Journal of Early Childhood Literacy

<http://ecl.sagepub.com/>

Packaging Process: Consequences of Commodified Pedagogy on Students' Participation in Literacy Events

Joanne Larson

Journal of Early Childhood Literacy 2002 2: 65

DOI: 10.1177/14687984020021004

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://ecl.sagepub.com/content/2/1/65>

Published by:

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://ecl.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://ecl.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://ecl.sagepub.com/content/2/1/65.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Apr 1, 2002

[What is This?](#)

Packaging process: Consequences of commodified pedagogy on students' participation in literacy events

Journal of Early
Childhood Literacy
Copyright © 2002
SAGE PUBLICATIONS
London, Thousand Oaks, CA
and New Delhi
VOL 2(1) 65-95
[1468-7984(200204)2:1;
65-95;022467]

JOANNE LARSON *University of Rochester, USA*

Abstract This article presents analyses of the language and literacy practices in one urban kindergarten. The intent is to examine ways in which process-oriented materials and pedagogies are used as decontextualized language arts 'packages' to teach isolated literacy skills. Furthermore, I will describe the consequences of this practice on students' access to literacy events. I draw on Goffman's (1981) conception of the participation framework as a linguistic structure that organizes and is organized by talk and interaction in activity to analyze what roles were available in the participation framework in this classroom and how these roles mediated access to meaningful participation in literacy events. Discourse analysis of available roles in the participation framework showed that student participation in literacy events was limited to the observation of 'pedagogized' literacy practices (Street, 1995).

Keywords literacy practices; participation framework

It may be only ten minutes from my house in the city to Cardinal Elementary School but the trip always made me keenly aware of the socio-historical distances that exist between racially segregated neighborhoods in US urban contexts. To get there, I passed through what is commonly referred to as the city's 'cultural center', crossing over the railroad tracks on a bridge leading to one of the most impoverished neighborhoods in the city. The irony of crossing railroad tracks to this section of the city was not lost on me as I drove over the bridge each week. I had been traveling this way every month for the past five years to work with the early childhood education teachers at this school as a consultant in literacy education. As I arrive at

the front door, an anonymous finger buzzes me through the secured front entrance. The kindergarten classroom I am observing is in the early childhood unit of this large elementary building. As always, I am excited to see the children and settle into my observation.

The kindergarten teacher, Ellen Greenwald,¹ and I decided to work together to understand and improve her literacy teaching. She wanted to examine more closely her specific methods and planned literacy activities and I wanted to observe the instantiation of what she called a whole language literacy curriculum. After receiving a research grant,² I spent a year in this kindergarten classroom ethnographically documenting language arts activities and practices. This article draws from that research to examine ways in which process-oriented materials and pedagogies can be used as decontextualized language arts packages to teach isolated literacy skills and will describe the consequences of this practice on students' participation in literacy events.

I situate my argument in the current accountability and standardization movement that feeds the education market for packaged literacies and pedagogies. In the USA, in particular, the politically conservative right has successfully fueled fears about the declining skills of American students in the global marketplace (Larson, 2001). Scholars using declining skills rhetoric cite 'scientific evidence' to argue in favor of a skills-only approach to literacy instruction (Coles, 2000). Even more troubling research on basic skills instruction, already shown to be based in controversial assumptions about ability and intelligence, has resulted in the banning of contextualized literacy instruction in favor of phonics-only instruction (Coles, 2000; Taylor, 1998).

The presumed reading crisis is currently instantiated as the 'reading wars' (Goodman, 1998), or the never-ending debate between meaning-based philosophy and basic-skills instruction. In its current form, the argument goes back and forth between contextualized, whole text instruction and systematic, explicit phonics instruction.³ As literacy educators, we have seen this kind of scholarly debate between whole text and the alphabetic principle for over a hundred years (Langer and Allington, 1992). In spite of calls to end the debate in order to focus on more meaningful discussions of literacy needs in the 21st century (Luke, 1998), the argument continues (cf., *Educational Researcher*, August/September, 2000).

The current political context of standardization and accountability puts teacher educators, teachers, and administrators in the difficult position of trying to make sense of these issues. Gee (2001: 3) suggests that the National Research Council's report on reading (Snow et al., 1998) asserts simplistic 'quick fixes' to a 'reading problem' as a way to avoid naming

and discussing much deeper economic, social, institutional, and cultural issues occurring across the world and in the USA as part of a new global capitalism and hegemonic neoliberalism. Instead, what is needed is a much broader discussion of literacy as a social practice and of the consequences of locally defined practices on literacy learning in urban contexts. The superintendent of this district has taken the quick fix approach to educational reform, implementing a plethora of packaged programs designed to raise test scores. Local teachers are under incredible demands to conform to the prescriptions of these programs, in spite of what they may believe about teaching and learning. The classroom described in this article is firmly entrenched in this tension between quick fixes and meaningful learning.

Teachers tend to retreat to existing beliefs and practices when criticized, citing the oft heard 'pendulum swing' metaphor as a reason for ignoring district mandates or simply following the directions in new packaged literacy materials. It is unreasonable to blame teachers alone given public pressure to be accountable for student achievement. Their jobs are at stake. At the same time district administrators are bombarding them with accountability demands and advertising in commercially produced materials and professional literature that promise new and improved literacy outcomes. By relying on commercially produced materials, teachers and administrators can shift responsibility from self-accountability to the pre-packaged materials and the reason for continued underachievement to students (Irvine and Larson, 2001). As I will show in this article, process-oriented materials and pedagogies are not immune to commodification in this larger context of performance pressures.

Accountability issues are at the forefront of teachers' lives in the district I observed. With the recent release of students' scores on the new state Fourth Grade English Language Arts (ELA) exam, local district officials are concerned about poor performance of City School District (CSD) students. In 1999, only 24% of CSD students met the state standard. Herein, I critique the commodification of process-oriented materials and pedagogies into ready-to-use activities as a response to accountability pressure, focusing specifically on one kindergarten teacher's use of big books and journal writing as decontextualized artifacts for basic-skills instruction. In other words, given that the pedagogical culture in this district leads teachers to treat process-oriented materials and pedagogies as tools for basic-skills instruction, I wanted to investigate how this process of transformation occurred in classrooms. I use discourse data, recorded on videotape, to illustrate how the social practice of literacy was separated into teachable parts that were decontextualized from their use (Street, 1995).

Locating the classroom

Description of the school district in general provides some context for understanding the classroom and some of the literacy practices I found. The City School District is a mid-sized district typical of most urban contexts in the USA. African American, Latino, Asian American, Native American students and students the district labels as 'other' make up 80% of the student population, while 79% of the teachers are white and do not live in their schools' neighborhoods. Poverty rates (measured by the percentage of students receiving free lunch) are high, reaching 98% in some schools. The school where I conducted this study was a high-poverty (90% of students received free lunch) Title I Pre-Kindergarten to grade 5 elementary school with approximately 1150 students and 75 teachers. The large school building was located in a park next to a federal housing project. The community center at the park was host to a multitude of organized activities throughout the year, and neighborhood children, both during and after school, frequently used the school playground.

The kindergarten classroom I observed was a colorful, well-appointed, child-centered context. The familiar design of the double-sized classroom (kitchen/home area, blocks, easels, puzzles, etc.) may be found in most early childhood classrooms in the USA. The scheduled activities were also typical of early childhood classrooms in the USA. They included activities such as morning circle, center time, whole class storytime, and journal writing. Students comfortably went about their morning routine of singing, working in groups, and playing together. The teacher planned for journal writing to be a part of this daily schedule; however, time often grew short, and writing did not occur. Students were read to when there was time available for whole class storytime.

My interest in this classroom focused on literacy pedagogy in general and the instantiation of what Greenwald described as 'whole language based' pedagogy in particular. She defined whole language as:

A philosophy, but it really isn't philosophy, all that I remember, I don't know I guess I think of it just as a way of teaching, where you're just pulling from the child, you're not always just up there directing. I mean you have to do some direct teaching but it's more incorporating different learning styles. I guess when I think of whole language it's not just paper and pencil all the time . . . I think whole language because we were talking, remember I was showing you those little books I got for Christmas gifts, those are like phonics readers. Troll sent them for free so I thought what the heck, somebody's Christmas present, but, when you look at it and read the pages it's not that, it doesn't sound like children talking, it doesn't sound like real talk. . . . It's that whole type of thing, you know hat and nat and all the, where at least with Yuck Soup, you know it's

a short phrase but it catches the kids so even though it's technically not real literature it's a fun literature, it's a fun type of reading to them and it catches them, it holds their interest, so I think it's still really beneficial.

The challenge of bringing such philosophies into practice emerged, however, in the discrepancies between her articulated understanding of whole language as a way of child-centered teaching and what I observed. The instantiated pedagogy was teacher-directed to the point that, despite attempts to contribute text ideas, student contributions were largely ignored. Her strict rules about talk undermined her stated goal of 'pulling from the child' to incorporate different learning styles and reduce 'paper and pencil time'. In spite of students' persistent efforts to contribute story ideas or to share their interpretation of books read, the teacher controlled talk so strictly that students were relegated to the observation of her literacy practices alone. In subsequent interviews and conversations at monthly meetings for the larger group of early childhood teachers with whom I worked, Greenwald referred to her students as being incapable of handling activities that she did not tightly manage. Her beliefs about her students' capabilities were clearly supported by her peers who articulated cultural deprivation rhetoric at these meetings.

Later interviews helped to further contextualize this tension between philosophy and practice. She talked about the pressures to conform to the existing pedagogical culture during her first years of teaching. The pedagogy that was dominant in this district emphasized the systematic teaching of basic-skills and pressure to succeed in such a controlling pedagogical context influenced Greenwald's practices. In previous work, I have discussed recent reading reform efforts in this district, and the consequences of that reform on literacy teaching and learning (Irvine and Larson, 2001; Larson and Irvine, 1999). The 'real world' in which Greenwald taught during this project, now in her sixth year of teaching, reflected district pressure for skills-only instruction.

You were put into classrooms where they had basal readers and were told well we don't do this, we don't do that and so you were kinda forced into a situation of starting off relying on the teachers' books and manuals and everything else. Then when I first started (here) a few years ago it was sorta the same way, you get dumped as a – all the teachers' manuals are piled up here. You know and you're so nervous that you need to evolve, in your head you sorta know how you wanna do things but yet you still are so unsure of yourself and it is a safe place to start. Because even teaching for five years I've evolved to relying heavily on that and I started with the letter of the week because that's what the other kindergarten teachers were already doing here within the building, so I thought well oh, they gave me the copies of all the themes, I thought well hey

this is saving me a lot of my weekend time, and then you go slowly, start questioning well geez, why am I doing this and you know that there's a better way.

Greenwald's questioning about better ways to do things led her to implement what she called a whole language curriculum. Her intentions were to construct a context in which students could meaningfully engage in age appropriate activities. However, the enacted curriculum reflected what Routman (1996) has termed 'doing whole language'. In other words, Greenwald adopted certain whole language compatible and process oriented artifacts, such as big books and writing journals, but maintained a philosophy of teaching that reflected the district's emphasis on the systematic, explicit teaching of basic skills. Students were learning isolated skills such as phonemic awareness and letter sound connections that were not fully integrated into reading or writing as authentic activities. The students focused on reading and writing exercises and learning reading and writing behaviors (Edelsky, 1991). As a result, there was little to no reading or writing events in which students could construct meaning. In my experience in other classrooms in this district, the lack of meaningful literacy events is prevalent (Larson and Irvine, 1999).

Analysis shows this teacher's attempts to make literacy more meaningful for students were undermined by time restrictions, pressure from her peers to align with deficit model theories, and district mandates to raise achievement scores. Furthermore, the data will illustrate that students' access to meaningful engagement in literacy activities was restricted by classroom interactional rules that were based on deficit model beliefs about students common among teachers at this school and in the district as a whole. Greenwald described her literacy curriculum as a balance of whole language and basic skills instruction that she believed prepared her students for school-based literacy learning (Edelsky et al., 1991). Discourse analysis of classroom participation frameworks revealed that the classroom language and literacy practices limited the students' participation to the observation of the teacher's literacy practices. The pedagogical emphasis on systematic skills development in literacy activities relegated students to the participation roles of 'overhearer' (Larson, 1999) and question-answerer, and established classroom texts as belonging to the teacher. Furthermore, the literacy activities available to students, in their instantiation, taught them to mimic the teacher's demonstrations through rote performance. Big book readings were used as drill activities for basic skills the teacher defined as prediction and vocabulary building. Certainly materials such as big books or journals alone do not generate learning-centered pedagogy. Materials need an underlying theory of language and literacy learning that would

lead to what Street (1995) calls an ideological social practice definition of literacy. Given the combination of an autonomous definition of literacy and a deficit model ideology dominant in this district (Irvine and Larson, 2001), big book reading activities and journal writing were reduced to commodified tools of skills-only instruction.

Writing up the research in this classroom has been a difficult process for me. I realize that the forthcoming article presents a critique of this teacher's practice. I want to say up front that this analysis is not meant to single out this teacher as ineffective or representative of bad practice. She is operating as an institutional actor within a system that supports her teaching and perpetuates the kinds of beliefs and attitudes that she presents. It is my practice to take videotaped interaction to the teachers with whom I work for discussion and joint analysis (Larson and Maier, 2000). I made numerous attempts to meet with this teacher to talk about the copies of videotape I had given her and each time she canceled the meeting, citing her busy schedule as the reason. As a result, we did not have an opportunity to discuss the data specifically. However, she continued to be a member of the teacher group I met with on a monthly basis for the year following the study. We spoke many times about what I saw and discussed ways for her to try to move beyond district restrictions. Unfortunately, her beliefs about students' abilities did not change. The group as a whole maintained the stance that their students were incapable of handling process-oriented activities. Along with 13 other teachers, she transferred out of this school at the end of that year.

Before moving into a more detailed discussion of this classroom, I want to ground the upcoming analysis in a multidisciplinary theoretical foundation. After this theoretical outline, I will describe two literacy events in Greenwald's classroom: one reading of *Rosie's Walk* in big book format and one writing period that included the teacher's modeled writing and students' journal writing time. The theoretical framework I discuss below provides a useful lens through which to understand the excerpts from classroom interaction that follow.

Understanding literacy as a social practice

In the analysis discussed in this article I define literacy as a social practice learned through joint participation in language activities, not a neutral skill autonomous of social, political, cultural, and historical context (Baynham, 1995; Bloome and Bailey, 1992; Dyson, 1995; Luke, 1994; New London Group, 1996; Nystrand, 1997; Street, 1995). As a social practice, literacy learning is mediated by language use in face-to-face interaction in specific

contexts, for specific audiences and purposes. Through participation in language activity (including language as written text), children learn a relationship to others, to literacy, to school, to society, and to the world as they learn to use language in particular contexts for particular purposes (Duranti, 1997; Duranti and Goodwin, 1992; Ochs, 1988, 1992; Ochs and Schieffelin, 1983; Schieffelin and Ochs, 1986). When teachers recognize and incorporate students' language and literacy practices into a curriculum in which they can meaningfully participate, literacy activities can be designed to foster learning, or changes in participation (Rogoff, 1994). However, if students' participation is limited to listening to instructions and performing pre-packaged literacy exercises, then changes in participation are seriously limited.

To understand how participation does or does not change in this classroom, I draw on Goffman's (1981) conception of the participation framework as a linguistic structure that organizes and is organized by talk and interaction in activity and Bakhtin's (1981) concept of the three-part utterance. As Bakhtin (1981) suggests, each utterance is inherently dialogic as it implies an addressee. Previous research has expanded the participation framework from a three-part structure that includes speaker, hearer, and overhearer to include the mutually constituted roles of teacher, author, and co-author (Larson and Maier, 2000). Specifically, I identified the ways in which changes in participation occur through shifts in participant roles, or footings (Goffman, 1981), in classroom participation frameworks (Larson, 1995, 1997, 1999; Larson and Maier, 2000). In this article, I draw specifically from research on the dynamic nature of participation frameworks as key tools of social organization to analyze what roles were available in the participation framework in this classroom and how these roles mediated access to meaningful participation in literacy events (Duranti, 1997; Goodwin, C., 1981, 1996; Goodwin, M. 1990; O'Connor and Michaels, 1996). Observing the organization of talk and interaction in classroom participation frameworks made visible how the language practices in this classroom positioned the teachers and the students in various roles in literacy events. In the analysis of the participation frameworks in this classroom, I found that the lack of opportunity to shift roles limited students' participation to mere observation of the teacher's literacy practices.

Furthermore, a post-structural analysis of the processes of text construction in this classroom illustrated how the instantiated pedagogy reinscribed texts as univocal in traditional ways and that resulted in classroom texts belonging to the teacher. Because classroom interaction carries powerful messages about what counts as literacy (Luke, 1994), it is important to investigate how language practices position students in relation to text

construction and how that position mediates access to participation in literacy activities. The ways in which power relations underlying this positioning deny access to participation necessitates an analysis of the consequences of positioning in classrooms. 'Power precedes speech because utterances are located within existing social institutions whose rules, power configuration, norms, commitments, and interests determine what can and cannot be said and what utterances count as' (Cherryholmes, 1988: 59) and thus what counts as knowledge.

In this classroom, literacy pedagogy became a form of surveillance, regulation, and discipline in which students were positioned as consumers of an institutionally defined literacy and objects of surveillance (Foucault, 1972, 1979). Classroom discursive practices position social actors in interaction and, through that positioning, contribute to the construction of students' social identities (Davies and Harré, 1990). The social meaning of utterances depends upon the positioning of speakers within the participation framework as it is locally constructed in moment-to-moment interaction. Thus, this article interrogates classroom discourse practices to illustrate how commodified language arts instruction may be used as a panoptical practice (Foucault, 1979) that positions students as objects to be disciplined in ways that exclude meaningful participation in literacy events. Students' attempts to question the ways in which the teacher positioned them in classroom interaction were thwarted by rigid disciplinary discourse practices.

Study design and analytic framework

Using ethnographic research methods, I undertook a yearlong study of the language and literacy practices in one urban kindergarten. I observed and videotaped the language arts period on a weekly basis throughout the academic year. In order to document the consequences of current language and literacy practices on classroom participants' literacy learning and to have access to the participant's perspective on literacy, I interviewed both the teacher and the students (formally and informally) and transcribed all audiotapes. Informal conversations with the teacher occurred after each observation and at monthly meetings described earlier. I took field notes during each observation to document the general flow of activity, particularly what happened outside of camera range.

Fifteen language arts periods were videotaped from October to June for a total of 30 hours of videotape. I viewed and summarized each videotape to identify key segments, or foregrounded literacy events (Heath, 1983) that emerged during initial coding of language arts activities. Key segments

were selected for transcription based on how well they represented the language and literacy practices of this classroom and the ways in which students and teacher shifted roles in the participation framework. The examples presented in this article are representative of the corpus of key segments. I used these transcribed segments for detailed discourse analysis of face-to-face interaction. Transcription conventions,⁴ derived from Atkinson and Heritage (1984) were used in transforming these data into text. Transcription of discourse, or the process of inscribing social action (Duranti, 1997), enables the microanalysis of how language use among activity participants mediates literacy learning. I transcribed all non-vocal, vocal and timing features as additional evidence of the nature of students' participation in literacy events (Ochs, 1979). These transcribed videotaped interactions represent the corpus of data analyzed for this article.

Reading big books

Reading events in this classroom occurred when time allowed and were limited to whole class read alouds orchestrated by the teacher. Occasionally, students had time to read independently, however, the teacher restricted access to books. Very few books were available on a daily basis because the majority of the books were stored in a teacher-only cabinet. Greenwald told me she worried students would destroy the books if they had unrestricted access to her library. The only reading instruction I observed consisted of read alouds, in which the teacher selected the books, read them to the class as a whole, and periodically asked prediction questions and what Heath (1983) has described as 'what' questions. The following example of this type of questioning comes from the reading of *Rosie's Walk* described later in the article. This book is a commonly read book in kindergarten in the USA and is most often used, in part, as a scaffold for students' understanding of prediction and directionality. The story follows a hen named Rosie through a number of adventures over, under, through, and around a series of obstacles while a fox tries to capture her. Greenwald did not explicitly say whether she was using the book to teach prediction, but her repeated use of phrases such as 'let's find out' suggests that this was her instructional goal.

Excerpt 1:

- 130 Teacher: what do we see in the pictures.
 131 Students: A fox
 132 Teacher: .hhh

- 133 what's the fox doing
 134 Students: A chicken=
 135 Shamir: He's gonna eat her.
 136 ((points to book))
 137 Student: =it's a chicken
 138 it's a chick-
 139 Teacher: Rosie is a chicken
 140 ((looking at student))
 141 or a female chicken is called a he:n::
 142 ((turns the page))
 143 Student: Hen:
 144 hen:
 145 Teacher: Acro:ss the ya:rd
 146 ((reading, following text with finger))
 147 she's walking across the yard
 148 Student: She's gonna get ()
 149 Teacher: ((turns the page))
 150 what's gonna happen to fox
 151 Student: He gonna be di:ed
 152 Shamir: He gonna bump his-
 153 He bumped his head
 154 Teacher: He bumped his head
 155 what i↑s this that he bumped his head o:n
 156 ((pointing to book))
 157 Student: A scraper
 158 Teacher: It's not a scraper
 159 it has a special name
 160 it's called a [rake]
 161 ((pointing to picture in book, looking at students))
 162 Student: [rake]
 163 Teacher: A rake

She followed what she understood to be a whole language technique or lesson structure in which the goal was to teach prediction. However, as the reading activity was instantiated, the students did not have access to the text in the form of discussion about what was being read, despite their efforts. The classroom discourse structure was limited to a strict IRE pattern that required that the students recite the teacher's understanding of the text (Gutierrez, 1993; Mehan, 1979; Nystrand, 1997). In Excerpt 1, twice the teacher corrected the students' words for something in the story into what she considered to be the acceptable word. In lines 137–44, she corrects the

students' word 'chicken' to her 'hen' and in lines 155–63 she corrects the students' word 'scraper' to her 'rake'. I am not suggesting that vocabulary building is not an important and valuable goal in early childhood, however, to do so in ways that replace the students' language with a standardized language of school restricts students' participation and excludes students' language resources in the construction of literacy knowledge. Thus, without an underlying philosophy grounded in a definition of literacy as a social practice, children's books such as *Rosie's Walk* become decontextualized tools for skills instruction; big books simply become an easier way for large groups to see better.

The following excerpt is taken from the whole class reading in big book format I briefly mentioned earlier. Greenwald began this whole class reading of *Rosie's Walk* by choosing the book herself (against student demand to read books they had selected), stating that while she would love to read all the books, 'I really wanted to read *Rosie's Walk*, so let me read that one for you.' She spent the first 5–10 minutes of this reading period trying to position the students into proper listening behaviors as Excerpt 2 indicates.

Excerpt 2:

- 65 Teacher: >th↑is story is about<
 66 Rosie.
 67 ((turns to face students))
 68 and Rosie decides to go:: for a walk.
 69 and I need-
 70 you're right Brenda
 71 no one can see back there
 72 ((shakes head no))
 73 because Shamir and Donai and Sharia and Ernest
 74 are all <on their bottoms-> on their knees
 75 you have to sit on your bottoms,
 76 Anton: ((reaches up to touch the upper right hand corner of book))
 77 Teacher: Anton you can be my page turner in just a minute okay,
 78 ((looks at Anton))
 79 kay
 80 Rosie's Walk
 81 ((points to title))
 82 this story is about a chicken who decides to go for a walk
 83 ((turns back to face students))
 84 and <so↑mething happens.>
 85 Student: [A wolf ate her]

- 86 Teacher: [Or it doesn't happen]
 87 let's find o:ut,
 88 ((turns back to book, Shamir turns the page))
 89 George honey on your bottom please okay,
 90 Shamir: [We saw this book before,]
 91 Teacher: [Rosi::e's Walk.]
 92 Shamir: We saw this book before
 93 Teacher: O↑::o
 94 if this is the title pa:ge,
 95 ((turning the corner of the page to glance at the next page))
 96 Shamir: You read us this once before,
 97 ((points to book))
 98 Teacher: ((turns page with Anton))
 99 O::o I see °something°
 100 Student: That's the title page
 101 Teacher: Did I read this one,=
 102 Shamir: Yeah
 103 Teacher: =I don't think so,
 104 the author is Pat (.) Hutchins
 105 ((spoken loudly))

The focus of the above interaction was on controlling students' behavior, to position them as docile listeners to the teacher's reading of the story. The teacher's instructional goal was to teach prediction, a common use for this story. What is interesting, however, is that the students had read this book before. Certainly it is possible, even wise, to teach prediction on a familiar book, but the teacher insisted that this was the first time the students had heard this story, in spite of one student's repeated claim beginning in line 90 that she had read this one before. Shamir states three times (lines 90, 92, 96) that Greenwald had read the book before. In line 101, she asks 'Did I read this one?' and, in spite of Shamir's affirmative response in line 102, she denies having read it and proceeds with reading the story. Subsequent comments from the group of students made it clear they had indeed read it.

This pattern of teacher-centered interaction continued in the writing activity described in the following section. Using one representative writing time, I will discuss the restrictive participation framework that is constructed when instruction focuses on writing behaviors and sub-skills rather than on writing (Edelsky, 1991).

Modeled writing in kindergarten

Writing in this classroom was called 'journal time'. As the kindergarten children slowly gathered on the carpet, Greenwald sometimes told them that they might read a book while waiting for everyone to join them. However, the scarce number of books on the shelf that students were permitted to use limited the children's choice of reading materials and few students chose to pick out a book as they waited. Greenwald started using a modeled writing activity in her instruction after a presentation from a suburban first grade teacher at one of our monthly meetings with the larger teacher group. The presentation reminded her that she used to model writing earlier in her career. She said she wanted to try it out again as a way to improve her writing program and to make writing more meaningful for her students.

The modeled writing activity began as Greenwald sat in a chair next to the easel, her back to the windows, and her students at her feet. Modeled writing consisted of two parts: writing the story and sharing it with the students. After spending about five minutes (of a very limited time slot) settling students down to her satisfaction, the teacher began modeled writing time by telling the students to 'let me think of my story'. Her use of the possessive pronoun 'my' established text ownership and set up a participation framework that restricted student participation to overhearers of the teacher's text construction. One student offered a suggestion ('You could make a spider or a snake') and, while she did respond with positive affect to the suggestion, she quickly took possession of text construction with her question, 'but is this my story or your story?' positioning students as observers of her text. Greenwald chose the topic silently and did not let the students in on her thinking processes (Larson and Maier, 2000). The resulting lack of explicitness about her topic selection strategies left the children guessing about her motives and constructed the beginning of the writing process as something mysterious, or perhaps something that only teachers can do.

The teacher's use of possessive pronouns in this activity separated her text from the students and cut short the students' attempts to shift roles in the participation framework from overhearer to co-author, something that I have documented is possible in classrooms with more flexible participation frameworks (Larson, 1995, 1997, 1999; Larson and Maier, 2000). The consequence of the teacher taking possession of the text in this way was that the students' participation did not change and they remained as overhearers or observers of a pedagogized, or commodified, literacy. The potential for co-authorship of text was eliminated.

After this introductory discussion, the teacher began to draw a picture that would assist students as they decoded the story text that followed. During this drawing period, students made repeated attempts to engage the teacher in a discussion about what she was drawing. She drew her picture in silence, however, and did not talk to the students except to admonish them using a disciplinary discourse common in classrooms that reflects what Foucault (1979) called disciplinary technology (Excerpt 3, lines 188–9). Such disciplinary techniques pervade early childhood classrooms in this district and all the teachers in the early childhood unit who are members of the larger teacher group demonstrated similar strategies.

As the interaction continued, students continued to offer guesses about what she was drawing. Rather than acknowledging student contributions, however, the teacher reprimanded what she perceived as disruptive talk. She used the first person plural pronoun 'we' ('We don't need to guess', Excerpt 1, line 179) to mark the separation of her writing from their talking and it positions her as an institutionally sanctioned author. The 'we' served as a marker of mock inclusion in the group of people who were guessing what she was drawing. I describe this as mock inclusion since the teacher herself was not guessing.

Excerpt 3:

- 179 Teacher: We don't need to guess
 180 I'll be writing the words on it
 181 in ju::st a fe:w minutes.
 182 Student: Who's that your makin
 183 Students: couch, car, couch
 184 ((guessing at what the teacher is drawing))
 185 Student: Oh y'all goin somewhere
 186 Student: A car and a cage and you in the- (.) and you in the-
 187 Student: OH SOMEBODY'S BIRTHDAY PARTY
 188 Teacher: Excuse me please
 189 ((turns to look at students and places forefinger across her lips))
 190 Student: Don't shout out
 191 Teacher: Don't shout out is right

Using exclusionary pronouns sets the teacher up as sole author and students as overhearers or observers of her writing. In this interaction, teaching writing was instantiated as classroom management, something I have observed to be common at this school and throughout the district (Larson and Irvine, 1999). She finalized the reprimand of student

contribution attempts with the utterance, 'Excuse me please' in line 188 and the subsequent gesture of placing her forefinger across her lips to silence them, thereby missing an opportunity to incorporate students' suggestions in a co-constructed text. Thus, opportunities for students to shift roles in the participation framework were eliminated. In this classroom, the inflexibility of the participation framework limited the participant roles to two: overhearer and copier (see later discussion for examples of the copier role).

Writing the story

As Greenwald began to write, the students asked questions about her word choice and about the characters in her story. Some revision and insertion of the students' comments were included as Greenwald continued to write, but because the processes of writing and revising were not explicit to the students, what happened in their co-construction was not seen by the students, as 'their process' as much as 'watching Greenwald write'. As a result, an activity that was originally demonstrated as an interactive process-oriented pedagogy was instantiated as a decontextualized artifact that focused on orthographic skills and positioned students as passive readers of pedagogized literacy (Street, 1995).

As the interaction continued, the teacher announced, 'Now, alright. I'm ready to write my story' and prepared to write on the easel paper. She began to write a story about what she and her husband would be doing the following night.

Excerpt 3.1:

- 236 Teacher: Tomo:row, (1.8) night.
 237 ((begins to write))
 238 (6.0)
 239 my: husband,
 240 (4.0)
 241 a:nd
 242 (4.0)
 243 I,
 244 Student: I,
 245 Teacher: a:re,
 246 Students: a:re,
 247 Teacher: going,
 248 Students: going,

- 249 (3.0)
 250 Student: a birthday party
 251 Student: birthday party?
 252 Teacher: to:,
 253 Student: the
 254 (2.0)
 255 Student: bi↑rthday pa:rti:
 256 Teacher: I need to think of the word I wanted to say
 257 ((sits back and places finger across lips))
 258 you made me forget
 259 Tomorrow night my husband and I are <going to,>
 260 ((rereading, following each word with her finger))

Students called out words for the story in their attempts to shift to co-author (lines 244–55) with increasing forcefulness (loudness in line 255), mimicking the teacher's words, even in prosodic sound shifts ('I,' in lines 243–4; 'a:re,' in lines 245–6). The teacher responded to these attempts at co-authorship with an accusation that their talk, in spite of being 'on task' (Dyson, 1987), made her forget a word (lines 256–8) and she placed her forefinger across her lips to silence them. This silencing re-inscribed the text as univocal and reinforced the students' positions as observers of the teacher's text. As the interaction continued, she reread the story to get herself back on track, though the ways in which writers use rereading as a writing strategy in the composing process were not explicitly discussed (Larson and Maier, 2000).

However, as the story continued, there were opportunities for student contributions to be incorporated in her story.

Excerpt 3.2:

- 296 Teacher: Because (.) m:y ca:r=
 297 ((writing))
 298 Student: broke down
 299 Teacher: =is o::ld,
 300 (1.0)
 301 Shameka: a:nd (.) ugly
 302 Teacher: It is ugly
 303 that's a go(h)od wo(h)rd
 304 ((looks at student))
 305 my car is o:ld and
 306 ((writing))

- 307 I[↑]ll use that word
 308 thank you Shameka
 309 ugly
 310 here's- this is how you write ugly
 311 ((writing))
 312 (2.0)
 313 a::nd=
 314 (2.0)
 315 Students: ((lots of overlapping talk))
 316 Teacher: =it (.) ke:eps,
 317 (3.0)
 318 breaki:ng,
 319 Students: DO:WN.
 320 Teacher: down.
 321 ((writing))
 322 yo[↑]u know the next word.
 323 Student: and you got a flat tire
 324 Student: NEW ONE
 325 Teacher: No (.) I just have new tires
 326 (2.0)
 327 Students: ((overlapping talk))
 328 Teacher: Remember it's my story
 329 ((turns to look at students))
 330 yo[↑]ur story can be about a car with flat tires,

In the example above, one student's word contribution was marked as a good word, verbally and affectively, and was used in the story ('that's a go(h)od wo(h)rd' line 303). The teacher immediately shifted to a demonstration of 'how' to write the word (line 310), however, shifting back to teaching writing as presentation of her text and direct instruction in proper orthography. Students began to offer contributions again, yet were quickly reminded that this was her story ('Remember it's my story' in line 328). The teacher appeared to perceive students' attempts at co-authorship as a loss of control and re-established that control by asserting her ownership of the text as sole author. Possessive pronouns such as 'my' and 'your' served as distance markers (Larson and Irvine, 1999), indexing the separation between teacher and student text contributions.

In spite of her consistent reprimands about guessing words described earlier, the teacher set up a context for students to guess a word she was writing. She had written the word 'red' in a red marker and asked the students if they could 'figure out what that word is?' (line 359).

Excerpt 3.3:

- 359 Teacher: did you figure out what that word is?
 ((points to second to last word in story)) I
 361 Students: [Ca::r] R
 362 Students: [No::] R
 363 Teacher: ((shakes head no)) E
 364 Student: Car?
 365 Student: New
 366 Teacher: Ca↑::r,
 367 ((turns to look at easel))
 368 makes the c-c-c
 369 ((puts forefinger to mouth))
 370 Students: "C"
 371 Teacher: "C"
 372 so this is the word ca::r
 373 ((pointing to another word))

As Excerpt 3.3 illustrates, the teacher set up a classic IRE (Initiation, Response, Evaluation) guessing game (Cazden, 1988; Gutierrez, 1993; Gutierrez and Larson, 1995; Mehan, 1979; Nystrand, 1997) in lines 359–63, in which the students were relegated to guesses of her already thought out text. There was no opportunity for students to shift roles that might have lead to more meaningful participation.

As the modeled writing activity drew to a close, the teacher reread her story, pointing to each word with her finger as she read. The students repeated several words along with her at strategic moments, typically at the end of sentences. At each time they repeated the word, they mimicked the teacher's singsong prosody, 'rekeying' (Goffman, 1974) her lesson to a playful mockery of her speech.

Excerpt 3.4:

- 384 Teacher: Let me go back and read my story from the beginning
 385 (1.3)
 386 Tomo:rrrow night my husband and I are going to look at new
 387 ((rereading, pointing to each word as she reads))
 388 (0.8)
 389 Student: ca:rs
 390 Teacher: ca:rs
 391 ((turns briefly to look at students))
 392 (0.6)

- 393 we wa↑nt to buy a ne:w car
 394 becau::se m[y:::,
 395 [((turns page))
 396 (2.0)
 397 [ca:r is o:ld (.) and ugly,]=
 398 ((turns frequently to look at students))
 399 Students: [ca:r is o:ld (.) and ugly]
 400 Teacher: =and it ke:eps (.) breaking [do::wn.
 401 [((looks down and toward students))
 402 Students: [do::wn.
 403 Teacher: <I want a [red ca:r]>
 404 Students: [red ca:r]
 405 Student: Alright

In the Excerpt 3.4, student contributions were limited to a fill-in-the-blank style repetition of the teacher's words. There was no opportunity for student questions about the story or chances for revision. Once again, rereading as a revision strategy was not discussed, modeled, or implemented. In writing instruction, Greenwald defined basic skills as proper letter formation; not strategies writers use to compose text. It may be possible that her skills orientation reflected her understanding of what was age appropriate; however, the instantiated pedagogy limited the kinds of meaningful participation that students themselves were attempting.

As she began the transition to student writing time, the teacher again took possession of the text ('and that's my story' in line 406), then marked the separation of student from teacher text when she asked, 'are you gonna write my story?' in line 415. When students responded affirmatively ('ye::s,' line 417), she quickly admonished them.

Excerpt 3.5

- 406 Teacher: and that's my sto:ry.=
 407 ((looks down at students))
 408 Student: red
 409 Teacher: =a red car
 410 and that's how we write ()
 411 Student: ()
 412 Teacher: it says its the same color as (flossy)
 413 When you work in your jo:urnals,
 414 (1.0)
 415 are you gonna write [my story?

- 416 [((looks at students, places hand on easel))
 417 Students: ye::s
 418 Teacher: No::.
 419 ((shakes head no))
 420 can you write a story about a ca:r?
 421 (1.2)
 422 yes
 423 but your story's gotta be <[different]>than mine.
 424 [((nods heads))
 425 ((dismisses students to tables for writing))

Her utterance, 'that's how we write' in line 410, signaled her membership in a community of writers that write in the way she had modeled and positioned students outside of the institutionally sanctioned community of which she planned to make them a part. The word 'how' indexed the role of modeled writing as simply the presentation of orthography (i.e. how to form letters). Furthermore, the students were not included in the 'we' that the teacher had articulated as the model for how to write. The internal processes and conventions writers ('we') use were not explicitly discussed or modeled. As a result, in spite of the systematic explicitness of the lesson on orthography, students' participation in the lesson was limited to observation. Presumably, the subsequent student writing time would provide her an opportunity to follow up on orthographic skill instruction. The teacher further indexed the separation of her writing from theirs when, using slowed speech, she emphasized that the content of their stories should be different than hers ('but your story's gotta be <different> than mine,' line 423).

As the examples illustrate, the internal processes, such as topic selection and rereading strategies, that the teacher went through as a writer were invisible to the students and, thus, explicit opportunities for more meaningful writing instruction that exposed these processes were never realized (cf. Larson and Maier, 2000 for a discussion of explicit instructional practices). In other words, what writers do when constructing text was not discussed, only implied and, as a result, the students did not have opportunities to make connections to what their own processes may be. In the end, the activity focused on watching the teacher write. Analysis of the participation framework showed that the students did not shift roles, but remained almost exclusively as overhearers to the teacher's presentation of text. Possibilities for changing their participation to a more engaged role of co-author, for example, were thwarted by strict rules about talking and text ownership. Writing was disconnected from students such that they did

not make the connection that, like the teacher, they too were writers. As a result, writing was decontextualized from its processes of construction and instantiated as a demonstration of orthography.

After this presentation of the teacher's text, students were dismissed to table groups for journal time. However, time constraints so often restricted writing time as to exclude student writing altogether. If time was allowed for student writing, the teacher sat with students as they wrote and focused her attention on behavior management. Discourse analysis of the following key segment revealed that the majority of her comments centered on discipline or direction giving through the consistent use of directives (Excerpt 4.1, line 273) and imperatives (Excerpt 4, line 220) in her talk.

Student writing time

As the following excerpts will show, student writing time mirrored modeled writing in that the teacher assumed responsibility for writing, once again positioning students as observers and copiers. Jerome announced earlier in journal time that he wanted to write about his mother taking a bath. In the interactions highlighted in Excerpt 4, the teacher took the role of author and relegated Jerome to the participation role of copier.

Excerpt 4:

- 216 Jerome (my mom is taking a bath)
 217 T She's getting in the tu:b
 218 okay
 219 ((pulls his journal toward her))
 220 can you write the mo:m for me,
 221 Jerome ()
 222 Alia "M"
 223 T Oh these guys are helping you
 224 ((points to several students))
 225 Students "M"
 226 "M"
 227 Alia "M-O-M"
 228 T Let's do it softly then please
 229 ((looks at Alia and places forefinger across lips))
 230 (1.0)
 231 do you know how to write "M"
 232 Jerome ((shakes head no))
 233 T Let me get my script

- 234 ((stands up and reaches across table))
 235 Alia Like this
 236 ((draws an "M" on her paper))
 237 T Beatrice can I use this paper right here
 238 ((picks up paper, sit back down))
 239 Alia Here
 240 ((picks up journal and turns page toward Jerome))
 241 Jerome: ((looks up at Alia's journal))
 242 T Okay Alia you're being very helpful
 243 but you know what,
 244 you are not working on your story at a:ll

The Excerpt 4 shows how the potential use of the participant role of peripheral respondent (lines 222–3) was thwarted by the teacher in lines 228–9. In previous work, I demonstrated how a flexible participation framework in kindergarten journal writing activity allowed for the construction of multiple roles for students' to increase their participation in writing activity (Larson, 1995, 1997, 1999). One of these roles was that of peripheral respondent. From this position, students responded to interaction in what I called the primary dyad of the teacher and the student author. Peripheral respondent comments were not silenced, but often incorporated into the primary interaction, thereby facilitating interaction among all participants. In this classroom, however, the teacher took over the assistance role and prohibited students from shifting to more socially meaningful roles. Alia persisted with trying to help Jerome (lines 235–6 and lines 239–41), however the teacher redirected her to do her own work (line 244).

The teacher-centered interactions restricted opportunities for interaction among students that might have led to a more interactive peer context, while the teacher took all the responsibility for writing, contradicting her earlier admonition to students to write their own stories.

Excerpt 4.1:

- 256 Teacher: "M"
 257 ((writes the letter on paper))
 258 Jerome: ((looks at her letter then writes "M" on his paper))
 259 Teacher: "O:::↑"
 260 ((writes the letter))
 261 It's a circle,
 262 Jerome: ((writes the letter))

- 263 Teacher: and then we put ano[↑]ther "M"
 264 ((writes the letter))
 265 Jerome: ((writes the letter))
 266 Alia: ()
 267 Teacher: ((looks at Alia and smiles))
 268 (5.0)
 269 Alia[↑]
 270 one more time
 271 and I'll have to send you to another table
 272 ((nods toward another table))
 273 you need to sit and quietly work.
 274 "M-O"
 275 ((to Jerome))
 276 and what did you just write,
 277 Jerome: Mom,

As this interaction began, the teacher wrote the letter 'M' on her paper as Jerome watched, then copied on his own journal page (lines 256– 8). This pattern of watching the teacher write, then copying continued for the remainder of his writing. Scribing students' stories is common practice in early childhood classrooms in the USA, however this teacher did not scribe stories, rather she wrote letters for students to copy. This practice was disconnected from her articulated goal of journal writing as an opportunity for students to enjoy creative writing. Her instructional goal focused instead on orthographic competence and appropriate writing behaviors. In this way, the teacher positioned students in the participation framework as observers or copiers of her text. The limited nature of available roles was reinforced in lines 266– 73, when the teacher firmly denied Alia the opportunity to shift to an assistance role, then threatened a disciplinary consequence that would exclude her ('one more time and I'll have to send you to another table' lines 270– 1) if she continued her efforts to help Jerome.

In line 276, the teacher asked Jerome 'what did you just write?' With this utterance, she gave the credit for writing the word 'mom' to Jerome when, in fact, she wrote the word and he copied it. This accommodating stance was reflective of the verbal strategies of white, middle-class American mothers documented by Ochs (1992). In that research, Ochs discussed the language production, interpretation, and praising strategies in mainstream American and traditional Western Samoan households. She documented that mainstream American mothers often so accommodate to the child's point of view as to deny their participation in accomplishing a

task. Greenwald, a white, middle-class woman, appeared to have taken this language practice to her classroom when she gave Jerome credit for writing that she did.

In the Excerpt 4.2, while the teacher opened up the potential for students to assist 'us' (line 304), she repeated the student response, wrote the letter herself, then took over writing completely (lines 316–19).

Excerpt 4.2:

304 Teacher: Allen can you help us out
305 ((turns to look at Allen across the table))
306 he wa-
307 he needs the letter that makes the bu sound
308 (2.0)
309 bu- bu- bu-
310 Allen: "B:."
311 Teacher: "B:."
312 ri:ght °make a "B"°
313 ((nods head yes and writes the letter))
314 Jerome: ((writes the letter))
315 Teacher: Ni::ce
316 Mo:m (.) tu:↑b.
317 ((moves paper toward her))
318 Mo:m < taking (3.0) a:, ba:th, (in the)>
319 ((writing, filling in the words))
320 (3.0)
321 let's look at our sentence
322 ((turns to journal back to Jerome))
323 (1.0)
324 <Mo:m taking a bath in the tu:↑b>
325 ((reading the sentence, following words with pencil))
326 and here's a period that means [stop
327 ((writing the period)) [((sits up quickly))
328 (1.0)
329 my sentence is o:ver.
330 (1.0)
331 Alri:ght
332 Jerome
333 nice wo:rk
334 >nice work<
335 I'm just going to put a note down here

- 336 ((begins to write))
 337 Jerome: ((leans in very close to where she is writing))
 338 (13.0)
 339 Teacher: Nice work Jerome

It was not clear why the teacher included herself in the 'us' (line 304) that needed help given that she had taken responsibility for writing thus far and given her strict rules about talking and assisting. The possibility for handing over the responsibility for writing to students (Larson, 1999), thereby allowing for the role of student author to be constructed, was eliminated when she assumed responsibility for Jerome's text. In the utterance, 'let's look at our sentence' line 321, she staked claim on the writing despite her earlier emphasis that students must write their own stories. Because the interaction was instantiated as an IRE sequence that undermined the possibility for more relaxed interaction, the possibility for students to shift participation roles was eliminated. In the end, Allen answered the teacher's test question (lines 304–12) and nothing more (Nystrand, 1997). Journal writing as a potentially meaning-based activity was eliminated through the use of journal writing as a decontextualized artifact of systematic skills instruction, specifically as an orthographic exercise.

In sum, this article presents analysis of the language and literacy practices of one urban kindergarten to describe how process-oriented materials and pedagogy can be transformed into artifacts of systematic skills instruction in the context of the current struggle over 'accountable' methods. Furthermore, this commodification process was reinforced by language practices that limited student participation in literacy activity to observing the teacher's literacy practices. There were few opportunities for students to shift roles in the participation framework to allow for increased participation in literacy activities. Patterns of participation in literacy activity control meaning, i.e. control how meaning is constructed in schools, by whom, and for what purpose (Luke, 1994). By understanding these patterns of participation, educators and policy makers may gain insight into how current language arts pedagogy commodifies process-oriented materials and activities in ways that restrict access to more meaningful and inclusive literacy practices. In the classroom described in this article, the students' struggle for recognition (Shannon, 2000) by the teacher at the micro-level may reflect macro-level exclusionary practices in segregated societies (Larson and Irvine, 1999).

Consequences of commodification

I have argued here and elsewhere (Larson, 2001) that commodification of literacy may be one consequence of high-stakes accountability pressures in the USA in general and in urban districts in particular. Teachers are positioned by the national discourse on accountability as inadequate and in need of prescriptive curricula. Locally, central office administration adopted and mandated the use of a basal reading series as a way to standardize and control instruction (Irvine and Larson, 2001; Larson and Irvine, 1999). Thus, local and national pressures to raise achievement scores combined with the deficit-model ideology prevalent among teachers and administrators produced the skills orientation that translated process materials and pedagogies into artifacts of skills-only instruction. Given this external pressure, with few exceptions (Gatto, 2001), teachers choose to conform rather than contradict the pedagogical culture in which they are situated.

Instantiated school-based literacy serves to persuade students as objectified 'other' to internalize dominant white middle-class language and literacy practices as normative. Such enforcement of a pedagogized literacy masks the diversity of the students' language and literacy practices. Teachers who attempt a literacy curriculum that integrates both whole language and skills-based pedagogies continue to 'underteach' (Delpit, 1995: 175) their students when access to text construction is restricted by a control ideology. By focusing on doing writing exercises and learning institutionally defined writing behaviors (Edelsky, 1991), opportunities to contextualize students' writing practices are restricted and the use of commodified, or packaged, literacies becomes dominant. Relying on commodified materials decontextualizes school-based literacy from students' own practices. As a result, students may have difficulty making connections between what teachers model and what they are to do as novice writers.

The power of discursive practices lies in the construction of multiple subject positions within which participants are assumed to be capable of exercising choice in relation to those practices (Davies and Harré, 1990). In classrooms where a control ideology is prevalent, the choice of positions is limited to what roles teachers make available through a tightly controlled participation framework. I argue here that, by removing students' choice of positions, teachers' language and literacy practices exclude the students from meaningful participation. Fairclough (2000) combines a social theory of language with a theory of discourse, which, in turn, examines the social purpose of text. Through microanalysis of classroom interaction I offer insight into how social purposes were constructed in moment-to-moment interaction and illustrated how disciplinary language practices and

commodified literacy materials and activities excluded students from participating in the construction of these purposes.

Notes

1. All names are pseudonyms.
2. The research described in this article was assisted in part by a grant from the Spencer Foundation. The data presented, the statements made, and the views expressed are solely the responsibility of the author. The data used in this article are drawn from a larger yearlong ethnographic study in two classrooms: the urban kindergarten classroom described here and a first grade classroom in a nearby suburban/rural school district. I want to thank the anonymous reviewers of the manuscript for their careful review and invaluable assistance and my colleague Bronwyn Low for her insight.
3. It is not the purpose of this article to articulate this complex debate in detail. See Coles, 1998, 2000; Goodman, 1998; Taylor, 1998 for further discussion.
4. The following transcription conventions, adapted from Atkinson and Heritage (1984) are used in the examples given:

Colons denote sound stretch ('he:n:'); Brackets indicate overlapping speech, Equal signs indicate closely latched speech, or ideas, outward facing brackets (<>) indicate slowed speech, inward facing brackets [><] indicate faster speech; = indicate latched utterances; for example:

Students: A chicken=

Shamir: He's gonna eat her.

((points to book))

Student: =it's a chicken

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 ('chick-') or with a period within parentheses (.). Rising intonation within an utterance is marked with an arrow ('i↑s'); Rising intonation at the end of an utterance is marked with a comma ('so,'); Falling intonation at the end of an utterance is indicated with a period ('pictures.'). Descriptions of speech or gesture are indicated within double parentheses ('((puts forefinger to mouth))'); Single parentheses surround items of doubtful transcription.

References

- Atkinson, G.M. and Heritage, J. (1984) *Structures of Social Action: Studies of Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination*, trans. M. Holquist and C. Emerson. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Baynham, M. (1995) *Literacy Practices: Investigating Literacy in Social Contexts*. New York: Longman.
- Blome, D. and Bailey, F. (1992) 'Studying Language and Literacy through Events, Particularity, and Intertextuality', in R. Beach, J. Green, M. Kamil and T. Shanahan

- (eds) *Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Literacy Research*, pp. 181–210. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Cazden, C. (1988) *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Coles, G. (1998) *Reading Lessons: The Debate over Literacy*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Coles, G. (2000) *Misreading Reading: The Bad Science that Hurts Children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cherryholmes, C. (1988) *Power and Criticism: Poststructural Investigations in Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Davies, B. and Harré, R. (1990) 'Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20(1): 43–63.
- Delpit, L. (1995) *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Duranti, A. (1997) *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duranti, A. and Goodwin, C. (1992) *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dyson, A. (1987) 'The Value of "Time Off Task": Young Children's Spontaneous Talk and Deliberate Text', *Harvard Educational Review* 57(4): 396–420.
- Dyson, A. (1995) 'Writing Children: Reinventing the Development of Childhood Literacy', *Written Communication* 12(1): 4–46.
- Edelsky, C. (1991) *With Literacy and Justice for All: Rethinking the Social in Language and Education*. New York: Falmer.
- Edelsky, C., Altwerger, B. and Flores, B. (1991) *Whole Language: What's the Difference?* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fairclough, N. (2000) 'Multiliteracies and Language: Orders of Discourse and Intertextuality', in B. Cope and M. Kalantzis (eds) *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*, pp. 162–81. New York: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archeology of Knowledge*. New York: Harper Colophon.
- Foucault, M. (1979) *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Vintage.
- Gatto, L. (2001) 'Success Guaranteed Literacy Programs: I Don't Buy It!', in J. Larson (ed.) *Literacy as Snake Oil: Beyond the Quick Fix*, pp. 71–88. New York: Lang.
- Gee, J. (2001) 'Reading, Language Abilities, and Semiotic Resources: Beyond Limited Perspectives on Reading', in J. Larson (ed.) *Literacy as Snake Oil: Beyond the Quick Fix*, pp. 7–26. New York: Lang.
- Goffman, E. (1974) *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodman, K. (1998) *In Defense of Good Teaching*. York, ME: Stenhouse.
- Goodwin, C. (1981) *Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1996) 'Transparent Vision', in E. Ochs, E. Schegloff and S. Thompson (eds) *Interaction and Grammar*, pp. 370–404. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, M. (1990) *He-said-she-said: Talk as Social Organization among Black Children*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Goodwin, M. (in press) 'By-Play: Negotiating Evaluation in Story-Telling', in G.R. Guy, J. Baugh, D. Shiffrin and C. Feagin (eds) *Towards a Social Science of Language: Papers in Honor of William Labov*, pp. 77–102. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gutierrez, K. (1993) 'How Talk, Context, and Script Shape Contexts for Learning: A Cross-Case Comparison of Journal Sharing', *Linguistics and Education* 5(3–4): 335–65.

- Gutierrez, K. and Larson, J. (1995) 'Language Borders: Recitation as Hegemonic Discourse', *International Journal of Education Reform* 3(1): 22–36.
- Heath, S.B. (1983) *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities And Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchins, P. (1968) *Rosie's Walk*. New York: Macmillan.
- Irvine, P.D. and Larson, J. (2001) 'Literacy Packages in Practice: Constructing Academic Disadvantage', in J. Larson (ed.) *Literacy as Snake Oil: Beyond the Quick Fix*, pp. 45–70. New York: Lang.
- Langer, J. and Allington, R. (1992) 'Curriculum Research in Writing and Reading', in P. Jackson (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Curriculum*, pp. 687–725. New York: Macmillan.
- Larson, J. (1995) 'Talk Matters: The Role of Pivot in the Distribution of Literacy Knowledge among Novice Writers', *Linguistics And Education* 7(4): 277–302.
- Larson, J. (1997) 'Indexing Instruction: The Social Construction of the Participation Framework in Kindergarten Journal Writing Activity', *Discourse and Society* 8(4): 501–21.
- Larson, J. (1999) 'Analyzing Participation Frameworks in Kindergarten Writing Activity: The Role Of Overhearer in Learning to Write', *Written Communication* 16(2): 225–57.
- Larson, J. (2001) 'In Sheep's Clothing: Literacy for Sale', in J. Larson (ed.) *Literacy as Snake Oil: Beyond the Quick Fix*, pp. 1–6. New York: Lang.
- Larson, J. and Irvine, P.D. (1999) '"We call him Dr. King": Reciprocal Distancing in Urban Classrooms', *Language Arts* 76(5): 393–400.
- Larson, J. and Maier, M. (2000) 'Co-authoring Classroom Texts: Shifting Participant Roles in Writing Activity', *Research in the Teaching of English* 34: 468–98.
- Luke, A. (1994) *The Social Construction of Literacy in the Primary School*. Melbourne, Australia: Macmillan.
- Luke, A. (1998) 'Getting over Method: Literacy Teaching as Work in "New Times"', *Language Arts* 75(4): 305–13.
- Mehan, H. (1979) *Learning Lessons*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- New London Group (1996) 'A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures', *Harvard Educational Review* 66(1): 60–92.
- Nystrand, M. (1997) 'Dialogic Instruction: When Recitation becomes Conversation', in Nystrand, M. with A. Gamoran, R. Kachur and C. Prendergrast (eds) *Opening Dialogue: Understanding the Dynamics of Language and Learning in the English Classroom*, pp. 1–29. New York: Teachers College Press.
- O'Connor, M. and Michaels, S. (1996) 'Shifting Participant Frameworks: Orchestrating Thinking Practices in Group Discussion', in D. Hicks (ed.) *Discourse, Learning, and Schooling*, pp. 63–103. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1979) 'Transcription as Theory', in E. Ochs and B. Schieffelin (eds) *Developmental Pragmatics*, pp. 43–71. New York: Academic Press.
- Ochs, E. (1988) *Culture and Language Development: Language Socialization and Language Acquisition in a Samoan Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1992) 'Indexing Gender' in A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds) *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, pp. 335–358. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. and Schieffelin, B. (1983) *Acquiring Conversational Competence*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Rogoff, B. (1994) 'Developing Understanding of the Idea of Communities of Learners', *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 1(4): 209–29.

- Routman, R. (1996) *Literacy at the Crossroads: Crucial Talk about Reading, Writing and Other Teaching Dilemmas*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Schieffelin, B.B., and Ochs, E. (1986) *Language Socialization across Cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shannon, P., ed. (2000) *Becoming Political: Readings and Writings in the Politics Of Literacy Education*, 2nd edn. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Snow, C.E., Burns, M.S. and Griffin, P., eds (1998) *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Street, B. (1995) *Social Literacies: Critical Approaches to Literacy in Development, Ethnography, and Education*. London: Longman.
- Taylor, D. (1998) *Beginning to Read and the Spin Doctors of Science: The Political Campaign to Change America's Mind about How Children Learn to Read*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Correspondence to:

JOANNE LARSON, Warner Graduate School of Education, Box 270425 Dewey Hall,
University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627, USA. [email:
joanne.larson@rochester.edu]