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What is This?
CULTURAL TENSIONS IN THE SCRIPTED CLASSROOM

The Value of the Subjugated Perspective

KRIS D. GUTIERREZ
JOANNE LARSON
BETSY KREUTER
University of California, Los Angeles

There have been many analyses of instruction in urban classrooms. This article, however, provides a more complex analysis of the construction of urban classroom life. Using ethnographic data, qualitative methods, and discourse analysis, we present a case study of how monologic instruction preserves the mutually exclusive social spaces created by students and teachers in one middle school. Through an analysis of moment-to-moment interaction between one marginalized Latina student and her teacher, we illustrate the value of the subjugated perspective in rethinking literacy instruction, teacher education, classroom-based research, and school reform. Finally, we argue that the persistence of monologic, monocultural, and monolithic instruction paralyzes both students and teachers and, thus, limits the potential for creating vital and rich classroom life.

Through all my experiences with people struggling to learn, the one thing that strikes me most is the ease with which we misperceive failed performance and the degree to which this misperception both reflects and reinforces the social order. Class and culture erect boundaries that hinder our vision—blind us to the logic of error and the everpresent stirring of language—and encourage the designation of otherness, difference, deficiency. And the longer I stay in education, the clearer it becomes to me that some of our basic orientations toward the teaching and testing of literacy contribute to our inability to see. To truly educate in America, then, to reach...
full sweep of our citizenry, we need to question received perception, shift continually from the standard lens.

—Mike Rose
*Lives on the Boundary*

The **standard lens** used to envision classroom life in American schools has not accounted for the various ways of knowing and doing, for the multiple experiences, perspectives, and literacies of urban classrooms. Instead this monolithic vision of what counts as learning reflects the socialization practices and dominant forms of caregiving of middle-class families (Gutierrez, Larson, & Kreuter, in press; Heath, 1983; Ochs, 1988; Rogoff, 1990). What helps sustain this vision are particular beliefs or folk knowledges about how people learn and how learning should be organized. However, these beliefs do not account for the varied yet effective ways learning is scaffolded in different communities or for how development is best understood as the relationship between what is learned and the interactional activity available to participants (Gonzalez et al., 1995 [this issue]; Rogoff, 1990, 1992).

In this article, we present a case study from a larger study\(^1\) of how classroom culture is constructed in an urban middle school in Los Angeles to illustrate how instruction is organized and how the social relationships constructed in a traditional urban classroom influence how learning—and specifically literacy learning—gets accomplished. We present these ethnographic data to help educators better understand the classroom and the curriculum as ever-changing sociocultural terrains and practices and to see the situated, provisional, open-ended, and relational nature of knowledge (Gutierrez, Kreuter, & Larson, 1994; Luke & Gore, 1992). We use discourse analysis of the participants’ conversations to see how particular classroom communities evolve and to illustrate how the schooling practices of an urban school serve to marginalize rather than accommodate the linguistic, social, and cultural capital of its diverse student population. In particular, we will illustrate how Nora, a Latina student, and Diane, her teacher, position themselves vis-à-vis one another in the various social spheres of the classroom and the consequences of their social interactions and practices.
Nora and Diane's story must be understood within the larger context of a traditional urban middle school located in a conservative, predominantly white, middle-class neighborhood in Los Angeles. The makeup of its student population has dramatically shifted over the past few decades. Although the school was once predominantly White and middle-class, its students are now mostly African American and Latino (80%). There have not been comparable changes in the school's teacher population. Ethnographic data including teacher, student, and administrator interviews and videotaped classroom observation data reveal that the school is at a critical transition point, experiencing tremendous conflict between maintaining social order—that is, ensuring the proper socialization of its new student clientele—and educating them. Incidents of violence and crime and, more often, the perceived potential violence among its very poor and urban student population heighten the importance of safety in this school community. Because the current school staff is not yet prepared to meet the needs of its diverse student population, there is a perceived need for absolute control—a perception that only serves to exacerbate racial tension and both students' and teachers' feelings of alienation and mistrust.

Interestingly, both its socialization and educational goals are addressed through a rigid system of control at various levels within the school. For example, an elaborate system of passes, time limits, and authorized signatures regulates the kind and amount of student interaction. New teachers like Diane receive administrative praise and peer approval for their quiet classrooms—undisputed evidence of their ability to control. Similarly, students, like those in Diane's classroom, are rewarded for their quiet behavior. In short, the social and spatial arrangements of the classroom organize instruction so that talk and interaction are not permitted. Thus, from a sociocultural perspective of learning (Cole, 1985; Moll, 1990; Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1962, 1978; Wertsch, 1991), participation in joint activity is so restricted that fundamental educational goals are subsumed and often subverted to ensure the control associated with "appropriate" socialization. This tension between controlling students and teaching students produces an educational institution that values social order over educational outcomes (McNeil, 1988)
rather than an institution that flourishes because of mutually informing and supportive social and educational processes and goals.

From our perspective, this tension should be the text for a curriculum as social practice: that is, a curriculum that is constitutive of multiple identities, discourses, roles, and their multiple forms of representation. In this article, we propose that schools and their members need to honor the tensions and negotiation processes that occur in classrooms resulting from the competing discourses and scripts of multiethnic urban student populations. By not honoring the negotiation processes that must occur in communities where multiple and hybrid discourses (Hull, Jury, & Ziv, 1994) exist, students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds become marginalized and resistant participants in the learning process. In addition to redefining the value of conflict, we will also challenge traditional notions of power as property, a zero-sum understanding of power in which there is only so much power available in school contexts; that is, if teachers give some of the power to students, then they must give up some of their own power (Foucault, 1980; Gore, 1992, p. 58).

The understanding that the curriculum of the classroom is constituted both historically and locally through moment-by-moment interaction between students and teacher and among students builds on our previous research that has illustrated how the script(s) of the classroom is interactionally co-constructed, maintained, countered, and transcended in the various social spaces available in the classroom and how such events shape learning in classrooms (Gutierrez, 1993; Gutierrez et al., 1994). The notion of script is useful in the discussion of classroom life insofar as the classroom script characterizes a range of social, spatial, and language or discourse patterns constructed by participants in the course of everyday classroom activity. Over time, then, script comes to represent an expected pattern or orientation that serves as a frame of reference for classroom participants. From this frame of reference students and teachers draw their sociocultural knowledge of the classroom as they interact in its various social spheres (Gutierrez, 1993). There are multiple scripts in the classroom; however, the most dominant script is the teacher’s script (Gutierrez & Larson, 1994). Our
research has identified that most teacher or classroom scripts are monologic: that is, instruction is teacher-controlled, restrictive, and culture-bound. Although this script, too, is co-constructed by both teacher and student, it represents the beliefs about the nature and function of schooling—in this case, the nature and function of teaching literacy—held by the teacher and the local and larger community. We refer to the scripts of the larger social context as the transcendent script (Gutierrez et al., 1994).

Within the social space of *underlife* in the classroom, there is opportunity for contesting both societal and classroom discursive practices (Goffman, 1961). Although students often participate within the teacher and transcendent script, they also construct their own counterscripts in the social spaces of underlife most evident in monologic classrooms (Brooke, 1987; Goffman, 1961; Gutierrez et al., 1994). These understandings of multiple social spaces and scripts in the classroom frame our analysis of one urban classroom and the way in which one Latina student simultaneously demonstrates individual agency, pedagogical alienation, and social marginalization in the classroom.

Identifying classroom script also helps make visible what counts as legitimate knowledge in the classroom. The question of what knowledge is of most worth, then, becomes central to our discussion and unpackaging of life in this urban classroom. It is linked to a curriculum that emanates from authoritative sources whose primary goal is social control and perpetuation of the status quo. The teacher’s emphasis on the physical control of students’ bodies—that is, their movement, whereabouts, and silence—translates into a classroom whose primary goal is social order. Certain rules are necessary to ensure the safety of students during the school day, but the overemphasis on social control in this classroom largely eliminates literacy instruction. The taught curriculum is secondary to efforts at social control. The microanalysis of classroom discourse that follows will illustrate how the emphasis on social order is manifest in face-to-face interaction and how this emphasis restricts the kinds of knowledge to which students are given access. It will illustrate how marginality is constructed in moment-by-moment interaction in classroom literacy activities and how Nora’s position
as a marginalized student has value because it exposes the teacher’s and, ultimately, the school’s monologic script. Finally, through the telling of key events observed in the course of an intensive 6-month ethnographic study, we will illustrate that what happens in the everyday life of classrooms contributes to one marginalized student’s perceptions of self as a reader, writer, and learner (Gutierrez, 1987).

We focus on the pedagogical encounters between Diane, a first-year teacher, and Nora, one of her seventh-grade students, for several reasons. Their sociocultural conflict reflects the ongoing tensions experienced in this urban school, the surrounding community, and the larger societal context. Further, although on the surface their disparate backgrounds provide grounds for their ongoing conflict, this very conflict, in fact, creates the opportunity space for changing literacy practices in urban classrooms. As Rose’s quote at the beginning of this article suggested, Diane’s misperception of Nora’s performance is well understood when we consider her own socialization. Unlike Nora, Diane has institutional, economic, and family support that allows her the opportunity to choose between working as a bank loan officer and teaching. A career in teaching, she reported, allowed her a more flexible schedule and one that is compatible with that of her 5-year-old daughter.

Nora, by contrast, is a foster child who is not only marginalized at school and within this particular classroom, but she seems to have very little of the traditional family support associated with social or economic success in this country. Diane’s classroom management and instructional practices are tied to her own socialization experiences and are reflected in the educational goals she sets. There were significant differences in how Diane organized instruction in her sixth-grade honors class and her seventh-grade regular class. Diane justified these differences based on her belief that students who already possessed life skills and who had already been socialized properly to the transcendent script of the larger society were ready—or “worthy”—of “real learning.”

This differentiated instruction was most evident in the amount of interaction permitted in the classroom. Although neither class was permitted opportunities to produce elaborated written or oral discourse, the honors class was allowed to participate in small
group projects. Informed by her own folk knowledge about how “these” children learn, Diane implemented a system of rewards and punishments in an attempt to encourage order in her regular classroom. This system functioned as both a rigid system of social control and as a mechanism for marginalizing students who constructed counterscripts in their own social space. Although many of the students in this classroom, particularly the Latina students, were overtly marginalized, only Nora actively resisted; the others were constructed as invisible by the teacher—their presence was unacknowledged. Because of the rigid system of rewards governing the classroom, students readily appropriated the teacher’s attitude toward Latinas.

Nora’s continued resistance to this restricted interaction created resentment among students who were penalized (with points) for having Nora in their row. Rather than attempting to resocialize Nora into the classroom structure, Diane isolated Nora’s desk from the other students, proclaimed her an “island,” and thus further marginalized her socially and physically. In this way, the teacher and the other students who openly resent Nora become complicit in the construction of Nora as marginal. However, rather than simply retelling a story of the failure of another Latina, in the sections that follow, we will present ethnographic and discourse data to illustrate how Nora, despite her subjugated position, offers useful insight into the teaching and learning of literacy in this particular classroom.

Nora is by no means innocent. She is disruptive and disrespectful by any teacher’s standards. Nevertheless Nora’s behavior and the teacher’s responses to her shed light on how these interactions, so typical of the interactions we have observed in six years of ethnographic study of urban classrooms in Los Angeles, continue to push resistant students out. Through Nora’s subjugated perspective, as Harraway (1991) has written, we as researchers are provided with a greater vision: “The standpoints of the subjugated are not innocent positions. On the contrary, they are preferred because in principle they are least likely to allow denial of the critical and interpretive core of all knowledge” (p. 191). As Harraway notes, the viewpoints of the subjugated are not necessarily better or worse
than other perspectives. Rather, the value of such standpoints is in the expanded vision they enable.

THE VALUE OF THE SUBJUGATED PERSPECTIVE

Our analysis below attempts to expand the vision of the critical social scientist and, in particular, the educator, by analyzing the literacy learning in one traditional urban classroom and, in particular, the discourse of one marginalized Latina student. In this classroom, the literacy learning available to Latino students like Nora is implemented through a system of regimented silence and independent seatwork. Through routine participation in these activities, students like Nora often are socialized into the position of subjugated learners. However, it is too easy to simply point the judgmental finger at teachers like Diane who follow the codes of the infrastructure and the society within which they work. Students also become complicitous. Thus, in our analysis, we neither glorify the role of the student—particularly, the resistant student, the marginalized student, the one who “fails”—nor deny the pattern of the unflappable teacher and the failing Latina student (cf. Zambrana, 1994). Instead we look for greater understanding of the subtleties in classroom practice that systematically lead to exclusion and failure. Nora provides a means to see how students like her typically fail or are pushed out of public schools.

Ultimately Nora’s interactions with the teacher reveal, through their uniqueness in comparison to other classroom activity, the tacit agreement or what we will call a *scripted pact* between the teacher and most students. The scripted pact in classrooms consists of the unspoken, culture-bound assumptions behind the language and actions of the teacher and most of the students in the classroom. This pact is signaled in discourse by “contextualization cues” (Gumperz, 1982) that are context bound:

Unlike words that can be discussed out of context, the meanings of contextualization cues are implicit. They are usually not talked about out of context. Their signaling value depends on the partici-
pants' tacit awareness of their meaningfulness. When all participants understand and notice the relevant cues, interpretive processes are taken for granted and tend to go unnoticed. (p. 132)

In this classroom, this tacit agreement allows the teacher to limit her instruction to the teaching of procedural information and allows the students to feign competence as they demonstrate their literacy and sociocultural knowledge through procedural display (Bloome, 1990; Gutierrez et al., 1994).

However, it is only when these cues are ignored or misunderstood that this tacit agreement, or scripted pact, is observable. The scripted pact constructed in this classroom is maintained by the teacher and the other students in order to preserve their own roles and status. This pact plays a role in maintaining the power configuration in the classroom by excluding voices that do not follow the same unspoken conversational and procedural rules. In this particular case, the teacher agrees not to teach anything too difficult and the students agree to sit quietly and follow directions. Thus, in the context of the larger school culture, both teacher and student are reconstructing and affirming the school's valued script. Nora's unique responses to the teacher's rigid script ultimately challenge the official discourse and the scripted pact.

In the discourse data that follow, we will illustrate how this pact is maintained and ruptured. Specifically, in Part 1 we describe the teacher script in more detail, revealing the teacher's general success at focusing on the goals of the larger school administrative structure, rather than on the linguistic and sociocultural needs of individual students. In Part 2, examples of the student commentary will reveal how, despite the seeming rigidity of the teacher script, multiple counterscripts (Gutierrez, 1993) exist. However, although varied student voices recast Diane's teacher script through mockery or sarcasm, these comments take the form of a "contained underlife" (Goffman, 1961), which has little effect on the teacher script (Gutierrez et al., 1994). As will be discussed in Parts 3 and 4, only Nora interacts with the teacher script in a way that interferes with the teacher's own rigidly scripted, culture-bound (or monologic) discourse. Through her marginalized status and unique response to classroom practice, Nora ultimately forces a breach in the teacher's
monologic discourse and exposes the scripted pact that sustains this particular classroom. Ultimately these interactions will illustrate the ways in which student knowledge is devalued and access to the meaningful interaction and activity needed for effective literacy learning is denied.

1. "DON'T TALK OR YOU WILL GET AN F":
THE MONOLOGIC TEACHER SCRIPT

Within this classroom, control of the construction of knowledge appears to be solely in the hands of the teacher. Her rigid structuring of activity and talk is apparent in the silence of the room, the configuration of the desks, and the physical constraint of all the students. There is little opportunity for students to bring their own perspectives into any classroom interaction or, in particular, to evaluate any element of the teacher’s talk or physical presentation (cf. Moll, 1990, for discussion of “funds of knowledge”). The teacher script is primarily monologic and restricts the possibility for dialogue through rigid monitoring of talk, movement, and writing. The students, as well as the teacher have a part in maintaining a monologic script, and as frequently illustrated in this classroom, monologic discourse is ultimately not single voiced (Bakhtin, 1981). These students generally comply with the teacher’s directives, sitting in their seats, writing in their test records, and responding accordingly when grades are used as a threat. They readily cooperate and contribute to the teacher script.

Nevertheless the threshold for accepting student contributions is extraordinarily low. This curtailing of any reflective possibility, this denial of “the dialogue inherent in all discourse” (Kristeva, 1980, p. 77) is precisely what sustains the monologism in this classroom. In fact, in Diane’s classroom, student contributions are limited to clarification questions, responses to known-answer questions, or requests for permission to get up. Only the teacher is allowed elaborate discourse and even her discourse is generally limited to three forms: (a) giving directions, (b) clarifying instructions, and (c) administering discipline. This restricted pattern of interaction and talk not only prohibits active co-construction of literacy activity but also denies access to more culturally diverse
forms of literacy knowledge. Thus the notion of multiple literacies and their various forms of representation is incongruent with this script. What counts as knowledge in this classroom, then, is the teacher’s definition of what constitutes being literate: that is, following directions, sitting quietly, and copying neatly.

Furthermore, our analyses reveal that there is, in fact, no instructional time evident in this classroom, neither with the teacher nor with student peers. Through her defensive hold on the teacher script and her consistent attention to the transcendent script, Diane curtails the possibility for any “real learning” in this classroom—although she believes that what is going on here is, if not the “real” learning, the most important kind of learning. Ironically, what counts as learning for Diane in both her honors and regular classes are forms of procedural display. This is consistent with the educational goals Diane articulated frequently in postobservation interviews. To teach her students “some social order and life skills to get along in the real world” were her articulated instruction goals. Educational goals that focus on the development of comprehensive literacy skills and the appropriation of the sociocultural knowledge needed for successful participation in various communities of practice play a secondary role and become icing, so to speak, after the social order is established. From her perspective, the students are in her classroom to “learn coping skills and if there is any real learning going on, then, that’s like a plus.”

However, Diane does differentiate in the kind of literacy knowledge to which her regular class has access. Because, as she describes them, these students are “not cut from the same mold” as the honors students, she believes their instruction must be simplified. As the excerpt below illustrates, what counts as literacy learning is the most reductive form of literacy activity and is limited to procedural elements such as the taking of a spelling test.

Example 1

T: [I’m only gonna ask one time
((speaking off camera))
row one
do you have any questions about the spelling test
°kay° pass your pap- yes
S:  Um (number) six and thirteen
T:  Number six is rookie: - and thirteen is humid
    pass your papers forward
    Row-
    don’t talk
    (0.8)
    or you will get an “F”
    (.)
    Row two do you have any questions (.) Cindy
C:  One and nine
T:  One is corrode
(1.0)
    and nine is grode
(0.8)
    kay pass your papers forward row three
(1.0)
    any questions
S:  ((shakes head no))

Although, in this excerpt, the teacher repeats the familiar “don’t talk,” she is willing to accept certain forms of talk that she has requested: that is, questions about the spelling test. The teacher’s culture-bound contextualization cues lead most students to understand that this is not a request for general questions about the test but rather simply a request for words they would like her to repeat. The teacher quickly follows her own question, “do you have any questions about the spelling test,” with a directive, “kay, pass your pap- yes,” suggesting that questions are not to interfere with basic classroom procedure. The students respond appropriately to this particular understanding of the question, reading off the numbers they missed and the teacher, in turn, repeats the spelling words. What is valued in this literacy activity is the production of the most abbreviated or telegraphic responses (“One and nine”) and getting the spelling words in the right order, with little or no attention to the correct spelling or meaning of the words. Students show their competence in this classroom, not through reading or writing, but by producing the correct cued responses.
2. "GOOD GOIN’ " THE STUDENT COUNTERSCRIPT

Even in a classroom where procedures and talk are so strictly monitored, the teacher does not succeed in completely stifling student voices and capacities for meaning making. Although students in Diane’s class are unwilling to directly challenge the teacher script, occasional student utterances take the form of a student counterscript that appears to challenge the teacher’s participation rules. The transcriptions below are formatted with these transgressing student utterances to the right to distinguish them from utterances within the monologic teacher script. In Example 2a below, one student reveals an understanding of the teacher’s limited requirements for “doing a good job.”

Example 2a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER SCRIPT</th>
<th>STUDENT SCRIPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T: Okay thanks for sitting quietly while I ( )</td>
<td>S: (Good goin’) ((sarcastic))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate your ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You’re doing a good job. (1.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this excerpt, the teacher states explicitly the value of quiet behavior implied in Example 1. She is pleased with the students for “sitting quietly” while she attends to some unexpected business and praises them for doing a “good job.” It is the only behavior she consistently praises. However, the student response does not accept this praise as given, but instead takes the form of a typical rekeying of the teacher script (cf. Gutierrez et al., 1994), changing the teacher’s praise (“good job”) into a sarcastic remark (“good goin’”), thus revealing the meaninglessness of this praise. This rekeying of the teacher script momentarily “transforms serious, real action into something playful” (Goffman, 1974, p. 41).

Keying and rekeying (Goffman, 1974) are ways to transform interactions from one mode (e.g., “praise”) to another (e.g., “playfulness,” or in this example, sarcasm). Such key changes are
indicated in conversation by key signals or cues at the microlevel of language, which include gestures, facial expression, repetition, and changes in volume, intonation, or dialect. "Communicative competence" (Gumperz, 1981) includes the ability to quickly change keys and is displayed in the student counterscript when this student rapidly appropriates the teacher’s praise and rekeys it through his sarcastic intonation. However, this demonstration of communicative competence is neither acknowledged nor built upon by the teacher.

Instead this transformation of the tone of the classroom discourse is only momentary and is limited to the student script. The rapid shifting of keys is not reciprocated by the teacher, who consistently maintains her teacher script, as shown below.

Example 2b

**TEACHER SCRIPT**

T: I’m gonna give you a few minutes
   no:w, to do some classwork
   on your spelling book.
   So how many of you didn’t bring a spelling book today:

**STUDENT SCRIPT**

S: (mock scolding))
   Ts ts ts ts ts ts ts
ts-

T: ( ) No, well you guys-
   you can go get one-
   let me getum for you-
   here jus- (mumbling something to herself)

Although not appropriating the teacher’s words as in Example 2a, the student above rekeys the very institutional procedures the teacher invokes through her monologic script. In the institutionally idealized classroom culture, all students should bring their books every day, and the teacher has stated this rule repeatedly in class. This student’s mock scolding ("ts ts ts") sarcastically rekeys the teacher’s request and colors it with triviality. However, the teacher does not react to this student counterscript.

Therefore, although the students within this counterscript may find meaning within these peripheral utterances, such contributions
are not incorporated into the teacher’s script and thus remain at the level of mere parody, what Goffman (1961) has called contained underworld; they do nothing to challenge the dominant script or to draw the teacher’s attention to the dialogic potential of her classroom. Nora’s contributions form a different type of counterscript, one which displays more overt resistance to the teacher script and eventually forces a breach in the teacher’s monologism. Her resistance ruptures the teacher-dominated script and creates the potential for a more student-centered and multivoiced instructional context. We have observed that these multivoiced contexts, characterized by more dialogic forms of interaction, provide the basis for creating classroom communities in which students can develop a more comprehensive set of literacy and biliteracy skills. Nora’s interaction with the teacher shows that in this classroom there are distinct yet unheard voices.

3. NORA: A DISTINCTIVELY RESISTANT COUNTERSCRIPT

Although Nora at times contributes to a more general student script, she also constructs her own script through both verbal and nonverbal behavior and through her reactions to Diane’s teacher script. Often, like the student counterscript in Examples 2a and b, above, Nora’s counterscript does not seem to interfere with the teacher script. However, Nora’s contributions to the class often take on a distinct and uniquely petulant, even resistant, character, through their oblivious relationship to the teacher’s contextualization cues signaling appropriate behavior. Further, in this classroom, Nora’s reactions to the teacher are often misperceived by Diane as just an “attitude” problem. In the excerpts below, Nora’s counterscript is printed in the center, in contrast to the more general student counterscript to the right, to highlight its isolated character. The slight delay in all of her actions creates an impression of overt resistance to the teacher:
Example 3a

TEACHER SCRIPT
T:  [Get out a piece of paper
    put everything else away
    (walking down the aisles))
    (3.6)

N:  ((puts in right earring))

T:  [Get out a piece of paper
    put everything else away
    (walks up the aisle)
    (1.0)
    who has their definitions around=

S:   [I do
    (raises hand, starts to get out
    paper with definitions))

T:   (nods and walks to front of room)
    (7.8)

N:   ((puts in left earring))

This example is typical of Nora’s nonverbal resistance to each activity in this class. When the teacher gives directions, the other students generally comply, as does Nora, although several minutes later. Nora’s nonverbal resistance to this particular activity is illustrated by engagement in her own personal activities before attending to those requested by the teacher. In Example 3a, these delaying activities take the form of putting in her earrings, slowly and methodically, as other students quickly take out their study materials. In other situations, while other students quickly get out paper and pencils, minutes and minutes elapse while Nora methodically unzips her backpack, removes her notebook, snaps and unsnaps her three-ring binder, searches for a pen, and repositions herself at her desk. Unlike the students in Example 1a, who act in a manner consistent with this teacher’s contextualization cues, Nora is either oblivious to or ignores these cues and, thus, gives a culturally inappropriate response and impression. In other words, Nora’s
behavior is inconsistent with the expectations of the classroom culture. This stalling activity is one of the many behaviors that isolates Nora from the rest of the class. In this way, Nora too contributes to the construction of her own marginal status within the classroom. This repertoire of resistant behaviors includes writing while slouched in her desk, her face nearly touching her paper, tapping her pen repeatedly while other students are engaged or the teacher is talking, or sitting with her pen down and her arms folded instead of completing an assignment.

These behaviors create an image of Nora that threatens the teacher script and devalues Nora’s potential contribution to and her status in the classroom. Sensing this threat, the teacher resists Nora’s contributions, even when Nora attempts to engage the teacher in a seemingly legitimate exchange. For example, when Nora asks the teacher a question regarding a grammar worksheet, the teacher simply rereads the instructions rather than answer Nora’s clarification question. Once again, she misperceives Nora’s legitimate attempt to participate as another form of disruptive behavior. At the close of this interaction, Diane impatiently tells Nora which answer to circle.

Example 3b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER SCRIPT</th>
<th>NORA SCRIPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>T:</strong> Nora.</td>
<td><strong>N:</strong> (    )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(off camera)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T:</strong> Hm?</td>
<td>No they say to circle the (    )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T:</strong> (reading, as proof)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°Choose the sentence in which all of the proper nouns are capitalized (talking) that’ll be your answer. So the first one you circled should have been the letter “B” o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N:</strong> (whining)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Great::t)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T:</strong> (impatiently) &gt;Circle “B” right there.&lt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this excerpt, Nora is not isolating herself through nonverbal behaviors (as in Example 3a, above); she is actually asking a legitimate question regarding the current grammar test. However, unlike the student questions that follow the teacher’s script (see Example 1), Nora’s response is not consistent with the contextualization cues, which call for brief, efficient exchanges in this classroom. The teacher’s tag question (“right?”) following her statement (“you know just to circle one answer”) indicates the acceptable response in this case is “yes,” enabling a swift return to the efficiency of classroom business as usual. However, Nora’s response does not comply with the intentions communicated in this tag question. Nora’s question is outside the teacher script, and Diane responds immediately to the resistant tone in Nora’s discourse. She quickly cuts off Nora when she remarks that “they say to circle the . . .,” defining this response as an unacceptable contribution. Diane instantly redirects the exchange from an elusive reference to what “they” say to do, by reading the test directions out loud directly from the paper. She will not allow this discussion to stray far from what is printed on the paper: directions that have come from the textbook. Nora’s appeals to the teacher and attempts at an alternate explanation only evoke impatient responses; she is cut off with a final teacher-provided solution: “Circle B right there.” In this example, authority resides in the text and in the teacher’s interpretation of the text and its directions. Nora is not allowed to challenge such authority. Thus occasions for problem solving or elaborated talk are not taken up; it is easier to give the right answer than to engage students like Nora in discussion or debate. Instead of assisting Nora’s learning, the teacher reserves real learning for students who have demonstrated the sociocultural knowledge and behaviors valued by Diane and the larger school culture. In this way, there is no threat of revision to her script, and thus she maintains a firm hold on control and power in this classroom.

Nevertheless the impatient tone in the teacher’s voice suggests that Nora is beginning to affect the teacher. With this challenge, the teacher’s directives take on a less tolerant quality, as evidenced by the speeded speech indicated by the arrows in “>Circle B right
there<.” Nora has begun to crack through the veneer of the teacher script and to reveal the shortcomings of a script that does not include her (Nora) or other diverse voices. In turn, Diane has begun to construct Nora as marginal, as one who simply must be dealt with as quickly as possible, but never as a full participant. In Example 3c below, Nora’s questions regarding the spelling homework are similarly resisted by the teacher, who responds to Nora’s inquiries about alternative ways to do the work by impatiently re-explaining the directions for the exercise.

Example 3c

**TEACHER SCRIPT**  **NORA SCRIPT**

((Students have been instructed to begin alphabetizing their spelling words. This is their homework, but they have been told to begin now, since the teacher is waiting for two students to return before she begins the next activity. Before Nora has even begun her assignment, she has a procedural question.))

N:  Um, Miss Bernard,
T:  Yes:::

N:  Can I just copy ’em down right here and when I get home (  

T:  Don’t you have a spelling book?

N:  This- this book except I left it at home.

(0.2)

N:  And so can I do it at home, the:=

T:  ((quietly to Nora)) =it is your homework but I want you to get started on it in class. So just start. (  

There’s no need to copy ’em down.

N:  (  )?

T:  When you alphabetize something how do you usually do it?

N:  “A B C”
T:  Okay so you wanna go “A::::” are there any “A”s?

N:  [(  )]
T:  [And then “B”s okay start with the Bs.

N:  And then there’d be another (  )
T:  Good.

N:  (  )
T: Good. So you know how to do it. 
   [Start with beetle, 
   [(((teacher moves away from Nora's desk 
   and then addresses another individual 
   student question))] 

Nora's first question, "can I just copy 'em down right here," and 
her suggestion that she can do the work at home are quickly read 
as resistant behavior by the teacher. She first responds with a 
rhetorical question, "don't you have a spelling book," reminiscent 
of "you know just to circle one answer, right?" in Example 3b. Both 
of these questions and Nora's responses illustrate the breakdown 
in communication between Nora and the teacher. The phrasing of 
these questions indicates that Diane has particular expectations in 
her discourse, which are continually frustrated by Nora. When Nora 
continues to suggest that she do the work at home, the teacher 
responds not by following Nora's reasoning for such a request, but 
by first telling her to "just start" and then by assuming that Nora 
does not know how to alphabetize ("Okay when you alphabetize 
something, how do you usually do it?"). She quickly repeats the 
directions for alphabetizing and reins Nora's alternative sugges-
tions back into the teacher script with a terse directive: "So you 
know how to do it. Start with beetle." Because of the teacher's 
need to maintain control, she reinvokes classroom practices and 
procedures that have little to do with literacy. Nora's question above 
is not about alphabetizing, but the teacher swiftly reformulates this 
question to maintain a curriculum of social order. In turn, the 
teacher's responses, which relate exclusively to simple procedures, 
progressively construct Nora not only as marginal, but as remedial. 

However, once again Nora has succeeded in slightly diverting 
the teacher from her given script. Unlike the more general student 
script, Nora's script includes more elaborated contributions and 
does not simply rekey teacher utterances, but actually draws the 
teacher into an interaction that threatens her script. As will be 
shown, Nora's continued efforts to engage the teacher, while simul-
taneously maintaining her own Nora script, ultimately force a
breach in the teacher script. In this way, Nora’s script has the potential to expose the ineffectiveness of the literacy activity and expand the teacher-controlled activity into one that must include student participation.

4. A BREACH IN THE MONOLOGIC TEACHER SCRIPT: CREATING OPPORTUNITY SPACES FOR MEANINGFUL LITERACY LEARNING

By maintaining some form of individual meaning making within a counterscript, the students in this class are able to sustain relationships that make class more interesting to them, but they do not directly challenge the teacher script nor do they create undue discomfort for themselves or inconvenience within the larger school administrative structure. They accept bad grades as a legitimate form of punishment and measure of their progress; they accept classroom rules, although they don’t always abide by them, and occasionally, through their student script, they partake in contained forms of underlife. Likewise, the teacher does not challenge these students to go beyond their own script, or their familiar notions of what classroom life should be like. By tacitly agreeing on rewards, punishments, and the limits of student participation, the teacher and most of the students are complicit in creating the scripted pact that maintains this classroom as model according to the local school standards. Within this classroom, then, most students help to maintain the dominant culture by constructing a student counterscript that has no substantial effect on the teacher script.

Nevertheless, this model classroom excludes less complicit voices, as exemplified by Nora’s contributions, which frequently fall outside the boundaries of this scripted pact. Her script is different from the general student script in that it directly engages the teacher. The teacher is unavoidably drawn into interactions that challenge her script and reveal it as simply scripted behavior that privileges knowledge of standard classroom procedures to the exclusion of broader literacy knowledge. It is not surprising that
contributions from a marginal character ultimately expose the culture-bound nature of interactions in this classroom. Because Nora does not consistently take part in either the student script or the teacher script, her alternative script fails to fulfill the scripted pact. Instead her script transgresses the boundaries of the teacher script and forces a recognition of the failure of the classroom to accommodate such marginal voices.

Nora’s marginal status is apparent in a variety of ways. In addition to her discourse patterns, which frequently confront cultural patterns in the classroom, she is a poor foster child, a Latina whose dress and behavior challenge the transcendent script. Although Nora’s outward behavior frequently matches that of other students in the classroom (many of whom are also poor, Latino, or African American), the combination of her outward appearance and seemingly confrontational discourse patterns expose and challenge the exclusivity of Diane’s classroom. Thus Nora herself comes to embody an ironic rekeying of classroom procedure, subtly revealing the scripted pact between student and teacher and exposing many classroom behaviors as hollow concessions to the transcendent script. In the example below, Nora and the other students are receiving graded tests from the teacher. Around the classroom students have generally remained quiet, but manage to brag about their good grades by showing their papers to their neighbors or through silent pantomimes of excitement.

However, Nora, who never receives good grades, makes a sham of this excitement over grades when she receives her test back and enacts a similar excited pantomime. Although Nora behaves as if she is pleased, the gradebook reveals that Nora has received nothing but Ds and Fs, up to and including this day. Although her excited reaction falls firmly within the student script and mimics exactly the excited expressions others have exhibited over their grades, her subsequent sober face upon seeing her actual grade reveals the farce inherent in many of Nora’s actions, which at first glance appear to fall within teacher and student script. Instead, Nora is simply pretending to be like the other students.
Example 4a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER SCRIPT</th>
<th>NORA SCRIPT</th>
<th>STUDENT SCRIPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T: <a href="0.6">Matthew’s not he:re.</a></td>
<td>(((teacher hands paper to Nora and Nora shows a smile))</td>
<td>(((Nora peeks at her test score, smiles and mouths “yes!” dramatically))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Keith. (0.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: (to individual student) Yes.</td>
<td>(((student off-camera asks question about test record))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>((Then she looks again, sober-faced))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Nora attempts to fulfill her role within both the teacher script (she smiles sweetly as she receives her test) and within the student script (she feigns excitement when she looks at her grade), the marginal nature of her role is revealed when she returns to the Nora script and her expression reveals the real grade she received. In this dejected expression, Nora acknowledges failure on this classroom’s terms.

Nevertheless, from this position of affirmed failure, Nora’s subsequent behaviors in the class reveal the consequences of the scripted pact maintained by the teacher and the other students. From this marginal perspective, all of Nora’s seemingly complicit behaviors create the possibility for a challenge to the pact by revealing the scripted and inflexible nature of this classroom. The students’ excitement over their good grades and the teacher’s acceptance of Nora’s polite smile are all simply part of the scripted pact—a pact that consistently excludes marginal voices such as Nora’s.

Perhaps Nora’s most dramatic challenge to both the teacher script and the student script occurs in the samples below where Nora openly cheats on her spelling test. This spelling test consists of two parts. In the first section of the spelling test, the teacher reads
definitions and the students who have prepared may write the words if they are able to guess them from the brief clues given. Very few of the students in the class complete this part of the spelling test, and the teacher only counts these answers as extra credit. The part of the spelling test that is actually graded comes next and follows traditional dictation format. It is during this section of the test that most students try to write down the words and spell them correctly. However, Nora has a different approach to this testing procedure. Instead of either guessing the words for extra points during the definition section or waiting until the definitions are over to take the dictation portion, she begins to copy the words off another student’s paper during the definition section. But before this process even begins, she again mocks classroom practice by hiding her paper, as the teacher walks by, as if she is trying to prevent other students from reading her copied answers. Because the teacher has so narrowly defined literacy and how to demonstrate competence and acceptable behavior, Nora believes she has figured out how to fool the teacher into believing that she too is a good student.

Example 4b

TEACHER SCRIPT        NORA SCRIPT
((the teacher is reading the definition for "cucumber"))
T:  Number four - a green vegetable
    (1.8)
    [used in salad it has a green rind (.) and white
    (1.8)
flesh inside
    [((walks up aisle past Nora’s desk))
    (3.0)

    N: [((puts hand over paper as teacher passes;
sits back and looks at Damon, then Matthew)]

    T:  number five

This behavior is typical of Nora’s other resistant nonverbal behaviors (see Example 3a). However, here Nora is acting as if these behaviors are part of the testing procedure. The teacher would probably interpret any other student’s similar behavior as within the teacher script: that is, as if they were legitimately hiding their answers from other potential cheaters. However, through her pre-
vious interactions, Nora has been constructed as a resistant student within this classroom, and as a result, covering her paper during the extra credit portion of the spelling test is an absurdity. Even though the teacher is not aware that Nora is cheating, she has no reason to believe that she has written anything on her paper that is worth covering up. As a marginal character, Nora creates a mockery of the classroom procedure by writing where she should and when she should and generally mirroring the behaviors of other, more compliant students in this classroom. More specifically, she is mirroring their procedural display of literacy; after all, none of the students in this classroom are engaged in meaningful literacy learning activities.

The fact that Nora’s outward display of acceptable classroom behavior actually consists of cheating on the quiz further exposes the farce of Nora’s mock hiding of her answers. In the excerpt below, as the teacher continues to read the definitions, Nora copies answers from a classmate’s paper. Literacy learning is reduced to copying spelling words.

**Example 4c**

**TEACHER SCRIPT**

T:  [Number fourteen
    (2.8)

    a sea animal
    1.0)
    [that is reddish
    (4.0)

    a sea animal that is reddish
    (.)
    people eat it for seafood all the [time
    (3.2)

N:  [((leans forward and looks at
    Matthew’s paper, coughs))

    ((leans back, then forward again
    as she tries to read Matthew’s paper))

    ((coughs, leans forward and starts
    to write a word she has seen on
    Matthew’s paper))]

**NORA SCRIPT**
TEACHER SCRIPT  
T:  a red animal you eat as seafood  
   (1.0)  
   it’s a sea animal  
   0.8)  
   ’kay number fifteen  
   (0.8)  

NORA SCRIPT  
N:  [((leans back, looks at Matthew’s paper and writes another word))  

T:  powder-like grains  
   ()  
   produced in flowering plants  
   and used for fertilization  
   ()  
   a lot of people are allergic to this  
   ()  
   it’s what [makes them [sneeze]  
   [((sits down at desk in the back of the room))  
   (4.0)  

S:  [Oh]  

N:  ["Move your hand"]  
   [((looking at Matthew))  

As the teacher continues to read the definitions, very few students opt to take this extra-credit portion of the test. Nora is one of the few students writing; however, she is cheating. She is not listening to the teacher’s definitions and taking the test as designed. She makes no attempt to even pretend she is paying attention to the teacher’s definitions before she copies down another of the answers from her neighbor’s paper. Nor does she need to conceal her cheating behavior at all in this classroom. Indeed, the teacher never seems to catch on to the fact that she is copying her answers. Nora even goes so far as to request in a quiet voice that the other student move his hand so that she can more easily see his answers to copy them.

Matthew does, in fact, move his hand and even turns his paper toward Nora to facilitate her cheating. As he turns his paper to Nora, he also turns toward the researcher and gives her a sheepish grin. Through this action, even Matthew, who has legitimately participated in the extra-credit portion of the test, has been implicated in Nora’s rekeying of classroom activity. When Matthew makes it
easier for Nora to cheat, he joins her in making a mockery of this particular quiz. Together, their actions rekey the test-taking activity as copying. Such may not be the case in other classrooms. When instruction is based on dialogic interaction as a means for scaffolding learning, joint activity is a regular feature of curriculum and assessment. In such classrooms, interactions in which learning is shared are condoned and promoted rather than condemned. However, the monologic nature of all activities in Diane’s classroom constructs an environment where cheating emerges as a possible option to achieve success.

Although Nora cheats quite obviously in full view of the camera, the fact that she is cheating at all suggests that she is trying to do something right in this room. In this class, learning is equated with acquiring high marks or good grades. As Nora’s pretend excitement at receiving a bad grade (see Example 4a) suggests, she wants to be successful. That is, she wants to get papers back that show high marks. Nora seems determined to fit somehow in either the teacher or student script. Nevertheless her marginal status has made even her undetected cheating an impossible means for her to be successful. Even though the teacher has no idea that she has cheated, Nora has already been constructed as someone who will not succeed academically. Nora’s antics display that cheating is not difficult in this classroom (and, no doubt, other students have done it), but even successful cheating will not change her status in the classroom because she has neither insinuated herself nor been accepted into the scripted pact between the students and the teacher. As the teacher’s expression indicates when she finally picks up Nora’s quiz (still with no knowledge of her cheating), none of Nora’s behaviors will be read as legitimate here.
Example 4d

**TEACHER SCRIPT**

T: Marissa (. ) why are you talking

((walks in front of the class, turns around and takes Nora’s spelling test. As she does so, she turns to the researcher, then immediately to the camera and gives a distinct look of disdain, as though ridiculing Nora’s test.)

N: ((looks at Matthew and bangs on the desk with her pencil))

The teacher’s disdainful look in the excerpt displays that nothing Nora contributes or does can be considered acceptable. With just a superficial glance, the teacher decides that this test or any paper that Nora hands in will not be judged the same as those written by other students. As ethnographic information consistently reveals, Nora does have literacy skills, but none that are encouraged in this classroom. One day, for example, when they were “doing literature,” Nora wrote a two-page letter to her friend. Although Diane noticed this writing and was impressed by Nora’s skills, she chose to describe this writing event as misbehavior. In an interview she discussed her discovery of this activity as having “caught” Nora, suggesting that even though Nora was engaged in a writing activity, Nora was somehow subverting more valid classroom activities. This response to Nora is representative of Diane’s attitude toward all the students in this regular class. None of these students will be judged effective or successful learners in the way Diane has defined good student. She has stated that “in all fairness, these kids are not cut from the same mold [as the honors students].” In other words, this entire class is marginal.

Although the teacher works to sustain her own script through such marginalization, this documented if brief look of disdain
forces a breach in her own script. Despite Nora’s following of the correct procedures within this room, the teacher’s look reveals her recognition that for some students those procedures are actually meaningless. In her mocking glance, the teacher mirrors Nora’s embodied rekeying of classroom activity, herself making fun of Nora’s effort to contribute. Her simple glance communicates the fact that any contribution Nora would be able to make in this classroom would be considered worthless. Thus all interactions that Nora takes part in are either cut short or are deemed merely superficial attempts at replicating classroom procedure. This devalued status of Nora’s contributions to this classroom is tacitly confirmed when the teacher flashes that look of disdain, identifying Nora’s contributions as a joke.

However, despite the depressing truth such a look entails, the look given above provides the possibility of dialogic change. Nora’s behavior has finally evoked a response from the teacher that departs from the rigid teacher script and forces the recognition that, at least as far as Nora is concerned, her classroom does not work. Unfortunately, this breach in the teacher script only provides a possibility for change. More than likely (and as Nora’s attendance record begins to indicate) Nora will join a large number of Latina students who are pushed out of high school and who never appropriate the needed literacy skills. Rather than accepting the change that these marginal perspectives and alternative scripts necessitate, schools typically remain the same and let these students leave. Dropping out is an understandable choice if one’s contributions in school are consistently relegated to marginal status. Conversely, more mainstream students and teachers are understandably protective of their comfortably scripted coexistence. It is not easy to take up the challenge of accepting and responding to different voices.³

However, what the analysis above indicates is that the voices of these marginal students are imminently valuable in that they have the potential to force teacher and students out of their mutually confirming scripts and to recognize alternative forms of classroom practice. Nora’s contributions in this class have the potential to force the teacher to see her individual and increasingly diverse students as valued members of the classroom context. It is when
actual dialogue between teacher and student occurs that the monologic script can be exposed and students, not the dominant culture, become the intended audience. In this way, student needs and goals, not bureaucratic necessities, become the focus of discourse in the classroom.

5. STUDENT, TEACHER, RESEARCHER: TAKING ANALYSIS BEYOND AN "OPTION FOR ACTION"4

By evoking the teacher's look and revealing the scripted pact in this classroom, Nora's actions have opened up the possibility for teacher and researcher to take a reflexive stance toward their work in this classroom. Although this teacher's look ultimately mirrors the mockery embodied in Nora's behavior, we as researchers must not return the glance she gave to the camera, ourselves becoming complicit in a classroom that treats outsiders as negligible distractions. Nora's behaviors have opened our eyes to the presence of the transcendent script that privileges social order and conformity over meaningful literacy learning. Our all-important next step will be to share with the teacher this awareness of the consequences of such a rigidly scripted classroom. Although the practices in this classroom are embedded within a larger culture, the potential of the classroom as a locus for social change lies in directing this teacher's discourse away from the transcendent script and toward the students and their diverse perspectives and experiences.

Only by recognizing Nora's contributions as potential forms of "disruptive" rather than contained underlife will her behaviors help force a radical change in this classroom (Goffman, 1961; Gutierrez et al., 1994). If we, as researchers, simply accept our analysis as an option for action—as our own form of contained underlife—Nora's behaviors will only become the first signals of her early school failure. If, on the other hand, we act on our analysis and communicate to this teacher and others the potential of marginalized students to positively transform classrooms, Nora's behaviors will be read as the necessary impetus for social change, not merely as "communicative [in]competence." The data analyzed in this article suggest there are many students who, within their own script, use a discourse that is inconsistent with the transcendent script. Under-
standing the value of Nora’s script challenges us to redefine what constitutes communicative competence and, in larger terms, effective instruction.

Urban classrooms are filled with students like Nora. Although they are often constructed as simply marginal, students like Nora must become our new lens for understanding and rethinking urban education. Reconceptualizing reform from the subjugated perspective underscores the importance of recognizing how the sociocultural tensions inherent in urban classrooms can become part of the fabric of the curriculum. Conceiving curriculum as social practice necessarily includes the multiple forms of interaction, experiences, perspectives, and literacies of contemporary urban society. From this perspective, the sociocultural terrain of the classroom does not have to be a battleground for power and control. In communities of effective practice, power, knowledge, and control are not exhaustive resources but instead are distributed and shared (Gutierrez et al., in press). All students, then, can become active and full participants in the construction of a heteroglossic and diverse classroom community (Bakhtin, 1981; Gutierrez et al., 1994).

NOTES

1. Funding for this study was provided by the CUES Project, University of California, Los Angeles.

2. The following transcription conventions, adapted from Atkinson and Heritage (1984), are used in the examples given:
   Colons denote sound stretch ("te:st"); underlining denotes emphatic stress ("write the grade"); brackets indicate overlapping speech or actions, for example:
   T: [I'm only gonna ask one time
   [((speaking off camera))
   Equal signs indicate closely latched speech, or ideas, for example:
   N: Can I do it at home, the=
   T: =it is your homework

   Intervals of silence are timed in tenths of seconds and inserted within parentheses; short, untimed silences are marked by a dash when sound is quickly cut off ("This- this book") or with a period within parentheses (.). Utterance final rising intonation is marked with a question mark, continued intonation with a comma, and falling intonation with a period. Degree signs indicate lowered volume ("move your hand"). Descriptions of the speech are
italicized within double parentheses ("((sarcastic))") Single parentheses surround items of doubtful transcription; and **boldface** indicates items of analytic focus.

3. This resistance to "different voices" is readily apparent by a single visit to any public school that has experienced a rapid change in population from primarily White middle-class students to primarily culturally diverse students. Teachers who have experienced such changes frequently feel their school has gone downhill and are uncomfortable with the notion of changing their own practices to accommodate the new perspectives of the changing population.

4. For further discussion of analysis as an option for action, see Forstorp (1994).
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