with his grandfather in the city. Anko makes reference to the cultural model of the independent, self-sufficient citizen, yet this self-perceived independence depends upon the validation of others—in this case her grandparents—“they know”—because her mother is reluctant to provide such validation, probably because similar validation was never afforded her. Anko accepts the teachers’ epistemology regarding authoritative sources of knowledge, and Anko therefore perceives his life experiences as non-authoritative. He does not explicitly question the dominant cultural model or the implicit need for validation of personhood. Finally, Anko does not overtly reveal significant interdiscursivity—he does not seem to make unnatural attempts to incorporate literary terms into his literary analysis.	
Sam (5) / (1)	
1) My first thought when I read the title was that someone or something resembled something. As I kept reading I came to find out that it’s a girl who just got done with Princeton and is looking for an apartment of her own in New York city. And her mother tells her, “why should I be surprised? You’re just like them. You know everything and you’re stubborn.” When she says that Laura resembles her grandmothers.	Follows the template established by the teachers. Continues to follow the template. Proof: out of context. Connects proof with title and first impressions.
2) C: I choose the quote “Look Mom, I’m a big girl now. I’m independent too. They know I can take care of myself.” For a minute I almost believed it. What this Quotation means is that her grandparents don’t like someone doing for them for	Copies the quotation. Interpretation of the quotation: adoption of the cultural model of independence and self-sufficiency obfuscates Sam’s ability to track the logical flow of his ideas. The quotation is spoken by the girl in reference

example if someone else cooks they say, “you cooked let us do the dishes.” They are kind of stubborn when it comes to them and their family.	to herself; Sam interprets the quotation referencing the grandmothers. The connection remains implicit. Proof.
3) This story reminds me of the movie Dudley Do right who is a canadian mounity and he’ll do things for other people and he don’t expect to have someone do something for him in return. Until Snidely Whiplash the bad guy turns out to be the good guy so Dudley has to become the one who has to save his friend by doing a lot of good things for the people but he messes them up so he becomes the good guy again. In A Natural Resemblance the Grandmothers do and do for everyone but won’t let anyone do for them.	Personal connection: thematic connection with the cultural model—it’s good to do for others but bad to need others to do for you. The good guy does for others. Connects his personal connection with the story.
4) The author was very successful in creating a good piece of literature because it had a lot of drama in it. The reason I say it had a lot of drama in it is because her (Laura) parents (mom) gets mad at her for going to live with her grandmothers. Laura’s mom also gets mad when she tells her that she wants to live in the city (New York City) and not on Long Island.	Judgment. Literary term. Understanding.
Summary: Sam follows the teachers’ formula right from the beginning of his analysis: “My first thought when I read the title was that someone or something resembled something. As I kept reading I came to find out that . . .” The disfluency of this statement reflects Sam’s ambivalence between his natural speech and the speech genre of literary analysis that has been taught to him. Sam also attempts to use quotations, literary terms, and personal connections; again, like Hull and Rose’s study of Tanya (1989), he has listened to instruction and he is following directions, as if using unfamiliar tools. His quotations are out of context, his literary terms are really meaningless, and his personal connection—the movie about Dudley Do-right—is somewhat baffling. Where Sam begins to sound natural is when he expresses his acceptance of the dominant cultural model: Sam sees Dudley Do-right’s virtue being “he’ll do things for other people and he don’t expect to have someone do something for him in return.” As with his interpretation of Dudley, Sam’s interpretation of the Grandmothers in the story is that “the Grandmothers do and do for everyone but won’t let anyone do for them.” Sam accepts and tries to employ the teachers’ strategies as he accepts and tries to synthesize the dominant cultural model.	
Jacob (7) / (3)	
1) While reading the story, I wasn’t sure of what it was about, until I read the last line. After that the whole thing seemed	Begins by following the template, poses a question and then attempts to answer his own question.

to make sense. I now get the theme of being independent can be a struggle and everything. The title makes more sense to me now as well. “A Natural Resemblance,” the resemblance is the girl resembling her grandmothers in the sense that she wanted to be the one who was always in charge.	Theme: dismissively recognizes the theme of independence—it’s “a struggle and everything.” Theme: seems to change his theme from a struggle for independence to a battle to be in charge. Giving other people orders is not the same as not needing other people’s help. Tyranny is not self-sufficiency.
2) C: This quote ties in with irony in the story, the girl doesn’t really think that she can do things on her own. She knows from experience that her grandmothers want to do everything themselves and not let anyone help. Also, her grandmothers don’t really think any of the offspring can do things for them selves, even though she told her mother that they know she could do it. She knows she could be an independent person, but she can’t when her grandparents are around.	Literary term. The girl lacks confidence that she can fulfill the requirements of living according to the cultural model. The girl’s grandparents are capable of living according to the cultural model. The grandmothers refuse to validate the capabilities of their progeny. Do the grandmothers think the girl can “do it”? Are they therefore lying to the mother? I need to see proof. Like kryptonite to Superman’s powers are the grandmothers’ refusals to validate the girl’s sense of independence to her sense of personhood.
3) This story says that people in general want to take charge of things that are happening. It seemed as if every character in the story wanted to have the overall say on things. Both grandparents didn’t want any help with anything they always did everything for themselves and always took charge. That also shows selfishness, because the grandparent wouldn’t let their children, or grandchildren take charge and be independent for themselves, they always wanted to take care of things. This reminds me of how my grandmother acts towards my dad. Whenever he tries to do something nice for her, she thinks that hes doing it because he thinks he has too. Like if he goes to shovel her driveway, she shoos him away so she can feel independent for herself. Just like in “A Natural Resemblance” all the grandchild wanted to do was have a nice meal for her grandparents, but they just ended up doing	Theme: Jacob reverts back to the theme of people wanting to be in charge: power. Confounding power over others with independence. Grandparents are selfish and have the power to liberate and to empower their own progeny, but they will not do so, as it may somehow diminish their sense of their own power and independence. This, to me, is a nonsequitar. The grandparents as tyrannical caregivers. Personal connection: family. Causal statement regarding grandmother’s motivation for not allowing Jacob’s dad to shovel her driveway: because the grandmother wants to feel independent. Is it the shooining or the shoveling that makes her feel independent? Maybe it is maintaining that illusion, that myth, the cultural model of not necessarily

the dishes for her anyway. They kept trying to help cook and clean too, when she was just trying to be independent for herself.	being but feeling independent that Jacob has intuited is the theme of this story. Understanding. Maybe Jacob's point would be made consistent by considering that the grandchild is not trying "to be" independent; instead, she is trying "to feel" independent," which is what he recognized about his own grandmother. The granddaughter was doing more than just "have a nice meal for her grandparents."
4) To me, a good piece of literature has a good use of language/descriptive, it has a sense of irony, and a theme that I can relate to. This story did pretty well in having what makes a good piece of literature, I liked the descriptive use of language in the Story. Like when it describes the sun rays seeming to bend around the edges of the shades, setting the floor and walls on fire, that was just one example of the stories effectiveness. Also, I think that a story with a theme that people can talk about and relate to is also an ingredient that literature should have. People don't always like reading things that they don't know a whole lot about, but I'm sure that the average person likes to have an idea of what they're reading and can connect. Everyone has to eventually move out of their house, and it's really a problem with some family members, Just like in the story. The girl was having a hard time with her mother moving out. The only thing that wasn't fully shown was irony, the only thing I can think of is how the grandmothers always ended up as the ones in charge, even though the children and grandchildren thought they could do it for themselves, but really they couldn't. Overall I think this was a well written piece of literature.	Defines "good literature," in accordance with the template. Literary terms, as per the teachers' template. Elaboration upon literary term. Proof. Aesthetic sense. Elaboration upon literary term. Intertextuality: see the cooking metaphor. Intertextuality and a new theme: see the discussion about the short story "Moving On." Misunderstanding or confusion: the mother is not moving out. Is Jacob confusing this story with "Moving On" now? Oh, I see: The girl, having decided to not move in with her mother, is having a hard time with her. Elaboration upon literary term. Reverts back to the theme about needing to be in charge. Reverts back to the independence theme. Why does Jacob say here that the children and grandchildren couldn't do it? They seemed to be doing fine. Their efforts, however, were not being recognized, validated.

Summary: Jacob confounds the concepts of being in charge and being independent—he sees them as synonymous, but they are not: giving other people orders is not the same as not needing other people’s help. Tyranny is not self-sufficiency. He begins his analysis according to the teachers’ formula: he poses a question and then attempts to answer his own question. Jacob dismissively recognizes the theme of independence—it’s “a struggle and everything.” The girl is the main character, according to Jacob’s interpretation, and her main problem is that she lacks confidence: “the girl doesn’t really think that she can do things on her own,” which is no wonder since “her grandmothers don’t really think any of the offspring can do things for themselves.” While the girl’s grandparents are capable of living according to the cultural model, they refuse to validate the capabilities of their progeny because “they always wanted to take care of things.” Jacob bases his connection with the story upon his father’s relationship with his—Jacob’s—grandmother, who will not let Jacob’s father shovel her driveway after a snowfall “so she can feel independent.” Maybe it is maintaining that illusion, that myth, the cultural model of not necessarily being but feeling independent that Jacob has intuited is the theme of this story. Jacob attempts to define good literature according to the teachers’ instruction, and he shares an aesthetic observation, a moment of powerful description. Jacob accepts the teachers’ instruction and is ambivalent about the dominant cultural model, as he grafts together his conceptions of power and independence. While “Everyone has to eventually move out of their house, and it’s really a problem with some family members,” the girl is capable of living independently if only her mother or her grandmothers would validate her new self. Jacob does not explicitly question this need for validation. We cannot be independent until social validation of our independence no longer matters.

Carmella (9) / (4)

1) I thought the story, “The Natural Resebalance” was a very good piece of literature. The author was very descriptive and had a good theme as to how indepenence in a person is always needed. The author clearly pointed out that it was not only Laura, who moved in with her grandmothers, but her mother and father who also tried to make the grandmothers relize they were grown up and could be on their own. The grandmothers, Anna, and Angelina, feel the need to always be doing something or everything, and that still occurs in situations even today. The last sentence in the story was when she was talking to her mother saying her grandmothers do give her indepenence and she said “Hold on, I’ll get them,” but when I looked in the dining room nobody was sitting there. I found them in the kitchen, doing the dishes.” This is showing that just

Judgment.

Literary term.

Theme: a person needs independence.

Students are recognizing as most important that one cannot have a sense of independence without the validation of those whose opinions you value and who have formed the mirror of your own self-reflection. I am sure the grandmothers “realize” that their children are grown and married and have children of their own; what they have not done is to legitimize, validate a sense of approval, a recognition of competency; if the grandmothers do not validate the perception, it ceases to exist, if not as an external reality, then as a sense of

when she thought she was getting her independence, it's not so, like in many cases today.	that reality as anything that may be internalized. The girl has certainly gotten her independence; what she has been deprived of is her sense of independence.
2) In the story "The Natural Resemblance," it is about how a girl Laura moves in with her two grandmothers but always strives for her own independence that she often doesn't get with her grandmothers. A quote that most reminds me of this would be when Laura was on the phone with her mother and she said "Look mom, I'm a big girl now. I'm independent too. They know I can take care of myself." For a minute I almost believed it." This quote tells how she is in dire need for her grandmothers to let her grow up. She knows that her grandmothers aren't doing this to be malicious but to try and help but Laura needs them to see she is grown up and needs to be trusted to do her own thing. To be able to take care of herself like many other people want. People strive to be their own person but are held back because of society or their own friends and family.	Theme: a young woman striving for independence—the cultural model. Copies the quotation. I wonder what is the antecedent of "it"? That her grandmothers perceive her as independent, or that she herself believes in her own independence? How can the grandmothers "let" the girl "grow up," or restrain her either? But all the grandmothers did was to react understandably, not at all unkindly, to an unfamiliar dinner and they did the dishes. What does this have to do with trust or denying the girl freedom to do her own thing? It has more to do with tradition, heritage, comfort, and competence.
3) In the story, "A Natural Resemblance", it told about how Laura moved in with her two grandmothers to stay in the city. The grandmothers were your typical, stubborn Italian family. Cooking big meals, constant food, fun, very family oriented, very welcoming, but at the same time very stubborn and pushy. I think that the story told about how people may think they're doing something good but really take it to far. I remember I was having a big party for my great grandmother. Well it was a lot of preparation and a lot to do, so to help, my other Grandmother was constantly asking what to do and felt she needed to do everything because of superiority. Well my mother got fed up	This is the only recognition by a student that this story is really a lighthearted look at a young woman's cultural heritage. However, even Carmella does not perceive the story as humorous. Theme: good intentions may result in hurt feelings when they are stubbornly adhered to. Personal connection: family.

and my Grandmother backed off but did things on her own. This relates to the story in how Laura just strives to be independent without much help from her grandmothers but they feel they have to much like with the party we had for my great grandmother.	Reconnects to the story, as per instructions. Carmella does not perceive the help the young woman's grandparents are giving her.
4) In a good piece of literature I look for three main things. I look for good descriptions, very vivid. I look for suspense and thrill and I look for irony. In the story, "A Natural Resemblance, it contained only one of the three things I require. The story had very good detailed and simile descriptions. For example when Laura first moved in with her grandmothers, she described the top floor of the house with such good detail. She said ". . . in the morning when the sun would insist its way in, spilling over the bed like melted butter. It hit the pillow first, moving toward the foot like a curious, desultory lover." Descriptions like that really give me a good description as to how things look so as I'm reading I can picture it in my mind. So, although this story didn't contain all the things I look for in good literature, I would recomend it because the descriptions were incredible.	Defines good literature, as per the template provided by the teachers. Literary terms. Evaluation. Elaboration upon literary term. Literary term usage reflects confusion. Proof: aesthetic appreciation.
Summary: Carmella quickly states her acceptance of the dominant cultural model as it informs the story's theme: "independence in a person is always needed." Carmella perceives as most important that one cannot have a sense of independence without the validation of those whose opinions you value and who have formed the mirror of your own self-reflection. I am sure the grandmothers "realize" that their children are grown and married and have children of their own; what they have not done is to legitimize, validate a sense of approval, a recognition of competency; if the grandmothers do not validate the perception, it ceases to exist, if not as an external reality, then as a sense of that reality as anything that may be internalized. The girl has certainly gotten her independence; what she has been deprived of is her sense of independence. Carmella is the one student who recognizes the cultural aspect of the story: "The grandmothers were your typical, stubborn Italian family. Cooking big meals, constant food, fun, very family oriented, very welcoming, but at the same time very stubborn and pushy," but she finds nothing really humorous about the story, and it does not alter her thematic interpretation—the story is about independence, not love. Carmella's connection is based upon her grandmother's relationship with her great-grandmother and is essentially plot-related. Carmella attempts to use a few literary terms as she defines good literature, and she shares one moment of aesthetically powerful description.	

Anna (8) / (3)	
1) The story “A Natural Resemblance” is a very well written short storie. There are a couple things I would like to question the author. I would really want to know what happends next and what is going to happend when the daughter realizes how stubborn she was. The one major problem that made me think about was the daughter moving in with her grandparents but then telling her mother she knows how to take care of herself and that she’s an independant big girl. The daughter doesn’t realize what she’s doing even though she thinks she does. Sometimes in life your parents need to let you make a decision of your own, one that you think you could handle and learn from your mistake. The daughter made a mistake by moving in with her stubborn grandmother like herself because later on she will realize how picky her grandparents are or she just might want to go back to her mother but it will probably be too late.	Question, as per template. Focus is on concern for the daughter when she realizes her tragic flaw—stubbornness. Understanding. Intersubjectivity: Anna feels herself to be wiser than the character. Theme as a moral: as their children grow older, parents must let their children decide important matters for themselves, even when the parents know better. It is an opportunity to learn. Anna sees home as a place to which one may not always be able to return. You can’t go home again, not after certain decisions have been made.
2) C: The mother responds to her daughter by saying to her “Sure, you wait . . .” Her mother must have gone through something like this and she knows that what her daughter thinks big girl, independent, and knowing how to take of herself is nothing close to what it really is. She is letting her daughter make her own decisions and then later on, most likely regret them. Living with your grandparents doesn’t show that you’ve become a big girl or independant, and no where near being able to take care of yourself. Her daughter will eventually figure out her stubbornness and her big mistake but it might be too late to go back. At some point in life she will need to learn how to do all those things she is already but she doesn’t realize that she really isn’t ready yet. She will also realize how much she will need her mother and she will say to herself “I should have listened.”	Copies part of the quotation. Intersubjectivity: Anna’s conjectures about the mother’s prior life. Theme: the laughable, pathetic, self-absorbed, self-deception of the uninitiated. Anna essentially undercuts the entire premise of the story’s theme, as that theme has been articulated by other students. Again, there are some actions, determined by our faults, from which we cannot recover. What exactly does Anna feel the girl is not ready for? Intersubjectivity: I wonder to whom and about whom Anna is writing.

3) The story talks about people in general and how they can have their moments of wanting to do their own thing. The granddaughter wanted to move out of her mother's house and her mother couldn't stop her because she is very stubborn. I remember one time a friend of mine moved out and didn't listen to her parents and moved out but after a little while she find out that the closest person is her mother. Just like the granddaughter moved out and didn't listen to her mother but she never admit that her mother is more important. Sometimes teenagers, even myself, think that what we want to do is the right thing for us and we refuse to listen to our parents. After we realize that it was a mistake, sometimes, there is no way going back. These are some example where it is shown that I could closely relate to this story with life experiences. This story is a good lesson for teenagers who think moving out is a great idea.	Theme: the consequences of doing your own thing. Is there a difference between moving out and just not moving back in? I think so, in which case Anna's personal story has dominated Anna's perceptions of what is literally in the story. Personal connection: a friend. Anna reflects vaguely and in the second person plural about her own experiences. Theme: the timeless consequences of some temporal decisions. I am left with the feeling that Anna moved out and thereby estranged herself from her mother. I also get the sense that things didn't work out so well—that her moving out was a bad idea, in retrospect.
4) The author was successful in creating a good piece of literature. There was good conflict and the author was able to describe every situation very well. An example of well described situation is when the family sat down for dinner and he explained how the grandparents were thankful that their grand daughter cooked for them and how they split chores. If one cooks the others do the dishes. Also another thing is when the author was telling the readers about the notes they left for each other. Good conflict situations were when the grandmother offerered her grand daughter to stay and live with them but her mother wasn't really able to agree. Her daughter is old enough now and wants to try on her own how is it living without parents. In the end her mother realizes that her daughter just like her mother are very stubborn people but they made things work between them. These literary techneques	Judgment. Literary term. Literary term. Proof. Elaboration upon literary term. Detail: what the detail proves is vague to me. Understanding and detail, again, vaguely used. Elaboration upon literary term. Understanding and detail. Actually, her daughter has just returned from college, where she has lived without parents for four years. The common tragic flaw—stubbornness—is the focus of Anna's interpretation.

make this literature a good piece.	
Summary: Anna focuses on the daughter and her one tragic flaw—her stubbornness. For Anna, this story is about what will happen to the girl when she realizes her tragic flaw. Will it be too late for her life to be redeemed? I have a feeling Anna's interpretation is colored by what is happening in her own life. Anna writes that the "daughter doesn't realize what she's doing even though she thinks she does." Since nothing in the story indicates the girl's incompetence, I sense Anna is looking in a self-perceived mirror. Anna's thematic interpretation is that "sometimes in life your parents need to let you make a decision of your own," and by the time the consequences of those decisions are realized Anna "just might want to go back to her mother but it will probably be too late." As we have seen, Anna tends to personalize her interpretations of literature. Next, Anna needs to learn how to use the text to exemplify her intensely personal interpretations.	
Tanya (7) / (3)	
1) When I saw the title I thought it was going to be about someone who is sick and they probably told them there is nothing to do to help the person and it can only be Natural and let their body do it. Come to find out the story is about a girl that graduates from Princeton and wants to find an apartment for her in the City. Her grandmother tells her to come live with her and she does. She notices that they eat a lot of pasta and things like that. She tries to help them by making dinner that is more healthy. The whole point of this story is that her grandmother does change and that how she has been living for most of her life with her sister. Her granddaughter is trying to show them other things in life that you can do and eat.	As per the template, Tanya explores her interpretation of the story's title, prior to having read the story. Disfluency. Understanding. Intersubjectivity: Tanya is a large young lady. Perhaps she has been told to eat more healthfully, too. How does the grandmother change?
2) The quotation that says "Look Mom, I'm a big girl now. I'm independent too. They know I can take care of myself" for a minute I almost believed it. This quote is about how her mother does have that much faith in her because she now how her grandmother is like that & how she is with her and father. The mother thinks that the grandmother is going to run her life and her daughter will never be her own person. Little does her mother know that she is trying to change her grandmother little by little while she lives there.	Copies the quotation. Interpretation of quotation. The mother is concerned that the grandmothers will destroy the girl's chances of ever achieving the cultural model.
3) This story says that people can be	

over controlling and that it only takes a person to just know and try to help one change eventually. I cant say that because I have a control Family Member who wants thing her way But now that we told her that she that way she tryes to work on it. This reminds me of this movie called Bats which was about a lady who was controlling and no one wanted to be around her. Until one day so one told her how she was and from there she tryed to change and be nice and let other people choose things too.	Theme: one person, like the girl, can change other controlling people and thereby help them. Personal connection: not family. Personal connection: movie. Plot connection. Does not explicitly connect her personal connection back to the story.
4) Good literature is something that might be ironic, drama, and suspense. I think this story had it, this story had drama because the grandmother was controlling and he daughter didn't like it and now she waiting until she die so that she can take over their life because she been controlling it. There is suspense because you dont know if she would last in the house with he grandmother and her grandma keep gooding the rate as she does. It ironic how her Mother use to live with her Mother, now her daughter stays with her and she thinks how her life gone to be messed up because of the grandmother.	Literary terms. Elaboration upon literary term. I cannot help but think the author has a good enough sense of humor to laugh at the irony of this interpretation. We wait most anxiously for the death of those elders we most love and therefore whose approval we ineluctably and savagely seek. Disfluency. Elaboration upon literary terms. The mother knows the granddaughter is doomed. Very interesting, in a Eugene O'Neill kind of way. No mention of the story's ending.
Summary: Tanya's response is an idiosyncratic interpretation of the story founded on the belief that the girl is trying to change her grandmothers—she is trying to get them to eat better—"they eat a lot of pasta." Since the daughter fails in her attempt, she is now "waiting until [her grandmothers] die so that she can take over their life because [the grandmothers have] been controlling [her life]." Tanya's connects her thematic interpretation of the story with a movie she has seen and is plot-related. Tanya attempts to employ the teachers' instructions—she uses literary terms, she creates a theme, she connects the theme to a movie, and she evaluates the quality of the story. At the same time, Tanya's voice is discernible. The disfluency evident in Tanya's answer attests to her attempts to use a speech genre currently unfamiliar to her.	
Isabel (6) / (3)	
1) When I first read the tittle my thought were, "oh this story is probably about the resemblance of two people". As i kept on reading i realized it was about a young girl who just got out of college, and she is looking for an apartment. I thought	Follows the instructional template. Understanding.

that her and her granmothers didnt get along to good because when they offered for her to stay at their house, she kept telling them no thank you, this makes me think about when i was 8 years old my uncle didnt want to live with my granma anymore but she wanted him to stay. it reminds me about the story because its similar to it. Also the father didnt say much to his daughter the mom seem to wine alot.	Personal connection: her family. Emotionally absent father. Whiney mother.
2) A: I think this quote relates to the tittle of the story because the mom is telling her daughter that shes just like her Grandmothers and the tittle is "A Natural Resemblance". but then again the mom could be jealous that her daughter choosed her grandmothers over her mom. I also think her mom was not ready to let her go, or the mom was mad cause she spent alot trien to get a house and things like that.	Connects quotation to the title. Interpretation of mother's emotional response: jealousy, reluctance to let go, sense of being unappreciated.
3) This story Reminds me when I was little and my uncle didnt want to live with my mom's mom. and she wanted him to stay because he had just got back from military and she didnt want him to go away again. also what this story says about people in general is that some like to be independent, they do things on their own, they dont like to depend on someone else. It reminds me of a t.v. show also cause in the t.v. show the mom and dad were so used to taking care of their daughter they were scared for their daughters to leave their house.	Repetition of personal connection. Theme: a young person's striving to be independent. Personal connection: television. Does not connect back to the story.
4) A good Piece of literature to me has, realistic character, suspense, and a background. yes this Author did a good job in creating a good Piece of literature. The characters seemed to be realistic because the girl had just go out of college. "I had just graduated from Princeton". Also it had some suspense because the mom kept on bragin about her daughter leaving their home. The story had all kinds of backgrounds. It discribed the	Defines good literature, as per the template. Literary terms. Background? Judgment. Elaboration upon literary term. Proof, vaguely used. Elaboration upon literary term. Proof, vaguely used. Elaboration upon literary term.

grandmothers homes and how they lived, it also described how the daughters mom lived. This story was a good Piece of literature.	Proof.
Summary: Isabel begins her analysis by following the formula, the template, offered by the teachers: she attempts to anticipate, to predict, the story before having read it. Quickly, Isabel makes a personal connection between the story and her uncle and grandmother—she returns to and elaborates upon this connection later. Isabel notes the father’s silence throughout the story and she perceives the mother as whiney. After Isabel attempts to explain the story’s title, she focuses her emotional interpretation upon the mother who “could be jealous that her daughter choosed her grandmothers over her mom. I also think her mom was not ready to let her go, or the mom was mad cause she spent a lot trying to get a house and things like that.” Isabel accepts the dominant cultural model—“what this story says about people in general is that some like to be independent”—and she interprets the story’s message accordingly. Isabel, for some reason, offers another personal connection, this time a television show; this connection, too, is plot-based. Isabel attempts to use literary terms as she evaluates the quality of the story, and she includes a short passage.	

CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to inquire into the epistemological interplay between teachers and a defined population of students in a school setting where the curriculum has a purportedly focused intent. In my inquiry, the students were identified, according to various test results—administered for purposes unrelated to the Saturday Academy’s enrollment—and teacher recommendations, to be at-risk for not passing the state of Connecticut’s Academic Performance Test (CAPT) as mandated under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The NCLB act concerns itself with four specific populations, or “subgroups,” of students: racial and ethnic minority groups, students living in poverty, students with disabilities, and English language learners. Since the state has focused its attention upon these subgrouped students, the school, the East Millton Academy (EMA), has also done so, thereby creating a kind of distinct subcultural population of students. The mandatory goal of the law is for 100% of all students to achieve a level of “Proficient” in reading, mathematics, and science by the year 2014; towards that goal, if any of a school’s subgroups do not achieve Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading and mathematics, things begin to happen, culminating in all the teachers being fired and the state taking over the administration of the school. This, as one can imagine, makes for a high stakes testing environment.

To address the needs of these “at-risk” students, the East Millton Academy established the Saturday Academy, a series of ten Saturday morning classes in reading, math, writing, and science, intended to prepare students for the CAPT.

My goal as I observed the Saturday Academy reading classes, and as I analyzed my data, was to begin to form an understanding of the meaning students were making of their experiences in the Saturday Academy. Specifically, I attempted to focus on the effects teachers and students were having upon one another's epistemologies.

I entered into my study with one most important preconception based upon intuition and personal experience: School is school, whether it's on Saturday or any other day; therefore, Saturday Academy students' experiences, cognitively speaking, become part of their school schemata, whatever form that category takes and wherever that category resides. Likewise, the teachers of the Saturday Academy interact with the students and deliver their curriculum in a manner consistent with their regular weekday classes. This preconception is supported by Sophie and Shelly during our interview (20-29). Neither students nor teachers distinguish between the Saturday Academy and regular school. They could have, if the program had been differently conceived—it could have been designed to be daring and ultra-progressive, but it wasn't. Thus, just like regular school experiences, Saturday Academy experiences have the intrinsic power to either reinforce or redefine existing school-related schemata, particularly those schemata-determined perceptions and interpretations pertaining to social identities, institutional identities, and worldviews. Their school-related schemata—the interpretive lens through which students will perceive and then interpret their experiences—is in part determined by their epistemology—their implicit, unconscious beliefs (though epistemological beliefs need not be either implicit or

unconscious) concerning the nature of knowledge: “what counts as knowledge, where it is located, and how knowledge increases” (Fitzgerald & Cunningham, 2002). For the purposes of this study I have focused on only one aspect of understanding the nature of knowledge: its source. The reason I focused on this singular aspect is because it is a component of many theorists’ definitions of epistemology, and I found it to be observable and verifiable.

Pragmatically, this is what makes this study crucially important. These students are at-risk, not because they have enjoyed unparalleled success in school and have thereby constructed empowering and productive school-related schemata, but because they have failed. With greater frequency they are rejecting the academic experiences the school system is offering them, and with each failure their debilitating school-related schemata, with all its destructive and socially-constructed implications, is being reinforced. School, with its vast institutional power, works to form the personhoods—the social and institutional identities and worldviews—of its young and impressionable students from the age of five to eighteen. Ironically, special programs like the Saturday Academy that students voluntarily attend are more highly leveraged than the regular school that students attend by force of law. This is because the students volunteer with renewed hope—they wear their schematas on their sleeves. It would be tragic if, instead of providing experiences that inspire students to re-imagine themselves, their personhoods and their place within society, these special programs reinforce debilitating, disempowering schemata. Perhaps the essential difference between lifelong learners and everyone else is the mutability of their schemata—the ability

to perceive the possibility of a different reality created through the deconstruction of schemata formed in the context of docility and failure and the subsequent reconstruction of schemata to be formed in the context of creative joy, where knowledge is not only delivered by authoritative figures, but is also freely created, intuited, fabricated from other explicit learning experiences, and, perhaps most importantly, derived from valorized personal experiences lived in the context of the Home and Neighborhood. It is our epistemology that enables or cripples our ability to create or to recreate efficacious and ever-evolving schemata. I believe this, and it is to inquire into the critical epistemological interplay between teachers and students that is the purpose of this study.

Results and Discussion

My results are guided by the following precept: the purpose of an inquiry such as this, employing a grounded theory, qualitative, participant observation, microethnographic discourse analysis methodology, is, ideally, to develop a valid interpretation of how participants are making sense of—“resymbolizing” (Bleich, 1978— their perceptions of events in the setting. The validity of a Grounded Theory inquiry is determined by the researcher maintaining a close proximity to the data—letting the data, not the researcher’s socio-political agenda, guide the findings, the inclusion of all data in the write up, a transparency of data analysis, and an intensive reflexivity on the part of the researcher (Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui, & Joseph, 2005). So, instead of “findings” that I can defend with some level of scientific certainty I have derived indications arising from my data and their implications explicitly stated herein.

Teachers of the Saturday Academy established an inflexible institutional discursive context within the classroom. This institutional discursive context allowed for the activation of only one epistemological resource—that which understands the source of knowledge as being authoritative figures verbally delivering skills and information to less knowledgeable and less capable recipients. This is a context that does not value, or even recognize, knowledge as being derived from intuition, free creation, fabrication based upon prior explicit learning experiences, or prior lived experiences in the context of the Home and Neighborhood. Students, with a tenacity born of an intuitive understanding of their own innate epistemological needs and capabilities, challenge the institutional context, as only a contextual change will allow for the activation of alternative productive epistemological resources (Hammer & Elby, 2002).

Evidence of the established institutional context is found in the analysis of the teachers' discursive practices and in the attempts made by students to alter this context (see Figure 4.1). Student resistance to this discursive context is evident in the analysis of their discourse as well. Students challenge the teacher-established context with humor, creativity, personal overtures, personal stories, cultural invitations, and, when all else fails, disruptive behavior. In spite of all the challenges, students end the final class compliant and academically docile. But what about their epistemological beliefs? How have their beliefs about the source of knowledge been affected?

Throughout the ten days of the Saturday Academy, the students have had projected upon them what their teachers assume to be their (the students')

worldviews. Concomitant with their worldviews being defined for them, they have also experienced the hegemonic imposition of social and institutional identities, some of which they accept and others against which they rebel. They have been told, subtly yet repeatedly, their world is a preeminently violent place that, soon, will leave them alone to fend for themselves—their families “or whatnot” will no longer be available to protect or to guide them; their skills can only be judged by experts—professors, teachers, and test-scorers; their friends are a distraction that must be ignored or informed upon; when given liberty they make faces at one another and play with their hair; no one wants to read their life stories because they do not have the requisite skills to make those stories credible; they are neither invited nor expected ever to enter the world of academia—they just “need” to pass the CAPT, to “get it done,” so even their needs are defined for them; if they sit up, focus, and copy the cultural models things are going to work out as well as can be expected, and if they don’t, well, they are morally culpable since they were predestined to fail in the first place by powers too great for us to contradict. This is quite a message for young people with a revived sense of hope to internalize as they construct their personhoods. So, again, do they internalize it? If they do, then their epistemological beliefs concerning the source of knowledge—even personal knowledge about their most personal selves—are thereby revealed.

As is evidenced by the students’ responses the CAPT RTL questions, students, at the time the assessment was administered, inhabited a kind of epistemological middle ground—a DMZ of literary analysis—between their

natural, culturally-situated discourse and a speech genre—vague, ill-defined, decontextualized, and supposedly formulaic (which it really is not)—with which they were trying to show the highest possible level of facility. In their answers, students generally reject the teachers’ projected worldview: families are forever and you can go home again; at the same time, they accept without question the dominant cultural model of the self-sufficient citizen and, what is more interesting, they premise their interpretations on the implicit belief that any important personal evolution must be validated by loved ones. What is exciting about this is that, while students recognize and valorize the knowledge derived by authoritative sources, they also strive for the activation of alternative epistemological resources that would reform debilitating schemata into schemata allowing for the perceptions and interpretation of themselves as secure, efficacious, empowered persons. All we teachers have to do is to create the appropriate context—the “epistemological bridge” (Hammer & Elby, 2002).

The disfluency observable in students’ discourse and the lack of eloquence, fluency, and depth of analysis in their writing could easily be misconstrued as incompetence. Admittedly, in many cases incompetence might well be an accurate determination. But so what? What important information is gathered by the summative assessment of a developing skill? You will miss a lot of crucial information if you assess my swimming aptitude—my motivation and my social and institutional identities—only by the observation that I am drowning. Maybe my brother just pounded me, or maybe I haven’t eaten anything healthful in a couple days, or maybe for the first time I’m trying to do the butterfly stroke. What

you want to look for, at this stage, are skills-in-development. These skills, I contend, are evident in the students' written responses—in the intertextuality, intersubjectivity, and interdiscursivity perceptible in a textual analysis of their written answers. Remarkably, the CAPT provides for such an assessment. While question #1 of the RTL section of the CAPT calls for a free exploration of perceptions and interpretations, question #2 requires intersubjectivity (what sense can you make of a character's words and actions), question #3 requires intertextuality (what other texts inform thematically your interpretation of the story), and question #4 requires interdiscursivity (using the speech genre of literary analysis, evaluate in your natural discourse the story's aesthetic value according to your own definition of good literature). It's like they had planned it!

So the next step is to forge an evidentiary link between intersubjectivity, intertextuality, and interdiscursivity in students' writing and their activated epistemological resources. In a decontextualized context, such as that in which the students create answers to the CAPT, students must create their own imaginary contexts capable of activating alternative epistemological resources. This is what students need practice doing—creating their own epistemological bridges; it is a skill that can be taught through authentic discourse. Those who are particularly good at it do it easily—it is this ability that I.Q. tests assess. Those who can't imagine alternative contexts are confined to use a small and thereby debilitating set of their innate, potentially-available epistemological resources. In the extreme case, a student who has completely adopted the teacher-as-sole-source-of-knowledge epistemological stance feels no need to imagine alternative contexts.

In the institutional context of the Saturday Academy, such a student's written answers would evidence: 1) an unquestioned acceptance of a bleak and fearful worldview where we all do whatever we must do to survive, alone, regardless of how our actions affect others; 2) an inability to interpret empathically the words and actions of characters, since there is no source of knowledge providing explicit and definitive hints, and students have not practiced this necessary skill for literary analysis and human survival; 3) a dearth of reference to his own prior experiences in favor of references to movies, which were the teachers' most referenced source for literary connections; and 4) a formulaic, stilted, and inauthentic writing style, as if the student were an imposter, using literary terms and strategies with no sense of meaning, just because he has been told to do so.

The students' written responses are an ambivalent mix of natural text production and best-effort schoolspeak: they have heard the teachers, and they attempt to employ the teachers' instructions, but they reject the teachers' worldview. The students whose skills are most in need of help adopt most completely the teachers' epistemology. For example, Bruno, who received the lowest possible reading score on the CAPT, states to me in his interview, "Everything that they taught us is at the academy basically that's what I went over and the CAPT test and (pause) hopefully (pause) I did good on the CAPT so (pause) I did what they did and if I did what they did I should do good on the CAPT" (6). I often speak with Bruno—he is a bright, energetic, charismatic young man, yet, in spite of his hopeful acceptance of the teachers as credible sources of knowledge, his inability to imagine alternative contexts restricts his

ability to activate alternative epistemological resources. It is not that Bruno lacks epistemological sophistication, it's just that he needs practice—in the form of text creation through discourse and feedback on his writing—imagining alternative contexts that would allow him to activate those epistemological resources and to thereby create his own knowledge. Bruno attempts to use the literary terms he has been instructed to use, and he attempts to state the story's theme: "The author symbolism is not everything gonna be the same, sometimes it will change." The term "symbolism" obviously makes no sense to him, and the theme of this story, in his mind, must be the same as the theme of "Moving On," which the teachers told him, too. He even accepts the teachers' projected worldview:

Sometimes you gonna afto move away from your parents most the times
you going be there all the time around them, their is a word name move on
the gotto understand that she is not go to be a baby your whole life she
grow up . . .

Yet the formula does not work for Bruno. In his interview he exhibits ambivalence, recognizes his need for his classmates (14)—"others"—as he analyzes his reading, yet you don't participate until you have the answer (29), and then you "just do it" (33); ultimately, "the teachers kinda left us on our own to find out what's going on" (125). Bruno has received the teachers' worldview, and he accepts, with ambivalence (he still recognizes the dog as the focus of his emotional interpretation of the short story "Moving On" (26)), their authority. After some leading questions posed by me, he says:

some kids probably they didn't pick up on it like fast as they could of or how they wanted to pick up on it, so that kinda made it hard for them, 'cause the teacher wasn't discussing a lot, arguing, ask you know opinions and all that stuff . . . (65)

Here, Bruno imagines a context where knowledge is not necessarily acquired quickly and where it is created from many sources using alternative epistemological resources. Surprisingly, Bruno does not perceive English class, or literary analysis, as a place that allows for authentic discussion; instead, and this is troubling to me, math and science are the subjects about which one may explore alternative interpretations:

Well, li like sometimes, yeah sometimes, like in my biology class now it doesn't have anything to do with English or history, science and math I have more argument on on those two subjects even though English and history the two main subjects than math and science but I think I have more arguments in math and science than English and history. (117)

Imagine that! This is a result of the CAPT and the pervasive institutional discursive context it imposes upon the English class, if teachers allow it to do so. The final strategy Bruno has retained and which he shares with me is to “skim”: “try skimming skimming through the story again (emphatic) and see what you have if it's right or not” (135). Bruno is trying to do a lot of swimming here, and he is doing everything his instructor is telling him to do, yet what he needs is for someone to teach him a different type of skill—one that has much more to do with epistemology, schemata reformation, literary analysis, and the creation of an

efficacious and empowered view of himself and his world than it does with strategizing his way through the CAPT.

Another example, Anna, one of the more academically successful Saturday Academy students (she received a passing CAPT reading score), maintains a contradictory epistemological perspective. In our interview she says, “You just go to school and you learn how to learn . . . you’re not born with (pause) any ability learning skills” (2) and “there really isn’t, um, a discovery on how to improve your ability to learn” (37); this may be due to the fact that school has not validated her primary source of knowledge—her own lived experiences—and teachers have therefore proven to be confusing: in response to my question (taken from the Schommer Epistemological Questionnaire—see Appendix A) “Things are not as complicated as teachers make them out to be” (46), Anna says,

Mmmm. I don’t completely agree with that unless the teacher really confuses you with, with the thing they’re trying to tell you. (I laugh.)

Because that has happened to me ah my support teacher always used to confuse you when I asked for help so I just thought I’d do it myself. (47)

Not surprisingly, when she is allowed to reference her own prior experiences her epistemological beliefs change:

you have your own, um, thought of the book (pause) so it doesn’t always have to be what the author, like you can take things, like you can um, take things sometimes in a different way than what someone else wants you (pause) take ‘em. (56)

Suddenly Anna, albeit implicitly, recognizes that, when she creates a context where there is no one single authoritative source of knowledge so she may reference herself, she has an innate ability to learn. Not surprisingly, Anna's written responses are intensely personal. As with Bruno, after some prompting on my part, Anna acknowledges the lack of authentic discourse in the Saturday Academy. While she worries about how her peers might perceive her if she were to talk too much about the stories: "they might think I'm just trying to be all stuck up and Oh I know everything (I laugh) you know" (123), she recognizes her classmates' general lack of academic motivation. When provided the space to explore her perceptions further, she interprets the teachers' pedagogy with impressive insight: "the teachers seemed to have one goal, to go over all the work and just explain to you what you should know for the CAPT, and not exactly to help you understand very well" (141), yet she still does not see herself as a credible source in the eyes of others: "it's not like anyone's gonna listen to my to what I have to say" (149).

In this instance Anna is probably correct. For the teachers of the Saturday Academy, knowledge is both a destination and a transferable possession. "We need to give them the knowledge" (1), Sophie says in her interview. Knowledge is something teachers "show" after students have attempted to form their own, after they have "done it" (4). The teachers assume a parental-like authority: "I feel like we kind of (pause) you know baby it a little bit in the beginning just to get them get used to it and to feel comfortable so then we can kinda throw them in" (29). Once students were "thrown in" they "came leagues away from where they were

when they walked in on that first day” (34). Are the students drifting in the overpowering current or are they self-propelled? Most pertinent is Sophie’s comment, “They they have a hard time unless it is about them (emphatic)” (89). This was Anna’s “problem.” The personal distance that Sophie maintained throughout the ten classes is reflected in an interaction she had with Hannah, which she recounted to me:

Hannah I saw a few days ago, “Why didn’t you tell me?” I’m like, “Why didn’t I tell you what?” “That you were pregnant when you were teaching us.” And I said, “Is it your business? [I laugh] I didn’t realize I had to tell you.” (99)

Finally, as when Shelly diagnosed Marcus’s back problems, Sophie diagnoses and then hands off to other professionals the students’ emotional needs: “And that’s part of the problem is that, I don’t know if it’s like, they need therapy and then they would be able to pay attention more (rising intonation)” (103). Sophie revisits a powerful and perplexing moment in the middle of day five when, amid the emotional sharing of sad stories, Sophie terminated the episode by having the students copy a teacher-created RTL response:

(After talking about feedback.) Yeah there was one question that you asked me, I don’t know if it was at the end of the day or during one class and I was just like Oh I didn’t even think about that (laughs). Oh you know I think (amid my recalling of that moment) yeah you said “Did you do this because,” oh it was when I because it was so intense in the class the discussion so I just gave them something to copy down so no one was

crying (amid my agreement), and I just did it because we were running out of time, I didn't do it because I was really thinking of anything intelligent, but really it had made sense to do that at that moment because they were so hot headed. (123)

Intense emotional displays born of authentic connections between students' prior experiences and their reading are threatening to Sophie. I don't know why. To me, this is what it's all about.

When my children first started taking swimming lessons, their instructor told them, as they flailed away frantically in the water, to reach their hands as far beyond their heads as they could, as if they were picking an apple off of a tree, and then to put the apple into their pocket, and to keep doing that, and as they tried to do so she repeated her words while offering frequent words of encouragement and advice. This is a change of context—an epistemological bridge—from the water to the orchard, and this context change allowed my children to make sense of the act of swimming; they were suddenly doing what they were always physically and mentally capable of doing, but in a different context. The Saturday Academy students are not dull. They too are capable of doing what the state is asking them to do, and what they obviously want to do as well. Without a doubt their skills need much attention, but the students are confused about epistemological resources they may use and they do not know how to activate them as they address their own needs. By assuming a position of authoritative source of knowledge in an unwavering institutional context, and by delivering test-taking strategies and literary terms without first considering the activation of students' innate

epistemological resources, teachers impose upon students an impoverished epistemology. To then assess their assimilation of that instruction and to judge the students accordingly risks reinforcing debilitating and disempowering school-related schemata. The teachers are, metaphorically, “throwing them” into a context for which they are unprepared to learn and to which they have had unequal access.

Conclusion

This inquiry was not intended to be about the CAPT or the CAPT’s influence upon the students; instead, the CAPT was only supposed to be a part of the setting—a device enabling me to define a subcultural population of students and a curriculum with a specific intent, thereby eliminating important ambiguities. But I found it impossible to not make the CAPT and its effects upon the students an important consideration as I analyzed the implications of my data. The institutional forces empowering the CAPT make it an anthropomorphic presence in the classroom, it predisposes the teachers to create an institutionally-empowered discursive context and to assume the position of authoritative dispenser of predetermined knowledge, thereby invalidating students’ prior knowledge—understanding formed in the context of Home and Neighborhood—as an epistemological resource. While students attempt to challenge and to change this hegemonic structure, they fail to do so. Overpowered by the Government, the Factory, the Temple, and the School, all of which assume their moral authority from the religious overlay pervasive in our culture, the students’ natural discourse is colonized by the speech genre of the Institutional context: a pseudo-intellectual

form of literary analysis intended to reveal the students' reading ability. The technologization of the students' discourse indicates a hidden curriculum, one that attempts to form the students' sense of personhood: their social identity, their institutional identity, and their worldview. The extent to which students accept, reject, or modify these determinations reflects the extent to which their epistemologies have been affected and, in turn, the extent to which an opportunity to reform debilitating and disempowering school-related schemata has been tragically missed. To the contrary, debilitating and disempowering school-related schemata have been reinforced. Evidence of the effect the teachers' epistemology has upon students' epistemologies may be discovered in the students' classroom discourse and in their responses to the RTL section of the CAPT.

Intersubjectivity, intertextuality, and interdiscursivity in the students' written responses are indicators of students' attempts to create an epistemological bridge—to change the decontextualized context of this test into a context that allows for the activation of productive epistemological resources. This demands a shift in the paradigm that guides and justifies the assessment of the students' performance. It essentially obviates the invalidity of the CAPT as a summative assessment and a graduation requirement.

Future Research

The evidentiary link between the presence in a student's discourse (including written text production) of intersubjectivity, intertextuality, and interdiscursivity and a student's epistemological understanding of the source of knowledge is currently somewhat tentative; future research must inquire into this

connection. Certainly, such a refocusing of assessment would inspire reconsiderations of the current curriculum and how that curriculum might most efficaciously be formed and shared with students in order to improve students' literacy. The intentional creation of epistemological bridges—analyzing the discursive context of the reading classroom, imagining alternative contexts that might possibly activate alternative productive epistemological resources, and allowing students to discover how and when to create these alternative contexts themselves would be a possible beginning. A place to start might be in a literature classroom where students who were previously unsuccessful in school are realizing consistent, joyful success.

A Note Concerning My Voice

In my write up of this dissertation I have consciously and intentionally employed a first-person presence—I am part of this analysis. I did this for two reasons. First, and most simply, I had to keep my own interest. Where I seem to be losing perspective, well, I was, and I felt the need to entertain myself. In other places I felt a personality, such as it is, was needed, a sense of the human, and so I went with the feeling. I asked my wife if I should edit out all of these moments, and she advised against it. “It’s what you experienced,” she said. “It’s what you are experiencing now. You have to do what you have to do.” Second, I agree with the position stated passionately by Rogers et. al. (2005) that the researcher’s reflective presence is a crucial component of qualitative study such as this, lending validity to the process. In their review of the literature pertaining to critical discourse analysis in education, they decry the dearth of researcher reflexivity, the

proclivity of researchers to position “themselves as if they were outside the texts” (p. 382):

There was alarmingly little reflexivity in the articles that we reviewed.

Some of the articles did include a researcher role section—a rhetorical strategy that is commonplace in publishing qualitative research. However, many of the authors did not move from reflection to reflexivity. This is a problem, especially in education research, where researchers often have successful histories of participation within the education contexts where they are conducting research. (p. 386)

“Thus,” they write, “the classic tension between distance and closeness in the research setting is often blurred in educational research” (p. 382). They define reflexivity as comprised of three aspects: “participatory construction of the research design, reciprocity, and turning the analytic frame back on the researcher” (p. 381). According to this definition, while I have begun to be reflexive, more work remains to be done. Next time I would have to include the students and teachers when constructing the study’s design, the methodology by which I would accumulate and analyze data, I would have to include participants in the data analysis, and I would have to analyze my own written analysis with the same framework upon which I have structured this analysis. Establishing my own voice was just a first step.

Appendix A

SCHOMMER EPISTEMOLOGICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

c Copyright by

**Marlene Schommer, Ph.D. (As of July 1, 2000: Marlene Schommer-Aikins)
1995****THE COLLEGE VERSION OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS PUBLISHED
IN THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY** (This

journal should be cited when using this questionnaire)

Schommer, M. (1998). The influence of age and schooling on epistemological beliefs. The British Journal of Educational Psychology, 68, 551-562.

I regard the Schommer Epistemological Questionnaire as an experimental measure. Its properties are still under further investigation. Changes and refinements in the questionnaire are underway. We can all imagine misrepresentations about someone's epistemological beliefs inferred from Epistemological Scores. Furthermore, if factor scores are used then the scoring of the questionnaire is complex. Yet some individuals may use simplified methods that either represent or misrepresent an individual's epistemological beliefs. With this in mind I want to exercise control over the uses of this questionnaire. I ask that each use of the questionnaire be cleared through me by providing in a letter the following information:

1. name, address, phone number, and e-mail address of the investigator(s)
2. institutional affiliation
3. characteristics of the sample
4. purpose of using the test

I hope that this extra step does not inhibit use of the questionnaire -- all professional and student researchers affiliated with recognized institutions are encouraged to use it.

The development of useful instruments depends on the efforts of many people. A data bank of epistemological scores is being formed to develop group norms. Therefore, if you conduct research with one of the Schommer Epistemological Questionnaires (there are several versions), I would like to receive:

- (1) a copy of your report
- (2) a copy of the epistemological raw data
- (3) along with the characteristics of your sample (age, education, SES, urban-rural-inner city residence, ethnicity, IQ if possible, etc.)
- (4) the precise procedure used to administer this questionnaire (group setting or individual setting, who administered it, the researchers themselves or a third party)

such as classroom teacher, the kind of training the administrator of the test received, etc.).

(5) a description of any changes you made in the questionnaire, e.g., change in wording, change in number of items, translations to another language.

(6) if changes were made, I would like to have a copy of the modified questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Dr. Marlene Schommer -Aikins// College of Education #123 // Wichita State University //Wichita, Kansas 67260-0123 // (316) 978-3326

Schommer Epistemological Questionnaire
(second revision)
[for college students]

c Copyright by
Marlene Schommer, Ph. D.
1989

**AS OF DECEMBER 1998: THE COLLEGE VERSION OF THIS
QUESTIONNAIRE WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE BRITISH JOURNAL
OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY** (This journal should be cited when using
this questionnaire)

This questionnaire was used as an instrument in my dissertation, which is available through University Microfilm Incorporated (UMI) (1-800-521-0600). The dissertation number is 89-24938. A journal article from this dissertation has been published in 1990 in the Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(3), 498-50.

For further inquiry write to:
Dr. Marlene Schommer-Aikins
College of Education #123
Wichita State University
Wichita, KS 67260-0123
(316) 978-3326
e-mail: marlene.schommer-aikins@wichita.edu

Epistemological Questionnaire
Second Draft

By Marlene Schommer-Aikins

Directions: There are no right or wrong answers for the following questions. We want to know what you really believe. For each statement fill in the circle on the answer sheet for the degree to which you agree or disagree. (FN:QUESA.DIS)

Strongly Disagree

1

2

3

4

Strongly Agree

5

1. If you are ever going to be able to understand something, it will make sense to you the first time you hear it.
2. The only thing that is certain is uncertainty itself.
3. For success in school, it's best not to ask too many questions.
4. A course in study skills would probably be valuable.
5. How much a person gets out of school mostly depends on the quality of the teacher.
6. You can believe almost everything you read.
7. I often wonder how much my teachers really know.
8. The ability to learn is innate.
9. It is annoying to listen to a lecturer who cannot seem to make up his mind as to what he really believes.
10. Successful students understand things quickly.
11. A good teacher's job is to keep his students from wandering from the right track.
12. If scientists try hard enough, they can find the truth to almost anything.
13. People who challenge authority are over-confident.
14. I try my best to combine information across chapters or even across classes.
15. The most successful people have discovered how to improve their ability to learn.
16. Things are simpler than most professors would have you believe.

Strongly Disagree

1

2

3

Strongly Agree

4

5

17. The most important aspect of scientific work is precise measurement and careful work.
18. To me studying means getting the big ideas from the text, rather than details.
19. Educators should know by now which is the best method, lectures or small group discussions.
20. Going over and over a difficult textbook chapter usually won't help you understand it.
21. Scientists can ultimately get to the truth.
22. You never know what a book means unless you know the intent of the author.
23. The most important part of scientific work is original thinking.
24. If I find the time to re-read a textbook chapter, I get a lot more out of it the second time.
25. Students have a lot of control over how much they can get out of a textbook.
26. Genius is 10% ability and 90% hard work.
27. I find it refreshing to think about issues that authorities can't agree on.
28. Everyone needs to learn how to learn.
29. When you first encounter a difficult concept in a textbook, it's best to work it out on your own.
30. A sentence has little meaning unless you know the situation in which it is spoken.
31. Being a good student generally involves memorizing facts.
32. Wisdom is not knowing the answers, but knowing how to find the answers.
33. Most words have one clear meaning.
34. Truth is unchanging.

Strongly Disagree

1

2

3

Strongly Agree

4

5

35. If a person forgot details, and yet was able to come up with new ideas from a text, I would think they were bright.
36. Whenever I encounter a difficult problem in life, I consult with my parents.
37. Learning definitions word-for-word is often necessary to do well on tests.
38. When I study, I look for the specific facts.
39. If a person can't understand something within a short amount of time, they should keep on trying.
40. Sometimes you just have to accept answers from a teacher even though you don't understand them.
41. If professors would stick more to the facts and do less theorizing, one could get more out of college.
42. I don't like movies that don't have an ending.
43. Getting ahead takes a lot of work.
44. It's a waste of time to work on problems which have no possibility of coming out with a clear-cut and unambiguous answer.
45. You should evaluate the accuracy of information in a textbook, if you are familiar with the topic.
46. Often, even advice from experts should be questioned.
47. Some people are born good learners, others are just stuck with limited ability.
48. Nothing is certain, but death and taxes.
49. The really smart students don't have to work hard to do well in school.
50. Working hard on a difficult problem for an extended period of time only pays off for really smart students.
51. If a person tries too hard to understand a problem, they will most likely just end up being confused.

Strongly Disagree

1

2

3

Strongly Agree

4

5

52. Almost all the information you can learn from a textbook you will get during the first reading.
53. Usually you can figure out difficult concepts if you eliminate all outside distractions and really concentrate
54. A really good way to understand a textbook is to re-organize the information according to your own personal scheme
55. Students who are "average" in school will remain "average" for the rest of their lives.
56. A tidy mind is an empty mind.
57. An expert is someone who has a special gift in some area.
58. I really appreciate instructors who organize their lectures meticulously and then stick to their plan.
59. The best thing about science courses is that most problems have only one right answer.
60. Learning is a slow process of building up knowledge.
61. Today's facts may be tomorrow's fiction.
62. Self-help books are not much help.
63. You will just get confused if you try to integrate new ideas in a textbook with knowledge you already have about a topic.

Appendix B

Student and Teacher Epistemological Interplay in a High Stakes Testing Environment

Informed Consent—Parental Protocol

For questions about this study contact:

D. Bruce Bierman
The East Millton Academy
305 Broadway
Millton, CT 06369
860-887-2505
biermand@Milltonfreeacademy.com

Description: You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by a doctoral candidate in the Joint Ph.D. program at Rhode Island College/University of Rhode Island. The researcher will observe the East Millton Academy's Saturday Academy, specifically the literature classes throughout the duration of the program. The researcher will record in writing, audiotape, and videotape the experiences of teachers and students involved in the program: the assignments, responses, and classroom conversations. The focus of the study is to inquire into the students' and teachers' beliefs about knowledge and learning as the efficacy of the program is explored.

The primary setting for this research study is the literature classroom of The Saturday Academy but will extend to other activities and informal settings (e.g., the hallway). The data will be collected over the duration of the entire ten-week program. Data collection that features student participation will include field notes, audiotapes, videotapes, and transcriptions. Student writings and other creative endeavors will also be reviewed. The verbal or written contributions of students whose parents do not grant permission for their child to participate in the study will not be included in the final study. Care will be taken to exclude these students from the transcriptions of audio or video recordings; their contributions will not be documented in the field notes. Interviews will be conducted with the classroom teachers, occasional interviews will be conducted with school administrators, and informal interviews may be conducted with students and parents who agree to participate. Interview data will include field notes, audiotapes, and transcriptions. No attempt will be made to elicit verbal or written contributions from students that would disrupt or go beyond the informal or formal classroom curriculum.

Confidentiality: Confidentiality will be preserved by the use of pseudonyms and the altering of any identifying descriptions. All audiotapes, videotapes, transcriptions, and field notes will be stored in a secure location in my home and

will be used only for research purposes and academic presentations or publication. Materials will be stored for five years, after which time discs and tapes will be erased.

Risks and benefits: Given the non-intrusive, non-experimental nature of this study, no risk to your child can be reasonably expected other than the brief, temporary disruption caused by the introduction of recording equipment. (Research has established that students habituate to such devices quickly; the initial novelty subsides soon after they are introduced, and the students thereafter regard them as unremarkable classroom features.) A potential, minimal risk to you as a parent is the loss of time that would be spent in a voluntary interview. Potential benefits include the presence of an additional educator in the classroom who, if called upon, will assist the teacher and the students with their activities and who will engage the classroom teacher and school administrators in reflective conversations.

Rights: Participation in this research study is voluntary. Declining to participate will involve no penalty (e.g., lowered grades or exclusion from activities) or loss of rights to which you as a parent or your child are otherwise entitled. If you agree to participate, you have the right to discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. If you choose to not participate in this study, care will be taken to exclude your child from the transcriptions of audio or video recordings; their contributions will not be documented in the field notes. Your privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study.

Contacts and Questions

The researchers conducting this study are D. Bruce Bierman and Professor Robert Carey. If you have any questions you may contact Mr. Bierman at:

The East Millton Academy
305 Broadway
Millton, CT. 06339
Telephone: (860) 887-2505
Email: biermand@Milltonfreeacademy.com

If the researcher cannot be reached, or if you would like to talk to someone other than the researcher about: (1) concerns regarding this study, (2) research participant rights, (3) research-related injuries, or (4) other human subjects issues, please contact Sue Pearlmuter, Rhode Island College Committee on Human Participants in Research at (401) 456-8753 or write: Sue Pearlmuter, c/o Rhode Island College Committee on Human Participants in Research at Office of Research and Grants Administration, Roberts Hall, 600 Mount Pleasant Avenue, Providence, RI 02908.

Statement of Consent

I have read the above information. I consent to participate in this research.

Please respond to the following questions regarding your child's participation in each aspect of this research study:

1. *I give consent for my child to be audio taped during this study.*

Please initial: _____ Yes _____ No

2. *I give consent for my child to be videotaped during this study.*

Please initial: _____ Yes _____ No

3. *I give consent for audio/video tapes resulting from this study to be used for research purposes and academic presentations and publications.*

Please initial: _____ Yes _____ No

I understand that this consent expires on January 22, 2007.

Signature _____ **Date** _____

Name of child _____

Student and Teacher Epistemological Interplay in a High Stakes Testing Environment

Informed Consent—Teacher Protocol

For questions about this study contact:

D. Bruce Bierman
The East Millton Academy
305 Broadway
Millton, CT 06369
860-887-2505
biermand@Milltonfreeacademy.com

Description: You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by a doctoral candidate in the Joint Ph.D. program at Rhode Island College/University of Rhode Island. The researcher will observe the East Millton Academy's Saturday Academy, specifically the literature classes throughout the duration of the program. The researcher will record in writing, audiotape, and videotape the experiences of teachers and students involved in the program: the assignments, responses, and classroom conversations. The focus of the study is to inquire into the students' and teachers' beliefs about knowledge and learning.

The primary setting for this research study is the literature classroom of The Saturday Academy but will extend to other activities and informal settings (e.g., the hallway). The data will be collected over the duration of the entire program, beginning in January 2006. Data collection that features student participation will include field notes, audiotapes, videotapes, and transcriptions. Student writings and other creative endeavors will also be reviewed. The verbal or written contributions of students whose parents do not grant permission for their child to participate in the study will not be included in the data collection. Care will be taken to exclude these students from the transcriptions of audio or video recordings; their contributions will not be documented in the field notes. Interviews will be conducted with the classroom teachers, occasional interviews will be conducted with school administrators, and informal interviews will be conducted with students and parents who agree to participate. Interview data will include field notes, audiotapes, and transcriptions. No attempt will be made to elicit verbal or written contributions from students that would disrupt or go beyond the informal or formal classroom curriculum.

Confidentiality: Confidentiality will be preserved by the use of pseudonyms and the altering of any identifying descriptions. All audiotapes, videotapes, transcriptions, and field notes will be stored in a secure location in my home and

will be used only for research purposes and academic presentations or publication. Materials will be stored for five years, after which time discs and tapes will be erased.

Risks and benefits: Given the non-intrusive, non-experimental nature of this study, no risk to your child can be reasonably expected other than the brief, temporary disruption caused by the introduction of recording equipment. (Research has established that students habituate to such devices quickly; the initial novelty subsides soon after they are introduced, and the students thereafter regard them as unremarkable classroom features.) A potential, minimal risk to the classroom teacher is the loss of time that would be spent in voluntary interviews and the initial adjustment to having another adult in the classroom. Potential benefits include the presence of an additional educator in the classroom who, if called upon by you, will assist the teacher and the students with their activities and who will collaborate with the classroom teacher and school administrators.

Rights: Participation in this research study is voluntary. Declining to participate will not affect your employment and will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you agree to participate, you have the right to discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. Your privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study.

Contacts and Questions

The researchers conducting this study are D. Bruce Bierman and Professor Robert Carey. If you have any questions you may contact Mr. Bierman at:

The East Millton Academy
305 Broadway
Millton, CT. 06339
Telephone: (860) 887-2505
Email: biermand@Milltonfreeacademy.com

If the researcher cannot be reached, or if you would like to talk to someone other than the researcher about: (1) concerns regarding this study, (2) research participant rights, (3) research-related injuries, or (4) other human subjects issues, please contact Sue Pearlmutter, Rhode Island College Committee on Human Participants in Research at (401) 456-8753 or write: Sue Pearlmutter, c/o Rhode Island College Committee on Human Participants in Research at Office of Research and Grants Administration, Roberts Hall, 600 Mount Pleasant Avenue, Providence, RI 02908.

Statement of Consent

I have read the above information. I consent to participate in this research.

Please respond to the following questions regarding your participation in each aspect of this research study:

1. *I give consent to be audiotaped during this study.*

Please initial: _____ Yes _____ No

2. *I give consent to be videotaped during this study.*

Please initial: _____ Yes _____ No

3. *I give consent for audio/video tapes resulting from this study to be used for research purposes and academic presentations and publications.*

Please initial: _____ Yes _____ No

I understand that this consent expires on January 22, 2007.

Signature _____ **Date** _____

Youth Assent

This study is concerned with students' and teachers' attitudes toward learning. I am asking for your agreement to participate in this study. As part of the study, your participation in class activities will be audiotaped, videotaped, and put into writing. You may be asked to participate in informal interviews with me. The primary setting for this research study is the literature classroom but will extend to other morning classroom activities and informal settings (e.g., the hallways).

Participation in this research study is voluntary. Declining to participate will involve no penalty (e.g., lowered grades or exclusion from activities) or loss of rights to which you are otherwise entitled. If you agree to participate, you have the right to discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. If you decide to not participate in the study, care will be taken to exclude you from the transcriptions of audio or video recordings; your contributions will not be documented in the field notes. Your privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study.

This assent document, if you sign it, will be placed in a file with other agreement to participate forms in no particular order. Only the researcher, D. Bruce Bierman, will have access to the file containing consent forms. You may withdraw from this study at any time with no negative consequences. Simply inform the experimenter that you wish to end participation. Should you wish to discuss any aspect of this study, please feel free to contact Mr. Bruce Bierman in the English Department of the East Millton Academy at (860) 887-2505.

Please take this time to discuss any questions or concerns about this study with the researcher before signing this form. If you sign this form, you will be given a copy for your records.

Statement of Assent

I have read the above information. I agree to participate in this research.

Please respond to the following questions regarding your participation in each aspect of this research study:

1. *I give consent to be audio taped during this study.*

Please initial: _____ Yes _____ No

2. *I give consent to be videotaped during this study.*

Please initial: _____ Yes _____ No

3. *I give consent for audio/video tapes resulting from this study to be used for research purposes and academic presentations and publications.*

Please initial: _____ Yes _____ No

I understand that this consent expires on January 22, 2007.

Signature _____ **Date** _____

Appendix C

Data: Transcripts and First Iteration Notes

Day 1: December 3rd, 2005. Sophie's Introduction

FRONT				DOOR
Marcus BM	Jasmine BF			Samuel WM
Marianna BF				
Isabel HF				Jacob WM
Hannah WF	Jim AM			
Tanya BF				
	Qing AF			
				ME

Absent: Anna, Anko, Liang, Carmella, Bruno

1. Videotape and timer begin at 0:00.	Already on the chalkboard when students enter the classroom at 8:00 a.m. on a cold Saturday—the first weekend in December 2006—are the three questions: 1. What types of things do you choose to read? 2. Why do you read these things? 3. School reading (textbooks), newspapers, etc.—why read them? Students walk past the board without taking explicit notice of the writing. The heat has been turned off for the weekend, so the room is cold and the students keep their jackets on. As this is the second period of the day, I am already situated in the back corner of the room. Sophie, the English teacher today, greets the students. She is friendly, young, and attractive—she has a fit figure, scrunched up dark hair with loose locks dangling down in front of her ears, and pretty green eyes behind a pair of

dark framed glasses. She wears blue jeans and a grey sweatshirt and smiles and chats with those students she already knows. Prior to the beginning of the first period I heard a student say, "I've had low grades since fifth grade." Now I hear in a mature male voice, "I will stab you in the throat." This is Marcus. He is talking to Marianna. "I used to dream about you," he says to her. Marcus is tall, powerfully built, and wrapped in a black winter jacket with a do rag beneath a black Boston Red Sox hat turned backwards on his head. Both Marcus and Marianna are, according to their records, "black," but they are obviously of mixed racial heritage. Marianna's black hair is pulled behind her head. She wears a black winter jacket zipped up all the way to her chin. My past observations of students at this school have predisposed me to perceive their social affectations as a *mélange* of local African American and Hispanic culture. The boys are possessive of the girls and treat them with rough mock disdain; the girls, in turn, form close bonds with one another while deeply internalizing the more insidious influences of their male peers. Overtly the girls stand against the boys; at the same time, their behavior and language reveal a self-abnegating adoption of the male ethos. While their language is defiant and occasionally profane, they know that when they swear in front of me they have committed a sort of taboo. Their sexual liberality fails to offer boundaries for male socialization. As a result, the girls end up being a threat to one another. First impressions offer little hope for Marcus. Marianna is enthusiastic and outgoing—her pencil and paper ready for note taking. Her offerings for Sophie to get to know her will be a recurring dynamic in her relationship—and that of several other students—with Sophie and the other English teacher, Shelly.

2. Sophie: (0:33) Um guys I'm gonna take attendance, if you could just raise your hands then I can know who you are . . . all right, Samuel, I know who you are, Lane. Um, Hannah (pause) Jones (rising intonation). Isabel (pause, attempts with uncertainty to pronounce Isabel's last name, rising intonation). Did I pronounce your last name correct? 3. Isabel: (In a deep, monotone voice lacking affect) Yeah, in English you pronounced it correct. 4. Sophie: Ok, can you say it in Spanish? 5. Isabel corrects Sophie's pronunciation of her last name with the l's silent.	Sophie takes attendance, calling names and checking them off on a piece of paper in front of her. She asks about students who are not here. Marcus and Marianna are sitting next to one another and talking. Marcus maintains a constant chatter. Ten students are in the class. Sophie takes attendance, talking with the students as she does so. Anna is not here today, but she will become an important presence. Isabel is in this class today, as is Tanya—later in the program both of these students will be switched to other classes for no reason immediately apparent to me. Sophie knows some of the students from prior experiences at the school. Sophie's grammar may be an attempt to use what she perceives as the students' vernacular. Isabel's response to Sophie's attempted pronunciation is not particularly friendly or cheerful. Sophie pursues the correct pronunciation. Assumes Isabel is and speaks Spanish. Isabel is Hispanic, according to her records. She is challenging, restless, attentive, and confrontational. What makes her confrontations difficult is that she chooses her moments and her issues wisely. One gets the impression she is on the lookout for unfairness, and she has the courage to address those moments. The accent evident in her voice reveals a sort of mock ghetto toughness.

6. Sophie: Oh it's much prettier like that. All right, um Jasmine Hopkins? (Jasmine raises her hand and seems to pronounce her first name differently.) Say that again? (After Sophie mispronounces the name again, Jasmine corrects her with an impatient tone—Jasmine.) Jasmine? Ok. All right. Jacob Elliot? Um, Anna I know is not here, do any of you know (pause) the deal? 7. Marcus: Who? Who? 8. Sophie: Anna. 9. Marcus: Anna Hoogaaa (this is not Anna's real last name). 10. Jasmine: She's working. 11. Sophie: She's working. Ok, so she may not actually be coming then. All right, how about Marcus (pause, says the second part of his hyphenated first name) Jarmon? Did I say it like that? Is that how you say it?	Sophie attempts a friendly overture, but Isabel does not respond. Again, Sophie attempts to hear and to pronounce the name correctly. Jasmine is a soft-spoken black girl—outwardly more docile and compliant than Isabel or Marianna, but when she is pushed or challenged in a way she deems to be significant, she can respond with strength. Jacob is gothic, dressed in black with unevenly cut straight black hair hanging below his ears. He adheres to the fashion. His skin color reveals no evidence of having recently encountered sunlight, and his affectations are somewhat effeminate. He is physically slight—skinny but not short, his fingernails are long and colored, his voice is soft, and he is pierced in various places—ears, nose, tongue, lip. As social relationships in the class evolve, Jacob's presence will become important. Marcus shows immediate interest in Anna's enrollment in the program. Their relationship, too, will become a defining influence upon the ecology of the class. Responds to Marcus's question. Marcus plays with Anna's last name. Marcus says this in a voice reminiscent of Al Pacino in <u>Scent of a Woman</u>: "HOOO-gaaa." Indication of social connection—the students know each other's work schedules. Repeats Jasmine's response. Assumes Anna may not be able to participate in the Saturday Academy. Request for verification of pronunciation. First interaction between Marcus and Sophie as Sophie takes

	attendance.
12. Marcus: Yeah, at first I used Marcus Jarmon but just call me Marcus.	Hint of instability at home.
13. Sophie: Just call you Marcus?	Request for verification.
14. Marcus: Yeah.	Polite reply.
15. Sophie: You sure?	Repeated request for verification. An overture of friendliness, perhaps.
16. Marianna asks Marcus with obvious care about the history of his name change. Marcus responds.	Marcus shares a personal revelation with a female peer.
17. Sophie: Marianna Washington? (Softly) I know you.	Sophie inadvertently interrupts this personal sharing.
18. Marianna: You do?	Distracted from Marcus's personal story, Marianna is surprised by and pursues Sophie's personal overture.
19. Marcus: (To Marianna) She not related to me at all (emphatically).	Marcus, continuing in spite of the interruption, offers a hint to Marianna of an apparently unpleasant and bitter personal story.
20. Marianna: You know me?	Marianna is surprised at this personal connection and recognition.
21. Sophie: Yeah, I don't know (emphasis) you, I think you're friends with someone that I had last year.	Marianna notes this "I don't know you," as will be seen shortly.
22. Marcus: Yeah, you probably were	Marcus interposes himself. Already he will not relinquish his relationship with Marianna to Sophie—or vice versa—not if it's exclusive.
23. Sophie: I remember you being near my room. Um, Liang? Or (attempts to pronounce her name)?	Personal connection. No response.
24. Marcus: (Laughing) You chill outside her room?	Marcus includes himself in the conversation. He mocks Marianna for her

	apparent attempt to be close to a teacher.
25. Sophie: Carmella's not here.	Sophie knows Carmella, a white girl.
26. Marcus: Who's that?	Again, Marcus exhibits interest in the students who will attend this class.
27. Isabel: Oh, Carmella?	Chatter ensues regarding Carmella.
28. Sophie: Or (turning to Jacob) or have you seen her yet?	Sophie immediately establishes a rapport with Jacob, turning to him for information about Carmella.
29. Jacob: Uh, I haven't seen her here today.	Polite response.
30. Sophie: Ok, maybe she's maybe she'll be here next week. How about Bruno?	Responds to Jacob and continues with attendance.
31. Marcus: (To Isabel) Yeah, we know who she is now you can stop.	Marcus shuts down a side bar conversation about Carmella. Sophie notices this, as is apparent by her discipline of Marcus, which follows.
32. Jasmine: Bruno who?	Curious about her classmates.
33. Sophie: Bruno.	Response.
34. Jasmine: I haven't seen him.	Polite reply.
35. Several students are chattering, including Marcus who says to Isabel about Carmella, "Shut your mouth."	
36. Sophie: (2:34) Marcus, I just need to tell you right now, I think it's very rude that you're talking	Discipline. Power.
37. Marcus: (Gently, contritely) All right.	Compliance. Feeling out the situation?
38. while other people are talking, ok? so please (emphasis) do me that favor and just (moving the fingers of her right hand quickly across her lips) zip it.	Explicit discipline.

39. Isabel: I think it's very rude when people are talking (?) in my ear (pause and student laughter, which inspires her to speak louder) and I'm trying to listen. 40. Sophie (Looking at Isabel, then looking down at her attendance sheet) How about um, Jim Yee. Did I pronounce it correctly? (Student response?) And Qing? Tanya? (In a lower voice) Tanya, I remember you last year. (3:16) 41. Sophie comes to the front of her desk 42. Sophie: (3:20) Um, you, did everyone in here get the florescent yellow sheet of paper that explains credits and all of that information? Ok. One more thing that I just want to add to that in case your last class teacher did not let you know is that yes you do earn credit if you are here for eight out of the ten classes. You will get the most out of it obviously if you're here for all ten classes but things happen. Um, the other thing that I just want to point out to you because this was a problem that came up with one student last year so I don't feel like this is something that's going to be a problem but just to let you know is that the student automatically assumed that because they were coming here that they would get the credit and they didn't	Obvious mockery of Sophie's discipline of Marcus. Isabel comes to Marcus's assistance. Correct grammar with the male Asian student, but not the female Hispanic student. Tanya is a powerfully-built black female. Her social position is enigmatic—she seems to be on the outside. Like Isabel, Tanya is willing to pursue issues of unfairness in the classroom. What does Sophie know about Tanya from last year? Her lowered tone seems foreboding. The desk proves to be an anchor. Neither Sophie nor Shelly venture too far from the desk for very long. Procedural interaction. Rules about attendance: Sophie's introduction is only about two minutes long; it reveals possible assumptions regarding student motivation, learning, and discipline: Students in the program to "earn credit"; students will "get" something over the ensuing ten classes that they "obviously" would miss if they were not there; "Things happen" to this population of kids. Most of the two minutes Sophie uses to address the problems of a student not in the class; presumably, this is a cautionary tale: the student whose head was "constantly . . . down in all of his classes," he was "disruptive," he "picked on students," and he talked "while other people were talking." Finally, he was

have to do anything so what ended up happening was because this student constantly had his head down in all of his classes, was disruptive, um, you know, whether it was, you know, picking on other students or, you know, just talking while other people were talking what ended up happening was after about four weeks he was kicked out of the program. So, it's the same rules that apply during the school day, um, it's the same thing here. So I expect you guys to be just as respectful to each other and to me as I will give back to you as you are every other day when you are in school. Ok. And I would expect that of you when you go home and every other time anyways. Um, so I just want to put that out there because I don't want there to be any miscommunication with that, ok? so you are expected to, you know, get involved and cooperate and listen to other people whether you disagree with them or not that's fine you can, you know, still voice your own opinion, um but you are required to at least listen to other people. Ok? Keep an open mind. (5:06)	“kicked out of the program.” One might assume this tale is inspired by and directed at Marcus. Note how Sophie's identification of the student's gender evolves from noun (“the student”) to plural indefinite pronoun (“they”) to gendered single indefinite pronoun (“he”), as if zeroing in on Marcus. In contrast to this morality play of misbehavior, Sophie establishes an expectation of mutual respect: “I expect you guys to be just as respectful to each other and to me as I will give back to you.” Students may exhibit respect, presumably, by getting involved, cooperating, listening, voicing their opinions, and keeping an open mind. The minimum expectation is that students are “required to at least listen.”
43. Sophie begins to hand out papers. She drops one and while she picks it up Marianna makes a comment to Sophie.	
44. Sophie: See you know who I am, you know me.	Re-establishing personal connection.
45. Marianna: I don't know (imitative emphasis) you. I know of (emphasis) you.	This is a challenge, a notice to Sophie that Marianna is attending to her personal innuendo, interpreting the tacit with the explicit. A couple minutes earlier while taking attendance Sophie had indicated to Marianna that she knew Marianna from last year. “You know me?” Marianna said with

46. Sophie: Oh, ok. 47. Jasmine: (As Jasmine, a quiet black	a hint of happy surprise. Sophie replied, “Yeah, I don’t know (emphasis) you, I think you’re friends with someone that I had last year.” So it should be noted Marianna’s line is a kind of payback. Important expectations for the next nine classes are reflected in this one sentence. Students are going to invite their teachers into the context of their discourse—to co-construct their identities and their worlds, and teachers’ responses to those tentative invitations will determine the extent to which students’ views of learning and their subsequent approach to knowledge formation and acquisition will be affected by their teachers. Likewise, the extent to which the teachers allow themselves to venture into the students’ various cultures—into the mode and method of their discourse—will influence how their own perceptions of learning, of knowledge formation and transmission, will be affected by their students. For the students, this is of primary importance. Teacher acceptance of cultural invitations varies indirectly with the amount of teacher discipline and overt acts of power necessitated by student behavior; concurrently, the amount of discipline necessitated by student behavior varies indirectly with the exhibited willingness of teachers to accept cultural invitations—it’s a dialectical construction. Relationships with these students are fragile—they have been disappointed in various settings, in school and out, and they find solace and security with one another. Relationships based upon assumed and enforced power are problematical; the students have developed their own methods of contending with it. Rejected, but ok. Does she perceive the message? Attempts to share personal connection.

girl—obviously a friend of Marianna and Marcus—reads the handout she recognizes the name of the other teacher, Miss Clines.) Miss Clines’s doing this? She’s my English teacher. Oh, I like her. 48. (6:00) Sophie introduces the “Reading for Information” and “Response to Literature” test and herself. 49. (7:03) Sophie: From what we have been told, Miss Clines and I are very much alike, in teaching, so I don’t think that you’re going to see a drastic difference when you change from having me to having her or vice versa, so I think that you’ll see that we teach pretty much the same. Um, in addition to that I’m going to be working with her very close so I’m going to know everything that happens in class with each of you individually and together. We will be, when we actually grade your, cause we’ll be giving you guys some grades so that you know what you can improve on and what you’re doing well, we will be discussing that together so we really work, um, very closely, so anything that, you know, you relay to one of us will get passed on to the other teacher, so you can just kind of think of us as the same person I guess, all right? (7:54) 50. * * * 51. Sophie: (8:15) Now one thing that I	Sophie does not validate this appeal for personal connection. Instead, she continues with her self-introduction and her introduction of Miss Clines, in absentia. Then she offers procedural and explicit test instruction. Sophie hears Jasmine’s comment about Miss Clines. Motivated perhaps by Jasmine’s remark, Sophie blurs the perceptual line between Miss Clines and herself. She and Miss Clines will “teach pretty much the same.” In fact, during the next class one student, Isabel, will exhibit brief confusion trying to distinguish between the two teachers’ physical appearance, which is humorous, odd, and revealing, as they look nothing alike to me. Some of Sophie’s statements may not prove true: she says, for example, that “I’m going to be working with [Shelly] very close so I’m going to know everything that happens in class with each of you individually and together. Sophie introduces grades: “We’ll be giving you guys some grades so that you know what you can improve on and what you’re doing well.” Letter grades will provide students with important feedback. Interestingly enough, the assumption of grades being a necessary aspect of education is so ingrained in the students’ perception of the necessary process that they do not question this. The real purpose of the test: to test

just want to say to you before we start getting into the actual test is that this test is not actually testing you (dramatic pause). You're suffering, you're going through the agony of having to take this and, you know, getting nervous right before the test, and, you know, and all of that, for us (placing her right hand over her heart). Because what this actually tests, and hopefully this will relieve some of your stress, is that teachers are doing their jobs. So if you do well and you can interpret a story and and, you know, um, develop a critical stance on it so you can say "Well, yeah, this is a good piece of literature" or "Yeah, this article makes sense because I can see, you know, people traveling by, um, you know, spaceships to schools instead of cars or busses" um, you know, you will be creating a a stance and you will be able to interpret this literature but you need the tools to do it, so what this test, what this test is to see if teachers are giving you those skills. So hopefully that relieves a little bit of the stress that you feel on you to actually, you know, we want you to do well on it, but really it's testing us. (9:17)	teachers. I imagine it is a hard concept for these students to comprehend, that the test-taker (each student) is not the subject of the test, especially when the test is acknowledged to cause "suffering," "agony," "nervous[ness]," and "stress" for students, not for the real targets—the teachers. In effect, Sophie's message is that students will endure torment in order for teachers to know if we are "doing [our] jobs." The epistemological stance Sophie is projecting to her students is reflected in her apparent belief that students "need [to be handed] the tools" that would allow them to "interpret" literature, and it is the intention of the state of Connecticut, the Saturday Academy, and its teachers to give them "those skills." The assumptions inherent in this belief include: Sophie has mastered those skills; she has the ability to transfer those skills to other humans; those skills have been accurately identified as being necessary for literary interpretation; those skills actually exist; those skills are transferable through talk; those skills are transferable at all; students may acquire those skills passively; students value those skills; students value the task that the skills presumably allow them to perform; the cultures of which the students are a part value those skills and the tasks those skills allow them to complete; the students have the cognitive ability to acquire those skills; the test is a fair and accurate assessor of skill acquisition; and the students and their cultures value the assessment.
52. Hannah: Then how come we have to suffer not graduating if we don't pass it?	An authentic motivation question.
53. Sophie: (Laughs.) Good question, um, I think what that is just implying is that you do not have the skills that you will need to go on to college.	Addresses the question. Power of authoritative knowledge. Who really owns the knowledge? While distancing herself from the school

And that is what EMA, you know EMA is an academic school so they want to know that all of you, I mean not only want to go to college, but they are going to try to make it so that all of you are going to college. There was a study done, and that's like where some of these, you know, Connecticut or statewide tests come up, where professors were saying students did not have these certain skills that they needed and they weren't getting them because they weren't getting them in high school. And so in order to make sure that they were that's where these tests come up with, um, yeah, it's a good question, I agree with you. (10:13) 54. * * * 55. Sophie: (11:00) What EMA wants to make sure is that you are all college bound. 56. Jacob: What if we still do all this and don't pass the CAPT test and we end up having to take the class, wouldn't it just be easier to just like not do any of this and just take the class . . . can you do that?	("they"), perhaps because she detects Hannah's implication regarding its seemingly capricious use of power, Sophie reinforces the belief that students do not currently have the skills requisite for success in "academic" institutions, either college or the East Millton Academy, and she supports this assertion now with even more credible authorities than herself—"professors" quoted in "a study." What she is agreeing with is unclear, but she seems to have recognized that she has established too much distance between herself and the students—siding with professors at "academic school[s]"—and this is an attempt to say to the students, in effect, "Yeah, we're in this together." In fact, Sophie goes on to establish a rapport of oppression with the students. Purpose of knowledge: college. While this is certainly a worthy and estimable goal, are the students able to make sense of it? In other words, is the idea of going to college a motivation in their world, or does it function, ironically enough, as a symbol of all they can never attain? Is it a Heaven attainable to all, or is it destined only for the predestinate and elite few? Another authentic question. Jacob expects no lasting benefit from the Saturday Academy other than passing the CAPT. He apparently feels that no real learning will be enjoyed. This attitude has likely been formed by his prior experiences in school.

57. Sophie: (11:00) Well, if it was an elective that means not everyone would take it (pause) um, I think by doing the test like this, well and first of all I mean they could and who who would you have grade it? You know I mean right now the graders are people who are trained and and paid in Connecticut to look for certain things and so it's not just EMA that's required to take this test, it's all of the um schools in Connecticut, so and actually you're your responses are being compared to students in all different schools in Connecticut (pause) so, um, you know I I think basically (rising intonation) in instead of like it being an elective where you know you have to take that credit basically you should be learning these skills in all of your classes. What this program does, because EMA wants to make sure that everyone (pause) gets the education that they deserve, is they they have this program so that students who um who are maybe weak in some skills (rising intonation) you know not in all of them, but like some, that they could you know progress and just do better with those, so, you know EMA is constantly looking to make you guys you know stronger readers and um just better in all different ways, so, you know I think that they have to somehow they have to check to make sure we're doing the right thing. I hope I answered (?). I don't have all the answers. I I personally, um, have never done well with testing, so when I, like when I was in college and I used to take the test to become a teacher I loved teaching, I won an award for my student teaching, but when I came down to take the test, to

Sophie delivers most of this answer in a soft voice while looking at Jacob. I do not know what she is referring to when she calls the course an elective.

Teachers at EMA could grade it.

The rubric that "trained" assessors follow is very simple.

So this is a competitive test. Who is comparing these scores, and why are they doing so?

"These skills" that the Saturday Academy will teach the students should be learned in all classes—they transcend all disciplines. Refers to EMA in the third person—why not the first person plural?

Some good resides in all of us.

Implication regarding the morality of academic achievement: "better."

"They"?

Again, reference to the morality of academic endeavor: "doing the right thing." Later, Anna makes reference to this same phrase, even though she is not in class today.

Sophie's own personal experiences with testing. Attempts to establish a connection with students through the sharing of test-generated misery. The construction of her sentence, "I used to take the test to become

actually become a teacher I really struggled with it and had to take it several times.	a teacher,” implies personal discomfort—a grammatical distancing; nevertheless, she makes it clear she is not too much like the students in front of her because she “was in college”—a place that she has already established they do not have the skills, yet, to attend—and she “won an award for [her] student teaching.” For some reason she is someone who can still be accepted by her colleagues, regardless of test results; I wish a student would ask why they are not afforded similar trust. That is, why can’t they fail the CAPT and still win awards for their scholarship? What is the essential difference between them and her? Predestination? Could it be racial, or socio-economic? It’s not like they haven’t seen these lines drawn before. The links Sophie establishes with the students are those pertaining to competence assessment—theirs real and consequential, hers insignificant and misrepresentative; the difference between Sophie and the students, according to Sophie’s words, is that Sophie is competent and has the skills, regardless of tests, so the links between Sophie and the students regarding test-taking experiences are at risk of being disingenuous.
58. Isabel or Hannah: What’d they ask you?	Genuine interest in and curiosity about Sophie’s experiences. This sort of attempt at personal connection, invitations made by students to teachers to join their cultures, happens often throughout the ten weeks, but it is never used or recognized as an important part of student learning or knowledge formation; instead, it is used to serve the social and disciplinary needs of the teacher.
59. Sophie: (13:08) What kind of questions did they ask you? Well for English in particular, um, there were over a hundred multiple choice questions about specific books of	What is the students’ reaction to Sophie’s description of this test?

literature and um you know just terms that you should know as an English teacher and then there are two essays that you have to answer, and I think the test is like a two hour test that you have to do all of this, or maybe it's two hours for each so it's four hours total, but it's you know it's kind of like the CAPT with you guys it's like SAT's, um, but if you are anything like me, and maybe those skills that EMA's trying to help you brush up on, are you are just test anxiety, you know, I know that as soon as I see a test I go my mind goes blank. Does that happen to any of you? And I just like forget what I need to write. It's not that I don't know that information. It's not that I couldn't teach you all about mythology so that you know every single god and, you know, what happened to them and how they were created and all of that, but when the test is in front of me I get nervous. So hopefully by you being here you will you know some of that anxiety will be relieved and so when you go into it you'll be more confident. With any situation, if you go into it more confident you will do better, no matter what what the skills are, just in life (?) so hopefully when you leave here you'll be very confident (pause) ok? Excellent questions. Any more? (No response.) Ok. (14:34) 60. * * * 61. Sophie: (14:43) So I'm going to go over quickly with you the two kinds of tests that you will see. 62. Begins "Reading for Information" introduction. Reads information from the State Department of Education	These students will later exhibit disbelief that they have to read a story as long as six pages during the CAPT. Another attempt at making a personal connection, this time through test anxiety. Sophie introduces her belief that contending with "test anxiety" is one of the "skills" that she will give to students, or, more accurately, they just need to "brush [it] up." She wants students to know the "information" and she is a good teacher: "It's not that I couldn't teach you all about mythology so that you know every single god and, you know, what happened to them and how they were created and all of that." It's just that, like them, she gets "nervous." Personal connection through praise. Explicit instruction.

website outlining the test. Her reading is interrupted by Leo Butler, the director of the program, collecting attendance forms. Continues with the “Response to Literature” portion of the test information. 63. Sophie: (17:40) When scoring your response the grader will be looking to see that you number one understood what you read and if you have Miss Clines I know that you’ve heard this a million times and I don’t I’m not sure about all the other teachers but never never never tell them “I don’t understand.” That right there is you saying to them “fail me” ok? (Responding to a student’s comment) Miss Didanato says that too? Even if you don’t understand every single aspect of the story (rising intonation) you do understand something, so tell them what you do understand, and if you don’t understand something (rising intonation) pose a question and then give a possible answer for it. So “I don’t know why the author had the character, um, you know, running around the track fifteen times before he went on his date but maybe it’s because he just needed to kinda clear his head, or he needed to, um, get ready mentally being prepared for the date,” ok? so if you don’t know why something happens just question it and then try to figure out an answer. Not a big deal. Ok, that’s all they’re looking for you to do. They’re not looking for you to be, um, you know, going into literature or English for a full time career. They’re just looking to see that you can read something and that you can figure out why it was written. Ok? Number two, they want to see that you can interpret what you’ve read, so that you actually	Explicit instruction regarding what NOT to do when answering a question: Don’t say you don’t understand and don’t ask questions you can’t at least attempt to answer. While I do not understand why revealing a mind in a state of exploration is taboo, students will remember this instruction on the last day of class and beyond—evidence of the power of negative instruction (teaching what not to do). This is what Sophie really meant to convey explicitly to the students. Will this message be reflected in their writing? Categories in Sophie’s monologues are resolving themselves: students’ intellectual limitations require a simplified form of literary analysis (“They’re just looking to see that you can read something”); implicit barriers exist between the students and the academic world to which they are supposed to aspire (“They’re not looking for you to be, um, you know, going into literature or English for a full time career”); and

can say well this is what happened but then give a reason why so that you, you know, actually are considering what the purpose of this story is, or article. Number three, they are trying to see if you can connect to it on some level, and I'll tell you right now that if you can make some kind of a connection, whether it's feeling the emotions that one of the characters are feeling or, you know, feeling, understanding the same theme that they're trying to come across which there's always several themes so you have many choices. If you can do that, I guarantee that you will enjoy every story you read. You may not love it, it may not be your favorite story in the entire world to read, but you will enjoy it because you will understand what the author was trying to say, ok? And you will be identifying with it. Number four, evaluate what you read, you want to judge this piece. First of all, it's an article (rising intonation) could this really happen? If it's a short story, is this a good piece of literature? And to do that you're going to have to develop your own definition of what you think good literature is. We'll help you with it, but, you know, it's a personal thing. So you're gonna have to develop that definition on your own, ok? Any questions on all of that? (20:26) 64. * * * 65. Sophie: (21:11) So you will be taking practice CAPT's with us continually over the next ten weeks. Ok? (No response.) All right. That is that. 66. * * *	students ultimately must be addressed with authoritative hyperbole ("I'll tell you right now . . . if you can do that, I guarantee that you will enjoy every story you read"). So, while they are not necessarily being invited into the Priesthood, they can still exist meekly and with humble understanding beneath Heaven. During this time Marcus has sat quietly, his right elbow propped on his desk, his head on his right hand. Marianna, sitting next to Marcus, is quiet as well. Marcus and Marianna are beginning to interact. Throughout, Sophie stands in front of her desk, right hand holding the paper from which she is reading, left hand in either her front or rear pocket, or emphasizing her words. One way to improve performance on the test is to practice taking the test, continually, over and over.

67. (23:14) Change of task. Sophie organizes groups. Introduces the three questions written on the board. Students are to explore these three questions in small groups. 68. Sophie: All right, what I'm going to have you do in these groups that I've put you in right now is answer three questions together, ok? You don't need to, break your answers into, you know, three or four answers because there's three or four of you in the group. Come up with these answers together, all right? So I want you to be talking about this. The three questions that I'm going to have you answer, if you could just look up here on the board (Sophie goes to the blackboard and points to the questions; Tanya's remains sitting with her back to the board). The first one, "What types of things do you choose to read?" (Pause) Think about things that you actually (expressive hand and arm movements, bringing them up from her stomach towards her mouth) choose to read, whether it's on Sunday when you get the newspaper and you read a particular part of the newspaper, whether it's, um, (pause) you know something that just kinda takes you away from the rest of your life that you kinda dive into, um, anything at all. Think of anything that actually has words on it that you are reading, ok? And you choose to, you want to do it, ok? And then, number two, why do you do it? What's the purpose? Why do you choose those things (pause) all right? Finally (rising intonation) number three, gets into something a little	What is the explicit purpose of this assignment? Attempting to have students explore their own literacy? Why not make the purpose of this exercise explicitly clear to the students? Repetition of Sophie's assumptions regarding students' literacy practices and motivation. Assumption about Sunday literacy activity. Assumption about purpose of engaging in literacy activity. Sophie projects reluctance on the part of the students to engage in academic pursuits; she asks the students, "School reading like text books and things like that, newspapers, why do you read those kinds of things, and maybe you don't want to, but we force you to, um, but why? What's the purpose? Ok? Do you understand what you need to do?" Sophie's suppositions are evident regarding student motivation and

different. School reading like textbooks and things like that, newspapers, why do you read those kinds of things, and maybe you don't want to, but we force you to, um, but why? What's the purpose? Ok? Do you understand what you need to do? (23:36) 69. Sophie: (24:02: In response to a student's question) Write all of them down. Oh yeah guys you should have multiple answers, so for like number one all of you I'm sure don't read the same exact thing so think about what it is that you do read. All right? Go ahead. I'm gonna give you five minutes. (24:16) 70. Sophie: (Comes to the group I am observing) Jacob, have you been giving input here? 71. Jacob: Yes.	the power of school to determine and to address students' needs: students do not "want to" read "things" but "we" "force" them to because we know that they "need to do" it. Most importantly, however, to the future climate and ecology of this class is the students' perceptions of Sophie's acceptance and rejection of students' cultural invitations. Response to a student's concern about the "correctness" of answers. I join Marcus, Jacob, Sam, and Tanya. Groups are focused and productive. Tanya, Marcus, and Sam are vibrant and happy. Jacob is adjusting his backpack—he does not verbally participate at all. Marcus drops his pen and Jacob moves to pick it up for him. Despite what I perceive to be focused and productive student interactions, this will be the only collaborative work the students are asked to do for the rest of the program. Sophie works enthusiastically with a group on the other side of the room. Jacob engages in conversation with me. Discussion is animated. Marcus leads the discussion and elaborates upon his ideas in detail. Sophie checks on Jacob's participation. This will be an important dynamic later in the program. Jacob is a fragile looking white boy, dressed in the gothic style. Marcus and Tanya are black. Groups work for about seven minutes. As I watch it on video, it seems to be productive. Again, I don't know why the

72. Marcus: (Nodding) Yes yes. 73. Group conversation continues. 74. Sophie: (34:17) Ok. I think what I want to do is have you guys share what you've come up with now and one thing about this class that, and I tell my ninth graders this all the time, is that as we're going through something, please listen girls. 75. Marcus: stop talking please 76. Sophie: if we're going through something and someone mentions an idea that you kinda go "Oh, I wish I'd a come up with that" write it down, ok? put a little check next to it so that I know that it's not your idea but that you wish you had come up with it. So for instance as we're going through things right now if there's something that you kinda wish that your group had come up with just put a check and then go ahead and write down what that person said or list that idea, all right? (35:06) 77. Sophie: So, first of all, um, question number one asks you what types of things do you choose to read? So tell me, what are some things that you guys like to read (not looking at Marcus)? 78. Hannah begins to read her answer.	class never again engages in group work. Marcus's tone is not sarcastic or competitive; instead, it is old-brother like. Is he the caretaker? Does he detect something about Sophie's concern for Jacob? Is he his brother's keeper? Discipline. Mock discipline—reconnection with female student. Asserting social power with humor. Ideas may be owned, possessed, and borrowed. Introduces the motif of copying. Possession of ideas to be assessed by Sophie. Repeats the idea of copying. Request for participation. Compliance.

79. Marcus: (Talking over Hannah with great volume connoting enthusiasm) Adventure books.	Dominant compliance.
80. Sophie: (High, gentle voice, with left index finger raised and indicating Marcus) Hang on hang on hang on.	Power to quell the dominant male. Silences Marcus and ignores his representation of his literacy, Hannah continues.
81. Hannah: (Continues to read her answer.) We choose to read things books that are real life stories, mysteries, and Dr. Seuss. We also like to read notes and newspapers. Marianna likes to read things she finds on the ground, like shopping lists and notes. We all also like to read magazines.	Authentic reading—literacy in the lives of these students. Relays information revealed in group conversation. Initiates the joke on Marianna, which Sophie will pursue instead of exploring Marcus's literacy.
82. Sophie: Good. I would make sure that if you are writing a note to someone that you do not drop in when Marianna is behind you because	Sophie attempts to humorously tease Marianna. This joke will be usurped by Marcus, and Sophie's attempt to form a connection will be rejected by Marianna.
83. Marcus: Yeah.	Joins with Sophie in her teasing of Marianna. Why? Perhaps he anticipates Marianna's defensive response, and he assists in driving a wedge between Sophie and Marianna. Perhaps he is just trying to ingratiate himself with Sophie by joining in on the joke.
84. Sophie: she will invade your privacy	Sophie continues teasing Marianna, but the dynamic has changed now that Marcus has joined in.
85. Marianna: (In a high protesting voice) What?	Doesn't sound like she's laughing.
86. Sophie: and read your note, ok?	Pursues teasing.
87. (Marcus laughs, not necessarily kindly.)	Pursues the same social dynamic.
88. Marianna: I told you that if it	Repetition of her explanation given

dropped and I seen you drop it I will give it back to you. 89. Sophie: Well ok, make sure if you do drop it that it's noticeable that you dropped it so that she can give it back to you. Ok? 90. Tanya: (With protective sympathy in her voice) Awww, that's not (?) 91. Marcus: (Talking over Tanya) If not she gonna read it, she gonna read your business and tell everybody 92. Sophie: (Talking over Marcus.) Right, we don't want that to happen. (38:01)	during group work, her plaintive tone indicates betrayal. Pursues teasing. Student-Student loyalty. Turns the teasing into a personal attack, which is possibly how Marianna perceived it already. This teasing somehow puts her at risk, which Marcus knew reflexively. Agrees with then overpowers Marcus.

Day 2: December 10th, 2005. Shelly's Introduction

FRONT			DOOR
Marcus BM	Anna WF		Samuel WM
Marianna BF			
Isabel HF	Anko HM (late)		
Hannah WF	Jim AM		
	Bruno BM		
Samuel WM (moved) ▲	Tanya BF		
	Qing AF	Liang AF	ME

Absent: Jacob, Carmella, Jasmine

1. Videotape and timer begin at 0:00.	Shelly is a young female teacher, fit and pretty, of medium height—in her 20's, with shoulder-length light brown hair, dark green eyes, and soft features. Her demeanor is affable and serious—she laughs with students at those funny moments that occur in the classroom, yet she takes her teaching to heart—her first priority is to deliver instruction to students. She comes well organized to all of the classes she teaches, even providing me with copies of her plans and materials. Anna is present today, for the first time. Marcus sits directly behind her and close to Marianna's left arm. Isabel sits to Marianna's right, and Hannah sits next to Isabel. Again the room is cold so several of the students are wearing their winter jackets. Marcus, hatless today, wears a black down jacket, as does Marianna. Anna is wearing blue jeans, white sneakers, and a white jacket with a fur-lined hood. Her long light brown hair is pulled back tightly behind her head and hangs down her back in a ponytail. She is a very pretty girl with a round expressive face and fair skin that at first glance appears unusually tinted. Anko and Jasmine are not present when class commences. Bruno is here today. He is, as best as I can describe him, a normal young man capable of boredom, enthusiasm, silliness, sloth, and all those other sins and virtues that make humans so

2. Shelly: All right, see who we have here. Is it Elazar (pronounced El-A-zar)? (Several students correct Shelly's pronunciation and tell her that he is not here.) Not here? Sam? Hannah? Isabel? Jasmine's not here, Jacob's not here. Is it (attempts to pronounce a formalized version of her name)? 3. Anna: It's Anna. 4. Shelly: Anna? 5. Anna: (Spells her name). 6. Shelly: Here or no? 7. Anna: I'm here. 8. Shelly: You weren't here last class. 9. Anna: No I wasn't. 10. Shelly: Marianna? Liang? Bruno? Bruno (he raises his hand but Shelly does not see him)? No, yes? 11. Bruno: Yes. 12. Shelly: Anko (Shelly attempts to pronounce his name)? 13. Anna: Anko's in the class? (Anna is turned and talking with Marcus. She pronounces his name correctly). 14. Shelly: Anko (pronounces his name correctly). 15. Anna corrects Killen's pronunciation of Anko's name, just as Shelly first said it. 16. Isabel: (After a few seconds) Wait, Anko's in this class? (This observation	enjoyable; even long after the Saturday Academy is over, he will remain loyal to the teachers and his experiences. His voice in conversation reveals a hint of a Haitian accent. He is a good looking, affable, and likable young black man. Taking attendance while I distribute permission forms. Introduction to Anna. Anna knows Anko. Isabel knows Anko, and his name elicits a

is followed by shrill laughter, once she gets another girl's attention. Marcus is acting something out for somebody—his arm movements are wild.)	loud response.
17. Shelly: (Still taking attendance) Marcus? (Marcus immediately stops his movements.) You were in my study hall last year.	Attendance perceived as discipline followed by compliance. Personal connection.
18. Marcus: Was I?	Rejection of teacher's personal connection. This is characteristic of Marcus.
19. Tanya: (?) know that? (Anna and Isabel laugh.)	
20. Shelly: Um, is it Qing? How do you say it? Qing? And Tanya? (Begins to review the prior class.)	
21. Tanya: I'm Tanya.	Tanya identifies herself.
22. Shelly: Anyone I didn't call? (1:41) All right folks (loudly talking over the chatter) last week Miss Morris started this off for you, and you should have received one of these, it's an overview of the course.	
23. Isabel: Wait, you're not the same teacher?	Oddly enough, Isabel finally recognizes that Sophie is not teaching this class today.
24. Shelly: We alternate. No I'm not the same teacher.	
25. Marcus: Are you serious?	Incredulous at Isabel's not noticing the difference.
26. Isabel: (2:00) Remember she told us they teach the same way?	Recalling Sophie's introduction from the prior class. Isabel listens. The power of suggestion.
27. Shelly: (Handing out papers from last class.) Do you folks have all of these?	Procedural question.
28. Student: No.	Response.
29. Bruno: (In a loud nasally voice) I don't have one homey.	Speaking in the vernacular. Invitation. Attempt to establish discursive context.
30. Tanya: I don't got one with me.	Speaking in the vernacular, too.

31. Shelly: (To Bruno) Can you please take your hat off.	Rules.
32. Bruno and Marcus chatter. Marianna stretches and yawns audibly. Anna removes her jacket. She is wearing a sleeveless low-cut, tight fitting white blouse. Shelly moves Sam to the other side of the room so all students are sitting on the same side. Marcus sees Anko at the door and becomes even more animated, rubbing his hands. Shelly continues her talk. Anko walks in.	
33. Shelly: Hats off please Anko.	Rules.
34. Shelly: (Amid loud chatter between Bruno and Tanya) All right folks.	Calling students to order.
35. Chatter.	Social energy.
36. Isabel: You're perverting me from learning. (Marcus initiates laughter—Anna, Marianna, and Bruno, in particular—at Isabel's pronunciation of the word. Marianna repeats Isabel's statement.)	Mock discipline.
37. Shelly: All right, first off what we're gonna do is flip over that piece of paper I just gave you.	Ignores Isabel's mock discipline. Offers instruction.
38. Bruno: This one? (Holding up the paper)	Procedural question.
39. Shelly: Yup. We're gonna use it as scrap paper.	Response.
40. Isabel: Oh, we're taking notes today?	Procedural question.
41. Shelly: We have a lot of stuff to do today. What we're going to do is very simple (amid much constant chatter) it's not it's not	Response. Mitigation of task: "simple."
42. Student: Miss Clines?	
43. Shelly: All you gotta do is write down one thing that you remember	Is Shelly looking for a particular answer, is she trying to find out what went on, or is this a review question?

44. Anna: I wasn't here.	
45. Shelly: from last week. If you weren't here then you can just hold on for a moment cause this is only gonna take a second	
46. Marcus: (3:58) What did she teach us?	Attempt at verbal recall.
47. Shelly: I don't know. You were here, not me.	Pursues assignment.
48. Tanya: She she asked us questions about how do we read.	Tanya is on task.
49. Marcus: Yeah.	So is Marcus.
50. Shelly: All right so write that down just write down anything you remember from last week, anything you remember.	Students comply.
51. Anna: (4:25) Oh my stomach hurts.	Call for attention.
52. Shelly: Shhhhhh	Discipline.
53. * * *	
54. Shelly: (5:30) All right, so, tell me one thing you remember from last week.	Pursues assignment.
55. Anna: Can I use the bathroom real quick?	Personal needs question.
56. Shelly: Yup. Tell me what you remember, what's your name again?	Response. Question.
57. Isabel: Isabel.	Response.
58. Shelly: Isabel. What do you remember?	Repeats response. Repeats question.
59. Isabel: She asked us what we like to read and stuff.	This was the peer group assignment at the end of the last class—it proves to be the first and the last peer group assignment in which students will engage. It is the activity Isabel can immediately recall. Bruno and Tanya are interacting like old friends. Bruno appears to have lost focus on the conversation.

60. Shelly: All right, what you like to read, good. Did she ask you how you read that stuff that you like to read?	Repetition of student answer. Another leading question, but this time unclear: what exactly does she mean by “how you read”?
61. Student: Yes.	Compliant answer.
62. Shelly: And what was the difference between when you’re reading stuff that you like and the stuff you have to read when you’re at school?	The “how you read” question is dropped. Difference in what? She assumes students do not like what they read for school—that they “have to” read it.
63. Marcus: It’s different.	Student responds, but his answer is unclear—what is the antecedent of “It’s” and what does he mean by “different”?
64. Shelly: How’s it different?	Pursues vague response.
65. Marcus: Because you you you get through it quicker and it’s funner.	Marcus finds enjoyment in reading. This reference to literacy is not explicitly pursued.
66. Shelly: It’s more fun (rising intonation implying the question has not yet been fully answered. Another student speaks but Shelly speaks over him.) The difference between reading what you like to read and reading what you have to read in school . . . how you read. When you read at home where do you, like, if you’re reading a magazine if you’re reading the newspaper if you’re reading you know whatever it is that you put down last week how where do you usually go how do you read it?	Repeats response. Assumes school reading is unpleasant. Focuses the question on where students read various pieces of writing and how they read that material.
67. Bruno: See, I don’t know, it’s better reading in school.	“Where do you usually go”? Introduction to Bruno. He changes the essence of the question to where he can read—where he can access knowledge.
68. Tanya: I I I look through the magazine and if I see something I like I read the article and at school . . .	Attempts to address Shelly’s question.
69. Marcus: What do you go? (Bruno laughs.)	Humor. Wrestling for power in the discourse.
70. Shelly: Shhhhhh	Discipline.
71. Tanya: I be, I just be like you mean I got to read this?	Tanya connects place with motivation. She apparently disagrees with Bruno’s point.
72. Shelly: All right so you can pick and	Restates Tanya’s focus. Shelly regains the

choose, right?	floor with her restatement of Tanya's answer followed by a rhetorical question.
73. Tanya: Yeah.	Acquiesces or finishes.
74. Shelly: All right, good.	Assesses Tanya's interaction.
75. Anko: And like if you're reading something in school and you have to read at home (Bruno interrupts) like at school they explain it if you don't understand	Pursues Bruno's response: it's not that they have to read in schools; instead, school is an easier place to read because at school there is help available. This was Bruno's original point. The hardship, of course, is that, as Tanya points out, in school you are told what to read.
76. Shelly: shhhhhh	Discipline.
77. Anko: what they're what you're reading at school they explain it better.	Continues through interruption.
78. Shelly: Mmm hmmm. All right so you can ask somebody when you're at school if you didn't understand something, good. When you're at school, um, do you always like what you have to read?	Regains the floor by restating and assessing Anko's perception. Rhetorical question follows. Assumes students do not like what they read for school. This seems to be what she wants students to say—that they do not like school reading. For Shelly this must connect to the CAPT. She must believe they will not like that either, but they will still have to do it regardless—they will have to “get it done.”
79. Several students: No, but . . .	Attempts to engage.
80. Shelly: Is it always the most interesting?	Talking over students. Initiating a call and response type interaction. Presumed answer is obviously “No.” Why?
81. Several Students: No.	Response.
82. Shelly: No, so what do you do when you have to read something that you really don't want to but you know you have to by the end of the period, what do you have to do?	Repeats students' answer. Another call.
83. Students' Voices: Force yourself.	Response.
84. Shelly: All right, so how do you prevent that? How do you prevent that from happening so you get the assignment done?	Assessment. Call.

85. Marianna: Make it interesting for yourself.	Response.
86. Shelly: Make it interesting for yourself (rising intonation).	Repeats the answer but with rising intonation and without another call, indicating the answer was not the one she was looking for.
87. Hannah: Hope the teacher reads out loud.	Attempt to adlib—spontaneous interjection.
88. Shelly: Shhhh. Skim through it, find something you like better.	Discipline. Rejects Hannah's answer. Interjects spontaneously.
89. Shelly: How do you have to sit?	Talking loudly over chatter. Attempt at call. How they sit will affect their performance.
90. Students: Straight up.	Response.
91. Tanya: I only read what I have to when I answer questions.	Spontaneous personal interjection. Reading in school is only valuable to the extent that it answers questions formulated by some foreign faceless power. Or having to answer questions makes reading a perfunctory and mundane activity. This is ironic, that an at-risk student's academic engagement and process is diminished by the test at the time of the test.
92. Shelly: All right folks, let's have hands up here please so we can get everybody to um share what they're saying. Yes (calling on Tanya).	Disciplinary move regarding procedure. Does not yet respond to Tanya.
93. Tanya: I only read the um stuff that's inside the questions like if we have to answer questions I (?)	Continues with her personal interjection, despite Shelly's disciplinary move.
94. Shelly: All right, so you look for that stuff. You look you look at the questions that you have to answer and you only read that stuff. Well then you're you're right on track with what we're going to be talking about today then. What else do you have to do? How do you have to sit (emphatic) when you're reading something that maybe isn't the most interesting but you've got to get it done?	Talking over Tanya. Repeats Tanya's process. Repeats question about how to sit, even though it has already been answered; assumes students feel the reading "isn't the most interesting"; "get it done" work ethic: Reminiscent of T. H. White's ants in <u>The Once and Future King</u> .
95. Student answers: (Unintelligible)	Compliant response attempt.

96. Shelly: Have to sit straight up, all right, what else do you have to do?	Repeats semi-correct answer. Pursues the “correct” answer.
97. Anko: Read loud, make sure everybody can hear what you’re reading.	Response attempt. He misunderstands the question—his context is the classroom.
98. Shelly: All right, so if you’re reading it out loud make sure you read loud enough so everyone can hear you. Good, um, what do you have to do if your friend is sitting right over there and they keep, like, throwing little pieces of paper at you (much student vocal response).	Response to attempted response. Assesses the answer. Nurtures Anko’s answer. Identifies and repeats another semi-correct answer. Assesses the answer. Pursues the “correct” answer. Reveals her real intent: discipline. Don’t let friendships interfere. Assumption: do their friends do this? If so, why?
99. Isabel: Punch him in the nose.	Humor? Reflects with humor upon the concept of the test being more important than friendship.
100. Marcus: Isolate yourself, if you want to get it done.	Offers what seems like a worthy response. He seems to embrace the concept of abandoning one’s friends—isolating oneself for the sake of the test. Ironic attempt at ingratiating himself with this new teacher by repeating her phraseology: “get it done.”
101. Shelly: If you want to get it done what do you do? Raise your hand. What do you do if you want to get it done?	Pursues the question, but the question is vague: what exactly does it mean to “get it done”? What of selfishly intrinsic value is accomplished when one takes the test? She seems to ignore Marcus’s response except that she repeats his phrases “isolate yourself” and “if you want to get it done.” I’m getting the feeling that taking the test is like Roald Dahl as a boy getting his tonsils sliced out of his throat without anesthetic: a child innocently, trustingly opening his mouth at the request of a knowing adult, and then . . . slash slash, pain, blood, and a lingering sense of outrage and betrayal.
102. Marcus: Snitch, tell.	Another appropriate response in his own vernacular, with its obvious and somewhat cliché social implications—to “snitch” has a negative connotation, like “to rat on” from old prison movies with George Raft.
103. Shelly: Tell him so and so is talking to me so maybe they’ll move him. All right. What else do you do?”	Restates Marcus’s answer in her own social vernacular with its own socially acceptable connotations. Shelly’s model statement includes a disciplinary recommendation; I do

	not hear Marcus or Marianna repeating these words. Isabel's suggestions enjoy relatively more verisimilitude than does Shelly's.
104. Isabel: Punch him in the nose.	Reiterates her already stated and ignored call for violence.
105. Shelly: No let's try to avoid violence. Yup (calls on Marianna).	Recognizes and rejects violence.
106. Marianna: Kick them in the leg and say stop.	Finds a middle ground with both violence and words—an attempt to bridge cultures. Humor? Defiance?
107. Shelly: No, avoiding violence, but you might say stop.	Maintains the floor.
108. Anko: Ignore them.	Appropriate response.
109. Shelly: shhhhhh. What do you have to do for yourself? (Much chatter and student-administered mock discipline.)	Shelly does not seem to hear Anko's answer. Students continue to voice answers amid other answers and teacher "shhh"ing.
110. Marcus: shhhhhh	Appropriates the floor. Humorous ironic answer? Mock discipline? I do not think so.
111. Shelly: (8:58) All right, but if you want to get it done a couple things that you said, work. You have to focus on what you're doing, sit up straight, not pay attention to them, ignore 'em, and it ties into, um, what we're doing today because for the reading for information test you've got two tests to do for English CAPT (Marcus stretches his arms extravagantly, Marianna ducks to her right to avoid his right arm coming behind her). Please stop doodling. Remember you're here we have specific things to talk about with you. (Responding to a student's question) You're here to learn about the CAPT because what do you have to do to graduate from here?	Killen does not recognize Marcus's input. She then proceeds with explicit test instruction, to "get it done," which is soon interrupted. The essence of this explicit instruction so far is to "sit up straight" and isolate yourself from your distracting friends. Killen could be talking to Hannah, Anko, Tanya—I cannot tell. She ignores Marcus. Bruno is hunched over next to Tanya looking intently at what she is writing Discipline and motivational message. In fact, students do not have to pass the CAPT in order to graduate from EMA.
112. Students: Pass it.	Students repeat information mentioned in prior class.
113. Shelly: Pass it. So this program that runs through March	Repeats students' answer.

114. Isabel: So what is the SAT for?	An authentic question.
115. Shelly: The SAT is something completely different. For the CAPT you have to pass the CAPT to graduate, so not everybody was asked to come here. You guys are lucky, not everyone's gonna get the one-on-one instruction this breakdown this practice.	Question is left unanswered—What is the SAT for? Attempts to establish the false notion that the Saturday Academy is for an elite group of “lucky” students who can still be saved. Makes what proves to be the false promise of “one-on-one instruction.”
116. Student: (Softly) I was forced to come here.	Student rejects the call for elite status with a touchingly honest and insightful reply; this could have been explored in class discourse. While a sense of elitism may be an alluring “tool” in elite cultures, it fails to convince this student. Sophie, too, will later attempt to establish an elite—and therefore powerful—status by referencing possessions and experiences—owning a Volvo, going to Paris—of value in her culture, and so, presumably, in theirs. Listen for cultural invitations and the forms they take. When these invitations are rejected, patterns of student behavior reveal hostility and disciplinary problems occur.
117. Shelly: But it's gonna help you. If you know you gotta take it you gotta pass this thing in order to graduate right? You gotta just get it done. How many of you do any of you play video games or anything? (Many hands are raised.) All right, do any of you go online and find the cheat codes so you can advance a little bit? (Many hands raised again.) All right, what we're going to be doing, in a sense, over the next few weeks is giving you	Hegemonic exhortation: “you gotta take it” and “you gotta pass this thing” and “you gotta just get it done.” Places students in the hierarchy of power. Initiates the analogy between test preparation and video game “cheat codes.”
118. Marianna: Cheat codes?	Mystified.
119. Anna returns and puts on her jacket.	
120. Shelly: Not cheat codes, we're giving you strategies to move it past this test, to move past it, graduate, and move on so that next year you don't have to do it again because they'll make you do it again, so we want you to get through it	The hegemonic threats then continue: “they'll make you do it again” if you fail. Who

now so you don't have to worry about it. All right, so, they're two types of tests, and they're both written on front of this sheet here, two types of test for English. You have the Reading for Information that we're going to talk about today and also the Response to Literature. Reading for Information Miss Morris started to talk with you about when she was asking you you know what types of things do you read how do you read it. When you're reading for information, when you're reading to answer those questions (rising intonation), right? What's the difference between that and just reading a book? When you're reading for information what do you have to do? (11:01)	is "they," exactly? Proceeds with monologue regarding explicit test preparation. "How do you read it"? This is a vague, yet possibly interesting question. Another vague "difference" question.
121. Indistinguishable student replies.	
122. Shelly: Right, you're looking for certain things, you're having to focus a lot more and what would be one strategy, the one that she mentioned actually, if you want to save a little bit of time, maybe you don't want to spend an hour on this assignment, you want to get it done a little bit quicker, what's the thing to do?	Introduces the first strategy of success.
123. Indistinguishable student replies.	
124. Shelly: (11:24) Look at the questions first and then look for the information and it goes in with this scenario ok? Which makes more sense? You drive around the state aimlessly (Marianna asks if she should take notes: "Write it?") nope, don't have to write it. You drive around the state aimlessly looking for a town, then you look at a map and figure out where you have to go, then you use your directions to drive to the town, or look at a map and figure out where you have to go, use your directions to drive to the town?	Appropriates the question and the answer: "Look at the questions first" is the strategy. She answers her question herself with a map analogy. Take notes? No. Strategies as map analogy. Ends with rhetorical question.
125. Multiple students answer: The second one.	Response.
126. Shelly: The second one. Shhhhhh.	Repetition and discipline.

127. Marcus: I like the first one because you might be able to find like a . . .	Spontaneous authentic response. One can intuit what Marcus is thinking right now, and it's pretty entertaining: his idea is that driving without a map is an opportunity for true discovery. This is a compelling extension to Shelly's analogy, and an artistic analogy for literary studies.
128. Shelly: Why does, shhhhhh, why does this one make more sense? what makes what's	Overpowers, disciplines, and temporarily silences Marcus.
129. Marianna: It's easier.	The looked-for response: ease, not exploration.
130. Shelly: It's easier.	Repeats student's "correct" answer, but then changes it to a more correct answer—the one she was looking for.
131. Marcus: It's quicker, you you get straight to where you're going	Marcus speaks very quickly, as if he must deliver his answer before he loses the floor.
132. Shelly: It's faster because you have you just figure out where you have to go and you go. You don't just drive around randomly so you end up you know . . .	Shelly does not validate Marcus's response. She then changes the wording of Marcus's answer from "easier" and "quicker" to "faster." So, while her strategies will allow students to take the test faster, they will not make the test any easier. A truth subtly delivered. The test is too hard for them, yet the strategies will allow them to "cheat" their way to success.
133. Isabel: No gas (student laughter).	Humor? Irony?
134. Shelly: No gas. Then you look at a map and realize you have to get back to where you just came from, right? so the second one saves you time, and that ties in with the reading for information test because if you look at your handout, how much time do you have, for the reading for information? (12:26)	Repeats answer. Procedural question.
135. Students: 45 minutes.	Student response.
136. Shelly: 45 minutes. How many articles do you have to read?	Teacher repetition and call.
137. Students: Three.	Student response.
138. Shelly: Three. And you have to answer	Teacher repetition and call.

questions for each one, right? So you really want to save some time. You want to save some time, so (chatter) shhhhhh if you think about this driving analogy here you don't want to just aimlessly read it without knowing what you're looking for, you want to look at the questions first, then read it, because otherwise, if you did this, if you read the article, then looked at the questions, now you gotta re-read the article, so why'd you read it in the first place? Because now you just have to re-read it all over again. So that's that takes you a lot of time if you do that . . . read the questions then read the article to find the information, you're gonna save time where ever you can (hands out paper and answers individual procedural and logistic questions regarding what they are doing). All right, so you're gonna read the question first then read the article so you don't end up reading the thing twice. The more time you save the better. And this is the question I asked another class: How many times in your lifetime have you been given an assignment where you had to say like read a chapter and answer questions at the end? (14:00)	Discipline. What Shelly intends to be a rhetorical question is actually authentic and problematical. Rhetorical question.
139. Students: A lot.	Students' response.
140. Shelly: All right. How many of you read the entire chapter before you answer the questions?	Call for students who take tests "incorrectly" or inefficiently to identify themselves. Confession.
141. Several students raise their hands—Hannah and Marcus.	Non-verbal response.
142. Shelly: A couple people? What do other people do?	Intended rhetorical question, the desired answer is obviously, "We read the questions first."
143. Shelly: For the purpose of that one assignment, what does that allow you to do if you look for that information just that information?	Call.
144. Shelly: You save time, so then you can go watch your TV or do whatever it is you gotta do. (14:34)	Repeats answer. What students really want to do (watch tv?) is not what they "gotta do" (take the test). Perhaps they read for fun. Is

145. Shelly: (14:46) If you know you're looking for specific information, what might you want to read with? 146. Flurry of answers and repetition followed by explicit instruction—test-taking tips. 147. Shelly: What's going to happen if you haven't marked anything? (To Tanya) Um now when you're you said before I'm sorry I've forgotten your name what was your name? 148. Tanya: Tanya. 149. Shelly: Tanya. Now when you're looking for that information do you read word for word looking for the information? What do you do? 150. Tanya: (Unintelligible) 151. Shelly: (17:05) All right. Skim through the lines, find something that stands out that means it goes with that question, so you skim through it, so if possible skim the article to look for answers to particular questions. (Pause) Rather than reading it word for word, skim it. Now there are some advantages and disadvantages to that so if you skim the article and answer the questions what's the advantage of that? 152. Students: (Unintelligible) 153. Shelly: You're saving some time, you're getting it done a little bit faster. What's the disadvantage, something you want to be careful of if you do scan? 154. Anna: Not missing any information. 155. Shelly: Right, good, you don't want to miss the information, so skimming it is good as long as you're careful that you know you're not missing information	Shelly assuming these students only read when motivated by tests? Call. Vague question. Enthusiastic response. You want to read with a pen or pencil or highlighter in your hand in order to take notes—this is the next strategy. Call. Repetition of call. Response. Repetition and elaboration. Skimming is the next strategy; the major problem is that students, in my experience, do not really know what it means to skim, and it is unlikely that any of them have the ability to do so. Request for guided response. Compliant response. Repetition and restatement of answer. Are scanning and skimming synonymous? Request for guided answer. Compliant response. Repetition and restatement of answer.

that's important to the questions, so if it's possible skim it. (Pause) Then what we were saying before, suppose when you're taking the CAPT test all your friends are in there, you still only get 45 minutes to finish it, what do you have to do? 156. Marcus: Concentrate. Focus. 157. Shelly: Focus, focus, don't look at 'em, just look at your paper right? You gotta focus. 158. Isabel: (Leaning back and reaching behind her head as she pulls her hair into a pony tail) And tell 'em to be quiet, don't talk to you. 159. Shelly: Right, so don't look at what other people are doing or who's in the hallway, who's waving at you through the window (Bruno's hand goes up, tentatively) in the hallway, hmmm? (calling on Bruno, who requests a pencil). Yes. All right? You wanna make sure that you focus for those 45 minutes just focus on what you're reading. You can always talk with your friends later, but those 45 minutes are all you get for the test (hands Bruno a pencil and he quietly thanks her) Yup. So just focus on reading answering it getting it done and then when you're done, then you guys can like communicate through your you know facial expressions or whatever so for that time you want to make sure you just focus on the test. (Pause) Avoid those distractions. Then, the last thing, you got for the Reading for Information you have two types of questions they have multiple choice questions and short answer questions. Which take longer to answer? 160. Students answer. 161. Shelly: The short answer questions. So what might you want to do? 162. Marcus: Get all of the multiple choice done first and then go to the short	Broaches appropriate social behavior. Request for guided response. Compliant response. Repetition of answer—three times. Appropriate, compliant response—leaves out Shelly's modeled suggestion to defer to the teacher and to include recommended discipline—just handle it yourself. Shelly instructs students to shun their friends during the test. Has this proven to be a problem during CAPT administration? Reading for Information explicit instruction. Request for guided response. Compliant answer. Repetition of answer. Request for guided response. Marcus suggests what I presume is the correct answer. Oooops, nope: see Day 6

answer.	Comment #185-189.
163. Shelly: All right so your strategy might be to do that quickly and then go to short answer?	Repetition and restatement of Marcus's response. Shelly's reply—"might be."
164. Anna: No (Anna's elaboration is interrupted by Shelly)	Anna disagrees.
165. Shelly: (Talking over Anna) What would you do? You'd do short answer first? Now why would you choose to do short answer first?	Authentic question. Restatement of response. Request for elaboration.
166. Anna: Because they're they're gonna be worth more points	Is this true? Who is right? On Day 6 we will see that Anna is right. The RFI section of the CAPT is comprised of three pieces of writing about which students must answer 12 multiple choice questions, each worth one point, and six short answer questions, each worth two points.
167. Bruno: Yeah	Agreement.
168. Anna: And multiple choice you can like if you don't have enough time you can just like kinda guess.	Strategy.
169. Shelly: All right go through it a little more quickly it takes less time (talking over Anna) All right, so, you know in some cases you might wish to do the short answer questions first to make sure you get them done because then maybe you can answer the multiple choice a little bit more quickly so if you only have five minutes left then you can get those done quickly whereas if you only had five minutes and you had three short answer questions that's gonna take you a little bit longer. (Pause) Now the other part of number five says in complete sentences, why is it good to write complete sentences for short answers?	Imprecise repetition of Anna's answer. Interrupts Anna's elaboration. Shelly's "in some cases" makes me think Anna's answer is not the one Shelly was looking for. Why doesn't she say so? What does "in some cases" mean? How are the cases ever going to vary? So which was the correct answer? Shelly sounds hesitant. Another strategy. Request for guided response.
170. Isabel: So you get the full points, it it makes sense	Compliant response indicating purpose: to get points and to make sense.
171. Shelly: All right, it makes sense to who?	Request for seemingly obvious elaboration.
172. Students answer.	Compliant group response.

173. Shelly: To whoever is reading it right? Because they're not gonna have you there to ask you what did you mean by this? So the more information you can give them, the, yeah, the better that they'll be able to see if you did what? (Pause) What are they looking for? 174. Student answers. 175. Shelly: If you understood, good. So the more information you give them the better they can see if you understood or not. If you only give them, you know, a phrase, like, uh, "The dog barked" (pause), yeah, they they don't know what you mean by that, they don't know how you're using that information so, the more that you can give them, the better they'll be able to see if you understood it, so the two things that they're looking for for this reading for information are that you can read these article and understand them, like Marcus said (Marcus nods his head and says something), and then also, if, you can interpret what you've read 176. Hannah: Do you want us to write that? 177. Shelly: Yup. Well actually I think it's on the front of your handout here (approaches Anko and looks at his handout) I think it says what it's looking for 178. Anna: Yeah it does. 179. Shelly: All right, so, they want you to understand it, they want to see that you understood it, and they want to see that you can interpret it meaning that you can come to you know your own conclusions about the article. (Pause) Now if they're looking to see if you understood it or not, what do you want to make sure you never ever ever ever ever ever say, never say 180. Students in unison: I don't understand this story.	Repetition of response Request for guided response. Compliant group response. Repetition of response. "The dog barked" as an example of incomplete detail. Giving "them" information so "they" can determine your understanding. Shelly recognizes Marcus's contribution. Unclear about note taking. No need to copy. Compliant student assistance. Repetition of purpose. "They." These terms are going to prove to be problematical. The great taboo. Catechism-style compliant group response.

181. Shelly: I don't understand it. Never say I didn't understand, because what does that do? As soon as you say that.	Repetition of taboo.
182. Anna: It makes you look dumb.	Catechism-style initiation.
183. Shelly: Well, not that it makes you look dumb, but it, it gives that per (responding to a student's comment) exactly (emphatic) the person grading it is gonna look at it and think all right, they either, they didn't get it and they're not trying maybe and so that that line is gonna stick in their head even if you say things later that show you understood (rising intonation) that one line will stick in their heads so you want to avoid saying I didn't understand. Another thing that you want to avoid is if the article's confusing, what do you not want to say?	Catechism-style response. The malevolent "person," the "they." Or that you don't know. Assumption is that the problem is motivational. Catechism-style request for further ultimate taboo. Taboo extended into synonyms.
184. Students in unison: The article was confusing.	Response.
185. Shelly: The article was confusing because that equals what?	Repetition of response. Catechism-style initiation.
186. Students in Unison: I don't understand.	Group compliant catechism-style response.
187. Shelly: I don't understand so it was confusing or I was confused equals I didn't understand so you want to avoid those phrases and just you know you gotta be on the lookout because it's really easy to write that down as your first reaction but you want to be on the lookout that you don't write that. All right, so these are the things that they are looking for.	Repetition of response. Confusion = I didn't understand. Sugaring over the devil himself. "Be on the lookout" for moments of truthful confusion, and avoid revealing them. This instruction will blend from the Reading for Information section of the CAPT into the Response to Literature section, which is contradictory since the first question on that section requires students to relate in writing their first reactions to what they have read. If confusion is part of their first reaction, should they not express that?
188. (23:00) Practice test is distributed and students begin work.	Shelly reviews answers—right and wrong. Hannah comes and goes, Marcus is rocking and must be distracting Marianna—he takes her paper off of her desk, Anko puts his head down, Bruno is distracting Tanya. Anko puts his pen in his mouth and plays with it. Shelly
189. Alarm bell rings. Shelly questions students about how they approached the test—what did they do? Then she	

reviews the test answers.	continues explaining right and wrong answers. I perceive students' participation as being on a mechanical level. Marcus begins to rock from side to side and to bob his head. Bruno applies lip balm and picks something out of his hair. Anko puts his head down as Anna reads her answer. Marcus's head is almost touching Marianna's, but Marianna does her best to ignore him. Shelly continues. Anna reads another one of her answers. They can answer Shelly's questions with seemingly minimal effort. During this entire time Shelly talks and asks guiding questions. Marcus is clearly doing his best to distract Marianna.
190. Shelly: So those would have been perfect answers. All right, now, before you leave for today because they're starting to get rowdy in the hallway here, I want you to write down one thing on that same scratch paper that same scrap paper that you did at the beginning, one thing that you know now leaving here that you did not know when you came in. You can write it anywhere, just write it down. . . . I'm going to ask you for it in a second, I'm going to ask you what you wrote down. One thing that you know now or understand better now that you didn't know at the beginning of this class about CAPT, anything about it, one thing you know better now, or you learned, yeah, not necessarily about the Tsunami. So what did you put, what did you learn, what do you know a little bit better about now?	Request for statement of what they learned.
191. Student: I put . . . (?)	Response.
192. Shelly: All right, doing the short answers first and in complete sentences. Yes	Assessment and repetition.
193. Bruno makes reference to the cheat codes.	Response.
194. Shelly: Strategies. Good, so that's what we're trying to do give you strategies, good. What did you put?	Restatement, repetition, and assessment.
195. Bruno: I put . . .	Response.

196. Shelly: Tips for answering the questions, good. What did you put?	Repetition and assessment.
197. Student: (Unintelligible)	Response.
198. Shelly: Read the questions first. Good. Yup.	Repetition and assessment.
199. Student: (Unintelligible)	Response.
200. Shelly: Good. Take quotations from the story as you read. Yup.	Assessment and repetition.
201. Student: (Unintelligible)	Response.
202. Shelly: Do the short answers first. Good. All right folks, now, what I'm going to have to do is put everything in your folder . . .	Repetition and assessment. Final procedural instruction. Collects the students' folders.
203. Before Bruno leaves class I ask him if I may speak with him:	
204. Me: Hey Bruno, Bruno, can I ask you a question? Hey, you answered B for number one and I was having trouble with number one, how'd you get that?	I ask Bruno to find in the text where his answer is explicitly stated. I could not find the answer explicitly stated.
205. Bruno: 'Cause I like I read it.	Begins answer with the apparent assumption that I am checking his process to see that it adheres to Shelly's teaching.
206. Me: Yup.	Acknowledgement.
207. Bruno: I read it and I was paying attention, at first I didn't I didn't get it yet.	Bruno continues to take me through his experience with the text and the question. He followed Shelly's instruction to focus.
208. Me: Right.	Acknowledgement.
209. Bruno: So but I I read it over and then I messed up and then I looked at it again . . .	Bruno's experience with the text. Then he "looked at it again," just as his teachers told him to do.
210. Me: Where's your proof for that because I'm not finding it, I I I can't find where that answer is, "There's enough evidence in the article to conclude that throughout history strange animal behavior has preceded natural disasters," do you know	I restate my question. I re-read the question aloud.

where you found that? . . . I just couldn't find it. I had trouble with that last period too but I didn't ask anybody. . . . I don't want to take away from your lunch period.	My authentic question.
211. Bruno: Heh, Oh, this is lunch period?	Apologetic recognition of my demands.
212. Me: Yeah, they got some sandwiches out there. . . . Was it this? Was it on the other side? Is this it?	Perhaps a polite dismissal of my concerns regarding his free time.
213. Bruno: I don't know.	Confusion about how he knew his answer—where the proof is.
214. Me: That isn't it.	Acknowledges confusion.
215. Bruno: Wait.	Searching.
216. Me: Here, go ahead, I'm sorry. . . . I just couldn't find the answer to that, I I	Found something?
217. Bruno: I think it was . . . I think it was this one.	Apologetic. I repeat my problem.
218. Me: (Reading) "More acute hearing might enable them to hear or feel tipping them off." So that's what you were using for that?	Points to text.
219. Bruno: Yeah.	I read aloud his support.
220. Me: Hey, let me ask you one other question if you don't mind. Does that support, this is my problem, does that support this, (reading) to conclude that . . . ?	Request for verification.
221. Bruno: Yeah.	Asserts his answer.
222. Me: Does it? Do you think that?	I am still having trouble making the connection between the question and the text explicit.
223. Bruno: Yeah. I think that cuz sometime when like you have bad disasters the animals don't even don't even want to come out or do whatever they just feel scared like they don't remember nothing tipping them off.	Verifies his answer.
224. Me: And that's a conclusion you're getting from the article.	I question his verification.
	Reasserts his verification and elaborates. "Like they don't remember nothing tipping them off"—I don't get it, but that does not matter—he does.
	Concluding with an implied question revealing lingering uncertainty.

225. Bruno: Yeah. 226. Me: That's interesting. Good job. Thanks, thank you for thanks for your time.	Final assertion. I recognize his extra effort for talking with me, even as lunch is disappearing out in the hall.

Day 3: December 17th, 2005. Sophie's 2nd Class: "The Fight Club" or "Whose

Class is this Anyway?"

FRONT				DOOR
Jasmine BF	Anna WF			
Marianna BF	Marcus BM			Samuel WM
Isabel HF				
Hannah WF				
				Jacob WM
Carmella WF				
Tanya BF		Liang AF		ME

Absent: Bruno, Anko, Jim, Qing

1.	Marcus begins class sitting next to Anna. He wears a red winter cap and a black winter jacket over a gray hooded sweatshirt. He drums on his desk; when he stops drumming, Marianna commences and continues until Sophie tells her to stop. Sophie then remains silent until Anna intervenes.
2. Sophie: (Taking attendance amid loud pen drumming and soft chatter) Jasmine Hopkins?	
3. Jasmine: Here.	
4. Marianna: (After Sophie waits) Right here (pointing to Jasmine).	
5. Isabel: It's just that you can't hear us.	
6. Sophie: Ok. Speak a little louder (Marcus's knuckle drumming continues). Jacob?	
7. Jacob: Here (loudly).	
8. Sophie: Thank you sir. Nice and loud. Anna I saw. (Marcus turns to Tanya and	Affectionate recognition of Jacob's compliant response.

says something critical. Anna, smiling, turns to Tanya and stops smiling. Isabel, curious, looks at Tanya.) Um, Marcus Johnson? 9. Marcus: Yes ma'am. 10. Sophie: Ok. (0:18) 11. Tanya: Marcus, why you always (pause) trying to put somebody down? (Marianna is drumming loudly with her knuckles on her desk. Sophie tells her to stop. Marcus turns to look at Tanya.) 12. Marcus: (Innocently) Do what? (Tanya says something that I cannot hear—something about “estimating her qualities”; she is obviously responding to Marcus’s prior critical remark.) What are you talking about? (Tanya says something else, again too softly for me to hear. Marianna sings.) Who? (Isabel is an observer. Marianna continues to sing as she puts her right arm around Isabel’s shoulder and bobs and sways. Isabel looks to Sophie, who remains silent. Marcus responds inaudibly: “You can’t even spell (?)”.) 13. Anna: (Plaintive, not angry) Guys! (interrupting and terminating a conversation between Marcus and Tanya) 14. Sophie: (0:41, after a few seconds of disciplinary silence) I’m not gonna try to talk over you. So you’re here to learn. If you want to learn you need to pay attention. So that means you need to put magazines away (waits) 15. Anna and Sam: (As students look at Tanya) Tanya! (Marcus laughs loudly). 16. Tanya: (Reading) Huh? 17. Anna: (Marcus laughs loudly, obnoxiously, like a large, rusty wrought iron gate opening slowly, then Isabel,	Why does Marcus attack Tanya? Marcus, too, responds with compliance but does not receive a Jacob-like recognition. Tanya, hurt, responds to Marcus’s attack. Discipline. Innocent protestation. Teacher-inspired, student-administered classroom management. Discipline. Directed at Tanya. Student-assisted discipline. Mock confusion?

who was surprised by Tanya's response, laughs.) You need to put the magazines away. (Marianna and Jasmine look down and do not even smile. Isabel, noting Marianna's disengagement, turns suddenly serious. Anna laughs, but suddenly stops.)	Student-assisted discipline.
18. Isabel: I thought we were allowed to read in here.	Challenge—comes to the aid of her fellow student.
19. Sophie: If you don't want to be here please talk to Mr. Butler 'cause I don't want you wasting my time or anyone else in here. (Marcus turns in one swift movement to face Isabel and Marianna).	Student reaction to this whole moment is one of docility.
20. Isabel: I thought we could read in here, anything we find.	Challenge repeated.
21. Anna: (Quietly to Marcus, in a disciplinary undertone) Just turn around.	Anna takes on the role of Marcus's protector—the embodiment of his better judgment.
22. Sophie: Anything I give you you can read. (Isabel, chewing her gum like a cat chewing grass before it throws up, begins to bob and weave rhythmically in her chair. Sophie continues taking attendance.) Carmella is not here. (Carmella contradicts this observation.) Are you related to Constance?	Sophie as the possessor and dispenser of knowledge. Perhaps in reaction to the prior disciplinary scene, Sophie attempts to establish a personal rapport with Carmella.
23. Carmella: Yes.	Response.
24. Marianna: I am too.	Interposes herself in this attempt to establish personal connections.
25. Sophie: Ok, you died your hair or something, you look different from last year. You were in Miss Ryan's class (this elicits an enigmatic and inaudible reply from Carmella, followed by silence and, finally, a little laughter). Bruno?	Sophie does not validate Marianna's interjection.
26. Marcus: He's not here.	Marcus assists Sophie with her attendance—he listens.
27. Sophie: Anko's, I thought I saw Anko (Marianna and Carmella interact verbally).	

28. Marcus: He's not in here, I guess.	Polite response.
29. Tanya: Anko didn't get on the bus this morning.	Tanya, too, assists Sophie, perhaps attempting to establish a personal connection.
30. Sophie: Um, Qing's not here, Jim's not here, Tanya?	Sophie does not validate Tanya's attempt to help.
31. Tanya: (In a serious, deep voice) I'm Tanya.	This is a déjà vu—see prior responses attendance. Tanya is having trouble being remembered.
32. Marcus: Anko and Bruno got beat up (Marcus imitates with his arms and fists a mock fight—jabbing and blocking blows).	Is this true?
33. Sophie: Ok, um, quickly, I would like to just discuss what you guys went over last week with with Miss Clines (rising intonation) so can someone remind me? (2:19)	Review of prior class.
34. * * *	
35. Sophie: (4:22) So you so you guys read a story, it was a CAPT test, do you remember what it was called?	Sophie begins with a review of the prior class. Students read an article.
36. Marianna: It was called it was called it was about animals (Marcus loudly interrupts her—mocking and imitating her answer. Marcus is restless and fidgety—his movements are large and loud as his metal chair and desk scrape the linoleum floor. Marianna evinces no reaction to Marcus's distracting behavior).	Attempted response.
37. Sophie: Do you know what the the title of the of the test was though?	Pursues through recitation questions her review of prior class.
38. Anna: Writing?	Attempted answer.
39. Sam: No, it was a reading one.	On the trail of the answer.
40. Sophie: Reading what? Reading for what?	Provides a clue.
41. Anna: Reading for comprehension.	A reasonable but wrong answer.

42. Isabel: Reading comprehension.	Another attempt.
43. Sophie: What were you looking for while you were reading the articles?	Provides another clue.
44. Anna: The questions. The answer to the questions. (Marcus pulls his read hat down over his entire head.)	Recalling prior class's explicit lesson regarding test-taking strategy.
45. Sophie: Ok. Facts. Answers to the questions. What does that provide you with?	Pursues the original question with another clue.
46. Sam: Knowledge?	Ha! If only.
47. Isabel: Ideas.	Hopeful answers.
48. Sophie: Knowledge. Another word for knowledge might be	Knowledge = Information.
49. Isabel: Smartness.	Knowledge = Information = Smartness.
50. Sophie: Reading for . . . information! (Sing song voice).	States the answer .
51. Sam: I said information.	Claims to have offered the correct answer.
52. Sophie: Did you? Oh I'm sorry.	Accepts claim.
53. Marianna: You said knowledge.	Rejects claim.
54. Marcus: You said comprehension.	Further rejection of claim.
55. Anna: (To Marcus, laughing) I said comprehension.	This is really funny. I am laughing too.
56. Sophie: So (pause) it doesn't matter who said it or when but now we know it so that's terrific. (5:13)	Praise.
57. Sophie proceeds to review the basic strategies for the Reading for Information test introduced last class.	
58. * * *	
59. Isabel sits next to Marianna and is constantly moving—chewing her gum widely, bobbing her head, Marianna joins her. They both dance in their chairs—	

it's really bizarre to look at, and I wonder why they incur no discipline. Anna tells Sophie she got a five on a practice CAPT RFI test.	
60. Sophie: That's awesome, that's what you want. (Isabel interrupts Sophie.)	Praise
61. Isabel: Miss Morris?	Requests the floor.
62. Sophie: (To Anna) That's great.	Continued praise for Anna.
63. Isabel: What happened to our folders?	Question.
64. Sophie: I have them.	The keeper of the folders.
65. Isabel: Are are you	
66. Sophie: Um	
67. Isabel: gonna pass them out?	Continued request.
68. Sophie: (Lightly, dismissively) Nope.	The controller of the folders.
69. Anna: You don't need them.	Continues her assumed role as teacher.
70. Sophie: So, what you guys are going to be, the test that you're going to be doing today though it's the same thing you're looking for the same things (Marcus blows into his cupped hands, as if to warm them. Anna looks at him and frowns) you're looking to do the same things as you did with the Reading for Information. For instance, one of the things that um I know Miss Clines had talked to you about was while you are reading there's one thing that you should do and she compared it to, um, driving directions, do you remember what she said about (drowned out by student response)	Student-assisted discipline.
71. Students: Yeah.	Review of prior class.
72. Anna: (Misunderstanding the question) Yeah, don't pay attention to others around you or out in the hall or if someone's kicking your chair or whatever just (pause) concentrate.	Compliant participation.

73. Sophie: What about what about	
74. Marcus: No, she said you gotta read the map first before you start endlessly driving around.	On task reply and elaboration.
75. Sophie: Right, so what should you do then when you are reading for information or	Review of strategies.
76. Anna: Read the questions first.	Compliant response.
77. Sophie: Read the questions first.	Repeats the answer.
78. Marianna: Find your destination.	Connects the answer to the analogy.
79. Sophie: That is the same thing that I'm going to ask you to do when you are also reading the story today. Ok. Isabel? (Isabel looks up at Sophie.) Who's Isabel?	Initiates disciplinary move concerning Hannah, who has her head down. Detects she has made mistakenly called Hannah by the wrong name.
80. Marcus: (Pointing behind him with his thumb) Isabel's right there.	Marcus assists Sophie.
81. Isabel: Me. Me.	Responds.
82. Sophie: You're Isabel? Who's who's sitting next to you, what's your name again? (Isabel kind of snarls her lips).	Awkward disciplinary moment.
83. Hannah: Hannah.	
84. Isabel: Hannah. You thought that was Isabel (Reaching up and pointing down towards Hannah's head.)	Mild outrage.
85. Sophie: I just can't remember all of your names. Um Hannah I need you to keep your head up, ok? This you won't get credit if you're in here and you have your head down and you're not paying attention. (7:29) So one of the things that you guys did with Miss Clines was to talk about how you need to read the questions first because this will provide you with uh a focus, and so you want to do the same thing with the response to literature which is what you're going to focus on today. Um, in addition to that	Explanation. Discipline. Review of prior class: strategies.

she had also mentioned to you want the two things were that the graders were looking for you to do and the two most important things when you are reading for information that you should do, uh does anyone remember what those are?	
86. Sam: Don't say I don't I didn't understand.	Recalls the taboo. This is a problem. The first question on the Response to Literature section of the CAPT requires students to explore their first reaction to a story. If their first reaction is confusion or a lack of understanding, should they not pursue this reaction? Otherwise, are they not just faking it—writing in a most disingenuous way about a most inauthentic topic?
87. Marcus adjusts over his eyebrows his red knitted hat—rolling up and pulling it down. Jasmine sits statue still.	Withdrawal.
88. Sophie: Ok, so the first thing they're looking is that you have an understanding, that you know what you've just read. Yes (indicating Anna).	Understanding.
89. Anna: That you get a lot like you take a lot of information in like quotes or if there's any from the story and you put into	Quotes.
90. Marcus: (Helping Anna) Your story	
91. Sophie: Into your response, yeah what you, no wonder why you did so well. Um yeah you're doing, yeah, that's perfect. (8:35) Um, so you want to make sure that you put in quotes that you use things from the story to show that you do understand what has happened, even if it's you know giving a brief summary of what what they just stated, all right? for instance with a short story. What else are they looking for you to do? They're see they're checking to see that you understand"	Continued praise. "They."
92. Tanya: (In a soft, deep, monotone voice) Answer in complete sentences.	
93. Sophie: So you want to answer in	Appropriate answer.

complete sentences, that will help them to understand that (Anna looks down at the front of her low-cut blouse and picks something off then picks another item off. Marcus watches) to see that you understand. And what else? (Anna turns and looks at Marcus looking at her. She shakes her head.) What do you do after you understand it? What what's the next step with reading?	Repeats Tanya's answer.
94. Hannah: Read it?	Distracting action.
95. Sophie: After you've read it.	To me, now, this is a vague question.
96. Marianna: Hannah put your head up.	I do not understand this response.
97. Hannah: (Whiney) My head is (emphasis) up.	I do not know where Sophie is heading.
98. Marianna: No it ain't.	Student-administered discipline.
99. Sophie: After you've read it. What's the next thing that you do? (Marcus turns to face Marianna.) After you understand it.	Implicitly accepts Marianna's role as surrogate teacher. Responds defensively.
100. Anna: You start writing about it.	Pursues discipline.
101. Sophie: Ok.	Ignores the interaction between Hannah and Marianna.
102. Anna: And if you understand it then	Still a vague question.
103. Sophie: (To Marcus, who is talking to Marianna) Shhhhhh	Response.
104. Anna: you'll be able to write a lot about it and, like, you won't get (Marcus grips with his hands his chin and the back of his head and twists, like he's cracking his neck) like I don't know how to explain it but like if you do know what the story's about you will write a lot about it but if you just don't understand it (pause) they will know that you don't understand it by you not writing like a whole page on it or whatever	Begins to elaborate upon her own answer.
105. Sophie: Ok, so you're showing that you understand it, and then what is it called when you develop an opinion, or an idea, about it. It starts with an I, the word I'm	Discipline.
	Continues elaboration.
	Repeats prior class warning.
	Repeats and rejects Anna's answer. Pursues her question.
	Provides a hint.

looking for.	
106. Marcus: Intelligence.	After you understand the piece you “intelligence”?
107. Sophie: You’re using your intelligence to figure out what the what the story’s about, and then?	Nurtures Marcus’s answer. Pursues question.
108. Hannah: Irresponsible.	Ha! Hannah heard Sophie’s hint but does not understand the question.
109. Sophie: What?	Confusion.
110. Anna: (Questioning Hannah) Irresponsible? What are you talking about?	Student response.
111. Marianna: Irregular.	Continues in Hannah’s vein.
112. Jacob: You’re saying random words that start with I.	Jacob perceives and diagnoses the problem.
113. Sophie: (Writing the word) Interpret, right? (9:59)	Sophie provides the answer.
114. Sophie asks for volunteers. Anna raises her right hand. Marcus, sitting to her right, grabs her hand and brings it down to below her chair and tipping her over actually into his lap. Anna looks at him and kind of smiles. She raises her hand again, and Marcus brings it down again. Marianna raises her left hand. Jacob speaks. Sophie hears him and repeats his words. Anna forcibly expresses herself. Sophie tells her to “hold on” and pursues Jacob’s comment. Marianna forcibly expresses herself, but she is ignored. Marcus expresses himself and is recognized by Sophie. Other students speak, but Sophie returns to Jacob, and a movie that he has seen becomes the topic of discussion. More discipline.	Marcus physically obstructs Anna’s participation. Anna gracefully responds to Marcus’s attempt at control; she does not let Marcus alter her involvement, nor do her actions diminish his social position in the class: both powers—Sophie’s and Marcus’s—are appeased. Sophie does not perceive the effort this response entailed.
115. Marcus: (11:39) You’re in trouble Hannah, just just quit and watch and listen	Developing struggle for Sophie’s attention: Jacob vs. Marianna, Anna, and Marcus. Student-administered discipline.
116. Anna: (Marianna comments upon Hannah’s shoes) You guys, stop	Student-administered discipline.

(laughing).	
117. Sophie: Are you guys done?	Teacher-administered discipline in the form of a question.
118. Hannah: (Lightly) Yeah.	Defiant response.
119. Sophie: Ok, 'cause you need to stay focused right now or you need to get out (Marcus points to the door). I don't care either way, but I want to teach people who want to be here, so if you don't want to be here, leave. And you can tell Mr. Sampson why you're leaving, because you don't care about graduating and you don't care about the CAPT, because right now that is what you're telling me, because you're being very disrespectful while other people are trying to learn things and talk. (Pause)	Teacher-administered discipline. Student-administered discipline in the form of a gesture. False threat. Assumption.
120. Isabel: (Raising her hand) I have a question, I'm not trying to be rude but if like a teacher kicks you out of class	Attempt to understand the consequence of possible disciplinary actions.
121. Sophie: You're not gonna get credit for that	Response.
122. Isabel: No, do you go home or what happens?	Pursues question.
123. Sophie: No, you go sit for the next three hours or so	Really?
124. Anna: (Incredulous) What?	Reaction.
125. Student chatter	
126. Tanya: Darn it man, I hate . . .	Visceral anger.
127. Anna: You guys!	Student-administered discipline.
128. Sophie: Again, if you don't want to be here, you don't have to be here (Tanya puts her head into her hand, resignedly).	Teacher-administered discipline. Reaction.
129. Isabel: I was just asking.	Defense of question.
130. Student chatter.	
131. Tanya: Miss, who said that?	Pursues the argument.

132. Sophie: Who said what?	Caught by surprise.
133. Tanya: We don't want to be here.	This is an interesting pursuit.
134. Sophie: This is your choice to come here. You're invited.	Continuing moral castigation and discipline.
135. Tanya: We got up at seven o'clock in the morning to be here.	Student defense: evidence that they care and the questioning of their motivation is unjustified.
136. Sophie: Right, so if you're gonna be here, you're not wasting my time and you're not gonna waste other students' time, if you want to be here then you need to be here to learn. If you're coming here to socialize or look at magazines or play with your hair or whatever the case may be, do it at home. Don't waste my time.	Time seems to be the issue—the wasting of it. Assumption. .
137. Tanya: I wasn't wasting time. You weren't doing nothing.	Recognizing the value of time and the social implications of Sophie's argument, Tanya offers a defense and an explanation.
138. Sophie: (13:40) Ok, so then just stay focused and go and we'll listen to what Jacob has to say about this movie (continues with instruction).	Acquiesces. What caused this whole diversion? Was it Sophie's calling on Jacob when Anna, Marianna, and Marcus all were claiming the floor?
139. * * *	
140. Tanya: (21:42. After eight minutes of students and teachers asking questions about Jacob's movie, <u>The Fight Club</u> , which only Sophie and Jacob have seen) Can I can I ask questions?	Tanya requests the floor in order to ask a question.
141. Sophie: (Haltingly, reluctantly) Uh well for this for this one particular thing? Have you read have you seen that movie? (Marcus is pretending to punch himself in the jaw, repeatedly, with his right and left hands.)	I sense from Sophie's hesitant reply that she is disinclined to allow Tanya the floor. Why? What is the point of this question? None of the other students, except for Jacob, have seen the movie, yet they have been asking questions.
142. Tanya: (Sadly) No. (Marcus looks at Tanya with obvious concern.)	Detects Sophie's rejection.
143. Sophie: All right we're going to stay focused on that movie then, you can ask	Explicit rejection, then withdrawal of the rejection, making it something more subtle.

(emphatic) questions if you want to. 144. Anna: (To Tanya) How can you get at how can you ask a question if you've never seen the movie Tanya? 145. Sophie: Anna. Shhh. Um (Marcus turns around and looks softly at Tanya for a few seconds, then he tries to make her laugh by pretending to throw up. He puts his head down and laughs, then turns back to Tanya and smiles. Marianna is looking seriously at Tanya. Isabel's head—her right ear—is placed flat against her desk. Tanya responds, but her response is unintelligible. Anna inclines her face upon her open palms, her elbows on her desk.) (22:33) so (hesitates, in a high voice) let me ask you this then, what do you think the what's like the point (emphasis)? 146. Anna: (Agitated) There is really no point to this movie if it's all about fighting. 147. Jacob: It's, it doesn't have a specific plot, but like, it's just, it's whatever story than having a point to it (chair movement drowns out Jacob's voice) it's just a movie, it has no point. 148. Sophie: So you don't think that the author was trying to to make anything 149. Jacob: Well 150. Sophie: any point in the story? 151. Jacob: there are messages in it like, uh, I know conformity and stuff, like when he's making the army he tells them that they're, that they're not special and that, uh, they're all part of the same rotting matter, and that all, all, like the survival rate eventually all equals to zero, and that everyone's gonna die. 152. Sophie: So what so what do you think	This is what the students have been doing for eight minutes. What's going on with the students and Tanya? Anna continues to attack Tanya. Why? Sophie rejects Anna's disciplinary move. Marcus intuits Tanya is not being treated fairly. Is this Marcus's apology to Tanya for his unkindness at the beginning of class? Appropriates the questioning of Jacob. Was she protecting him? Anna critiques the movie and its violent content. Vague reply. I think Sophie is making an attempt to elicit Jacob's interpretation of the movie's theme. Hesitant reply. Conformity. Disempowering theme.

the author of this cause it's a book too, what do you think the author of this book that was turned into a movie, what do you think he's try, he or she is trying to say about conformity?	Pursues Jacob's idea about conformity.
153. Jacob: That	
154. Sophie: That you that you should (emphasis) conform to society or?	Interprets Jacob's interpretation—nurtures his response.
155. Jacob: No, it's (pause) he he was conforming his army alone, but like people were ending up dying like when they were doing the, it was more like vandalism (rising intonation)	Rejects Sophie's interpretation.
156. Sophie: Ok.	Allows Jacob to maintain the floor.
157. Jacob: Uh, and like, one guy ended up getting shot in the head, and so like they can't, they brought him back to their hideout place, they just buried him in the garden, so no one would find him (rising intonation).	Elaborates upon his idea, but I do not know what he is really doing—what idea is he proving with this detail?
158. Sophie: So (pause) so the main character here is trying to get this group of people to be like under his reign and he was trying to get them to conform.	Again, Sophie interprets Jacob's interpretation. Refocuses on conformity.
159. Jacob: Yeah, he was like, making them all like work really really hard and like, it was almost like a torture thing, like he would like pour acid on their hand and like wouldn't let them	Jacob now accepts Sophie's interpretation with what is perhaps his own coloration: conformity through torture.
160. Anna: (Raising her head) Oh my god (talking over Jacob, who continues to speak haltingly) I don't want to see that.	Anna evaluates the movie.
161. Jacob: He's trying to like, make them think and like make them be a better person, but like in a bad way (rising intonation)	Effectively ignores Anna. Be a "better person in a bad way."
162. Sophie: Ok.	Allows Jacob to maintain the floor.
163. Jacob: But like, mature more, as a person like, deal with it.	Elaborates vaguely.

164. Sophie: (24:07) So do you think, just based on what you're saying it seems to me like maybe one of the things the author was trying to to have you get out of this was that there are people in society today who will try to get you to conform, and that you know you should just want to be your own person, I mean really it seems like from this from the story that you were telling that the pe the people who were conforming lost all sense of their identity	Interestingly ironic thematic observation, considering the powers descending upon this group of students who, if they really acted according to their own desires—if they were really “their own person,” would not ever take the CAPT. One requirement of the test may be that these students “lose all sense of their identity” in order to succeed.
165. Jacob: Yeah.	Complacent agreement.
166. Jacob: . . . and they . . .	Attempt at continued participation—overridden.
167. Sophie: It was like a cult.	Further interpretation.
168. Jacob: Yeah.	Complacent agreement.
169. Jacob: Like they all they all shaved their heads and stuff.	Provides detailed proof to support Sophie's claim of cult-like behavior.
170. Sophie: Oh ok so they all became like one person instead of being themselves.	Further interpretation of the movie. This is really an ironic moment, considering the undervaluing of the various cultural backgrounds of this eclectic group of students.
171. Jacob: Yeah.	Complacent agreement.
172. Sophie: Have you guys ever heard or read or seen anything that relates to that idea of people conforming. Do you have people conforming? Do you know people in high school today who will do anything to kind of like fit in so that they'll change	Theme of the explicit conversation: conformity. Sophie now is obviously trying to elicit a particular “correct” response from the class. This is an attempt to connect her theme of the movie with students' experiences.
173. Isabel: My brother's like that.	Attempt to personalize the dialogue.
174. Sophie: . . . is? Your brother does that?	Recognition of student's personal anecdote and prior knowledge.
175. Isabel: (Unintelligible)	
176. Sophie: What does he do?	Request for elaboration.
177. Isabel: He tries to dress like I don't know he tries to impress people by not being himself and he gets on my nerves.	Complies with Sophie's request for elaboration.

'Cause he's not himself anymore. 178. Sophie: So similar to the to the character in this story and you know it kind of seems like the main . . . 179. Jacob: He wanted them to be loyal to him. Like he wanted them to be really like when they showed up at his door he would yell at them and tell them they're not good enough and stuff and like go away, you're too fat and you're too old you're too young whatever. 180. Sophie: And they would just stay? 181. Jacob: They would just stay there out in the cold it was like freezing cold they would just have to stand there for like three days. 182. Sophie: That's a little pathetic, huh? 183. Jacob: Yeah. 184. Sophie: Um . . . 185. Jacob: Yeah. It's a really good movie. 186. Sophie: I was just about to ask you that. 187. Sophie: Based upon all of what you're saying it seems most people in the beginning were you know they wanted to see it, it has action, its got you know this killing things like that but then um you started talking about the things that were kind of disgusting but you think it's a good movie. 188. Jacob: I think it's a really good movie. 189. Sophie: Why?	Appropriates and interprets student's personal story to make a thematic point about the movie. Returns the topic of the conversation to the movie. Elaborates. Sophie allows Jacob to interrupt and to reestablish his dominance. Request for elaboration. Complies with Sophie's request for elaboration. Judgment: establishment of implicit moral code of the group. Assumes agreement. Compliant agreement. Attempt at participation. Preempts other student's attempt at participation and agrees with Sophie. Jacob anticipates Sophie. Their conversation is beginning to exclude all other students, as Jacob responds, not to her stated questions, but to questions she is thinking. Sophie attempts to make her point explicit. Request for Jacob to repeat his judgment. Unaware of Sophie's attempt, Jacob again establishes rapport with Sophie by agreeing with her thought that it was "a good movie." Open-ended question.

190. Jacob: 'Cause it had a really good story, like the things that they say like, it makes you think, like I can't I don't know I can't really remember everything I only saw it once, the first time I saw it was yesterday, but yeah.	Exploratory speech. This is a conversation that perhaps should have occurred during a peer group exercise. While Jacob is finally exploring with all the glory of inarticulate exploratory speech, all other students have been excluded. There may be a price to pay for this.
191. Sophie: So after you were done what were some of the things that it was making you think about?	Request for elaboration.
192. Jacob: Um, just like, their ideas of (?) special and stuff how you can't that you can't be your own snowflake or whatever.	Further exploration. Theme.
193. Sophie: (Softly) Do you agree with that?	Authentic question.
194. Jacob: Uh, to a certain degree. It's hard to be an individual . . . in modern society . . .	Authentic response.
195. Sophie (simultaneously): In society today. Because there are so many expectations.	Assists student's discourse.
196. Jacob: Yeah. . . . And like he was telling everyone, everyone should just let go. Like they wouldn't care, like they were all driving in the car they were driving on the wrong side of the road and they just let go of the wheel (motioning with his hands and arms) and just like everyone in the car just like went off the highway and stuff and they they were like all laughing and stuff, I've never been in a car accident before and like yeah.	Interprets Sophie's appropriation as a request for elaboration; his elaboration, however, reverts to exploratory speech—the connection with his prior point seems tenuous—"Just let go." More detail.
197. Sophie: So it seems like there is a pretty big message here, behind behind the story, um.	Sophie is concluding the discourse.
198. Isabel: Probably the message is just to be yourself, while you're growing up, and something.	Attempt to enter the discourse and to be included.
199. Sophie (ignoring Isabel's comment): and the and the characters (Marcus appears comatose) too that that you described, I mean this doesn't seem like a very cliché	Maintains and reinforces her exclusive relationship with Jacob. Why Jacob? Why was so much time allowed him for exploratory speech? Why was he asked so many authentic

plot (Sophie looks to the other side of the classroom, one student laughs, perhaps Marianna) Do you know what that means? Trite or cliché where it's overused, um, I don't know if	questions, providing him the opportunity for exploratory speech?
200. Jacob: Yeah, I haven't seen anything else like it.	Reestablishes his apparent social and intellectual dominance, as well as the personal connection he and Sophie are sharing.
201. Sophie: Which makes it really interesting.	Sophie grammatically finishes Jacob's sentence: Sophie's projection of Jacob's thought.
202. Sophie: Um, one thing I have to say, I loved this movie, I've seen this before, and uh actually I had to watch it twice to make sure that I picked up on everything because at the end it takes a total twist, doesn't it?	Confession. Takes possession of the conversation.
203. Jacob: Yeah.	Requests verification.
204. Sophie: And so, um, I had to watch it two times right in a row, um I, don't tell your parents I said this, but I would highly recommend seeing it when you're ready to, it is a very cool book, or very you know read the book too if you want, um really cool movie, um, definitely the first time I watched it I had a stomach ache the whole time because there is a lot of blood and um just really	Complies with request for verification.
205. Jacob: Oh yeah yeah like	Attempts to establish intimate rapport with students. Why would their parents not approve of this movie? What is Sophie's assumption about their family discourse? She invites students into the morality of her culture, if only they will be discreet. Then they may be included, as Jacob was. What was the point Sophie was trying to get students to articulate at the beginning of this conversation?
206. Student: Disgusting	
207. Jacob: That guy wanted his face put back and like he was just like (?) and he jumped on him and he was like bleeding out of his face (?).	
208. Student: Yeah, he beats himself up.	
209. Now chatter from the other side of the room.	
210. Student: What's it called?	
211. Sophie: <u>The Fight Club</u>.	

212. Marianna: Miss Morris (raising her hand). 213. Sophie: Yes. 214. Marianna: Have you ever seen <u>The Passion of Christ</u>? 215. Sophie: I have not. 216. Anna gasps—great intake of enthusiastic air. More enthusiastic chatter and moving of furniture. 217. Marcus: (smiling, in a soft mocking voice) I cried. 218. Sophie: (loudly) All right, before we get off task, um, based on what we just did up here, you guys did a really great job at this, this is, if you can do this with a story then you are . . . you're golden. This is exactly what you want to do. This same way that you are analyzing this movie is the same thing you want to do with a short story. Here, first of all we got an entire summary of what this was about, just like on the CAPT they're looking to see that you understand what you read, clearly Jacob understood what he saw in this movie. The more prodding we did, the more questions we asked, um, the more he remembered about the story, so as you are reading through a story on your own, in order to, ask yourself questions, make comments, make connections to it, you know the way that Anna was making a connection, do all of those things as you are going through and reading because you will reali, you will get so much more out of it in the end, um, you know at first Jacob started out with like a sentence and you	Demands attention and a place to participate. Invitation to join, now. Invitation into her culture. Summarily dismisses and rejects the invitation. No request for elaboration. Why? Hearing Jacob's discourse with Sophie does not provide Marianna the cognitive challenges and benefits of engaging in discourse herself. Joins Marianna, as do other students who, until now, have been left out. Anna takes over Sophie's role, as she has seen it acted out, of being a partner in discourse. She continues her role as teacher, which she established in a disciplinary context early in this class period. Joins the girls. With the threat of "getting off task" looming, and amid praise, Sophie emphatically ends the movie discussion and does not validate Marianna's cultural invitation. Here Sophie makes her point explicitly: when taking the CAPT, summarize to prove comprehension, ask yourself questions (prod yourself—the metaphor is perhaps revealing). Strategies: ask questions, make comments, make connections.

know he we spent the past few minutes discussing this story but it was from prodding from asking questions, question your story, really think about it, ok? Um, we discussed the characters, the problems, you guys were asking good questions, like what was the problem like what's going on, um, clearly having a schizophrenic who thinks the, um, you know, is not schizophrenic is not the problem here, um, you know, quoting, you know that we're not special, that that we're all the same, um, you know being able to pick those quotes and put that into, you know, your definition of what you think is good literature, the fact that the theme is so well done that, you know, the author trying to say that if you, you know, are going to conform then yeah you aren't going to be special, you're gonna be just like everyone else. You said that there's action in here, um, you gave a lot of good reasons for why this was such a good story, um the fact that it wasn't overplayed so much. Now I think probably quite, you know, uh uh, people probably the first time I ended up watching this movie I thought to myself that you know it was really disturbing and I didn't like it that much and it was because I just didn't get it and so my second time watching it I was like wow this is really an amazing story, and so but it took you know understanding and questioning and thinking about everything . . . (to Marianna) What were you going to say? (30:58) 219. Marianna makes a connection to the horrifying movie <u>Sybil</u>, a movie she has seen more than once. 220. Sophie: As you were, that you needed to see that two times too? 221. Marcus: (head on his right arm) Yeah. 222. Sophie: I didn't get it at first. She had	Literary terms: character, problem, questions, plot ("what's going on"), action. "Good literature." Restatement of theme: conformity (was it?). Ends a long recap. Another invitation. Lends cursory attention to Marianna's idea. Sophie does not ask for elaboration, she merely establishes a rapport of nonunderstanding. Is the implication that Jacob could teach but Marianna could not? Joins Marianna. Sophie assumes the reason Marianna

like two personalities too.	watched the movie twice was because she did not understand it the first time, but this is not necessarily true. Maybe she watched it again because of its disturbing portrayal of a desperate young woman.
223. Sophie: So what do you think (talking over chatter) if you don't understand (Jasmine engages) shhhhh . . . If you don't unders (Marcus lifts his head and turns to talk to Marianna or Jasmine, Anna also turns) . . . If you guys don't understand (Marcus and Anna still turned) part of your (Marcus puts his head back down) part of the story that you're reading what should you do then? (Anna is now talking with Marcus)	Rejects Marianna's second attempt to make a connection. Repeats her assumption that Marianna did not understand the movie. Sudden outbreak of defiant discourse.
224. Marianna: Read it again.	Procedural question: request for "correct" answer.
225. Sophie: Read it again, reread that part. Ok? I don't know that you'll have time to read the entire story but if there's a part that you don't understand just like you would go back and watch a movie again, reread that part.	Responds to question correctly.
226. Marianna: They should do that.	Repeats correct answer. Reiterates her point: reread what you don't understand. Was this the point from the beginning?
227. Sophie: See if you can figure it out. Question it.	Side conversation yields an idea.
228. Marianna suggests a change in the CAPT—from reading a story to watching a movie.	Pursues her own intent.
229. Sophie: What do you mean? As you're listening to a story?	Makes public her idea. Yet another invitation.
230. Marianna: No, for CAPT test.	Requests elaboration then misinterprets.
231. Carmella: (Interpreting Marianna) We should watch a movie instead of having to read a story.	Elaboration
232. Sophie: (sarcastically) I'll pass that along to the state, I'm sure they will welcome it with open arms (sarcastic, followed by a little student laughter).	Interpretation of Marianna's idea for Sophie—assisting Sophie to enter Marianna's ideas.
233. Marianna: They should.	Rejects Marianna's bid with attempt at sarcastic humor. Why the sarcastic dismissal?
	Defends her suggestion. Missed

234. Carmella: It would be better. 235. Sophie: (Talking over Carmella) In addition, um they have asked you to (conversation continues between students respecting Marianna's idea) um, you know, one of the things that that that Jacob did was he evaluated the story you know he told us whether he thought this was good or not, you guys did a really great job with this, the plot the setting, um you know, that it takes it takes place underground, part of it takes place going to these meetings um that he doesn't really need to go to and so on. All of those things are the things you want to do when you are reading a story. The same way you've analyzed this, do the same thing when you're reading a story. Put comments, put questions, and go through all of that, ok? Um, right now you guys have fifteen minutes 236. (32:38) Sophie passes out the next assignment—"The Blanket". Much social interaction and inter-student discipline. Anna touches Marcus's face. Sophie finishes handing out the short story and instructs the students to read it. Isabel is still bopping and snapping her fingers. Marcus's chin is on the story—his eyes inches away. Anna reads and annotates her text. Marianna and Jasmine read. 237. Liang, the lone Asian female student, has remained silent throughout this class. 238. Three weeks will pass before these students will meet to discuss the story.	opportunity: Why does Marianna feel this way? Defends Marianna's idea. Attempts to reestablish her own dominance and that of Jacob as appropriate model. While Sophie rejects Marianna's invitation, her peers do not. Reference to Jacob. Rapid exit. Praise of all students' participation in prior class activity. Concludes: "go through all of that"; subtle message regarding her feelings for the test and those who must pass it. Withdrawal. The silence of the Asian students.

Day 4: January 7th, 2006. Shelly's 2nd Class: "The Blanket"

FRONT				DOOR
Jasmine BF	Anna WG			Carmella WF
Marianna BF	Marcus BM			
Anko HF	Bruno BM			Liang AF
Hannah WG	Jim AM			Sam WM
				Jacob WM
				ME

Absent: Qing

Tanya and Isabel have been moved to other sections.

20.	Shelly is wearing a knitted red-hooded v-cut top, flared jeans, and pointed-toed boots. Anna is wearing her white winter jacket, blue jeans, and ankle-height boots. She is sitting to Marcus's left. Marcus is wearing a blue do rag. He is bundled in a puffy black winter jacket with a fur-lined hood. His actions are occasionally bizarre—for instance he intermittently flicks his tongue. Bruno sits two seats to Marcus's right. Marianna, Jasmine, Anko, and Hannah sit in the row behind Marcus and Anna.
21. Shelly: How many of you got to at least read through "The Blanket" last time with Miss Morris?	There is some question about who has read this story, which is not surprising since three weeks have passed since the class last met.
22. * * *	
23. Shelly: How many people raise your hand if you finished reading the story. (Pause) A couple people, all right, so to start us off let's just talk about the story and then we'll talk about the end so we can take a look at how you go about answering question number one. Tell me a little bit about the story. Um Carmella what do you remember about the story?	Ostensibly a comprehension check. Explicit explanation of the lesson: "how to answer question number one" on the CAPT. Request for factual information: story review.

What do you remember about the story?	
24. Carmella responds softly, with confusion and says something about not remembering. Jasmine helps, but her words are unintelligible.	Response.
25. Shelly: The Grandfather, yes, they were sending the grandfather to a home, yes, why were they sending him to a home? Why was he getting kicked out?	Repetition and request for factual elaboration.
26. Jasmine responds.	Response.
27. Shelly: Yes, the father is getting married to his new young wife and so he's kicking out his old dad and sending him to the home.	Repetition.
28. Anna: That is not (emphatic) right.	Response indicating student morality.
29. Shelly: And who's the grandson, what's the grandson's name?	Does not respond to moral statement. Request for factual elaboration.
30. Student response.	Response.
31. Shelly: Petey, Petey is the grandson. And what is Petey doing on this evening before they have to send granddad away, it's granddad's last day with them?	Repetition and request for factual elaboration. Appropriates elaboration in the form of a question.
32. Student response.	Response.
33. Shelly: He's talking to them, he's crying a little bit, he goes inside because he doesn't want anyone to see, and he's obviously upset, right? that the granddad is going. What does the father give to the grandfather?	Interpretation of character action and request for factual elaboration. Question.
34. Student response.	Response
35. Shelly: A blanket. They're sending the grandfather to a home. They're kicking him out of their house and they're sending him to like a convalescent home.	Repetition and elaboration of factual content.
36. Student comment (unintelligible).	
37. Shelly: The grandson's crying because he um is sad, right? that his grandfather's	Elaboration.

having to be sent away. So the father is sending him away, he's married, or he's getting married, he gives the grandfather a blanket. Why does he give him a blanket?	Interpretation and appropriation of elaboration. Request for factual interpretation.
38. Student response.	Request for interpretation.
39. Shelly: Well, it was a nice blanket, right? What was significant about the blanket?	Response.
40. Marianna: It was a double blanket.	Two requests for interpretation.
41. Shelly: It was a double blanket, it was a thick blanket, it was an expensive blanket, right? And what did his new young fiancé think about this blanket?	Student response.
42. Marianna: It was magnificent.	Repetition. Appropriates elaboration.
43. Shelly: She thought it was really nice, and, well we we can kind of guess that she wanted it because was some of her comments about it when she saw the blanket, you can take a look back at the story, this was on the second page when this new young fiancé comes in and she proceeds to take a look at this blanket that her soon-to-be husband gave to the grandfather, what are her comments about the blanket?	Student responds with vivid diction.
44. Jasmine finds and reads the detail.	Rewords—does not copy—and disempowers the answer: from “magnificent” to “really nice.”
45. Shelly: Yup, she says it's a fine blanket, read it read a little bit more and see what you see about her reactions to that blanket.	Reminiscent of Sophie's point during the prior class: re-read the text if you do not understand it the first time.
46. Jasmine: (Unintelligible)	Request for factual elaboration and use of textual detail.
47. Shelly: All right, Jasmine just said she's jealous, she wants it, how do we know that?	Response.
48. Student Response	Repetition and request for interpretation.
49. Shelly: A double blanket too (in character voice), it costs something. What do you think she's thinking in her	Request for factual elaboration.
	Response.
	Repetition and request for factual elaboration: “how do we know that?” The “correct” interpretation can be “known.”
	Response.
	Interrupted appropriation of character interpretation.

head? She's like . . .	Request for interpretation.
50. Student response.	Response.
51. Shelly: It's worth money, so here her new, you know, her fiancé, her soon-to-be husband is buying this very expensive blanket for the grandfather, what's going through her mind?	Repetition.
52. Student response.	Request for interpretation.
53. Shelly: Maybe she wants one . . . why didn't you buy her one? Maybe what else might she be thinking?	Response.
54. Student response.	Repetition of "incorrect" answers and repeated request for interpretation.
55. Shelly: Why did you give it to him? You know, what else?	Response.
56. Student response.	Repetition of "incorrect" answer and repeated request for interpretation.
57. Shelly: She maybe she thinks she should be the most important one.	Response.
58. Student response amid chatter between Marcus and Anna.	Repetition of answer.
59. Shelly: What's that?	Response and sidebar conversation.
60. Student response.	
61. Shelly: Shhhhh. He doesn't need a double blanket she says all the same. Right? So she's wondering why did he spend all that money this guy? He should have spent the money on her, he should have gotten her the blanket instead of wasting this money.	Discipline. Appropriates the "correct" answer.
62. Marcus: Nooo.	Offers opportunity for argument implicit in the story. Shelly ignores this.
63. Shelly: (Student inquires about the cost of the blanket. Marcus replies, "It cost a pretty penny baby." Students laugh quietly) It was pretty expensive, so, now, she walks away, she gets all mad, they get in this little argument presumably about the blanket and the	Appropriates elaboration and requests literal plot elaboration. Shelly does not respond to Marcus, but other students do.

fact that it was expensive, what does Petey do?	Repetition and request for factual elaboration.
64. Student response.	Response.
65. Shelly: He goes in and gets some scissors, why does he do that?	Repetition and request for factual plot elaboration.
66. Student: So he can remember his granddad.	Incorrect response—hints at confusion.
67. Shelly: Well, what does he decide to do with the scissors?	Assessment. Request for literal elaboration.
68. Student response.	Response.
69. Shelly: All right, he's going to cut the blanket in two, like Sam said, right, he's going to cut it in two. Now look at the ending here, let's take a look at the end of the story to see why he's doing that. (6:31)	Assessment. Repetition. This pattern of questioning continues. Shows Sophie's comments on the overhead projector.
70. Student response.	Response.
71. Shelly: Exactly, look at the end here, on the bottom of page two um he says oh she's right said the boy coldly and he held out a pair of scissors, cut the . . . (reads the end of the story—final reaction by Marcus, "Wooooo." Anna looks up. Marcus smiles.) What's he doing there? Well what's he trying to do? (Student chatter.) Making him feel bad. Why are you kicking your own dad out?	Appropriates the sharing of detail. Request for interpretation. Request for interpretation. Request for interpretation.
72. Marcus: Using reverse psychology.	Marcus answers.
73. Shelly: Yeah you understand how would you feel if I did this to you? Now what does that make the father do the dad do at the end? Take a look. (Sam reads the ending.) Yeah, it says look after he says (appropriates reading—finishes the story) So what do you think it made the dad think about when Petey did that, when he said yeah (brief student chatter as students address the question) how selfish he is maybe he's thinking about not sending him but you know Petey	Rhetorical question. Request for factual elaboration. Sam appropriates the sharing of detail. Shelly re-appropriates the sharing of detail. Request for interpretation.

makes this statement like yeah we'll save the other half so when you're old I will give it to you like nice job dad you're kicking your own father out. So if you take a look at the story while you were reading and I know a number of you didn't quite get to the end there, but while you were reading how many of you made comments in the margins? (Students respond quietly.) Good. Good. Let's see some of those comments in the margins. (8:49) 74. Shelly: Now, I'm gonna show you Miss Morris's paper. Now I know Miss Morris's an English teacher so she tends to make her own comments a lot, but . . . you ready? (Shows students Sophie's comments. Students are impressed. 9:00) 75. Shelly's Questions: 76. Now how many of you wrote down a comment that maybe it wasn't as long as that but you knew what it meant? 77. What types of things do you write down when you're reading? 78. What else might you put down? 79. How many of you wrote about the title? 80. How many of you even looked at the title before you started reading? 81. When you come to a story, why might you want to look at the title first? 82. Why is it important maybe to read with a pen and to write stuff down and to keep your mind going while you're reading your story especially one that's like six	Disfluency. "I know a number of you didn't quite get to the end there." How can they then discuss the story? Remember, Tanya was discouraged from asking questions about a movie she had not seen. Shelly walks around the room, looking at the comments students wrote on their stories during the prior class. She acknowledges the comments Marianna and Anna wrote, but she makes no comment to either Marcus or Bruno who wrote no comments. This is one of the few times she will get physically close to the students. It is unclear which students ever finished reading the story or if they remember it, having read it so long ago. It is a short story and students needed a chance to reread the story—it certainly would not have hurt anyone to have done so. Shelly's comments and questions are recitation and procedural and express her ideas about how to take the test. Absent are references to students' ideas—perceptions and interpretations—regarding the story and how to get at those ideas. In effect, the implicit message is that their ideas are inaccessible, so the most efficacious and efficient strategies pertain to procedural behaviors, not intellectual, aesthetic, personal explorations guided by their own curiosity.

pages long that you're then gonna have to write about later? 83. If you don't do that, if you just sit and you read a six page story and put it down and you go to write, what can sometimes happen during those six pages while you're reading? 84. How many of you have ever read an entire page and not known a thing that you read (most hands go up)? 85. Why does that happen? 86. How many of you have done that? 87. Why do you do that? 88. Why does it happen? 89. All right, you're falling asleep as you're reading it, your eyes are rolling back, you're trying really hard and your eyes are going over the words but what's not registering? . . . So you're not thinking about the story. You're thinkin' about food, you're thinkin' about what you have maybe next class, you're thinkin' about maybe you've got a test coming up, maybe you just got in a fight with your friend, so your mind is elsewhere but your eyes are going over to this so by the time you get to the end you've wasted all that time right so if you make this effort where you're writing down notes, you're saying "all right, I understand I can relate to this, whenever either of my parents met somebody new they always pushed others away" who's she talking about here, which character? 90. Now (referring to Sophie's annotations) why are all these little things, these details that she's commenting on, you know these things that they remind her of things like irony things like symbolism why is that important for her to write down as she is reading? 91. Is that question ever answered in the story? 92. (In response to Bruno's comment about the fiancé) What's that? Yeah 'cause what is she it sounds like when she makes that comment about the blanket what does it sound like sound like she wants? 93. So what is it she wants this whole relationship to be about?	2nd person narration in scenario construction. Expectations and assumptions? Literary terms.

94. Shelly and several students: Her. (15:25)	
95. Shhhhh. (15:51)	Discipline.
96. Shelly hands out CAPT questions and Sophie's response (16:30). She then reviews the handout, particularly about judgment. Marcus has pulled his hood around his face and puts his head down. Shelly tells him to remove his hood and sit up (19:15). He does so as he withdraws his arms from the arms of his jacket so they are inside the body of the jacket.	Literary term. Discipline.
97. Marianna: What's interpretation? (19:35)	Authentic question regarding literary term. Remarkably, Marianna has detected her own confusion about the difference between interpretation and factual elaboration masking as interpretive questions.
98. Shelly: Interpretation is when she's coming to her own conclusion like she read something and she, um, assumes, like we assumed that, um, you know . . .	Definition is confusing. Stuck.
99. Hannah: (?) was bad.	Attempts to complete Shelly's sentence.
100. Shelly: Well, but that's what they they want you to interpret it	But what is interpretation? "they"?
101. Marcus: Right.	Offers assistance.
102. Shelly: like based on what you're reading.	Disfluency.
103. Marcus offers in a voice too soft for me to hear an elaboration as he and Shelly talk over one another. Shelly accepts it quietly. Hannah adds a comment.	
104. Shelly: But then well there's a difference between understanding it and interpreting it, like interpreting it is	
105. Hannah: Yeah, that's what I'm saying, she's interpreting that.	Agreement.
106. Shelly: Right, well, like if you look at	Elaboration of definition of literary term.

the fiancé when we were looking at the fiancé and how what she was saying about the blanket we interpreted that she was jealous, it didn't say she was jealous, we came to that conclusion based on her behavior the fact that she said, o it was really expensive and she walks off in a huff (Hannah attempts repeatedly to get the floor) we assumed that that meant she wanted the money spent on her maybe.	Rebuffs Hannah's attempt to engage.
107. Hannah: So (hesitatingly) wouldn't she [Sophie, in her written response] be assuming it's about a child's blanket?	Pursues her confusion about the difference between prediction and interpretation.
108. Shelly: Well, she was predicting and then it says (reads Sophie's answer). Now are we told it's about a father, son, and grandson? Yeah, so that's understanding, but it's not interpretation. (Several students pursue this apparent confusion. Anna asks a question I cannot hear.) Prediction. See you're when you're actually interpreting the story that was before she even started really reading it.	Offers explanation.
109. Hannah: I know but so she was interpreting the story.	Pursues her confusion.
110. Shelly: She was interpreting the title. Yeah. You could you could say that you can say that yeah.	Finalizes her definition of interpretation.
111. Hannah: All right.	Claims victory. Change of activity: on the copy of Sophie's written response students are to identify the following: a) understanding (single line) b) interpretation (double line) c) connection (dotted line) d) evaluation (judgement) (circle)
112. Marianna: Can we can we do it together?	Request for collaborative group work.
113. Shelly: Yeah , we're I'm gonna read it and I just want you to do it I'm gonna ask you what you came up with so as we	Agrees to it, but then it never happens. I do not think this is what Marianna meant by doing it together, but maybe it was.

read just do that anytime you think it's understanding underline it . . . (continues with instruction)	
114. Shelly begins reading Sophie's written response. Some students are trying to do the assignment as she reads. Students try to keep up, but soon drop out. Jasmine voices confusion.	Student confusion about activity.
115. Marcus: We should just forget it.	Confusion and rejection of assignment.
116. Shelly: (Softly) We're gonna read through it first.	
117. Hannah: Yeah, let's do it sentence by sentence.	Another request for collaborative approach to this activity.
118. Bruno's head is down on his right arm; he raises his head and offers advice I cannot understand.	
119. Shelly: I'm stopping so just keep going. I'm stopping right here, so . . . (Bruno and Marcus have obviously withdrawn physically from the assignment.)	Students are withdrawing.
120. Shelly reads Sophie's response more slowly now, allowing students more time to address the assignment. Bruno sits motionless, leaning back diagonally in his chair, his sweatshirt hood pulled over his head. Marcus picks up a pen and does something. Bruno looks around at the Asian student sitting next to him and picks up his own pen, his head horizontal, resting on his hand. Marianna, Anna, and Hannah are engaged in the assignment. At 26:00 Shelly asks what students have found.	
121. Shelly: (27:00) Now the difference between that [literal understanding] and interpretation is that now you're not just saying a fact from the story, you're you know reading it and developing an idea about it. So did anybody find a place where they felt she was making an interpretation she was coming to a conclusion about it (Jasmine offers a very softly spoken response, which I	interpretation = developing an idea interpretation = coming to a conclusion

cannot hear and which is apparently correct). All right so she's interpreting it as this was given from guilt she knows this was not right she shouldn't be giving it from guilt, um, because is it ever said in the story the father feels guilty? No 122. Anna: I messed this whole thing up. 123. Shelly: It's never said in the actual story that he feels guilty so when (Anna sighs audibly and leans back in her chair, discouraged. Marcus looks at her) she says if you look at this (reads from Sophie's text) now that's understanding, right? because that we know from the story we can 124. Bruno stretches his arms behind his head close to Hannah, who is sitting behind him. Hannah makes a confrontational remark. Bruno responds. There's a little back and forth. Shelly intervenes, coming to Bruno's desk and touching it. She tells him to move to a desk across the room, but he moves to the adjacent desk, the one next to Marcus, instead. 125. Shelly: (29:06) All right, guys, if you need to go down to the office I can send you there but you're interrupting the rest of us who are trying to do (?) so get over it and let's move on. 126. Exercise continues. Anna and Hannah are responding. Marianna, Jasmine, and Hannah seem engaged. Bruno and Marcus talk. Anna yawns and stretches luxuriously, arching her back against her chair and raising her clasped hands straight up and then behind her head, her brown blouse rises above her bare belly button. (30:47) 127. Shelly continues talking. Hannah asks a question. Bruno loudly criticizes Hannah. Hannah defends herself. Bruno nudges Marcus, and both boys turn to look at Hannah (32:12). Shelly continues talking until they finish with this activity.	Confusion about the activity. Pursues definition, still. Anna withdraws. Rising student anger. Discipline. Physical proximity. Discipline required. Why? Up until now students have been compliant. Was it Anna's withdrawal that gave Bruno permission? Persists. No one seems to notice this aesthetic moment. Students continue to turn on one another. Bruno's criticism of Hannah is presumably for prolonging the exercise, but perhaps for being involved enough to ask a question; in any case, Hannah's involvement is a threat to Bruno's sense of well being.

128. Shelly: So what we're going to do today is start fresh with a new story. (33:37)	
129. Change activity to taking notes on the story "Moving On." After initial instructions by Shelly, students begin reading (35:38) and taking "marginal notes." I can't tell if Marcus is reading. His hood is pulled over his head so his face is not visible. He rests his head on his hands, and he sits motionless. I don't think he's reading. Bruno is not taking any notes. I cannot tell if he is reading either. After a few minutes Shelly comes over to Marcus, bends, and peeks into the darkness of his plastic cave. Then she talks with Marcus, who until that moment may have been sleeping. He pulls his hood behind his head.	Physical proximity.
130. When time is up the alarm sounds (46:10). Hannah says she didn't finish reading.	
131. Shelly: So let's talk about the types of things you did this time that maybe you didn't make comments on last time, all right? Now I heard somebody say that they were asking a lot of questions	Request for metacognitive analysis of task.
132. Anna: I wasn't.	Response.
133. Shelly: What have we said that you want to make that if you ask questions that you put them in your essay what do you want to make sure you can do?"	Appropriates answer. Confusing construction of her question.
134. Anna suggests you try to answer them.	Response.
135. Shelly: Yeah, make sure that they get answered if you're going to include them because if you in your response put a lot of questions what is the person grading you going to think?	Repeats answer. Repetition of prior class lesson.
136. Inaudible student response.	Response.
137. Shelly: Yeah, so even if you did get it they're going to they're going to think you didn't because of the number of	Repetition of admonishment regarding asking questions. Asking questions signals a lack of understanding.

questions so, um, just make that if you do ask questions that you can answer them somehow. Um, what kind of things did you comment about while you were reading? What did you say?"	Request for evidence of participation.
138. Anna: On the title I wrote that um that it might have to do with um like leaving something behind and moving on with like as life goes on.	Response. Follows teacher's advice and analyzes the title prior to reading the story.
139. Shelly: All right, so, you're starting to wonder maybe this story is about this or that based on that title, good. What else did you include? What other things did you comment on? Anybody connect to anything?	Repetition of answer. Literal question.
140. Carmella: Um, I connected two things, but I noticed like when I read, it didn't really have a specific topic, it was just a bunch of random things jumped from the brother to the dog which she kept talking about.	Request for participation.
141. Shelly: She talks about the dog, yep.	Response
142. Anna: To her dad to the car, it was just a bunch of things.	Comprehension problem.
143. Shelly: She does talk about a number of different things, so what can you tell about the speaker in the story, the narrator? (Soft answer) That you can tell that it's a girl, what?	Interruption and repetition.
144. Sam: That she's like young.	Continues with response.
145. Shelly: She's young. All right, so you can tell it's from the point of view of a child and what might you say about that? What's the difference between reading a story that's maybe from the point of view and written as though a child is writing it or speaking it versus somebody is writing about this experience? (Pause) How is this written, how is this different from if somebody were writing about this young person? Like an adult writing about this experience?	Repetition and request for factual response. Literary terms: speaker & narrator. Request for interpretation. Response. Repetition. Request for elaboration. Literary term: point of view. Question. Flurry of questions in pursuit of this literary term. But an adult is writing about this experience.

146. Marcus: . . . like an adult writing about somebody else? It would be like detailed (drowned out by Shelly's voice, yet he continues answering for several more words)	Response. How could he respond when he, according to my perceptions, did not read the story?
147. Shelly: All right, so the little details, the way that it's, you know, read and information comes out, what does that kind of help you to realize about the narrator?	Overpowers Marcus.
148. Marcus: He doesn't know a lot about everything.	Continues to participate, even though he has not read the story, as is evidenced by his confusion regarding the narrator's gender.
149. Shelly: All right, yeah, it's like a little kid you know thinking about different things	Restates and attempts to nurture Marcus's answer.
150. Marcus verbally overpowers Shelly but his words are indecipherable.	Marcus will no longer be silenced.
151. Shelly persists: All right, what did you, before we leave here, one last thing, what did you learn about how you have to read these stories that you didn't maybe know when you first started doing it last Saturday with Miss Morris? (Pause) What do you realize now about how you have to read these stories for the CAPT that maybe you didn't realize before?	Request for explicit review. Request for metacognitive awareness of process.
152. Marianna: You have to make sure you (softly fades).	Repeated question. Incomplete response.
153. Shelly: You have to make sure you remember things, so what should you do?	Appropriates answer. Request for explicit learning.
154. Bruno: Write write down comments.	Response.
155. Shelly: Write down comments, write down places you can connect to it, look for places where you can judge it, look for places where you (voice drowned out by loud moving desks—Bruno's in particular. Final instructions about folders. 49:35)	Repeats answer and appropriates elaboration.

Day 5: January 21st, 2006. Sophie's 3rd Class: "Moving On" & The Invitation

FRONT			DOOR	
Jasmine BF	Anna WF		Marcus BM	
Anko HM	Marianna BF			Qing AF
	Bruno (BM)		Carmella WM	Liang AF
Hannah WF				Samuel WM
	Jim AM		Jacob WM	
		Bruno BM (moved)		ME

1. The class starts out with Sophie taking attendance. When she gets to Jasmine she asks her if that is her real name. Bruno, Marianna, and Anna look at Jasmine and laugh.	How does Jasmine interpret this implicitly? Her facial and physical gestures do not indicate a good-natured acceptance of the question or the ensuing attention and laughter. But Anna and Marianna laugh, and then Jasmine laughs, too.
2. Sophie: Marianna I saw.	Personal recognition.
3. Marianna: Hello Miss.	Anna looks at Marianna and laughs.
4. * * *	
5. (Student and teacher chatter.)	
6. Sophie: (1:25) Ok, so, what I want to go over with you guys today, you guys started going over with Miss Clines well you tell me, what did you do last class?	Request for review.
7. Student: I don't know.	Dismissive response.
8. Student: I don't remember.	Dismissive response.
9. Student: I don't remember.	Dismissive response.
10. Hannah: It was so long ago.	Reasonable response.
11. Sophie: You read you read you read my thing yes.	Reminder.

12. (Chatter about how many comments Sophie wrote.)	
13. Anko: (Looking at a copy of the story with the teacher's notes in the margins) You made so many comments, oh my gosh.	Surprise regarding Sophie's annotations.
14. Sophie: That's what you need to do.	Explicit lesson: take notes when you read the story.
15. Jasmine: You wrote stories in the margins.	Assessment of teacher work: very impressed by the amount of writing.
16. Anko: I know right.	Agrees with assessment.
17. (Chatter.)	
18. Sophie: (Amid chatter) And that's why it takes me thirty minutes to read through my story because I make sure that I'm commenting the whole time you know why? Because when I answer questions (rising intonation) it makes it that much easier and it is that much less time that I have to work on actually figuring out what I need for each of the questions, go ahead tell me Carmella what did you do?	Validates students' portrayal of herself as model. Turns student praise into an explicit lesson about how to take the test.
19. Carmella: Um, we read that "Moving On" story and we had to comment on that	Repetition of her request for review.
20. Sophie: (Talking over Carmella) Excellent	Complies with the request.
21. Hannah: That was a good story though.	Assessment—enthusiastic, but what exactly is she assessing? Is it a warranted assessment, an invitation into her culture?
22. Sophie: Did you start answering question number one?	Judgment of the story.
23. Jasmine: I don't remember.	Procedural question requiring simple recall.
24. Anna: I didn't even start reading it (pause) I mean finish reading it.	Continued assessment and rejection of prior class.
25. Anko: That was so long ago	Recall of prior class.
	Mitigating possible hurt feelings.

26. Sophie: All right, let me remind you, you guys went over responses notes you did not get to write question number one. I think what we'll do is, um, just to save some time I might give you the answer or I might give you the response that um Miss Clines did then we'll do number two together. Ok? But what I want to do first because I know were all of you here? (One muttered response: "I was.") Awesome. Um, what I want you to do right now is take out in front of you have the story out in front of you I'm going to read through it with you quickly with you because it's been two or three weeks, all right? and then "Moving On."	Appropriation of her original question. Offers to give students the teacher's answer—presumably the "correct" answer reflecting the quality to which these student should aspire. Time seems to be pressing.
27. Bruno: Which one?	Praise.
28. Sophie: This one, it looks like this.	Instructions.
29. Bruno: What page are we on?	Is a quick reading necessary in this situation?
30. Sophie answers him.	Request for additional procedural instruction.
31. Sophie: So let's read this story together. (To a student off camera) Do you do you have a cold or anything? (Soft response) All right, I know I haven't seen you in a while.	Procedural reply.
32. Jacob: (Interposing his perceptions) I didn't like this story. I felt bad for the dog.	Another request for additional procedural instruction.
33. Sophie: You felt bad for the dog?	Procedural reply.
34. Student: So did I.	Attempt to establish a personal connection outside of the curriculum.
35. (Chatter.)	Trying to reestablish his model status from prior class, perhaps?
36. Jacob: The dad's mean.	Repetition of Jacob's answer.
37. Sophie: Didn't you feel bad for the girl at all?	Bid for inclusion with teacher and Jacob.
38. Jacob: Yeah.	Rejection of invitation.
	Jacob attempts to reestablish rapport with the teacher.
	Establishes the girl as victim, which becomes the focus of the class conversation.
	Agrees to change focus from father to girl.

39. (Chatter.)	Continued rejection of invitation.
40. Jacob: The dad's grimy.	Willingness to accept thematic focus but only in his own words. Invitation for other students to join his linguistic culture.
41. Student: I remember reading this story.	Gradual engagement.
42. Sophie: Did you just say the dad was grimy?	Accepts invitation into their linguistic culture.
43. Jasmine hears this and laughs amid much prolonged chatter about the story.	Laughter caused by the seeming shifting balance of power—the unusual occurrence of a teacher leaving her own context and entering theirs.
44. Sophie: Can can you just define for me (drowned out by student chatter about Sophie's use of the word).	Gathering additional information evincing a genuine interest in their linguistic cultural context.
45. Marcus: (Amid chatter) . . . like he's messed up . . .	Joins the conversation.
46. Student: He's mean.	Joins the conversation.
47. Student: Oh so he was like . . . he's kinda like tricky . . . he's . . . is that? . . . like he's	Enthusiastic participation now as the students attempt to establish the context of the discourse.
48. Anna: No, grimy means that he's like	Becomes again the teacher.
49. Hannah: That dog's just going down, now	Assumes she has the power to refocus the conversation.
50. Anna: Grimy means that he's not acting right.	Rejects Hannah's attempt. Continues to indoctrinate Sophie by teaching her the language of her culture.
51. Sophie: Shhh, one person.	Tries to contain the enthusiasm.
52. Anna: Like he's messed up, like, that's	Inexorably continues language lesson.
53. Jasmine: And that's your slang for the day.	Concludes with humor the language lesson.
54. Sophie: Thank you. I want to learn something every day. I will, I might even call my mother to pass this on to her 'cause she's a teacher as well and I don't want her to miss out on any of the lingo as well.	Sophie does not pursue this pledge with the diligence and interest expected by the students, as is evident in later analysis. The students do not forget this moment; in fact, they pursue it actively and relentlessly.

55. Hannah: Are you, do you seriously do that?	Incredulous excitement at the prospect of recruiting Sophie's mother into their culture. Will Sophie and her mother actually talk about them and their language?
56. Sophie: What?	Losing the thread of the conversation.
57. Hannah: Call your mother and tell her the lingo?	Incredulous.
58. Sophie: Yeah. (Anko laughs) She teaches eighth grade. She needs to know these things . . . you know?	Reiterates pledge.
59. (Chatter and a sort of amazement.)	A burgeoning sense of power and equality.
60. Hannah: . . . a new word grimy and it means this?	Trying to comprehend the new and nearly incomprehensible.
61. Sophie: Mmm hmmm.	Reaffirms pledge.
62. (Chatter.)	Excitement.
63. Sophie: . . . you can be my own personal dictionaries . . .	Sophie leads students to believe she will copy them in her world. She does not, however, do so.
64. Anna: That's not a new word, that's not a new word, that's not a new word.	Anna questions Sophie's appropriation of leadership by questioning her accomplishment. Or perhaps this evinces Anna's strong desire to continue as Sophie's teacher—that she has much more to teach, and Sophie would find value in her knowledge and tutelage.
65. Bruno: It's a new word for her (emphasized and elongated).	Is this Bruno coming to Sophie's defense or an attack upon Anna's assumed position of higher status?
66. Marianna: I learned that word in third grade.	Assault upon Sophie's status—her accomplishment was childlike. Are the students vying with Sophie for status now, as if she has entered their reality, their context, and so now must compete for her place just as they do, or are they competing for their own status in this new context?
67. Sophie: Ok, so take a look at the story and then we will talk about why you guys think dad is so grimy. ok. (5:00)	Verbal offering of respect and camaraderie?

68. Sophie now reads the entire story.	The story is so trite it's painful to hear—blatantly manipulative and sentimental. I hate this story. It is everything that's bad about young adult literature. Man-hating, father-bashing mendacity. Students are totally taken in. They love it.
69. Sophie: (Reading in the voice of a young girl) "Fly is my bestest and only friend."	Affected voice, simulating childlike vulnerability.
70. Anna: "Bestest?" That's not a word.	Repressing powerful sentiment. Rejection of nonstandard English, though the meaning and purpose of the word is clear.
71. Hannah: That's so sad.	Gives herself over to the powerful sentiment.
72. (Brief chatter.)	
73. End of story reading.	
74. Hannah: (In a profoundly plaintive and emphatic voice) That is so sad. (10:32)	Spontaneous overflow of powerful feeling.
75. Jasmine: Ohhh.	Concordant emotional connection.
76. Sophie: Hannah, why is it sad?	Request for elaboration of obvious detail: because the little girl was watching through her tears her only friend—her dog—disappear in a cloud of Oklahoma dust while her ignorant, insensitive, sadistic father cackles ruthlessly behind the steering wheel.
77. Hannah: For one the dog's her only friend, her brother knows that that they're keeping the dog there, he didn't say nothing, and their father's just laughing at the dog's chasing them and she's just crying cause she just wants her puppy.	Embraces the sentimentality and elaborates.
78. Sophie: So you feel bad for her?	Restates the obvious in question form.
79. (Chatter.)	
80. Hannah: I feel bad for the dog too because the dog's gonna die. He's got no food or water.	Embraces the painfully obvious.
81. Marcus: I would have snuffed my dad.	Attempt to re-establish the discourse context—another word—another invitation.

	It's about an unloved child's hatred for his father. I mean, why not kill him? Marcus seems to be making a more personally relevant connection.
82. Sophie: You would have snuffed him?	Another opportunity to engage in students' discourse. Does she really not know what "snuffed" means? This word, too, will not be forgotten by the students.
83. Hannah: I would have jumped out of the car.	"I would have . . ." Perhaps, but how does she really know what she would do? This is worth exploring in class as a topic of true discourse.
84. Sophie: All right, what does it mean?	Repeats request for definition of the word "snuffed."
85. (Much chatter and laughter as she is answered.)	
86. Sophie: Ok yeah so now tell my why is dad grimy? I need I need a . . .	Maintains membership in the culture by repeated use of their word.
87. Marcus: (Amid Hannah's protestations) 'Cause instead a saying like he didn't like he could a like made up a story with o uh the dog can't come cause he got rabies or something like that but he just he just ignored her let her back there crying kept on going faster and he said what he said ha ha	Appropriates the focus of the conversation: it's all about what the father could have done to spare the feelings of his daughter: make up a obvious lie. Why does Marcus attempt to change the scenario instead of trying to interpret the given characters' respective motivations?
88. Sophie: (Cutting in) You want you want the you want the dad to create a lie to this little girl?	Questioning the morality of Marcus's answer. Somehow Sophie's tone makes this question sound unauthentic, as if Marcus's answer were obviously morally wrong. Again, this is worth exploring in class because it would be worth exploring in writing during the CAPT. If what students do in class is what they learn, then they should explore interpretations. If what they are doing is trying to guess the "correct" answer, then they are all doomed to failure.
89. Marcus: It's better than just driving and saying ha ha that dumb dog is still following us and not answering her.	Defends unconvincingly his answer (and himself) against Sophie's reply.
90. (Chatter.)	

91. Hannah: Or say that some things have to be left behind. Like make her feel a little better, don't make your poor daughter	Joins Marcus. Note the "some things have to be left behind." This is what Sophie hears and soon pursues.
92. Marcus: Or we're going to get a new dog or something like that.	Elaborates his defense.
93. Sophie (Turning from Marcus to Hannah): You just said something that is standing out to me.	Shifts the conversation to a another student.
94. Hannah: Me?	Hannah is surprised that Sophie recognized importance in her words; Marcus likely senses Sophie did not perceive importance in his.
95. Sophie: Yeah.	Confirms her interest.
96. Hannah: Don't let your poor daughter sit in the back seat and cry.	Attempts to answer Sophie, but it's the wrong answer. Who has the authority to determine what parts of her discourse are important?
97. Sophie: But what did you say before that? What should the dad explain to her?	Pursues correct answer.
98. Hannah: Like make her feel better.	Still trying to discover what it was she said that was so important.
99. Sophie: Why? What what you (pause) think of what you just said to me.	Pursues correct answer.
100. Hannah: Like make her feel better about why the dog has to stay	Still trying.
101. Sophie: Why does it have to stay?	Leading hints.
102. Hannah: Because there's no like there's no room in the car and they're traveling cross country and they can't stop	Nope. Too literal. Strike three.
103. Sophie (pointing to another student who has apparently said the right answer): Say what you just said.	Gives up on Hannah, attempts to hear from another student the correct words Hannah shared.
104. Jasmine: You have to leave some things behind.	Got it!
105. Sophie: So sometimes you have to leave things behind?	Repeats the correct answer.

106. (Chatter.)	
107. Hannah: Dude, that's going to make me (emphasis) cry.	Considers fully embracing the emotion she expressed earlier.
108. Sophie: Anko, what were you going to say?	Invitation for Anko to join the discussion.
109. Anko: I forgot.	Rejection.
110. Sophie: You forgot?	Incredulous.
111. (Chatter. Marcus is animated—comes up with the idea to hide the dog in a washtub).	Marcus pursues his belief that the answer to the problem lies in altering the story's plot in order to deceive the irrational and cruel father.
112. Hannah: Yeah, they should put it in a washtub.	Repeats Marcus's idea.
113. Sophie: They should put the dog in a washtub?	Repeats and questions Marcus's idea.
114. Hannah: Yeah.	Reasserts Marcus's idea.
115. Sophie: Sure, they could do something with it. Or they could . . . (Marcus and Hannah pursue ways the children could have deceived the father, hidden the dog, and kept the little girl happy. Bruno's head is down upon the crook of his left arm. Sophie, pointing towards Sam and about to call on him, retracts her arm as she makes a connection with <u>Summer Vacation</u> about the dog being tied to the car fender. 13:00)	Sophie recognizes but does not validate Hannah's remark.
116. Sophie: All right, what were you going to say Sam?	Appropriates the conversation.
117. Sam: Well they they need to make sacrifices, sometimes.	Returns to Sam, clearly asserting her power to do so.
118. Sophie: Sometimes you have to make sacrifices.	Sam does not seem to recognize the power that has just been employed. He offers important thematic insight—the first of the conversation. I wonder if they could perceive the father's sacrifices. This idea is fertile ground for interpretations discovered through discourse.
119. (Chatter.)	Repeats Sam's idea.

120. Sophie: Have you guys ever had to make a sacrifice like this?	Request for personal connection.
121. Anna's hand goes up.	Beginning of Anna's personal connection.
122. Anna: When I had to leave Bulgaria and come over here I left all my family behind, and everything.	Offers personal connection.
123. Sophie: How many bags did you get to bring with you here?	Attempts to preempt the connection—the number of bags Anna brings soon proves to be most unimportant.
124. Anna: I don't remember. I think they had . . . like . . . six altogether.	Answers the question. Respects but resists Sophie's question and thereby her power to direct the flow of the discourse.
125. Sophie: Do you remember there being a certain object?	Will not allow Anna to establish her own story-telling style and pace. She dominates Anna's story with questions.
126. Anna: Yeah, there's a lot of stuff I had to leave behind . . . (significantly) a lot.	Perseveres.
127. Sophie: How does that make you feel?	What would have happened to Anna's story if Sophie had just remained silent?
128. Anna: I had to leave all my family and like it's sad because like you don't know like you're coming here and you're like so far away and then you . . .	Continues with her connection in her own voice.
129. Marcus: (Softly) Don't cry Anna.	Discomfort—mocking? I'm not sure. He senses Anna's sadness and responds. Bruno's head is up and he is smiling—he leans forward to look past Marianna at Anna. Perhaps this is his excited reaction to a truly visceral, emotional, meaningful, not contrived response.
130. Anna: I'm not gonna cry (smiling, and obviously about to cry)	Anna denies her true emotional connection. This is a very compelling moment to watch on video.
131. Sophie: You can cry if you want.	Maintaining distant authority, gives Anna permission to express emotion.
132. Anna: Anyways (Anna is still smiling, barely able to hold back her tears) stop looking at me (turns away from Bruno, laughing, Marianna smiling, Jasmine	Bruno too senses the emotion. Moment by moment she relinquishes herself to emotion. Now where does she belong? What role is she performing?

laughing)	
133. Bruno: I need a video camera man.	Bruno wants to record this moment. Why? To tease Anna later? As a record of a most unusual event—Anna crying, or a student caring? Some sort of revelation?
134. Anna: so when you have to leave all your family behind you don't know how long they gonna be alive for like (turning explicitly sad) I lost my grandfather and um (choking up) like (looks at Marcus, smiles, covers her face in her right hand; Marianna and Bruno turn serious as Anna breaks down and hides her face in the crook of her right elbow. Marianna sucks on her lips. 14:08)	This is a powerful moment for me, even as I read it. I wonder why.
135. Marcus: (In a rising and falling voice) ohhhhhh	Threatened or touched or discomfited by Anna's engagement, tries to mock and thereby mitigate and dispel the emotion.
136. Sophie: It's sad. Have any of you guys had to go through something like that where you had to move that far away? (Marianna nods)	Offers scant commiseration, keeps her physical distance from Anna, though she could easily approach her.
137. Marcus: (Contending with Sophie for speaking rights) My my my aunt my auntie has um can lung cancer right now. And she just got out of the hospital.	Attempts to join Anna, or to invite Anna back to him.
138. Sophie: Is she around here though? I mean do you get to see her?	Rejects Marcus's misery. "Though." Because Marcus gets to see his aunt, his personal connection does not count.
139. Marcus: Yeah.	He does not seem to detect the linguistic rejection in the word "though."
140. Sophie: So Anna didn't even get to see her grandfather. (Bruno, smiling, pokes Marianna's arm and motions towards Anna. Marianna smiles at Bruno then turns to Anna.)	Explicit rejection of Marcus's personal connection; rejection of Marcus's participation. Marcus remains silent, but he will try again.
141. Marianna: (Softly to Anna) Are you all right? (Anna nods.)	Marianna's voiced concern seems to compel Sophie's sense of compassion, as she immediately approaches Anna.
142. Bruno (Smiling broadly): When I was smaller my grandma died and I never got	Bruno tries his luck with a personal connection, possibly in an attempt to connect

to see her.	with and to recall Anna—to join her. Why? What about this experience and Anna's place in it does Bruno find enticing? That she has established the dominant discursive context?
143. Sophie comes over to Anna and momentarily holds Anna's left bicep with her left hand as she pats Anna on the back with her right, whispers something in Anna's left ear, and turns away.	Bruno's personal connection does not register with Sophie—she does not seem to hear it, although the volume makes it impossible to ignore. Instead, she has gone to Anna. This is the only time either Sophie or Shelly physically approach with tender concern and actually touch with a kind of soothing affection a student. Anna breaks down at 10:43 into the class, Sophie touches her at eleven minutes, Anna raises her head and rejoins the class at 12:30.
144. Sophie: (Pointing to Anko) What were you going to say?	Distributes speaking rights.
145. Anko relates that his grandfather died on Anko's birthday in Puerto Rico and Anko did not get to see him.	Anko's personal connection. Password into the newly forming culture. He got the message: sadness only counts when you can't be with the unfortunate beloved party. Sophie's point is that it's sad to leave people, and dogs, when you move on, but sometimes you have to.
146. Bruno: My grandma died when I was a baby and my other grandma died just like last year and I couldn't get to go to none of their funerals.	Bruno demands recognition and elaborates upon his personal connection. Sophie does not verbally respond.
147. Jasmine's hand goes up straight with her palm pointing up and a smile on her face.	Jasmine's turn.
148. Jasmine: My father died in jail, I hadn't seen him for like seven years, I couldn't go to his funeral.	Jasmine's personal connection. She too could not be with the object of her sadness. Sophie does not explicitly acknowledge or pursue this sad story.
149. Sophie: What so you guys obviously your your immediate reactions to this, what's your feeling as to this all this stuff happens?	Attempt to regain control over the conversation, to re-establish her discursive context by refocusing the content and not validating students' prior knowledge. This question is not understood by the students—it is literally “out of their context.”
150. Marcus: My my cousin my cousin was dragged over there by um by Dunkin' Donuts, she was the one dragged by a car	Marcus's second attempt.

151. Sophie: Oh yeah yeah yeah. . . . And so how what's your your immediate reaction is what, how are you what are you feeling inside? 152. Marcus: I want to whoever like I find out who did it if I see them . . . 153. Sophie: You wanted to snuff them? 154. Marcus: Yeah (amid an odd and enthusiastic laughter). 155. Jasmine: Do more than that. A lot more than that. 156. Sophie: Um, but what, but why, what is what is why is that your reaction, what's your feeling inside? 157. Marcus: I'm I'm really sad but then again I'm healing because I'm mad that someone would even do that to (pause) I don't know (pause) I guess 158. Jasmine: your family.	The tone of Sophie's question reveals no sympathy; the question itself is again "out of context." Marcus is vying for power and inclusion—a redefinition of his role, he's not in group therapy. Where is this going? Marcus threatens murder in reprisal. Sophie attempts to make humorous the very real nature of this threat. I have known people like Marcus. Sophie also reasserts her dominance over their group: while she can use their language, they have little knowledge of hers. She uses the word "snuff" with understanding. Most importantly, valuation of their prior experiences is determined by the teacher. Making a real threat even more real. Jasmine understands—she implies that she would torture the culprit. Does she perceive the violent rage in these young people—the capability of inflicting harm? This is what may be causing Sophie's seeming discomfort and why she does what she does in a few minutes. She has lost control of the context of the class discourse. She is afforded a glimpse into their culture—a peek. She has accepted if only for a moment their invitation to join them. Sophie's question could be the focus of an entire discussion. But she runs from it. Is Marcus's rage caused by love, shame, fear, cultural expectations? What is Sophie's intent—does she recognize the profound implications of her question, and how those implications pertain to the story? Finally, what does her question have to do with her epistemological stance? This is real, sensitive, personal insight. Finishing with empathy Marcus's sentence, as Sophie had finished Jacob's, before.

159. Marcus: Yeah, you may think that it would never happen to your family member. 160. Sophie: So you're sad, you're angry, do you think this little girl probably feels a little bit of both of those like anger with her father for cracking pretty much cracking a joke . 161. Anna raises her head. (16:00) 162. While Anko and Sophie talk about something I cannot understand, Bruno sees a tissue on the floor, pokes Marianna in her right ribs, and, smiling, motions to the floor. They share soft words as Marianna picks up the tissue, holds it to her face, and smells it. Then, saying something, she waves it in his face and drops it as he flinches away. She wipes her hands on her pants legs and picks up her pencil. 163. Sophie: Um, I agree I agree with you but hold on these two don't forget Hannah whatever you have to say do not forget it (what is said for the next 30 seconds is lost in the sound of Bruno moving his desk). 164. A student questions if there was anything the father could have said that would have made the girl feel better. 165. Sophie: Right. You know how sometimes when you go through something really sad, like you don't want everyone to be talking about it all the time you just want someone to like give you a hug or just you know just be there, like.	Repeats Marcus's words then immediately brings all of these personally tragic stories back to the trite story in order to make a tenuous point about the CAPT. Marianna has the ability to be seamlessly distracted. She was writing something on a piece of paper, Bruno imposes himself upon her, she responds in a way that quiets Bruno, and then she resumes her prior posture; this entire scene was unacknowledged by Sophie. Why is Bruno allowed to assert his dominance over Marianna? Sophie comes over to Bruno now, touches his desk with her left hand, and points to a desk where she wants Bruno to sit, all this while Anko is making his point explicit. Bruno sits up suddenly in mock surprise and outrage when Sophie turns away. Response. Authentic question. But she didn't hug Anna, not really. Why not? She wasn't really "there." This is ironic. What exactly is Sophie's belief about the study of literature? Is it an academic exercise, is it an escape into an already discovered world of sentimental manipulation, or does it allow for the exploration of personal revelations? What does the CAPT require?

166. Marcus: Yeah.	Sincere understanding.
167. Jasmine: I need comforting words, like.	Listen to Jasmine's innate recognition of the critical importance of discourse as we integrate powerful emotion and interpret events!
168. Sophie: You need words.	Sophie omits the necessary adjective.
169. Jasmine: Comforting (soft but emphatic) words.	Jasmine does not let this omission go, because it would severely trivialize her important perception.
170. Sophie: So maybe that was what this girl possibly needed, someone to explain to her you know that this is part of growing up, this is part of life, that you have to do this? Hang on for one second, Jacob you said you were gonna you would be mad if you got if your brother gave you the pecan, you'd be mad . . . for candy?	Sophie's terms are vague to me. What exactly is the "this" that the girl needed? Comforting words? What is "part of life"? What do you have to "do"? And to what population, to what culture does any of this apply? Sophie's? Mine? Not in any way reflected by the story. Asserts her power to control the conversation—how it will be conducted and who will speak.
171. Jacob: That's not the right time to give you candy, like trying to like make you feel better is like (amid chatter) a piece of pecan whatever (Marianna laughs) I'd be like get that away from me, I don't want candy.	Look where this conversation has arrived. Whose context are we in now?
172. Sophie: And that prob probably part of that would be the anger that you're feeling already at like your dad and you know your mom for not	Why second person? Who does she see when she looks at Jacob? I'd love to know how she was going to finish this thought.
173. Anko's hand goes up.	Requests the floor.
174. Jacob: Yeah because when I get mad I take it out on everybody.	Takes the floor. What exactly does Jacob get mad about?
175. Anko: Miss	Requests the floor—to be heard.
176. Sophie: Ok, so can you warn us when you're mad then so that we know that you're going to be taking it out on us	Ignores Anko. Makes a joke, establishing a context for the class in which she is comfortable.
177. Anko: Miss! I have a question.	More emphatically requesting the floor.
178. Sophie: Hang on because Hannah has been waiting so patiently and then you're next.	Comes back to Hannah, forestalls Anko for what will prove to be a long time.

179. Hannah: My cousin had to go to Iraq.	Refuses to let her tragedy go unexpressed.
180. Hannah: (Hannah proceeds to tell about the anguish she feels for her cousin in Iraq and how she might never see him again. Like Anna, Hannah reduces herself to tears.) My cousin had to go to Iraq in um December and he's out there for a year and we don't know if he's gonna come back um but the hard part is that he lives in Las Vegas anyways he's like my brother and I don't really get to talk with him as much as I want to . . . and it's scary to think he might not be coming home.	Hannah copies Anna's prior emotional expression.
181. Sophie: What is this, you know, obviously it makes you upset you know that this is going on, which it should, but what does this do for all of you when you go through an experience like this, what does it cause you to do in your life?	I presume Sophie's point, eventually, will be that the little girl in the story is forced to grow up, and growing up is symbolized in her crying silently, like the adults, except for the father who is cackling.
182. Student: Grow up.	Response.
183. (Student chatter)	
184. Sophie: It makes you stronger, it makes you grow up, you have no choice.	I wonder.
185. Bruno: But I have a question.	Requests the floor.
186. Sophie: Go ahead, ask us a question.	"Us." Anko's question has been tabled.
187. Bruno: Well you're you're the one that signed up to go there. (18:43: an emotional confrontation ensues between Bruno, Jasmine, Sophie, and Hannah regarding whether or not we should feel compassion and, if so, for whom we should feel it. Much confusion about the draft is also evidenced. Hannah is allowed a lot of time to explain her agony.)	Bruno is rejecting what he perceives to be the gratuitous sentimentality of Hannah's sad story. Bruno deems Hannah's story to be unworthy of eliciting commiseration. Consider that both of Bruno's attempts to have his sad stories acknowledged were rejected. Now he is rejecting Hannah's sad story. An argument ensues regarding getting drafted and much inaccurate information is presented as proof for both sides. Bruno's point is that Hannah's cousin chose to join the

	military, so neither Hannah's cousin nor Hannah warrant any commiseration. Bruno argues this position against virulent rebuttals by Jasmine and Sophie that Hannah should still be pitied. Hannah weeps copiously—her face distorted with pain—and then elaborates significantly upon her sadness.
188. Sophie: (21:07) So why do you think that of everyone in the family, why do you think that Hannah might be taking it the hardest?	Request for interpretation.
189. Marcus: She's the closest one to him.	Response.
190. Student: (Talking over Marcus) like she doesn't know everything behind it.	Response.
191. Sophie: (With deliberate and significant meaning in her voice) Because she hasn't been through it yet.	Appropriates the answer. What exactly is "it"?
192. Hannah continues to elaborate significantly upon her family's military history. Bruno continues to challenge the sentimentality of Hannah's story, but he is the only one who does so.	Battle to see who establishes the dominant context of the discourse.
193. Sophie: (22:57) I just need to thank you guys because I know that this is stuff that is definitely, you know	Voiced appreciation. Nice, but what exactly are the students being thanked for?
194. Male Student: Personal?	Sounds a little resentful.
195. Sophie: difficult for you and very personal, yeah, and, you know, to share it with the class is, you know, thank you so much (fades softly) anyway, thank you, you know, I I don't think that you would have necessarily been thinking about these things at this moment if there wasn't something in the story that sparked it, and so that plus the ideas (Sophie's voice raises an octave) for this girl it is just a dog, for you it's people, so it's you know obviously it is a lot harder (Anna nods her head, Jasmine raises her hand) what you're going through than what this little girl is, but (emphatic), it's still (Anko raises his hand uncertainly) that feeling it's still a feeling of loss, you	Continued thanks. Gratitude. Gratitude. Something in the story, and their lives. Recognition of students' emotional reactions. Jasmine requests the floor. "But"? Anko tries again.

know, that is something that whether you lost, you know, a relative or you've had to leave a country (Jasmine puts her hand down) or someone has gone to war you know you all have experience that even if it was you know moving when you were in second grade and leaving your best friend behind, ok that (emphatic) is a difficult thing in itself too. (Lowering her voice) What were you going to say? (23:55) 196. (Student chatter about the importance of the dog to the girl.) 197. Sophie: It's her bestest friend! 198. Anko comments but is dominated by Hannah. 199. Anko: Because if I was the girl and that when the brother when her brother gave her the candy I would have taken the candy and thrown it at the dad, that probably would have made him stop the car and given the dog some time to get to the car 200. (Hannah comments.) 201. Sophie: Um, Anko, I have a question with what you were just saying. So you said you would take that piece of candy and throw it at the dad, why do you think she doesn't? 202. Student: 'Cause she knows she'll get whooped. 203. Marcus: She gonna get whooped. 204. Sophie: Possibly. I I think she's probably too hurt at this point, and if do you think she's come to some realization like as she sees her brother look at her with that look of you know that sad look on his face? Do you think she's come to some realization at this point? The same realization that you guys had at the very beginning of the class? Sam, what what did you say? That sometimes what	Jasmine withdraws her request. Tries to manipulate the premise of the story—to alter the plot. Authentic question: request for interpretation. Response, before Anko could respond. Response. The correct answer. Implied helplessness. The victim. Authentic question, which she answers herself.

213. Bruno: (?) 214. Hannah: you didn't understand it and that's why you're using that (?) 215. Sophie: (Interrupting Hannah) No, no they don't know that. We just tell you that to help you get started, they have no, and you know all it's saying is that you just don't know where to start, and, so, whatever, it's a time saver because, um, it's not that you don't understand the story, it's just you didn't know, you have so many ideas you didn't know which one to start with. That's it (lightly). 216. Hannah: Is the CAPT uh thing gonna be longer than the one we just read? 217. Sophie: Yes. You'll have more time too. It will be, um, about six or seven pages. 218. Student reaction expresses dismay. 219. Sophie: And you have a half hour to read it. 220. More student dismay. 221. Hannah: You have a half hour just to read it? 222. Sophie: Yup (lightly). 223. More student dismay. 224. Sophie: You need to you need to stay focused, you need to stay focused, if you can stay focused you'll do fine (student chatter) and I know that because you've done a few with me (28:40). 225. (29:36) The classroom lights go out, the overhead projector is turned on, Sophie reads instructions, and students begin copying Shelly's answer as Sophie reads and elaborates upon the answer. Sophie talks as students focus on copying the	interpretations. Really? Is that ok? Concern about the test. Length of story. Reaction. Time. Reaction. Incredulous. Response. Reaction. Review of tips. Don't underestimate how much effort is required by these students to copy a long answer. This demands their full physical and mental attention.

answer.	
226. Marianna: We have to write the same thing? (30:51)	Marianna critically questions the assignment.
227. Sophie: No, as long as you have some kind of you know you want to write your own personal thing that's fine I just figured we'd do this to save some time then we're gonna do number two together. (Continues reading and explaining Shelly's answers as students continue copying. Marianna questions how Shelly got her answer onto the transparency.)	This is uncomfortable to watch because I don't understand why the students are copying and why Sophie is talking. She is not talking much, but the students cannot and do not attend to what she says. The disconnect here is palpable. How is she getting away with it? Why aren't the students questioning this activity? They never do number two together as she said they would.
228. Sophie: (36:30) There's a story that, um, well yeah, I think I can make a connection to it, there's a story that we did last year that I think we'll probably do with you guys this year that every time I read it I cry. I already know what happens in it.	They do not read this story, not during the Saturday Academy. I wonder what the students think of this statement—is this a motivation to read in their culture?
229. Bruno: What story?	Requests title.
230. Sophie: Every time I read it I cry.	Repeats her emotional reaction to the story. Withholds title.
231. Bruno: What story?	Repeats request for title.
232. (Students comment about their activity.)	
233. Bruno: Which story is it?	Repeats request for title again.
234. Sophie: I don't want to tell you because then you're going to be able to know what it is ahead of time.	Refuses to share the title.
235. Hannah: You can't tell us the name of the story?	Incredulous that a teacher will not share the title.
236. Sophie: No. Just in case . . .	Refuses to divulge the title and begins to explain rationale.
237. Bruno: What if we want to read it?	Incredulous that he is being kept from reading.
238. Sophie: Uhh, if you don't read it I'll make a copy for you guys. You might not think it's sad. It's just because of	They do not read the story, and she does not make a copy for them. This reveals one aspect of Sophie's epistemological stance, especially

something that happened in my life that . . .	as it pertains to her relationship with this population of students: she is the possessor of knowledge—knowledge may be shared and it may likewise be withheld at her discretion. She also offers a vague hint, a peek at something personal. The value of her prior experiences is determined by herself, not the students.
239. Continued conversation about the father in the story. Sophie explains Shelly's answer	
240. Sophie: Like you said you would either throw a piece of candy at dad or	Recalls Anko's point.
241. Hannah: That dad was grimy. (38:10)	Reminds Sophie about the word.
242. Sophie: ok?	Ignores the reference, continues with the explanation..
243. Marcus: Or snuff him.	Reminds Sophie about the other word.
244. Sophie: He didn't seem to realize how sad his child was. Yes, I'll have to be sure to let . . . Miss, um, Clines know about the snuffing.	Makes an important comment, as if in passing. Promises to tell Shelly about the words.
245. Hannah: And your mother.	Reminds Sophie of another prior promise.
246. Sophie: And my mother will know.	Acknowledges and reiterates promise.
247. Anna and Marianna give up copying and engage in conversation for a moment. Sophie continues talking. Students continue copying. Conversation about dogs. Sophie expresses a desire to get a pug. Conversation becomes animated about dogs. Then monkeys and how they really do "fling poop." Much enjoyment about this. Sophie asserts herself and keeps the class as focused as possible. Anna makes Marianna laugh, and Marianna offers to share Anna's funny statement, but Sophie tells her to wait. Conversation between students ranges widely. Anna tells a story about a brutal pit bull attack that caused her severe neck injuries: "My meat was hanging off," she says. She says she has had trouble remembering things since the attack.	Sophie explains that the little girl's dog was supposedly a pug. This begins about three minutes of genuine, youthful, childlike, infectious joy—laughter and hilarity and several topics. Sophie makes repeated attempts, ultimately successful, to quell the laughter. This genuine moment of students talking over one another while listening, laughing, and repeating their statements is impossible to transcribe. It is, nevertheless, the happiest most natural and inclusive moment of the entire ten weeks.

Sophie terminates the copying assignment. No one has finished. Sophie tells students to put a dot dot dot and then copy the last sentence about “sacrifices.” (47:00) 248. After the end of the final period of the day: 249. Me: Hey, you want a professional question that can I fire a question at you? 250. Sophie: Yup. 251. Me: (Sophie slings her bag over her shoulder and moves toward the door) The second, are you are you out are you gone am I holding you up? I know I am. 252. Sophie: No, go ahead, ask your question. 253. Me: Hey, the second period class, which was remarkable in a lot of ways. 254. Sophie: (Positive enthusiasm) I know. 255. Me: Um . . . uh they they took it upon themselves to copy, and it was never your intent I don’t think to have them copy it . . . the the the uh Shelly’s answer. 256. Sophie: No, I wanted them to copy it. 257. Me: (Overlapping) You wanted, how come? 258. Sophie: ‘Cause I didn’t want to waste any more time on it. . . . I wanted to like get number two done. I thought we would get, wait, no no no number two 259. Me: Yeah, you had them copy. 260. Sophie: No, Shelly’s is number one. 261. Me: The long one, the long passage. 262. Sophie: Yeah yeah yeah. That I wanted them to just kinda get done so that we could do number two together (rising	I timidly request permission to question Sophie’s teaching. Grants permission. Apologetically pursues further permission to ask a question. Grants permission again. Introduce question. Agreement. I question the assignment and Sophie’s intent. Asserts intent. I continue to question the teacher’s intent. What time was “wasted”? How was that a waste of time? Confusion. Copying the answer took a long time, and they never approached question number two.

intonation). They've already done number one, like with me with "The Blanket" and stuff so I was kind of hoping they would just . . . jot it down, you know, see what like a sample a good sample is and	They didn't just "jot" it down—it was laborious, and students did not finish.
263. Me: Right	
264. Sophie: have to write it	But what good does "writing it" do?
265. Me: Right.	
266. Sophie: so they can actually like, you know, visualize, it and you know have it actually sink in. And so that was really what I, once I had looked in to see how much Shelly my hope was to have everyone caught up with question number two but two classes (pause) didn't get that far.	So to learn students must copy. "Visualize it" so it would "sink in"? Did students need to copy in order to visualize? What exactly has the visualization sunk into?
267. Me: Was that question one? Did I have that?	Question.
268. Sophie: That was question one.	Clarification.
269. Me: That was question one.	
270. Sophie: Yeah, so that class was completely behind, they were like a whole day behind, so now they're . . . sort of up to par.	Justification.
271. Me: So but that was the only class that did that.	Continued questioning.
272. Sophie: Yeah, cause the rest of them had already done it.	But what had they "done"?
273. Me: Oh.	Perplexed.
274. Sophie: That was the only class that did not complete number one with Shelly last week.	
275. Me: Was it really, ok.	Confused.
276. Sophie: The rest of them had we started. She wrote for me that it was class three that hadn't done it, but it was actually	So they're not talking. Confusion.

class two. 277. Me: Ok. All right. 278. Sophie: So. 279. Me: I was curious about that cause it was such a an emotional riot . . . that . . . I didn't know if you were trying to calm things down. 280. Sophie: Well, when they started joking around at the end of the class I let them do that 281. Me: (Laughing) Yeah. 282. Sophie: for that reason. 283. Me: Well you kept allowing them to do what they were doing and then coming back to the text, you kept coming back to the text. I don't know what I would have done. I don't know, it was uh . . . 284. Sophie: Well that's why I can't do um, um, uh, "A Farewell to Violet" (moving towards door, carrying all her materials) that's a story about a girl who dyes her hair because she's going through chemo 285. Me: Oh yeah 286. Sophie: I lose it every time I read it. 287. Me: That second period class was wild. 288. Sophie: Yeah (continuing to move towards the door). 289. Me: That's a funny class. 290. Sophie: And usually they're not that good. 291. Me: Well they're always . . . they're always . . . taking it making it personal. 292. Sophie: Right. 293. Me: Yeah.	Still vaguely and timidly pursuing the question. What was her real intent? Did she? Ok. I was trying to understand why she maintained such a distance. Reveals to me the title of the short story that she likes and that makes her cry. Back to the class. "Good" in what way? Personal connections are important to the class.

294. Sophie: Yeah, they like to talk about themselves a lot (physically turns away). 295. Me: Yeah. 296. Sophie: So (leaving). 297. Me: Thanks Sophie. 298. Sophie: Yup. Thank you. Have a nice weekend.	Don't we all? What is her implication?

Day 6: January 28th, 2006. Shelly's 3rd Class: Moving Beyond "Moving On"

FRONT				DOOR
Jasmine BF				
Marianna BF	Marcus BM			Qing AF
Anna WF	Bruno BM			Liang AF
Anko HM			Carmella WF	Samuel WM
			Jacob WM	Jim AM
				ME

1. (0:00) The class starts out with Anko immediately asking Shelly if Sophie had told her about the word "Grimy." Shelly does not know what Anko is talking about—she obviously has not been told about "grimy" or "snuffed." Meantime, Marcus is obviously energetic and seemingly defiant as he turns to talk with Marianna, Jasmine, and Anna just when Shelly is calling the class's attention to herself and her words. Marcus is a large and dominant presence, made even larger by the oversized winter jacket he wears and the white do rag. 2. Shelly: (Talking to Anko) Uh oh, no she didn't. 3. Shelly: Marcus (Marcus is turned half way around, talking with Jasmine—she is laughing quietly). 4. Anko: She said she was going to tell you and your mom. (Anko is obviously disappointed as she turns his head downward, slumps his shoulders, and smiles to himself like a dispirited child.) 5. Shelly: All right, so, if you take a look at "Moving On" (Marcus turns back to	Check. Uh oh. Discipline. Veracity check from last class and reaction. The importance of this moment is immediately apparent to me, as I laugh, not at something funny, but rather a recognition of irony.

Marianna as she is talking to him) Marcus I'm gonna have to move you if you can't focus cause you're distracting my class. 6. Anna: Ohhhh (protracted, but not directed at Marcus; instead, she is commenting upon the cold classroom), it's cold in here. 7. Shelly: All right 8. Marcus: I'm (emphasis) distracting your class (plaintive resentment) 9. Shelly: (Speaking over Marcus) Moving on from last week 10. Marcus: You're distracting me (emphasis). 11. Shelly continues speaking as Marcus noisily drags a chair closer to him with his feet and then places his feet noisily upon it. 12. Shelly: (0:45) Marcus 13. Marcus: Huh? We're looking at the packet again? 14. Shelly talks. Anna laughs at something with Marianna, as Shelly continues talking. Marcus asks a procedural question. Shelly comes to him and points to a piece of paper. Marianna and Anna have a joke going. Bruno is looking at the camera and me. Shelly continues to address the RTL CAPT question (#2) for "Moving On." They vote for which quotation they will address. Anna and Marianna vote for A. Jasmine and Marcus vote for C. Shelly opts to do quotation C. 15. Anna: What can you write about C? 16. Marcus: What can you write about A?	Discipline. "my" class. Disruption. Outburst. Possibly a distraction—taking Shelly's attention away from Marcus, for his own good. Asserting control. Latent reaction to discipline. Implication that she is distracting his class, or that he considers himself to be one of her most attuned students. Continued defiant reaction in word and action. Marcus's physical defiance. Discipline Assumes a passive aggressive stance. Physical proximity to Marcus. Democratic vote. Marcus gets his wish. Defiant rebuttal question. Antagonistic reply.

17. Marcus is restless—he turns and talks with Bruno and Anna. Anna hits him in the puffy right sleeve of his winter jacket. Shelly is a juggernaut and continues talking. Marcus turns again and talks with Anna. Bruno and Marcus interact nonverbally. Marcus begins to drum with his pen on his desk and he bounces rhythmically in his chair as he rolls his right blue jean pant leg up, revealing a bright red knee sock.	Student distraction. Physical activity.
18. Shelly's Questions:	
19. Shelly: (2:55) Here's what we have to do for question two, all right? Here are tips so you want to write this down please. You can write it right here in this little space and actually you can see some tips right below here. Before you even begin make sure you've determined the theme of the story, so that means before we can answer question two we have to determine the theme. What's the	Tips: explicit test instruction for question number two on the Response to Literature section of the CAPT. Theme.
20. Anna: So we have to write steps to answer number two?	Looking for something to copy.
21. Shelly: Well right now let's look down in this space here	Response.
22. Anna: Oh ohhh	Recognition.
23. Shelly: So it says before you begin make sure you've determined the theme of the story. So what's the theme in a story?	Request for literary term definition.
24. Marcus: What it's about.	Marcus attempts to answer the question.
25. Anna: Um, leaving stuff.	Anna mistakenly focuses the generalized question upon the story the class discussed during the prior class.
26. Shelly: It's a little bit 'bout more than that.	Implicit request for elaboration.
27. Anna: It's leaving something behind.	Pursues her answer.
28. Shelly: All right, so, leaving something behind or growing up. Theme, instead of saying theme, what could else what else	Allows Anna's answer, yet pursues her original question.

could you call it? (Pause) What else is it from the author?	Vague question: “from the author”?
29. Jasmine: The message.	Attempts to define the literary term.
30. Shelly: The message. So the theme is what the author wanted you to get out of it. So we need to figure that out before we start writing. (3:56)	Theme defined and redefined. Why not use writing as a tool students can use as they figure out the theme?
31. Shelly reads instructions in a rapid voice, as if it is a recipe with which she is familiar. Jasmine answers questions as Anko fixes his do rag and Anna helps Marianna with something in her eye. Marianna and Anna are talking and laughing quietly. No disciplinary action. Marcus turns to Bruno and gives him a look and a half smile and Marcus pulls his fur-lined hood over his white do rag. Bruno returns a half smile and looks at the clock.	Student distraction.
32. Shelly: You’re gonna tell me what to write.	
33. Marcus: Yes (he pumps his fist once).	This does not sound or look sarcastic to me.
34. Shelly: You’re going to copy it down.	Again students must copy.
35. (Shelly says to look at quotation C. Marcus says he voted for B.)	Defiance. This is wrong. He voted for C.
36. Shelly: (5:23) What was (emphasis) the message of the story? What was (emphasis) what you know the purpose that the author was trying to present? Yup.	Request for thematic response.
37. Anna: Um, the author was saying how like moving on is helping you grow up sometimes and you have to learn how to, you know, leave things behind and move on with your life. (5:34)	Eloquent verbal response. Echoes of the prior class. But is she exploring what the author was saying or repeating what the teacher said? Either way, Anna’s answer is evidence of the transition from exploratory to formal speech.
38. Shelly: All right, so it helps you to grow up (rising inflection on “up”). Somebody said before, a loss of innocence.	While Anna attempted to resurrect the emotional veracity of the prior class, it is lost on Shelly because she was not there.

39. Bruno: That you're not going to be at the same stage.	Opportunity for deepening discourse.
40. Marcus: Oooooo.	Recognition of Bruno's answer.
41. Anna: That's moving up.	Defense of her words. Interesting distinction between moving on and moving up.
42. Shelly: All right, so you have to, you know, your life has to progress. And sometimes you have to do what?	Repeats Bruno's response. Fill in the blank question.
43. Marianna adds a comment quietly.	
44. Anna: Move on.	As if stating the obvious now. I wonder what Anna would have written about the theme of the story, had she been left to her own personal explorations. What would she have discovered? What would all the students have discovered?
45. Marianna: You have to leave stuff behind (unintelligible).	Repetition from prior class.
46. Shelly: All right. Sometimes you have to leave stuff behind, so, let's look at (pause) the question again, knowing that that's our theme now, moving on you know, losing innocence, growing up a little bit. So it says (reads from story) Now, what is the first thing our tips tell us to do when we start writing? So not the theme, we already did the theme part, what do we have to do when we start (emphasis) writing? What's the first thing?"	Adopts the class's answer. Another thematic re-interpretation. Reference to the tips. Repeated reference to the tips.
47. Student offers a mumbled response.	
48. Shelly: (Apparently reading) Explain the quotation, who said it, and where it occurs. So, tell me my first sentence here, what is the easiest way to tell us where the quotation occurred? (Marcus's pen almost rolls off of his desk, but he lunges and catches it. Student offers a mumbled response.) How do you start that sentence? (Quiet response.) How do we start the sentence, though. Start it for me. (Uncertain, hesitating	Explicit instruction. Pursues her question. Continues to pursue her question. Pursues the question.

responses.) Well we're talking about the quotation so what might we start with? (Anna and other students work through an answer verbally while Shelly molds and copies the answer. Students copy Shelly's written answer.)	Pursues the question.
49. Anna: No, we're not going to write the quotation, we're not going to take up space (student laughter). (7:10)	Humorous recognition of a way to fake it.
50. Jasmine: I would.	Response reflecting a humorous lack of confidence.
51. Shelly: All right, so this quotation we have to say where it occurs who said it so (begins to write on the transparency) "This quotation," yup, you're going to copy it down with me. "This quotation"	Procedural directions: copy.
52. Marianna: Can we write on the first line where the C is?	Procedural question.
53. Shelly: Yeah.	Procedural reply.
54. Anna: Doesn't it, isn't it This quotation occurs (pause) um (pause) when (pause)	Exploratory speech—attempts to answer the question.
55. Bruno: What's her name?	Question.
56. Shelly: She doesn't have a name so we can say the narrator or the little girl.	Response.
57. Marcus: The chick (softly, then louder) the chick.	Derogatory comment: does Marcus understand the offensive nature of the connotation, especially for a young girl?
58. Bruno: The little girl.	Rejects Marcus's comment.
59. Marianna: The little girl.	Rejects Marcus's comment.
60. Shelly: (Unintelligible) chick.	Rejects Marcus's comment.
61. Anna: No, the little girl had to leave her best friend behind.	Rejects Marcus's comment and advances the discourse, thereby minimizing the possibility of a confrontation.
62. Shelly: And who's her best friend?	Question.
63. Several Students: Fly. (7:50)	

64. Shelly: (Repeats the words as she writes) All right so now we know who said it, where it occurred, what else can we say about when this occurred? What has happened for her at this moment? (8:07)	Questions regarding the context of the quotation.
65. Marcus: She's crying, she's offered a piece of candy.	This is not the answer Shelly is looking for.
66. Shelly: Well her brother does offer her a piece of candy, you're right. When she says it it makes me cry harder like the grownups do, what is she realizing, what's going on in her mind? Yeah? (calling on Marianna)	Why the apparent reluctance? Request for interpretation.
67. Marianna answers and Bruno talks over her. Shelly molds and copies Marianna's answer, ignoring Bruno's.	
68. Shelly: All right, so, (pause, while writing on the overhead transparency) She is so hurt and upset that what?	Request for interpretation.
69. Marianna answers softly.	
70. Shelly: Well she's crying but she's not . ..	Fill in the blank question.
71. Marianna: making noise.	Fills in the blank.
72. Shelly: Making noise that (writes as student says something softly).	
73. Jasmine: Her soul was hurt (Marianna looks at Jasmine) (8:44)	Other than Marianna's glance, this goes apparently unheard.
74. Shelly: Now why is she crying like the grownups do? What is that supposed to mean? (Several students answer.) We talked about it. (Chatter.) All right, so, so we could say (writing) the fact that, can you finish the sentence for me? (Extended silence. Anna asks for something—a piece of paper. Anna laughs. Marcus is copying Shelly's writing.) All right what does it show us so we started it the fact that she is crying like the grownups do shows us what?	Request for interpretation. Request for interpretation. Fill in the blank question.
75. Bruno then Anna answer. Marcus	Request for interpretation.

pounds on his desk with his right fist.	Sudden action.
76. Shelly: Shhhhh	Discipline
77. Anna: She's becoming more mature.	Interpretation.
78. Shelly: Ok. She is becoming more mature, I like that (writing). She's moving on. So she's becoming more mature. So if she's becoming more mature what's she losing? What could we say?	Repetition. Assessment.
79. Marianna: She's losing her immaturity.	Leading interpretative question. Ha! I love this response.
80. Shelly: Well losing immaturity she's also losing innocence when you are what? (Shelly molds her answer as she writes amid minimal or ignored brief student comments.) When you're little when you're a child, so she's becoming more mature and (writing) losing her	Leading interpretive question: fill in the blank. Misses the delightful originality of Marianna's perspective.
81. Marcus: (Softly) Innocence.	
82. Shelly: childhood or you could say innocence. (Marcus offers comments softly.) Now at this point what is she realizing? Some someone said it earlier when we were talking about the theme. She's realizing what? (Students' halting responses.)	Muted recognition of Marcus's contribution. Leading interpretive question. Search for the already-said correct answer.
83. Marianna: Her dad don't care.	This is an answer worth exploring. Failure to do so is a missed opportunity. It might lead to the discovery of various themes based upon perspective. Writing the answer according to the cookbook instructions has become more important than pursuing authentic discourse and then writing.
84. Shelly: (10:21) Well about life. What's she realizing about life? Somebody mentioned it while we were talking about theme. (Various student responses. Shelly molds and writes. Bruno and Anna offer suggestions.) All right, so sometimes, all right, wait, we'll say that she realizes	Fill in the blank question. Answers her own question with Anna's first comment. Another fill in the blank question.
85. Bruno: That at a point in life she (pause)	Attempt at participation.

something like that (fades away) 86. Anna: Yeah, that at a point in life you lose your loved ones, something like that (softly fades away) 87. Shelly: Sometimes in life you have to what? Let's make it more general. 88. Students: Sacrifice. 89. Shelly: Sacrifice things, and not just any old things, but what what was Fly? He was a thing that was . . .? 90. Anna: A best friend 91. Shelly: All right, so that that would be something that you . . . ? 92. Anna: Cherish? 93. Shelly: Cherish you care about so sometimes in life you have to sacrifice things you care about (pause). Now so we've we've said a lot in here but now let's make sure the person grading it knows we're talking about the overall message of the story so we could say this quotation appears our middle section here, this quotation ties in with the theme (pause) I'll finish after we write the theme here and let you catch up and then we'll finish it up, so the quotation ties in with the theme that (Shelly molds and writes while students copy) what's our theme, what's our message? (Softly mumbled response.) Moving on helps you and is what? In order to grow up you have to . . .? (Softly mumbled response). Move up move on, so, moving on is . . . a part of 94. Bruno: Growing up. 95. Shelly: Growing up. (Pause while writing.) She had to learn how to deal with loss. I'll leave that there so people could catch up before we continue. (12:18) Well we're doing a lot of things	Hearkens back to the prior class. Ignores exploratory speech. Leading interpretive question: fill in the blank. Fill in the blank question. Fill in the blank question. Nice word! Why change the word? Why dummy it down? Students are copying Shelly's answer. Fill in the blank question. Offers response. Repeats response.

in here you've already given me some ideas that put up put up there you're you know interpreting it, you're not just giving us a summary of the story you're definitely interpreting it for us because you're talking about themes and message and growing up and loss of innocence you're talking about some great things	
96. Marcus: What is that other teacher's name?	Assessment. Praise.
97. Shelly: Miss Morris.	Apparently this praise inspires Marcus's return to Sophie's promise. Challenge.
98. Marcus: Did she tell you what grimy means? (Anna and Marianna are talking.)	Response.
99. Shelly: No. (12:41)	Challenge. Checking on Sophie's credibility.
100. Marcus: Oooooo, she's slacking on her job. She said	Response.
101. Bruno: She said she was going to tell her mom.	Response. Humorous accusation.
102. Shelly: I'll have to ask her. I only got to see her (Marcus and Bruno argue about something)	Joins in accusation.
103. Marcus: Yes she did!	Another promise. Excuse.
104. Shelly: for a few minutes this week.	Aggressive response.
105. (Argument continues.)	Continued excuse.
106. Shelly: Shhhhh, I'll ask her, don't worry. You can yell at her next week for not telling me. (13:00)	Discipline. Promise reiterated. Offers opportunity for student-administered discipline—humorous.
107. After Shelly attempts to get back on task, Anko and Marianna now ask about "grimy"—they did not hear Marcus's and Bruno's prior comments. Shelly asks Anko if that is what he was talking about at the beginning of class. Anko, unsmiling, says yes.	Joins the questioning of Sophie's promise.
108. Shelly: It must have slipped her mind. I'll have to ask her.	Anko seems hurt, as if his trust has been betrayed. Excuse.

109. Marianna: She said she was going to tell her mom.	Marianna joins the challenge.
110. Anna and Bruno join in. An argument ensues about whether she was going to share grimy with her sister or her mom. Marianna and Anna continue conversing. Shelly reads her answer. Marcus drums with both palms on his desk, then turns to Marianna. Shelly overpowers the chatter and reads from her answer written on the transparency. She finishes reading the answer and then commences reading quickly and loudly from the tips sheet. Bruno is still copying. Anna makes a comment regarding Shelly's written grammar, but she has skipped a line in her reading.	Physical activity.
111. Marianna and Anna continue talking, not particularly quietly. Marcus's right foot is tapping. He begins banging rhythmically on his desk.	Physical activity.
112. Shelly: Shhhhhhhhhhh (15:03)	Long, extended hushing.
113. Shelly's questioning pattern continues regarding the girl's emotional agony and how she changes. Shelly writes, asks leading fill in the blanks questions, molds students' responses, and writes.	Continues with the assignment.
114. Shelly: (16:00) So the little girl in the story, now what, you're going to finish it for me	Continues with the assignment.
115. Jasmine: You're gonna talk about how she changes?	Response.
116. Shelly: Yeah, how she grows up, how that ties in with this theme. (Pause.) What happens to her in this story?	Pursues the concluding idea.
117. Marcus: She gets offered a piece of candy.	Appropriate response, connects to the comment he made in the prior class—about throwing the piece of candy at the father.
118. Jasmine: She gets like her first heartache.	Nice.
119. Shelly: All right	Response.

120. Bruno: (Loudly, and with passion) She got her best friend taken away.	Appropriate response.
121. Shelly: (Talking over Bruno) it's like her first heartache, good (enthusiastically). She has you know her best friend taken away so (writing) "The little girl in the story suffers her first real loss by having her special friend taken away, and as a result" what happens to her?	Validates both Jasmine's and Bruno's responses.
122. Bruno: She started to mature.	Another response.
123. Jasmine reads aloud as she writes.	
124. Shelly: (Writing) "As a result she grows up a little" right? When people just said she moved on.	Continues writing.
125. Bruno: (17:30): Are you good friends with Miss Ryan?	Attempt to reclaim the context of the class.
126. Shelly: I don't know Miss Ryan very well. I don't ever see her.	Response.
127. Bruno makes a comparison between Miss Ryan and Shelly.	
128. Jacob: She's nasty. She told us	Jacob joins the conversation and the criticism of Sophie's broken promise.
129. Shelly: Stop.	Discipline. Jacob is disciplined for the first time.
130. Jacob: she hated us.	Continues with recrimination, regardless of discipline.
131. Shelly: Stop.	Discipline repeated.
132. Anna: She told us she what?	Continues, regardless of discipline.
133. Jacob: Nasty.	Continues, regardless of discipline.
134. Bruno: She didn't tell us that. She just give us a lot of work. (17:50)	Bruno defends an absent and demanding teacher being maligned. Why is he the one who defends her?
135. Shelly continues talking. Marcus and Marianna have some sort of facial interaction. Marianna smiles. Marcus	

drums. Shelly talks. Marcus stretches his back and his arms. Marianna talks to Jasmine, who laughs. Marcus returns to copying Shelly's answer. Anna begins asking a question, but fades. Bruno picks it up, but fades. Marcus asks Marianna about a cut on his finger. Jasmine and Marianna talk and laugh.	Copying continues.
136. Shelly: Shhhhh. This is a great one guys. (20:10)	Discipline and vague appraisal.
137. Marianna: Are we the best class, because that's what everyone says	Seeking affectionate appraisal.
138. Shelly: You're awesome (emphasis).	Enthusiastic assessment.
139. Shelly continues to talk about the difficulty of question number two and the time constraint of the test. Bruno adds to this topic. Marianna's chatter with Jasmine is incessant.	Time.
140. Shelly: Shhhhhh	Discipline
141. Marcus: Yo, I've been copying the same line over and over again. (21:26)	Profoundly ironic representation of the implicit curriculum.
142. Shelly: Shhhhhh, yup? (calling on Anko)	Discipline.
143. Marcus reads what he has written.	
144. Shelly: Shhhhhh	Discipline
145. Laughter, Marcus puts his head down and laughs for a moment. Anko and Marcus laugh with one another. Shelly talks about their answer. Reads it rapidly. No one is reading along with her.	Humorous moment.
146. Shelly: Awesome. Really really good (claps). (22:23)	Withdrawal.
147. Anxiety about the test's logistics. Marcus taps and drums. Bruno is profoundly confused about the structure of the test. Marcus pounds his desk once with his right fist and turns to Bruno, then stretches his legs out straight and	Praise.
	Physical action.

folds his arms across his chest (23:40). He sits motionless. Then turns to Marianna and Jasmine again and gets some candy. Anna reaches for candy from Jasmine. Shelly continues to talk about the test. Introduces the Reading for Information test. Marcus receives and distributes candy from Jasmine.	
148. Shelly: Now looking at this you know if you if you studied these tips you know on how to answer question number two do you guys think you could do this?	Request for informal assessment.
149. Anna: Yeah (laughs).	Humor.
150. Shelly: Like the the formula is pretty simple you remember (reading rapidly) say where the quotation occurs who said it talk about how it relates to theme talk about how it relates to the character and then just finish it off. Right? Not that bad if you know the formula. (24:46)	Writing as formulaic.
151. Shelly transitions now to the Reading for Information section of the CAPT.	
152. Shelly: (While students are finding and taking out of their folders the handout from the first class) Marcus, turn around please. (25:47)	Discipline
153. Shelly continues talking about the logistics of the RFI test. Marcus turns again. More talk about logistics of the test.	Watching this causes me to feel frustration.
154. Shelly: Shhhhhhh.	Discipline.
155. Jasmine: I don't get (emphasis) this Miss Clines (elongated). (27:18)	Confusion
156. Shelly: Shhhhh. That's because we're having a lot of people talking today.	Recognition of confusion.
157. Marianna: I get it.	Talks regardless of Shelly's request for order.
158. Shelly: I heard such good things about this class last week, but people are not	Discipline.

listening today and that's adding to the confusion and I'm repeating myself and I hate being a record.	
159. Marianna: I'm sorry. (27:30)	Contrition.
160. Killen recommences talking about the CAPT, the RFI, specifically. She reads from the instructions. Students again become anxious about their ability to succeed.	Transition.
161. Shelly: So, if you know you only have fifteen minutes per article, and you have to answer questions about them, what do you have to do first?	Review of strategies. Request for recall of strategy.
162. Bruno: (Raising his hand) Read.	Response.
163. Shelly: Read.	Repeats student's response.
164. Bruno: (Talking over Shelly) Answer the questions, no read the questions, and, and then (fades away).	Bruno tries to make sense of the strategies as he recalls them to his memory.
165. Shelly: (Talking over Bruno) Read the questions first.	Nurtures Bruno's answer.
166. Bruno: Then read the story.	Response.
167. Shelly: Because, otherwise, what do you end up doing? If you don't read the questions first you just (Marianna or Jasmine are trying to speak as Bruno says something about forgetting) you don't know what you're looking for so then after you read the questions now you've gotta go back and re-read that whole article and that wastes a lot of time. Yeah. (28:34)	Strategy. Time.
168. Carmella: Um, when you, when you do it can you read them, like, one question at a time so that as you're reading like once you get the question you can keep reading	Request for clarification of the test's construction.
169. Shelly: (Interrupting) So they're not always in order (Bruno says something) so I wouldn't do that, I would read them all first and know what you're looking	Response.

for and you know keep glancing back to see and then as you find information	
170. Bruno: Put it down under that	
171. Shelly: Yeah. So you always read with a pen or a highlighter, um, which is why that's why that's what the second tip is, we went over this um second class I think we ever had, so, if the question's asking for you to find evidence read with a highlighter kind of pencil so you can pick out sentences and phrases to use as evidence. (Reading) "If possible skim the article to look for answers to particular questions." So skimming helps you to do what?	Another strategy.
172. Anna: Go through it faster and look for things you need.	Another strategy.
173. Bruno: Yeah	
174. Shelly: Yup. It helps you to speed it up so you're making more use of those fifteen minutes, but what do you have to be careful of if you skim? What do you have to be careful of?	Metacognitive consideration.
175. Marcus: Missing a real important part like	Appropriate response.
176. Shelly: Yeah, like what if you miss something, good, so you want to be careful if you are skimming just make sure you're aware you might be missing information unless you're really careful. All right? (29:46) Um, the other thing, the problem that we're having today a little bit is what should you do when you're taking this test so that you make sure	Discipline and a strategy.
177. Marcus: Focus	Appropriate response from a seemingly ironic contributor.
178. Shelly: You focus. So don't look at what other people are doing or who is in the hallway, focus on reading and answering the questions for those forty-five minutes. (30:00)	

179. * * *	
180. Marianna: (As Sophie is talking about where the students will take the test) I'm not coming (30:23)	Voiced resignation.
181. Shelly: Then you're gonna do it next year.	Not quiet the truth. Again, the repetition of a grim motivation.
182. Bruno: You're gonna fail. Or you're gonna go to a class.	This is the truth!
183. Shelly: You have to do it to graduate, so I would just get it over with.	Again, not necessarily true.
184. * * *	
185. Shelly: And then the last thing (Marianna sneezes) bless you, answer the short answer questions in complete sentences first (emphatic). What might you want to do that?	Another strategy and justification.
186. Anna: Because it will take longer and then if anything the multiple choice you can just	Answer the short answers first. Ah ha! See Day 2 Comment #161.
187. Bruno: Guess.	Completes Anna's sentence.
188. Anna: guess on them.	Anna completes her own sentence.
189. Shelly: Yeah, if anything at least you you have you could do multiple choice rather than having two short answers left and (fades away as students take over the answer). It doesn't work all the time, but for some people that helps for time management. (31:21)	Justification. Time.
190. Begin RFI activity and will continue for the remaining 15 minutes (31:35).	Transition.
191. Anko appears to be sleeping. Marcus reads. Bruno reads. Anna reads. Jasmine reads. Anko turns his paper over and rests his head on his other arm. Then he explicitly goes to sleep—burying his face in the crook of his left arm. Shelly sits in the corner of the room, by the computer. Anko raises his	Physical withdrawal and disengagement.

head and looks around. Marcus could be sleeping—his head resting on his left fist, but I don't think so. He moves. Anko isn't even looking at his paper. Now he is.

If student-learning is guided by what they do, then what have they learned today?

Day 7: February 4th, 2006. Sophie's 4th Class: "The Battle for Middle Earth"

FRONT			DOOR	
Jasmine BF	Bruno BM			
Marcus BM	Anko HM			Qing AF
	Marianna BF			Liang AF
Hannah WF	Anna WF		Carmella WF	Samuel WM
			Jacob WM	Jim AM
	Moved to this seat. ↓			ME

1. Students enter the classroom with energy and volume. Marcus sits next to Jasmine and pulls the fur-lined hood of his thick winter jacket above his white do rag, which stretches below his eyebrows. Anna takes off her white winter jacket; beneath it she wears a tight yellow cotton t-shirt and tight faded jeans. In the front right pocket of her jeans hangs a cell phone. Her hair is pulled back into a tight ponytail. Marianna's black jacket is zipped to her chin. Anko's baseball cap is turned backwards on his head. Within 30 seconds Anko challenges Sophie about whether she told her mother and "the other teacher" about their word grimy. Anko, with a smile, accuses her of "slacking off." Sophie takes attendance and warns Hannah about her absences. Anko drums, so does Marcus who seems very fidgety already. 2. Marcus: (Yelling to someone outside of the classroom, apparently) T-Ray! 3. Attendance 4. Marcus: (Loudly) T-Ray! 5. Bruno is drumming. Anna and Anko talk with me about my research and I answer	The word. Restlessness and physical activity. To this day Anko is still interested in how I am doing with my study, and he wants to see it.

their questions. Marcus talks with Anna briefly then loudly asks about his attendance status. Sophie does not acknowledge him. Much conversation about attendance. Bruno asks when “they” will allow more than two days absence. (3:31)	
6. Sophie: Probably never, the point is for you to learn	Bruno questions the rules.
7. Marcus: Oooooo.	As if Bruno is trying to avoid learning.
8. Sophie: they need the time.	Marcus apparently perceives this as a confrontational comment.
9. Bruno: I know but	Who is “they”? Why is Sophie disassociating herself from the process?
10. Sophie: to teach you as much as they possibly can.	What is Bruno’s point?
11. Sophie asks the students what they did with Miss Clines. Marianna and Bruno show her their papers.	“They”? Why does Sophie use the third person here?
12. Sophie: Ok, what is that called? (3:53)	Request for procedural information. Sophie now wants students to answer that they practiced for the “Reading for Information” test.
13. Marianna: It’s called “Driving into the Future.”	Pursues recitation question.
14. Sophie: Ok, that’s what the article is called, what is it called when you are reading an article and you are um gathering . . . this what?	Response—provides the title of the article they read.
15. Marianna: Summarizing.	Pursues her question.
16. Sophie: You’re summarizing what you’ve read, what’s this test called though?	Fill in the blank question.
17. Marianna: (singsong) I don’t know.	Attempted response.
18. Bruno: What test?	Pursues question.
19. Student: Reading for comprehension.	Confusion.
20. Sophie: Close. Reading for . . . (waits, amid many student responses).	Confusion.
	Attempted response.
	Pursues question with another fill in the blank question.

21. Sam: Literature.	Attempted response: "Reading for 'Literature'?" Ha! Sometimes these students really make me laugh. They try so hard sometimes to give their teachers what they think their teachers want, regardless of the sense it makes to them. And then at other times they are completely self-centered, regardless of the teacher's requests. Just like the rest of us.
22. Sophie: Reading for what? What are you reading for?	Pursues fill in the blank question.
23. (Jasmine hands Marcus her lip balm, and Marcus puts a dab on his finger and begins applying it to his lips.)	
24. Hannah: Facts?	Attempted response: "Reading for 'Facts.'"
25. Anna: Comprehension.	Attempted response.
26. Sophie: You're close. Facts, what's another word for that?	Pursues fill in the blank question.
27. Marianna: (Softly) Knowledge.	Attempted response.
28. Sophie: Knowledge, what's another word for that? When you read a newspaper what are you getting from it?	Epistemological stance: knowledge = information. Pursues fill in the blank question.
29. Bruno: (Loudly) Understanding.	Attempted response.
30. Students: (One after another) Information.	Correct!
31. Anna: Information, that's what it is.	Repeats the correct word.
32. Sophie: Information. You're reading for information, ok?	Repeats the correct word.
33. Marianna: That was hard. (4:32)	Ha! Yes it was—for everyone. Marianna's reaction to the prior few minutes makes me laugh.
34. Anna laughs.	Brilliant. Sees the humor.
35. Sophie: So, Miss Clines, if you guys can just everyone look up here (pause, then to Marcus) put the your put the lip gloss away please. (Anna, Hannah, and	Obvious affront to Marcus's masculinity in the guise of humor. It's lip-balm, not lip-gloss.

Jasmine look at Marcus and laugh. Then Bruno and Anko turn and laugh. Sophie proceeds with explicit instruction as she reviews the tips from the prior class). (4:48) 36. * * * 37. Sophie: (8:35: As she is telling students the necessity of remaining focused while taking the CAPT) Well you're going to eat soon but this is the price you pay cause you need to be sure that you pass CAPT, ok? 38. Bruno: Wait, wait. Are we here because we failed classes or cause we need help on CAPT? 39. Sophie: Um because your teachers felt that you could use a little bit of extra help to make sure that you pass it all (pause) so we're here to help you but you guys, it, you know, it's 50 50, you need to you need to put in 50 percent and we'll put in 50 percent. 40. Anko is drumming loudly with his right hand while holding a pen in his left hand. 41. Bruno: Is it the English teachers or just all your teachers? 42. Sophie: All of your teachers. (9:16) 43. Sophie now goes into a review of right answers from the RFI test. She reads from the overhead transparency. Marcus drums with his left hand. Bruno shakes his head and bares his teeth. Anna leaves the room to wash her hands, then soon returns and puts on her white winter jacket, shivering. Sophie continues to explain the correct answers to the Reading for Information practice test the students took last class.	I have observed that Marcus does not joke with teachers—he does not laugh with them when they joke, and he does not make teasing fun of them. Using humor with Marcus is a mistake. It will get you nowhere. This is the price they pay for what? What did they do to incur this debt? Why the crime analogy? Bruno detects the analogy. Day seven and Bruno is not sure why he is here. Will Sophie answer the question honestly? Is she saying this program will ensure their success? “To make sure”? Put in 50 percent of what? Restlessness. Bruno pursues his question: Why is he here? Who put him here? Is he to blame somehow? If so, what did he do? Kind of like <u>The Trial</u> by Kafka. Reply. Bruno is trying to determine something important. I do not think he knows where exactly his place is at this school, and he is trying to figure it out. Review of the practice RFI test the students took at the end of the prior class. Restlessness.

44. Sophie: The correct answer is A and here's why. (10:05)	Review.
45. Sophie: Ok, the correct answer was G, ok? here's why. (12:12) And now Jacob you had picked F right, all right? So we're going to go over why the answer is G.	Sophie makes contact with Jacob.
46. Jacob: I picked E.	Corrects Sophie.
47. Sophie: You picked E? Ok, so the correct answer is G. (Goes on to explain the answer and why it is correct.) Jacob, you ok with this?	Checks on Jacob.
48. Jacob: Yeah.	Jacob grants Sophie permission.
49. Anko sticks a pen in his cap, drums, and looks at Marianna. Sophie reads. Anko drums. Anko and Bruno exchange something. (13:20) Anna and Marianna write to one another. Sophie continues her work.	Much fidgeting and activity.
50. Jasmine: Can I change my answer? (13:41)	This is an odd question. Of course she can—who would possibly care? Does she think anyone is going to look at her answers?
51. Marcus taps Bruno on the shoulder.	Distraction.
52. Sophie: Actually the answer is the one no one picked. (14:14)	Review, continued.
53. Students: A?	Attempted student response.
54. Sophie: No, a few people picked A. The answer is B.	Correction.
55. Marcus: (Loudly) B.	Challenge?
56. Jacob: I picked B.	Attempts to elicit praise.
57. Sophie: You did?	Response.
58. Jacob: Yeah.	Reply.
59. Sophie: Good job Jacob. Raise your hand!	Praise.

60. Jacob: Oh snap, oh, I I wasn't paying attention (Anna laughs). 61. Sophie: Oh oh. Pay attention, so I can give you all this credit. Um, the article . . . (continues reading from her answer and the article). 62. Marianna tears out a piece of paper and balls it up. Bruno turns to talk with Jasmine. Anko drums. Marcus leans completely over onto Jasmine's desk. 63. Sophie: (To Bruno) Turn around. (15:10) 64. Marianna applies lip balm. Anna laughs quietly. Anxiety is increasing with each question students get wrong. Marianna and Anna have a sidebar conversation. 65. Sophie: (Quietly to Bruno) (16:10) Turn around, turn around, stay focused. This whole article as you're going through talks about how and if you even even if you just look at like that first page there (pause) even the second page and the third page you see a lot of numbers, a lot of statistical data about you know car makers with profit margins up to fifty percent um a fifty four jump up from 2001 so it's using the statistical data to make its point, ok? um, answer F would be accurate if the question asked how the authors supported their position on the reason new car buyers wanted the add-ons and there is no information for choices F or H (Bruno has his red sweatshirt hood pulled over his head and is swaying rhythmically from side to side). Now, one of the things that you may have noticed here too if any of you I know um probably a few of you had chosen letter F, did anyone choose letter F? Ok. And it's saying you know this isn't this isn't you know an inaccurate	Is this a rejection of Sophie's praise? Are his feelings still hurt? Motivation: pay attention for credit. Is Sophie hurt by Jacob's rejection: "I wasn't paying attention"? Much distracting movement. Discipline. Distracting action. Discourse seems to have lost all value and purpose—it no longer exists, at least not for the moment. Is this because of the irreconcilable battle for context? Discipline. Review: elaboration concerning why the correct answer is correct. Physical withdrawal.

statement but look at what the question is, make sure that you're answering the question that they're asking for, they might throw in some information from the article that does make sense, but make sure that that backs up what the question is asking. Ok? So that's why that first one is um (pause) is A, all right? All right. (Continues with number 5.) (17:35)	I cannot determine what explicit instruction is being received.
66. Sophie dispenses much information. Marianna raises her hand and reads her answer softly (18:30). Sophie calls on Anna. She reads her answer. Sophie follows up with a request for specific detail. Anna looks to the text and finds the answer (18:49). Sophie explains the importance of specific detail. Marianna and Anna chat. Sophie relates her own experience buying a car and the accident she was in. (20:44)	Review of RFI continued. Anna and Marianna are on task and are responding appropriately. Sophie's personal story about her Volvo.
67. Marcus: You got a Volvo? (Sophie does not answer him. Talking about the six airbags in Sophie's car. Much animated conversation about this.)	Impressed by the implied elite social status of owning a Volvo. Perhaps surprised that Sophie, a teacher, would or could own one.
68. Sophie: Here are the answers that you could have. (21:50)	Dispenses correct answers.
69. Hannah: Should I just write one of those answers down? (22:00)	Procedural question: should I copy?
70. Sophie: I would suggest if you don't if you don't have shhhhhh any of these specific statistical bits of information (rising intonation) I would suggest that you write maybe two of them down in your answer just so that you have those.	Discipline. Why do they need the answers copied in their folders?
71. Bruno asks a question (22:35). I cannot decipher a word. His voice is soft and lifeless.	Numbed affect.
72. Sophie: Say that again. They put what?	Even Sophie cannot hear.
73. Bruno repeats the question but it sounds like his mouth has gone numb.	Repeats his question with continued diminished affect.
74. Sophie: Was that in the was that from	Questions the source of Bruno's ideas.

the reading or was that from your own ideas? 75. Bruno responds. 76. Sophie: Ok, so if they say to you how do the authors pro what are the authors doing to provide this information? they don't care what you have to say I'm sorry to say. 77. Marcus: Oooooo. 78. Sophie: (During what follows Anna and Marianna copy from the transparency) They want to make sure you can read this article and that you can comment on it. If they said , um, why do you (emphasis) think they do this stuff but they won't they won't be testing you for that on this specific test, reading for information, that's what you're doing, you're reading for information because when you guys, in a few years and you're no longer in high school and you are on your own you're eighteen years old and you need to take care of yourself (Jasmine raises her right hand from her desk and emphatically slaps it on her desk, glancing at Marcus, drawing her shoulders back, and kind of smiling or grimacing, she inhales, sighs, and yawns audibly), you're gonna have to participate in elections you are going to have to make your own decisions, you're gonna have to buy cars yourselves and you are not going to have someone (soft chatter) shhhhhh, you're not going to have someone telling you, a parent or whatnot, what you need to do you're gonna have to make these decisions on your own, so what you are going to want to do is to read articles from newspapers from magazines listen to the news to make your decisions, and so you need to know how to read for information because it's it's all about you, you have to make these decisions for the rest of us (23:56). 79. Hannah asks about the necessity of	I still cannot hear. Confusion. Huh? A challenge? Marcus will answer it. Acknowledges the challenge. Hegemonic use of monologue in the guise of a motivational sermon. So "they" are not interested in what "you" "think." I know this might sound unfair, but I do not know what the students are hearing now. Again, as in the first class, this is a revealing assumption about the culture of these students. Cultural assumption. Was Sophie taking care of herself at the age of 18? Who is taking care of them now? Aren't their parents taking care of them? What makes Sophie think their parents will withdraw their care when their children reach age 18? Did Sophie's parents withdraw their care? We know they didn't, at least not her mother, who is a teacher. Why? This sounds so bleak and austere and lonely. Is this how Sophie perceives their lives? Where will their parents be? Newspapers and magazines are the source of critical knowledge. How is it possibly all about them? Huh? They will not be deciding for me. If they do they are fools. And so am I. The age-old question: "Why do we have to

learning anything beyond adding and subtracting. Marcus and Jasmine talk. Anko drums his pen loudly. Anna and Marianna talk. Sophie patiently answers that she needed to know algebra when she painted her room. Anna and Marianna continue quietly their sidebar conversation. Sophie repeats test-taking strategies: highlight stuff, underline, and read the questions ahead of time. (25:29 Sophie moves Anna.) 80. Sophie: Marianna and Anna, you guys are like pushing me to the edge right now, I need one of you guys to move, so, Anna just 'cause you're at the end, or Marianna I don't care, one of you guys just move somewhere else so that I don't have to listen to (sound drowned out by moving desks). 81. Marianna drums. Marcus puts his head down on his right arm. Anko drums. 82. Sophie: (26:02) We are going to, start something new. 83. Marcus: Noooooo. 84. Sophie: Shhhhhh. Hey guys, can you stop tapping or (fades) (26:31) 85. Sophie continues. Marianna yawns. Anna yawns and answers Sophie's question about an article they have read and are now discussing. Anna refers to detail. Sam reads detail (28:55). Sophie tells Sam his detail is not pertinent. She wants specific detail from the text. Anna reads her detail. Sophie tells Anna her detail is not what she is looking for. "In reality." Hannah's hand has been raised for a while. Sophie reads the right detail. Sophie pushes for detail. Hannah is called on and brings up "Pimp my Ride." Sophie makes a joke about pimping her classroom. Anna laughs. Much chatter. Sophie continues to push for detail from the article. Anna responds. Marcus responds with nonsense. Much chatter.	learn this? When will we ever use it?" Distracting behavior. Discipline. I wonder why the sudden loss of patience. It seems like with the boys discipline begins at the beginning of their distracting behavior, whereas with the girls they are allowed much more latitude until the teacher can no longer endure it. Continued withdrawal. Transition? <u>The Lesson.</u> Discipline. The physically distracting behavior is reaching Sophie as well. Sophie ignores this. This article is all about the obscenely wealthy or the sadly misguided and the money they will spend on extravagant gadgets for their cars. The context is explicitly Sophie's.

86. Marcus: (32:44) He's a hustler. (Anna laughs.) I told you.	Response, in his vernacular.
87. Sophie: So I would not put in your answer George Barris is a hustler. Ok? I would not put that down.	Rejects Marcus's answer. Why not?
88. Hannah: (33:00) Did you call your mom and tell you that's a new word, hustler?	Resurrects this subject. Why? Because of the word "hustler"?
89. Sophie: Oh I know hustler, I know it.	Dismisses Hannah's attempt to redefine the context.
90. Anna: Did you tell her about being grimy?	Pursues the attempt to redefine the context.
91. Sophie: Uh huh.	Avoids the question—dismissive.
92. Bruno: What did she say?	Pursues her attempt.
93. Sophie: Well she already kinda knew, she teaches middle school and she said they were using that word.	Their cool lingo was not so cool after all—even an old middle school teaching woman knew the word. Devaluation of their attempt to establish the classroom culture and discursive context, and a rejection of their invitation to enter their linguistic world.
94. Anna: That's grimy (laughs).	Ha! Anna sees the humor. This is another brilliantly funny moment. But there's a bad moon on the rise. Disengagement follows.
95. Recitation continues (13:10). Marcus talks with Jasmine. The class conversation becomes gradually confrontational as they discuss who has authority to make statements of fact—it climaxes with Bruno's attack upon Hannah.	Rising anxiety.
96. Bruno: (34:53) Oh yeah, go call him [the author of the article] up right now, is his number in the paper (looking, sarcastic) the story or something.	Questions who has authority over the information.
97. Sophie: Let me ask you this.	Trying to put out the burgeoning flames.
98. Hannah: Shut up Bruno.	The members of the group turn on one another.
99. Bruno: You shut up. You don't know what you're talking about.	Reprisal. Personal attack.

100. Sophie: You guys, listen to each other. Don't	Discipline. Listen to what, exactly?
101. Bruno: You're confusing yourself	Attack continues.
102. Hannah: (Smiling as she talks with Marcus, then suddenly turns serious as Bruno's words sink in) I'm (emphasis) not confused.	Self defense.
103. Marcus: Oooooooooo, fight.	Sees this as power raging against the dominant context. They will establish their own context one way or another.
104. Sophie: Ok ok	Placating. Losing control of her context.
105. Marcus: Fight fight fight fight	Inciting.
106. Hannah profanes—something about Jerry Springer and motherfucker while Sophie is trying to speak.	Explosion! Profanity in the classroom, recognized by all the students as a real taboo.
107. Anna: Oooooooooo.	Recognizes the extremity of Hannah's outburst.
108. Bruno: Yo, (to Sophie) you better talk to this girl, ok?	Tells Sophie to do her job while he is calmly restraining himself. Threat of impending violence.
109. Anna: (to Sophie) You really need to talk to her.	Tells Sophie to do her job while recognizing the threat in Bruno's words.
110. Hannah says something softly, like a kid, smiling self-consciously.	Contrition, due to the reaction of her peers? She broke the rules of her own culture's context.
111. Anna: She said the F word.	Like a shocked little kid witnessing naughty behavior.
112. Jacob: She said the mofo word.	Picking up on Anna's voiced perceptions.
113. Hannah: (Laughing) The mofo word.	Laughter. I know why, but I can't explain it—a kind of recognition of our own inexplicable behavior. Anyone who has ever been in serious trouble might remember this giddy feeling.
114. Anna: She said the F word right on the camera.	Recognition of the researcher, me, and my equipment.

115. During this entire interchange Sophie is trying to continue the lesson.	
116. Sophie: Ok, we got stuff we need to get through today.	Tries to re-establish her context.
117. Hannah: He won't put it in his project.	Hannah is concerned her words will become part of an historical document.
118. Bruno: Yeah he will. (35:40).	He's right.
119. Much loud back and forth between students. Bruno calls for quiet. Hannah says she wants to see my project and apologizes.	
120. Sophie: Don't waste my time and don't waste everyone else's, you don't want to be here (rising intonation) get out.	Discipline.
121. Marcus: Peace.	The end?
122. Sophie: You don't need to be here. I'm I'm saying this to everyone (Bruno says something) you need to keep it quiet (Bruno seemingly repeats the word or phrase) because just like you said she made a statement that she couldn't back up with this article (rising intonation) you did it five minutes ago. (36:07)	No, continued discipline. Sophie attacks Bruno: power.
123. All students: Ooooooooooooo (Bruno smiles).	Students validate the attack.
124. * * *	
125. (38:08) Task change: RTL #3. Anna and Marianna give expression to their hunger. Sophie stays on task. Talks. Moves on to next question. Marcus makes noise with his fingernails or something. Jasmine slaps her desk. She is getting frustrated and antsy. Sophie brings the class back to "Moving On." Sophie talks about question #3 on the RTL section of the CAPT.	Task change. Physical restlessness.
126. Sophie: In your life what have you done? (41:09)	Vague question.
127. Marcus: Shot people. (Jasmine and	Reference to violence.

Marianna laugh.) 128. Bruno: Leave my country. 129. Sophie: I don't think you'd be here right now. Leave your country. 130. Marcus: I have (emphasis) shot a person before. (41:21) 131. Bruno: Better opportunity. 132. Sophie: Opportunities. But you're leaving your family behind. 133. Chatter. 134. Marcus: (Loudly) Shhhh. 135. Sophie: Marc, zip it, or out. 136. Marcus: Me? 137. Sophie: Yeah, you. 138. Marcus: You don't want me to leave your class, you need me in here. 139. Sophie: (Fatigued) I do not need you in here. (Bruno laughs) And if you don't want to be here don't stay. 140. Marcus: I do (emphasis) want to be here. 141. Sophie: Ok then pay attention. 142. Sophie goes on trying to make her point—make connections—in this case sacrifices. 143. Sophie: My only request to you is do not go in there and make something up (regarding personal connections) because it's very obvious in your writing. So you have to think about where you could connect this like at what point in your life could you connect this so, something personal? or is it a movie you've seen,	Personal response. Is this true? Violence. I believe him. Elaboration about why he left his country. Who? Mock discipline. Attempts to shut Marcus up. Why does his statement incur discipline while Hannah's profane and angry outburst did not even warrant a rebuke? Professes a sense of injustice. Comes back strongly in his vernacular. Attempts to placate her with charm. Discipline. Dismisses Marcus's value in the class. Sincerely professes his care. Discipline. Resurrecting personal connections discussed the last time she taught this class. Why not? Why would it be obvious in their writing? Are they bad storytellers?

you know, a video you've watched, whatever the case may be (rising intonation) . . . ok?	

Day 8: February 11th, 2006. Shelly's 4th Class:

"Bedtime Story"—Marcus's Exile

FRONT			DOOR	
Jasmine BF	Bruno BM			
Marianna BF				
Marcus BM	Anko HM			
Anna WF			Carmella WF	Samuel WM
Hannah WF			Jacob WM	Jim AM
				ME

Absent: Liang, Qing

1. The period begins with Marianna warming her backside against the heater. Hannah sits with her head down, resting in the crook of her arm, as if asleep. Marcus and Anna enter joined at the ear—one earphone apiece attached to an iPod and listening to something. Soon after he sits, Marcus is bouncing and rocking to music he is sharing with Anna. Marianna comes over. Anna asks for her folder as Anko is distributing them. Jasmine moves in. Anko sits and turns to face Anna and Marcus. Bruno comes over. Marianna yells at Bruno.	
2. Marianna: Give me my folder! (1:13)	Marianna can be tough. But it does not linger at all.
3. Shelly: My goodness, do you really want your folder that bad? All right guys headphones away, put them away please.	Tries to placate Marianna with an attempt at humorously diminishing the value of Marianna's work in her folder.
4. Anko drums. Hannah is on the outskirts. She lifts her head slowly and stretches her arms. Marianna is laughing with Bruno.	Already made up.

5. Shelly: How you guys doing? You awake?	Request for personal contact.
6. Marianna: I'm not awake.	Response
7. Continual chatter. Loud.	
8. Shelly: Are you ready to get snowed in on your weekend? Gonna get stuck at home? (Much boisterous student chatter.) All right, so (loudly) ladies and gentlemen. Before this snowstorm comes we are going to prepare you for CAPT, isn't that exciting (sarcastic), ok.	Claims the floor with volume. Assumes students are not enthused about preparing for the CAPT.
9. Shelly's attempt to talk over them does not work at first, but then she begins explicit test instruction regarding the types of connections students want to make with the stories they will read for the CAPT in order to please their assessors.	A long stretch of explicit test preparation.
10. Shelly: Last week Miss Morris started talking to you about the last two essay questions, and the one that you guys got through, according to Miss Morris was question three, this was the connection one, right? When they ask you to somehow relate this story to your life or something you read or something you've seen, right? So, question three says, "What does it say about people in general, how does it remind you of people you've known or experiences you've had? You may also write about stories you've read, movies, etc." Now	
11. Anna: Was that C?	Procedural question.
12. Shelly: This is question three.	Response.
13. Anna: Where is it?	Procedural question.
14. Bruno: Yeah, where's that?	Procedural question.
15. Shelly: Um, I don't know that she gave you something on question three, I have something on question four that I'm gonna give you in a second, but question three basically asks you to somehow	A little confusion. Begins explanation of question number 3 on

relate it to your life. Now, the thing is, they don't want what we call a plot (emphasis) connection because they want you to come up with some way the story reminds you of your life, something you know.	the CAPT RTL.
16. Bruno: Are they are they gonna have like run on and all that stuff?	Concern about punctuation.
17. Shelly: Like what?	Request for clarification.
18. Bruno: Run on and all that?	Pursues question.
19. Shelly: Grammar?	Request for clarification.
20. Bruno: Yeah.	Not really, punctuation.
21. Shelly: No, they won't grade you on grammar.	Response.
22. Bruno: If you did something like you had a run on sentence	Pursues question.
23. Shelly: They don't mark you off for that. (Chatter) All right, so (pause amid chatter) guys, if you're here, if you got if you bothered to get up this morning you may as well go home with something, right?	Response. Discipline.
24. Marcus: All right, I feel you.	Connection.
25. Shelly: (3:28) All right. So. Here you go. Now for the connection you gotta come up with something that's not plot based, so, how many of you read, um, <u>The Crucible</u> ? I know the people in my class did. (Marianna, Marcus, Anko raise their hands.) How many other people did? Good.	Rejection of connection. Plot connection. Focuses her attention on the class.
26. Jasmine: Read what?	Patient response.
27. Shelly: <u>The Crucible</u> this year. (Chatter) All right, so <u>The Crucible</u> tells the story of the Salem witch trials, right? And how all these people got accused of witchcraft and got hanged and they're dead, right? So, what would a plot connection be? One time, this reminds	Plot review.

me of one time when	
28. Marcus: (Raising his hand) Hold it, I have I have a question	Question.
29. Shelly: Shhhhhh. (Pointing to Jacob) I know you know it, what would be the plot connection? Carmella's writing her response to <u>The Crucible</u> this reminds me of when	Discipline—Marcus's question is rejected.
30. Carmella: Uhhh, I was falsely accused of something?	Fill in the blank question.
31. Shelly: Well plot connection though, you're good you're good, it's because you're so, you're on the right track. That's why. (Pointing to Jacob) Yup?	Offers a response.
32. Jacob: Um, you know what? Never mind.	Praise. But not quite there yet.
33. Shelly: All right, here's what they don't (emphasis) want, so say you had to write the answer for <u>The Crucible</u> , what they don't want is for you to write, <u>The Crucible</u> talks about how people were accused of witchcraft and hanged for it and this reminds me of one time when I was living in Bozrah and I was accused of witchcraft and they took me out into the woods and they hanged me.	Claims the floor, then relinquishes it carelessly.
34. Anna: Oh my God.	Example of what not to do.
35. Shelly: That would be a plot connection. Because obviously in you know 2006 it's very rare for you to be living in Southern New England and be accused of witchcraft (Jacob gets Shelly's attention with words he is speaking) and taken out before the town and hanged. Very unusual. That's plot. The person grading it is going to go, this is highly unlikely I think they made it up. So what would be a better kind of connection and Carmella you started talking about this, what would be a better kind of connection? This reminds me of how people do what?	Violence. Reaction to violence. Is that bad? Students have been warned about making up examples—it's taboo.

36. Carmella: Umm.	Considering a response.
37. Shelly: What kind of things does <u>The Crucible</u> show that people do? (Anko offers a response, softly. Bruno leans back in his chair and talks to Marianna sitting behind him.)	Anko responds.
38. Marianna: Shut up.	
39. Bruno: You shut up.	
40. Shelly: (Repeating Anko's answer) How people accuse others of things they didn't do. Good. Hmmm? (Looks to Carmella, who says something softly.) Framing people (repeats Carmella's answer) good. What else? Why did some of those people frame others? (Chatter) To get what they (emphasis) wanted	Repeats response. Repeats another response.
41. Marcus: They (emphasis) didn't want to get in trouble.	Yes! I like this answer. It reveals understanding.
42. Shelly: (Pointing towards Marcus) also so they wouldn't get in trouble, right?	Repeats Marcus's answer.
43. Bruno: So they won't get killed.	
44. Shelly: So they won't get killed. So you can talk about how people in general try to save themselves so they accuse others so that they don't get in trouble for it. You could talk about how people are filled with revenge so they accuse people they don't like. So those are a little bit more generic and could apply to any time period, instead of saying this reminds me of when exact same thing happened to me. All right, give me um, think about the the movie <u>The Terminator</u> , all right?	Elaboration. Repeats elaboration. In whose culture? Assumption regarding human nature.
45. Marcus: (Enthusiastically) Which one?	Another violent movie.
46. Shelly: Any of them. Think about any of them ok? Now a plot connection would be if you read a story like <u>The Terminator</u> and you said this reminds of one time when all the machines turned on the human beings and attacked us, ok? It	Again, Shelly provides an example of what

hasn't happened, that's a plot connection. 47. Anko: It will. 48. Shelly: Possibly, but that's a plot connection. Now you could talk about other things. (6:34: Bruno drops change from his pocket and it rolls on the floor. This is followed by a little laughter—Marcus squeals loudly and Marianna laughs quietly. Bruno picks up his money. Shelly talks through it all.) You can talk about being heroic, you can talk about facing challenges, but you don't necessarily want the plot connection. All right? Shhhhh. So you gotta somehow make it a little more general, and the questions that is says to help you are, "What's the universal theme?" like does it say something about people, does it show how everybody has revenge at some point does it talk about um how people tend to back stab does it talk about how love conquers all, you know things like that, you can think of common phrases so what's the universal idea and have you encountered something similar either in what you've read seen you or your friends you don't have to talk about you personally you can talk about friends, so that's question three. Now in question three the last thing you should talk about in your essay is what? You don't want to go off and tell your life story and have just a biography. In your conclusion what should you talk about? Your life, or? (Students answer) The book, the story. So the last thing you should talk about in question three when you're writing your response is the story because they're grading you on whether you understood the story, so they do want to know your connection but they don't want to know your whole (emphasis) life story, so you need to end talking about whatever it was they had you read. All right, now, the last CAPT essay question, we're already there, is question number four and that asks if it's a good piece of literature. Did Miss Morris give you this last week?	not to do. Ha! Who exactly are the machines? Maybe not—perhaps he is thinking metaphorically; Shelly is assuming he is not. What if he connected his comment with Jacob's focus on <u>The Fight Club</u> and conformity—conformity and human machines? Distracting behavior. Discipline. Original sin. Original sin. God's love. Does Shelly assume the students would frivolously divulge their life stories?

(Student chatter) She may have taken it back. So (hands out explicit instruction) all right, you're welcome, it tells you at the top, "Question four asks for your opinion of the short story that you read. The value of your answer depends upon the criteria you choose to use. To say that good literature is a story that is interesting to you is not specific enough." Honestly, the person grading it isn't really interested in whether you really liked it or not (rising intonation) they just want to know if you can judge it, yeah (responding to a comment of Anko's) if if you understood it, if you can recognize the qualities of good writing. Think about it in terms of if you turned in the story to a teacher would that teacher give it an A or would they say it's not well written, um, so it says, "The reader does not know your likes and dislikes. Before you begin to write your answer you need to establish your criteria; in fact, it is wise to create your own definition of what good literature is before you take the CAPT test," so that's why we're practicing. "Jot down titles of novels and short stories you've enjoyed reading," well, we're gonna skip that so we can move ahead but look at the list that they have here. These are things that will help to give you ideas about what to write about and question for (Shelly watches for a moment the prolonged interaction between Marcus and Marianna.) So, one of the things is says that good literature (Marcus turns to interact with Anna, but she places her left index finger over her pursed lips in a sign of silence) has realistic characters. All right, how many of you have liked stories that have realistic characters? Characters that you could relate to, they seemed real, you know you knew somebody like them, good. Like Abigail Williams was a very hate, like you could hate (emphasis) her because you could kind of relate to people like her who just were vindictive. All right? Think about vivid description. How many of you have enjoyed stories that you can picture it, it's very	Do the students know the difference between judging a piece of literature and stating whether or not they liked the piece? Explicit strategy. CAPT preparation. Student-assisted discipline. Anna helps Marcus to not get in trouble. Hate. Request for participation—really a rhetorical

descriptive	question.
49. Marcus: (Nodding his head) Yeah.	Response.
50. Shelly: even like, um, if you read a gory story, a really you know true story that's very descriptive, Jacob's like yes (raising her hand enthusiastically, Shelly imitates Jacob's apparent enthusiasm for gore) all right? Exciting scenes, does it help if exciting things happen in the story, to keep you interested? Absolutely. (Jacob makes a comment. Shelly looks at him.) What about suspense? How many of you enjoy a story that's suspenseful?	Personal connection. Student's enthusiasm for gore. Rhetorical question. Rhetorical questions.
51. Anko: Oh I hate that, man. I freakin' hate that.	Ha! Engagement—no lack of empathy.
52. Shelly: All right, you don't like that (laughing and pointing to Anko) it bothers you. It gets you tense. (Marcus attempts to gain the floor.) Shhhhhh.	Response to Anko. Discipline—tries to interrupt Marcus's joke.
53. Marcus: We'll see who wins . . . right after the break.	Perseveres with joke.
54. Shelly: (Anna, Anko, and other laugh at Marcus's joke. Shelly, smiling, continues) all right so they keep you they keep you wanting to read more, all right? Through provoking conflict. Shhhhhh. Have any of you ever read a story that it bothered you because whatever was go or an essay whatever was going on it like you weren't sure if you agreed with it or not and it kind of bothered you? All right, some of you have had that, good. So thought provoking conflict, it makes you think about the situation. A satisfying ending. Now how many of you have read a story where the ending was awful (emphasis)? You just thought that it should not have ended that way, ok? (everyone's hands are raised) so it helps if the story has a good ending, has an ending that seems to fit. Surprises, when they throw in those little plot twists.	Marcus's joke is well received. Discipline. Rhetorical question. Rhetorical question. Rhetorical question.
55. Anna: Yup.	

56. Shelly: Good. Clear plot development. It helps if the story follows a good line, right? So that you're not jumping all over the place and you don't know what's going on, right? Universal meaning. What's that mean? What is universal meaning? It's the same as saying what?	Rhetorical question.
57. Hannah: Many meanings?	Rhetorical question.
58. Shelly: Well it, you could say a meaning that like	Fill in the blank question
59. Marcus: It could be interpreted in different ways.	Authentic question.
60. Carmella: A meaning everybody experiences.	Response.
61. Shelly: (Points briefly to Hannah, looks at Carmella) Yeah everybody could interpret it it could all you know everyone could experience it, so it's really talking about theme, like the message of the story, so universal meaning it would be the same as theme. Artful use of language. Does it help if it's like well written? You know, uses interesting words rather than see Spot run.	Elaboration.
62. Carmella: Um, actually	Elaboration.
63. Marcus: (Smiling) See Spot run (Shelly looks at Marcus).	Rhetorical question.
64. Carmella: (?) you couldn't you couldn't put that under artful use of language?	Example of what not to say.
65. Shelly: Well, you might criticize it as saying that it's not, you know, as approachable to a reader in many time periods, you could talk about that, um, sometimes though if you think about how an author writes and how they try to throw in some description and some creative things rather than just saying very simple, very simple sentences. Characters that incite empathy. If you	Humor.
	Authentic question.
	Response?

can feel bad for characters does that help you out? How many of you read <u>Of Mice and Men</u> (hands go up)? How many of you felt bad for some of the characters?	
66. Marcus: Hold on wait wait. What is it? Is it Steinbeck (?)?	Marcus's literacy.
67. Shelly: Yes.	Response.
68. Marcus: (Proudly) Hey (elongated). (Laughter)	Proud.
69. Shelly: His characters, do you feel bad for any of them, like Candy missing a hand (chatter)? You can sympathize with them, you can feel bad for them. How many of you like, um, shhhhh like fantasy books? Any of you like those? (Jacob's hand goes up.) Like science fiction kind of stuff. (13:08)	Discipline.
70. Shelly: (As Anna is enthusiastically telling her about <u>A Child Called It</u> and <u>One Child</u> and how good those books are and amid much chatter) Guys, shhhhhh, So those have those have realistic conflicts like	Shelly attempts to turn Anna's visceral engagement with these two novels into a CAPT lesson. Discipline. Literary term.
71. Anna: No it's true.	Defends her novels from reinterpretation or manipulation.
72. Shelly: Those two are, yeah. Guys, shhhhhh, yeah, good, guys I want to hear what all the stories are that you're talking about so please, you know, when other people are talking don't have little side conversations because then the rest of us miss out on the books that you're talking about. (13:19)	Discipline.
73. (Marianna stretches, raises her hand, and begins to ask a question. Marcus touches her armpit and she flinches.)	Marcus distracts Marianna, attempting to dissuade her from participating in class.
74. Marianna: What about <u>They Cage the Animals at Night</u> ?	Marianna's literacy.
75. Shelly: Yup, that's the one that he was just mentioning. You guys like that one?	Request for elaboration about a novel some

What do you like about it? 76. Anko attempts to answer, but Bruno interrupts him. Bruno has put something in his mouth which does not taste good, apparently. He kind of spits and wipes his tongue with his fingers. Marcus, Anna, and Marianna laugh. Anko stops talking and turns to Bruno and laughs. Then he turns back to Shelly and continues answering. Anna elaborates impressively upon Anko's answer. She obviously knows the plot of the novel. Anko nods and articulates agreement, then elaborates. Marcus talks to Anna and touches her left arm while she is listening to Shelly. Anna hits Marcus's right arm—his puffy black winter jacket with the fur-lined hood halfway above his white do rag. 77. This lesson about the CAPT question number 4 is comprised of long tracts of explicit instruction, recitation questions, class chatter, and “shhhhhh”ing, a long conversation about what makes a good piece of literature. 78. (17:40) Bruno is rocking and drumming. Shelly hands out the short story, “Bedtime Story.” 79. Shelly reads the story and finishes (18:44). Anna and Marianna look up perplexed, Marcus continues to look at the paper, as does Anko, Bruno turns to Marcus. 80. Jasmine: Ha ha, I get it. 81. Anna: I don't get it. 82. Jasmine, smiling, repeats that she gets it. Shelly leans back and laughs. Shelly repeats the ending of the story and acts out looking down the barrel of the pistol, her hands clasped and forming the image of a gun, index fingers pointing. 83. Shelly: His wife hired her, right?	students have read. Interrupted attempted response. Disruptive behavior. Awkwardly joins in the disruption. Anna assists Anko—elaborates upon his interrupted expression. Marcus now attempts to distract Anna. Anna reacts appropriately. Discipline. Distracted behavior. New activity. Sudden comprehension. Confusion. Explicit physical explication. Explicit verbal explication.

84. Anna: Ohh (of comprehension).	Comprehension.
85. Bruno gives the impression that he understands the story's ironic plot.	Comprehension.
86. Marianna: I still don't get it.	Lingering confusion.
87. Shelly continues on strongly. Anna turns to Marianna and engages in a sidebar conversation, explaining the story (19:18). Shelly hears and stops speaking, allowing Anna to speak. Then she joins in	Sidebar explanation. Shelly acquiesces.
88. Shelly: He didn't know.	Assists Anna as Anna continues to explain the situational irony to Marianna.
89. Marianna: Ohhhhhh.	Comprehension due to side conversation.
90. Shelly: All right, shhhhhh. (19:30)	Discipline
91. Continues with tips and instructions. The tips are templates providing words and structure—all students have to do is fill in the blanks.	Shelly takes full possession of the class.
92. Marianna: Where are questions one and two? (22:20)	Confusion.
93. Anna: (22:57) I have absolutely no idea what to write.	Confusion.
94. Bruno is still confused about the story. Marianna and Anna are talking and laughing. Marcus hides in his prodigious hood. Shelly painstakingly and explicitly explains the story again to Bruno. Hannah joins in with a misinterpretation—she too is still confused.	Confusion. Withdrawal. Hannah still does not understand. My impression is that Bruno still does not get it, or he overestimated the complexity of the story and he understood it all along.
95. Jacob: That's grimy.	Jacob will not let go of this.
96. Anna laughs (24:10), so does Anko and Hannah. Marcus turns to look at the wall—he has apparently hurt his back while trying to crack it. Anna laughs. Shelly continues with instructions. Bruno is still confused about what	Confusion.

exactly he is expected to do. Shelly explains. (25:00) Students make an attempt to begin the assignment.	Further explanation.
97. (25:40) I leave the room.	
98. (Marcus is talking to Anna and Marianna about his back—something about a chiropractor—while Carmella talks with Shelly and Anko leans back in his chair (26:12). Shelly finishes her conversation with Carmella and turns towards Marcus.) Shhhhhh. (Pause, waiting for Marcus to begin writing.) Marcus let's go, if you're not going to do it you're going to sit in the office.	Distracted behavior.
	Discipline.
	Discipline.
99. Marcus: (In a soft voice, like a little kid in trouble) I'm gonna do it, (plaintively) my back hurts.	Placating.
100. Shelly: Relax then, don't mess with it and it will get better.	Mollified.
101. Marcus: I'm trying to stretch, like this (leans back in his chair, extending his arms behind Marianna and Anna. Bruno turns around to look at Marcus).	
102. Shelly: (Amid chatter by Bruno, Anna, and Marianna; Anko, too, turns to look at Marcus) The more the more you mess with it the worse it's going to hurt so just relax, sit still, then it's not going disturbed (26:32).	
103. Marcus asks Anna and Marianna about the assignment.	Confusion.
104. Shelly: (26:47) Shhhhhh. (She attempts to discipline or to focus Marcus.) Shhhhhh. (Marianna and Marcus are talking. Bruno turns to Marcus and says something to him as Hannah makes another comment to Shelly.)	Discipline.
	Discipline
	Distracted behavior.
105. Anna: (Loudly) Shhhhhhhh.	Student-administered discipline.
106. Shelly: All right, guys (firmly) let's go please (sing-song voice).	Teacher-administered discipline.

107. Marcus: Come on Bruno, just turn around.	Student-administered discipline.
108. Shelly: Shhhhhh. (Marianna says something. Marcus playfully nudges her right arm with his left arm. Marianna responds by hitting playfully his left arm.)	Discipline Student withdrawal.
109. (A student mutters something. Someone says Shhhhhh.)	Student-administered discipline.
110. Marcus: Shhhhhh.	Student-administered discipline.
111. (A student continues to speak inaudibly.)	
112. Marcus: (27:29) Shhhhhhhhh (very loudly).	Student-administered discipline. Mockery of Shelly's "Shhhhhhh." Copy.
113. Shelly: (Firmly) Guys, I don't want to hear another voice, other people are trying to write. If you need to be moved to the other side we'll do that (?)	Discipline.
114. Marcus: Wait, I forgot what we are writing, what are we writing again? (Anna helps.) (27:36)	Confusion and Challenge.
115. (28:00) Bruno yawns audibly.	Challenge.
116. Anna: Oh my god. (28:10)	Student-administered discipline.
117. Shelly: Shhhhhhh.	Discipline.
118. Anna directs a comment and laughter towards Marcus. Marcus, playing with something, looks towards Marianna, but she does not respond. Again. Hannah asks a question—she is reclined and seemingly tired. Marcus uses this as an opportunity to talk to Anna.	Marianna is doing her best to contend with Marcus's assault upon her attention. Student withdrawal.
119. Shelly: Shhhhhh. (29:55)	Discipline.
120. (30:38) Marcus elbows Marianna twice. Marianna looks at him, frowns, and elbows him back then hits him in the back of his left arm. He turns to her, smiling, chewing something. Bruno looks around. Anko asks Shelly a question. Bruno follows up. Then	A whole lot of looking going on.

Hannah. Marcus starts to drum, briefly. Bruno is chewing on his pen. Another question from the opposite side of the room. I cannot hear the questions. It doesn't matter. Hannah makes a loud noise with her desk. "Ooops." Marcus is looking at Marianna, smiling. Marianna looks back at him, responds verbally, quietly, stares at him, smiles, words pass, they nod and shake their heads at one another, as if they are having a staring contest. Marcus stares at her, his head resting on his right fist. He seemingly is staring at her. (34:00) Marianna is having trouble ignoring this. Marcus is motionless, then he gets back to his paper. Marianna now watches him. Anko turns and glances behind him. Marcus leans back and looks at Marianna. Bruno turns to look at Marcus. Marcus moves his pen in his mouth, backwards and forwards as if it were a toothbrush. Marianna watches him. Anna turns to Marcus. Marcus leans close to her and makes the same motion with his pen, creating a sound like tooth brushing. 121. Hannah: Are you brushing your teeth. (35:25) 122. Shelly: Shhhhhh. 123. Marcus looks at Hannah and continues using his pen as a sort of tooth brush or something. 124. Shelly: Marcus, you need to go sit in the office, because I really don't have the patience for this. I got up early on Saturday and didn't do it to listen to you do that, and I don't think anybody else did either 125. Hannah says something with a laugh. 126. Anna: Oh my god I lost my thought Hannah stop talking! God.	Marcus's behavior becomes increasingly bizarre. Student recognition of Marcus's bizarre behavior. Hannah calls Shelly's attention to Marcus. Discipline. Marcus's response and continued bizarre behavior. Discipline: threatens to send Marcus to the office. Is this because Hannah called Shelly's attention to Marcus? Frustration—due to the distracting behavior, Anna cannot focus her attention on the assignment. Interestingly, she blames Hannah. Why? Perhaps because Hannah focused

127. Shelly: Shhhhhh. 128. After a couple seconds Anna reaches over and wrestles the pen from Marcus's mouth and places it emphatically on the far corner of her desk. I return. Marcus reaches over and retrieves his pen. Marianna stands up and adjusts her pants. Marcus is bent over his paper, doing something. I'm not sure if Bruno has written anything. Anko leaves the classroom. Marianna and Jasmine interact nonverbally. I leave again. Some question and answer. This distracts Marcus who had been writing. He begins to drum his pen and he bobs towards Marianna rhythmically. 129. Shelly: (39:00) Marcus (a long arching wave with her right hand) bye bye. That was the last time, that was three times I've had to talk to you. 130. Marcus leans back and raises both forearms, a gesture of innocence and injustice. 131. Marcus: Why you gotta kick me out for? 132. Marianna looks at him with her eyebrows raised. 133. Shelly: (With her pen still pointing towards the door.) Because you can't keep quiet. Let's go. 134. Marcus: (Quietly.) That's really messed up, man. 135. Anna and Marianna are both looking at him, then they turn away as he makes his first move to leave. He gives Killen a long stare. She motions again with her pen. 136. Marcus: I'm going. (Still staring at her.)	Shelly's attention on Marcus. Hannah does not respond to Anna, which is interesting too—it implies a social hierarchy. Discipline. Student-administered discipline. Protects Marcus from discipline. Marcus's further bizarre behavior. Teacher-administered discipline. Gentle defiance, an attempt at using charm to assuage disciplinary action. He appears to be genuinely surprised. Innocence and injustice. Marianna offers no commiseration. Removal of Marcus from the class. Defiance. Attempt at visual intimidation. Continued visual intimidation.

137. Bruno laughs. Anna says something.	Student reaction to Marcus's behavior.
138. Shelly: Shhhhhh.	Discipline.
139. Bruno smiles broadly and rises loudly simultaneously with Marcus and asks to go to the bathroom. He and Shelly interact but I can't understand anything they say. Marcus follows and hands his folder to Shelly. Anna raises both arms, hands clasped, above her head, stretches and sighs. Marianna and Jasmine watch Marcus leave. Bruno returns, leans back in his chair and slumps.	Bruno aligns himself with Marcus.
140. Shelly: You guys have about ten minutes left. Remember, the more you write the more they have to read. (40:19)	Marcus leaves.
141. Shelly: Shhhhhh.	What is the point of this?
142. Bruno rises again and walks past Shelly, hiking up his pants. Anko returns and sits sideways—he does not resume writing. Shelly leaves the classroom briefly, then returns.	Discipline
143. Shelly: Shhhhhh.	Bruno's defiant behavior.
144. Students work quietly. Anko looks around.	Discipline.
145. (44:16) I return. Bruno returns, and sits, but does not engage in the assignment. Instead, he seems to write on his folder, then he glances around behind him as Marianna and Jasmine interact. Jasmine makes a comment to Shelly. Anna and Marianna interact. Marianna and Jasmine interact, then Marianna writes on the back of her own hand. Shelly responds to a question. "Shhhhhhh," she then says as another student speaks. Another student question. I sneeze. Bruno makes a comment.	Bruno's continued defiant behavior.
146. Hannah: Oh my God I can't think, shut up Bruno. (48:07)	A lot of teacher talking and teacher "shhhh"ing. How are the students to know what talking is ok?
147. Bruno: You shut up!	Student frustration and student-administered discipline.
	Bruno's response.

148. Anna's hand gesture indicates impatience at Hannah.	
149. Shelly: Hey hey, guys.	Tries to assuage the peaking frustration.
150. Marianna and Anna interact, as Anna puts on earphones, preparing to listen to music. Bruno mumbles something.	Student withdrawal.
151. Bruno: She getting on my nerves (then something else).	Pursues reprisal against Hannah.
152. Anna to Bruno: Oh my god Bruno, just be quiet. (48:17)	Student-administered discipline. The real peacemaker.
153. Shelly continues to converse with Carmella through the end of the period.	

Day 9: February 25th, 2006. Sophie's Last Class: "Rope-a-Dope"

FRONT			DOOR	
ME				
Marianna BF			Sophie	
Anna WF	Anko HM			
Marcus BM	Bruno BM			Liang AF
			Carmella WF	Samuel WM
Hannah WF				Jim AM
			Jacob WM	

BACK

1. As class begins Hannah is recounting with evident enthusiasm to Sophie her recent experience with a practice CAPT she took in English class.	
2. Hannah: I'm saying oh my gosh oh my gosh.	Enthusiastic recognition of improved competence.
3. Sophie: What was the story you guys read?	Request for elaboration upon personal academic experience.
4. Hannah: Um, "Short Papa." And like I got it. This is so true.	Response.
5. Sophie: Who is your English teacher?	Request for elaboration upon personal academic experience.
6. Hannah: Mrs. Andrews.	Response.
7. Marianna: I got a B+ on that.	Marianna, too, realized success.
8. Hannah: And I (talking over Anko) and I got it, and like I was sitting there writing either half a page to a page for each question.	Continued enthusiasm.
9. Sophie: That is so awesome.	Response.

10. Hannah: I was screaming (enthusiastic intake of breath) I can do it. (0:30)	Continued enthusiasm.
11. As I do my paperwork at the beginning of class, Anna engages Sophie in a conversation regarding <u>A Child Called It</u> and drugs. Marcus is very active. He and Anna and Marianna are sitting close to one another. After I finish Sophie commences the lesson, reminding students about “Bedtime Story,” the story with which they ended the prior class.	
12. Marcus: That was that was a OG story. (4:44)	Is this an offering of another word—another key to inclusion in his culture? Is this a peace offering after his dismissal from the prior class?
13. Sophie: One person, what’s OG?	This gets Sophie’s attention.
14. Marianna: It was mad hot.	More lingo.
15. Marcus: Original gangster.	Answers Sophie’s question.
16. Marianna: It was mad short.	Funny follow up to her own prior statement.
17. Sophie: Oh. Ok, I I learn new lingo every time I’m with you guys.	Recalls prior interaction.
18. Bruno: I didn’t know what to do. (He is looking at his writing from the prior class.)	Bruno’s perplexity arises from his withdrawal from activities during the prior class and his unresolved confusion.
19. Sophie: So what is what do you mean can you can you define what “original gangster” would mean according to this story?	While ignoring Bruno’s professed confusion, Sophie attempts to use this word from the students’ context.
20. Marcus: All right, so I say I say it was hard body.	Another word offering—vying for friendship?
21. Sophie: It was what?	Request for elaboration.
22. Marcus: Hard body, that’s that’s that’s the easiest.	Response—Marcus is now the teacher in his own context.
23. Sophie: All right, what’s that mean?	Further request for elaboration.
24. Marianna: (Smiling.) Dang.	Expressing humorous surprise that Sophie does not comprehend the meaning of this word.

25. Marcus: (Hesitating.) Tough like.	A moment of childlike hesitation—he's not sure how to explain this term to Sophie—he becomes suddenly shy.
26. Marianna giggles.	Detects Marcus's sudden change in attitude.
27. Hannah: Wow you're mean.	Why is Sophie mean? Does Hannah think Sophie is intentionally making Marcus squirm? Perhaps she is.
28. Sophie: I need to know. I don't know what all this stuff means.	Defends her innocent curiosity.
29. Marcus: Hard body?	Struggles to find a simile or definition appropriate for what he perceives to be Sophie's cultural norms.
30. Sophie: Yeah.	Sophie persists.
31. Marcus: Like . . . it means hot.	Offers a synonym.
32. Sophie: Ok. Which is a good thing?	Request for elaboration.
33. Marcus: Yeah.	Response.
34. Sophie: Ok. Ok.	Response indicating comprehension.
35. Marcus: It was like it was like mad short. But then again you know you know what they was saying.	Response to Sophie's original question about the short story the students discussed during the prior class.
36. Anna: A lot said.	Joins in the conversation.
37. Marcus: Yeah.	Agrees with and approves of Anna's elaboration.
38. Anko: It was kind of funny but it was kind of weird though.	Joins in the conversation.
39. Sophie: What did the author use here?	Sophie does not recognize Anko's attempt to join the discourse. Instead she offers a vague question in an attempt to redefine the discursive context.
40. Anko: He use . . . (cut off)	Again, Anko attempts to answer.
41. Sophie: Think about in comparison with some other short stories that you've read before, especially all the ones you read before in this class, what's the	

difference? What do they use a lot in this story that they did not use as much of	Leading question.
42. Anko: Quotes?	Attempted response.
43. Sophie: in some of the other stories? Dialogue. And so	Answers her own question, or rephrases Anko's answer without recognizing him.
44. Anna: And	Attempts to get the floor.
45. Sophie: go ahead	Gives Anna the floor.
46. Anna: Um the thing is that this story was like it was good, because um like . . .	Attempts to answer, but is interrupted by Marcus. Why is Anna's and Marianna's participation such a threat to Marcus?
47. Marcus: "like"	Perhaps feeling a loss of social prestige, attacks Anna's involvement.
48. Anna: Shhhh. It was a really short story there was a lot said and a lot, you know you were able to understand what they were talking about and used very little bit of words.	Student-administered discipline. Exploratory speech.
49. Sophie: Yes. This story actually the reason why I use this story where I found this story, um, when I was I was traveling with some students in Paris um like three or four years ago and we stopped off at this store and there they had this book there uh which I was already teaching English at the time and it was called "The Writer's Block" which a lot of people will say that there's no such thing as writer's block	Personal story. Justification of her curriculum. Paris. As with her Volvo, it seems to me Sophie uses this specific detail as a hegemonic and elitist tool—a power grab—a cultural reference that works vacuum like to suck these students out of their culture and into her context. As we have seen before, I question if it is efficacious to use for behavioral motivation—visions of a Heaven those same sinners can never attain.
50. Marcus: Hold on wait wait what happened?	Sophie either loses Marcus or elicits his attention. I think the latter.
51. Sophie: It's this little book that I have called "The Writer's Block" let me see if I have Oh I have it right here. And so in this book what they do it's like if you have writer's block, um, then you can just flip through and it will give an idea of something to write and so one of the ideas that they gave you here was try to write a story in under 55 words and so the story that you guys read actually	Appropriates conversation.

there is this um fiction, um, contest and it's called "55 Fiction" and you have to write a story in 55 words or less and this story won first place and so they post it in this and so every time I read it I I absolutely just like love it and every time that I read it depending on you know what I've read recently what I've seen in the news recently or what movies I've watched which I'm gonna give you an example of that in a second it always kind of changes the way I think about this story and so um I'm gonna show you like the most recent I did your I did the same thing that you guys did I took the CAPT like you did and so um I wrote out question number three just as you did to show you a a sample ok? so this is from 55 Fiction which you can actually probably check out on line if you wanted to look at some other stories	Personal connection.
52. Anna: Where did you get that, um, "Writer's Block"?	Shows interest in Sophie's book.
53. Hannah: Paris.	Or online at Amazon for \$8.95.
54. Bruno: France.	Then why mention that she found it in Paris?
55. Sophie: So I'm sure that you could get it here but it just so happened to be a writing store and so I went inside and I checked it out.	
56. Anna: I want to get one.	Sophie has hooked them.
57. Sophie: Ok? Um yeah just look it up online.	
58. Anna: It's called "Writer's Block"?	Obviously wants the book now.
59. Sophie: Yeah.	
60. Marianna: How about how about if we borrowed yours and photocopied it?	Marianna wants the book too.
61. Anna: That would be a lot of pages.	
62. Sophie: You're going to photocopy this whole thing?	I wonder why Sophie dampens their evident enthusiasm about this book. This is the second

63. Marianna: Yeah. 64. Sophie: (8:27) All right. So you need to answer two questions. Questions number three and four, that's what your focus has been for the past week. Um, in preparation for next week I will just let you know that what you are going to be doing with Miss Clines is you are going to take a look at a short story very similar in length to the one that you just read and you are going to be answering all four CAPT questions 65. Anna: Tomorrow? I mean 66. Sophie: Next week. That is your last week. And Miss Clines and I are going to be comparing your responses to the responses that you've been giving us all along because we want to see how much you've grown. Now I could tell you right now cause I went through if you look on your responses I put notes on there (rising intonation), um, and questions and things like that, and as I was going through I took my own notes and actually I think this was one of only two classes where I actually photocopied what a few of you had written because I thought it was so good, ok? so I want to make sure in case you didn't want to share it in class (rising intonation and slight pause) I was going to make sure I (emphasis) did, and I won't use your names, because I don't even have it written on here, but I did want to make sure that you had some of your stuff shared with the rest of the class, so I took notes on what you had done and I have to say that overall I thought you did a terrific job, um, with both questions three and four, um, I don't want to get too much into question four right now	time Sophie has offered a piece of literature to the students and has then withheld it. The effect is one of teasing them with literature—something that is out of their reach, as their presence in this class seems to indicate. Marianna will not give up her pursuit of this book. Introduction to next week's curriculum. This never happens. This never happens. Note that growth—cognitive, I presume—is the focus of her assessment. Sophie never offers students the opportunity to share their own work—she maintains possession of it.

because, um, I want to save that for next but (emphasis) I can tell you that the one thing I was the happiest about because that was the most recent thing I had worked on with you was that you had all had your own definition, I think there was only one or two of you that didn't write your definition of what you thought good literature was. So I'm psyched (emphasis) that now, if nothing else, you have figured out what your definition of good literature is, and you're able to explain does this story is this story good literature? Ok? Anna, pay attention. So the first question that I asked you was what does this story say about people in general? In what ways does it remind you of people you've known or experiences you've had you may write about stories read that you've read or movies or TV shows that you've seen, basically what are you doing with this question? 67. Anna: (Softly) You're making a connection. 68. Sophie: You're making a connection. That's all you need to do. Ok? It goes a little deeper than that though and so there was definitely one thing that I'm going to ask you to improve on for when you answer question number three again. If you do this, I'm positive that all of you are going to do very well on the CAPT, eh, just I mean it's obvious that you understand the stories that you're able to develop your own interpretation that you were able to make um a connection and that you were able to evaluate if this is good literature. What I need to make sure that you're doing though is writing it all out so that someone else who's grading this (rising intonation), knows you are doing that. I know it because I know who you are and I know what you're thinking based on what you're writing, but I need to make sure that a complete stranger can look at your work and say all right they get it and they and they can make the connection to the	"If nothing else"? How does this sound to the students? Discipline Question. Question. Offers a response. Repeats answer. "That's all you need to do . . . but it goes a little deeper than that though"? This feels confusing. "Positive"? Sophie knows who they are and what they are thinking. How are the students experiencing this monologue, and how will their imminent behaviors evince their perceptions? Do they actually care what a "complete stranger" thinks about their writing?

story, and I'm gonna explain to you what I mean by that in just a second. Um, some of you, I, it's funny because one person in here actually used one of the connections that I used cause I told you I was going to show you what I put for question number three (rising intonation), Sam I hope you don't mind me picking on you here but his, one of the things he wrote about in his question number three cause it asks you you know how can you connect to this, so many of you had put down, like you had used a theme, you'd come up with what your theme was and then you had explained well I've seen this in my own life in a movie, um, many of you connected it to your own life you know a lot of you had put I I can't remember who said this but like you can't trust everyone that you meet, um, or that you shouldn't trust them right away, another person put stuff about being like back stabbed by people that were close to them, especially friends who had, you know, at one time, you know, been buddies with them and then like you know wanted to be part of like the cool crowd or whatever so they changed and you know back stabbed everyone you know the person that they had been close with, um, another person had talked about the theme being people are always trying to get back at each other, so like that idea of revenge, um, which we definitely can see in this story, or that people are deceitful, it shows how people react when they are dealt the wrong hand, ok? which this class didn't use this specific word but in other classes a lot of people like talked about karma or what goes around comes around, and you know I think that you know that kinda was the underlying theme in a lot of what you had written about. Sam had written about betrayal, and how um, maybe you can explain a little bit about what I want to say. (13:20)

69. Sam: (Pause) Like I I related it to Mr. and Mrs. Smith and

Does he mind?

Repeated references to movies—why? The students have a proven ability to talk about other books they have read. What about their own lived experiences as a source?

Repeated assumptions of a violent and malevolent world.

Original sin.

Fate, predestination.

Divine retribution.

70. Sophie: You guys how many of you guys have seen that movie? <u>Mr. and Mrs. Smith</u> .	Movie connection.
71. Marcus: I saw some of it.	
72. Anna: Yeah I saw some of it.	
73. Sophie: Is it with Brad Pitt is that it and Angelina Jolie?	
74. Marcus: Yeah, Angelina Joli (pronounced Jo-Leeee, with enthusiastic arm movement).	
75. Sophie: Ok, if you haven't seen it you should definitely rent this movie, so good, go ahead.	
76. Sam: It's about two spies (pause) two hit men who met each other and don't know they're both hit men and at the end they try to kill each other. But it don't work.	
77. Anna: That's (emphasis) what the movie's about?	Rejects Sophie's movie as summarized by Sam
78. Sophie: Their passion takes over, yeah, they're they're like they get they fall madly in love and they get married like pretty quickly and they're married for all these years and like in the beginning you don't know if they're like cheating on each other or what's going on because they always kinda like sneak outta the house and you don't know why and like you know like like the wife will be wearing one outfit and then they show her the next scene and she's got like a new outfit and she's going somewhere else and then you come to find out that they're both hit men, hired by the government.	Ignores Anna's critique and appropriates the summary.
79. Sam: And the, like the two companies that they're hired by try to have them kill each other, they send them to the same spot, they try to kill the same guy and it was all a setup.	Sam elaborates.
80. Sophie: And and neither of them know	

this, until the very end when they find out this when they see picture this is the person that you need to kill, and so he's like "My wife's a hit man? I didn't know this" and she's thinking the same thing about her husband and yet that's their job so they still try to kill each other, um, knowing who the other person is that they're trying to kill and they both figure it out too, so then they like come home at night and like you know one will carry around a knife the whole time he's in the house because he he's afraid his wife's gonna kill him, and then she's got a weapon with her, yeah, she's got a gun with her, so they wanna make sure they're protecting themselves, you know, and so they like live like this for like a little while, and then their passion ends up taking over and so you know they just can't resist being with one another.	More violence.
81. Jacob: (In a droll voice) How romantic.	Jacob interjects himself into Sophie's monologue.
82. Sophie: Yes, yes, very romantic.	Recognizes and responds inclusively to Jacob.
83. Jacob: (As Sophie is speaking) I need to see this movie.	Why would Jacob "need" to see this movie?
84. Sophie: Yes, and so they don't end up killing one another in the end, but, um, which I think is a little different from what we read here, now here's (her voice rises) my question, now that you guys all know this story, not just Sam needs to answer this, but how does that, that what was just described to you, how does that connect to "The Bedtime Story"?	Given that summary, do they "know" the story? Request for connection.
85. Sam: The wife was trying to kill the husband and the husband was trying to kill the wife.	Response.
86. Sophie: Ok, so what what's the word that I used in the beginning that you had focused on?	Sophie's call to copy her.
87. Sam: Betrayal.	

88. Sophie: There's this betrayal of husband and wife, ok? (Bruno's head is down on his arms. Anko is chewing his fingernails. Marcus too has put his head down.) (16:00) Boys, can you keep your heads up, because you're not gonna get credit for being in here if you're sleeping, so, just stay focused. Um, so I really I thought that, um, Sam had done a good job with this and it's probably because I'm partial because I wrote about the same thing, um, but, you know, you guys all did such a terrific job with answering this question, and where did I put (Anna helps) some of you some of well I just I'll show you what I did but I just took notes on what you had done, um one of you had written about like made a connection with <u>The Secret Window</u>, (rising intonation, pause) yeah can you explain that movie to us. 89. Marcus: What's <u>The Secret Window</u>? Is that with Johnny Depp? 90. Sophie & Jacob: Yeah. 91. Sophie: All right tell me about it. I learn all these great movies that you watch from you guys go ahead. 92. Jacob: Uh, well like (pause), I don't know how to explain it really, but like uh in the movie 93. Sophie: Umm hmmm 94. Jacob: His wife, cheated on him 95. Sophie: Ok 96. Jacob: And um it really messed him up and like really wanted revenge on her but so like since he wanted (?) revenge really messed him up, in the head, and like he he developed another personality that he didn't know about (pause) so he had like two personalities, and he kept thinking that somebody was after him, but it was	Revealing behavior. Withdrawal. Discipline. What exactly will they get credit for? Sam's job is good in part because it is similar to Sophie's. Assessment. Really? Jacob? Request for elaboration. Appropriate request for elaboration. Response—together. The movies that the class has discussed have been introduced and discussed only by herself and Jacob. Is her assumption that the students have not recognized this? Sophie again approaches Jacob and allows him to establish the context of the conversation. Encouragement. Is this common in the culture of these students? Encouragement. Jacob continues his summary.

really himself, as	
97. Sophie: Like chasing after his wife though?	Assists Jacob.
98. Jacob: Yeah	Working together now.
99. Sophie: Not really chasing after him.	Further assistance.
100. Jacob: Well like like chasing after him too like, he would find a, he found his lawyer dead in a car and he did it and he thought the other guy did it, but the other guy really doesn't exist	Elaboration.
101. Hannah: And he found his dog	Attempts to join the conversation.
102. Jacob: Yeah yeah his dog was dead with a screwdriver through it's head	Elaboration.
103. Anna: Oh my god that's nasty. (17:41)	Anna judges and rejects another of Sophie's picks.
104. Hannah relates her seeing the movie. Then Sophie talks about her experiences with scary movies and <u>The Shining</u> , which Jacob brings up. Then Jacob talks about <u>The Reanimator</u> . Sophie resurrects <u>The Fight Club</u> .	
105. Sophie to Jacob: (19:22) You love (voice rises an octave), like, this moo this movie that you were talking about though is very similar to like <u>The Fight Club</u> with that whole idea	Sophie interprets Jacob's assessment. Recalls prior conversation.
106. Jacob: Yeah	Interweaving their conversation.
107. Sophie: like a second	Interweaving continued.
108. Jacob: Yeah, it's another personality	Interweaving continued.
109. Sophie: personality	Interweaving continued.
110. Jacob: I mean they don't neither one knows that	Interweaving continued.
111. Sophie: Um so	Interweaving continued.
112. Jacob: Yeah, he ends up killing his wife	Interweaving continued.

113. Sophie: Ok, so in both of these stories (rising intonation) what characteristics do you see between your movie and “Bedtime Story” what characteristics do they both have? 114. Jacob: Revenge. 115. Sophie: Ok, there’s the idea of revenge, this whole idea of suspense, um, so you can definitely see the connection between the two, ok? Betrayal, all of that, it’s all in there. Um, and yes, revenge (talking over Jacob now) was what you focused on in your in your written stuff so I really liked that. (19:57) Um, let me see cause I know I also, all right, here was um another person’s response and I’m gonna tell you what I, what my comments were to this person (rising intonation) like how to make it even a better a better response to make sure that you are including everything because here’s one thing that, um, this person did not do this this person did this part well and that’s why I’m I’m having you listen to this, but what a few of you, um, need to work on, and this is the one thing I want you to work on for the next time you answer number three is make sure after your connection is that you explain how that connection really does connect to what you just read, because a lot of you had put down, you know, for instance, um Sam and I don’t know if you definitely did this or not but you said you know this reminds me of <u>Mr. and Mrs. Smith</u> because in <u>Mr. and Mrs. Smith</u> it’s two hit men and they’re trying to um you know kill each other and they don’t realize it (continual rising intonation) so it’s this whole idea of betrayal and Sam did this well too I think this is why I photocopied Sam, “This is just like in ‘Bedtime Story’ when Mrs. Smith tries to kill Mr. Smith after she finds out that he was in her way of completing the kill.” And but what you want to do then is say in “Bedtime Story” that same thing happened and here’s how, so make sure that you bring it back to the original text	To whom is she asking this question? Interweaving continued. Interweaving continued. Appropriates conversation. End of interweaving. Is that possible—to include “everything”? Teacher exploratory language? That will be during the official CAPT. Vague introduction to Sam’s work. Praise. Reads Sam’s answer. The point.

that they gave you that they want to know you can analyze, um, Carmella I think this one might be yours, I'm not sure though. Um, so here's what here's another good one where they went they tied in the um "Bedtime Story" very well (21:40). (Sophie reads Carmella's response from last class.) "What helped me understand the theme or conflict of bedtime story was when I saw that the man described in the writing was trying to setup a murder and the woman he was with was about to succeed in killing that man." Now one thing that, well, can you guys think what's the one thing that I recommended after that first . . . sentence? (Pause) What I would suggest doing? (Pause) She said "What helped me understand the theme or conflict" (Pause) What is the theme or conflict? (some mumbled student responses) That so I would want you to state that, thank you. Tell me what is the theme or conflict that you're trying to talk about? Based on reading the rest of this response (rising intonation) I felt like it was betrayal or being caught in lies or something like that. All right, let me finish reading. (22:22) Um, "I remember being in a situation once when a girl I knew was dating a boy for a really long time" do you mind that I'm reading this? (Carmella says no) ok "for a really long time and she didn't know he was cheating on her. The girl asked her boyfriend to try and hit on the boyfriend to see what he would do and she would secretly be there when she did it, but her boyfriend wouldn't know. So when she did he came to the friend's house and the girlfriend stood in the closet and caught her boyfriend trying to kiss her friend" 116. Anna: (Smiling) That's a good one. 117. Sophie: (With humorous enthusiasm) Isn't it? 118. Anna: That's a really good one. 119. Sophie: Isn't it a great connection? But	Sam and Carmella are both white—not a subgroup for the CAPT. "Theme or conflict"? Which? Students engaged in Sophie's discursive context. Open-ended question, with a correct response awaiting recognition. State what? Which is she talking about?—the theme or the conflict? Begins reading Carmella's written response. Request for permission to read Carmella's piece. Permission granted. Deception. Anna is still listening. Evaluation. Agrees with Anna's evaluation. Emphatic appreciation and evaluation. "But"?

here's the good part. Here's the excellent part. "It ties into the story in that the woman was completely aware of what was going on because the wife hired her to kill her husband like the girl I knew asking her friend. It was easy to see the girl would break up with her boyfriend and the woman would shoot her husband." So you know you could the connection between the two is there and not only that but Carmella did a great job of bringing it back to the story to "The Bedtime Story" cause that's the most important thing, you want to bring it back. Ok? Um, all right, let me think, I've got I think two more here. Nope, this is question number four, oh I've got two number fours, all right, so we're gonna hold off on those . . . Comments or questions? . . . I think overall you did a really terrific job with picking out the theme and then making a connection. Number one make sure you state the theme, so that we know, that's the only recommendation I would make to Carmella, ok? Explain what the theme is that you're talking about, whether it's dealing with betrayal or you know what goes around comes around or anything like that, and then the second thing is after your connection (rising intonation) make sure that you bring it back to the original story; you do those (dramatic pause) you're an ace in the hole.	Continues reading Carmella's response. Explicit lesson. General assessment. This is hard to believe, given the distractions that occurred during this exercise last class. Begins review of process. Review. "Ace in the hole"?
120. Hannah: Are we getting back our folders and stuff? (24:24)	Procedural question. Concern about the folders. Hannah is justifiably concerned about the testing schedule and having her folder returned to her in time to use it as a resource.
121. Sophie: At the end? You mean like after we're done with everything, um I, yeah, well I'm trying to think what we did last year I think last year if people wanted their folders they came to Miss Clines or I, here's the thing, you guys are gonna a your like a final CAPT next week; Miss Clines and I want to go through it and see	This does not happen, so far as I know.
122. Hannah: Yeah.	Voiced approval.

123. Sophie: how much you guys have improved and you know see you know that we've actually done our job, um and so we are going to be reading yours and and looking at your responses	Expectation of improvement. So who is the subject of the assessment? This does not happen.
124. Hannah: How long do you think that will take because these will help with like trying to	A most pragmatic question!
125. Sophie: like preparing for it?	Reveals her true feelings about the worth of their folders and prior work.
126. Hannah: (Pen falls from her desk.) Yeah.	Voiced procedural agreement.
127. Sophie: You do that every five seconds. Um, I would say if you guys gave us um like a week and a weekend we would be able to get it done and that's plenty of time before the CAPT, right?	Hannah drops her pen every five seconds? Why the stress? Is this a defensive attack? Confusion.
128. Hannah: Well CAPT starts this week.	The date matters to Hannah, although she will be absent when the examination is given.
129. Sophie: Does it start this week already?	Confusion. Sense of urgency or personal investment.
130. Hannah: Yes, we have, um, a class after the CAPT has already started.	Hannah knows.
131. Sophie: It starts this Thursday?	Confusion.
132. Sophie: Maybe what we'll do is give you your folders except for your last assignment.	Then what would be the point of the practice if the students receive no formative assessment?
133. (25:30) Conversation ensues regarding the CAPT.	
134. Sophie: (26:45) My feeling is, um, after going through all of these classes if you guys have been you know paying attention staying focused, I don't think that you have really anything to worry about in any of the (?) (Hannah talks about the efficacy of the program, particularly science. Sophie talks about including Hannah in a review of the program. Begins talk about question	Review. Really? To my knowledge, the program is never reviewed.

number four.)	
135. Sophie transitions to question #4 and talks with Jacob about his response, which she reads to the class, feigning ignorance that it was his.	
136. Sophie: (29:11) Um, one of you, I took a quote from your sss from your response, I loved this, “This story showed human nature at its worst” (dramatic pause) I loved that. Oh that was yours (to Jacob)?	Assessment of Jacob’s answer. Love.
137. Jacob: Yeah.	Response.
138. Sophie: What did you mean by that so everyone understands?	Request for clarification, for other students.
139. Jacob: ‘Cause uh human nature’s not very good at all, like, in general, people are like, nasty, like they only look out for themselves and	We are all sinners in the hands of an angry god. Bleak appraisal of human nature supported by the class readings and discussions.
140. Sophie: All the time?	Interweaving revived.
141. Jacob: Not all the time	Interweaving continued.
142. (Bruno rests his head upon his right hand, as if sleeping.)	Senses what is coming?
143. Sophie: Ok	Interweaving continued.
144. Jacob: but I said in general, um (pause)	Interweaving continued.
145. Sophie: (Reading slowly and significantly) “Show human nature at its worst” (pause) I thought that was a great line (long pause). (29:51) I just didn’t think of that I mean I told you I worked on answering these questions myself and I just I didn’t think, you know, that this that yeah this was perfect this showed realistic characters because there are evil people in the world; if you watch the news ever um you know I I remember watching the news uh I think it was last year when there was a husband who and I know this happens often with spouses but a husband had killed his wife just down in um it wasn’t Canterbury was it? it was in like near Lisbon	Personal connection. Personal praise. Great. Perfect. It does? In whose world? Is this a reflection of Sophie’s perceptions. More violence.

146. Hannah: Lisbon.	Hannah knows of the local violent crimes.
147. Sophie: Yeah.	Recognizes Hannah's knowledge.
148. Hannah: It was in Lisbon. Like right down, right down the street and like everybody was freaked because we were like, ok this is little ole Lisbon and we have a murder now.	Hannah elaborates—joins in the conversation between Sophie and Jacob.
149. Sophie: Right, you know, so go ahead Jacob	Terminates Hannah's participation, returns to Jacob.
150. Jacob: Yeah, well like, they should, they uh, it's like people act on their emotions too quickly and that's what (?) they take everything, it said like in the heat of the moment they want to like kill somebody	Jacob elaborates.
151. Sophie: Right	Validation.
152. Jacob: But if you like wait a week or something and you look back on it you realize it was, like, yeah	Jacob continues elaboration.
153. Sophie: Do you guys do you can you guys think of some like characteristics of human nature like what what is something that all humans have within them, now whether we act on these or not . . . is one thing, but we all have these, what did you say? (31:15)	Question regarding student's perception of our common humanity and essential human nature. Original sin.
154. Marcus & Anna: Anger.	More original sin.
155. Sophie: Anger, ok? so that could completely go along with what you are saying, you know, that this woman and man's anger for their spouses, which we don't even know where it came from, um, you know, that is definitely a great example of showing human nature, I loved (emphasis) that comment, loved it. (31:34)	A very revealing answer! Ha! Agreement: people are essentially angry? I'm beginning to think school. It is human nature to be angry at your spouse? Love. Love.
156. (Sophie begins to talk about irony. Calls on Anna. She finds and reads her answer, but it is devoid of irony.)	Anna attempts to participate.
157. Sophie: How could you show that the	

title is ironic? (33:27)	
158. Marcus: Because when you think of bedtime you think of peaceful people going to sleep and comfortable	This is an intelligent, perceptive answer. I wonder where he would have gone with his response.
159. Sophie: (Talking over Marcus) When your parents read you a bedtime story do they read about a husband and wife trying to kill each other? (33:38)	Seems to ignore Marcus's attempt to join the conversation, yet she restates his answer.
160. Class: No.	
161. Sophie: Ok. What are bedtime stories usually about?	Request for fill in the blank answer.
162. Discussion about Disney, drugs, and sex. Very animated. Hannah and Anna get in an argument about the presence of drugs and sex in <u>The Lion King</u> .	Is Anna's aggression towards Hannah a result of being excluded from Sophie's interactions with Jacob?
163. Sophie: Shhhhh.	Discipline.
164. Continues.	
165. Sophie: (34:30) Shhhhhh. Ok, you guys shhhhhh Ok, you guys can watch this stuff at home, but I'm pretty sure when Lewis Carroll created he was actually on LSD, so I mean it's . . . (34:44)	Discipline. Discipline. Discipline.
166. Continues	What do these students make of this comment?
167. Sophie: Stories you know stories like that you know the three little pigs where there's a happy ending, the bad person gets killed in the end. (35:03)	Happy? Well, the wolf does die and the pigs eat him—the warrior man, the hunter, is killed and eaten by the intellectualized and somewhat effeminate pigs.
168. Students continue talking among one another.	
169. Sophie: Shhhhhhhhhhh.	Discipline.
170. Jacob continues talking about "Rockabye Baby." Hannah begins a passionate critique of <u>Finding Nemo</u> .	Jacob, who has been quiet since the effusive praise of his writing, reminds the class of his presence.
171. Sophie: All right Hannah, hang on hang on Hannah, I've got to stop you just cause you'll keep going.	Hannah claims the floor. Sophie rejects Hannah's bid for the floor. Hannah is denied Jacob's status.

172. Hannah: No no no. 173. Sophie: Stop, (Hannah slumps, purses her lips, and places her forehead on her right palm) because that's not necessarily a story that you would read at bedtime because you don't have the time if you're a parent. 174. Anna: <u>Finding Nemo</u> is a long story. 175. Students continue to vie for domination of this moment, particularly Hannah. 176. Sophie: Hang on hang on hang on. All right, so (35:38) Thinking about, um, and I think Marcus really nailed it on the head here is that when you think of a bedtime story you don't picture, um, you know, parents reading a story about two people trying to kill each other and yet this is the title (emphasis) of this story so that whole idea is ironic so I know you wouldn't comment on this with question number four based what we you know the questions and what they ask you question number one says what is so symbolic about the title, but I just wanted to make sure that you kinda had thought about that as well. Um (pause) (36:14) 177. (Sophie continues talking about question four.) (36:25) Marianna can you just put that away and pay attention to me right now, ok? Ok, that is what I wanted to say about that one. (Reads two more responses, the first is Hannah's. Anna, Marcus, and Marianna interact. Sophie tells them to listen.) (40:20) So I know you guys have your you know you've got your cut and dry this is what I think good literature is but then what you want to also think is you know even though it doesn't have all the ingredients it's kind of like you know if you were making you know some kind of a cake or something and you had to put you know if you	One final plea to retain the floor. Hannah is seemingly defeated. Time. Addresses enigmatically Hannah's attempt to establish the discourse. Is she soothing Hannah's hurt feelings or siding against her? Sophie appropriates the conversation. Praise for Marcus. She recognizes him and quotes his words (see #158). Irony. Discipline. Marianna frowns perplexed as she is asked to put away her pull string purse. Almost four minutes pass. "cut and dry"? Begins cooking allusion.

didn't have one thing and you threw an extra ingredient in and then you have this like great surprise because then it tastes so much better (rising intonation) um maybe the same thing happens with some of these stories, if the one ingredient that you thought should belong in a in a good piece of literature is missing but maybe they've thrown something else in and you can add that, you know maybe this person who said that their definition included realistic characters exciting scenes and suspense might also say, um, that you know although maybe it doesn't have realistic characters like maybe they would prove that there wasn't realistic characters there were like Martians in the story or something maybe you could also say well no but it does have a theme that is very timeless that you know that goes on and on like this idea of betrayal is happening because as Jacob said it's human nature (significantly), ok? (41:26).	Reminder of Jacob's preeminence.
178. Sophie continues with explicit instruction—repeating what she has said earlier: 1) “Bring it back to the text”; 2) “Provide specific examples from the story to back yourself up.” (42:33)	Explicit review.
179. Sophie: For question number four what is some that you could do well any of the questions, what's something you could also provide in your answer that shows that you were really paying attention to that story? What's something you could put in there? (Silent pause.) From the story. (A mumbled, soft student response.) Quotes, evidence. (Continues talking about quotations. Prepares to share her answer to “A Mother in Manville.” Reads her answer. Bruno watches Anko playing with a watch on a chain. She finishes her example (45:00). Students prepare to leave. Sophie continues talking about the coming tests.)	Question. But don't students have to do more than simply prove they were “paying attention”? Students have not read this story in the Saturday Academy.
180. Sophie: (47:47) So before you guys leave, the one I do want even if you don't get to do another Reading for	

Information test, I want to see how much you do remember. What are the hints, what are the things that you should remember when you are reading for information, what's the very first thing that you should do?	Question about the RFI section of the CAPT: Review.
181. Marianna: Don't put don't put I don't understand.	Marianna remembers the great taboo.
182. Sophie: Well you're thinking of, um	Oooooops. Not the right answer.
183. Marcus: Writing a response	Marcus attempts interweaving with Sophie.
184. Sophie: Um the not Reading for Information, the uh, (students assist) the Response to Literature, thank you.	So her question is about the RTL.
185. Marianna: Oh.	Recognizes the confusion.
186. Sophie: What's the first thing that you need to do?	Repeats her original question.
187. Bruno: Um, when you're reading the story take notes (?) while you're going through it.	Response: annotate.
188. Sophie: Ok take notes while you're going through it. What should you do absolutely first before you even start reading them	Validates Bruno's response, but it is not the one she is looking for.
189. Marcus: Read the title? No read the questions read the question	Marcus is still with it. Isn't his first response correct?
190. Sophie: Read the questions first, um, remember how Miss Clines said you know if you're gonna go to you know say go visit a friend in, uh, Canterbury, and you're leaving EMA and you don't know where you're gonna go, what should you get?	Answers her own question. Map analogy resurrected. But that analogy applied to the RFI. Now I'm confused.
191. Anko: Directions.	Anko participates.
192. Sophie: Ok, so you need to do the same thing here, when you're reading a story, find some directions, ok? Read the questions first (emphatically). Bruno turn around. The second thing Bruno already foc already said to, you know,	I am still confused—is Sophie talking about the RTL or the RFI? If she is talking about the RTL section, why read the questions first? The questions are always the same—that's the point. Discipline.

focused on for us, if the questions as you to find evidence (rising intonation) read with a highlighter, pen or pencil so you can pick out sentences and phrases to use as evidence, you want specific details, ok? Highlight, underline, um (Marianna tells Sophie she is blocking her vision) Oh, sorry, it's kind of hard to know what's going on if you can't see it, huh? If possible skim the article to look for answers to particular questions, what about if one of your friends is out in the hallway? 193. Several student: Don't look at 'em. 194. Sophie: Don't, no, 'cause they're gonna make you fail. 195. Student chatter. 196. Sophie: Focus, they shouldn't, but I know a few people who sometimes walk the hallways like when I'm teaching class and they stand outside my doorway and talk to students while I'm trying to teach class, not picking any names or anything like that (Anko laughs).	Now we're back to reading an article. I thought she was talking about a story? Behavioral question. Response. Your own friends are out to make sure you fail. Back stabbers. Implicating one of the students present? Anko, perhaps?

Day 10: March 3rd, 2006. Shelly's Last Class

FRONT				Door
Marcus BM	Anko HM			
Anna WF	Bruno BM			Liang AF
Marianna BF			Carmella WF	
Jasmine BF				Samuel WM
			Jacob WM	Jim AM
				ME

BACK

1. I begin the videotaping after the students have read and answered a RFI exercise. Shelly asks her questions from the practice test and students answer. Bruno and Marcus have their respective heads down as the taping begins. 2. Shelly: (Softly) Marcus. Hood off please. 3. Marcus: (Raising his head) Huh? 4. Shelly: Hood off please. (Marcus complies but puts his head back down on his desk). All right, number one says, "Based on the information provided in the preceding article explain the difference between an epidemic and a pandemic." Anna (who is raising her hand). 5. Anna: Well, as far as I (emphasis) understand it is that epidemics, epidemics are diseases, they're three of them, and they struck at different times, and they all make up, um, pandemics, or whatever however you say that. 6. Shelly: Pandemic. So	Discipline. Passive aggressive defiance. Discipline. Begins review of RFI task. Response.

7. Marcus: Epidemics epidemics	Attempts to answer.
8. Anna reclaims the floor as she talks over Marcus. Anna speaks louder, but Marcus outlasts her.	Anna attempts to overpower Marcus's participation.
9. Shelly: All right, so, uh an epidemic that is really (emphasis) large then is called a pandemic.	Shelly hears and repeats the correct answer offered by Marcus.
10. Marcus: Yeah.	Asserts that he is the source of this correct answer.
11. Shelly: Yes. So what you should have written down is that a pandemic is a really large like vast version of an epidemic, so an epidemic might have a smaller a smaller group of people involved. Pandemic means it's more wide spread.	Shelly appropriates the answer.
12. Marcus: I put	Attempts to elaborate.
13. Shelly: Nationwide maybe.	Elaborates upon her own answer.
14. Marcus: I put epidemic is a disease that spread (as Marcus reads his answer, Marianna and Jasmine talk, laugh, and share their writing)	Marianna and Jasmine are allowed these sidebar conversations.
15. Shelly: Yeah, it's a it covers a larger area. So (loudly) it says that there were three plague epidemics meaning that this happened the plague broke out (Marianna yawns and stretches her left arm high in the air) at different times, three different times, and because it was it covered such a large area they called them pandemics. "What's another name for the plague?" What'd you get Jasmine (odd accent, kind of soft and southern—drawn out)?	Responds to Marcus's answer. Elaborates. What is more important, the students hearing the "correct" answer or creating and defending it themselves?
16. Jasmine: (Looking at her answer) Um, I put the that B word, whatever it's called.	Literal question—the answer is in the text of the article. Attempted response. Wrong answer.
17. Shelly: Bubonic plague? Or the Black Death?	Ha! Shelly offers Jasmine the answer.
18. Jasmine: (Looking at her answer page) Ne neither (Marianna laughs) it was	Pursues her own answer.

19. Shelly: Oh, the bacilli?	Assists Jasmine.
20. Jasmine: Yeah.	Accepts Shelly's assistance.
21. Shelly: Ok. Well that's what causes it, yup, that's what causes it, but what do they also call it? Ummm (Marianna raises her hand)	Pursues her question as she looks to call on another student. Why not stay with Jasmine?
22. Jasmine: (Softly) Oh, the Black Death.	Jasmine answers the question; still, it goes unheard by Shelly and her peers.
23. Shelly: Marianna.	Marianna claims the floor.
24. Marianna: I put plague equals disease, it is a kind of disease (her voice fades away).	Marianna attempts to join the conversation.
25. Shelly: It is a disease but what was another name for it? Anna (her hand is raised).	Pursues her question.
26. Anna: Um, rosies were the pink rash associated with the disease and they're called that. (Pause. Holds up her paper defensively) Says it right at the top.	Anna attempts to join the conversation.
27. Marcus: Is it the Black Plague?	Offers proof.
28. Shelly: It's the	Marcus attempts to answer.
29. Marcus: The Black Death.	Transforms the question into a fill in the blank.
30. Shelly: The Black Death.	Got it.
31. Anna: But isn't it the second sentence of the article?	Repeats the correct answer.
32. Marcus: Yeah but that	Defends her answer.
33. Shelly: (Drowning out Marcus) No that the second sentence of the article tells you what rosies were but it's asking what is another name for plague? For the plague that um this one had, it was the Black Death. It says um it was the time of the black death is what it became known as because of the plague. (2:40)	Defends his answer. This is now an interesting interchange between two students.
	Interposes her perception.
	So Anna is wrong. But it would be interesting to explore the intelligence in her answer rather than its rightness or wrongness.

34. Shelly proceeds to the next two questions—both easy multiple choice questions. 35. Shelly: (3:12) Then, number five, what causes the plague? (Anna's raises her left arm) You gotta you had to go down to the (Marcus reaches up, takes Anna's hand, brings it down to her desk) real root of the (Anna raises her right arm; Marianna raises her right arm) it what causes it? Diseased rats, flea bites, or forms of microbes called bacilli? Jacob. 36. (Anko walks in at three minutes and 20 seconds into the class. Question and answer. Much interaction, physical and verbal, between Marianna and Jasmine. Jacob answers. Marcus is leaning back, staring. Anko is twirling his hat. Jasmine isn't writing anything.) 37. Shelly: Right, so the actual, what actually makes you sick are the bacilli, but it's transferred to you from the fleabite, which jumps off of the rat. So the actual thing that makes you sick what actually causes you to get the plague is the bacilli, so it should have been bacilli. Number six. "Some children today still chant ring around the rosie without knowing the rhymes history. What where rosies?" what was a rosie, tells you, this is what you said. 38. Marcus: The rash. 39. Shelly: The rash (talking over Jacob's wrong answer) the rash. (4:17) 40. Anko: I'm gonna tell my sisters this.	Marcus physically intervenes in Anna's attempt to join the conversation. Anna persists. Marianna attempts to join the conversation. Someone should connect this detail to Anna's answer, thereby allowing her to see her own reasoning. Physical action and inaction connoting withdrawal. Accepts Jacob's answer. The fleabite jumps off of the rat? I'm just kidding—we all probably make this sort of mistake as we talk. What is astounding throughout this transcript is the presumed ability of students to interpret what is really very loose talk. Another interesting observation is how often Marcus is on-task with his responses—in this written analysis he seems like an engaged student—an antsy young man confined in a classroom where his disruptive behavior results in his being dominated, disciplined, and ignored, yet he participates. He distracts other people, makes annoying sounds, and his size, energy, and intelligence make him a dominant presence. Repetition of Marcus's answer. Anko makes this personal connection as he

41. Shelly: Huh? 42. Anko: I'm gonna tell this to my sisters today when I go home 43. Shelly: (Laughs) Every time they sing? 44. Anko: No, (?) sing it I just (?) 45. Killen: (Talking over Anko) All right 46. Anna: (Loudly) So it's A? 47. Shelly: Well, the answer to A is the rash. Rosies are the rash. 48. Anna: Oh, you see so I thought we had to pick, um (laughs) 49. Shelly: (Loudly) Ohhhhhh. (Anna laughs) 50. Shelly: B, what according the rhyme caused the plague? The rhyme (emphasis) now, not the article but the rhyme. It says ring around the rosie a pocket full of posie achoo achoo we all fall down. Jacob? 51. Jacob: Um . . . like . . . it was uh . . . the smell of the rotting flesh (Marianna and Jasmine are talking), that there they said the vapors from the smell 52. Shelly: But what did from the from the nursery rhyme is what is it? 53. Jacob: That's what it said, achoo achoo 54. Shelly: Ok (Marianna and Jasmine still talking and interaction physically—Marianna reaches over and touches	assimilates the information. Request for repetition. Anko wants to share with his culture what he is learning in Shelly's culture. This is powerfully reminiscent of his hurt at Sophie's not sharing their lingo. Of all students, Anko seems to be the most emotionally engaged, the most disappointed, the most hopeful, and the most interrupted—by everyone. Interprets Anko's comment in a way I do not understand. Rejects Shelly's interpretation and attempts to elaborate. Rejects Anko's participation. Requests verification. Response. Elaboration upon thought process. Validation, but no elaboration. A complex question with several possible answers. Jacob is called upon again. Jacob answers, but incorrectly. Marianna and Jasmine withdraw as Jacob answers. Request for text-supported response. Allows space for Jacob to respond. Jacob defends his answer. Dynamic continues: Shelly questions, Jacob answers, Marianna and Jasmine talk.

Jasmine.)	
55. Jacob: Like, yeah.	Jacob answers.
56. Shelly: So would it explain the achoo achoo?	Shelly questions.
57. Jacob: No it said um a pocket full of posie (Marianna reaches over and touches Jasmine's forehead), um (Marianna says Jasmine's forehead is dry) yeah, it says they carry it they're perfuming it so the vapor it said the vapor helped to spread the disease, like the smell.	Jacob answers and elaborates. Physical withdrawal.
58. Shelly: (Uncertain.) Ok, what's the achoo achoo indicate? (5:10)	Reiterates his incorrect answer. Request for literal response—still driving towards the desired destination. Still allowing Jacob the space to create understanding through discourse.
59. Student: Ashes.	Incorrect student response indicating nonengagement in the activity.
60. Marcus: They're sneezing. (Marianna and Jasmine are still talking audibly. Bruno sneezes.)	The correct answer.
61. Shelly: Sneezing, sick from sneezing too so you could put down sneezing.	Repeats Marcus's correct answer. But does one get sick from sneezing? Is that the message of the text? Jacob was never explicitly proven wrong.
62. Anna: So for B it's sneezing?	Anna joins the conversation with a question indicating she was not following the interchange between Shelly and Jacob.
63. Shelly: Yup. (Marcus shakes and rolls his head extravagantly while making large biting motions. Marianna reaches towards Jasmine with her right hand and touches Jasmine's left cheek.) Sneezing was one of the symptoms there . . . and then what other symptom of the disease does it suggest that after you sneezed?	Marcus's bizarre physical movements. Physical withdrawal. But a symptom is not a cause.
64. Marcus: You die.	Correct!
65. Shelly: You fall down. (5:51)	Shelly alters Marcus's answer with words from the song.

66.	Shelly: Um, number seven, “Using context clues provided above explain what a maelstrom is.” (Marianna raises her hand.) So the sentence was “Swirling around the Mediterranean sea in a deadly maelstrom for more than two centuries” (Anna raises her hand) “killing as many as forty million people” (Anna lowers her hand) it was like a deadly storm (Jasmine elaborates) Yeah, a big storm (Marianna passionately tells Anna, “I told you,” and Anna laughs) all right, that it was just never ending, it was swirling around the Mediterranean sea like it was some sort of	Continues with review. Shelly rejects Marianna’s bid as she elaborates upon her question. Marianna withdraws. Anna attempts to enter the conversation, but Shelly rejects her bid. Anna withdraws. Jasmine answers. Marianna and Anna respond.
67.	Anna: Wait, so is it	Student question.
68.	Shelly: sea storm	Finishes explanation.
69.	Anna: So is it all right if you put (continues reading uncertainly her answer).	Request for assessment.
70.	Shelly: Shhhhhh, yup.	Discipline.
71.	(Anna reads her answer, but she has again misread the intent of the question.)	
72.	Shelly: Well but it wants to know because they’re using maelstrom as like a figur figurative way to talk about the disease, that the disease was like a storm, like it you know, swirled around	Further elaboration about use of figurative language in this example. Shelly provides this information—could the students have created it?
73.	Anna: Oh, killed lots of people.	Comprehension and restatement.
74.	(6:39) Marcus is bobbing his head and dancing with his upper body and arms. Shelly proceeds to number eight. Student chatter ensues. Jasmine stands and hikes up her pants while Shelly is reading an answer:	Marcus’s bizarre physical movements. Shelly proceeds.
75.	Marcus: Aiy-eee! (6:58)	Marcus’s war cry? Revenge? This is Marcus’s new and most irritating tactic, to regain power for himself, or to establish the context of his discourse.
76.	While Shelly explains the correct answer to number eight, Marcus and Anna talk	

and Marcus misses the question eight discussion: “Wait, what was number eight?” Anna plays with the bracelet on Marcus’s left wrist. She turns to Marianna, who is copying off of Jasmine, and asks what she missed. Anna and Marianna talk and laugh. Marianna continues to copy something from Jasmine—I can’t imagine what. Shelly and Jacob converse about the logic of the correct answer. This seems to be a personal conversation as Jasmine, Marianna, Anna, Marcus, Bruno, and Anko all appear to be disengaged, judging from how they are sitting, where they are looking, and who they are talking with. Sam joins Shelly’s interaction with Jacob.	Student activity connoting academic withdrawal. Copy. Withdrawal.
77. Shelly: (8:25) All right, now, uh, we have two more things to do one of them’s a survey but I think I will save that for last, what I want to do is give you like, almost like a cheat sheet to review from before you go in to take the CAPT test remember you can’t use anything on the CAPT but (Bruno pounds on his desk three times with his right fist; Marianna and Jasmine continue their interaction) it’s a good thing to summarize what we’ve been doing and help you out with that response to literature one the one where you read the short story and answer the four essay questions, I saw people doing some really good things when you guys were reading that article just now I saw a lot of you reading with a pen and underlining stuff that’s great	Shelly proceeds. Resurrection of the “cheat sheet.” Physical rebellion. Review of strategies. Transition to RTL?
78. Marcus: (After blowing in Anna’s ear, in a soft high voice, like a baby coyote) Ah-oooo.	Distracting behavior. Why?
79. Shelly: so on this worksheet we’ve reproduced all four of those essay questions that as we went over them there were a few weeks between it so we wanted to put them all on one sheet for you, so what we’re going to do is write down again some useful information to remember when answering them, all	Copy.

right? so this is the one where you read a short story and answer the four essay questions. So the first question says “What are your thoughts and questions about the story? You might reflect on the character’s problems, the author’s use of symbolism, the title, or other ideas in the story.” All right, what is the first thing you want to remember? What’s this question grading you on?	Review of RTL questions and strategies.
80. Bruno: Whether you understand it.	The anthropomorphic question. Loose, imprecise language.
81. Shelly: If you understand it so the first thing you should write down is grading whether I understood it or not. This one’s looking for understanding.	Response.
82. Marianna returns Shelly’s pencil.	Repetition of answer.
83. Marcus: Aiy-eee!	Cry to the gods?
84. Anna and Anko laugh.	Reaction to distracting behavior or to Marianna’s returning Shelly’s pencil? I think the latter.
85. Shelly: (9:56) Oh, frosty (smiling) insulting my pencils. All right, so, the first thing you should know is it’s graded on whether you understood it or not so . . .	“Frosty.” Teachers have cultural lingo too, you know.
86. Anna to Marcus: Stop. (Then she asks a question. Marcus leans over close to her ear, opens his mouth widely, and blows softly and fully in her left ear. She somehow ignores this; Shelly does not address this.)	Student-administered discipline, then re-engagement in class activity. Marcus responds with an extraordinarily distracting action that goes undisciplined. Why?
87. Shelly: We can write down things that you should say and things that you shouldn’t say, what should you not (emphasis) say?	Explicit test instruction, ignoring the social dynamic taking place. Fill in the blank review question.
88. Everyone: (Loudly) I didn’t understand it. (Laughter.)	This they seem to have taken to heart.
89. Marcus: I didn’t like it.	A better answer, again. He will not internalize the implicit methodology, the pedagogical epistemology—that learning comes from copying.

90. Shelly: (Laughing.) You should not say I didn't understand it and along with that don't say that it was confusing because then that translates into I don't get it so, if at all possible kinda talk around it	Ignores Marcus's answer as well as his behavior, but at whose expense? You cannot do so without sending messages. “talk around it”? Fake it?
91. Jasmine burps	Well, I'm not sure what to make of this.
92. Shelly: talk your way out of it	“talk your way out of it”? Why? Questioning is not a crime. Lesson: fake it.
93. Anna: (Remonstratively) Jasmine	Anna notices Jasmine's burp.
94. so they don't think you didn't get it. Shhhhhh.	Shelly talks through Jasmine's burp. Discipline.
95. Anko turns to Jasmine and says something that sounds like “dialyo.”	Anko responds to Jasmine's burp.
96. Marcus: What the heck is dialyo, what does that mean? (Anna says something to Marcus.) Oh. All right. (Anna laughs.)	Marcus responds to Anko.
97. Shelly: Shhhhhh. All right, so, what can you talk about? What could be the first thing that you talk about after you finish the story?	Discipline. Continues with review.
98. Jasmine: (Raising her hand with enthusiasm.) Oooh.	Enthusiastic participation.
99. Shelly: Jasmine.	Recognition.
100. Jasmine: When, um, when I first read the title I thought this but then when I read I thought that it was something else.	Response.
101. Shelly: Good. We just did this in my class too so when I first read the title so the first thing you should do look at the title jot down what you think it might be about.	Evaluation. Explicit test instruction.
102. Anna: You know there's this little green um little like uh	Joins the conversation—all of this information is already copied for them.
103. Shelly: Bookmark.	Assists Anna.
104. Anna: Yes, I have that.	Ok.

105. Shelly: Miss Morris and I made them.	Claims herself as a source.
106. Anna: Who made them?	Did not hear.
107. Shelly: Miss Morris and I came up with them a few years ago.	Repeats.
108. Jasmine: I have two.	Status? Compliment? Personal connection.
109. Anna: Miss Johns gave it to me. (Marcus, his pencil clenched sideways in his teeth, is slouched and staring at Anna; he moves his head behind her back, close behind her shoulder. She turns to look at him.)	Questioning Shelly's claim. Marcus's odd physical movements. Physical withdrawal. It's funny to me now—it wasn't at the time.
110. Shelly: We, um, all your teachers should have gotten some. (Amid chatter) A bookcard. You may have gotten it a long time ago. Yup. (Marcus stretches both arms wide, his right up and behind Anna.) All right, shhhhh (Bruno turns and asks Marianna a question—she playfully responds that he should pay attention) quiet guys, if you, um, if you come by my room I can get you one if you don't already have one but you can't use it on the real test. All right, so (11:31), you can talk about the title say what you first thought the story was going to be about when you read the title and then what you realized it was actually about, because sometimes what you think it is going to be about is not it at all (emphatic). So that gives you a good way to start your essay, it's an easy way to begin. Now you it says that you can talk about the character's problem symbolism other ideas, you can just comment on things, you can comment on the character like I thought the character was, you know, mean or	Defiant action. Defiant action. Discipline. Student-administered discipline. Discipline. Continues with explicit instruction of strategies. Cultural assumptions revealed in use of example.
111. Anko: Nice	Anko rejects Shelly's cultural assumption.
112. Shelly: nice or anything like that but every time you say something like that what would be a good thing to do in order to show the person grading why you think that	Validates Anko's input. Third person presence.

113. Anko: Because like	Bid for the floor.
114. Shelly: What could you put in your essay to show the person that's grading you	Shelly rejects Anko's bid in favor of reinforcing the presence of a third person power.
115. Anko: Show show what the character does.	Anko preserves, regardless, yet ineffectually.
116. Shelly: All right, what the character did what the character said so you could put in quotations write specific examples, that way they know what you're basing your judgments on. Um, you can talk about what else? The thing that you should do when you first finish the story?	Continues with explicit instruction. Question.
117. Anna: Um, connect to it.	Response.
118. Shelly: All right you can talk about a connection (drowned out by the scraping of Marianna's chair as she rises and adjusts up her pants) what should you do when you first finish the story? Determine	Evaluates and repeats Anna's answer. A lot of pants being hiked up throughout the Saturday Academy. Is this a statement?
119. Carmella: Plot? No, not the plot, the theme.	Recalls prior interaction with Shelly.
120. Shelly: The theme, so you could talk about the theme, you could talk about the message, what was learned in the story. All of those things can go into question one question one is pretty open. Now, um, you might want to do question one last because if question one's grading you on understanding, you have three other opportunities to show you understood it (rising intonation) so you might save question one for last	Repeats and elaborates upon Carmella's answer. The anthropomorphic question. Presence of third person in power.
121. Anna: But if you don't answer question four then	Participation.
122. Shelly: If you don't answer question four you're in tough shape.	Interruption and completion of Anna's idea.
123. Anna: Yup.	Validates Shelly's statement.
124. Shelly: That's really hard.	I do not understand.

125. Anna: You should answer	Another fragmented statement.
126. Marcus: you could say deep sh	Like Shelly, Marcus interrupts Anna, but with a feigned vulgarity.
127. Shelly: So you might want to do two three and four	Explicit test strategy.
128. Anko: (Laughs through his teeth, like a hiss.)	
129. Shelly: and then go back and do question one and put in anything else that you didn't get to say, all right? So write that down too.	Continues with explicit test strategy. Copy.
130. Marianna: (Bent over her paper with a pen in her hand) Write what down?	Request for procedural elaboration.
131. Anna: (Distracted by Marcus) Write what down (grabs her pen and prepares to write)?	Re-engagement.
132. Shelly: To answer question one last, answer the other ones first (Jasmine sits with her head resting on her left land, which is supported by the back of her chair) because you'll show understanding in the other essays (pause) so if you don't get to number one until the very end that's ok.	Repeats strategy.
133. Anna: (13:50) You know on my CAPT uh practice in Miss John's (Marcus looks at Anna) you know I got a six, thirty out of thirty.	Personal connection reminiscent of Hannah's excitement in a prior class.
134. Shelly: Excellent.	Praise. Personal connection is validated.
135. Marcus says something mockingly.	
136. Marianna: I got a B+.	Marianna joins in the personal connection moment.
137. Anna: I'm gonna (Marianna says something to her).	Pursues this connection with Shelly.
138. Shelly: That's awesome, so you just gotta do it again.	Praise.
139. Anna: Yeah, I want, I wanted to show it	Deepening personal connection.

to you but um she wanted to keep it so to prove that we did it in class	
140. Shelly: Yup.	Minimal validation of personal connection attempt.
141. Anna: but when she gives them back I'll show you.	Continues pursuing a deepening personal connection.
142. Shelly: Excellent.	Praise.
143. Anna: I'll come see you in your room.	Request for personal proximity.
144. Marcus is crooning some mockery near Anna's ear, but she is turned towards Marianna. Marianna says something smilingly.	Marcus is doing his best to disrupt Anna's bid for a personal connection with Shelly.
145. Shelly: Shhhhhh (chatter between Marianna and Anna continues, and Marcus joins in as Shelly talks with Carmella) It's better that you don't finish that one than the others, like if you if you know you can't possibly finish them all (rising intonation) at least you've shown understanding elsewhere.	Discipline.
146. Carmella: ok.	Validates Shelly's advice.
147. Anna: No. (Denying something. Marcus continues to mock her as he moves his head in front of hers. Anna's mouth opens in a sign of denial or surprise. Marcus tucks himself into his hood, still talking. Marianna smiles knowingly and laughs, covering her mouth with her right fist.) That's fucked up. (Shelly talks. Anna pulls herself into her jacket. Marcus, still looking at Anna from in front and a little above. He laughs.)	Anna profanes.
148. Shelly: All right? Question two	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.
149. Marcus: Aieeeee.	Some sort of victory cry?
150. Shelly: you get you might get one of two things all right? so for question two you might either get the one where it has quotations (rising intonation) and you	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.

have to pick a quotation (rising intonation) or you get one that says how does the main character change, so if you get the quotation one (Marcus begins to bob and weave rhythmically in his chair) and they say here pick one of these three quotations and talk about it	Explicit physical withdrawal.
151. Marianna: That's hard.	Spontaneous evaluation of the test.
152. Shelly: first thing you should do is say what about the quotation?	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.
153. Anna: Read them (other chatter)	Responds, as if nothing has happened.
154. Shelly: Yeah, go back to where that quotation was in the story, so what you might do is (Anna, in response to something Marcus says to her, hits softly with her left hand Marcus in the right arm. Shelly pauses momentarily) figure out which ones that they're gonna ask you to choose from first and that way you can highlight them in the story (Marianna and Anna are talking now) go back to that quotation and then in your essay explain who said it and what was going on in the story at that time that should be the first thing so that's under question two which is right below question one here (Anko's head is down upon his right arm lying flat upon his desk) first thing you should do, write down who said it where it occurred in the story, all right? now you look at the question it says explain what it means about the characters or the theme so the second thing you could talk about is what that quotation shows us about the character (rising intonation. Anna's jacket collar is up around her ears and zipped up past her nose) or characters	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction. Marcus continues distracting Anna. Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.
155. Anna: Wait, what? (Anna has been talking with Marianna. She now picks up her pen again, sensing that it is time to copy something)	Physical withdrawal.
156. Shelly: so the first thing is explain the quotation explain where it occurs, second thing is say what it shows us about the	Temporary withdrawal. Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.

character	
157. Anna: Um, show what (Marianna laughs, which makes Anna laugh).	Humor.
158. Shelly: Show what it says to to what it shows us about the character (Bruno, Anko, and Jasmine are writing now. Marcus is not.) like if it tells us anything about what the character values, what, um, you know, what the character's fears are what the character's conflict is just explain what it tells us about the character. And then the last thing you can do is talk about how it helps us to understand the message of the story, how it ties in with the message of the story	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.
159. Anna: (Hitting Marcus again as he leans in front of her and says something) Shut up. Stop.	Anna has to contend with Marcus. Student administered discipline.
160. Shelly: So number one, explain the quotation, number two, talk about how it relates to the character, and number three, talk about how it ties in with the author's message, what it has to do because they don't choose these quotations randomly, they pick out quotations that have something to do with the characters and the theme so you should be able to find something to talk about so those are three steps three things to follow for the rest of the (drowned out by Bruno rapping his pen). All right?	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction. Physical withdrawal.
161. Anna: Wait (looking at what she has written) so I talked then the third is talk about how it ties in with the character in the story?	Trying to figure out what to copy.
162. Shelly: It's uh the third the last thing is how it ties in with the theme.	Addresses Anna's confusion.
163. Anna: Oh (moans, writes).	Compliant action.
164. Shelly: The second thing is character the third thing is theme	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.
165. Anna: So	Lingering confusion.

166. Shelly: And that gives you a lot to talk about because now you know you got three things to talk about you're gonna have a few sentences for each of those three things (pause) so you'll be able to fill up more space. Now if you get the one that says how does the character change from the beginning of the story to the end (Marianna and Anna are interacting again) you can talk about if you want to jot it underneath here (Marianna drops her pen) what the character learns, you can talk about what the character learns, you can talk about	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.
167. Anna: Wait a minute. Where?	Confusion about what to copy.
168. Shelly: Right here.	Addresses Anna's confusion.
169. Anna: Oh.	Ok?
170. Shelly: What the character learns in the story (rising intonation), um, you could maybe (Marianna and Jasmine interact) provide what to show the difference between beginning and end, what could you pull out of the story?	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction. Question.
171. Bruno: Evidence.	Appropriate general response.
172. Shelly: Evidence, so quotations, you could give us a quotation that helped to explain the character at the beginning of the story and then a quotation that helps to explain the character at the end of the story (Jasmine stands up quietly and adjusts her pants. Marianna leans back and yawns.)	Repeats Bruno's answer. Shelly continues with explicit test instruction. Another pants-hike.
173. Anna: Oh my (writing, mumbles something) so what the character learns from the story	Request for affirmation.
174. Shelly: Yup.	Validates request.
175. Anna: And then pull information to prove it or	Repeats Shelly's instruction.
176. Shelly: Yeah like talk about how the character was at the beginning, what he or she valued, what he or she thought and	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.

then what they think or feel at the end (Marianna mumbles something in a funny voice as she looks at and copies from Anna's writing). All right, now, what you can always remember for question three is three four three. All right, so three things to do for question three, the first thing you should do when it says what does the story say about people in general? is (Bruno and Anko have their hoods pulled over their heads) shhhhhh (at whom?) say what the story's message is about human beings, like people value money over life or people'll um	Looking to one another for help. Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.
177. Anna: So what the message of the story is.	Anna struggles to keep up.
178. Shelly: Yeah what the mes first thing you should do is say what the message of the story is (pause) shhhhhh (I don't know who is being shhhhhh'd) the very first thing	Shelly addresses Anna's confusion. Discipline. Discipline.
179. Bruno: (Writing) Yup.	
180. Shelly: The second thing you want to do is somehow tie that in with your life so you could talk about a movie you saw you could talk about friends	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.
181. Bruno: A a movie to compare?	Yes, they have witnessed this being.
182. Shelly: Well you you come up with a connection like some something that it reminded you of in your own life, but you want to base it on the message not on the plot so if you get a story about, um, somebody who finds a magic lamp you don't want to write that	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.
183. Anna and Shelly in unison: like one time I found a magic lamp	Echoes of a prior lesson.
184. Shelly: but if that person learned that you know	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.
185. Anna: Just like "Short Papa" Oh my friend lost his watch, like that.	Anna makes a most appropriate connection.

186. Shelly: Yeah, you don't want to say like Oh I lost a watch (Marianna says something) but say say you read a story about somebody who found a magic lamp and then they whisper all these things but then didn't really enjoy life and you know because they it wasn't what really mattered you could then say well you know one time I wanted this game really really bad and then I got it and it wasn't such a big deal because I realized that it took me away from my friends or whatever, so it's more about the message of the story, not the plot so connect to the message, then the last thing you should do because we'll assume that the person grading your response doesn't get why you chose to make that connection (rising intonation) explain that connection by talking about the story, so my example is just like in the story because here's what happened in the story. (19:53)	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction. The power of the omnipresent third person.
187. Anna: (Writing) Explain the connection?	Copying.
188. Shelly: Yeah so you explain your connection like, my (Anko is laughing at something outside of the room) example is just like in the story because in the story here's what happened, and tell us what happened in the story. (Jasmine is not writing. Anna, Marianna, and Bruno are writing. I can not tell what Anko and Marcus are doing.) So the last thing you do is explain you should end talking about the story they made you read, so you're explaining exactly why you came up with that connection.	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.
189. Carmella: You should end with that, like	Carmella contributes.
190. Shelly: You should end talking about that story yeah, you don't to end talking about yourself then the last thing they're reading is about you not about the story so they're not determining that you were able to talk about the story very well, so you want to end talking about the story. And then question four, this is a very	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.

critical one, it's critical stance and it's critical that you do it. It asks you, how successful was the author in creating a good piece of literature? 191. Anna: To good um oh (?) 192. Shelly: So the first thing you should do though is say, here's what makes good literature (pause) you know whatever irony suspense and description. 193. Anna: Characterization. 194. Shelly: Characterization, whatever. Um, you come up with three things, you say, um, to me a good piece of literature should have (pause) this this and this and you come up with three things you think make up a good piece of literature. So that's the first thing you do. 195. Marianna: What were the things? 196. Shelly: You could choose from a lot. In your folder (while Anna is talking with Marianna) there should be a list of things like suspense irony plot twists, um, vivid description a theme that applies to many people, so first thing you do is write down a good story has this this and this, then you say this story is ineffective or is not ineffective because it either did or didn't have that stuff so you figure out if the story had it or not, and you determine if the story is good or not. (Marianna asks a question I can not hear.) Yeah, so you pick out which one it is you determine whether it is or it isn't, so you can go one of you can go either way but, um, sometimes it's easier to say that it was that it did have those things that it was effective as long as you can find it, because then the last (Bruno suddenly drums frantically on his desk with his pen and drowns out Shelly's words) say this story was effective because it had irony plot twists and suspense, now you have to go and find that in the story and say the story was ironic because here's	Copying. Shelly continues with explicit test instruction. Contributes appropriately. Repeats Anna's answer. Looking to copy what she thinks defines a good story. This is funny. Shelly continues with explicit test instruction. Sudden frustration exhibited as frantic physical action.

what happened, the story had plot twists because here's what I thought would happen but here's what actually happened, the story had good description because here's a quotation that's very descriptive.	
197. Marcus: Ai-eeee. (22:29)	The call of the wild.
198. Shelly: So you have to give examples, you can't just say it has it you have to prove it to them, prove that you know what it means. (Pause) All right, so this you can study from, and if you come on Tuesday I can add anything any questions that you may have I can add to it. (22:52)	Shelly continues with explicit test instruction.
199. Finally Shelly introduces the next activity—a survey.	Transition to a survey.
200. Bruno questions Shelly one more time about the likelihood of the attendance policy being changed; Shelly expresses little hope for such an alteration in policy. (23:50)	
201. Marcus: Aiye. (24:10)	Winding down.
202. Marcus: I hate this stuff. (24:37)	So did I—as a student I hated end of the class evaluations.
203. Shelly: (26:10) Cause we're gonna have a meeting on how to improve things we might change all that stuff so we're going to use your information so please give us your	This does not happen.
204. Marianna: I guess I'm not putting my name on this then.	Assessment.
205. Shelly: You don't have to, nope.	Responds.
206. Marcus: Aiye (27:38)	Free at last.
207. (31:09) Students leave.	

Interview with Bruno

Transcript	My Notes
1. Me: (1:04) Any ideas, any any things you'd like to share before I start asking you specific questions about what your impression was about how you were taught and how to assess, how to test, your knowledge of a story, anything like that?	
2. Bruno: It's well it's much better now understanding that what the teachers is telling you is that the Academy is like way better, cause they tell you what to do, they don't give you answers, they tell you what to do first, like if you doing multiple choice and so to answer you gotta read a big packet, you just read it read the plague story first and then you start it, you don't answer any questions you know and then when the time comes down you can answer the multiple choices 'cause those is easy to answer, all you gotta give is A B C or D so it's better to do that first	Literary terms and epistemological stance. "Teachers is telling." "They tell you." "They tell you what to do." "You gotta." Process: "read the plague story first": confusion—Bruno does not distinguish between specific and general strategies. "When the time comes down . . . answer multiple choices." "It's better to [answer the multiple choice questions] first."
3. Me: So they give you some strategies about how to approach the test.	
4. Bruno: Yup.	
5. Me: Anything else?	
6. Bruno: Everything that they taughted us is at the academy basically that's what I went over and the CAPT test and (pause) hopefully (pause) I did good on the CAPT so (pause) I did what they did and if I did what they did I should do good on the CAPT.	Hope. Epistemological mimicry.
7. Me: How how do you think the CAPT went, just out of just out of curiosity?	
8. Bruno: It was ok but like some couple part of it it was kinda little difficult (pause) that that's it. It wasn't it wasn't	Task evaluation.

bad like anything it wasn't hard anything it was just ok. Basically you just had to like rig your brain and remember it and stuff (3:05) 9. Me: What's the best way for you to understand a story? 10. Bruno: Like understand any story? 11. Me: Yeah yeah. 12. Bruno: To read it (leaning back) to read it and read it and talk and talk about it, and stuff like that. 13. Me: And talk about it with who? 14. Bruno: Your teacher, your classmates and all that. 15. Me: How do you get at a right answer for the story? 16. Bruno: How do I get a right answer? You read, well uh how I get a right answer I read the question, then read the story and find out (haltingly) what's the best answer, what's the best answer that fit to the story and that's the one that I pick. 17. Me: Does the, do, what what if you disagree with the teacher about an answer to a story? 18. Bruno: (?) disagrees to the teacher and try to find a correct answer or ask her if my answer is right or what what what my answer was wrong (pause) and try to show her where I get my answer from, um, what make me get that answer. 19. Me: What'd you think about the discussions during the academy? 20. Bruno: It was good 'cause it kinda help, kinda help with the with the program to show how we could get along and discuss stuff like students.	The importance of talk when trying to understand a piece of writing. Discourse community. Is there a right answer? Does it depend upon the question? "Read the question" first. Questioning the authority of the knowledge giver. Ask the teacher for correctness of answers. Exploration of the student's response. Evaluation of discussion. Social aspect of class discussions.

21. Me: You guys had some pretty passionate discussions 22. Bruno: Yeah. 23. Me: in in your class. You had an interesting group of kids in that class. 24. Bruno: Yup. 25. Me: Do you remember any one discussion? 26. Bruno: Uh, yeah I remember the one with Hannah when she was talking about her uncle, and I remember the one with uh, the dog when they had to left the dog behind, 'cause they didn't have space in the car, and all that, stuff, that was a big, one of the big discussions and all (fades away) (5:20) 27. * * * 28. Me: (Drawing questions from the Schommer instrument) (7:00) If you were every going to be able to understand something, it will make sense the first time you hear it. So if you were going to learn something you would learn it right away. You're not gonna learn it if you're not gonna learn it 29. Bruno: If I were to learn something then probably like I would read it and then go over it I'm not gonna learn it like get it right away, we gotta practice on it and see how you do it and when you practice and now you get it and how you know it and you understand it, you not just gonna read something and then understand it after you get done reading it so I wouldn't go about doing it that way, I would go about reading it, practicing it couple days or (pause) time and study and then you when you know you understand it you tell the teacher, uh, I get it and then you start participating 'cause you know you understand it.	Recalls the conversation between Hannah and himself regarding the legitimacy of Hannah's sadness and worry concerning her cousin. Bruno still remembers the dog. Question regarding quick learning. It is best to involve the teacher only after he has explored the topic himself. The time to participate is when you understand.

30. Me: So being smart has nothing to do with getting something the first time	
31. Bruno: No	
32. Me: it has to go back at it and back at it and back at it.	
33. Bruno: No. Yeah. Once, it just once you just put your head to it, you know you want to do something just do it, you don't have to be smart, you don't have to be (pause) all that, all you gotta do is	"Just do it."
34. Me: But being smart could just	
35. Bruno: Yeah	
36. Me: Going back	
37. Bruno: Yeah	
38. Me: and keep doing it over and over I mean that could be an intelligent person.	
39. Bruno: Yeah that could be, intelligent person, yeah. Definitely.	
40. Me: Um (pause) Here here's one. "People who challenge authority are overconfident or cocky." People who tell a teacher that the teacher's wrong, sorta thing.	
41. Bruno: Well, now, that doesn't always mean that, when someone challenge the teacher that mean they got you know, that mean they know what they doing, if the teacher is wrong she probably making 'cause not everyone is perfect, everyone make mistakes so teacher might made a mistake and he's correcting her, and, probably some kids 'cause they can't correct the teacher 'cause they know they don't know if theirs is right or the teacher's is right so they don't go about correcting her so if the kid that know he's right, he sh he gonna challenge the teacher and tell her (pause) that's right or that's wrong.	Question authority. Still, a "right" answer.

42. Me: Do you do that in class? (9:34) 43. Bruno: Yeah, sometimes I 44. Me: Do you? 45. Bruno: Yeah 'cause it's not everyone perfect, teachers make mistake, us make mistake, everyone make mistake, not everyone perfect, no one is perfect. 46. Me: Do you remember doing that in the Saturday Academy at all? 47. Bruno: Yeah, I remember that. 48. Me: Do you remember 49. Bruno: I remember telling her and the teacher telling her that I was right and she said yeah, it's better when she goes over it again 'cause she probably seen one answer and she gonna keep like reading and reading and find a other answer so that could be one part of it too. 50. Me: That's interesting. Um, I agree with you. 51. Bruno: Yup. 52. Me: I think a lot of learning, I think the teachers can do a lot of learning from the kids perceptions 53. Bruno: Yup. 54. Me: of a story and that I think that's what the CAPT test believe it or not is even trying to do, is uh (pause) is to get you to express your own interpretation of a story. 55. Bruno: Yup. 56. Me: "The most successful people have discovered how to improve their ability to learn. The most successful people have discovered how to improve their	Religious overlay? Moral stance regarding education? Epistemological stance? Permanence of knowledge.

ability to learn.” (Bruno nods) It seems like (pause) 57. Bruno: (11:11) Sometimes a lot of people (interruption) some some kids that’s successful they go about they study a lot they go over and go over they do their homework some people they try very they try very hard to accomplish something in life so the want to do as much as successful kids so they try harder than them, might the successful kid don’t have to try as hard as they do cause they basically know more than them, but it’s not always about if you’re smarter than the next one this one or anyone even if you’re you’re not smart you still could get the right answer that the smart people gets. 58. Me: Hey, can I challenge you one something? 59. Bruno: Sure. (12:04) 60. Me: (12:18) It seemed to me during Saturday Academy there was very little discussion. 61. Bruno: Yeah. 62. Me: There was almost no back and forth. You really didn’t get a chance to argue your point much. 63. Bruno: Yup. 64. Me: Do you th am am am I right about that or 65. Bruno: I think I think they just want to know like, well, they want to do it so you get it and then move fast, but some kids (rising intonation) they, some kids probably they didn’t pick up on it like fast as they could of or how they wanted to pick up on it, so that kinda made it hard for them, ‘cause the teacher wasn’t discussing a lot, arguing, ask you know opinions and all that stuff on it so, that’s how some kids look at it in some ways	Learning how to learn. Time spent on task. Prior knowledge and privileged culture. Acceptance of the existence of “the right answer.” Fast learning. Evaluation. Lack of discussion and exploration of opinions.

that they want to that they don't want to try any harder 'cause sometime the teacher doesn't give them them as much attention 'cause they's a lot of kids in the class so the teacher want to give everyone a chance to discuss it, go over it, argue, like some kid might not like it, some kids might love it, so 66. Me: The story 67. Bruno: Yeah 68. Me: or the way she 69. Bruno: The way the way she do it or 70. Me: Yeah 71. Bruno: the story 72. Me: But there weren't a lot of kids in the class. 73. Bruno: No (arms crossed). 74. Me: So there was time to argue if 75. Bruno: Yeah 76. Me: you wanted to argue. 77. Bruno: I think the teacher just wanted to see that you get it and then move on. 78. Me: Can you tell me get what? 79. Bruno: Like get get the point 80. Me: Of? 81. Bruno: Of (pause) let's see, get the point that they want to get the story and get whatever they like the work that they doing so they can move on to something else that gonna be on the CAPT, just not be on one subject, just moving on and on like getting to the challenging part leaving from the easy sections. 82. Me: But it but in the CAPT if they give	Lack of motivation due to lack of one on one instruction. Teacher as the authoritative source of knowledge to be learned rapidly. "The point," like "the right answer." "Move on" to what? Reflects assumptions and the structure of knowledge. Sometimes you gotta leave people behind, I suppose. Ironic connection between the epistemological stance and the title of the short story.

you a story you're gonna need to deal with that story, you gonna to come up with your own interpretation of that story. 83. Bruno: Right. 84. Me: What did, what, it seems to me that during a program like that what you should do is argue and the teacher should get close to you and kind of like we are now 85. Bruno: Yeah 86. Me: (Bell rings) Kind of like there should be back and forth like this. 87. Bruno: Yeah, argue the way like you would um in a room politics you you vote and then you're goin' back and forth you should be like head to head 88. Me: And that way when you read the story you've got that argument going on in your head that it's ok I'm goin to go back and forth here 89. Bruno: Yeah. 90. Me: and and and it seemed to me like there there was you're you're right they wanted to get to the next and to the next and to the next, but how does that help for the CAPT when when when the it's a simple test in how to take it, what's hard to have the story land on your desk and then have to have that argument in your head. 91. Bruno: Yup 92. Me: It seems to me if you're going to have that argument in your head you gotta have it in the classroom over and over and over. 93. Bruno: Mmm hmmm. 94. Me: And so what concerned me was that I didn't hear any arguments, I heard	Physical proximity. Connection with the ill structured issues in the political world. A "head to head" construction of knowledge.

95. Bruno: It felt like the kids didn't want to argue about it, or they argue a little about it and it stopped.	
96. Me: Right.	
97. Bruno: That's what it felt like (pause). That's what it felt like.	I cannot argue that I have not led him to this opinion.
98. Me: Yeah.	
99. Bruno: And I felt like the teacher just wanted to move on.	
100. Me: Right.	
101. Bruno: She just wanted teach and know that you get it and understand and show you strategies and all that	Strategies.
102. Me: But what if what if there is no understanding it, what if you understand a story because you've talked about it but your understanding is very different	
103. Bruno: Yeah.	
104. Me: still, and what's important is having that conversation, having that discussion and argument	
105. Bruno: Yup.	
106. Me: I mean we're having an argument right now about the Saturday Academy.	
107. Bruno: Yeah.	
108. Me: I don't know what you're gonna think about the academy or me when you leave, I don't know what I'm gonna think about you or the academy when you leave, but what I know is that I'm gonna be thinking about it.	
109. Bruno: Yup.	
110. Me: And	
111. Bruno: Going over it in your head	Bruno completes my thought.

(pointing to his head). 112. Me: That's right, exactly, and when I look at a program, another program, I'll be thinking about what you've said and I'll be thinking about how we talked to each other (Bruno has been nodding and saying "Yup" intermittently.) So this conversation is changing the way I I would approach looking at a program, the same way that this conversation would change the way you're looking at a story if we were talking about a story. Do you know what I'm saying? 113. Bruno: Right. Yup. (Nods.) 114. Me: So I was very concerned that I didn't hear those the the ac the academic fighting going on 115. Bruno: Yeah. 116. Me: So that so that you could have that academic fight in your head when you have a story land, do you have arguments like that in in your English class? 117. Bruno: Well, li like sometimes, yeah sometimes, like in my biology class now it doesn't have anything to do with English or history, science and math I have more argument on on those two subjects even though English and history the two main subjects than math and science but I think I have more arguments in math and science than English and history. 118. Me: Really! 119. Bruno: Yeah. 120. Me: That's interesting. (16:41) 121. Bruno: I think if you don't have a a good teacher that don't understand about arguing, you 're not gonna have a lot of argument.	I think I have established the discursive context for this conversation. I am attempting now to gather hints regarding the similarity between Bruno's experience in the Saturday Academy and his experiences in his regular English class. Bruno experiences discourse in his biology and math classes, not English or history. At first I found this surprising. Wow. True.

122. Me: But there was no argument.	
123. Bruno: No. No.	
124. Me: So how do you feel about that?	
125. Bruno: I felt like she kinda well the teachers kinda left us on our own to find out what's going on, in the story there, in the section, I think she kinda left us out at that part, but the rest of the part she did ok.	So the more students are told what to think the more they are "left on their own" to figure out what they think. Paradoxical, funny, ironic, and sad.
126. Me: Yeah, but here I'm gonna challenge you again, what did you learn that you actually sat down at the CAPT, when you took the test and you said wow, I really needed to know that?	Loyal and protective.
127. Bruno: To read to read the long stories first, well, read the questions first and then read the stories after don't do the multiple choice before the short answer that's what I really like about it and I I really think that part really helped.	"Read the questions first."
128. Me: Hey, let's talk about the short story part of the test. The short story, so so not the one where you gotta read and answer the multiple choice but the ones where you gotta read the short story and then answer the four or five questions.	
129. Bruno: Yup.	
130. Me: How about that? In reading that story what was going through your head about the Saturday Academy saying this is I'm glad I learned that (emphatic) in the Saturday Academy because now I can do this better?	
131. Bruno: Yeah 'cause you know what you have to you know what you gotta do (pause) you practice it in Saturday Academy	
132. Me: Like what? Do you have a specific?	
133. Bruno: Like you read you read you read	

the stories and then you gotta really (touching his temples with his fingers) have it, you gotta understand it, you gotta understand it before you start answering the questions. 134. Me: Ok. 135. Bruno: Yeah. So that's what you have you have to really do understand the story then go about reading another questions reading another question over again and then try skimming skimming through the story again (emphatic) and see what you have if it's right or not. (18:51)	"You gotta understand it." What if your understanding comes from the act of writing? Skim.

Interview with Shelly and Sophie

Transcript	My Notes
1. Sophie: In terms of what you were saying, I mean I think that (pause) you know like there's some things that we need to give them the knowledge of, you know like what plot is, what you know like analyzing that stuff, but I think um you know our focus which you know kinda goes along with what you're saying is that from there then it's like up to them to kind of make their own, you know instead of telling them what the story meant (rising intonation) they have to interpret it and then they got to hear what other people said, and then we we showed them, so it's kind of like the reverse of what you we're saying (rising intonation), you know that that is what you like (emphatic) to happen because I mean that's not really what we, we don't want them to think like we think.	“give them knowledge” Literary terms: plot, analyzing. interpret Consider other interpretations. “we showed them” Ok. But do you want them to think what (emphasis) you think?
2. Me: No.	
3. Sophie: You know, so	
4. Shelly: We did do it in the reverse because we didn't show them samples until after they had done it	I am not so sure this is accurate.
5. Sophie: Well depending on the time too.	Modification of prior statement. Time.
6. * * *	Rapid learning.
7. Shelly: But I mean I do think you need to give them something. When they came in I think that (pause) they saw CAPT testing as, they didn't even know what it was, what it was looking for, what they were supposed to do. They didn't really have that much of an understanding about what was going to happen with this CAPT test when they sat there for, you know, seventy minutes for like the Response to Literature, and I think after we went through the questions	Knowledge acquisition as giving. Importance of test preparation— understanding the structure and requirements of the test.

and looked at what the questions were looking for and what that meant they were doing I think they started to understand that a little bit more and they felt more, I mean	The anthropomorphic test.
8. Sophie: Comfortable with it	
9. Shelly Yeah, that class two, once they figured out what it was they were kind of like “Oh I get it” and then they’d expand on it, remember class two, the ones that had all different (pause) discussions and stuff.	This was the most socially interactive class.
10. Me: Yeah, that’s the class I really started to focus on.	
11. Shelly: Because they verbalized a lot more	
12. Me: Yeah	
13. Shelly: About what they were (pause) go about what was going on in their mind.	
14. Me: Yeah. I agree.	
15. * * *	
16. Me: The role of discourse in the Saturday Academy, did that significantly differ from the role of discourse in the way you teach your regular English classes, because of the intent with just getting the kids comfortable with the test, because the kids were effusive, remember that? At the end of the program they just felt so confident about their ability to go out and and know what was going to be asked from them on the test, um, that that was a huge success.	
17. Shelly: I think given the size of the class it was more dramatic. I think in like in my regular classes you get that with some of the kids but it doesn’t seem as	Given the small class size, Shelly perceived more drama than she does in her regular English class.
18. Sophie: I think all of them know they’re in the same boat too	What is the assumption? Was Bruno correct in his implicit fear that he had been identified as a failure?

19. Shelly: Yeah that was the other thing, they all felt this comradery with the rest of them.	What was that comradery based upon?
20. Me: Did you use discourse the same way in the Saturday Academy conversations, arguments that you do in your own classroom?	I pursue explicitly and with more courage the question I had intended to ask.
21. Shelly: (Nodding) Yeah	Same pedagogy. So this was a familiar environment for the students.
22. Sophie: We don't go as in-depth in ninth grade, I don't (pointing to Shelly) she does.	
23. Shelly: I did some of it and then I had some of those students from Saturday Academy in my classes so then they were more likely to (pause)	Prior knowledge of students.
24. Sophie: Apply themselves.	
25. Shelly: Yeah, and jump out with things and then you know it got more people talking and so, but it's, the style was the same.	Same style. Similar styles.
26. Sophie: Luckily I think we both have very similar styles so	What exactly is the same about their teaching styles?
27. Shelly: (Amid laughter) That's what all the students tell me.	
28. Me: (I ask them if they have any comments about how they use discourse.)	
29. Sophie: I think minus a few discipline problems they got where we, of course you know we'd like always want it to be better but I think they got to a point where they did finally understand how to discuss literature. You know, I don't say to them, my kids and what we do in ninth grade, you know pretend like this is a movie and go through, you know what I mean, I feel like we kind of (pause) you know baby it a little bit in the beginning just to get them used to it and to feel	Discipline problems. Knowledge acquisition as a destination. What evidence is there to support this perception? Evaluation of movie discussions. Students as underdeveloped, immature. "it"? Literary discourse? Like birds from a nest? Like a child into

comfortable so then we can kinda throw them in, see (?)	water?
30. Shelly: By the end (?) the very short story	
31. Sophie: Yeah.	
32. Shelly: That you brought in. They, I mean, they had a lot to say and they all came up with you know coming up with themes	Perception of "Bedtime Story" class.
33. Sophie: Right.	
34. Shelly: They were, I think they came leagues away from where they were when they walked in on that first day. And I think they were able to talk it out more (rising intonation) than in the beginning (rising intonation).	I am not disagreeing with Shelly's perception, I just do not know what empirical evidence she is basing these perceptions upon. Where is the evidence of anyone "talking it out"?
35. Sophie: And use the correct terms.	Literary terms.
36. Shelly: Yeah.	
37. Sophie: Literary terms	
38. Shelly: Definitely.	
39. * * *	
40. Me: (I question the possible consequences of the students not passing the CAPT.) What happens if they end the program thinking, "Wow, I guess I was stupid after all"?	
41. Sophie: Oh, if they don't do well you mean?	
42. Me: Yeah, yeah.	
43. Sophie: That would be really disappointing	
44. Me: Yeah	
45. Sophie: Well because I think that's the you know I'll say this a few times to them, you know during the program and	But what if these students are made comfortable? Will they pass? Aren't the implications much more significant than this?

then also to my other students, it's honestly just getting comfortable, you know, don't psyche yourself out, that's like the biggest thing about the test, I know because clearly (smiling and laughing a little) I'm not really good with tests. But (emphatically) if you come into my classroom and see me teach I think that you know you'll see that I'm doing something, but um, yeah I think that it's just you kinda they psyche themselves out and that's the biggest part of it 46. Shelly: The other thing is they're they're going to do a lot better than they would've if they hadn't gone 47. Me: Yeah 48. Shelly: I mean if they had just walked in there 49. Sophie: Even if they don't end up 50. Shelly: you know? 51. Sophie: getting a grade, yeah 52. Shelly: Even if they, I mean even if they just have a low proficient you know or whatever it is that we need for graduation, I think it's a lot better than they would have had (pause) if they didn't do it at all. 53. Me: Yeah 54. Shelly: Just knowing the test. 55. (Sophie asks for my recommendations for next year. I qualify with sincerity any recommendation I might make.) 56. Sophie: We don't get tons of feedback. 57. Me: There weren't a lot of kids talking to other kids, about the literature, there wasn't a lot of breaking up into groups, you guys were very, very teacher-	Doesn't this let us say, "Well, it was his fault, he psyched himself out. I told him not to. He has the skills he needs to pass. I know because I taught him those skills"? Personal identification with the students. I don't disagree, but how do you know? And what else happened in the Saturday Academy? Knowledge of the assessment tool. This is true at EMA. I am curious about how they will respond to this transcript.

centered in teaching the class, and I didn't know if that was because of the program or because that's just the way you teach, and that's fine too. 58. Shelly: I think that part of it, we've tried to do that in other years, do a little bit more group work, but I think part of it is the time that you get. 59. Me: Well I didn't know how much of a difference that was making. 60. Shelly: Because we only have, we have fifty minutes, but that's fifty minutes if you got exactly by the time that's on the schedule, which it never is because kids would wander in, or um, you know you'd have to, even just passing out the folders and things you'd lose five minutes or so, so I mean, that is part of it. 61. Me: And there's no, there's no way you can carry over from class to class 62. Shelly: Yeah, it's very structured 63. Me: There's too much time 64. Shelly: as far as the time um 65. Me: You'd have to reread the story for, I mean the kids would need to sit down and reread the story if you're going to carry over anything. That was very hard. 66. Shelly: I mean the time this year was harder too because it was broken up 67. Me: Yeah. 68. Shelly: And maybe if they were back to back more, like next year I know we mentioned that, it might be easier to do, or if we even had other stories, like 69. Sophie: If we had what? 70. Shelly: Other stories, like the one that you had that was really short, where you could do that and then break them up and	But why would you use group work? What would be the benefit? Time. Perception of students. Time.

let them do that.	
71. Me: Yeah.	
72. Shelly: But having a, a source of stories too that are short enough for them to do, quickly (rising intonation) and then practice on their own.	
73. * * *	
74. Shelly: (After a conversation about how they might be able to be less teacher-centered.) And the other thing is some of the kids were like Marcus who came in because he needed a credit but got kicked out of every single class.	Perception of Marcus's motivation. But this wasn't the purpose of the class.
75. Me: Yeah.	
76. Shelly: You know he got kicked out of history, he got kicked out of our class, he got kicked out of science	Marcus and discipline.
77. Sophie: Did he get a credit for it?	
78. Shelly: I'm pretty sure he did.	
79. Sophie: Which is (?)	
80. Me: He did?	
81. Shelly: I mean you have you have that, because he was there 'til the end.	
82. Me: He was, he was tough.	
83. Shelly: and that wouldn't have happened in other years, the first year it started those kids were (emphatic hand gesture) done after the first time.	I wonder how exactly Shelly would define and describe "those kids."
84. Me: But that second period was tough too.	This was my perception as I watched and before I transcribed the classes.
85. Shelly: They well they	
86. Me: I I followed them to science and it was, I don't, I I woulda lost my mind.	
87. Sophie: In civics they gave her a really	

(emphatic) hard time too. 88. Me: They just did not follow direction, they could not follow step by step directions in science they were making a sundial and it was chaos. 89. Sophie: They they have a hard time unless it is about them (emphatic). 90. Me: Yeah (laugh). 91. Sophie: They, they're very you know, like who's the girl that um (pause) that had started crying, not Anna 92. Me: Yeah, what was her name? 93. Shelly: Marianna? 94. Sophie: Not Marianna. 95. Me: It was the blond. 96. Shelly: Oh, Hannah. 97. Sophie: Yeah. 98. Me: Hannah, yeah. 99. Sophie: Hannah I saw a few days ago, "Why didn't you tell me?" I'm like, "Why didn't I tell you what?" "That you were pregnant when you were teaching us." And I said, "Is it your business? [I laugh] I didn't realize I had to tell you." 100. Me: Yeah, they wanted to personalize everything. 101. Sophie: You know I mean they like yeah like they 102. Shelly: Yeah. 103. Sophie: And that's part of the problem is that, I don't know if it's like, they need therapy and then they would be able to pay attention more (rising intonation) 104. Me: Yeah.	This is what I saw. Marianna and Anna were tough in science class the day I sat in. Perception of the students. I wonder if this distinguishes them from any of us. Rejection of personal connection. Recognition of greater needs.

105. Sophie: Um, or what, I mean maybe I know that for for some of my students maybe we could do this for a kid like that, if I have a student who comes in this year and who I can tell is like, you know, totally not where they need to be, in class focused, um, I'll say sit down and write for five minutes and then they're fine for the rest of the class, but they get to get out whatever they need to and, whatever, but um, you know, someone like Hannah needed therapy I think more than 106. Me: Marianna got expelled. 107. Shelly: She did? 108. Sophie: I've seen her at the, um, library being tutored. 109. Me: I was shocked about that. 110. Sophie: She was a sweet kid you know she was a sweet kid. 111. Me: Yeah. 112. Sophie: She had good ideas. 113. Me: Something must have 114. Shelly: I think they could (pause) I mean outside of that class, I know a couple teachers who have them in their two levels and I know she was bad (emphatic). 115. Me: Well Marianna and Anna together were just you couldn't, in science that I saw you couldn't control them. 116. Sophie: Mmm, I had Anna before so (?) 117. Shelly: See I thought they were, I thought in ours they seemed, they seemed ok together. 118. Me: Yeah. 119. Shelly: And even like um Bruno was he	Academic and emotional preparedness as a place. Shelly and Bruno.

Interview with Anna

Transcript	My Notes
1. Me: (19:58. Reading from question number eight from the Marlene Schommer-Akins instrument) “The ability to learn is innate.” That means it’s born with you, it’s part of, it’s not something you learn, you don’t learn how to learn, you know how to learn.	
2. Anna: Um (long pause, scrunches her face and purses her lips.) Hmm. Uhm. (Continued pause.) Well you’re not born knowing how to learn. You just go to school and you learn how to learn. So would that be, like a disagreement? Because you’re not born with (pause) any ability learning skills, because you’re still a a baby (laughs, as if stating the obvious) when you’re born so wouldn’t really know, you’re not born with it, so I would probably say like a like a two.	Anna’s answer indicates a novice’s understanding of metacognition. So the purpose of school is to make one capable of and perhaps adept at learning. But Anna must understand that babies learn. I wish I had asked her about this. I am not sure her spoken words are revealing her understanding.
3. * * *	
4. Me: (21:30) “Successful students understand things quickly.”	It becomes apparent that Anna does not consider herself to be a “successful student.”
5. Anna: Um, a a four.	Agrees. Learning is done quickly by successful students.
6. Me: (Number eleven) “A good teacher’s job is to keep his students from wandering from the right track.”	
7. Anna: From the right track?	Anna is understandably confused by the syntax of this question.
8. Me: Huh.	
9. Anna: That’s like that’s a one (strongly disagree).	
10. Me: (Laughing) Why, why is that, because I think you reacted to the same thing I did.	
11. Anna: (Smiling) I mean like the	

teachers shouldn't just let you, like, my biology teacher, she said no one in, no one in this class should fail (emphatic pause) and that is the only class I kept my grade, like class and English is the only class I kept my grade at not lower than a B+ or B-. 12. Me: How come? Why, why do you think? 13. Anna: Because she keeps on telling you that, I mean, it's Miss Langley, like she's a good teacher 14. Me: Oh, I love her. 15. Anna: Yeah 16. Me: Yeah, she's wonderful. 17. Anna: she's so nice. 18. Me: She's great. 19. Anna: Yeah and, and her, like today I was like, I've been having like, not a good weekend and there's just just things in my head and 20. Me: Are you ok? 21. Anna: Um (pause) yeah I'm trying to (pause) get through it but (? 22:59) gonna be a little painful but, af, you know that's life, you gotta work through it, some things, unwanted or wanted. 22. Me: Are you sure you're all right? 23. Anna: (Lightly—in a higher octave) Yeah. 24. Me: (Softly) All right. 25. Anna: But, um, she and I I wasn't try I didn't feeling like doing any (emphatic) work today and we're taking notes and I just said to her I I I don't want to do 'em, and she said well how about you do them right now because you (hesitates) and	Personal connection. Personal problems.

you (?) because I said I want to copy them from my friend, like the one I was sitting next to (rising intonation) um and she said well you why don't you do them right now, as a class work, like everybody else did it, so I said well you know that's a good point because, and that's that's (gaining emphasis) one way that she kept me on the right track because if I like I don't think I would have even copied them down because I was just decided not to listen but then I realized that like once you write something, like once you write notes, you it gets through your head once so when you read over it you remember Oh yeah I remember when I wrote that, so 26. Me: Yeah, it's true. 27. Anna: Yeah it is, like for a teacher to, uh, a good teacher's job is to keep the students on the right track. 28. Me: So that would be a strongly agree then. A good teacher's job is to keep the student his students from from (emphasis) wandering from the right track. 29. Anna: Isn't that supposed to be (pause) 30. Me: So you agree with that. A good teacher keeps students from wandering off the right track. Right? 31. Anna: (Her face reveals continued confusion.) Isn't it supposed to be that the the student the teacher's job is to keep the student from being on the right track? 32. Me: No. From going off the right track. 33. Anna: Oh. Oh that's a strongly agreement. 34. Me: Ok (24:29). 35. * * *	Copy. Aware of her own metacognitive processes.

36. Me: (Number 15: 25:33) “The most successful people have discovered how to improve their ability to learn.” Their ability to learn. The most successful people have discovered how to improve their ability to learn. 37. Anna: Well there really isn’t, um, a discovery on how to improve your ability to learn, as long as you just (pause) pay attention in class and (pause) just (pause) not go off the right track, so (pause) and and not only successful people know how to improve their ability to learn, it’s just anybody that someone’s that off the right track could simply just listen to a friend or a teacher, um, getting advice as you (hesitates) should start paying attention in class because it’s, um, it’s the right thing to do. 38. Me: I hear what you’re saying. You’re saying that anybody, it doesn’t have to be the most successful people 39. Anna: Yeah 40. Me: it could be anybody 41. Anna: Yeah 42. Me: can benefit from that. 43. Anna: Yeah. (26:38) 44. Me: (Number 16: 26:38) “Things are simpler than most professors [or teachers] would have you believe.” Things are simpler (emphasis) than most teachers would have you believe. 45. Anna: Um. 46. Me: Things are not as complicated as teachers make them out to be. 47. Anna: Mmmm. I don’t completely agree with that unless the teacher really confuses you with, with the thing they’re trying to tell you. (I laugh.) Because that has happened to me ah my support	Is this a missed opportunity? Pay attention. Copy. So anyone can improve their ability to learn. Moral implication: religious overlay.

teacher always used to confuse you when I asked for help so I just thought I'd do it myself. (27:12) 48. * * * 49. Me: (Number 22: 30:40) "You never know what a book means unless you know the intent of the author." 50. Anna: What does the last thing mean, like the intent of the author? 51. Me: What the author intended (emphasis) when the author wrote au the book, the purpose that the author was writing (pause) the, um, when the author sat down and wrote (emphasis) what did she want her audience to get from the story. (Pause) Do we have to know the intent of author in order to know what the story means? 52. Anna: Well we don't have (emphasis) to but by reading the book you understand what the book is about and you, in a way it gives you the idea of why the author (pause) might have wrote the book. 53. Me: What if you were to read a letter that the author wrote that stated her intent, and it differed from what you (emphasis) thought her intent was. 54. Anna: That would have been a different, um (pause) 55. Me: Would that be ok? Or are you wrong, in that case? 56. Anna: Not necessarily because you have your own, um, thought of the book (pause) so it doesn't always have to be what the author, like you can take things, like you can um, take things sometimes in a different way than what someone else wants you (pause) take 'em. 57. Me: And that's ok. 58. Anna: (Pause) Well that, hmmm	Hints at a transactional belief in literary analysis. Even the author's stated intent does not necessarily prove your interpretation wrong.

stupid or something? And I'm like 72. Me: Huh. Who said that? 73. Anna: a person that doesn't really do anything in school (rising intonation) and I said ok well look at you 74. Me: Yeah 75. Anna: at least I'm trying to learn and understand something that I don't understand like, so, that's something I do (slouching back) I really like I could care less what anybody else says about my (emphasis) learning, because if I don't understand something I will do everything possible to do to get it right so then I won't I will know it for later on and sit at a test I won't be like (stares stupidly slack-jawed and round-eyed into distant space, imitating the unknowing, unquestioning student) so what was this about? You know? 76. Me: Hey, you know keep doing that too is my advice to you 77. Anna: Yeah. 78. Me: don't let anybody stop you from doing that. Especially as you go on to college and everything. 79. Anna: Mmm hmmm (her eyes shift to her left). 80. Me: Keep speaking up, don't be shy. (37:19) 81. * * * 82. Me: (Number 31: 37:40) "Being a good student generally involves memorizing facts." 83. Anna: Mmmm. That's not true, really. Being a good student means that you put all your effort in being a good student. (37:50)	The good student is the student who works hard.

84. * * * 85. Anna: (39:35: responding to question 34: “Truth is unchanging”) I mean truth like at one point like say back in like 1800’s what was true back then is definitely changed from what it has been so truth is (emphatic) changing. (39:44) 86. * * * 87. Anna: (41:13: responding to question 35 and quoting question number 32) Just like saying, um, wisdom is not knowing the answers but knowing how to find the answers. Like using your knowledge to answer the question or find the answers. 88. * * * 89. Me: (41:39: Number 36) “Whenever I encounter a difficult problem in life, I consult with my parents.” 90. Anna: Ummmm, I (emphasis) would have to (takes a quick sideways glance at me, to her right) dis (emphasis) agree with that. Because me personally I don’t go to my parents (looks at me again). 91. Me: What’s the point of that question do you think? (Pause) I wonder what that’s getting at. 92. Anna: Like I would think that they’re asking that if you find a problem in your life that like a difficult problem in your life that (shrugs) you know you go and you talk to your parents about it, but not many students do that nowadays because (pause) they think that their parents don’t understand what they mean, and they think that they’re gonna give them, or they will get like the parents will give them what’s best for them but they won’t think it is because they’re teenagers and they’re their parents, so they go and they go and talk with friends and see what they think, or even go to counselors if anything (pause)	Recognition that truth and knowledge is not permanent. The structure of knowledge. Rejects connection with her parents.

93. Me: Huh. 94. Anna: Like well it's like that with me because I barely get to see my parents because they work, they leave for work at twelve and they come back around ten at night so I don't get to see them really, I just get to see them like on Mondays and Tuesdays. 95. Me: Where are they working? 96. Anna: At the casino. (Long pause. Anna strokes her head) It's hard like that I mean me and my mom have grown apart and my brother went off to college and I don't even talk to him and then my dad just never talks to me, really, like we just 97. Me: Why? 98. Anna: It's just that he it seems like he doesn't know the right thing to say to me, because I might take it the wrong way because, I mean, out of everybody in the family I like I mean me my mom my brother my father I look at my dad the most, and I get along with my dad better, than my mom, (pause, draws in her lips) and I get what I want, I'm his little girl, I mean, I get what I want, really (laughs) If I tell him drive me here please (imitates herself pleading) he would just grab the car get in and drive me, but my mom tries to stop him from doing that because she thinks that he's spoiling me like she thinks that he's spoiling me that but it's just that like, I mean when they're home I I don't like staying home really because it's hard for me to (pause) get like I mean it's not hard for me to get used to talking to them, because I can talk to them at any point, but it's just that I have so much pressure from moving from a different continent (emphasis. I laugh) basically it's just it has been a big pressure on me and I was talking about it to my classmates in class when I was doing my presentation and I said that I've changed totally like dramatically I've changed, I	Anna's relationship with her parents. Introduction to Anna's family. Anna and her father.

was I (pause) I was my mom's little girl but now I'm just like my own person, and I get, like I get aggravated over the littlest thing.	
99. Me: Hey, what language do you speak at home?	
100. Anna: I speak Bulgarian to my parents but	
101. Me: Do your parents speak English?	
102. Anna: They do but not that much.	
103. Me: Really?	
104. Anna: Yeah.	
105. Me: Wow. I'm just astounded by your English.	
106. Anna: Yeah, but I talk to, I, I um, uh like I uh could be a secretary if I grow up. Like I'll be good with phones because I talk on the phone all the time. I don't	
107. Me: You should think about teaching.	
108. Anna: I don't ever (emphasis) get off the phone. It's just (pause)	
109. Me: Teaching would	
110. Anna: my best friend.	
111. Me: give you the opportunity to talk a lot.	
112. Anna: (Laughing) Yeah (laughing) I won't give my students the time to talk. (45:26)	
113. * * *	
114. Me: (47:28) Did [the program] give you what you need to know?	
115. Anna: Yeah, I mean I already knew because I mean back in Bulgaria we we wrote essays in fifth grade and just like a	

Change.

Humorous perceptions of being a secretary.

Humor.

gigantic test and everything so that was a pressure for me, so when I came here I, in a way I knew how to, uh I mean if I have a good topic I can write really well. 116. Me: Yeah. 117. Anna: And that, and um just going to the Saturday Academy like my my math (rising intonation) it was just something I already have known since like sixth grade, or n ninth grade or whatever, I mean there's just things that like the teachers went over to just refresh your mind because of the um, because of the (pause) the CAPT test and in English and history it was, it helped me get used to it, and be more free to write about something, like it helped me get used to it so I mean when we have to I mean when we actually have the CAPT for um the two the two big essays and the English the four questions, I did very I think I did very well because (pause) like I like for the four answers (rising intonation) like we write about a page like I wrote over into the bottom and like I just write a little line in the bottom too. 118. Me: Wow. 119. Anna: So like I had a lot to say about something because it, like, I got to um, like, I forgot what the word is, I guess I got to experience what it looked looks like and it helped me understand what they're looking for, because the teacher, they went over and showed you what's bet like what's a good, like what a good answer to a question would be and how sh you should re how you should write it and don't rewrite the question and just simple things like that, like just start and just try to talk and elaborate the uh the question as much as possible, so you can, so the the person that's grading your reading (rising intonation) you can prove to them you understand the question story because you elaborate enough that you prove to them that you understand it and (pause) yeah. And then in science it	Presence of the omnipotent third person.

was just all (draws in a deep breath) I mean in science we had a lot of fun (laughs) we had a lot of fun (laughing) and just (laughs) I mean it would be always an activities and it's like people people were saying oh I think I'm gonna fail because we're not learning anything, I mean we did, um, we did (rolls her eyes up) um, like, I don't know how to say it, um, (pause) experiments that help you understand, I mean to have, do an experiment about something you try to learn about helps you understand it a lot better, because you actually get to see and experience it, in one way or another, like, like we did, in all the other ones (softly fades away). (50:50). 120. Me: Hey, if you had to understand a story, you're given kind of a complex story, and you're trying to figure it out (pause) in order to be able to do that with other stories later on, you know, CAPT preparations, giving you stories so you can see how to analyze them and then take the test and and and do the same thing on the test, would you rather talk with your classmates or with the teacher? 121. Anna: If I have to talk, if I have to talk about a story? 122. Me: Yeah, a story. 123. Anna: I (elongated) would (pause) I would do both (pause) just because like I would like say if I talked to a student (rising intonation) they might think that I'm just trying to be all stuck up and Oh I know everything (I laugh) you know, but, um, a teacher would tell you, um, I'm happy with the answer you have I can understand that you understand what we're talking about and the topic and that you have an idea of what to say, like the teacher wouldn't uh would understand you (pause) I think that she would understand you a lot more than what a student would, because they, like many students (rising intonation) don't th, like not many but I'm not gonna say most of	Social ramifications of academic engagement. Need for the teacher.

them, not half but less than half of them they don't even care about school, they just go just to attend, and just not drop out and just get a diploma and get out of high school, and um, they wouldn't even care what you have to say. 124. Me: Right, I hear you. 125. Anna: So if you're sitting in a group of say three people or four people and you try to talk to them, only probably like one person would listen to you and actually uh try to help, like try to understand you and the others would just (imitating the uninterested student) oh you know my friend called me last night and we're talking on the phone and (I laugh) yeah. 126. Me: Was there anybody in that class you would have spoken to about a story, instead of speaking with the teacher? The you would have preferred (emphasis) to have talked to? 127. Anna: Um I would have spoke with Marianna. 128. Me: More. 129. Anna: Yup. And, I believe Isabel was in m our class for a little bit but then she got switched out because I don't I don't even know why her and Tanya got switched out, but Marianna is a really it's a she's a really good person to have a conversation with. 130. Me: She seemed that way. 131. Anna: Yeah and she understands you, like she might look (pause) like under like out on the street she might look like she's a bad like all like she's a fighter (rising intonation). 132. Me: I never got that impression, just from the classroom. 133. Anna: Yeah but in a classroom she uh	Perceptions of her own classmates. I agree with this observation. A grim motivation. Perceptions of her classmates. Anna and Marianna. Anna silently notices and questions disciplinary moves. Marianna's appearance belies her academic prowess.

she like proves to teachers and her classmates that she's a totally different person in class because she is she cares about her education she wants to get her education and not just (pause) not care about it, like. 134. Me: Is she gonna be ok? 135. Anna: Um, I think so, I saw her at my friend's sweet sixteen sweet well not sweet sixteen seventeenth birthday party, um that we went to, and I saw her there and I was like oh my God, what, like what happened to you? Why aren't you in school? She said well I got expelled. 136. Me: Was she sad? 137. Anna: Yes, she misses school a lot. (54:00) 138. Me: Hey, do you know in the program there was almost no discussion between students? 139. Anna: Yes I yeah. 140. Me: There was no small group work. Do you know the teacher didn't work with you one on one at all? 141. Anna: (After I express my respect for both teachers of the academy) Um, the teachers seemed to have one goal, to go over all the work and just explain to you what you should know for the CAPT, and not exactly to help you understand very well. 142. Me: Isn't that important? 143. Anna: Yeah, that that is very important and to me it was, it was ok for me because I already, in a way I was already experiencing some of that because in my English class we did um stories like that we answered in my history class we did a test, that was very disappointing because my teacher said that it was a horrible essay but when I let Mr. D. read it he	Marianna's motivation. This is either a leading of the witness or a granting of permission. Anna's perception of the teaching. Anna's writing ability as assessed by her

said it was a great essay. 144. Me: Get used to that. It happens. 145. Anna: Yeah, I'm like (I laugh) I was so mad (Anna laughs) that was like I wrote so much about this essay that he was going to sit here and tell me that it's a bad essay, I was like, ok, I I understand you have a different opinion, well that's ok (I laugh) just like people have different opinions. 146. Me: Yeah, every time I hand in a paper I would be it's anywhere between an A and an F, I don't know 147. Anna: Yeah, I mean yeah, some might think it's a great paper, some might just be like, well . . . you didn't word this right and this is wrong, there is a punctuation error and this and that and (pause) you're not talking about the topic, or talking you're slacking off the topic you're talking about something different, and that you but then you're just trying to show that you understand the story by giving another example of it or of the question or something (Anna becomes suddenly drained of energy—she slumps, looks down, and drops her arms on her desk). 148. Me: I found that to be important, that there was no one on one work with you. No one ever sat down with you. 149. Anna: Say next year we have the same program (rising intonation), I mean I can't attend anymore because I'm gonna be in eleventh grade, but I would suggest as in like, it's not like anyone's gonna listen to my to what I have to say but like I would it would be a lot helpful if the teacher's actually (pause) don't go I mean they have a certain schedule you have to go through these materials, you don't always have to go through all of them as long as you make sure your students understand what you have to do, just not teaching them, like I thought I I	history teacher. Writing a lot is not enough, apparently. Confusion.

mean I think that the teachers thought that we're fast learners but not all of us were a fast learner. (57:10)	Interesting perception of what the teachers perceived.

Bibliography

A Nation at Risk [On-line]. Retrieved October 9, 2003, from

<http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/risk.html>

Academic Innovations [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from

<http://www.academicinnovations.com/report.html>

Achievement gap summary tables [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from

<http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/F55C28AB-3129-4904-B0DE-8B8157B53F12/0/sstables.pdf>

Anafara, V., Brown, K., & Mangione, T. (2002). Qualitative analysis on stage: Making the research process more public. Educational Researcher, 31, 28-38.

Applebee, A. (1996). Curriculum as conversation: Transforming traditions of teaching and learning. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Applebee, A., Langer, J., Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (2003). Discussion-based approaches to developing understanding: Classroom instruction and student performance in middle and high school English. American Education Research Journal, 40, 685-730.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). The dialogic imagination. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barnes, D. (1992). From communication to curriculum, 2nd Ed. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1987). The affective dimension of learning: Faculty-student relationships that enhance intellectual development. College Student Journal, 21, 46-58.

- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986).
Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind.
 New York: Basic Books.
- Berliner, D. C. & Biddle, B. J. (1995). The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud,
and the attack on America's public schools. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.
- Bleich, D. (1978). Subjective criticism. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins
 University Press.
- Bloome, D., Carter, S., Christian, B., Otto, S., & Stuart-Faris, N. (2005).
Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy
events: A microethnographic perspective. New Jersey: Lawrence
 Earlbaum.
- Brownlee, J., Purdie, N., & Boulton-Lewis, G. (2001). Changing epistemological
 beliefs in pre-service teacher education students. Teaching in Higher
Education, 6, 247-268.
- Bruer, J. (1999). Schools for thought: A science of learning in the classroom.
 Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Bruner, J. (1996). The culture of education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
 Press.
- Campbell, J. (1968/1949). The hero with a thousand faces, 2nd Ed. New York:
 Princeton University Press.
- Cazden, C. (2001). Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning
 (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Christoph, J. N., & Nystrand, M. (2001). Taking risks, negotiating relationships: One teacher's transition towards a dialogic classroom. (CELA Research Report No. 14003). Albany, NY: University at Albany, The National Research Center on English Learning & Achievement.
- Cohen, D. (1990). A revolution in one classroom: The case of Mrs. Oublier. Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12, 311-329.
- Connecticut State Department of Education. District Federal Report 2001-2002 pursuant to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Norwich Free Academy [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/der/schools/100_900/901_NFA_district.pdf
- Connecticut State Department of Education (2003). 149 Connecticut schools need to make more progress: Commissioner sees process as "opportunity for change" [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from <http://www.state.ct.us/sde/AYPNEWSRELEASE.pdf>
- Connecticut State Department of Education. District Reference Groups (DRG's), 2005-06 to Date. [On-line]. Retrieved June 2, 2007, from <http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/cedar/edfacts/drgs.htm>
- Connecticut State Department of Education. Division of Teaching and Learning (1998). Language arts curriculum framework [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/PDF/Curriculum/Curriculum_Root_Web_Folder/ctframe.pdf

Connecticut State Department of Education. Division of Teaching and Learning.

Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction. Connecticut Academic

Performance Test (CAPT) [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from

http://www.state.ct.us/sde/dtl/curriculum/currlang_publ_capt.htm

Cremin, L. (1961). The transformation of the school: Progressivism in American education. New York: Vintage Books.

Creswell, J. (1994). Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches. London: Sage.

Dalton, D. (Speaker). (2000). Great minds of the western intellectual tradition [Cassette Recording]. Chantilly, VA: The Teaching Company.

Dewey, J. (1997/1910). How we think. Mineola, N.Y.: Dover.

Donaldson, M. (1978). Children's minds. New York: Norton.

Eisner, E. W. (1994). Cognition and curriculum reconsidered (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Eisner, E. W. (1998). The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis. New York: Longman

Fitzgerald, J. & Cunningham, J. (2002). Mapping basic issues for identifying epistemological outlooks. In B. Hofer & P. Pintrich, P. (Eds.), Personal epistemology: The psychology of beliefs about knowledge and knowing (pp. 209-228). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Gee, J. (1999). Discourse Analysis: Theory and method. London: Routledge.

Geertz, C. (1983). Local knowledge. New York: Basic Books.

- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Hall, D., Wiener, R., & Carey, K. (2003). What new “AYP” information tells us about schools, states, and public education [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from <http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/4B9BF8DE-987A-4063-B750-6D67607E7205/0/NewAYP.pdf>
- Hammer, D. & Elby, A. (2002). On the form of a personal epistemology. In B. Hofer & P. Pintrich, P. (Eds.), Personal epistemology: The psychology of beliefs about knowledge and knowing (pp. 169-190). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Harry, B., Sturges, K., & Klinger, J. (2005). Mapping the process: An exemplar of Process and challenge in grounded theory analysis. Educational Researcher, 34, 3-13.
- Haycock, K. & Wiener, R. (April, 2003). Adequate yearly progress under NCLB. Paper prepared for the National Center on Education and the Economy Policy Forum. Implementing the No Child Left Behind Act, Washington, D.C. [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from <http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/F7F160C3-DE70-4F63-BF0C-2DC47911DA66/0/AYPUnderNCLB.pdf>
- Heath, S. B. (1983). Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hillocks, G., Jr. (2003). Fight back: Assessing the assessments. English Journal, 92, 63-70.

- Hofer, B. (2001). Personal epistemology research: Implications for learning and teaching. Journal of Education Psychology Review, 13, 353-383.
- Hofer, B. & Pintrich, P. (1997). The development of epistemological theories: Beliefs about knowledge and knowing and their relation to learning. Review of Educational Research, 67, 88-140.
- Hofer, B. & Pintrich, P. (Eds.). (2002). Personal epistemology: The psychology of beliefs about knowledge and knowing. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Hull, G. & Rose, M. (1989). Rethinking remediation: Toward a social-cognitive understanding of problematic reading and writing. (Tech. Rep. No. 19). Berkeley, CA: University of California, Center for the Study of Writing.
- Johnston, P., Woodside-Jiron, H., & Day, J. (2000). Teaching and learning literate epistemologies. Albany, NY: University at Albany, The National Research Center on English Learning & Achievement.
- Kane, R., Sandretto, S., & Heath, C. (2002). Telling half the story: A critical review of research on teaching beliefs and practices of university academics. Review of Educational Research, 72, 177-228.
- Kardash, C. & Howell, K. (2000). Effects of epistemological beliefs and topic-specific beliefs on undergraduates' cognitive and strategic processing of dual-positioning text. Journal of Educational Psychology, 92, 524-535.
- Kardash, C. & Scholes, R. (1996). Effects of preexisting beliefs, epistemological beliefs, and need for cognition on interpretation of controversial issues. Journal of Educational Psychology, 88, 260-271.

- Kardash, C. & Sinatra, G. (2003). Epistemological beliefs and dispositions: Are we measuring the same construct? Poster session presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (84th, Chicago, IL, April 21-25). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 479164)
- King, P. M. & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). Developing reflective judgment: Understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuhn, D. (1991). The skills of argument. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Langer, S. (1942). Philosophy in a new key: A study in the symbolism of reason, rite, and art (3rd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Levi-Strauss, C. (1997). Look, listen, read (Brian C. J. Singer, Trans.). New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1993).
- Linn, R. L., Baker, E. L., & Betebenner, D. W. (2002). Accountability systems: Implications of requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Educational Researcher, 31, 3-16.
- Louca, A., Elby, A., Hammer, D., & Kagey, T. (2004). Epistemological resources: Applying a new epistemological framework to science instruction. Educational Psychologist, 39, 57-68.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (1995). Designing qualitative research. London: Sage.
- Marshall, J. D., Smagorinsky, P., & Smith, M. (1995). The language of interpretation: Patterns of discourse in discussions of literature. (NCTE

Research Report No. 27). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

McCombs, B., Lauer, P., & Peralez, A. (1997). Researcher test manual for the learner-centered battery (grades 6-12 version). A set of self-assessment and reflection tools for middle and high school teachers. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Regional Educational Lab. (DRS No. ED 422 377)

McNamara, E. (2003, October 10). Local educators slam federal education act. The Day, pp. A1, A6.

Mehan, H. (1979). Learning lessons. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Meier, D. (2000). Will standards save public education? Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. NAEP Data. [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/tables/pdf/ltt1999/NTR31021.PDF>

National Center for Education Statistics. NAEP Data. [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/tables/pdf/ltt1999/NTR31031.PDF>

Neisser, U. (1976). Cognition and reality: Principles and implications of cognitive psychology. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Nystrand, M. & Gamoran, A. (1991). Instructional discourse, student engagement, and literature achievement. Research in the Teaching of English, 25, 261-290.

- Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., & Carbonaro, W. (1998). Towards an ecology of learning: The case of classroom discourse and its effects on writing in high school English and social studies. (CELA Research Report No. 11001). Albany, NY: SUNY-Albany, The National Research Center on English Learning & Achievement.
- Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., Kachur, R., & Prendergast, C. (1997). Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nystrand, M., Wu, L., Gamoran, A., Zeiser, S., & Long, D. (2001). Questions in time: Investigating the structure and dynamics of unfolding classroom discourse. The National Research Center on English Learning & Achievement. Albany, NY: University at Albany, National Research Center on English Learning & Achievement. [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from <http://cela.albany.edu/nystrand01-5/index.html>
- Patton, M. (1987). How to use qualitative methods in evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. (1990/1980). Qualitative evaluation and research methods, 2nd Ed. London: Sage.
- Perry, W. G., Jr. (1968). Patterns of development in thought and values of students in a liberal arts college: A validation of a scheme. Cambridge, MA: Bureau of Study Counsel, Harvard University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 024315)

- Rex, L. A. (2001). The remaking of a high school reader. Reading Research Quarterly, 36, 288-314.
- Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D. and Joseph, G. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research, 75, 365-416.
- Rose, L. C. & Gallup, A. M. (2000). The 32nd annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll [On-line]. Retrieved October 18, 2003, from <http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/kpol0009.htm>
- Rose, M. (1989). Lives on the boundary. New York: Penguin Books.
- Ryan, M. (1984). Monitoring text comprehension: Individual differences in epistemological standards. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 248-258.
- Schatzman, L. & Strauss, A. (1973). Field research: Strategies for a natural sociology. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Schommer, M. (1990). Effects of beliefs about the nature of knowledge on comprehension. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82, 498-504.
- Schommer, M. (1993). Epistemological development and academic performance among secondary students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 85, 406-411.
- Schommer, M. (1998). Schommer epistemological Questionnaire. Reproduced with permission from the British Journal of Educational Psychology, The British Psychological Society.

- Schommer-Aikins, M. (2002). An evolving theoretical framework for an epistemological belief system. In B. Hofer & P. Pintrich, P. (Eds.), Personal epistemology: The psychology of beliefs about knowledge and knowing (pp. 103-118). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Schommer-Aikins, M. (2004). Explaining the epistemological belief system: Introducing the embedded systemic model and coordinated research approach. Educational Psychologist, 39, 19-29.
- Schommer-Aikins, M., Mau, W, Brookhart, S., & Hutter, R. (2000). Understanding middle students' beliefs about knowledge and learning using multidimensional paradigm. The Journal of Educational Research, 94, 120-127.
- Schraw, G. & Olafson, L. (2002). Teachers' epistemological world views and educational practices. Issues in Education, 8, 99-148.
- Schraw, G., Olafson, L., Bendixen, L., & Klockow, J. (2001). Teachers' epistemological beliefs and classroom practices. [On-line]. Retrieved May 5, 2004, from <http://edtech.connect.msu.edu/Searchaera2002/viewproposaltext.asp?propID=2738>
- Sergi, T. (2003a). Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from <http://www.state.ct.us/sde/der/CTAYP.pdf>
- Sergi, T. (2003b). Connecticut Master Test Fall Assessment and No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Circular Letter: C-13. [On-line]. Retrieved October

16, 2003, from

http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/der/nclb/cletters/series_02-03_c-13.pdf

Spradley, J. (1980). Participant observation. Florida: Harcourt College Publishers.

Stone, D. (2002). Policy paradox: The art of political decision making (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: Norton.

Strategic School Profile 2001-2002. Norwich Free Academy [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from

<http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/der/ssp/dist0102/dist148.pdf>

The ABCs of “AYP”: Raising achievement for all students [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from <http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/9C974109-4A70-4F5E-A07F-6DC90D656F0F/0/ABCAYP.pdf>

The Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills. U.S. Department of Labor. June 1991. What work requires of schools: A SCANS report for America 2000 [On-line]. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from <http://wdr.doleta.gov/SCANS/whatwork/whatwork.html>

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J. (1998). Mind in action. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

White, B. (2000). Pre-service teachers’ epistemology viewed through perspectives on problematic classroom situations. Journal of Education for Teaching, 26, 279-305.

Windschitl, M. (2002). Framing constructivism in practice as the negotiation of dilemmas: An analysis of the conceptual, pedagogical, cultural, and political challenges facing teachers. Review of Educational Research, 72, 131-175.

Table 4.1

Day 1: Evidence of Institutional Contexts, Activated Epistemological Resources, and Technologization of Discourse

Transcript: Discursive Episodes	Institutional Context	Resources for Understanding the Sources of Knowledge					Evidence of Technologization					Resources for Understanding Epistemological Stances
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Turns 2-40: Teacher establishes initial context.	S	+					+					Student acceptance of a traditional school, teacher-centered context.
Turn 42-52: Context change.	T	+					+			+		Students remain compliant in the context of the Temple.
Turns 52-59: Context change: student questions.	G	+					+	+	+		+	Students do not challenge the presence of dominant 3 rd person.
Turns 61-65: Heterogeneous context.	S, T, G	+					+					Students sit passively.
Turns 68-: Context change.	S, Hpem	+			+		+			+		Students engage in group activity but never question the purpose.

Note. Institutional Contexts: F=Factory, T=Temple, S=School, G=Government; H=Home (pev+=prior experience validation; pev-=prior experience not validated; pem=prior experience manipulated). Resources for Understanding the Source of Knowledge: 1=propagated stuff; 2=free creation; 3=fabricated; 4=direct perception; 5=inherent. Technologization: 1=expert/teacher; 2=policing/"they"; 3=techniques/strategies; 4=personal experiences referenced for public ends; 5=standardization of discourse/CAPT.

Table 4.2

Day 2: Evidence of Institutional Contexts, Activated Epistemological Resources, and Technologization of Discourse

Transcript: Discursive Episodes	Institutional Context	Resources for Understanding the Sources of Knowledge					Evidence of Technologization					Resources for Understanding Epistemological Stances
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Turns 2-61: Teacher establishes initial context.	S, Hpev-	+										Students begin to challenge the teacher's authority.
Turn 62-78: Context change.	F, Hpem	+					+		+	+		Students see Shelly's compliance, and they are compliant.
Turns 78-169: Context change.	F, T, G, S	+					+	+	+	+	+	Students accept and begin to copy Shelly's epistemological stance.

Note. Institutional Contexts: F=Factory, T=Temple, S=School, G=Government; H=Home (pev+=prior experience validation; pev-=prior experience not validated; pem=prior experience manipulated). Resources for Understanding the Source of Knowledge: 1=propagated stuff; 2=free creation; 3=fabricated; 4=direct perception; 5=inherent. Technologization: 1=expert/teacher; 2=policing/"they"; 3=techniques/strategies; 4=personal experiences referenced for public ends; 5=standardization of discourse/CAPT.

Figure 4.1

The Three Cycles of Discursive Context Evolution