

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

**TEACHING SELF-ESTEEM AND CLASSROOM COMPETENCE:
AN ETHNOMETHODOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE.**

BY

BRENDA JEANNE RUMPEL

A DISSERTATION

**SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

DEPARTMENT OF GRADUATE DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

CALGARY, ALBERTA

DECEMBER, 1996

©Brenda Jeanne Rumpel 1996



**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced with the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-20768-4

ABSTRACT

From an ethnomethodological perspective, the structure of the classroom is viewed as the product of the socially organized activities of the members interacting to accomplish the specific task at hand. In this study, routine classroom lessons and practices are located and analysed for ways in which the social structure of what counts as self-esteem is exhibited.

The discussion begins with the suggestion that the self-esteem of children with learning disabilities and attention disorders should be examined using an alternative perspective to the use of correlational studies and diagnostic assessments and other related procedures. The ‘ objective reality of social facts’ such as competence, participation, academic success and the other skill based and behavioural elements of the self-attitudes that are labelled in the conventional literature as self-esteem, are viewed as an ongoing accomplishment in the affairs of the classroom rather than as social facts in and of themselves. This research views student self-esteem as inextricably linked to the linguistic practices used in the everyday routine of the classroom.

Chapter Four demonstrates that the elements of what counts in the classroom as self-esteem are embedded in the routine organizational structures of the classroom, and are made visible within and as a consequence of that structure. What counts as self-esteem in the classroom is both an instructional topic and resource in this classroom. The primary mechanism or structural element used in the instruction of the elements of self-esteem and classroom competence in this classroom is the judicious and intentional exercise of the

asymmetrical rights and privileges of the teacher. The constitutive elements of self-esteem are not only visible as instructional content, but in the moral organization of the classroom, and learning and attention disabilities have remained and been maintained and organized through the structure of the classroom and lessons as backgrounded features. They are features of the interaction which we all know and take for granted, and do not have to be spoken about in-so-many-words.

Self-esteem in the academic setting is both a production and function of the specific organizational structures used commonly in classrooms and as such, it is within the ability of those structures to produce competent members in the academic community. The evidence detailed in this study demonstrates that the constitutive elements of *what counts as self-esteem for all practical purposes* in the classroom is *teachable* within the routine lesson structures in the classroom. Further, this study demonstrates that through the intentional organization of teacher authority, learning disabilities and attention deficits need not be *remarkable* within the classroom.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The completion of a dissertation requires the combined effort of a number of individuals whose assistance is critical. To speak of this document as the product of my labour is misleading and undervalues the support and involvement of family and friends. I would like to thank my family for their support, patience and tolerance throughout this process. In particular, I would like to thank my sons for adapting to my need to work when they wanted to play. I owe my husband a debt of gratitude for his support, encouragement and computer skills, without which this dissertation would never have been completed. I would like to thank Susan Miller for her support and willingness to listen to my ideas and dilemmas throughout the duration of this project.

A second debt is to the administration, staff and students of The Foothills Academy. In particular I would like to thank the teachers and students of the study classroom. I was always welcomed to the classroom in good humour and made to feel part of the class. The willingness of the students, their families and the teachers to be part of this study, was indeed critical, for there would be no study without them.

A debt of gratitude is owed to my Supervisor, Dr. Richard Heyman for his time, assistance and valuable comments, as well as the assistance and comments of my supervisory committee: Dr. Lynn Bosetti and Dr. Robert Stebbins. My thanks as well to Dr. Marlene Mackie and Dr. Richard Hirabayashi for their comments and participation.

Finally, I would like to thank Mr. Edward Romaine for his editorial assistance and support in the final preparation of the dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
TRANSCRIPTION NOTATION	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the Problem	1
The Research Perspective	8
The Study	13
<i>The Classroom</i>	16
<i>The Data Collection Process</i>	18
<i>Data Analysis</i>	20
CHAPTER TWO: ACADEMIC SUCCESS AND SELF-ESTEEM	22
Reviewing the Relationship	22
The Definition And Indicators of Self-Esteem	22
Self-Esteem And Learning Disabilities	25
<i>Self-Concept, Esteem And Self-Perception</i>	26
<i>Peer And Adult Relations</i>	28
<i>Classroom Behaviour</i>	30
<i>Achievement And Social Status</i>	31
<i>Coping Mechanisms</i>	32
CHAPTER THREE: THE ETHNOMETHODOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE	37
Theoretical Influences	37
From the Phenomenological to the Ethnomethodological Perspectives	50
Ethnomethodology: Assumptions And Key Concepts	54
<i>Institutional Discourse</i>	60
Methodological Implications	65
Conversation Analysis as an Analytic Strategy	70
A Synthesis of the Theoretical, Methodological And Substantive Issues	78
CHAPTER FOUR: ACHIEVING CLASSROOM COMPETENCE	89
The Typical Nature of the Classroom	89
<i>The Structure of Classroom Lessons</i>	90

<i>The Organization of Instruction</i>	97
<i>Teacher Authority: Contest And Reproach</i>	105
The Constitutive Elements of Self-Esteem in the Classroom	123
<i>Acknowledging Classroom Competence</i>	124
<i>What Counts As Best Work</i>	128
<i>Problem Solving</i>	135
<i>Direct Teaching of the Elements of Competence</i>	145
Acknowledging Academic Skills And Progress	151
<i>Defining Expectations: What Counts as Work</i>	151
<i>Defining Expectations: Effort And Progress</i>	155
<i>Opportunities to Display Competent Membership</i>	160
<i>Summary: Expectations And Acknowledgements</i>	163
Peer Interactions	164
<i>Working Together</i>	165
Making Problems Visible	183
CHAPTER FIVE: A SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS	
AND CONCLUDING REMARKS	193
A Summary of the Findings	197
Concluding Remarks And Implications	202
BIBLIOGRAPHY	206
APPENDIX	222

TRANSCRIPTION NOTATION

The notation used in these transcripts is derived from the convention developed by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974), and adapted as well from the transcript of Macbeth (1994).

Italicized - letters and letter combinations indicate sounds louder than surrounding talk

words - phrases and words underlined indicate a stressed sound

(?) - indicate pauses in seconds

(.) - indicate pauses of less than a second in duration

// - indicates the point at which one speaker overlaps another

= - indicates an absence of a discernable gap between the ending of one utterance and the beginning of the next.

(.h) - indicates an inbreathe

(h.) - indicates an out breath

- indicates the cutoff of a word or phrase during the production.

* * - softly spoken word or utterance

∴ - indicates the stretching of a sound or part of a word

() - indicates an unheard utterance

[] - Description of physical or other activity occurring during the utterance.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Background to the Problem

It is widely postulated by researchers interested in the challenges faced by children with special educational requirements that the relationship between academic achievement and future occupational choice is of critical importance to administrators and classroom teachers working with children with learning disabilities. There is a wide range in the estimates of the prevalence of learning disabled children in the classroom (Winzer, 1993: 249 - 250). What is certain however is that learning disabilities affect or impair academic achievement for many children on a routine basis. Children experiencing severe academic and social challenges face serious consequences in that future educational and occupational choices are affected or curtailed. In addition, learning challenges affect student school and classroom placement, academic screening procedures, the availability of remedial opportunities and the social and academic peer group into which a child is placed. All of these practical consequences of learning disabilities have a direct impact on future educational and occupational attainment for the child. The problem is to understand and remedy the inability of learning disabled students to routinely interact as competent and skilled members in their classrooms.

Although there is no consistent or universal definition of learning disabilities, the definition proposed by the Learning Disabilities Association of Canada contains elements common to most definitions.

Learning Disability is a generic term that refers to a heterogeneous group of disorders

due to identifiable or inferred central nervous system dysfunction. Such disorders may be manifested by delays in early development and / or difficulties in any of the following areas: attention, memory, reasoning, co-ordination, communicating, reading, writing, spelling, calculation, social competence and emotional maturation.

Learning Disabilities are intrinsic to the individual, and may affect learning and behaviour in any individual, including those with potentially average, or above average intelligence.

Learning Disabilities are not due primarily to visual, hearing or motor handicaps; to mental retardation, emotional disturbances or environmental disadvantage; although these may occur concurrently with any of these. Learning disabilities may arise from genetic variation, biochemical factors, events in the pre- to peri-natal period, or any other subsequent events resulting in neurological impairment (LDAC: 1981).

Just as there is the ongoing debate with regard to what should or should not be included in the definition of *learning disability*, the typification of or characteristics of a learning disabled child are under debate. Students with learning disabilities do not present a homogeneous sequence or series of problems. The exception to this heterogeneity is that learning disabled students are often unable to learn using traditional instructional methods in regular classrooms (Winzer, 1993: 241).

The lack of a universal definition of learning disability results in contradictions in the estimation of prevalence. The characteristics of the learning disabled population are disparate, and often difficult to diagnose with common assessment techniques. In addition the syndrome often acts as a residual category for problems that are difficult to diagnose resulting in mis-diagnosis. There are however a number of common elements to all definitions including neurological dysfunction, uneven developmental growth, difficulty in academic or learning tasks, discrepancy between academic potential and performance and average to above average intelligence (Winzer, 1993: 243-244).

According to Winzer (1993) in Canada in 1986, twenty six per cent of all disabled children were children with learning disabilities. These make up the largest single group of children with disabilities in Canada. This figure varies in the literature depending on the definition and the assessment procedure used by the researcher to estimate the prevalence. Winzer (1993: 249-250) indicates that the best estimate, taking into account the definitional debate, is that from two to four per cent of the school age population is affected.

A variety of learning deficits and challenges are encompassed within the definition of learning disabilities with significant consequences for cognitive, academic, perceptual and motor co-ordination development and learning. Learning disabilities can be viewed as a syndrome, that is a group of related academic and social deficits and behaviours that affect the child's ability to perform both academically and socially across a number of domains.

There is some disagreement with regard to the origin of the attention disorders that often accompany learning disabilities. The conflict is centered around the view of these attention disorders as being a part of the galaxy of learning disabilities or as a separate syndrome with a specific diagnostic criteria. When diagnosed separately the attention disorders are classified as Attention Deficit Disorder with or without Hyperactivity Disorder (ADD/HD). Research into these disorders indicate a strong relationship exists between ADD and HD (Hallahan and Kaufman, 1986). The conflict arises because of the presence of similar characteristics shared by children with learning disabilities and those with attention disorders. Many children diagnosed as Learning Disabled have many of the same characteristics or difficulties as children diagnosed with ADD/HD (Winzer, 1993:

267). The debate is of little consequences for the purpose of this study. What is of consequence is the effect of both learning disabilities and attentional disorders in the classroom. It is estimated that ten to twenty per cent of the school population suffers from attentional disorders with or without hyperactivity, although there is tremendous variability depending on the definition and the assessment procedures used.

An important aspect of the discourse surrounding this particular diagnosis lies in the designation of Attention Deficit Disorder as a syndrome. The diagnosis is based on the "clustering" of particular behavioural and cognitive tendencies in the behavioural repertoire of individual children. The particular tendencies in themselves are not unique to those diagnosed. The concern is generated because of the severity and persistence of particular characteristics well beyond what is considered to be the normal developmental time frame based on aggregate measures of the average developmental milestones achieved in children of a particular age under particular conditions.

The most common behavioural and cognitive characteristics associated with A.D.D. include: distractibility or shortness of attention span; poor impulse control; hyperactivity (considered to be excessive for chronological / developmental age); difficulties in gross or fine motor co-ordination; resistant and domineering social behaviour; emotional difficulties and a generalized immaturity. These symptoms are consistent in the clinical descriptions of hyperactive children by many authors (Cantwell, 1975; O'Malley and Eisenberg, 1973; Stewart et al., 1966; Werry, 1968). A formal diagnosis of A.D.D. is more prevalent in boys than in girls, and the syndrome is often accompanied by other " Specific Developmental Disorders' in reading, spelling or arithmetic. According to Cantwell

(1975), a comprehensive evaluation includes: interviews with children and parents; the completion and assessment of Behaviour Rating Scales; physical and neurological examinations; and a variety of clinical studies such as metabolic and biochemical studies should be completed prior to diagnosis.

In his discussion Wender (1987) lists a number of synonyms for Attention Deficit Disorder (hyperactivity, maturational lag, hyperkinetic reaction, perceptual motor problems and minimal brain or cerebral dysfunction) and differentiates between Attention Deficit Disorder with and without hyperactivity, a trend that is mirrored in ongoing research in this area. The syndrome is generally diagnosed through the use of checklists of symptoms or behaviours, and the specific behaviours change as the child gets older. Certain symptoms of the syndrome become more or less problematic with age. The important point to note is that the specific attributes are not in themselves unusual; many of the symptoms are present in all children at different times and to a certain degree. What is considered to be abnormal is the degree and intensity to which the more negatively socially valued attributes are present. This information, when taken into account with the persistence and patterning of the symptoms in particular social contexts such as home or schools, often generates the impetus for the diagnosis of the syndrome.

From the literature it is apparent that children with both Learning Disabilities and A.D.D, particularly those with hyperactivity experience difficulty in school. Both conditions are generally thought not to affect intelligence as measured on standard intelligence tests and the proportions of bright, average and slow learners within the population of children with LD and A.D.D is the same as in the general school

population. A further characteristic of children with A.D.D has been identified by Wender (1987) as an unevenness in intellectual development; once again a characteristic thought to affect children diagnosed with learning disabilities as well. To further complicate the diagnostic procedure, not only is intellectual development often uneven, but social competency is most often situational. In these studies social competency refers to the ability of the child to understand and to use the culturally accepted and contextually specific behaviour patterns of the environment (Winzer, 1993: 285). That is, the A.D.D. child is often able to concentrate, and is adequately mature in many social situations, though not in the context of the classroom. Indeed, for many children, the first time that social and intellectual development comes into question is at the point of entrance into the school system.

In summary, diagnosis of such variable and socially relative phenomena is difficult, and because of the variability of the characterization of LD /ADD a diagnosis calls into question many competencies that for most children would be assumed to be "normal". Diagnosis is usually made after social competency deficits are noted. Hence, a labelling process of some sort is often already in place before the formalization of the "real problem".

When one considers that the central characteristics of both L.D. and A.D.D. include: difficulties with attention and distraction; impulsivity; restlessness; reluctance to accept direction; perceptual and learning difficulties; social aggression and often hyperactivity (Wender, 1987; Greene, 1987) it is not surprising to note that difficulties in schooling, both academic and social, are prevalent. Children with LD and ADD/HD are often limited

in their ability to learn or synthesize information presented to them in traditional ways. The difficulties encountered by children with these challenges in mastering a sense of social competency and social skills intensifies an often negative experience in the classroom (Bryan, 1974; Winzer, 1993). For this reason it is important to examine the ways in which LD / ADD students can achieve a sense of academic and social competence and learn appropriate social skills within the context of the classroom. There is a widely held belief among researchers working with LD /ADD students that self-concept plays a central role in the learning process. It is postulated that the difficulties in academic achievement that result from learning and attention disorders may foster a sense of failure and poor self-esteem in LD /ADD students. The role of self-esteem in the classroom is discussed by a number of researchers including Chapman (1988), Burns (1982), Byrne (1984) and Winzer (1993).

There is a large corpus of research dealing with the identification of LD / ADD in school- age children. The predominant methodology used in the existing research is a direct consequence of the conceptualization as the problem being child centered and atypical (Cantwell, 1975).

There is, however, a paucity of research that conceptualizes the competency and skill deficits as embedded in and part of the organization and structure of the routine activities of the classroom itself. The focus of this research is the process by which student competence and self-esteem are developed and managed by children with LD / ADD in the classroom. An additional concern is the relationship between academic achievement and social competence and self-esteem, and the social organization and structuring activities

that assemble classroom expectations for student performance and behaviour. Particular attention is paid to the interactions among members in the classroom setting that do the work of defining, maintaining, and renewing the self and the other view of the child as a competent member of the class.

This study investigates how the interactions of members in classroom settings do the work of structuring the self and other view of the child as competent in the negotiation of the academic and social aspects of his day to day world; and the consequences of this structuring on the self-definition process of the student. The primary concern is the management of individual self-esteem within the institutionally-generated structure of routine classroom affairs.

The Research Perspective

It can be seen from the previous discussion that a commonly-held view or perception of a child as academically or socially problematic has several consequences for the future educational and occupational career of that child. The perception of the child as problematic determines a number of possible alternatives for the child that serve to remove the child from the mainstream or in many ways direct the child to alternative school placements, pending the resolution or remediation of the problem. The classroom that this study is about is one such placement. The formal diagnoses of LD / ADD provides for each of these children a biographical history as the basis on which future educational decisions are made (Mehan et al, 1986).

The study employs an ethnomethodological perspective in that it considers the

“objective reality of social facts as an ongoing accomplishment of the concerted efforts of everyday life” (Garfinkel, 1967: vii). The structure of the classroom is the product of the socially organized activities of the members interacting to accomplish the specific task at hand. In this study, routine classroom lessons and practices are located and analysed for ways in which the social structure of what counts as self-esteem is exhibited. By examining specific work activities, the conventional practices through which social objects such as self-esteem, are created as outcomes or products can be identified. The classroom studies that are discussed demonstrate how social and academic “facts” about students such as intelligence, academic achievement and routine patterns of classroom organizational and student behaviour are jointly achieved in the interaction between all members in the classroom setting. The question to be answered is: “ Does the speaking and instructional structure of this classroom and the work of producing and sustaining this structure, make visible the relevance and achievement of what counts as esteem for the members of the class?”

There are a number of studies that illustrate the advantages of using an ethnomethodological perspective in school and classroom studies. For example, David Goode (1990) in his ethnographic study of a deaf and blind girl interacting in her home, points to the relevance of an ethnomethodological perspective to clinical and behavioural research. The use of this perspective allows for the portrayal of everyday events in production, rather than a description of a professionally - prejudicial account of a phenomenon (Cicourel, 1963). That is, it is an account of what is professionally judged to be relevant and important in an interaction. As Goode discusses, the knowledge produced

by a scientific method, is not relevant to the production of the phenomenon under study.

The question of student placement practices is addressed by Leiter, in his inquiry into the assessment practices used by teachers to organize experiences with students (Leiter, 1974). He uses an ethnomethodological perspective to analyse the elicitation practices used by teachers to produce information from students that could be counted as results. These elicitation practices provide continuous and reflexive feedback that allows for the maintenance of social structure in the classroom. He concludes that the student tracking systems in both schools studied were constituted through the teachers use of social types as interpretative schemes, and that the practical circumstances of daily teaching are embedded in these social types.

The question of promotion, placement and retention of students is addressed in a study by Mehan, Hertweck and Meihls (1986). An analysis of the routine decision making activities by teachers and administrators reveals that routine bureaucratic practices, such as the imposing of specific time lines for referral and the changing of administrative procedures tend to structure educational opportunities through the regulation of access to programs. As a consequence, student educational careers are affected by school calendars, resource availability and financial resources. The researchers conclude that designations such as handicapped, normal, and learning disabled are a function of background characteristics, talent or academic effort and the teacher's interpretation of student behaviour. They conclude that social facts such as intelligence and scholastic achievement are the consequences of two interactional processes: interactions between educators and students that produce an original designation and interactions between the individual

student's behaviour and educational categories to produce an action that is taken as counting as learning disabled or educationally handicapped (1986: 87).

For all children with special educational needs, the act of referral immediately determines the student as different, and reinforces the supposition. The referred child is restricted and limited by the boundaries established in discourse (Mehan et al, 1986). There is agreement as well with the work of Goode (1990), in that professional opinion is seen as more authoritative than lay opinion. The professional opinion is credentialized as the official version of the student (Mehan, Hertweck and Meihls, 1986). The researchers conclude that routine bureaucratic processes influence student life and structure educational careers by constraining access to programs and resources. As student identities are constructed by the institutional practices of the school, educational disabilities can be seen as constituted by the educational practices enacted as a routine part of educational life.

Mehan (1979), notes that effective participation in interaction requires that individuals must be able to produce and interpret behaviour in a manner acceptable to others. In addition, to understand interactional competence, the production and comprehension practices must be understood. This in turn requires recognition of the constant reflexive relationship between production and comprehension (1979: 130). A competent member in a classroom not only has the academic skills and abilities, but uses the appropriate form in which to cast membership (1979: 129-131). Mehan concludes that classroom lessons are sequentially - and hierarchically-organized events assembled by the structuring work of teachers interacting with students.

The question of the production of knowledge about student intellectual capacity and skill is addressed by Robert Mackay in his examination of standardized tests as objective / objectified measures of competence (1974). He analyses the relationship between the idealized conception of standardized tests as taking place in a noncontextual environment, and the reality of the impossibility of this idealization. He focusses on a grade one reading test, and examines how the students arrive at the answers. MacKay points out a number of teaching and learning assumptions such as the assumed capacity of students to discriminate between relevant and irrelevant utterances, and the assumption that memory is an indicator of comprehension and competence. He outlines the strategies through which teachers exhibit correct teaching, and through which children exhibit learning. The critical point is that the requirement for a context neutral testing situation makes these strategies of teaching and learning unavailable. Obtaining the correct answer depends on the child's ability to correctly identify the frame of reference of the tester.

Using the ethnomethodological perspective allows the researcher to focus on the possibility of self-concept as linked to and dependent on linguistic practices used in interaction. A discursive model of self allows for a focus on methods used in interaction to construct a self. Self-esteem is then an artifact of the way in which "self" is talked or theorized about in discourse (Gergen, 1985; Potter and Wetherell, 1987). The way in which the self is conceptualized linguistically has vital consequences for individuals. Language is the medium for self construction (ibid.).

In summary, a number of research studies have addressed key issues for the proposed study. Precedence is set to study classroom structuring activities, student competence, and

the teaching and learning of academic and social competency skills within an ethnomethodological perspective.

The Study

The setting for this study is a private school for learning disabled children operated under the auspices of a non- profit society. The Foothills Academy Society was established to offer a full-time educational and treatment program for children with severe learning disabilities. In addition the Society operates a Community Services component out of the school facility that offers assistance to professionals and parents through research; tutoring; in-service seminars and training programs; and lectures and publication of material relevant to children with learning disabilities.

Children attending the Foothills Academy school program have experienced ongoing difficulties within regular or special education programs in their home school jurisdictions, and have been identified as having severe learning disabilities as described by the Provincial Education Department and according to the definition of the LDAC, although the specific nature of the disability is not always determined at the time of entry into the school program. The acceptance process includes an evaluation of the student's psychological assessments, achievement testing and school history. In addition, typically these students have average or above average scores on intelligence tests, and do not display significant primary behaviour or emotional problems. A file review of reports and assessments from previous academic placements indicates " poor self-esteem " as a

contributing factor in the lack of school success for all but one of the children in the classroom studied. The evaluations of student self-esteem for the students in this study were generally made without evidence of a formal assessment procedure by teachers and or parents. In only one case was self-esteem listed on a formal assessment document. In addition, a fear of a degenerating esteem problem in the future is noted on a number of files by parents and classroom teachers. These anticipated self-esteem difficulties are unexplained and are inferred from the cumulative difficulties these children are having in a more typical classroom. It is important to note that very few specific assessments are referenced for possible or potential esteem problems as expected when dealing with a multi-dimensional and variable concept such as self-esteem.

The goal of the school program is the successful re-integration of students into community schools as quickly as possible. While in attendance at the school, the child is comprehensively tested, and an individualized education plan is formulated for each child. These plans are routinely updated as the child progresses academically and socially with the priority placed on effective work habits and student specific strategies for learning. Students work at their own academic level, and the Academy offers Government of Alberta approved courses of study.

In addition to the regular curriculum, the Academy also teaches a “cognitive curriculum”. The latter reflects the high priority placed on the development of personal responsibility and accountability by the students for behaviour, personal and academic success. This curriculum varies with the age and academic level of the student. At the elementary school age the curriculum includes problem solving, thinking strategies,

organizational skills, classroom participation and the development of respect for staff, peers and property. The cognitive curriculum underpins all aspects of the core curriculum and is actively incorporated into the daily routine of the classroom.

At the time of the study there were approximately one hundred and twenty students enrolled at the school between the ages of six and eighteen. The school is co-educational although the majority of the student population is male. Children who attend the school are bussed to school from neighbourhoods throughout the city. Parental involvement in the fund-raising activities of the society are required as a condition of acceptance. In addition at the time of the study, public school boards assisted with the costs for a portion of the school population to attend the school.

There are a maximum of twelve students in a classroom with a teacher and an assistant teacher in the junior (elementary) school program. All children attending the school have been formally diagnosed as having learning disabilities, including attention deficits with or without hyperactivity. Application to the school is open, and placement is determined by need. The bursary program ensures that students accepted will not be prohibited from attending due to lack of available funds. The selection process is blind to ensure fairness and that students with the most severe disabilities are accepted. Class assignments are based on academic and social needs rather than random or chronological assignment. A major concern in the class placement process is the availability of a peer group for the student.

In the tradition of ethnomethodological research, the selection of the study site was not guided by the requirement that the site be typical or necessarily representative of all

classrooms. The use of a special school for this research is not seen as problematic as the intent is not to demonstrate correlation, causation or to predict a certain behaviour, but to describe and uncover processes of classroom interaction. A school dealing with children who all have learning disabilities seemed an appropriate place to study difficulties with this population of students. This classroom is atypical in a number of ways including the number of students, the student-to-teacher ratio, the diversity of academic skill level of the student participants and the mixed-age grouping. In addition, each child has a unique pattern of disabilities and requires individual educational programming to address these learning challenges. There are general features of the school program itself that may be atypical, including the direct instruction methods used in teaching a cognitive curriculum as well as core curriculum subjects. What is typical about this study site is that despite the specialized focus and objectives it is a classroom where teaching and learning are the primary objectives.

The Classroom

The selection of the classroom to be studied was determined in conjunction with the school administration, and was based on the willingness of the teacher and assistant to participate. A single class was chosen as the project site as it was not practical to attempt to study in depth more than one class in the time available, nor was it practical to attempt to get permission from more families and staff involved. All participants in the classroom were willing to participate and all parents and guardians gave permission for their children to participate in the study. The students in the classroom studied ranged in age from six to

nine years at the time of the study. The range of academic skills varied as well with some students at the primary reading and mathematical skill level and other children at or above the skill level deemed typical for their chronological age. For the purpose of this research the specific skill level of each child is not relevant as the focus of the research is on the purpose and consequence of talk in the classroom rather than on individual academic progress. Some children in the class were familiar with the teacher and the assistant teacher from the year before, but for a number of the students, this was their first year at the Academy. At the time of the study, all the children were familiar with the normal practices and routines in this classroom having been with this teacher from September until April, the time at which the study commenced.

The classroom itself is a large, bright sunny room with colourful displays and student work on the walls. One side facing the street is windowed, with the opposite side of the room having windows facing into the hall. The front of the room has a large chalkboard with the eleven desks in a horseshoe formation facing the board. A stool for the use of the teacher is centered in front of the board. Each child has his or her own desk, and most individual work happens in a seated position at this desk. The desks also function as a focal point between activities and personal storage space for each child. A coatroom / quiet reading area takes up a back corner, and cupboards line the wall opposite the chalkboard. The room is equipped for science and art project cleanup, and a separate rugged area is set aside as the calendar corner. There are tables set up in the remaining available space for small group project and teaching work.

The Data Collection Process

The videotaped data for this project was gathered over an eight-week period during the months of April, May and June of 1994. In addition file and interview information was gathered during a six-week period in September and October of the same year. This dissertation is primarily concerned with transcriptions of classroom interaction, as the predominant interest is in the teacher-to-student and student-to-student discourse and interaction. The schedule for video taping sessions was set in advance with the teacher and reflects the degree of comfort she felt with the presence of the camera in the classroom. In the final analysis the schedule reflects a combination of practical and theoretical concerns, including the preference of the teaching staff; the presence of teachers, students and visitors outside of the study population; requirements of the daily teaching plan, and the location of the students in the school. Some areas of the school were unavailable as research sites because of noise and space conditions and other technical limitations. My preference was to videotape during periods of academic and social activity because of my interest in the skills and abilities used collaboratively by teachers and students in pursuit of classroom competence. Teacher and student interaction was studied in all activities, including formal lessons, and game or fun times in the classroom.

The study was limited in a number of ways. Videotape was the data collection tool of choice because of the retrievability factor. However, because of the size of the classroom, and the need to remain as unobtrusive as possible, sound quality is a problem in a number of sessions. Taping sessions were scheduled for either a full morning or afternoon for three times a week for the duration of the agreed-to period of time. Morning and

afternoon sessions were taped alternatively to ensure that the analysis would reflect routine events in the classroom. Sessions in the gym and library were not taped because of the presence of non study personnel and the inability of the camera to pick up sound in large open area. Two sessions were captured in the computer room, with limited success.

The daily schedule of events and the need to be as unobtrusive as possible determined the placement of the camera. The Hitachi VHS Video Camera was set up as close to the activity as possible with the permission of the teacher to attempt to capture the interaction as clearly as possible. There were times, however, that the teacher requested that the camera be turned off when it was apparent that the camera was affecting the student progress on the task at hand. The placement of exterior microphones was not possible, as the camera and equipment had to be removed after each session. In addition, every attempt was made to minimize the distraction for the children in the classroom.

A total of 22 hours of recordings was made with approximately seven hours of tape proving to be unusable because of a lack of auditory clarity. Tapes were replaced in the machine as required in the classroom, with some loss of continuity and interruptions in the lessons. The biggest technical constraint proved to be recording quality. The microphone in the camera was adequate to capture teacher focussed discourse, but failed in some peer activities. The camera proved inadequate in large open conversations and during stressful periods for students. There was one student who was consistently inaudible.

A typical morning in the classroom began with the class assembled in the "calendar corner" in which organizational issues such as the day of the week, the time of year and the temperature were discussed. In addition, the days' schedule was reviewed and "work

" assigned. At this point the work of the day was started and moved through formal and informal group and individual instruction. Academic lessons and tasks were routinely completed during the morning with non academic subjects and activities such as gym, art, and library scheduled in the afternoon.

Data Analysis

The video tapes were reviewed repeatedly and reduced to five hours of videotape that were subsequently audio-taped. Transcriptions were produced from the videotapes, confirmed with the audio-tape then checked against the videotapes. Utterances could not always be easily attributed to speakers who appeared on camera. Off camera utterances are identified as such when they occur in the transcription. The transcriptions were numbered for ease of reference and sequentially arranged. The orienting concern of the analysis was to identify segments where the work of expressing and developing self-esteem in this classroom was made visible. A second concern lies in the identification of the elements of what counts as self-esteem and the routine instruction of what counts as competency in this classroom. An additional concern was evidence for the development of self-esteem as part of the work of the classroom. All data was analysed using discourse analytic assumptions, as the dominant concern is the function and consequences of the different organizational structures. This study is an attempt to make visible and relevant the production of what counts as self-esteem in the routine activities of the classroom under study.

Chapter Two briefly presents the current conventional research literature that outlines

the relationship between self-esteem and elements of social and academic competency in the classroom. The intent of the following discussion is to deconstruct the concepts of self-esteem and classroom competency into the constitutive elements for further analysis.

CHAPTER TWO: ACADEMIC SUCCESS AND SELF-ESTEEM

Reviewing the Relationship

The relationship between self-esteem and classroom competence in children with learning disabilities and attention disorders has frequently been the subject of educational, psychological, and social psychological research. The reason for the interest in the characteristics of children with A.D.D. / L.D. is the almost intuitively felt belief in a relationship between self-perception or self-esteem, classroom competence and academic performance; and the progressive relationship to occupational choice and achievement. The relationship between school achievement and positive self-esteem has been hypothesized in many ways; however, as can be seen in the literature review to follow, there is little consensus regarding the significance of this relationship.

The Definition And Indicators of Self-Esteem

The concept of self-esteem in the literature is described in a number of different ways, but most often Coopersmith's (1967: 4-5) definition is described as the basis for the discussion:

the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself - it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval and indicates the extent to which an individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful and worthy.

This definition is presented in the literature as standard, although there have been a number of expansions and elaborations on this theme, including discussions about the

structure of the concept as unidimensional, hierarchical or multifaceted (Bryne, 1984; Shavelson and Bolus, 1982; Walker, 1991). The concept of self-esteem is like other such concepts in that it has a career in the literature and is transformed according to the context and the demands of the research.

A number of researchers have addressed the sources or components of academic self-esteem. The components are commonly listed as problem solving, critical thinking and communication skills. In addition personal assertiveness, personal responsibility and the ability to learn co-operatively are listed. However, as Burr and Christensen (1992) note, although there are more than fifteen hundred articles on adolescent self-esteem, relatively little is actually known about the correlates, determinants or predictors of self-esteem as it applies to the educational setting.

In the search for the replacement of academic achievement as a primary origin of self-esteem for students, Murtaugh (1988) concludes that non-academic achievements can act as alternative paths to self-esteem. Synder and Spreitz (1992) and Streitz and Owen (1992) stress the importance of participation in the activities of the school and the classroom as an alternative path to positive self-esteem in an educational setting.

The question of the origins of low academic self-esteem is addressed by a number of researchers (Landau and McAninch, 1993; Mercer, 1987; Walker, 1991). These researchers discuss the negative effects of labelling and the impact of labelling on peer relationships. Many students with LD /ADD have feelings of low self-worth due not only to repeated academic failure but, also to social disappointments, failures and frustrations. It is suggested by Peck (1981), that student response to failure and other difficulties in

school act as an indicator of low self-esteem and poor adjustment. According to Peck, students with low self-esteem project blame onto others, lack self-regulation abilities; view themselves as inadequate; focus on failure, and anticipate future failures. Children with LD /ADD placed in classrooms with normally achieving classmates are likely to experience fewer opportunities to evaluate themselves in a positive way, with the projected increase in the likelihood of reporting lower self-esteem. The relationship between academic performance and self-esteem is thought to be mediated by a number of factors such as; personal and family aspirations and support; positive peer relationships; social self-measurement; and parent and teacher expectations (Forman, 1988; Jackson, 1984; Sarafica and Harway, 1979). Walker (1991) concludes that the data reported by the various studies about self-esteem, self-concept and achievement are complex and problematic. The associations reported between self-esteem and it's correlates are mixed, insignificant or absent.

The construct of self-concept is often equated and generally not formulated differently than the concept of self-esteem in the literature. Forman (1988) lists four aspects of self-concept: self-worth, scholastic competence, specific behaviours, athletic competence and physical appearance. He concludes that the most important predictor of these four aspects of self-concept are support from classmates and parental support. Haynes and Comer (1990) see self-concept as a multidimensional concept comprised of all the perceptions people hold of themselves which involve feelings, attitudes and knowledge about the individual's abilities, skills, social acceptance and appearance. Lyon and MacDonald (1990) and Rubin, Dorle and Sandidge (1977) note that a clear and consensual model of

the structure of the model of self concept is needed. The confusion continues with the addition of the concept of self-perception. Often the concept of self-perception is defined as self-concept (Shavelson, Hubner and Stanton 1976: 411). More recent research is developing an expanded definition of self-concept that acknowledges the multi-faceted nature of the construct (Fleming and Courtney, 1984; Marsh, 1986; Shavelson and Bolus, 1982). This inconsistency in the literature with regard to the specific construct of interest obscures the applicability of findings beyond the original study population.

Self-Esteem And Learning Disabilities

There is a broad variety of research pertaining to the education of students with learning disabilities. The literature explores topics ranging from specific teaching techniques, diagnostic categories and procedures, and the analysis of the utility of medication and other intervention procedures, to topics such as self- and other-perceptions of competence, autonomy as a motivational factor and the relationship of academic self-concept to self-esteem. As the proposed study is concerned with the relationship between academic and social competence and academic self-esteem, I will review recent research on topics related to this interest. As Serafica and Harway (1979) point out any comparison of the results of the various studies or generalization from studies to the population of children with learning disabilities is difficult because of the prevalent methodological problem of group homogeneity. Although there is often overlap in the groups being studied, the underlying definitional criteria are not identical.

Self-Concept, Esteem And Self-Perception

Learning Disabled students experience academic failure often as early as first grade. A number of practitioners and researchers have shown interest in the extent to which repeated academic failure effects self-esteem in the classroom. In the literature there is a confounding of the constructs of self-esteem, self-concept and self-perception. The difficulty arises because these terms are not often defined or clearly differentiated from one another within the research.

There is some evidence that the diagnoses of the disability, and the labelling that goes along with the diagnoses of LD / ADD may ameliorate or reduce the child's negative self-evaluation. Remaining in a regular classroom, while being singled out for remedial assistance however, heightens the child's perception of reduced personal competence. The question of social comparison is critical to self-perception in learning disabled children (Battle & Blowers, 1982; Chapman, 1988; Chapman & Boersma, 1979; Morvitz & Motta, 1992; Schurr, Towne & Joiner, 1972).

As many researchers have pointed out the results of research projects studying self-perception are often contradictory (Alley & Deschler, 1979; Black, 1974; Griffiths, 1970; Halechko, 1977; Priel & Lesham, 1990; Rogers & Saklofske, 1985; Rosenthal, 1973; Silverman, 1978), as are studies examining the relationship between self-evaluation and student placement (Forman, 1988; Renick, 1987; Ribner, 1978). Heyman (1990), cites empirical studies that employ a variety of measures to show that students with learning disabilities have lower school self-esteem than non-disabled peers (Chapman, 1988; Black, 1974; Bruinicks, 1978; Lasen, Parker and Jorjorian, 1973; Ribner, 1978; Rosenthal,

1973; Serafica & Harway, 1979) and makes a case for the generalization by students with learning disabilities of the negative self-images generated by failure in specific cognitive area to global negative self-images. Other researchers, (Serafica & Harway, 1979) characterize the concordance of self-esteem and academic achievement as modest.

The relationship between self-perception and self-esteem is difficult to assess in the current research literature. This task is made more difficult by the fact that terms are rarely defined, and are often used interchangeably without the underlying assumptions regarding specific usage being stated.

In a comparative study of boys with and without specific learning disabilities, Bingham (1980) refers to the importance of self-esteem and self-attitudes as influential determinants of behaviour. Citing the work of Maslow (1970) and Rogers (1951) she points out that as self-esteem needs are satisfied, the individual "...experiences feelings of worth, strength, capability and adequacy." (1980: 41). Bingham refers to a number of studies that have attempted to measure the relationship between self-perceptions and school performance. As is most often the case in the literature reviewed, self-esteem and self-perception are used interchangeably. Bingham notes a significant positive relationship between self-esteem and achievement, and suggests that the academic self-esteem of children with learning disabilities may also be influenced by the specifics of the learning problem. Bingham questions whether the level of self-esteem can be expected to increase, decrease or remain stable as children advance developmentally and chronologically.

The relationship between academic achievement and self-esteem is likely mediated by factors such as personal and familial aspirations, peer accomplishments and teacher and

school expectations (Serafica and Harway, 1979). Generally comparisons between students with learning disabilities and normal learners find that L.D. students have lower self-esteem or a lower self-perception of themselves. Serafica and Harway (1979: 230) conclude that " Lowered self-esteem or a more negative self-concept would appear to characterize children with learning dysfunctions".

Peer And Adult Relations

Contemporary research has focused predominately on the social relations between children with learning disabilities and their peers and significant adults. Numerous researchers have referred to the importance of peer relations in the classroom as a positive or negative force in the psychological adjustment of students and as a motivational factor in the decision to remain in school (La Greca and Vaughn, 1992: 340-347; Parker and Asher, 1987). The question of the genesis of problems in peer relations is still under debate. Gresham (1992: 343-360), discusses the possibility that difficulties in peer relations may be caused by the same conditions that precipitated the learning or attentional difficulties experienced by the student. Findings in this area however are not confirmed.

The quality of social interactions for children with learning disabilities may vary with the particular setting, context and content of the interaction. Bryan (1974) found that children engaged in more on-task and less off-task behaviour with special L.D. teachers than they did with regular classroom teachers. Social responsiveness may be related to the behaviour of the special teacher. Children with learning disabilities appear to differ significantly from comparison groups in the accuracy with which they identify and

comprehend a variety of social cues such as facial expressions, gestures, and voice tone with the corresponding lowered ability to make an adequate determination or appropriate inferences about the feelings of others. Once again there appears to be an inconsistency in results. Serafica and Harway (1979: 229) consider this inconsistency to be largely the result of diverse foci, sampling of different age groupings of children, and the use of a variety of different measures. These factors combine to reduce the replicability of the studies.

Peer relations are difficult for learning disabled children. Learning disabled children are consistently found to be less accepted and/or more rejected by non disabled peers as assessed by various popularity measurement scales (La Greca and Vaughn, 1992; Stone & La Greca, 1990). There is evidence that students with learning disabilities are involved in more negative interactions in the classroom; are ignored more by teachers and peers and are perceived as less socially skilfull (La Greca, 1987; Vaughn & La Greca, 1988). As there is a lack of agreement on the definition of social skills (Gresham, 1992), it is difficult to make concise statements about the social skills of students with learning and attention disorders. As Gresham remarks, there is no clear epidemiological data with regard to the distribution and cause of the lack of social skills in students.

Conventional research indicates that academic achievement is significantly related to social status. Serafica and Harway discuss what they refer to as two major explanations that account for the relatively low social status of children with learning disabilities (1979: 229). The first explanation advances the consequences of academic difficulties with the attendant behavioural difficulties generated by frustration, anxiety and the sense of failure

as the primary cause of low social status. With these behavioural tendencies come the alienation from and antagonism of peers and significant adults. In addition, the obvious difficulties of the child, and the additional attention generated by these difficulties result in the child being perceived as different and labelled accordingly. A second way of viewing the low social status of learning disabled children is to view academic and interpersonal difficulties as stemming from the same source. Distinguishing characteristics are seen as resulting from disorders in one or more psychological processes. Serafica and Harway note that the validation of the second view would require evidence that the socio-emotional and communicative abilities of learning disabled children differ significantly from their peers and would in addition require the demonstration of a causal relationship between the psychological process disorder and the social communication deficit. Neither issue is addressed currently in the literature (Serafica & Harway, 1979: 229).

Classroom Behaviour

A good deal of literature is available for review describing the difficulties encountered by learning disabled students in the classroom as well on attitudes of teachers toward mainstreamed learning disabled students (Bender and Golden, 1988). Bender and Golden identify a crucial issue with most of the research designed to study learning disabled students. Most of the comparative research does not differentiate between low achieving non-disabled students and disabled students although earlier work by Bender demonstrates that adaptive behaviour of the two groups is different (Bender, 1985). As La Greca and Stone note, it is possible that low achievement may also account for personal and

behavioural problems identified in children with learning disabilities rather than the presence of a learning disability per se (1990).

Achievement And Social Status

As discussed earlier, academic achievement has been seen as significantly related to social status. But these studies indicating a relationship between achievement and social status, fail to differentiate between learning disabled and non-learning disabled students. A study by La Greca and Stone (1990) matched children across achievement levels to determine whether students with and without learning disabilities differ with respect to peer ratings on acceptance. The conclusion was that lower peer acceptance, fewer positive nominations, lower feelings of self-worth and more negative self-perceptions cannot be considered a function of the low achievement that accompanies learning disabled status. They conclude that it is possible that negative self-perception interferes with social interaction and perpetuates existing interpersonal difficulties. Other researchers have failed to find significant differences between learning disabled and low achievement groups (Bursuch, 1983; Sater and French, 1989). Flicek, extends the research with his study of social status with boys with not only learning disabilities but also Attention Deficit Disorder (1992). His thesis is that failure to control for the impact of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder may account for the lack of consensus in the research literature. In his study he examined the relative contribution of low achievement, learning disabilities and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder to social status ratings. He concludes that the most serious problems with peer rejection, popularity, and social behaviour are most

strongly related to a combination of learning disabilities and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. Other researchers have noted the significant peer problems known to be associated with both LD and ADD/HD. (Landau & Moore, 1991; Vaughn & La Greca, 1988). Flicek concludes by noting the importance of identifying appropriate sub-groups when studying problems of learning - disordered children.

Coping Mechanisms

There has been very little research done directly investigating how children with learning disabilities cope in their day to day lives with relatively low social status. Siperstein, Bopp and Bak (1978) indicate that possession of non-academic talents may enhance learning disabled student's attractiveness to peers. There is some evidence that learning disabled students ignore the attitude of their peers (Bruinicks, 1978). Some learning disabled students may rate themselves significantly higher in social status than their actual status.

Renick and Harter (1989) conclude that social comparison processes play an important role in the formation of an L.D. student's perceived academic competence. It is interesting to note that the perceived competence of L.D. students decreased across the grade span when they were asked to compare themselves with normally achieving students, but they maintained perceptions of academic competence when they compared themselves with LD peers. The authors note the differential use of social comparison information as a method for evaluating the self (1989: 631).

As discussed in research by Veroff and Veroff (1980) the school environment

intensifies this comparison with structural elements such as grading, class groupings and performance evaluations. Renick and Harter (1989) predict that learning disabled students would perceive themselves to be significantly more competent when comparing themselves with learning disabled peers, than with normally achieving peers. Learning disabled students perceived themselves to be much more academically competent in the L.D. classroom than in the regular classroom.

There are several problems noted in the research literature that are thought to produce the lack of consensus and consistency in the research focused on learning disabled children although, there is no universal agreement regarding these problems (Priel and Lesham, 1990). The comparison of results across the studies is seen as not possible because of the absence of a consistent definitional criteria for the population under discussion. In addition, as a number of the researchers have remarked, there are major differences in the sampling criteria used across the studies. The researchers attribute contradictory and inconsistent findings to an inconsistency in definitions, varying constructs of the variables being studied such as self-concept, and self-perception, and the use of a diverse range of measurement instruments. As well, there are problems that relate generally to the use of correlational studies and the use of variable analysis. Conventional research in the area of atypical learners and self-esteem concentrates predominantly on what is thought to be the behavioural manifestations of poor classroom self-esteem in children. However, there is a great deal of confusion as to what are manifestations of poor classroom or academic self-esteem versus manifestations of the syndrome itself. Correlational studies predominate in which various aspects of the lives of individuals are treated as social or cognitive facts to

be measured.

The traditional research can only be seen as applicable to this study if certain assumptions about social facts and social action are made. Firstly, we must accept that the particular phenomena of concern, academic or classroom self-esteem, can be studied in accordance with the traditional scientific paradigm. Secondly, we must assume with some degree of certainty that we can measure the phenomenon under study. Cicourel notes (1964: iii) that

The typical problem of measurement in Sociology is, on the one hand, one of implicit theories with vague properties and operations tied in unknown ways to measurement procedures which, on the other hand, have explicit quantitative properties wherein the operations permitted can be defined concisely.

The majority of the current research dealing with the lives and school careers of L.D./A.D.D. students examine data expressed as correlations between background variables such as parental expectations, peer relationships, teacher attitudes, and classroom behaviour and specific educational designations or categories. Data collection is based almost exclusively on survey and clinical assessment methods. As Cicourel (1964) suggests, these methods are designed to constitute comparability rather than to reflect comparative features. The aggregation of characteristics and the resulting typification has the effect of reducing multiple venues of comparability in favour of scientifically verifiable characteristics or facts. For example, the tendency is to use a professionally generated checklist to find out "what's happening" with a disruptive child in the classroom rather than utilizing direct naturalistic observation. Actions then can be seen as "professionally prejudicial" (Goode, 1990) accounts of a phenomena. Clinical scales and checklists

measure what is professionally reasoned to be important to a particular categorization, rather than the lived experience of the activity. As Garfinkel and Cicourel conclude, these procedures methodologically creates comparability but do not necessarily reflect empirical similarities. The result is that a process is "materially transformed to fit with professional theories and methods" (Goode, 1990: 4).

The bulk of the existing educational research literature on the relationship between self-esteem and school performance looks to "scientific" knowledge about educational matters. That is, facts that are verifiable through experimentation, variable control and statistical manipulation versus a concern with the common sense knowledge, by which actors in social situations proceed to make sense of and negotiate every day life. The raw data that forms the base for the abstracted data analysed in conventional survey, clinical and field studies is rarely presented or included. As researchers move away from raw materials to coded data to summarize findings, the data becomes increasingly abstracted and removed from any sense of process. With the increasing abstraction comes a decreasing ability to consider any alternative interpretation of the data other than that imposed by the researcher (Mehan, 1979), and as an artifact of the methodology, hence, there is a researcher constructed reality. As Cicourel suggests (1968), an abstract vocabulary of indicators, presumed to stand for a known phenomena or environment of objects displaces both the objectification and the description of actual events from which inferences about social structures are made. The correspondence between what is claimed as observed, and the vocabulary used to describe what is observed, are not available for independent verification. Assumptions and judgements in the formulation of "objective"

data are unexamined and because of the degree of abstractionism, unexaminable. The problem of selectivity of subject, of account and of interpretation remains, despite technical attempts to enhance the capability of traditional methodologies to account for "what really happens". The question under consideration is: How applicable is the current research to the question at hand? That is, does the current research inform us of the process or the interpretative procedures involved in defining, maintaining and renewing what counts as self-esteem for all practical purposes in the classroom? The nature of the question determines the nature of the data that is required. As we are reminded by Joel Smith (1991), the question of importance is the link between the question posed and the appropriate methodology. The course of the inquiry is shaped by the nature of the phenomenon under study and by the question asked. As addressed by Cicourel (1964: iii), the "... solution requires certain theoretical and meta-methodological clarifications.....that are linked explicitly to concrete methods of social research." To be more specific, the validity of the research discussed is suspect for the purpose of this study not only because of technical and methodological issues, but because of the imposition of procedures *external* to the observable social world. Correlational analysis and the analysis of variance cannot portray how everyday events are produced and experienced. By examining the literature it can be seen what elements of classroom life may have an impact on self-esteem. These elements include academic successes or failure, competent behaviour in the classroom, and the effect of peer relationships. Chapter Three will provide the framework for the examination of these elements from an ethnomethodological perspective.

CHAPTER THREE: THE ETHNOMETHODOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Theoretical Influences

In order to understand the full implications of the focus of the proposed study, it is important to outline the relevant theoretical background and assumptions of the ethnomethodological perspective. The theoretical and methodological roots of this perspective are to be located in the phenomenological writings of Edmund Husserl and Alfred Schutz, and expanded with the focus on the development of a phenomenological sociology by Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann.

Edmund Husserl has been credited with the initiation of the theoretical tradition of Phenomenology (Alexander, 1987: 239; Grossmann, 1984: 89; Heritage, 1984: 38). Reinhardt Grossmann speaks of Husserl's concern with the problem of knowledge (1984) as reflected in the acceptance by Husserl of the Platonic tradition of visualizing the world of *becoming* through perception and the mental activity of reflection. The problem for Husserl was the reconciliation of the Platonic view of the role of perception in reality, and the concept of human intentionality as developed by his teacher, Brentano. For the purpose of this discussion, the key concept is that reality is structured by individual perception, in the sense that " The basic unit of the world, the fact, is presented to us in a unitary act of the mind" (Grossmann, 1984: 114). With this formulation of the nature of perception, Husserl was able to maintain a belief in the existence of a collective reality (Alexander, 1987: 239) and at the same time acknowledge the role of perception. Husserl visualized action and order as produced intentionally and anonymously. The practical

outcome of Husserl's elaboration of the role of perception in the apprehension of reality was the move toward a "rigorous deductive science of subjectivity" with the primary assumption of a correlation between an object perceived through the act of cognition and that object's subjective structure (Heritage, 1984: 38-9). These structures are active in the constitution of a subjective realm.

Husserl saw the *bracketing* of assumptions about the reality of existence as critical to the study of social action (ibid.: 244). This phenomenological reduction was to be an essential element in the science of phenomenology as it enables the study of acts as they are accomplished. As Grossmann writes:

At the deepest level, Phenomenology thus consists of a reflection on consciousness, that is, on ordinary mental acts of perception, experience, desire, fear, etc. This sets it quite clearly apart from the natural sciences. It has its own method, reflection on mental acts, and it has its own subject matter, consciousness. ... *Phenomenology*, we can finally sum up, is the study of the essence of consciousness. (1984: 144)

The philosophical and programmatic assumption put forward by Husserl includes the tenet of the existence of multiple rather than single realities. The term *natural attitude* is used by Husserl to characterize and to interpret mundane perceptions of the social world. The practice of phenomenological reductionism or suspension of doubt is an outgrowth of the characterization of the *natural attitude*, and plays an important role in Husserl's program for a phenomenologically based social science (Heritage, 1984: 41; Schutz, 1962: 106). According to Leiter, this assumption is central in that it philosophically separated the scientific and commonsense rationalities, and provides a base for the "social production of facticity" (Leiter, 1980: 39). Further, this assumption underscores the basic

difference between social and natural environments and the dependence of social objects on human recognition for existence (Leiter, 1980: 40). The intent of the adaptation of a phenomenological perspective in the study of society was to establish as pre-suppositional, the doctrine of individualism as a counterpoint to the doctrine of determinism in the study of social action (ibid.: 244). This perspective as proposed by Husserl reflected as a primary concern the function of consciousness in the perception of reality. That is, objects exist as a product of the constitutive acts of consciousness in a unity of meaning, and are established at the time of the actor's recognition of the object (Heritage, 1984: 42). Husserl's conception of consciousness as the foundation of knowledge was at the root of the development of the concept of *Lebenswelt* or life world; the mundane world of everyday experiences (Heritage, 1984; Husserl, 1970). This world is constituted of the cognitive perceptions of actors, and is both the foundation and starting point of Alfred Schutz's work on the nature of intersubjectivity.

Alfred Schutz built on the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl in that he applied the phenomenological view of reality to the study of human action with his direction that the construction of categories and models used in the social sciences should be founded on the commonsense experience of social reality (Schutz, 1962: 21). Alexander refers to this directional change as a move away from a transcendental reality to a mundane reality (1987: 251). Beginning with the concept of the *Lebenswelt*, and the elements of the cognitive constitution of objects, Schutz described the features of the social world as constituted by and oriented to ordinary actors engaged in mundane activities (Heritage, 1984). His theory of action was formulated on the "...knowledgeable character of actor

activities” (ibid: 46). This is the fundamental difference or division between the phenomenological and the ethnomethodological perspectives: the concern about consciousness versus the focus on empirically observable social activities (Ritzer, 1992: 373). This departure from the focus on consciousness to a concern with subjective and specifically intersubjective relationships was reflective of Schutz’s concern with the nature of routine everyday life. Actors do not interpret life in accordance with the direction of the scientific method, rather everyday life is interpreted according to “... naive and pre-scientific interpretations...” that “... constitute (the) subject matter of social science...” (Leiter, 1980). Leiter sees this insistence on the need to confront reality where the structures are located, i.e. in subjective commonsense constructs and typifications, as a key contribution to the ethnomethodological perspective. In addition Schutz contributed the conceptualization of social action as the interpretation of motives, in order to understand actions and behaviours (Schutz, 1962). As Weber, Schutz’s work reflects the acceptance of the notion of “... collectively rooted normative patterns” (Alexander, 1987: 251), and reflects an alternative to the prevailing neopositivist view of the social sciences at the time (Heritage, 1984: 45).

A number of integral concepts routinely used within the ethnomethodological perspective derived from those defined and elaborated in the work of Alfred Schutz. The conception of the world as intersubjective, or as common to all, and the simultaneous sharing of space and time are key philosophical elements in the view of the social world as created intersubjectively. The concept of typification, and the resulting view of action as determined “...by means of a type constituted in earlier experiences...” (Berger and

Luckmann, 1967; Ritzer, 1992: 376), point to the glossing of the unique features of an individual or an event with a generic or homogeneous feature. Ritzer sees both typification and recipes as interchangeable in Schutz's work, but recipes "... serve as techniques for understanding or at least controlling aspects of ... experience." (Natanson, 1973: a:xxix).

Husserl's conception of the *Lebenswelt* is expanded in the writings of Alfred Schutz as the "... world in which intersubjectivity and use of typifications and recipes takes place" (Ritzer 1992, p.378). This common-sense world, or world of everyday life (Natanson 1973, a:xxv) is the world taken for granted and is characterized by the basic features of a special tension of consciousness; the suspension of doubt by the actor in the existence of the world; the activity of *working* that is actors engage in "...action in the outer world, based on...and characterized by the intention to bring about the projected state of affairs by bodily movement" (Schutz, 1962: 3-47).

In addition to the feature of *working*, the common-sense world is further characterized by the "... common intersubjective world of communication and social action" (Schutz, 1962: 207-59). Ritzer notes that the question of the status or the impact and influence of a cultural world is addressed by Schutz as an intersubjective world created by people in the past and present (Ritzer, 1992: 379). All cultural "... objects - tool, symbols, language systems; works of art, social institutions, etc. - point back by their very origin and meaning to the activities of human subject" (Schutz, 1962: 287-356). The question of the existence of constraining forces within society is acknowledged by Schutz, although, the concern is predominantly with the existence and potential use of shared knowledge within society. The shared stock of knowledge consists of both private "biographically articulated"

knowledge, and the knowledge of skills (Schutz and Luckmann, 1973; Ritzer, 1992: 371). This shared stock of knowledge is used in the production of social action, although Schutz differentiates private biographical knowledge and the common-sense world.

Schutz's typology of the realms of social reality points to a central component of the theory behind the practical reality of social life: the *umvelt* and the *mitvelt* or the worlds of the *we* and *they* relations. These realms are based on an interpretation of the social world of the actor: The *umvelt*, the world of face to face interaction, and the *mitvelt*, the world in common with all other actors. In keeping with the origin of reality, the *umvelt* is characterized by the degree of shared knowledge of personal biographies and a *thou orientation* : the "... universal form in which the other is experienced in person" (Schutz and Luckmann, 1973: 62). The *mitvelt* is characterized by *they* relations, that is relationships with individuals as part of the larger social structure. This lack of accessibility to biographical information about all others, or the probable or possible lack of intimacy forces the adoption of typifications to interpret action (Schutz, [1932] 1967). The ongoing revision of the typification and recipe knowledge is not possible within the larger structure. As Ritzer discusses (1992) the *mitvelt* is a stratified world characterized by different levels of anonymity in social relationships. The levels of intimacy most available to scientific study are the most anonymous. Without face to face interaction, an actors stock of common sense knowledge is restricted to "... general types of subjective experience" (Schutz, [1932] 1967).

The concept of type construction or typification in Schutz's work is based on the assumption of the permeation of the process of *verstehen* in social life. It is through the

process of *verstehen* and the "... application of learned common-sense constructs to actions, events and their contexts..." (Schutz, 1962) that the actor is able to interpret and negotiate mundane activities. *Type constructs* exhibit a number of features including the variation in the level of accessible knowledge dependent on the stock of knowledge of the actor, and the subsequent ability of the construct to be shared in common between actors *for all practical purposes* despite the element of risk and misunderstanding (Heritage, 1984: 49). Schutz sees this common sense knowledge as adequate to allow for the interpretation and sharing of the common sense social reality (*ibid.*; Schutz, 1962: 55).

Schutz discusses *normal form typifications* as the feature of interaction that allows participants to presume the existence of standardized or normal forms of acceptable talk. The actor's knowledge of these normal forms is part of the socially distributed knowledge systems. The breach of, or breakdown in, the mutual assumption of a standardized form of acceptable talk generates an attempt to normalize the interaction, and importantly provides the actor with a reference point for comparing and determining meaning in interaction.

Schutz's retention of Husserl's concept of consciousness in his work and the elaboration of typicality provided the starting point for the analysis of mundane knowledge. The process of typification begins with an object constituted as the "... sedimented product of past activities of comparing and contrasting..." (Heritage, 1984: 51), with the consequence that experiences occur against a background, or an "... horizon of familiarity and preacquaintanceship..." (Schutz, 1962: 7). Type constructs become part of the stock of knowledge of the actor, and are used in the immediate interpretation by the actor in conjunction with the actor's current practical purpose and sense of relevance (

Heritage, 1984: 52-3; Schutz, 1970).

Schutz 's notion of intersubjectivity marked an alternative conceptualization of the phenomenological interest in consciousness to the analysis of relationships in social action. The consequences of this alternative conceptualization in the designation of the problem of intersubjectivity as a mundane problem rather than the philosophical problem (Heritage, 1984: 50), was the redesignation of the scope of the problem to the analysis of the sharing and communication of common experiences. Schutz recognized the impossibility of identical experiences being shared by actors, but questioned the necessity for shared experiences to be identical in content. The difference in perceptions by actors is irrelevant because of the feature of intersubjectivity that allows each actor to assume and act as if experiences are similar *for- all - practical - purposes* (Heritage, 1984: 54). The traditional phenomenological emphasis on the subjective nature of the social world was translated by Schutz into a concern for the intersubjective nature of the social world (Ritzer, 1992). In his discussion of social action as involving the cumulative consequences of the orientation to all the attitudes and actions of others (1967: 13), Schutz defines the practical impact of the concept of intersubjectivity as a reflexive base for all social action and extends this concept to a mutual reciprocity of perspectives (Schutz, 1967; Cicourel, 1972; Garfinkel, 1967).

Schutz outlined these assumptions in his *general thesis of reciprocal perspectives* as idealizations. The idealization of the interchangeability of standpoints, and the idealization of the congruency of the system of relevances allow for the maintenance of a common world of actors and allow the actor to interact despite the incongruencies in personal

world view. The maintenance of these idealizations is the only “ guarantee” in the interaction (Heritage, 1984: 55). In sum, this perspective states that the speaker and hearer assume the context of the interaction in the same way, and disregard personal differences in the assignation of meaning. These assumptions insure that participants approach interaction in a presumably identical manner, and the utterances generated will be intelligible and are necessary in making assumptions about the meaning of utterances and actions. Actors utilize their stock of personal typifications in order to understand and interpret direct and indirect experiences. Schutz stressed the interpretation of a common sense world through socially constructed categories. These categories allow “... actors to interpret ... grasp the intention and motivation ... achieve intersubjective understanding and navigate the social world “ (Heritage, 1987: 224). These typifications provide both a resource and a guide for the assumptions necessary for social interaction and the rule for the interpretation of each interaction. This enables the actor to deal effectively in a social situation defined as ambiguous.

Two additional theoretical concepts discussed by Schutz are his discussion of the problems of relevance (1962), and rationality (1964). In order to determine the relevance of an action, the actor must comprehend or apprehend a rule for recognizing the normative form typifications (Cicourel, 1973). The problem of the actor’s determination of the relevance of the self at a particular time, and the specific consequences of this relevance is tied to the question of rationality- in - action. The resolution, that actors act and account for their actions within the local context, and in terms of the available local logic, ties action and logic “... reflexively ... to past events and future outcomes, but is

irremediably and unavoidably local...” (Boden, 1990: 194). The local and irremediably reflexive nature of action is critical to the ethnomethodological perspective. These seen but unnoticed attitudes of everyday life form the “... world known in common and taken for granted” (Garfinkel, 1972: 3). Schutz discusses rational action in terms of the actor’s situational response rather than as an objective quality of an act itself. Once again, the pragmatic character of common-sense knowledge stands as the critical assessment point in the view of rational choice. The theory of the process of typification specifies that all choices are of necessity *essentially incomplete* or always indeterminate and revisable because of the nature of type constructions. Actors devise action courses on the basis of the available stock of knowledge in a reflexive fashion, that is, the outcome of action is integrated into the stock of “ socially standardized typifications” of the actors (Heritage, 1984: 75).

Berger and Luckmann further refined the prospect for a phenomenological approach to the study of social action in their text *The Social Construction of Reality* . The primary interest was stated as a contribution to the Sociology of Knowledge, but their work had the impact of further elaborating on the work of Alfred Schutz as it relates to a sociological perspective. In their analysis of everyday life, they repeat the notion of the *we* relationships as involving the interchange of biographical history and meanings and specify society as a “... human product. Society is an objective reality. Man is a social product” . The implication of the work of Berger and Luckmann (1967), being that if reality is viewed as socially constructed, then we must analyse the process in which this occurs. Berger and Luckmann (1967) define reality as a quality of a phenomenon that we recog-

nize as having a being independent of our own volition. Knowledge is the certainty that phenomena are real; they have a being, and they possess specific characteristics. A critical point is that we take different realities for granted and that specific configurations of reality and knowledge pertain to specific social situation or contexts. All human knowledge is developed, transmitted and maintained in social interaction, or in other words, all social knowledge is socially constructed, and socially distributed. The key to understanding society lies in understanding how subjective meanings become objective facts.

To understand how subjective meanings become social facts it is necessary to see everyday life as an ordered reality, that is, phenomena are "... prearranged in patterns that seem to be independent of my apprehension..." (Berger and Luckmann, 1967). The implication of this ordering of phenomena is that the reality of everyday is objectified; constituted by an order of objects with a prior designation of objects. The primary tool used to continuously maintain this objectification, and the prior order is language. The use of language allows for the sharing of this objectified world in interaction. This common-sense knowledge is shared with others in the normal day to day routines of daily life, hence the reality of everyday life is taken for granted, and does not require verification until the day to day routine is disrupted. Then, using the stock of commonsense knowledge available to us, we integrate the problematic into the non-problematic once again.

Objects are given meaning through the process of typification (Schutz, 1962). As discussed by Heritage in Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology (1984: 51), Schutz "follows" Husserl in arguing that objects as constructs are constituted of sedimented products

(objectification) of past activities, compared and contrasted to produce what is called "mundane" typification. The consequence of this is that all experience is familiar or gauged against a background of normality. The social reality of everyday life is framed in a continuum of such typification which is progressively anonymous as one moves further and further away from the face to face interaction. Social structure can then be seen as the sum total of all these typification (Berger and Luckmann, 1967; Mehan, 1983; Heritage, 1984), and as an essential and embedded element of everyday life. Language, once again is the tool that allows for the construction of typification in a highly abstract form, and allows for the reviewing and re-creation of past or typified experiences to the present, both temporally and spatially. These symbols defined by language are objectively real elements in every day lives. To expand on this thought, it can be seen how language becomes constitutive of the reality of everyday life (Berger and Luckmann, 1967).

This patterned or habitualized reaction or action toward a typification is a precursive component of institutionalization. Institutions can be seen as being formulated in a reciprocal process of typification (Ritzer, 1992: 390). These typifications reflect the common-sense knowledge of what can be expected in a given social situation, and constitute a mediation between the *umwelt* and *mitwelt*, or what Ritzer refers to as large and small scale worlds (Ritzer, 1992: 388-91). Institutionalization is not seen as an "... irreversible process despite the fact that institutions, once formed, have a tendency to persist." In an objective sense, the stock of common knowledge ensures that every individual takes for granted the existence of the institution, however, in the subjective sense, an individual's knowledge of what is generally accepted and known about the

institution varies with the degree of anonymity the individual experiences in the day to day interaction with the institution (Berger and Luckmann, 1967: 99).

The concept of reification is used within the phenomenological perspective as a process by which the institutional order is objectified. It is the interpretative tool or strategy used by actors in the "... apprehension of human phenomena as if they were things, that is in non-human or possibly supra-human terms" (ibid: 106). In other words the product can be seen as becoming the producer. The relationship between the objectification of the social world and the process of reification is described by Berger and Luckmann as:

The objectivity of the social world means that it confronts man as something outside of himself. The decisive question is whether he still retains the awareness that, however objectified, the social world was made by men - and therefore, can be remade by them. In other words , reification can be described as a extreme step in the process of objectification, whereby the objectified world loses it's comprehensibility as a human enterprise and becomes fixated as a non-human non-humanizable, inert facticity. (ibid: 106).

The process and strategies of legitimation "... ascribe cognitive validity to objectified meaning (Ritzer, 1992: 391). Legitimation of the institutional order functions as a method of not only stabilizing this order, but ensuring longevity of the existing order. Berger and Luckmann see this legitimation as "... providing a normative dignity" to the "... practical imperatives..." of the institutional order. The notion of practical imperative plays an important function in the development of the ethnomethodological perspective in terms of a conceptualization of a social situation *for all practical purposes*. Berger and Luckmann deal extensively with the concept of legitimation, but for the purpose at hand it is sufficient to note the process in the maintenance of the institutional order.

From the Phenomenological Perspective to the Ethnomethodological Perspective

The transition from the phenomenological focus to the ethnomethodological perspective occurred as a consequence of the work of Harold Garfinkel and his program of research into the nature of social action. Within the sociological literature there is some consensus that Garfinkel designed his research program as a reaction to, or as radical challenge to the work of Talcott Parsons (Alexander, 1987; Heritage, 1984; Ritzer, 1992). Garfinkel's focussed on the production of a framework for a sociological research perspective that reflected the philosophical imperative of the study of social action *in situ*, that is, in the mundane world.

The term ethnomethodology is the label given to this alternative view of social action by Garfinkel, to describe the study of the range of phenomena constituting mundane knowledge, and the range of procedures members use to interpret and produce this knowledge (Heritage, 1984). Garfinkel maintained both the phenomenological vocabulary and philosophical perspective in his use and expansion of the concepts of intersubjectivity, reflexivity, rationality and relevance. In this way he was able to frame a perspective of social action with the actor as knowledgeable, and at the centre of social action. The implication of the adaptation of the phenomenological perspective on social action was a possibility to focus on the necessarily reflexive relationship between social structure and social activity, and to study the locally produced temporal determination of meaning *in situ* (Heritage, 1984: 2). Garfinkel, like Schutz, sees the social world as the ongoing practical accomplishment of actors, negotiated through practical reasoning. From Schutz,

Garfinkel incorporated into his work the notion of norms and rules operating in conjunction with consciousness (Alexander, 1987). There is agreement with the work of Schutz that most daily activity is routine, and negotiated without the need for much reflection on behalf of the actor (Ritzer, 1992), and with Durkheim that social facts are the fundamental sociological phenomenon. However, it is in the view of the constitution of social facts that the deviation occurs. Rather than being constrained by external criteria, for example social institutions and structures (Ritzer, 1992: 393), social facts are the result of the concerted effort of interaction in mundane lives. Actors play the critical role in the development and maintenance of the structures and institutions in which everyday activity takes place. They are responsible for the production of what Pollner calls "... the extraordinary organization of the ordinary..." (1987: xvii) through the process of typification. Rather than being interested in cognitive process, ethnomethodologists are interested in the procedures, methods and practices of members as they go about their daily lives.

Leiter (1980: vi) refers to ethnomethodology as "... chiefly the study of how typifications of the stock of knowledge are brought into play through the use of the practices of commonsense reasoning to create and preserve a sense of social reality." In a similar vein Heritage, defines ethnomethodology as the:

study of a particular subject matter: the body of common-sense knowledge and the range of procedures and considerations by which ordinary members of society make sense of, find their way about in, and act on the circumstances in which they find themselves. (1984)

Ethnomethodology refers to the ability of members to sort out reality procedurally, in the context of the interaction. The context of the interaction is in turn determined by the procedure. The central concern is the study of member's use of practical or mundane reasoning to communicate with each other (Cicourel, 1973), and as such is an empirical approach to the study of social action. As Ritzer points out, studies utilizing the ethnomethodological perspective reflect both the theoretical and methodological content and advances (1992) as outlined by Husserl, Schutz and later Garfinkel. The social reality of everyday life is framed in a continuum of typifications which become progressively anonymous as one moves away from face to face interaction. Social structures can be seen as the sum total of all typifications and language is the tool that allows for the construction of the typifications (see previous discussion).

Deirdre Boden attributes the confusion about the parameters and philosophical justification of the ethnomethodological perspective to these factors: the nature of the perspective as an incommensurably alternative sociology with philosophical and theoretical roots in both phenomenology and Parsonian social theory; the technically dense presentation of the early studies; and the large volume of research to be found in the research completed in substantive areas rather than in formal theoretical writings. The consequence of the general diffusion of ethnomethodological perspectives within the substantive research has led to the general acceptance of fundamentally ethnomethodological findings (1990: 186-7). Boden describes the "fundamental truism" of ethnomethodology as the redefinition of the problem of order. The problem addressed by the ethnomethodological perspective is not the mechanisms by which actors internalize

the norms of the larger structure, but how order is produced as the local achievement of actors (Boden, 1990; Heritage, 1984; Zimmerman and Boden, 1991). Inherent in this problem statement is the rejection of a deterministic role for social norms in the mundane actions of individuals, in favour of the actor as a knowledgeable agent. In addition, human action is reflexive, in that joint action shapes and renews understanding. The actor is purposeful in that actors collaboratively achieve and sustain action.

Garfinkel (1964) emphasizes the importance of common-sense knowledge as the institutionalized knowledge of the real world. It is the knowledge base and the rules we all expect to follow, and invoke as the mechanism for making sense of social interaction and to maintain social interaction. The basic consideration in the study of practical reasoning is the member's use of talk or accounts to describe the factual status of their experiences and activities. The ethnomethodologist's concern is the study of the member's practical reliance on common-sense knowledge or practical reasoning to communicate (Cicourel, 1973).

Common-sense knowledge is referred to by Cicourel as *interpretive procedures*: the invariant properties or principles which allow members to assign meaning, sense or substance to the rules, or as commonly called, the social norms (1973). These procedures can be viewed as complimentary to Garfinkel's process of the *documentary method of interpretation*, the method by which individuals search for the appropriate patterns or the appropriate common-sense knowledge in interaction. Each appearance of a familiar event or object is seen in reference to, or as an expression of, or documents the underlying pattern. This process is central in the location and organization of an interactive event.

The perspective was developed first by Mannheim, and elaborated by Garfinkel with the

addition of the specification of the appearance of an object is treated as pointing to, or standing on behalf, of a presumed underlying pattern (Heritage, 1984). A second criteria was added by Garfinkel: the individuals act on the basis of their individual stock of knowledge in their interpretation of the event, that is “ what is known” (ibid.). The rationale for the use of the documentary method is the member’s need to interpret the event in reference to the norms and regulations of conduct and behaviour in a seen-but-unnoticed process. The member’s process of interpretation is essentially an unconscious awareness of the procedures and aspects of social organization in which responses and future action are formulated (Heritage, 1987).

The *utterance* is the starting point for the process of interpretative inference (Heritage, 1984: 140). Utterances do not stand as objects, but are the initiating element in discursive action. The phenomenon of *procedural trust* dictates that social encounters will not be abandoned because of deviations from the normative order in discursive events (Heritage, 1987). With the focus on accounts as the subject matter of ethnomethodology, Garfinkel emphasizes the indexicality of action, that is, all new objects are treated as signs or an index to prior events or knowledge. This indexicality is the basis for the functioning of the normative order. Social action is accomplished through the members’ practices.

Ethnomethodology: Assumptions and Key Concepts

There are a number of key assumptions within the ethnomethodological perspective that reflect the basic views of the nature of social reality including several perspectives of social action developed by Husserl and Schutz. The principle of intersubjectivity specifies

that individuals experience the world in different ways but assume and act as if their experiences were identical *for all practical purposes*. Intersubjectivity is possible because of the acceptance of the general thesis of reciprocal perspectives, that is, the idealization of the interchangeability of standpoints and the idealization of the congruency of the system of relevances. Garfinkel developed intersubjectivity as a procedural approach in that an intersubjective relationship is assumed and maintained in the routine daily activities with a continuous process of adjustment between the knowledge of a shared world and the acceptance of different perspectives. The sense making procedures are normally seen-but-unnoticed, with the deviation from the normative expectancies of what Garfinkel calls the moral attitude of everyday life treated as morally sanctionable activities (Heritage, 1984: 99-101).

Garfinkel also retained the view of discourse as indexical. Indexical expressions, are those in which the meaning of the expression alters with the context in which the expression is used. The ethnomethodological conceptualization extends the linguistic meaning by further specifying that the contexts of the indexical expressions are also indexical . Within conversations and other instances of discourse, the sense and meaning of an expression is resolved through interpretative work to accomplish the meaning of a specific utterance or sequences of utterances (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). The meanings of a concept or a description reflects a range of possible meanings, made accessible through the interpretative procedures used by the members. The context plays a critical role in the interpretation of meaning. Context in the ethnomethodological sense is not a static or pre-determined physical or mental site or state, but is accomplished as an open

ended and continuously constituted event. The meaning of an "object" is bound to or connected to the context in which it is presented. As talk and action are indexical displays of the everyday world (Cicourel, 1968, 1973; Garfinkel, 1967), without the reaffirming or revision of context inherent in the discursive procedures, objects and events have equivocal meanings (Leiter, 1980: 107). Meanings are structurally determined, and are dependent on the context in which they appear (Mehan and Wood, 1975: 23). As the properties of indexical expressions have been demonstrated in the EM literature to be ordered (rational) properties (Garfinkel and Sacks, 1970: 341) as part of an "...ongoing practical accomplishment of every actual occasion of commonplace speech and conduct (ibid.), the ethnomethodological perspective views context as generated within the talk and interaction of an event rather than as a stable situation in which the event occurs. In short the context of an event is created in and through the talk of the participants, and is shaped by the ways in which it is designed and understood by the participants..

Reflexivity refers to the multi-formative and multi-consequential nature of talk. It is the key process in the relationship between commonsense knowledge and action in that it accounts for the ability of members to respond in a flexible way to the changing situation in the course of social events and action. The concept of reflexivity is inextricably related to indexicality and refers to the fact that the particular elements or constitutive elements are themselves indexical. In addition reflexivity is also a process which is engaged in by all members to create a sense of reality (Ritzer, 1992: 393) and refers to the relationship between the mutual interdependence of context and content. This is the basis of the social construction of action in the EM perspective. It is this reflexive nature of action that

creates and maintains the sequence of interaction. The phenomena in question creates the action, and the action creates the phenomena.

The ethnomethodological assumption is that human actors are knowledgeable, and act in accordance within the parameters of common sense knowledge. As such members are not constrained by factors external to those accomplished within social settings. All action is local and locally produced. This concept is expanded from Schutz's notion that defines the problem of relevance as the concern for the circumstances under which particular aspects of social structure come to be realized in interaction. All relevances do not weigh equally on members, nor do they exert a constant and similar force. Members determine relevance in and because of the specific interaction.

A key element in the integration of the phenomenological perspective into Garfinkel's program of the study of social action was the eradication of the conventional distinction between rational and non-rational action. With the specification of rationality as contingent on and constituted through the use of common sense knowledge and action, the distinction between the two became irrelevant in the study of social action. The convergence between rational and non-rational action was an outgrowth of the conception of knowledge as dependent on context for interpretation and meaning.

The question of rationality within the ethnomethodological perspective is the question of *order*, and is not conceived as external to the individual or as internalized controls but rather as the practical and lived production of members. From this perspective, the social structure is not conceptualized as a background constraint but as instantiated and constituted in action. It is because of the local, contingent, situation-specific nature of

order and social structure that EM is exempt from the criteria for the conventional measure of validity and reliability (Boden, 1990). Members act in a context that reflects the criteria for the principles of intersubjectivity: that is in a taken for granted background, in an accountable way. All action is accountable as observable, reasonable, and moral (Heritage, 1984). Within the EM perspective the actual occasion of rationality in action is paramount versus the notion of rationality as an exclusively singular cognitive action.

The term *for all practical purposes* refers to the demands and practices of a particular organization (Alexander, 1987). All practices are embedded in the social organization in which they take part. *Work* is defined as the details of practical action in highly circumscribed natural settings (Alexander, 1987: 278). To do the *work* of interpreting meaning in social action refers to the processes and resources members use to maintain and complete discursive activities.

Garfinkel describes the *moral order* as the “ rule governed activities of everyday life” (1972: 1-30). This order is recognized by members as “ perceivedly normal courses of action, and as the world known in common and taken for granted. These normal courses of events are the *moral facts* of daily existence both *as* and *in* the real world” (Garfinkel, 1970: 1-30). In a reference to Schutz’s conception of the attitudes of daily life, Garfinkel specifies the *background expectancies*, the seen but unnoticed socially standardized and standardizing, features as the resource used by members to interpret familiar events (ibid.). These background expectancies come into view in cases of breaches of the expected pattern or the morally necessary character of action. In Garfinkel’s terms, linguistic events are important as events that document or “point to” or “stand on behalf of” an underlying

pattern derived through a members use of documentary evidence, and specifies background understandings as "... 'adequate' recognition of common place events. " (ibid.). The institutionalized knowledge of the real world is defined in the common-sense knowledge of these facts of social life or the moral order. A breach in the background expectancies is a breach in the moral order (ibid.), thereby making it necessary for members to reconstruct the order. This social standardization of common understandings (the moral order) is the guide used by actors to orient themselves to the normal and abnormal course of affairs with the required restorations, and mobilization of action (ibid: 24).

Garfinkel and Sacks (1970) discuss the notion of member as the "... heart of the matter..." of the analysis of social action in taking into account the indexicality of expression . The term is not used to refer to a specific person, but rather the ability or the mastery of natural language. This mastery is referenced as the ability to *somehow* be heard in the production and display of commonsense knowledge. In other words, mastery of natural language is the ability to produce *account-able* interactions (Garfinkel and Sacks, 1970: 342). The criteria for the mastery of language or membership includes the capacity to produce "...adequate descriptive representations of ordinary, everyday affairs..." (Garfinkel and Sacks, 1970). In sum the basis for membership is the capacity to formulate hearable descriptions or accounts and the capacity to understand the accounts or descriptions of others. The formulation and understanding involves the capacity to use the common-sense knowledge applicable to the setting and make for all practical purposes a determination of it's applicability (Heritage, 1984).

Institutional Discourse

Garfinkel stressed the role of common-sense knowledge as the basis of the institutionalized knowledge of the real world, and defined the role of the standardized expectancies as the mechanism for the interpretation and sense making procedures in social interaction. Within the study of practical reasoning, members' accounts describe and create the facts of social action within the context of everyday events and experiences. Language is the tool through which actors create and sustain the reality of the everyday world, and forms the basis for the reality as a coherent body of reflexive knowledge (Cicourel, 1964; Heyman, 1980; Mehan and Wood, 1975; Miller, 1994).

There have been a number of studies of institutional discourse that demonstrate the expansion of conversation analytic studies from everyday mundane conversation into the arena of specific institutional discourse. It is through the specific and detailed local turns and sequences that institutional contexts are observably and accountably talked into being, and are maintained in the symmetry between the members' production of action and the recognition of the event as morally sanctioned. The question of the relationship between individual social realities and the development and maintenance of institutional realities is addressed by Miller (1994: 280-306). From the ethnomethodological perspective of all social realities as socially produced in interaction, the focus on the study of institutional discourse is the procedures through which members in specific settings construct social contexts that structure but not determine the mutually agreed to activities in that setting (Miller, 1994). Miller defines *institutional discourse* as consisting of "... fundamental

assumptions, concerns and vocabularies of members of settings and their usual ways of interacting with one another.” (1994: 282-3). This type of discourse exhibits a number of features including shared and standardized and standardizing frameworks which constrain and make accountable interaction members’ behaviour and responses (1994: 285-7).

Conversational practices can be characterized by the term *institution* when they reflect standardized and standardizing practices associated within a setting with an accomplished context. Institutions exist as a consequence of specific standardized interactional and interpretational practices and are made visible and observable through recurring activities.

. Social settings are organized by the interactional and interpretive practices used by participants to construct a variety of reality claims and social relationships.

It is in the maintenance and elaboration of discourse that members simultaneously develop and modify a sense of institutional reality (Heritage, 1984). In order for the institutional order to be maintained, events must be fully produced in all “..circumstantial detail so as to be analyzable with the relevant frame of action” (Heritage, 1984: 210). In sum, all other anticipated or expected elements or expected elements routinely present in events such as the institutional event being accomplished must be visible, observable and reportable by all members. Within the framework of the action itself, the maintenance of the institutional activity requires the recognition by members that the assumed sharing of the perception of the moral order, or accomplished state of affairs, is “...undergirded by a variety of institutional procedures.” (ibid: 212). This maintains the view of the world in common as a moral activity.

Merry (1990) discusses the use of a specific discourse as an “... ideological language:

(1990: 110). An ideological language refers to a system of impersonal modes or styles of language which construct or constrain the production of a particular culture. The assumption in conversations which are based on ideological discourse is that all the interactants understand the use of the discourse as a gloss for the expanded production or explanation that is rarely spelled out in detail by the members (Miller, 1994: 293). Classroom discourse as a specialized form of institutional discourse exhibits the features of ideological language: that is, there is a more or less coherent set of categories and vocabulary for events in the classroom. This explicit repertoire is evidenced in the analysis of specific units of interaction. The role of institutional discourse in the constitution of social settings is that of an organizing or structuring force. The use of institutionally patterned discourse and action provides the clue to students, for example, that a lesson has begun or ended, or that an answer is sufficient or insufficient for the purpose at hand (Miller, 1994). In addition, the use of institutional discourse describes to, or instructs members as to what the purpose at hand is, or the appropriate interactional pattern associated with the setting (Miller, 1994).

Accounts are the basic descriptions of activities including the ways that actors describe, and idealize activities (Bittner, 1973; Ritzer, 1992). Accounts can serve many functions including the provision of justifications for certain claims or events. They can be used as apologies, requests, disclaimers or in a number of other ways (Potter and Wetherell, 1987) The conceptualization of accounts and action as *account-able* speaks to the visibility in the interaction of the member's definition of the situation, *for all practical purposes*. As all elements of discourse and context within the ethnomethodological

perspective, accounts are indexical and are interpreted within the context of their production. It is in the analysis of accounts that the practical reasoning of the member is made visible as a part of the process used for the determination of context. As such, accounts are, of necessity, descriptions. This is what is meant by the *account-able* nature of social action. All social action is formulated with the knowledge of, and reference to the needs of the members to recognize and describe the event (Heritage, 1984: 130).

Accounts function as descriptions, in that they make reference, either directly or indirectly to a particular state of affairs, and as they are embedded in interactional and situational contexts, they are “unavoidably ‘ consequential (Heritage, 1984). Because of the reflexive and indexical nature of accounts, they are organized by and organize the structure of the events in which they occur. Accounts function as the normative accountability structure of the interaction. To be accountable within an interaction means that accounts are part of the seen-but-unnoticed procedures used by members to accomplish routine courses of action and to reflect the normative constraints of the interaction. Accounting is the process through which members provide or offer accounts in order to make sense of the world. Accounts and settings mutually elaborate each other through a process by which an account makes observable specific features of settings, which then in turn depend on the context for a specific meaning (Leiter, 1980: 138-9).

The *work* of producing *account-able* phenomena is the members’ practical accomplishment in an ongoing course of action. In addition, *work* is accomplished through an “... assemblage(s) of practices whereby speakers in the situated particulars of speech mean something different from what they can say in just- so- many- words, that is as

glossing practices" (Leiter, 1980). These *glossing practices* exist in diverse forms, and are the methods members use to accomplish observable, reportable and accountable understandings. They are an essential component in the mastery of natural language, because they stand for the what the actor assumes is what all members know and need not be said in-so-many-words. In addition to the role that accounts play in the normative accountability of action, accounts constitute in the interaction the sense of the moral accountability of action. Accounts by members constitute that members' awareness of the moral accountability structure of the interaction (Heritage, 1984:243-4).

From an ethnomethodological perspective, every situation in a game can be referred for definition and interpretation to a rule by the actor. As rules embody and are constituted by and through past experiences, the reference to the rule for interpretation produces and directs future action. (Alexander, 1987: 253-4). This is what Garfinkel (1963) refers to as normalization; the ongoing process that allows all new events to be depicted as normal due to their reference to both past events and rules.

All rules are unavoidably and necessarily incomplete (Mehan and Wood, 1975: 76). Once a rule is invoked, the situation in which the rule is invoked is altered, and rules like actions only appear as part of a web of practical circumstances. Intertwined, the members, rule and the present definition of the situation constitute the action (Mehan and Wood, 1975). The use of rules is part of the interpretative process, and as such are both contextually situated and changeable (Mehan, 1974). The role that rules play in the ethnomethodological perspective is not one of guide or template, but as a resource to be used to perform a task.

As any one set of rules cannot provide for all contingencies, in addition rule use varies with context and is not knowable until all aspects or contexted features of the situation are known. Some conditions that insure this are that different observers provide different accounts of actions, and behaviours according to diverse perspectives and experiences. Rules function as interpretative devices as opposed to causal or explanatory agents. A “...formal rule is not complete in itself in that it does not include background features...” (Mehan and Wood, 1975: 79). Rules can act as constraints, when part of an attempt to standardize interaction.

The et cetera clause speaks to the inability of any set of rules to refer to every possible event in a game, or in an interaction. Some aspects must be filled in by the participants to allow the interaction to continue (Garfinkel, 1967; Ritzer, 1992). This clause specifies that every given set of rules must be extended to cover every incident without an apparent or formal change of the rule by the members (Alexander, 1987: 254). Rules are elaborated to fit each new situation .This process of normalization is critical for the preservation of normality. Without it the “congruency of relevances” and the assumption of the “ interchangeability” of standpoints are breached , and the normative order breaks down. Rules are inescapably embedded with variations of the et cetera clause. This clause allows for the assimilation of unexpected or novel instances of response or reaction the rule.

Methodological Implications

The methodological differences between phenomenological sociology and

ethnomethodology stem from a fundamental difference in the focus of the two perspectives. Husserl was concerned primarily with operation of consciousness, while the ethnomethodological focus is on empirically observable social action (Ritzer, 1992).

The basic methodological premise of the ethnomethodological perspective is that the conventionally defined or patterned social relationships become visible and viable only as practical features of concrete interactional moments (Boden, 1990). The paradigm centers on details of action and the production of order. There is order in the world generated as a production of members in social interaction. This order is visible, observable and recognizable.

The fundamental methodological commitment of a sociology philosophically oriented to an ethnomethodological perspective is a commitment to the study of the phenomena of everyday life on their own terms (Douglas, 1971). Accordingly, the social sciences must deal with social behaviour in terms of the common sense interpretations of social reality in use by members of the group under investigation. To determine social meaning, we must rely on an understanding of everyday life gained through direct observation, and through the use of common-sense understandings derived from the observation in the everyday world (Douglas, 1971). Douglas discusses the fallacy of treating society as a separate level of existence:

....there is no way of getting at the social meanings from which one either implicitly or explicitly infers the larger patterns except through some form of communication with the members of that society or group; and, to be valid and reliable, any such communication with the members presupposes an understanding of their language, their uses of that language, their own understandings of what the people doing the observations are up to, and so on almost endlessly. (1971: 9)

Cicourel (1964), Garfinkel (1967) and Goode (1990) remark on the inadvisability of the attempt to dissect human action into variables because of the risk of altering the structure of that which is to be studied. The attempt at pulling out or isolating variables is to deny the constitutive nature of social action. Understanding human action must begin with and be built on the understanding of the everyday life of the members.

Inherent in the ethnomethodological perspective of the study of social action is a number of methodological implications that arise from the basic tenants of the perspective. The acknowledgement of the indexical properties of language dictate that there is no solution to either the reflexive or indexical nature of everyday practical discourse. A methodology that seeks to remedy the indexical nature of natural language results in the transference of actual activities into ideal typifications of events:

Structures are then analysed as properties of the ideal and the results are assigned to actual expressions as their properties, though with disclaimers of “ appropriate scientific modelling” (Garfinkel and Sacks, 1970: 339).

The remedial practices of conventional sociological research function as an attempt to complete the distinction between events as objective rather than indexical expressions in order to facilitate the substitution of objective facts for indexical expressions. This substitution facilitates practices such as theory elaboration, model building , and the use of experimental and quasi-experimental methods in the investigation of social action (ibid.). Garfinkel and Sacks call these professional sociological practices *constructive analysis* and specify the irreconcilable interests “... between constructive analysis and an ethnomethodological perspective in the phenomena of the rational accountability of

everyday activities and its accompanying technology of practical sociological reasoning.” (ibid: 340). The primary focus of these “irreconcilable interests” is the perspective of indexical expressions. The alternative task of a sociology oriented to ethnomethodological principles is to describe the formal structures of practical action that make up the members’ achievements of practical sociological reasoning (Garfinkel and Sacks, 1970). The ethnomethodological research focus is the same as that of constructive analysis, the formal structures of everyday activities, however, it is the understanding of the approach to the study of formal structure used within the ethnomethodological perspective that points to a second methodological implication. The accounts of formal structure are available within all forms of discourse and interaction including the accounts of professional sociologists. This is the basis of the procedural policy of ethnomethodological indifference to the practice of professional sociological reasoning in favour of the study of practical sociological reasoning.

The concept of ethnomethodological indifference was developed by Garfinkel and Sacks (1970), and refers to the need for the bracketing of *a priori* assumptions about social phenomena in order to view social action in an empirically rigorous way (Boden, 1990: 191). This assumption is based on the perspective that social action is an observable recognizable, shared-as-familiar action of actors in a local event.(Boden, 1990: 191). The stance of ethnomethodological indifference removes the theoretical and methodological barriers between the observer and the “...organizationally significant features of social activity” (ibid.).

As noted by Goode and Cicourel, the everyday existence of human beings has an

integrity that cannot be dissected into variables without the altering of our understanding on the social structures of everyday reality. The formal structure of everyday activities includes the properties of uniformity, reproducibility, repetitiveness, standardization and typicality as produced as independent of specific sites or situations. Members recognize their accomplishments as unique practical situated accomplishments (*ibid*: 346).

Garfinkel based his research program on social action on two assumptions. The first assumption was the replacement of the theory driven study of social action, with the role of theory as predetermining the constitution of a set of social circumstances (as in Parsonian sociology) by the “direct analysis ” of the construction and circumstances of the events *in situ* (Heritage, 1984: 36). The second assumption was events as accomplished and constituted by members will be “ methodical “ because human action is generally intelligible and orderly (*ibid.*). Inherent in this assumption is the transformation of the conventional view of rational action to a view of rational action as constituted locally in interaction, and the rejection of what Garfinkel calls the view of the actor as a Cultural Dope: This term is used by Garfinkel to describe the:

man - in - the - sociologist’s society who produces the stable features of the society by acting in compliance with pre-established and legitimate alternatives of action that the common culture provides (*ibid*: 24).

To this end, within the ethnomethodological perspective research should be based on the unavoidable engagement of members in producing the accomplished character of action (Heritage, 1984: 133).

Conversation Analysis as an Analytic Strategy

The primary use for discourse and conversational analytic strategies is the examination *in situ* of the function and consequences of language use in the construction and creation of social action in diverse social worlds (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). This approach combines the ethnomethodological concern for the details of action *in situ* and the detailed production of order with a rigorous methodology (Boden, 1990: 190). For the purposes of this research, discourse analysis will stand as a generic term both for research concerned with language as it is embedded in the social context, and as a generic though not singular term for research concerned with the cohesiveness and connectedness of utterances in both mundane and institutional forms of talk (Potter and Wetherell, 1987).

There have been a number of theoretical and methodological distinctions made between discourse analysis and conversation analysis in the research literature. For example, Levinson contrasts the two forms of analysis on the basis of distinctions in theoretical and methodological strategies (1983). This project will follow Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Gilbert and Mulkay (1984) in using the term discourse analysis to refer to the analysis of all forms of spoken interaction, including formal and informal spoken and written texts of all kinds, with the exception of research concerning primarily questions of linguistic, cognitive and cultural or sociolinguistic theory. The intent is not to recover events, beliefs and cognitive process but to examine the ways in which discourse or accounts are constructed as social action (ibid.). Starting from the assumption that talk serves many functions, and that accounts by actors vary according to the function played by the talk, accounts can be seen as serving many purposes. The purpose or consequence

of the utterance as action is both constituted and constituting simultaneously. This properly allows for the self-conscious recognition and repair of accounts within the sequence of the interaction.

Hatch and Long, in their discussion of the analysis of discourse, reaffirm the need to view language within the context in which it is produced, and further note that the form of the talk is not necessarily related to the function that the sequence or utterance plays (1980). The concern is rather how the speech event is accomplished through the speech acts. A discourse unit is defined as "... natural pieces of discourse such as arguments, complaints, recipes, jobs- we recognize as being somehow separable from the rest of discourse" (1980: 9-10).

There is diversity within the research focus within the body of ethnomethodological studies. Conversational analysis which will be understood as a form of technical application of discourse analysis is commonly used as a method of understanding the fundamental structures of conversational interactions (Ritzer, 1992), and accommodates two of the criteria for the study of social action within the ethnomethodological perspective: firstly, the data is generated and captured in naturally occurring situations, that is everyday events and conversations and secondly, the analysis flows from the everyday world rather than a structure imposed on it (Ritzer, 1992). Because of the data collection procedures, that is the use of audio and videotape, the data can be repeatedly examined in the original form, rather than in a categorized or codified form.

Zimmerman defines conversation as an interactional activity, that exhibits a pattern of stable and orderly properties that are analyzable, as achievements of the interactants

(1988). The conversation proceeds with the use of rules and procedures with internal constraints with the goal of producing a conversation (*ibid.*). Zimmerman outlines a number of working principles of conversation analyses: the collection and analyses of detailed data for the orderly accomplishment of social interaction; and the use of a fundamental framework of sequential organization including the management of the interaction by the participants, through the use of a turn by turn achievement of the stable orderly properties by the actors involved (Zimmerman, 1988: 413-423). In addition, an important characteristic of conversation is that conversations are seen to be both context shaping and context renewing . What is said is shaped by the preceding utterances or series of utterances in the sequence and in turn becomes constitutive of future utterances (Heritage, 1984; Ritzer, 1992; Zimmerman, 1988). Potter and Wetherell (1987) discuss conversation analysis as being relatively more concerned in comparison to discourse analysis with the contributions that the various actors in an interaction make in the formulation of different types of action.

Conversational analysis as developed by Harvey Sacks in collaboration with Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson, is the dominant form of analysis within the corpus of ethnomethodological research (Heritage, 1984: 233). The primary focus is on the analysis of the various facets of conversational activity including all forms of communication and gestures in interaction. According to Heritage, conversation analysis was developed as a counterpoint to the concerns with the tendency of ordinary language description to gloss or idealize phenomena as a consequence of the unavoidable use of type constructs by actors in their communication of concepts. The consequence of these glossing practices is

the indeterminate relationship between concepts and a specific set of events (1984: 234). The development of conversation analysis was an attempt to maintain data in the original form, and the avoidance of the problems inherent in forms of research based on descriptions or glosses of events. These methods involve processes in which specific details of naturally occurring events are irretrievably replaced by idealizations. Sacks advocated the use of recorded data as an essential corrective to the limitations of intuition, recollection and other forms of glosses in social science research. The intent was to use data neither idealized or constrained by the design, methodological practices or premature development of a particular theory or hypothesis.

The domain of interest to conversation analysts has been in the properties and functions of mundane or everyday conversational events. The rationale for this interest is the pervasively conversational nature of social action, and the medium of talk and conversation as a primary tool in the socialization of young children (Cook-Gumperz, 1975; Heritage, 1984). However there is a large body of studies using the techniques of conversation analysis in the study of institutional settings. These studies point to the variation in range and procedure of conversational practices in these settings, and are important in that they point to the special or unique uses certain procedures and practices have in specialized rather than mundane contexts (Heritage, 1984: 240).

There are a number of basic assumptions in the use of conversation analysis as an analytic strategy including the concern with the competencies which underlie ordinary social activities, and the description of these competences in use. All interaction is organized and irremediably contextually oriented, the consequence of which is that no

order or detail can be dismissed as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant. The description of the procedures by which tasks are completed, and interactions interpreted by actors are accountable products of a common set of methods or procedures (Heritage, 1984; Potter and Wetherell, 1990). In addition all aspects of social interaction exhibit stable identifiable structures which can be analysed for patterns of action with the general objective of the description of both the role that particular conversational procedures play with respect to one another, and the account-able products of a common set of methods and procedures (Garfinkel, 1967; Heritage, 1984). The fundamental assumptions of conversation include the conceptualization of all interaction as structurally organized in that an organized pattern is exhibited as stable and identifiable; all contributions to the interaction are unavoidably contextual in that each speaker's contribution is both shaped and renewed by the context of the interaction and as a consequence of these properties no order of detail can be "... dismissed, *a priori* as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant" (Heritage, 1984: 24).

With the principal focus or concern on the events of everyday mundane affairs, the role of mundane talk plays an essential part in the routine activities of everyday life. Conversation analysts have concentrated on the verbatim transcripts of ordinary conversation, and the analysis of conversation can provide a highly detailed of the processes used by interactants to construct and sustain social relationships and settings (Miller, 1994; 288).

Sacks examined action sequences as they occurred in the natural context, that is embedded in conversational sequences and identified a set of principles that govern various aspects of conversation. He was concerned with the ways in which utterances

accomplish action as a consequence of sequential placement. With the specification of sequences and turns of sequences as the primary unit of analysis Sacks and Schegloff examined the sequential implication of turns (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). They concluded that the talk of a turn projects a range of relevant next activities to be accomplished by a next speaker (Heritage, 1984: 245). The framework in which conversational activity takes place is the *adjacency pair* structure. This framework is structured by the sequencing of two utterances such that they are adjacent and produced by two speakers, and identifiable as ordered in two parts and of the type or disposition that the first utterance requires a particular second part or range of parts (Heritage, 1984: 245; Schegloff and Sacks, 1973: 295-6). The identification of the adjacency pair as the basic structure of conversation enabled the relationship between utterances to be analysed for the function of the utterance, and was conceptually extended through the analysis of the sequential implications of sequences and the conditional relevance that the production of a first utterance or action subsequently places on a second. These analytic structures permit the location of the ongoing status of particular conversational events as present or absent in the interaction, and further open the door to the analysis of the consequences of this particular status (Heritage, 1984: 249). There are a number of extensions of this research that are not particularly important to the point of this review of conversation analysis as an analytic strategy, however a critical aspect is the significant role that adjacency pair organisation plays in the analysis of the intersubjective nature of discourse. Because of the organized and anticipated nature of the structure of talk, speakers can use actions as a *presumptive* basis to interpret what is said (Heritage, 1984: 254). Because the

adjacency pair structure is reliable and account-able as a template or organizing guide for interactants, it serves as an organizing guide to the interpretation of events as well (ibid.).

Heritage sums up what he calls the critical point:

The point here, and it is a crucial one, is that *however* the recipient analyses the first utterance and whatever the conclusion of such an analysis, *some analyses, understanding or appreciation of the prior turn will be displayed in the recipient's next turn at talk.* (ibid.).

The application to the ethnomethodological perspective of the intersubjective nature of talk is at this point integrated to a methodology that can explicate this feature of talk in the context in which it is accomplished. Embedded in the adjacency pair structure and the rules of turn taking are the features that ensure that interpretations are publicly available to speakers to understand and in retrospect determine if they were understood. The linkage between any two actions is a critical resource for the determination of sense and meaning in an interaction: "... It is through the use of adjacent positioning that appreciations, failures, corrections, et cetera can themselves be understandably attempted." (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973: 297-8) Through the use of the turn by turn organization, linking speaker action, intersubjective assumptions are sustained and made visible in interaction. These linked actions can be seen as producing and maintaining the reality of intersubjectivity for the participants in the speech event, as the actors use the sequenced response as the basis on which to interpret the meaning of the event. The adjacency pair structure allows for the moment to moment assessment of the actor's interpretation of the event in the context of a public display of intersubjective understanding.

Sacks's (1974) work on membership categories is important because it further defines

the process members used to locate commonalities or differences in interaction. He defines a *categorization device* as

that collection of membership categories, containing at least a category, that may be applied to some population, containing at least a member, so as to provide, by the use of some rules of application, for the pairing of at least a population member and a categorization device member. A device is then a collection plus rules of application.

The problem of how an utterance (the starting point for the process of interpretation) is taken into account is resolved through the action filtration system that category membership devices provide, the hearer can determine from the presence of recognizable properties the possible next utterances. Membership categorization devices operate as frameworks for interaction, in this way they are interactionally consequential.

Categories or typification play an important role in discourse in that it is by virtue of the membership in particular categories that the attributes of members are determined. The use of categories by members is in preparation for action, as categories form part of the common-sense knowledge systems. The formulation of categories or typification is a social accomplishment that is articulated in discursive acts, and can be seen as recurrently used systems of terms used by actors in the characterization and evaluation of events and actions (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). The practice of saying-in-so-many-words-what-we-are- doing is the practice of formulating. This practice is an account-able feature of conversation in that is exhibited and observed in the discourse. In practice, formulations consist of glosses, and as such as properties of indexical expressions. Sacks, detailed the attention that actors pay to the use of categories in ordinary reasoning (1974) and addressed the repertoires used routinely by actors .

The assumption that everyday talk is normal is achieved through the maintenance of the "... delicate balance between features that can receive attention ... and those that must remain hidden." (Cook-Gumperz, 1975). Foregrounded features are features of talk or interaction that are codifiable as rules of etiquette, politeness, greetings, rituals and other ceremonial features of communicative encounters and are the features of talk that are open to attention and public discussion. Backgrounded features are the ways in which the former are accomplished. They are the hidden features of talk that are recognizable, but through the public presentation become codifiable as deviations from the norm, or problematic. Backgrounded features singled out for public attention and scrutiny, affect the appearance of competency on the part of the actor (ibid.).

A Synthesis of the Theoretical, Methodological And Substantive Issues

This discussion began with the suggestion that the self-esteem of children with learning disabilities and attention disorders should be examined using an alternative perspective to the use of correlational studies and diagnostic assessments and other related procedures. It was proposed that the 'objective reality of social facts' such as competence, participation, academic success and the other skill based and behavioural elements of the self-attitudes that are labelled in the conventional psychological and educational literature as self-esteem, be viewed as an ongoing accomplishment in the affairs of the classroom rather than as social facts in and of themselves.

In order to study the ongoing accomplishment of routine and mundane affairs in the classroom, it is necessary to recall the goal of the ethnomethodological perspective: the

study of the range of procedures members use to produce the stock of common-sense knowledge that formulates the classroom setting as an institution. The problem of order in the classroom is the problem of the local production and achievement of that order (Boden, 1990). The EM perspective of common-sense knowledge as the institutionalized knowledge of the real world or the moral order points to the necessity of studying the specific details of the local turns and sequences that are talked into being within the institutional order of the classroom. The classroom as an institution is maintained in the symmetry between the member's production of action, and the recognition that an event is accomplished as the moral order. The characterization of the classroom as an institutional order reflects the standardized and standardizing practices associated with this particular setting.

To study how the interactions of members in classrooms do the work of structuring the view of self as competent in the negotiation of the academic and social aspects of the classroom, it is important to review the formulation, maintenance and elaboration of the discourse that members use to reflexively develop and modify the sense of institutional reality (Heritage, 1984). To view the student as a competent member, and as having a positive sense of what *counts* as self-esteem in the classroom , is to view the procedure through which the members construct the social context in the classroom. The work of producing one self as competent reflects an *account-able*, therefore empirically analyzable phenomenon as the practical accomplishment of a member.

At this point it is important to review the formulation of the definition of self-esteem, and the role that classroom interaction plays in the management of individual self-esteem.

At what level does academic or classroom self-esteem become an issue to be resolved and at which point does it become an attitude or a learning problem? The designation of a student as having poor self-esteem is based on routine assessment tools in which the definition is based on the need for a quantifiable research strategy rather than on the specific needs and *in situ* characteristics of the children themselves. A review of the written documents show that the problem of poor self-esteem is examined within a circle of conflicting definitions, and with the designation of diverse factors and elements whose measurement is meant to stand as evidence of the reasons for poor or good self-esteem both for typical and learning challenged children. Starting with a basic definition of self-esteem as an attribute maintained by the individual with regard to his feelings or attitude toward himself as positive or negative, researchers attempt to identify causal or explanatory relationships to find a rationale for what is professionally measured as poor self-esteem.

From an ethnomethodological perspective, the contradictory findings in the conventional literature are indicative of the use of an inappropriate methodology, rather than a result of problems related to measurement and operational definitions. The effect of the use of aggregated data and the attempt to formulate mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories disassociate student and syndrome. The student, as a member of the category, becomes defined in generalities, and is removed from the context or situation in which the problem is formed. The syndrome, or problem is no longer representative of a particular situation, and is not stable in appearance or incidence. As the context changes, the meaning changes, hence the typification used and renewed by the members may change.

Within the research presented in Chapter Two, the correlates of self-esteem described loosely fit into several orientations. One orientation is behavioural, with LD/ADD children exhibiting a lack of personal responsibility, assertiveness, and an inability to get along with peers. A second group of deficits is in the skill areas such as problem solving skills, critical thinking skills, the ability to learn cooperatively, communication skills, deficits in self-regulatory skills and deficits in general academic skills. It is at this point that the concept of self-esteem becomes a problem to be resolved in the classroom. Skill and behaviourally based deficits can be remediated through the use of targeted educational programs. These problems can be attended to within the school and classroom context. However, these remediations do not appear to affect self-esteem to any significant degree. There are a number of rationales offered for the assumed or projected problems with self-esteem including the effects of labelling, academic failure, social disappointments and frustrations and the impact of social comparison groups. In short, self-esteem is seen in the current literature as being affected by teacher and peer attitudes, issues of scholastic competence, specific classroom behaviours, and skill competence levels. It is at this point that the skill based deficit becomes a problem in that there is potential for interference in the perception of the student as competent by teacher, parents and peers. These orientations are all reflected in the conventional research literature as possible variables in the explanation of poor self-esteem in not only learning disabled, but other groups of students as well. Using an ethnomethodological perspective it is proposed that what is glossed as self-esteem is visibly and reportably accomplished within the routine daily events of the classroom.

In summary, from the literature it can be seen that the elements or behaviours that

form the gloss of events categorized as the “ what we all know as poor or good self-esteem”, includes elements such as; academic skills and progress, confidence and classroom competence. A breach or lack of these particular behaviours or qualities make self-esteem or rather a lack of it, visible in the classroom. In contrast to the view of self-esteem as antecedent to, predictive of, or causal to academic failure, this analysis will view what counts as self-esteem as embedded in the classroom organization, structure and discourse as made visible in the classroom talk. These all function as backgrounded features to the classroom and structure routine classroom activities, and the social facts generated. Using the research data generated in the classroom the next chapter will deal specifically with what counts as self-esteem in the classroom.

A number of research studies using an ethnomethodological perspective have demonstrated the applicability of conversation analysis as an analytic strategy in the study of the organizational features of institutional settings such as schools and classrooms. These studies range in focus from school assessment and placement practices (Leiter, 1974; Heap, 1985; MacKay, 1974) to the social organization of trying (Hood, McDermott and Cole, 1980), the practices used by classroom teachers in the maintenance of teacher authority in the classroom (Macbeth, 1991) and the moral organization of student achievement (Baker and Keogh, 1995). A number of these studies offer direction to the study of the constitutive elements of self-esteem in the classroom.

Hood, McDermott and Cole (1980) in their study of the social organization of trying to have a good day, remark on the location of a disability as part of the context in which it is made visible by the structures that are a constituent of that context. Disabilities are

described and made visible as part of the context in which they are produced. This can readily be seen in the case of LD/ADD children in that the classroom academic and behavioural expectations often makes visible the academic and social differences of these children rather than making special skills and aptitudes visible. In the typical classroom structure discussed by Hood et al, there is a differing response to failure for the less academically competent student, and this response frames the response for the future failures and successes for this child. The dominant concern is the analysis of the different ways in which text and discourse are organized and the function and consequences of these organizational practices. This study demonstrates the visibility of a learning disability as embedded in the routine structure and organization of a class of typically achieving students. The present study will analyse the routine practices of an atypical classroom, with a view to the location of the structuring activities that make a lack of academic incompetence visible in this location.

Macbeth (1991), in his study of teacher authority as practical action, promises the analysis of ordinary affairs for their accomplished character and native cohesiveness. Through the analysis of the dominant two party speaking structure of the classroom, he identifies and examines sequences of reproach as the interactional organization of the practical action of the maintenance of authority. The management of the cohort is important in the production and sustaining of the "... distinctive symmetry of teacher's rights and privileges" and provides the practical evidence of the local production of the authority of the teacher. Macbeth demonstrates two concepts of importance to this study, the conceptualization of practical action as a shorthand notation for the constitutive

practices that make for an unremarkable coherence and familiar sense of lived affairs, and how an attitude or abstract concept such as authority is formulated as an analyzable achievement and displayed in the organization of classroom talk as an emergent competent course of action (Macbeth, 1991).

This study emphasizes the conceptualization of practical action as constituted by the daily routines and affairs of the classroom (Garfinkel and Sacks, 1970). The constitutive practices of esteem building are collaboratively produced or accomplished in practical action. The challenge of the analysis is to make visible the practices that constitute a student's self-esteem.

A second general concept important to the analysis in Chapter Four is the use of the term *remarkable*. Macbeth (1991), notes the unremarkable character of routine affairs. However, in this analysis, the term *remarkable* is used as an analytic category. A speech event or utterance is remarkable because it is noted, singled out, or generates an unanticipated response. It functions as the first clue that the unexpected has happened in the conversation. In this analysis an utterance is made remarkable by a party in the interaction taking notice of it. The conditions under which a speech event becomes remarkable are of analytical interest as these events may define deviations from the expected routine.

The concept of interactional competence (Mehan, 1979: 126-171) is important in the following analysis as it gives meaning to a significant component of what counts as self-esteem in the classroom. In Mehan's analysis, competent membership in the classroom involves the demonstration of two types of skills: academic skills and knowledge and the

ability to display these skills and knowledge in the appropriate way. This is an expansion of the concept of membership as discussed by Garfinkel and Sacks (1970) in that it enhances the criteria for the status of *member* with the addition of the concept of interactional competence. To qualify as a member of the classroom, effective participation is required. Mehan acknowledges that this definition is broad in scope as it is intended to encompass the requirement of communication. Garfinkel and Sacks (1970) definition of member hinges on the mastery of natural language. Inherent in Mehan's definition of competent membership is the ability to communicate in the particular institutional situation the actor is in. Hence in the classroom, the mastery of natural language may not be sufficient, if the student does not possess the common-sense knowledge required as a member of the specific institutional setting. Mehan's view of competent membership does not necessarily involve a particular level of academic skill as a criteria; only that the student capacity for competent membership meet the criteria of the setting.

Hatch and Long (1980), in their discussion of discourse analysis speak to the issue of unequal power in discourse. Classroom discourse studies point to the teacher's ability to determine not only the content of the discourse in the classroom, but to control this discourse temporally, contextually, and, as well, to control the access of students to participation. Typically within classrooms there is a high degree of teacher talk relative to student talk. In addition students are constrained by the types of questions they are asked, and respond to a set of specific functions. There is an extensive literature on the framework or structure of classroom talk including the work of Bellack et al (1966), Cicourel et al (1974) and Mehan (1979) on the identification of the classroom teaching

framework (structuring, soliciting, responding and reacting). Sinclair and Coulthard point to the highly structured nature of classroom interaction, and discuss the ability of the structure of the classroom to provide clues to students about appropriate behaviour (1975).

Mehan et al (1986) discuss the ways in which student identity comes to be constructed by the institutional practices of the school. This identification and consequential organization of the student as problematic is a result of the organizing practices of the members. Institutional practices construct student identities and the consequence of these identities. What *counts* as a learning disability is a reflection of the organizing practices firstly of the assessment and diagnostic tool used in the classification of students and secondly as the organizing structures of the institution. The assumption underlying the ethnomethodological perspective is that inherent in the notion of *doing the work of* assessing, classifying or teaching a learning disabled child is the constitutive and fluid aspects of the institutional practices, that is, doing the work of screening, assessing, teaching and planning for LD/ADD children (Mehan et al, 1986). All these activities involve the use of member's tacit knowledge and interpretative procedures in the procedural work required to solve the problem.

In order to achieve the purpose of this research, it is necessary to describe and track what is common in all the daily routine activities and events in the classroom that clearly define and maintain for all members in the interaction the student's status as socially and academically competent, within the context accomplished by members in the interaction, and further, how the individuals in the interactions manage social situations within these

definitions. Following from the work of Cicourel, Goode, Mehan and others, the social structures involved in the interaction are visible in the conversational and discourse structures apparent in the interaction..

In Chapter Four, I will examine the possibility that student self-esteem is inextricably linked and dependent on the linguistic practices used in the everyday routine of the classroom. Taking from the ethnomethodological perspective, a suspension of the belief that self-esteem is an objective social fact, the constitution and accomplishment of routine daily activities and the interactional practices of the classroom will be examined in order to explicate the elements of self-esteem. I will analyze the impact of the routine of linguistic practices operating within the classroom. The use of a particular discourse that reflects to the student a particular view of self reflects the standing of the student in the classroom, and is constituted as common knowledge in interaction. If the self is constituted in the classroom in one way, then all other constitutions are excluded within that setting. This study is about the constitution of a student as competent and therefore an esteem-able member of the classroom.

Classrooms are not simply passive settings through which students pass but active vehicles for the teaching and learning of a diverse range of skills. To understand self-esteem researchers must look to actual and mundane affairs and activities of the members in classroom and to the function and consequences of the practical actions *in situ*.

In order to study the patterns of behaviour specific to the classroom, the work of interpretation which generates the pattern of the behaviour itself must be analysed as “..It is through this interpretative work that the social facts and structures such as the

classification and categorization of students is accomplished” (Heyman, 1980). The practices of members in social interaction, spatially and temporally, locate the student in the social and academic world of the classroom. The clinical assessments which are the primary formal diagnostic tools for the identification and classification of specific learning disabilities and attention disorders, illustrate the shortcomings of the use of these tool to address and provide the types of information required in the classroom for the successful management of the daily classroom routines of children with learning disabilities and attention disorders. The aggregation of raw scores become a gloss of the problems experienced by an individual child, and as a consequence a gloss for what we all know about learning disabled children.

CHAPTER FOUR: ACHIEVING CLASSROOM COMPETENCE

This chapter includes the detailed analysis of segments of classroom discourse that serve to document the institutional nature of this classroom as typical in the structure of lessons, the organization of classroom instruction, and in the impact of teacher authority structures. Evidence detailing the organization and teaching of the constitutive elements of self-esteem is presented, with a view to analyzing the social organization of what *counts* as competence and self-esteem in this classroom.

The Typical Nature of the Classroom

A notable aspect of the work or lesson structure in this classroom is the ordinary unremarkable characteristics of the organization and structuring activities that form part of the daily routine. A number of well researched routine classroom organizational structures can be demonstrated using fragments of the data generated in this study. In Chapter Three, a number of research projects were outlined that discuss various organizational, teaching and classroom techniques and strategies relating to topics such as; the structure and structuring of classroom lessons; turn allocations (Mehan, 1979: 81 - 125); and the maintenance of teacher authority in the classroom (Macbeth, 1991: 281 - 313; Mehan, 1979: 81 - 125). All these issues are germane to this classroom as well, and will be demonstrated.

In all the transcriptions that follow, the notations T, T1 and T2 will be used to designate an utterance of either the classroom teacher or the assistant teacher. T will be

used when only the classroom teacher is involved in the interaction, T1 and T2 will be used when they are working with the group together. Students are designated by the use of a pseudonym within the text of the transcription, and by the first two or three letters at the line markers. The letters Ss indicate a number of voices, and the designation S? is reserved for single unidentifiable voices. A full transcription notation is included, and the full transcription of the event is provided in the appendix. The transcriptions presented in the body of this chapter have been shortened for the purposes of illustrating specific discussion points. These transcripts have not been punctuated in accordance with the traditional rules, but rather as a reflection of the transcribing process. The intention of the punctuating practice in these transcripts is for ease of reading, and to maximize where necessary, the reader's ability to apprehend the activity underway without compromising the nature and spirit of the transcription.

There are a number of technical terms specific to this classroom that refer to special teaching and learning strategies. *Chisambop*, or *chis* refers to a method of finger calculation used extensively in the school, and *add* is a shortened form for Auditory Discrimination In Depth, the reading / spelling strategy used in the classroom. These strategies are taught to and used by all students in the classroom. Other special notations will be discussed as they occur in the transcripts.

The Structure of Classroom Lessons

This segment opens with the teacher sitting on her stool at the front of the classroom, facing the class. They have just completed a lesson, and her initial comments serve as a

method of focusing the group on the next task.

Segment 1.

1: B: 2:

- 034 1. T: Got a deal for ya
 2. Ss: ((ya::h what::))
 3. T: Did a good job here (1) Do you want to play round the world
 4. () add and chis together?
 5. Ss: Yeah
 6. T: and then you can play heads up seven up for a while ()
 7. Ss: // (yeah yay)
 8. An: // it's ten o'clock
 9. T: // you guys
 10. deserve it
 11. An: It's ten o' clock
 12. T: ok ? so
 13. An // it's ten o'clock
 14. T: Who read the time first?
 15. An: // me
 16. T: // Robert? (1) oh who was it
 17. Ss: Andrew Andrew
 18. T: Andrew reading that clock good job ok whose ready
 19. let me see here Jake you can touch Robert's desk and we'll
 20. Ja: // no:::o
 21. T: // go around
 22. this way
 23. Ja: It's gonna be (tough)
 24. T Ready? It's gonna be either add or chis it's gonna be a
 25. surprise (1) give me the sound at the top of the front stairs
 26. Ja: ee
 27. Ro: //ee
 28. T: Jake
 29. Ro: // ((a:h:::))
 30. T: ten times four
 31. Al:
 32. Ja: forty
 33. T: Jake.
 34. Ja: I beat him?
 35. T: Give me a windy sound
 36. St:
 37. Ja: wh:: wh::
 38. T: Ja:ke
 39. S?: be careful

40. S?: // be careful about (her)
 41. T: five times three
 42. Ca: fifteen
 43. Ja: // I knew something was gonna happen
 44. T: six times zero
 45. Ca: zero
 46. Su: (1)// zero
 47. Ss: ((general noise and excitement))
 48. T: give me a- (.) oh Excuse me I can't hear myself think over
 49. here, give me a quiet tip tapper.
 50. Su: t t t
 51. Ca: // t t
 52. T: Su::sann I need a sound at the top of the back stairs
 53. Su: oo::
 54. Ma: // um oo
 55. T: Susan
 56. Je: // good job
 57. T: // give me the sound in the basement
 58. St: umm:
 59. Su: // a
 60. St: // ah
 61. T: Susan.
 62. S?: // yeah Su:: san
 63. Ja: yeah fo:rr ()
 64. Ca: // Susan
 65. T: give me (.) a nose sound
 66. Ca: (1) n nn:
 67. Su: (1) n n
 68. T: tie give me a quiet skinny sound
 69. Cm: // sh::
 70. Su: // sh
 71. T: tie six times zero
 72. Cm: zero
 73. Su: // zero
 74. Ss: // Cam's got (it)
 75. T: Cam just by a hair
 76. Cm: // now don't (give me)
 77. T: two times four
 78. Cm: ummm: ummm:
 79. An: // eight. I can't believe that
 80. T: Andrew
 81. An: // I can't believe that ()
 82.. T: nine times one

83. An: nine
84. Al: // nine
- 056 85. T: just by a hair (.) nine times three
[giggles and chatter]
86. Ja: twenty seven [laughter and looking at times table chart]
87. An: // twenty seven [jumping around and pushing]
- 057 88. T: that's getting a little out of hand guys
89. Su: hey take off the ()
90. T: thanks good problem solving Susan [to boys] you need to
91. use your chis not that () Jake. We'll give them
92. another one (3) nine times four
93. Ja: um: thirty seven
94. T: go Andrew
95. An: // twenty seven (.) I mean thirty six
96. T: yep
97. An: ye::ss
- [general noise in the room T looks at T2 and addresses the next remark to her]
98. T: and Jake just let's it let's it uh affect him huh you don't even
99. do it (1) four times zero
100. An: zero
101. Su: // zero
102. T: go Andrew (2) nine times three
103. An: umm twenty seven
104. Ca: // twent- (o:hhhh) I would call that a tie
105. T: Andrew no he got it out there before you did (2) six times
106. zero
107. An: Zero
108. Cm: // Zero
109. Ma: // Zero
110. T: Why were there three people yelling here
111. An: Cam
112. Ma: //Cam
113. Cm: I don't - I don't know (.) Mary was over there and she
114. stood in front-
115. T: ok ok (no Andrew's) and now (you're) touching Cam's
116. desk six times two
117. Cm: six times two I don't know the six times- I don't know the -
118. An: // eighteen eighteen
119. Cm: // I don't know the the six-
120. T: // you know the twos ? six
121. times two
122. Cm: eighteen
123. An: // twelve twelve

124. S?: Andrew?
 125. Ca: Susan get him get him Susan
 126. T: give me a noisy scraper
 127. Su: m: (()) scraper gg:
 128. An: // (())
 129. T: Andrew
 130. Ca: aw come on Robert get him
 131. An: I already made a round
 132. T: four times one
 133. An: // four
 134. T: (3) An:dr:ew round of applause for Andrew
 [round of applause]

Several features of standard classroom talk and interaction are documented using this fragment. At the start of the sequence the class is getting ready to play a classroom game called *Round the World*. The object of the game for the student is to successfully answer the question posed by the teacher first. Each student competes with the student in the next desk in the circle with the winner being the student who successfully beats all opponents in sequence, and gets back to his desk. The students are all in their desks and have just completed a work task. The teacher is facing the class:

- 034 1. T: Got a deal for ya
 2. Ss: ((ya::h what::))
 3. T: Did a good job here (1) Do you want to play round the world
 4. () add and chis together?
 5. Ss: Yeah
 6. T: and then you can play heads up seven up for a while ()
 7. Ss: // (yeah yay)

Here we see a variation of what Mehan describes as a standard opening sequence for classroom lessons (1979: 36 - 43). The teacher has generated the interest and the attention of the class by her question to the cohort as a whole. The remark is directed to

the whole class and responded to by the cohort. The reason for the activity is stated as reward for *a good job* and consensus that the activity is appreciated and can go ahead is made visible at line 2. Dissenting voices are not heard at this point.

8. An: // It's ten o'clock
 9. T: // you guys
 10. // deserve it
 11. An: It's ten o' clock
 12. T: ok ? so
 13. An // it's ten o'clock
 14. T: Who read the time first?
 15. An: // me
 16. T: // Robert ? (1) oh who was it
 17. Ss: Andrew Andrew
 18. T: Andrew reading that clock good job ok whose ready
 19. let me see here Jake you can touch Robert's desk and we'll
 20. Ja: // no:::o
 21. T: // go around
 22. // this way
 23. Ja: It's gonna be (tough)
 24. T Ready it's gonna be either *add* or *chis* it's gonna be a
 25. surprise (1) give me the sound at the top of the front stairs

Lines 8 through 18 document an unanticipated or forgotten task or response. Andrew (line 8) is perhaps responding to a request by the teacher to cue her on the time, or perhaps is responding to an original or temporarily forgotten contest or assignment. As there is no response from T, or any response from any other member of the class, the rationale for Andrew's comment at line 8 remains unaccountable to both the teacher and the cohort at this point. The first comment by Andrew (line 8) is lost as an interruption to the teacher's discussion of the rationale for the new activity. Andrew repeats the comment in line 11. This generates an improvisational strategy (Mehan, 1979: 47-68; Macbeth, 1991: 281-313) by the teacher to sort the event out and to continue with the

task of the moment which is to start the game. T's response in line 12 can be seen as either indicating her confusion as to the reason for the interruption and functions as a response to line 11, or perhaps as the ending to her explanation for the game as an opportunity (*o.k.*) and the start of her next utterance (*so*). When the comment is then repeated a third time in line 13, once again as an interruption to the continuation of the activity, T reveals in lines 14 to 17 that she is unaware as to which student is interjecting the information about the time and turns the event (lines 18) to a positive acknowledgement of the fact that Andrew has read the time first. The rationale for the interruption is never clarified, but the strategy enables the task to continue. Lines 18 to 25 demonstrate T's final instructions and the start of the activity.

This section documents the routine and typical nature of the opening sequence necessary for the organization and structure of classroom lessons (Mehan, 1979: 35-41). The introduction to the activity is formulated in lines 1-7 with the attention of the class gathered through the use of a conversational strategy by the teacher and the reward rationale for the activity explained to the students. This rationale alerts the class to the less formal nature of the upcoming activity with the use of the word *play* in lines 3 and 5. The formal initiation of the activity does not start until line 18 with the utterance *ok whose ready* and the designation by T of the first players. Two types of activities can be seen as occurring in lines 19-25. In line 19, Jake and Robert are designated and assembled at Robert's desk to start the game despite Jake's protest of line 20. In addition, T provides information about the rules of the game in line 23. The two utterances in the initiation sequence of this interaction function to physically position the cohort for the activity, and

to provide information about the activity to the cohort (*ibid.*). Both are accomplished at line 23.

Lines 26-130 document what Mehan (1979) calls the maintenance phase of the lesson. Once initiated, the game continues until the logical (in this case) end: the declaration of a winner. The maintenance phase is characterized by questions and answers, evaluations and the focusing of the cohort back to the task at hand. When Andrew attempts to initiate closure of the activity in line 131, it is ignored by the cohort until line 134 with T's statement of the formal closure of the lesson with her request for a *round of applause*. This is the formal closure of the activity.

The function played by the opening sequence (lines 1-7) is the generation of the physical and mental attention of the cohort to the activity, and to inform the cohort that a lesson is imminent. Despite the description of the activity as *play*, it is the right of the teacher to determine the start, the rules and the end of the activity (Mehan, 1979; Macbeth, 1991). The activity is accomplished by the cohort within the institutional context of the classroom.

The closing sequence, although alluded to by the student in line 131, remains under the control of the teacher. The formal closure is accomplished in line 134 with T's acknowledgement of Andrew's success and her request for applause. It is with this confirmation that the lesson is over with, *for all practical purposes*, and the primary agenda in the classroom is maintained: the completion of the task at hand.

The instructional component of the classroom lesson is generally composed of a variety of elicitation practices by teachers geared to a number of functions including accessing student knowledge of factual information, opinions and student interpretation of events

(Leiter, 1974; Mehan, 1979). These elicitation practices not only provide teachers with an opportunity to evaluate student response, but provide the accomplishment of the context in which the student responds. In this way the essentially reflexive nature of the interaction between students and teachers emerge. The following segment documents a number of practices invoked in the ongoing organization of classroom instruction.

Segment 2

1: B: 5:

- 356 1. T: forty six (.) forty eight (.) *fifty?* Clear K you guys that's the
 2. two times tables on your fingers (1) ok this is what we're
 3. doing here folks (1) We gonna do the (1) same the same
 4. thing we've done this week for math and then next week
 5. instead of updating (.) um (.) ti:me and reviewing time (.)
 6. Who thinks they can guess what we might review next week.
 7. What's another biggie important one that we we'll need to
 8. remember? Jake can you think of one?
 9 Ja: ()
 10 T: Andrew.
 11 An: the six times table
 12 T: ok besides chis honey (1) not chis (2) Ok something we
 13. learned we'll review (fractions times) fractions later (.)
 14. Carolyn?
 15. Ca: division?
 16. T: We never did division yet honey (2) K try and think of
 17. something else. What was another biggie we did and we
 18. played store (over) there and stuff (1) Jenny?
 19. Je: money
 20. Pe: // money
 21. T: Mo:ney that's what we're gonna review next week
 22. Ja: oh no

23. T: well Jake the reason- (1) I'm gonna give everybody a second to
 24. recheck themselves cause some of us are really not where we
 25. should be right now. We all know where we should be thank
 26. you (.) yes Andrew
 27. An: (can we have) umm round the world um math and time
 28. T: Well honey you know what we'll do there (.) We have reading
 29. buddies next ummm what time is it? Can somebody tell me
 30. what time it is I can hardly see that clock (3) Andrew?
 31. An: It is umm (1) I Kno::w
 32. S?: // eleven forty five eleven forty five
 33. T: // O my goodness major static Andrew what time is
 34. it?
 35. An: Eleven forty five
 36. T: Is it eleven forty five?
 37. An: // no?
 38. T: // Is it eleven forty five?
 39. Ja: ten forty five
 40. An: // ten forty five
 41. T: umm Jake I'm gonna ask you I know that you know it but you
 42. need to keep it in hon great job though you guys
 43. remembering that ok. um (.) actually we don't even have time
 44. for chis today I'm just gonna quickly review the six times tables
 45. with my kids ok (1) my six times group the rest of you to be
 46. working on your time booklet's (1) ok.
 47. Su: But I'm all done
 389 48. T: Most important I'm gonna give you another one working on
 49. quarter hours

The fragment documented above has an ' incidental' quality in that the question posed at the start of the interaction elicits information that does not appear to have a bearing on the teaching agenda at the time. What follows, however, documents many of the features of the structure of elicitation and responses and common turn allocation strategies in the classroom (Leiter, 1974: 17-75; Mehan, 1979: 49-71; Macbeth, 1991: 281-313). The teacher is once again at the front of the class at the blackboard and is finishing a math lesson. The fragment starts as T moves into a new phase of the lesson and begins with the

gathering of the class's attention or what Mehan (1979: 36 -38) refers to as the opening sequence:

- 356 1. T: forty six (.) forty eight (.) *Fifty?* **Clear** K you guys that's the
 2. two times tables on your fingers (1) ok this is what we're
 3. doing here **folks** (1) We gonna do the (1) same the same
 4. thing we've done this week for math and then next week
 5. instead of updating (.) um (.) ti:me and reviewing time (.)
 6. Who thinks they can guess what we might review next week.
 7. What's another biggie important one that we we'll need to
 8. remember? Jake can you think of one?

In line 2 the interjection of “ok” marks the end of the previous lesson and the start of new business. The use of the address “**folks**” in line 3 underscores the relevance of the change in task for all participants. It functions as well as a gathering device and informs the cohort of the need to remain alert to new instructions. Lines 4 and 5 describe what will be done at the present time. It is Line 6 that invites to students to guess at future plans. This elicitation pre-empts the current agenda. The posing of the question determines the task of the group, that is, to guess at future plans. This can be seen as what Mehan (1979) describes as a “process elicitation”. Students are being asked for an opinion or an interpretation. According to the principle of co-occurrence relationships (Gumperz, 1964; Leiter, 1979), the responses provided by the students reflect the same difficulty in interpreting exactly what T is looking for as the correct answer, leading to the provision of further clues by T at line 5 to enable the students to guess at the correct response. The teacher uses a nomination strategy in an attempt to start the elicitation process in line 8, and moves into an extended elicitation from the point of Jake's inability to respond at line 9.

8. remember. Jake can you think of one?
 9. Ja: ()
 10. T: Andrew.
 11. An: the six times table
 12. T: ok besides chis honey (1) not chis (2) Ok something we
 13. learned we'll review (fractions times) fractions later (.)
 14. Carolyn?
 15. Ca: division?
 16. T: We never did division yet honey (2) K try and think of
 17. something else. What was another biggie we did and we
 18. played store (over) there and stuff (1) Jenny?
 19. Je: money
 20. Pe: // money
 21. T: Mo:ney that's what we're gonna review next week

The response at line 11 generates a clarification sequence, that incorporates an additional clue for the cohort at line 13. The acceptance of yet another bid and the rejection of Carolyn, at line 16 generates a second guess at the nature of next week's plan culminating with the third and acceptable response. T uses various strategies to generate an acceptable answer to the question posed including the use of hints (lines 13, 17 and 18) to clarify the request. A correct response is generated by Jenny after the hint by the teacher in lines 17 and 18. That the response is what the teacher accepts as accurate is made visible by the initial repetition of the correct answer in line 21 with the stress on the correct word. Lines 22 through to the end of the segment are interesting because they demonstrate the ad hoc nature of the task underway. T deals with deviations from the task by bringing the class to order through the use of verbal reminders about listening, turn taking and by providing clues to the cohort as to the correct response.

22. Ja: oh no
 23. T: well Jake the reason- (1) I'm gonna give everybody a second to
 24. recheck themselves cause some of us are really not where we

25. should be right now. We all know where we should be thank
 26. you (.) yes Andrew
 27. An: (can we have) umm round the world um math and time
 28. T: Well honey you know what we'll do there (.) we have reading
 29. buddies next umm what time is it? Can somebody tell me what
 30. time it is I can hardly see that clock (3) Andrew?
 31. An: It is umm (1) I Kno::w
 32. S?: // eleven forty five eleven forty five
 33. T: // O my goodness major static Andrew what time is
 34. it?
 35. An: Eleven forty five
 36. T: Is it eleven forty five?
 37. An: // no?
 38. T: // is it eleven forty five?
 39. Ja: ten forty five
 40. An: // ten forty five
 41. T: umm Jake I'm gonna ask you I know that you know it but you
 42. need to keep it in hon great job though you guys
 43. remembering that ok. um (.) actually we don't even have time
 44. for chis today I'm just gonna quickly review the six times tables
 45. with my kids ok (1) my six times group the rest of you to be
 46. working on your time booklet's (1) ok.
 47. Su: But I'm all done
 389 48. T: Most important I'm gonna give you another one working on
 49. quarter hours

Line 22 functions both as a comment on the projected calendar of events and the impetus for the teacher to rationalize her future curriculum choice as indicated in her response to Jake's comment at the start of line 23. At this point she chooses to make her rationale available to all members of the class by a reminder to the class to bring themselves to attend to the interaction (lines 23, 24, 25 and 26). On answering the question posed by Andrew at line 26, T moves further away from the explanation started in line 23. Indeed this explanation remains unfinished business. At this point a boundary has been put on the question of what we will do next week and T moves away from the

subject by bringing the attention of the class back to the listening position. Lines 26 to 45 bring the conversation back to the present and T once again uses the ad hoc nature of the interaction to “teach” a lesson. She repeats the question and answer sequence once again, but asks for factual information this time (line 29 and 30) to elicit a correct response from Andrew at line 30. It is at this point that the sequence changes from the elicitation of factual information to a sequence aimed at maintaining order in the lesson. It has become a problem of classroom management for the teacher. The objective of T at this point, as documented in line 30, is to elicit a response from a specific designated student. An unknown student responds both inappropriately and incorrectly at line 32 with the resulting sanction applied by T to the class as a whole at line 33. T directs a repeat of the question to the chosen respondent and receives an incorrect response at line 35. The choice of response by T differs, just as the type of elicitation differs. When the question posed was structured as a guess or opinion, T’s response to the student’s guesses, were firstly facilitative of second and third attempts, and secondly recognized the validity of the attempt even if the response was not deemed to be the correct one. The response to the elicitation for factual information reflects a more direct indication to the student of error (line 36 and 38). To elicit the correct response from Andrew she proceeds with a direct question about the validity of his response. There is a variation in the sequence again in the form of an unsolicited turn allocation at line 39. Jake responds at line 39 to a prompting or correction process aimed at Andrew despite the availability of the cohort warning at lines 33 and 34. T then uses a strategy of incorporation, that is, she acknowledges that Jake knows the correct answer and combines the acknowledgement with a reminder to obey the

rule about when to speak (lines 39 and 40). At this point the teacher returns to the business initiated in lines 3 and 4 and proceeds to initiate that activity at line 45 with the use of *ok*.

This segment documents a number of classroom structures described in the research on classroom organization in addition to the ad hoc nature of classroom talk. Mehan notes the precedence of social control and maintaining the social structure of the classroom over academic matters (1979: 83). This can be seen at line 26 when T restores the structure of the question and answer sequence rather than respond fully to the comment from Jake and again at line 29, when the use of *can somebody* once again changes the character of the interaction from a private to a public domain. The continuation strategies are clear with T's use of repetition, clarifications, prompts and hints. In this segment the teacher makes use of a number of continuation and turn allocation strategies to get an acceptable answer, as well as to control and direct the interaction to the task at hand, the transition to a new work assignment. These strategies form the basis for the structuring of the classroom lesson in that they make it possible for the teacher to manage the context and interaction in a way that facilitates the successful completion of the objectives despite the practical circumstances of the classroom (Mehan, 1979). Within this sequence there are two identifiable instances of divergence from the elicitation- response- evaluation sequence. The first is at line 22 with the comment on the plan by Jake, the second is at lines 30-43, with the violation of the respondent choice of the teacher. In both instances improvisational strategies are used, in the first instance to rationalize the teacher's future lesson plan, and in the second to restore the order and authority of the teacher through the

application of a mild sanction to the offending student. The ad hoc nature of classroom lessons become visible through the identification of the use of such strategies. However these strategies are embedded in the elicitation - response - evaluation structure of the lesson.

Teacher Authority: Contest And Reproach

The management of the organization of classroom lessons by the teacher provides evidence of the achievement of teacher authority. This authority is displayed in the ongoing organization of talk in the classroom (Macbeth, 1991; Mehan, 1979), in the "... competent, detailed, paced engagement of students and teachers." (Macbeth, 1991: 283). Because of the distinctive organization of classroom interaction (Macbeth, 1991; McHoul, 1978; Payne and Hustler, 1980), teacher authority can be seen as emerging out of competent courses of action (Macbeth, 1991). This distinctive organizational structure is evidenced in the two party structure of speaking involving the assembly and maintenance of talk between the teacher and the cohort. Embedded within this speaking structure is the asymmetrical rights and privileges of the teacher to determine content, participation and to evaluate competence (Macbeth, 1991; McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979). A second characteristic of the structure of the classroom that affects the organization of teacher authority is the public nature of talk within the classroom. When the teacher speaks, it is to the entire cohort, and all accountability is available to the cohort as well (McHoul, 1978). The right of the teacher to determine participation and importantly the opportunity to demonstrate competence by individual members is part of the exercise of

teacher authority, as is the right of the teacher to require accountability for individual actions.

Segment 3

3: A: 3:

- 107 1. T1: () come up with some ideas you guys know what's
 2. goin on Andrew?
 3. An: ummm one page:: (1) journal.
 4. T1: Ok uh so I'll just put journal (1) K good one Andrew. Jenny
 5. Je: art?
 6. T1: K. no I want something like I said that's work after you're done
 7. three work things on here (.) then (.) like we always do you
 8. could do reading or art or drawing or whatever we have to do
 9. three (2) big things first Robert.
 10. Ro: uhh one page (1) time and (.) money?
 11. T1: Ok time or money good for you (3) time or money booklets?
 12. S?: (5) time or (1) can you do both?
 13. T1: Well time and yeah. Don't forget all of this means one full page
 14. (1) How many pages of corrections is one full page? (1) Jenny.
 15. Je: A booklet um one page is (2) four pages
 16. T1: Four pages of corrections is one page
 17. Je: What if you only have one page?
 18. T1: Ok we'll (.) then you gonna have to:: (.) figure something else
 19. out you guys know that (3) actually before I continue on up
 20. here (we) have some great things I'm gonna ask everyone to put
 21. your certificates away they're quite distracting to some of you
 22. (right now) umm Carolyn darling where should your eyeballs be
 23. right now honey thank you. (4) Ok Steven?
 24. St: ummm uh () chis and handwriting
 25. An: // oh oh oh oh oh
 26. T1: Good um (.) actually if you guys want to sit on top of your
 27. desks right now that's cool [students move to top of desks]
 28. chis (.) handwriting printing ok (4) what else. (.) Alex?
 29. Al: umm(.) umm(.) umm(.)
 30. T1: // what did you do last night for homework?
 31. Al: (2) um we uh
 32. T1: Oh I'm asking Alex
 33. Al: (the quiz)
 34. T1: The sheets (.) Ok you can work on those the compound words
 35. and all that
 36. An: I'm done that
 37. T1: What else? did we use. (.) have we not done for a while and

38. some of you aren't done that sort of thing compound words (.)
 39. homonyms blah blah blah blah (1) member?
 40. An: (cut and glue)
 41. T1: Cut and glue there's a bunch of cut and glue books (.) booklet's
 42. back there to do with contractions compound words (1) etc.etc.
 43. Je: I finished those
 44. An: // I finished those
 45. T1: Yeah but a lot of people have a couple of pages left or whatever
 46. so cut out booklets. (6) What else could you poss ibly work on
 47. during your independent work time here. (2) Oh I'm just going
 48. (to) wait for hands up. Robert?
 49. Ro: uhh (3) (hh) umm our umm uh animal ()
 50. T1: // your animal research
 51. project. anything else you guys can think of (2) Carolyn?
 52. Ca: umm (we could ask you)
 53. T1: Nope (2) this is total independence I don't want to be involved
 54. here (1) it's all on your own except for the fact that you're lucky
 55. enough to have Sharon in the room but she ain't gonna help
 56. you
 57. An: Yes she is
 58. T1: () well she's not gonna tell you though? [to
 59. Sharon] If they're asking you a question are you gonna tell
 60. them the answer?
 61. Ss: ye::ah
 62. T1: No way
 63. An: (you) said she not gonna be able to help us
 64. T1: Oh? no she'll help you but she won't tell you the answer
 65. T2: She'll support you
 66. An: She lies
 67. T1: (3) I really like the way that Alex (.) Jenny (.) Mary are really
 68. keepin it together and Susan you're waiting so patiently with
 69. your hand up that is great (2) that is great (.) Susan
 70. Su: uhh (then maybe if you- after? maybe we're done our three
 71. things) everybody () around the world of all that stuff?
 72. T1: OK? an assorted around the world we could do after ok. (1)
 73. How about your environment booklets in science?
 74. Ss: no no oh no::
 75. T1: // Oh no whoa whoa whoa it's up to you guys you have to
 76. pick three of these things and do them properly (3) K? I want
 77. everybody to look up and pick your three. I don't want any
 78. talking til one min- no no no in your desks
 79. Je: // you said look up here-
 80. T1: I didn't say come up here I said look up here

[noise and chatter (8)]

81. Je: o:h we forgot to put phonics up
82. T1: I'm (1) I'm confused here.(1) can everyone get in listening
83. position for a minute. (2) I'm totally confused (1) Susan what
84. did I just ask everybody to do?
85. Su: get in listening position
86. T1: Ye:ah but right before that I said everybody look up here and
87. what.
88. Su: (1) (think) what you're gonna do
89. T1: ok. (.) did I say go get your stuff yet?
90. Su: No
91. T1: // No did I say get out of your desk.
92. S?: no no::o
93. T1: // Ok so that's why I'm confused (1) K everyone in listening
94. position eyeballs up here? Giving you one minute to pick your
95. three things K? [noise] () K(.) yeah and we forgot
96. phonics yes (3) K I'm timing you now. (.) one minute (.) and I
97. want you to know so you can go and get them (3) [chatter]
98. Robert (.) and Steven you need to sit one minute isn't up yet. (.)
99. I will tell you when you can get your stuff
100. An: (5) (got up from my desk) [giggles]
101. T1: Excuse me Sharon? what? did I just say?
102. Sh: Look up on the board and get three things (you didn't say get
103. your stuff) or get your stuff or get your stuff out
104. An: You never said get
105. T1: // Someone in this room understood me it's re:ally cool.
106. An: She said look on the board (Sharon said) look on the board and
107. get three things
108. T1: Well (.) it looks like Peter is doing his job Peter () you get
109. your three things? (1) great (.) Can you get them together
110. darling? yah
111. Pe: ()
112. T1: You still have to do three things honey but you can do your free
113. times first (3) Robert.
114. Ro: what's this?
- 188 115. T1: [gestures] K go to work

The segment opens with T1 at the front of the class preparing the cohort for a period of independent work time. A visitor is in the class today to assist with miscellaneous duties. The role of Sharon (the visitor) in today's class becomes the topic of conversation.

The segment starts with the teacher eliciting choices for what constitutes acceptable work tasks for the upcoming individual work time. (The process of the determination of what counts as work will be discussed later in this chapter.) The students are in their desks and have already been brought to order by the teacher. Lines 1-49 reflect a turn taking procedure that sees T1 manage turns within the cohort as she elicits possible and probable independent work activity ideas from the students. She manages the task in a way that keeps the task moving, yet at the same time she answers questions that come up and keeps the group on task. It is at line 50 that events are disrupted. This discussion begins at the point of disruption.

50. T1: // your animal research
 51. project. anything else you guys can think of (2) Carolyn?
 52. Ca: umm (we could ask you)
 53. T1: Nope (2) this is total independence I don't want to be involved
 54. here (1) it's all on your own except for the fact that you're lucky
 55. enough to have Sharon in the room but she ain't gonna help
 56. you
 57. An: Yes she is
 58. T1: () well she's not gonna tell you though? [to
 59. Sharon] if they're asking you a question are you gonna tell
 60. them the answer?
 61. Ss: ye::ah
 62. T1: No way
 63. An: (you) said she not gonna be able to help us
 64. T1: Oh? no she'll help you but she won't tell you the answer
 65. T2: She'll support you
 66. An: She lies
 67. T1: (3) I really like the way that Alex (.) Jenny (.) Mary are really
 68. keepin it together and Susan you're waiting so patiently with
 69. your hand up that is great (2) that is great (.) Susan

Prior to line 50, T1 has elicited a number of acceptable suggestions for independent work projects. At this point a classroom visitor (Sharon) has entered the room to assist

the teacher for the morning. Sharon has been in the classroom for a number of days and is familiar with the routine of the classroom. At the suggestion of Carolyn (at line 52) that T1 could offer individual help, T1 responds at line 53, 54 and 55 clarifying the requirement of total independence. In addition, as a consequence of entering the room just at this point in the interaction, Sharon is pulled into the interaction by T1 with the utterance of lines 54, 55 and 56. Here, an exception to the rule of total independence is made, that is, *Sharon is in the room but she ain't gonna help you*. The informal language used by the teacher is noted by the cohort as evidenced by the continuation of the game-like response of line 62 (Gumperz, 1964; Leiter, 1979). The student acknowledgement of the nature and context of the interaction is demonstrated at line 61 with the response to T's question at line 60 and with T's continuation of the context at line 62 *No way*. The comment by T1 at line 62 is the impetus for the repeat of Andrew's challenge of both the context formulated, and the teacher's right to reformulate the context back to the *work* of the classroom of line 64. This challenge no longer has to do with the type of work that is acceptable as independent work, but has to do with the role played by Sharon. From line 57 to line 66, the focus of the interaction is no longer the question of appropriate work tasks, but with the question of the level of help available from Sharon. At the point that the authority of T1 is contested by Andrew (line 57), T1 attempts to clarify the condition placed on Sharon's involvement (line 58), first as an appeal to Sharon then as a firm command in line 62. This strategy is ineffective at stopping the contestation however and T1 makes a second attempt at clarification in line 64 acknowledging that *help* can be expected, but not the answer. The situation is inflamed by Andrew at line 66, *She lies*.

This is an interesting utterance with consequences for the interaction. It is not immediately clear from the transcript as presented as to who is referenced by Andrew as lying. Within the two party reproach structure T1's comment (line 64) offers to the *cohort* a variation of what assistance Sharon can offer, that is, *help* but not the answer. This accommodation of the meaning of independent work is directed to the *cohort*, not specifically to Andrew. However, it appears that Andrew's accusation of lying is addressed to T1. T1 chooses not to publicly acknowledge the comment, however at this point the tone of the interaction changes from an informal game to a reproach. T1 ignores the accusation and attempts to reformulate the lesson by bringing attention back to the rule of successful participation, that is, waiting with your hand up for a chance to speak (line 70). She exercises her authority to change the subject and uses a strategy of the public acknowledgement of appropriate behaviour to reformulate the organization of the lesson. This strategy functions to remind the cohort, as opposed to a specific individual to *keep it together* and to use the appropriate mechanism to access permission to speak. In addition it informs the cohort that the negotiation of what counts as independent work is over. The task is resumed by the cohort at line 70. This is the beginning of a series of contestations around the misunderstanding of directions and the reluctance of the students to be swayed from the interaction. Although the use of a strategy of ignoring Andrew's comment of line 66 has temporarily enabled T1 to manage the task at hand, a second contestation develops at lines 75-77 with T1's request that *everybody look up and pick your three things*. Once again a miscommunication is evident by comments made by members of the cohort at line 79. This miscommunication is not necessarily one of misinterpreting the specific meaning

of the utterance, but also one of misinterpreting the nature of the utterance. The student may not be aware that the game engaged in by the teacher and the students earlier is over from the perspective of the teacher. T1 resolves this misinterpretation through a series of questions and evaluated responses (lines 80 and 86). An interesting utterance occurs at lines 86-88. Susan responds to T1's request for information with the *meaning* of the request rather than a repetition of the specific words used by T1 at lines 76-77. T1 acknowledges Susan's verbalization of the intent of the statement that is, Susan has said what is meant but has not said it *in-so-many-words*. The work of the teacher in managing the cohort continues.

101. T1: Excuse me Sharon? what? did I just say?
 102. Sh: Look up on the board and get three things (you didn't say get
 103. your stuff) or get your stuff or get your stuff out
 104. An: You never said get
 105. T1: // someone in this room understood me it's re:ally cool.
 106. An: She said look on the board (Sharon said) look on the board and
 107. get three things
 108. T1: Well (.) it looks like Peter is doing his job Peter () you get
 109. your three things? (1) great (.) Can you get them together
 110. darling? yah

The situation is not resolved until Sharon adds her authority to the account of the teacher (line 102) and the teacher interrupts the initiation of another authority contest from Andrew and confirms the accuracy of the visitor's statement (line 105). Andrew attempts to formulate not only a contest to the teacher's authority, but attempts to reformulate the context back to an informal or game-like context again (line 106) and is subsequently ignored by the teacher and the other students. In this sequence the teacher's management of the practical occurrences and disruptions of classroom lessons is made

visible through the use of a number of strategies including clarification requests, question and response reformulation, the use of a nomination strategy to elicit the desired answer and the use of the strategy of ignoring the disruption. The teacher's actions are geared to the return of the normative order in the classroom, that is, a return to the task at hand, determining what constitutes independent work. Andrew, particularly at lines 104 and 106 attempts to formulate the interaction in the context of a continuing game.

The next reproach sequence from the study data is unusual, in that it is a reproach in the private teacher to student realm. It is interesting for a number of reasons. First of all, all the examples of authority contests discussed to this point are in the public view. That is the reproach is made with the teacher in the teaching or lesson position at the front of the class and in full view of the cohort. Each student does the work of making the reproach relevant to his own individual state of affairs (Macbeth, 1991; Mehan, 1979). The authority contests and reproaches discussed earlier have been public exchanges and remained in that view as a result of the decision made by the teacher to resolve these conflicts with the cohort as a whole. Secondly, in the previous example the teacher has assumed that the knowledge of the problem, or resolution or rule to be followed is equally available to all members; that is, the problem need not be specified in-so-many-words. In the following example the classroom rule about partnership is interpreted and reinforced differentially to the students involved. This data segment demonstrates an authority contest / reproach sequence on two fronts simultaneously: The teacher and student contest and the student to student contest. This segment has been edited for length as it appears elsewhere in this paper and is presented fully in the Appendix.

Segment 4

3: B: 7:

- 240 1. An: (you) read I write
- 241 2. Ca: Ok circle (1) r n
3. An: I know I know ()
11. T: You need to read to (.) gether.(1) you need (.) to (.) read (.)the
12. (.) book (.) together folks that's part of it
13. Ca: (oh hah) You have to read the book (together) (2) K?
14. An: yu- you read I write
15. Ca: Ok. [reading] cross the stream
- 271 16. An: Jake having a (fun) time? (1) I'm not [gestures at Carolyn]
- 295 23. T: Andrew are you reading with Carolyn darling?
24. An: I don't know how to read ()
25. T: K well (1) Carolyn
[Andrew gets up from his chair and moves about a metre away from T and Carolyn]
26. Ca: What.
27. T: How do you need to work (1) with (.) Andrew?
[Andrew leaves the vicinity and goes to the book corner]
28. Ca: But uh I but this is an easy book and he says he can't read it .
29. T: (3) Carolyn? (.) is everything that's easy for you easy for
30. everybody else?
31. Ca: I know but I know how
32. T: // no Carolyn is everything that's easy for you
33. Ca: // No:::oo
34. T: easy for everybody else
35. Ca: no:::oo
36. T: // K you need to look at me for a moment. so if you're in a
37. partnership what do you need to do.
38. Ca: (pick a book) both of us to read the book but I know how
39. T: // could
40. you help Andrew to read would that be a possibility?
41. Ca: I was going to but he said he didn't wanna read(.) didn't wanna
42. read.
43. T: well you need to work to help him fit in the group here ok.
44. An: [returns with book] Zoom I got one you read I read you read
45. that hot [Carolyn leans over Andrews book to help] two two
46. (in a word) in a word yay!
[Andrew starts to read and identify sounds to be written down]
63. An: Now you read (you go) you read

64. Ca: // but-
65. An: You read it
66. Ca: // (bike bike)
67. An: Read your own book
68. Ca: We supposed to be in partnership you know we're gettin marks
69. An: Yeah so I don't care (1) you read your own book
70. Ca: (but we'll) get checks
71. An: You read your own book (1) uh double one
72. Ca: Andrew I want to get checks
73. An: You read your own book
74. Ca: Andrew.
75. An: Your own book
76. Ca: (2) Andrew
77. An: read your own book
78. Ca:
- 332 79. An: No you read (.) it's ok if you read one and I read one she
80. doesn't mind
- [both work on their own books for about two minutes]
- 345 81. An: Zoom Zoom (12) Zo:o:om two zooms (5) (word in word)
82. ye::ah I like my words in word (2) there's at in em (15) (l.l.k)
83. Ca: Andrew marry marry
84. An: K
85. Ca: marry
86. An: I know how to spell that
87. Ca: m- a- double r
88. An: m-a (2) there marry (2) marry is that marry?
89. Ca: (3) ok something from your book
90. An: K zoom another zoom
91. Ca: // (fill) fill K if you already got one zoom we
92. can't (do) zoom again
93. An: (4) Is that how you spell fill.
94. Ca: f-i-l-l
95. An: f-i-l-l K and (zoom)
96. Ca: No we already got zoom
- 373 97. An: so what?
- [both go back to individual reading]
- 375 98. An: so (1) what other word? (7) (are them)
99. Ca: come (.) come
100. An: okay (1) come (12) mmm is that how you spell come? um c-u-
101. u-m. no. c u m e (.) o m c o m e
102. An: c- o (1) m e
- 395 103. T: K guys (1) put everything away nicely just relax. and put your
104. sheets on Mrs. B's desk (5) K put everything away nicely

This segment begins as both the teacher and the assistant teacher are moving around the classroom monitoring the performance of the students. The students have been assigned partners by T, and are working together jointly reading a book and noting as many different sound combinations as possible. The students are sitting together side by side at a small table, Carolyn is holding and reading a book, Andrew is writing. Lines 1-3 illustrate the conflict between Andrew and Carolyn.

11. T: You need to read to (.) gether. (1) you need (.) to (.) read (.) the
 12. (.) book (.) together folks that's part of it
 13. Ca: (oh hah) You have to read the book (together) (2) K.
 14. An: yu- you read I write
 15. Ca: OK. [reading] cross the stream
 271 16. An Jake having a (fun) time? (1) I'm not [gestures at Carolyn]

At lines 11 and 12, T repeats the task directions to the class at large. Carolyn indicates at line 13 her knowledge of the “rule” for the task and she repeats the rule to Andrew and asks for agreement to the process (line 13: K?). Andrew, by choosing a variant of the “rule” in line 14, *you read I write* rejects the rule. In line 15, Carolyn agrees to the variation and work proceeds with Carolyn reading, and Andrew writing down the words. Andrew and Carolyn have worked out what appears to be a solution to the accomplishment of the task. This is a reflection of the emergent student to student moral order of the lesson.

23. T: Andrew are you reading with Carolyn darling?
 24. An: I don't know how to read ()
 25. T: K well (1) Carolyn
 [Andrew gets up from his chair and moves about a metre away from T and Carolyn]

26. Ca: What.
 27. T: How do you need to work (1) with (.) Andrew?
 [Andrew leaves the vicinity and goes to the book corner]
 28. Ca: But uh I but this is an easy book and he says he can't read it .
 29. T: (3) Caroln? (.) is everything that's easy for you easy for
 30. everybody else?
 31. Ca: I know but I know how
 32. T: // no Carolyn. Is everything that's easy for you
 33. Ca: // No:::oo
 34. T: easy for everybody else
 35. Ca: no:::oo
 36. T: // K you need to look at me for a moment. so if you're in a
 37. partnership what do you need to do.
 38. Ca: (pick a book) both of us to read the book but I know how
 39. T: // could
 40. you help Andrew to read would that be a possibility?
 41. Ca: I was going to but he said he didn't wanna read(.) didn't
 42. wanna read.
 43. T: well you need to work to help him fit in the group here ok.

An extended reproach begins in line 23 with T's question to Andrew about reading with his partner. This is a direct question which generates an answer by Andrew as an account for not following the rule rather than a yes or no. T does not challenge the account in line 25, rather turns her attention to Carolyn instead. It is not clear from T's response to Andrew's reply why this particular account was successful. However, the breach in the standardized expectancy, that is, that both students would be held accountable, points to a background characteristic involving Andrew that is not to be discussed *in-so-many-words*. Andrew moves away from the pending reproach as T addresses Carolyn in line 25. Line 25 serves the purpose of notifying Andrew and Carolyn that an explanation of sorts from Carolyn is required. This question assumes that Carolyn is aware of the problem, and will have an explanation ready without a direct reference or

clarification from T. However Carolyn's question at line 26 forces T to clarify the problem at line 27. The problem becomes publicly defined as Carolyn's inability to work with Andrew rather than Andrew's inability to read.

At this point an interesting twist takes place. The reproach becomes a bid or invitation to provide information or an account for, rather than a direct explanation of Carolyn's "behaviour". At this point Andrew leaves the area completely. Carolyn starts to provide her account of the situation, but T does not accept the account and formulates her question in a different manner. The problem is no longer one of the students not meeting the rules specified in the assignment, that is reading together, but a different sort of issue.

Lines 29 to 35 continue with T's refusal to entertain an account from Carolyn and culminates with the question at line 36 and 37, regarding what to do in a partnership. Here we can see that the intent of the reproach is to clarify the rules of "being in a partnership" rather than the rules of the lesson. At this point Carolyn is now in the position of managing the "rules of the partnership" and the rules of the lesson. Line 38 demonstrates that Carolyn does understand the rule of the partnership, that is, using a book they both can read. As she starts to offer an account for why that was not done in this case she is once again cut off with the utterance of a second rule, that is of helping Andrew. The reproach ends at line 43, as T closes the conversation verbally and moves away. At this point Andrew returns with a book from the book corner.

44. An: [returns with book] Zoom I got one. You read I read You read
 45. that. hot [Carolyn leans over Andrews book to help] two two
 46. (in a word) in a word yay!

Although Andrew has not been a visible part of the reproach sequence, he shows his awareness of the exchange between T and Carolyn by indicating at line 44 his willingness to share reading with his suggestion that *you read I read*. The difficulties continue throughout the remainder of the segment with the negotiation of the new rules. Within this sequence it is possible to begin to grasp the notion, or to “see” two distinct normative or moral organizational structures emerging in the classroom. The first is the structure of the work done by the teacher to manage the situation so that the background information about Andrew (his inability to read the book) does not become a foregrounded characteristic (Cook-Gumperz, 1975). T does the work of organizing her reproach so that Andrew’s difficulty does not need to be talked about publicly and defined in detail. The second normative order is found in the emergent negotiation of the rules by the student to complete the task. Within the private domain of the work group, the students have successfully accomplished a sense of order that enables both members to proceed without conflict. The intrusion of T into the order necessitates the reformulation of the rules to meet teacher expectations.

The next sequence is of a more common form in that it is a teacher-student reproach sequence that emerges and is accomplished in the public view.

Segment 5

4: B: 4:

- 166 1. T1: [to Peter] Ok let's see your neatest printing darling you need to get that done K you have a great start keep it up? (.) K
 2. to get that done K you have a great start keep it up? (.) K
 3. (3) just concentrate on your printing (slow yourself down)
 [On camera but inaudible. Jake is erasing his work]
 4. T2: [to S?] Oh man look at that printing (4) oh that is gorgeous
 5. T1: (..h)! That is most fabulous
 6. T2: Mrs. T? (2) Wol we both have a fabulous thing going on

7. at the same time look at this writing
- 8 T1: Ok
9. T2: This is totally () yes?
10. T1: // well just look at this printing (2) now
11. he had r's that were floating upwards
12. T2: Is that my Alex?
13. T1: Yes it is (indeed)
14. T2: // you've got to be kidding I'm thrilled really (.) hey
15. Alex (1) give me half a one
- [number of Ss standing around and listening to the exchange between the teachers]
16. Pe: Miss S?
17. T2: excuse me [moves to Steven's desk]
18. St: Now what should I do?
- [T2 moves to Steven's desk and glances at Jake's work]
19. T2: Jake (.) you need to do this (again) (1) Well I'll give you a choice. (.) that (.) is not (.) your best work I need your best work
- 20.
21. work
22. Ja: ()
23. T2: Yeah I did. Now I want your best printing on these and if it's not on there this is your choice? (1) you cannot redo it however you miss () today and you will (do it) Ok
24. (.) whatever you choose it doesn't matter that's not the point
25. go ahead you have a choice either you'll do that or you'll
26. miss () capice?
- 27.
28. miss () capice?
29. Ja: ()
- 184 30. T2: capice.
- [T2 walks away. Jake continues with work and his level of frustration starts to grow visably]
- 188 31. Ja: [to Steven] *is that neat?*
32. St: ** (no)**
33. Ja: [erases] This pencil is small Carolyn I can't write with it
34. Ca: what?
35. Ja: It's too small I can't write
36. T2: // () that is not Carolyn's problem that's your problem
37. (Carolyn's the one that gave it to me)
38. Ja: (Carolyn's the one that gave it to me)
39. Ca: Yeah cause he didn't have a pencil
40. T2: Ok (.) No Carolyn that's not your problem you continue on (.) that's Jake's problem
41. that's Jake's problem
42. Ja: ()
43. T2: [turns to Peter] Ohh (.) that printing is absolutely gorgeous well darling could you colour that in your best coloring use a
- 44.

45. **different** colour for each stripe () stuff that
 46. would look **great**.
 [moves to Peter's desk with her back to Jake and Steven]
 47. Ja: () [glances toward T2] Oh? oh?
 206 48. T2: [to Jake] you know what Jake I didn't ()
 [Jake leaves the room]

This reproach sequence demonstrates an *if/then* contingency sequence. The contingency sequence in this example happens over the body of the whole segment rather than in adjacent parts. This extension of the sequence is typical in this class in that there is a “times three rule” in place. That is, each student has three chances before being asked to leave the room as a disciplinary measure. T1 and T2 are circling the room during an individual work period and monitoring the quality of work. Each student is to work on their neatest and best printing. Jake has been having a difficult time off camera which culminates in T1 approaching him at Line 19.

19. T2: Jake (.) you need to do this (again) (1) Well I'll give you
 20. a choice. (.) that (.) is **not** (.) your best work I **need** your best
 21. work
 22. Ja: ()
 23. T2: Yeah I did. Now I want your best printing on these and if it's
 24. **not** on there this is **your** choice? (1) you cannot redo it
 25. however you miss () today and you **will** (do it) Ok
 26. (.) whatever you choose it doesn't matter that's not the point
 27. go ahead you **have** a choice either you'll do that or you'll
 28. miss () capice?
 29. Ja: ()
 184 30. T2: capice.

T2 directs her attention to Jake and clarifies for him what is expected, that is *I need your best work*, in lines 19 and 20. At this point the *if/then* contingency is imposed. The choice given is to either do the work again on the basis of *needing* Jake's best work. A comment made by Jake (inaudible) at line 22 is apparently heard by T2. T2's response at

line 23 provides insufficient information to guess at the contents of Jake's comment. At this point the *if / then* contingency is reformulated by T2 (line 24 and 25) as a consequence of Jake's comment. The option to redo is withdrawn, but the *if / then* contingency for Jake's failure to provide his best printing becomes *to miss* (). The *if / then* contingency is now formulated as Jake producing his best printing or missing (). Jake is reminded in line 26 and 27 that he has a choice and consensus appears to be formed on lines 28, 29 and 30. It is possible that these lines reflect the teachers boundary on the discussion rather than consensus, or perhaps Jake's decision not to challenge the teacher's authority. In this segment the contingency sequence is perhaps affected by the disagreement between T and Jake that occurs over the remainder of the segment. This disagreement culminates with the student leaving the room at line 48. The final status of the *if / then* contingency in this case is unknown.

This last segment documents the management of an authority contest / reproach sequence through the use of a publicly stated, though not necessarily shared consensual statement by T2 (lines 28, 29 and 30). The function of the public statement to the cohort serves notice that there is a consequence for the non-compliance to the rule of best work, and more importantly the expectation that this should be so. Jake is not given the opportunity to contest the contingency. That a consequence is forthcoming is morally or normatively sanctioned to and by the cohort through the use of an apparent consensual agreement between T2 and Jake. In addition the contingency serves public notice of the boundary of negotiation in this instance. All students become aware of the consequence for not producing their best work.

This section has demonstrated the routine nature of the organization of classroom lessons and processes in this classroom. Teacher and student strategies routinely used in the day to day activities in this classroom are similar to those found in many classrooms not just in a classroom of children who face learning and attentional difficulties. This classroom is typical in that the distinctive organization of classroom activities is present (Macbeth, 1991; McHoul, 1978; Payne and Hustler, 1980) and are made visible in the organization and management of the cohort as accomplished by the students and the teacher. In addition to the specific classroom strategies and structure discussed, many other classroom tasks are made visible in this data. In the remainder of this chapter I will discuss some of the unremarked on yet remarkable elements of classroom activities.

The Constitutive Elements of Self-Esteem in the Classroom

In an earlier discussion self-esteem is conceptualized in the traditional research literature, as a multi-dimensional concept rather than as a category or event that provides an interpretative scheme for the evaluation of student performance (Leiter, 1974: 17-25). The first part of this chapter demonstrated the typical nature of the organization and structure of activities in this classroom. This segment will discuss the collaborative achievement of what counts as self-esteem by the members of this classroom, and is meant to challenge the traditional view of self-esteem as a causal, predictive or antecedent variable in the understanding of academic failure. Using an EM perspective the constitutive elements of self-esteem, or what-we-all-know *counts* as self-esteem; classroom competence; academic success; and producing what *counts as work*, are seen as

embedded in the organization and structure of the classroom, and are made visible in the speaking structure of the classroom. Where possible, fragments previously used to demonstrate the typical nature of this classroom will be used to demonstrate the constitutive elements of what *counts* as self-esteem. Members construct what *counts* as self-esteem as a series of competences exhibited publicly in the classroom. Although not always publicly spoken about in so-many-words, these competences are available to the members as evidence of specific skills and progress. Specific examples will be analyzed within the organizational context of the classroom. Various elements of self-esteem will be documented including classroom competence, academic skills and progress, peer relationships in the classroom and the visibility of specific learning challenges with a view to documenting evidence for the member's achievement of what counts as self-esteem in this classroom.

Acknowledging Classroom Competence:

There are a number of concepts central to the discussion of the acknowledgement of classroom competence including what Mehan calls "interactional competence" (1979: 129-130). Mehan's conceptualization as competence as being available in the interaction, points the way to the examination of routine classroom activities for documentation of the elements that constitute classroom competence. To participate effectively in the classroom students must produce knowledge and behaviour that is acceptable within the structure of classroom activities and lessons, both academic and social situations, displaying personal responsibility for classroom behaviour, understanding what constitutes "work" and in

providing appropriate answers to questions and displaying problem solving skills. Each of these skills is an element of what counts as competent membership in the classroom community. A second concept incorporated in this discussion is the notion of the constitution of mundane activities. The acknowledgement of individual student competence in classroom activities is a routine activity. It is the nature of routine activities that they are in fact mundane or ordinary. These activities form the often seen but unnoticed or unremarkable character of classroom life. This analysis will discuss the consequences of the mundane nature of the routine acknowledgement of student competence.

Segment 6

1: B: 5:

22. Ja: oh no
 23. T: well Jake the reason- (1) I'm gonna give everybody a second to
 24. recheck themselves cause some of us are really not where we
 25. should be right now. We all know where we should be thank
 26. you (.) yes Andrew
 27. An: (can we have) umm round the world um math and time
 28. T: Well honey you know what we'll do there (.) We have reading
 29. buddies next umm what time is it? Can somebody tell me what
 30. time it is I can hardly see that clock (3) Andrew?
 31. An: It is umm (1) I Kno::w
 32. S?: // eleven forty five eleven forty five
 33. T: // O my goodness major static Andrew what time is
 34. it?
 35. An: Eleven forty five
 36. T: Is it eleven forty five?
 37. An: // no?
 38. T: // is it eleven forty five?
 39. Ja: ten forty five
 40. An: // ten forty five
 41. T: umm Jake I'm gonna ask you I know that you know it but you
 42. need to keep it in hon great job though you guys
 43. remembering that ok. um (.) actually we don't even have time
 44. for chis today I'm just gonna quickly review the six times tables

45. with my kids ok (1) my six times group the rest of you to be
 46. working on your time booklet's (1) ok.
 47. Su: But I'm all done
 389 48. T: Most important I'm gonna give you another one working on
 49. quarter hours

This scenario was described previously in the earlier discussion about the structure of questions and answers in the classroom. For that reason, the entire segment has not been duplicated here, and is available in the appendix. In brief the class has just discussed future work plans and the fragment opens with the teacher's response to Jake's comments on the prospective plan. The teacher is standing at the front of the class in front of the blackboard, and has previously gathered the attention of the cohort.

There are many instances in the data set of the routine acknowledgement of skills, and other competencies and they will be analysed as they appear in the following segments. However this segment is particularly remarkable because of the relationship of the acknowledgement, the rule statement and the functions played by this dialogue between T and Jake. The fragment of particular interest is centered on lines 29 to 46. At line 29, T opens the question to bids from the cohort and nominates Andrew to provide the answer. Andrew is either unsure or not fast enough and an unknown student provides an unsolicited answer for him at line 32. The unsolicited response is addressed immediately after it starts by T, who reinforces the nomination for the answer and engages in a process to assist Andrew in generating the correct answer. However, Jake provides a correct though unsolicited response and the teacher's teaching process is pre-empted by Andrew's repetition of the correct answer. The teachers response of lines 41 - 45

functions in a number of ways. It serves to repair Jake's miscue (providing an unsolicited response after two clarifications by T as to the identity of the nominated student) and still enables T to acknowledge the correct nature of Jake's response. More importantly, by choosing that particular sanction format, T facilitates Jake's public presentation as competent, and through the acknowledgement and incorporation of his correct answer into the lesson, she confirms Jake's answer as the correct one. This structure facilitates Jake's public presentation as a competent member in the classroom. In a similar vein, T's response of lines 41 - 42 accomplishes a second objective. It reinforces the rule to *keep it in* for the cohort. The third function of T's response is to bring the cohort back to the structured question and answer scheme, and allows T to continue with the classroom agenda without a long delay.

Jake's asynchronous utterance created an opportunity for T to reinforce to the cohort the rule about unsolicited answers thereby reinforcing her authority in the classroom and at the same time allowing Jake to produce evidence to the cohort of his academic skill if not his ability to use the rule. The structure of the response used by T allows for Jake's display and for the reinforcement to the cohort of the rule, but not for the opportunity to continue the question and answer sequence with Andrew, and by extension to further teach the remainder of the cohort about telling time. In this particular fragment it is possible to document both the embedded nature of acknowledging the right answer into events as they happen, as well as the preference for a return to the routine classroom structure of questions and answers.

The organizational structure specific to the classroom that allows for the

accomplishment of this type of display of competence is the asymmetrical rights and privileges inherent in the structure of teacher authority. The question of whether or not this particular choice of sanction was motivated by the desire of the teacher to allow Jake to display his competence is irrelevant. This event occurred as a mundane event in the classroom as a seen but unnoticed component of the interaction.

What Counts as Best Work

The designation of what is acceptable as a student's best work is once again within the scope of the constitutive elements of teacher authority. In addition, embedded in the notion of what counts as a student's best work is the notion of rules and the relationship between subjective evaluation and the et cetera clause.

Segment 7

4: B: 4:

- 166 1. T1: [to Peter] Ok let's see your neatest printing darling you need
 2. to get that done K you have a great start keep it up? (.) K
 3. (3) just concentrate on your printing (slow yourself down)
 [On camera but not audible. Jake is erasing his work]
 4. T2: [to S?] Oh man look at that printing (4) oh that is gorgeous
 5. T1: (..h)! That is most fabulous
 6. T2: Mrs. T.? (2) wol we both have a fabulous thing going on
 7. at the same time look at this writing
 8. T1: Ok
 9. T2: This is totally () yes?
 10. T1: // well just look at this printing (2) now
 11. he had r's that were floating upwards
 12. T2: Is that my Alex
 13. T1: Yes it is (indeed)
 14. T2: // you've got to be kidding I' m thrilled really (.) hey
 15. Alex (1) give me half a one
 [number of Ss standing around listening to the exchange between teachers]
 16. Pe: Miss S?
 17. T2: excuse me [moves to Steven's desk]

18. ST: Now what should I do.
 [T moves to Steven's desk but glances at Jake's work]
19. T2: Jake (.) you need to do this (again) (1) well I'll give you a
 20. choice. (.) that (.) is not (.) your best work I need your best
 21. work
 22. Ja: ()
23. T2: Yeah I did. Now I want your best printing on these and if it's
 24. not on there this is your choice? (1) you cannot redo it
 25. however you miss () today and you will (do it) ok
 26. (.) whatever you choose it doesn't matter that's not the point
 27. go ahead you have a choice either you'll do that or you'll
 28. miss () capice?
 28. Ja: ()
- 184 29. T2: capice.
 [T2 walks away. Jake continues with his work and his level of frustration starts to grow visably]
- 188 30. Ja: [to Steven] is that neat?
 31. St ** (no) **
 32. Ja: [erases] This pencil is small Carolyn I can't write with it
 33. Ca: what?
 34. Ja: it's too small I can't write
 35. T2: // () that is not Carolyn's problem that's your
 36. problem
 37. Ja: (Carolyn's the one that gave it to me)
 38. Ca: Yeah cause he didn't have a pencil
 39. T2: *Ok* (.) No Carolyn that's not your problem you continue on (.)
 40. that's Jake's problem
 41. Ja: ()
 42. T2: [turns to Peter] Ohh (.) that printing is absolutely gorgeous
 43. well darling could you colour that in your best coloring use a
 44. different colour for each stripe () stuff that
 45. would look great.
 [moves to Peter's desk]
- 206 46. Ja: () [glances toward T] Oh? oh?
 47. T2: [to Jake] you know what Jake I didn't ()
 [Jake leaves the room]

This scenario was discussed earlier in the chapter in the section on reproach contingency sequences. In summary, T1 and T2 are circulating in the classroom monitoring and encouraging the students to do their very best work on the printing

assignments The segment opens (lines 1 - 4), as T1 is discussing with a student a number of conditions for what would qualify as his best work. Embedded in the discussion are qualities that are available as information to the whole cohort, including the *need to see your neatest printing* and the need to get the task completed. In addition the inclusion of *great start keep it up* acts as an encouragement not only to Peter but to the cohort. The class is further directed through the teacher's conversation with the student to *concentrate* and (*slow yourself down*). This is the initial definition of what counts as best work in this segment. Lines 9-12 provide a further clue as to best work for the students. It defines for the cohort what will *count* as best work, thereby providing to the member a base on which to judge or assess their own ability and competence. For Alex his best work is a matter of r's not floating upward. A final clue to *best work* is provided at lines 30 and 31. This clue is different however, as it reflects a student's interpretation as to what constitutes *best work*. Here we have three very different descriptions of best work. The point is that *best work* is determined as a function of individual performance and presented to the cohort as a whole for each student to find the relevance within his or her own work. This relates to the discretionary use of teacher authority in determining " what counts " as the best work of a student. In this fragment, the abstract nature of *best work* is defined for the cohort in the process of the teacher's practical action of evaluating individual student effort.

In lines 4 - 15, a public display of an acknowledgement of effort is configured jointly by T1 and T2. The public acknowledgement of good work is made available to the cohort, ostensibly as a mechanism for further defining *best work* and contains additional inferences as to what is acceptable. This is an opportunity for each student to self evaluate their

effort and find the relevance of the teacher's not-said-in-so-many-words improvement and best work. At this point the class has a significant amount of information about what the constitutive elements of *your best work* include, and this information has come to them as part of the routine comments about the work of individual students that is in the practical organization of the lesson.

16. Pe: Miss S?
 17. T2: Excuse me [moves to Steven's desk]
 18. St: Now what should I do.
 [T moves to Steven's desk but glances at Jake's work]
 19. T2: Jake (.) you need to do this (again) (1) well I'll give you a
 20. choice. (.) that (.) is not (.) your best work I need your best
 21. work.
 22. Ja: ()
 23. T2: Yeah I did. Now I want your best printing on these and if it's
 24. not on there this is your choice? (1) you cannot redo it
 25. however you miss () today and you will (do it) Ok
 26. (.) whatever you choose it doesn't matter that's not the point
 27. go ahead you have a choice either you'll do that or you'll
 28. miss () capice?
 28. Ja: ()
 184 29. T2: capice.

Lines 16 - 29 were discussed extensively in the demonstration of the *if / then* contingency sequence. They are reintroduced at this point because they demonstrate a number of other concepts, including the rationale for doing your best work and the presentation of the reminder of the availability of personal choice as an option in the contingency plan. In line 19, the teacher invokes the *need to do this* as part of the reproach sequence. This is the same condition for doing your best that was invoked initially in lines 1 and 2. Once again no explanation is given as to why the task must be completed, or why there is no need for the request to be discussed in-so-many-words, as the teacher's

authority is sufficient rationale. The teacher is exercising her basic rights and privileges in the classroom to determine the class agenda. Similarly a decision is made that the work completed is not the students best work and will have to be completed in an acceptable manner. The consequence for noncompliance is the inability to redo the work and miss a favourite activity. An additional consequence is the public knowledge of a deficit in Jake's classroom competence. We can see a second chance formulated in the sequence of talking about the initial problem; that is Jake's poor performance on the assigned task. In this sequence we can see the development of a choice model for Jake that still ensures T2 will have the work done according to her expectations (lines 24 -25). This is an opportunity for Jake to repair the problem, and for T2 to mediate the consequences. The onus is now on Jake to repair the breach in expectations. This is determined in part by T2's formulation of the *if / then* contingency that specifies the future action to be taken, and by the reminder to the student of individual choice (line 24). Here is evidence of the organization of the moral order in the classroom. Choice is an option, however choice carries with it a practical consequence.

30. Ja: [to Steven] is that neat?
 31. St: ** (no) **
 32. Ja: [erases] This pencil is small Carolyn I can't write with it
 33. Ca: what?
 34. Ja: It's too small I can't write
 35. T2: // () that is not Carolyn's problem that's your
 36. problem
 37. Ja: (Carolyn's the one that gave it to me)
 38. Ca: Yeah cause he didn't have a pencil
 39. T2: *Ok* (.) No Carolyn that's not your problem you continue on (.)
 40. that's Jake's problem
 41. Ja: ()
 42. T2: [turns to Peter] Ohh (.) That printing is absolutely gorgeous

43. well darling could you colour that in your best coloring use a
 44. different colour for each stripe () stuff that
 45. would look great.
 [moves to Peters' desk]
 46. Ja: () [glances toward T] Oh? oh?
 206 47. T2: [to Jake] you know what Jake I didn't ()
 [Jake leaves the room]

Line 30 demonstrates an attempt by Jake to further define “neat”. Jake chooses another student, Steven, as a source for the opinion on his work rather than T2. He does not elicit further clarification on the task at any point in the sequence from T1 or T2, but relies on information available to the cohort. It is notable that the sequence starts with a request from Steven for assistance, with Jake being evaluated in an incidental way. Lines 32 to 37 form the basis of Jake's accounting of his poor performance. He formulates an account of the responsibility for his poor work as Carolyn's responsibility for lending him a pencil that is too small (line 31), despite the intervention of T2 at lines 35 and 39 delegating the personal responsibility to Jake rather than Carolyn. It should be noted that the account was not made directly to T2, but to Carolyn and the class as a whole. This furnishes T2 with the opportunity to let the reproach stand in the public rather than the private view and to openly clarify where responsibility lies (lines 35 and 36). Jake persists in his account, which results in an expansion of the rule about the ownership of the problem more directed at Jake than the cohort this time (line 39 and 40), although available to the cohort. At this point Jake's difficulty with personal responsibility is visible to the cohort. By ascribing responsibility to another student publicly, he has required that T2 clarify for Carolyn and the remainder of the cohort his specific error or lack of ability

to take responsibility. It is in the resolution process of the problem that the inability is made visible to the cohort, as an affair in the routine management of classroom events. The segment ends with T2 using the strategy of returning to business as the method of restoring the routine structure of the task at hand.

This segment documents the teaching and learning of a number of elements of what counts as self-esteem and classroom competence. *Best work* is defined to the cohort as a process of description of individual accomplishments with each student finding the personal relevance of each utterance. The cohort finds the relevance to their personal best work despite the fact that *best work* is not and does not need to be defined. An examination of the segment is remarkable in that it yields information on the development of the agreement in action made between the teacher and students as to what is expected when one is doing their *best work*.

In addition, this fragment demonstrates the work that Jake does to account for why he cannot benefit from the opportunity to repair the contest with the teacher by doing his best work. It demonstrates the process of the negotiation of personal responsibility within a logical sequence of talk, and as part of the practical action of the classroom and the normal sequence of events. This exchange is made available to the cohort and functions as a clarification of responsibility for Jake, as well as for the class, and simultaneously provides an opportunity for the teacher to instruct the class in an element of what counts as self-esteem, that is, assuming personal responsibility for learning and behaviour. This segment offers documentation on the social organization of assuming personal responsibility for one's academic and social performance. Through the structure of the

reproach sequence, the rationale for the *need to do your best printing* is validated, as the practical consequence of the asymmetrical nature of teacher authority. Through the accomplishment of teacher authority the moral order of the classroom emerges. The accomplishment of teacher authority, in the ability to reproach Jake because of his refusal to do his *best printing*, reflects the moral order of the classroom in that the reproach foregrounds the breach of the standardized expectancy; that is, the requirement of *best printing*. The use of the *if / then* contingency reinforces for the members both the consequence of the breach of the rule governed activity and the enforcement of the rule of doing the work of producing *your best printing*. A fact of life in the classroom is the requirement to produce *best printing* when the teacher requests. These concepts are made visible to the cohort within the routine structure of an individual work period. Part of what *counts* as self-esteem in this classroom is the exhibition of performing to the demands of the moral order.

Problem Solving

Problem-solving abilities are referenced in the conventional literature as an element of self-esteem, although the relationship between the abstract concept of self-esteem and a developed level of skill is not explicated. What is apparent in this classroom, in fact, is the status of problem-solving skill as a core curriculum area. This sequence documents one opportunity taken by the teacher to specifically teach problem solving skills.

Segment 8

1: B: 2:

135. T: no Robert no stay where oh yeah Ok now we'll do hands up

136. seven up so we'll have our round the world man Andrew (1)
 137. *Birthday* boy yesterday Steven and I need a girl our sick
 138. girl yesterday Carolyn - glad to have you back. (1) K you guys? ..
 139. (.) go for it. head down thumbs up
 [designated students go around touching hands of students with heads down]
- 085 140. An: heads up seven up? (5) no Jenny (2) heads up whoever got
 141. touched stand up (2) ok () Mary
 142. S?: there's three up now
 143. An: ok umm just ()
 144. S?: Cam Cam
 145. Su: // Cam
 146. St: ohhh shoot
 [giggles]
 147. St: (don't) me
 148. An: // I don't know
 149. Ca: // he won't
 150. An: [giggles]
 151. S?: // cheater
 152. S?: it's Andrew
 153. St: // it's Andrew
 154. An: No::o
 155. St: It's Carolyn
 156. An: too bad .
 157. St: Was it you?
 158. An: no:: no::
 159. Ca: yes
- 096 160. St: // aw shoot you're telling I told you you should've listened to
 161. ()
- [section not transcribable to much general noise in the classroom]
- 098 162. T: All Right Ms S's interrupting here Everyone
 163. Sit down
 164. An: * thanks a lot.*
 [general noise and confusion as all take seats]
165. T: (excuse me) you need to get in listening position (5)I was busy
 166. talking to Ms T. and so I have no (.) clue what happened (here)
 167. all I know is all of a sudden things weren't working
 168. An: I know what happened?
 169. T: Well I don't want to know what happened (2) but I don't like
 170. the way it was dealt with Who figures they were using their
 171. problem solving (skills) ? Didn't sound to me like anybody was
 172. re:ally I want you all to close your eyes and think about how
 173. you could have dealt with this using (good) problem solving
 174. Je: // I didn't do anything

175. T: I'll go through the steps if you didn't do anything ? you know
 176. what happened up there you still think of a plan (.) ready? What
 177. was the problem everybody think of it in your head (1) Andrew
 178. that is not appropriate darling (1) What was the problem think
 179. about it. k? What was the plan that you did use it didn't work
 180. did it.
181. Ss: [in unison] no::o
182. T: Good. think of another one (3) think of another plan (1)
 183. something that would have worked. K? You know what the
 184. problem was you knew that what you used didn't work (3) k?
 185. think of another plan (.) A good one and go through the steps
 186. til the end of the problem. Who? would like to share their new
 187. plan with me (3) () someone who was involved ()
 188. Cameron what's your new plan.
189. Cm: umm: (just)
190. Je: // let them guess
191. T: So you think we could have solved this whole thing (1) by just
 192. not telling who picked who to begin with. So in other words
 193. keeping the mouth shut unless it's your turn. (.) Who thinks that
 194. might be a good plan [several hands up] (3) We all have to
 195. work together when we're playing a game you guys K? Is there
 196. any other plans (1.) Mary.
197. Ma: Umm:: (2)don't call out (people were)
198. T: // so in other words you could have stopped
 199. the whole situation from happening if there was just no calling
 200. out going on ok Andrew.
201. An: If the people I- if somebody got picked they should go down
 202. (2) cause that was part of the problem um: somebody picked
 203. em and somebody didn't go down and () told () she
 204. guessed you (so) she goes but it's not fair cause they called out
 205. so-
206. T: // Ok but we're going all the way back through the whole
 207. problem Andrew
208. An: // (that's the whole problem)
209. T: // I just wanna know the new
 210. solution (1) so the new solution is if you actually touch
 211. someone's thumb when they guess your name ((pop)) you
 212. change right ?
213. An: (yep)
214. T: Ok let me see this one more time the original three people up
 215. there let's do one round and see if you can put this in to use
 216. here. (1) heads down thumbs up
217. An: Carolyn () heads up seven up (.) Mary?

218. Ma: Steven?
 219. St: // no::o:o
 220. An: Susan?
 221. Su: (5) Steven?
 222. St: // ye::ah
 223. An: () [giggles]
 224. Je: Carolyn (2) that's how I knew
 225. An: That was too easy
 149 226. T: Very nice folks get in your desks take your shoes off

This segment follows after the class has just completed a game of *Round the World*.

T1 initiates a game of *Heads Up Seven Up* with the class (lines 135 - 139) as a reward for hard work. Initially it appears that the game is considered to be a fun activity rather than an academic exercise. Three students are nominated by T to start the game in the coveted leader spot. As the game begins, the nominated students are at the front of the class with the remainder of the group sitting at their desks, with their heads down and their thumbs up. The three designated students quietly touch the thumbs of three seated students and return to the front. The leader calls out "heads up seven up" (line 140), and the game begins. The object of the game is to take turns guessing who has touched each student and an exchange of personnel occurs with each successful guess.

- 085 140. An: heads up seven up? (5) no Jenny (2) heads up whoever got
 141. touched stand up (2) ok () Mary
 142. S?: there's three up now
 143. An: ok umm just ()
 144. S?: Cam Cam
 145. Su: // Cam
 146. St: ohhh shoot
 [giggles]
 147. St: (don't) me
 148. An: // I don't know
 149. Ca: // he won't
 150. An: [giggles]

151. S?: // cheater
 152. S?: it's Andrew
 153. St: // it's Andrew
 154. An: No::o
 155. St: It's Carolyn
 156. An: too bad .
 157. St: Was it you?
 158. An: no:: no::
 159. Ca: yes
 096 160. St: // aw shoot you're telling I told you you should've listened to
 161. ()

An initial problem is noted by S? right at the start of the game. The incorrect number of students at the front is remarked upon at line 141. Andrew attempts to formulate a response in line 142, but is unsuccessful and the game continues without resolution. The students are continuing with the game despite the departure from the formal rules of the game until line 159, when Andrew is challenged about his status in the game by Carolyn. The problem for the students is defined publicly by Steven who feels that Carolyn's *telling* has ruined the game. For the students the telling becomes the problem in the game. Lines 147 to 161 document the evolution of the informal problem solving structure accomplished by the cohort in this activity. First, the contest about who did or did not touch someone's thumb locates the problem within the activity of the playing rather than in the formal rules of the game. The talk then becomes the focus of the problem rather than a result. In other words, the student's talk about the problem becomes the problem. This talk is in fact what alerts T to the awareness that things *weren't working* (line 167). That the student problem solving ability as a deviation from the formal problem solving mechanism taught in the classroom, becomes visible in line 160, with Steven's definition to the cohort that there is a problem. It is at this point that T becomes involved and the

transition from an activity structure to a lesson structure begins. T's intervention moves the process from an informal student accomplishment to a formal process, as she brings to the activity an instructional focus. The effect of the intervention is that the class is no longer able to continue with the resolution process using the same resolution structure.

- 098 162. T: *All Ri::ght Ms. S's* interrupting here Everyone
 163. *Sit* down
 164. An: * thanks a lot.*
 [general noise and confusion as all take seats]
 165. T: (excuse me) you need to get in listening position (5) I was busy
 166. talking to Ms T. and so I have no (.) clue what happened (here)
 167. all I know is all of a sudden things weren't working
 168. An: I know what happened?
 169. T: Well I don't want to know what happened (2) but I don't like
 170. the way it was dealt with Who figures they were using their lem
 171. problem solving (skills) ? Didn't sound to me like anybody was
 172. re::ally I want you all to close your eyes and think about how
 173. you could have dealt with this using (good) problem solving
 174. Je: // I didn't do anything

The transition to the formal problem solving structure is remarkable in that there is no negotiation, or capability to sort out whether the problem can be resolved within the informal structure by the student group. A formal structure is initiated, as lessons often are initiated, in line 162 with T's declaration of *All Ri::ght*, and request that all students sit down. This utterance functions both as a halt to the informal problem solving structure, and the indication to the class that the organization of the class will now change from the activity structure to a lesson structure. This direction continues in line 165, with the direction to go to listening position, and moves into a familiar structure of introducing the task to be instructed that is, the problem solving model. Lines 165 -167 define T's impression of the existence of an as yet unspecified problem, except for the proviso that

things *were not working* . Andrew's unsolicited attempt to tell T what happened is disallowed in line 169, and with it the opportunity to resolve the problem without progressing through the teaching process. By disallowing Andrew's request, T chooses to proceed with the opportunity to instruct the class. In summary, the teacher intervention at line 165 functions in three ways:

1. The intervention restores the organization structure to a lesson structure, and
2. creates an opportunity for the direct instruction of a problem solving model.
3. It serves to remind the cohort there is a correct (instructed) method of problem solving. By stopping the student's problem solving process, T is in fact although not in-so- many- words negating the validity of the student accomplishment in favour of the formal structure.

The transition point of lines 160 - 173 is important as the choice of T to instruct or not instruct is made visible and socially organized to support the decision made. Lines 168, 169, and 170, support T in her decision to move into an instructional phase. The change in the status of the activity from a game to a lesson begins with the change in the structure of the questions and answers.

T now moves physically in the classroom to a point where she can be seen by all members of the cohort, and makes her comments of lines 165 -170 available to all members. She opens the lesson with an open invitation to bid at line 170. This, however, is not an invitation for an accounting of the problem, but an invitation to start a specific teaching process. She refers directly to the subject to be taught *problem solving (skills)*, and the agenda for the class is to demonstrate their knowledge of that process, not

account for the problem in the game structure at this point. This is reinforced by T later in the segment. Particularly at lines 192 - 203 with the review of the rules of behaviour in lessons, that is the maintenance of an orderly structure of speaking (line 193), working together (line 195) and *no calling out* (line 199).

188. Cameron what's your new plan.
 189. Cm: umm: (just)
 190. Je: // let them guess
 191. T: So you think we could have solved this whole thing (1) by just
 192. not telling who picked who to begin with So in other words
 193. keeping the mouth shut unless it's your turn. (.) Who thinks that
 194. might be a good plan [several hands up] (3) We all have to
 195. work together when we're playing a game you guys K? Is there
 196. any other plans (1.) Mary.
 197. Ma: Umm:: (2)don't call out (people were)
 198. T: // so in other words you could have stopped
 199. the whole situation from happening if there was just no calling
 200. out going on ok Andrew.
 201. An: If the people I- if somebody got picked they should go down
 202. (2) cause that was part of the problem um: somebody picked
 203. em and somebody didn't go down and () told () she
 204. guessed you (so) she goes but it's not fair cause they called out
 205. so-
 206. T: // ok but we're going all the way back through the whole
 207. problem Andrew
 208. An: // (that's the whole problem)
 209. T: // I just wanna know the new
 210. solution (1) so the new solution is if you actually touch
 211. someone's thumb when they guess your name ((pop)) you
 212. change right ?
 213. An: (yep)

Lines 190 to 199 demonstrate the teacher's strategy of gathering information from students and the clarification and reformulation of their responses for repetition back to the class. At line 201, Andrew again attempts to account for the specific problem in the earlier game. At line 206, T interrupts the account and once again clarifies the task as not

going back through the whole (original) problem but *wanting to know the new solution* (line 209) clearly identifying the objective as the teaching of the formal model of problem solving. This is the last attempt by any of the students to account for the problem. T then directs the class to demonstrate the correct skills. Line 174 to 226 reflects the work that the teacher has done to elicit and sequence the instructed version of the problem solving strategy. This segment ends with an re-enactment of the game using the instructed rules.

The segment above documents the important distinction between the structure of lessons and the structure of non-academic activities in the classroom. This segment documents both the ad hoc routine problem solving initiated by the students, and the ways in which the class learns or is instructed, in a specific pre-formatted model of problem solving. This distinction is not made to claim that one or the other format is correct or more appropriate, but that they are different. Both are routine activities, and the problem is resolved or resolvable within whichever activity structure is in use. The formalized problem solving model utilized in this segment is remarkable in that:

1. It is directly taught using a classroom organizational structure of opening (line 162-170), instruction (lines 171-213) and closing (lines 214-226). A standard question and answer structure is used.
2. The formal model is a pre-determined model and taught consistently with little deviation from any other formal lesson in this classroom.
3. As can be seen in the transcript, there is no negotiation on the rules of the process. T uses her authority to accomplish a classroom lesson rather than a recreational activity.

4. This model is not initiated by the students but rather is utilized by the teacher as part of the asymmetrical rights of her position.

Both the ad hoc informal nature of the student's problem solving, and the formal problem solving model that is directly taught to the class by the teacher, are embedded in the activity structure. A *remarkable* transition is to be found at the intersection of the informal with the formal mechanisms. This transition documents the barriers to the continuation of the informal model, and the subsequent adoption of a formal lesson. These barriers are found in the asymmetrical rights of the teacher to determine whether a lesson or an activity will proceed.

The question of the exhibition of competence is more complex in this sequence. There are two types of problem solving formats documented in this sequence. The initial format accomplished by the students and emerging out of the routine interaction of the game being played is geared to keeping the game going, rather than the strict adherence to the rules. The formal problem solving mechanism initiated by the teacher is imposed on the game, changing the character of the event. The formal lesson structure functions both as a mechanism for the teaching of a curriculum item and as an organizational structure to maintain or restore order in the classroom. By virtue of the inherent right of the teacher to determine the organization and structure of the lesson, the game is transformed into a classroom lesson. However, to say that one particular problem solving sequence reflects a higher degree of competence than the other is misleading. In both cases the goal of the interaction, however discrepant, is achieved. In this sequence, the teaching of the "correct" problem solving sequence takes precedence over the practical accomplishment

of the game. From the actions of the teacher, it would appear that competent problem solving lies in the accomplishment of the instructed rather than the practical sequence.

Direct Teaching of the Elements of Competence

The next two segments document an organizational change in the structure of lessons that emphasize the creation of a student as a competent member of the classroom. First, rather than being embedded within the context of a lesson or task as in the previous example, and dealt with on an ad hoc basis, these lessons take place prior to the formal classroom lesson. They are announced as separate issues, and self contained, in that the academic lesson does not begin until the skill lesson is over. This strategy intensifies the visibility of the skill being taught, and indicates in advance the teacher's expectations for behaviour during the teaching of the next lesson. Two elements of competent membership will be examined: appropriate behaviour while teaching (Segment 9) and showing respect (Segment 10).

Segment 9

- 002 1. T: I'm just going to clarify something right now K [writing on
2. board] We need to have (.) appropriate behaviour while I'm
3. teaching ok Jake What's? appropriate behaviour? Can
4. someone tell me while I'm teaching what's something you
5. should be doing while I'm teaching you (.) Jenny?
6. Je: It means (in listening)
7. T: Stay in listening position very good that let's me know that
8. you're (.) you're on track Robert what's another ()
9. Ro: (X ray)
10. T: *Ok* well
11. Ro: (that thing)
12. T: Sorry honey I just took a short commercial message from there
13. and I just wanna know some of the things you should be doing
14. while I'm (teaching you)

15. Ro: // (stay) in listening position listening to you ()
 16. An: Eye contact
 17. T: Andrew put up your hand () Andrew?
 18. An: Eye contact ()
 19. T: Very good that let's me know you're on the ball OK now for
 20. those people who have a hard (time) getting it I'll just teach you
 21. this at recess time ok cause I don't want to waste everyone
 22. else's time unless you're really paying attention ok () so
 23. exam does everyone have their little things on their desk?
 24. S? no ()
 25. T: take em out if you have em what does the x say there(1) stick it
 015 26. up on your forehead (1) x zam

Segment 10

1: B: 4:

- 312 1. T1: K I'm gonna ask everyone to put everything down Ok don't
 2. hold anything in your hands right now (.) uh (.) thank you
 3. Carolyn inappropriate use of that right now. Thank you you're
 4. gonna lose all of your (pals) you're gonna have none (.) life's
 5. rough go put (em) on my desk
 6. Ca: ()
 7. T1: Let's go oh yes it's mine (.) it's mine yeah (3) for life (1) actually
 8. I have quite a drawer full
 9. T2: // la collection
 10. T1: of stuff that I could keep for life really (.) I do. too bad I wasn't
 11. like T (who likes to keep it I could make use of it all) ok. that
 12. needs to be put away honey (.) ok? (1) thank you (5) ()
 13. everyone's waiting for you to put your stuff away (3) ok. what?
 14. (.) does listening position include most of you have all of it
 15. down pat except where should these be ? (3) Cam where should
 16. these be.
 17. Cm: (umm) on you
 18. T1: Ok (.) Why (.) can anyone tell me why I want your eyes on me?
 19. (.) Carolyn?
 20. Ca: So that we'll be listening to you
 21. T1: So I know you're listening what does does what does that show
 22. me when you're looking at me when I'm talking you're it's
 23. showing me that what (1) you're showing me what?
 24. Cm: res pect
 25. T1: res pect thank you Cameron *Do* I look at you when you're
 26. talking Cameron
 27. Cm: ya::h

29. T1: Because I'm showing you ?
 30. S2: Respect
 31. T1: Right the big R word K that means your hands need to be on
 32. your desk too (.) guys the hands need to () let's go very
 338 33. good Mary Steven Let's press twenty four everybody watching
 34. my fingers

The first segment takes place just before the start of a lesson on learning to recognize and to spell X words. This is a re-occurring lesson, and the students have resources to help them. The teacher is in the teaching position at the front of the room and has moved to sit on her stool as the segment starts. The class has been advised that X words are the next topic. T opens the lesson with lines 1 to 6. The use of the word right in line 1 adds a degree of authority to the task of clarifying the expectation for the cohort to attend, and serves as an indicator that what is going to be talked about is important. In line 2, T states her expectation and nominates a student in line 3 to answer. Later in the same line, the nomination is withdrawn, an open invitation to answer is made, and a second student nominated. The first nomination, prior to the open invitation to bid, functions as a warning to the cohort to attend, as well as providing an opening for the teacher to exercise her authority and nominate a candidate to answer without voluntary participation. Jenny's answer at line 6 is made visible as correct by T's repetition of her answer in line 7 and the request to Robert for an expansion.

8. (.) you're on track Robert what's another ()
 9. Ro: (X ray)
 10. T: Ok well
 11. Ro: (that thing)
 12. T: Sorry honey I just took a short commercial message from there
 13. and I just wanna know some of the things you should be doing
 14. while I'm (teaching you)

15. Ro: // (stay) in listening position listening to you ()
 16. An: Eye contact
 17. T: Andrew put up your hand () Andrew?
 18. An: Eye contact ()
 19. T: Very good that let's me know you're on the ball OK now for

The source of the miscue in line 9 -12 appears to be related to the pre-opening period. The response by Robert at line 9 makes visible his failure to listen and serves to further validate T's choice to instruct the class on appropriate behaviour prior to the actual lesson. T does some repair work in line 12 and for the benefit of the cohort reformulates her initial question. The question this time is framed as information that T wants to know rather than the open bid process utilized in lines 3, 4, and 5. At line 15, Robert is able to provide a response, although it is a repetition of Jenny's response of line 6 and T's confirmation of that response at line 7. An unsolicited response from Andrew in line 16, has the effect of preventing T from seeking further clarification from Robert, and T deals with the nature of Andrew's asynchronous behaviour at lines 17, 18, and 19. This fragment documents the typical nature of the organization of the question and answer structures of lessons, despite the fact that this lesson is about expected skills and social / classroom competency, rather than an academic task. It shows the parallels in structure of all routine business of the classroom members. By routine business, I mean the specific tasks the teacher determines are important to successfully do the work of producing competent students.

19. T: Very good that let's me know you're on the ball OK now for
 20. those people who have a hard (time) getting it I'll just teach you
 21. this at recess time ok cause I don't want to waste everyone
 22. else's time unless you're really paying attention ok () so

23. **exam** does everyone have their little things on their desk?
 24. S? no ()
 25. T: take em out if you have em what does the x say there(1) stick it
 015 26. up on your forehead (1) **x zam**

This fragment introduces a contingency reproach structure at this point. It is of note that it occurs *after* Robert's miscue at line 9. T has repaired the original miscue and is now serving notice to the cohort that inappropriate classroom behaviour is not acceptable. It is interesting to note that the miscue was tolerated while T was actively engaged in the lesson, but is not to be tolerated after the instruction component of the lesson is finished. This statement functions as an alternative response to Robert's miscue, and acts as a warning after the fact. In addition, the cohort is alerted to the consequences of inappropriate behaviour at this point, to an unspecified future time (line 20) with the contingency of *I'll just teach you this at recess time*. This signals to the cohort the importance T places on the listening position. The *ok* in line 22 singles the boundary point. One lesson is over, and the next will now start.

- 312 1. T1: K I'm gonna ask everyone to put everything down Ok don't
 2. **hold** anything in your hands right now (.) uh (.) thank you
 3. Carolyn inappropriate use of that right now. Thank **you** you're
 4. gonna lose all of your (pals) you're gonna have none (.) life's
 5. rough go put (em) on my desk
 6. Ca: ()
 7. T1: Let's go oh **yes** it's mine (.) it's mine yeah (3) for life (1) actually
 8. I have **quite** a drawer full
 9. T2: // la collection
 10. T1: of **stuff** that I could keep for life really (.) I **do**. too bad I wasn't
 11. like T (who likes to keep it I could make use of it all) Ok that
 12. needs to be put away honey (.) ok? (1) thank you (5) ()
 13. everyones waiting for you to put your stuff away (3) ok. what?

T1 opens the lesson with *K* in line 1 signalling the start of the lesson, Her first instruction to the class, *put everything down*, is designed to gather everyone's attention and is followed up with an expansion of this request at the end of line 1 and line 2. She immediately moves into consequences for Carolyn who has failed to comply with her request. Lines 3 to 12 demonstrate the ensuing challenge to the application of consequences until at line 13, T1 terminates the contest by assigning responsibility for the class having to wait to get on to business to Carolyn, rather than to the function of the event itself. Line 13 signals the resumption of the lesson. The remainder of the session continues the task of teaching what counts as respect, and follows a routine lesson structure.

Segment 10 is similar to segment 9 in a number of ways, however there is a notable difference. There is again a disruption immediately following the introduction of the topic of concern, this time the importance of showing respect. The segment opens with instruction about listening position, in particular what counts as listening position. In this example, once again, dealing with the disruption stops the progress of the lesson with different consequences. T1 does not work to repair Carolyn's inappropriate behaviour but moves immediately to a consequence.

Collectively these segments document the two approaches, prevalent in this data set, used to teach the skills required for competent classroom membership. These skills are not addressed as competency per se, but are individually and directly taught as the skills required to do well at school. Segments 6 to 8 show how the teaching of the constituent elements of self-esteem are embedded in and reflexive of the routine classroom lessons.

The data documents how the elements are made visible and are resolved within the normative social organization of the classroom. Segments 9 and 10 document a second approach to teaching the skills required to be a competent member of the classroom. Here the standard organization of lessons is used to directly teach competence skills, making these lessons, for all practical purposes indistinguishable from any other activity in the classroom.

Acknowledging Academic Skills And Progress

This section is about how failures and successes are achieved within the social and academic organization of this classroom. The same strategies will be documented in this section as elsewhere, in that I will look at elements of acknowledgements embedded in routine activities, and the elements embedded in structures specifically created for the purpose of acknowledgement. This is not an examination of the academic progress made by each individual child, the data is not applicable to that type of task. Progress is made visible in the course of the routine organization of the classroom.

The following sequence demonstrates how the class routinely defines expectations for performance, how progress and skill is made remarkable in the course of a day, and how success and failure are made visible in the classroom

Defining Expectations: What Counts As Work.

Previously the concept of what counts as *best work* was discussed. This section addresses the more general question of what counts as sufficient and appropriate effort in

the classroom, and addresses the issues of sufficient output, rather than personal best work. The question is rather one of what constitutes school or academic work rather than activity.

Segment 11

3: A: 3:

- 107 1. T: () come up with some ideas you guys know what's
 2. goin on Andrew?
 3. An: ummm one page:: (1) journal.
 4. T: Ok uh so I'll just put journal (1) K good one Andrew. Jenny
 5. Je: art?
 6. T: K. no I want something like I said that is work after you're
 7. done three work things on here (.) then (.) like we always do
 8. you could do reading or art or drawing or whatever we have to
 9. do three (2) big things first Robert.
 10. Ro: uhh one page (1) time and (.) money?
 11. T: Ok time or money go:od for you (3) time or money booklets?
 12. S?: (5) time or (1) can you do both?
 13. T: Well time and yeah. Don't forget all of this means one full page
 14. (1) How many pages of corrections is one full page? (1) Jenny.
 15. Je: A booklet um one page is (2) four pages
 16. T: Four pages of corrections is one page
 17. Je: What if you only have one page?
 18. T: OK we:ll (.) then you gonna have to:: (.) figure something else
 19. out you guys know that (3) actually before I continue on up
 20. here (we) have some great things I'm gonna ask everyone to put
 21. your certificates away they're quite distracting to some of you
 22. (right now) umm Carolyn darling where should your eyeballs be
 23. right now honey thank you. (4) Ok Steven?
 24. St: ummm uh () chis and handwriting
 25. An: // oh oh oh oh oh
 26. T: Good um (.) actually if you guys want to sit on top of your
 27. desks right now that's cool [students move to top of desks]
 28. chis (.) handwriting printing ok (4) what else. (.) Alex?
 29. Al: umm(.) umm(.) umm(.)
 30. T: // what did you do last night for homework?
 31. Al: (2) um we uh
 32. T: Oh I'm asking Alex
 33. Al: (the quiz)
 34. T: The sheets (.) Ok you can work on those the compound words
 35. and all that

36. An: I'm done that
 37. T: What else? did we use. (.) have we not done for a while and
 38. some of you aren't done that sort of thing compound words (.)
 39. homonyms blah blah blah blah (1) member?
 40. An: (cut and glue)
 41. T: Cut and glue there's a bunch of cut and glue books (.) booklet's
 42. back there to do with contractions compound words (1) etc.etc.
 43. Je: I finished those
 44. An: // I finished those
 45. T: Yeah but a lot of people have a couple of pages left or whatever
 46. so cut out booklets. (6) What else could you poss ibly work on
 47. during your independent work time here. (2) Oh I'm just going
 48. (to) wait for hands up. Robert?
 49. Ro: uhh (3) (hh) umm our umm uh animal ()
 50. T: // your animal research
 51. project. anything else you guys can think of (2) Carolyn?
 52. Ca: umm (we could ask you)

This segment was addressed earlier (segment 3) and begins with the teacher at the front of the class in the position she habitually takes when a “ lesson” is about to start. The class is about to start a period of individual work and decisions are being made as to what *counts as work* and how much *counts* as enough. Lines 1-50 demonstrate how the teacher and students, using a similar question and answer structure to that used throughout the data set, collaboratively define what constitutes work. The fact that T did not define work directly is *remarkable* in that the inference is that the students understand what T means by the term *work*. This understanding is demonstrated by the answers that she accepts as being work, although the understanding is not universal in the class, as made visible by the replies that are rejected. T solicits possible topics for work and in line 6 rejects the suggestion on the basis that art (line 5) does not constitute work (line 6). The answer to Jenny at line 6 functions as an indication that it cannot be assumed that all students

understand what are the acceptable constituents of work. As well, this line initiates the continuation of the work of the cohort to define work. At line 9 in the interaction, *work* has been defined as not reading, art or drawing, but rather *three (2) big things*. The teacher assumes the students know and understand what is meant by work, as at this point there is no clarification of what *is* work or what is meant by *big things*. This assumption appears to be valid as Robert makes a suggestion in line 10 which is accepted by T, and later re-inforced as correct (line 13) as part of the response to S?

A similar sequence appears from lines 13-23. At line 13, T reminds the cohort that in addition to only certain activities constituting work, a second criteria is set. That is, the amount to be done is also part of what counts as work. The teacher then specifies the amount of work in line 13, and asks Jenny to provide information about the equivalency in corrections rather than original work. At this point the class has information about some of what counts as work, what is not work and how much. Lines 15 to 18 are a negotiation between class members and the teacher that further set the conditions for acceptable individual work. The response to Jenny's question at line 17, produces the responsibility for the resolution of the problem to be placed back on the student as *you guys know that* (line 18). Lines 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 demonstrate the strategy used to maintain the sense of order in the classroom before the task continues with *Ok*. This utterance functions to halt the definitional work about how much work should be done, and allows T to place a boundary on the discussion. She regroups the cohort to the task at hand with the question in line 23, directed at a specific student, but available to the cohort. The formal task is resumed with *Ok*.

This segment outlines the process used within a formal question and answer structure to define for the cohort what counts as work. The foregrounding of what *counts* as , or what is expected is critical in that it provides information to the cohort as to how each student should evaluate their own performance. The assumption underlying the foregrounding practice is that the cohort may not all know or understand what is expected, and clues are used to maintain the view of the cohort as competent in their individual judgement of what is expected. In this way expectations are clarified and all members of the class are able to point to the direction collaboratively produced as evidence to support personal efforts. The teacher has specified in what manner work will be defined: on the basis of acceptable tasks and amounts, not on the basis of a pre-assessed level of skill. The agenda in this segment deals more with the visible, and traceable elements of what work is, rather than the less measurable and less visible aspects.

Defining Expectations: Effort and Progress

This next sequence documents the organization of teacher expectations with regard to the competency of the cohort to solve more complex problems. It demonstrates the work of maintaining a positive view despite the perceived inability to complete a task.

Segment 12

4: A: 2:

1. T: () every kilogram of bananas you buy is gonna cost
2. you thirty nine cents (.) now I'm gonna give you guys a really
3. hard question here (1) If apples (.) cost (1) thirty cents (2) per
4. kilogram (3) K. and I'll be back in a second I 'll give you a while
5. to figure this out don't help anybody. do it all on your own use

6. your chis or use a piece of paper (.) this is (.) How much apples
 7. cost [writes on board] how much would it cost me (1) to buy
 8. (we're) gonna make it rea tough eleven kilograms of apples
 9. figure that out (.) I'll be right back. eleven kilograms of apples
 [T leaves the room room. The classroom bursts into activity and chatter as they all try to figure it out. The teacher comes back in and addresses the last child as he goes back to his desk]
- 10.. T: were you being the teacher Cam
 11. Cm: I's just () it out
 12. Pe: thirty! forty one!
 [hands go up waving and gestulating]
13. T: Who knows (2) how much would it cost to buy eleven
 14. kilograms of apples Peter.
 15. Pe: forty (.) one
 16. T: forty one cents?
 17. Pe: Yeah
 18. T: K does any one else have a guess.
 19. An: uh um I still have to figure it out
 20. T: Anyone else have a guess if you still have to do go ahead Mary?
 21. Ma: fifty
 22. T: K fifty cents Cam don't you
 23. Ja: // one dollar!
 24. T: shh (5) Jenny
 25. Je: forty (.) two
 25. T: forty two cents
 27. Je: yeah
 28. T: K (2) any other guesses? (1) Alex
 29. Al: thirty five cents
 30. T: thirty five ok let's
 31. An: // No I'm not finished said twenty five
 32. T: twenty five?
 33. An: sixteen ()
 34. T: I love the way Steven put up his hand yes Steven
 35. St: I think it is ()
 36. T: K and one more (.) Cam
 37. Cm: I don't know but it is (thirty cents times nine) I guess it would
 38. be something (1) a hundred?
 39. T: That's a dollar?
 40. Cm: ye::ah
 41. An: // no I got-
 42. T: Ok (.) I wanna show you guys how to figure that out that was
 43. above your heads I just gave you guys that question so I could
 44. go to-

45. An: // I know it I know it
46. T: Andrew.
47. An: (just give me a second)
48. T: (4) Well you know what Andrew actually that's ok. I-I think
49. that if you keep-
50. An: // thirty six?
51. T: thirty six?
52. An: () three dollars (.) three dollars and thirty cents
53. T: (4)
54. An: I got it?
55. T: [moves to board gives Andrew a check] (2) Way to go ! come
56. over here round of applause for Andrew that was tough
57. [isolated clapping] (3) Good job round of applause for
58. Andrew [better applause] K I'm gonna wait Andrew for
59. everyone to recheck their positions and then I would like you to
60. come up and explain to the class how you figured that out. That
61. was a very very hard question to figure out k. (.) Mary (.) very
62. nice Susan good job (4) very nice (1) Stevern [walks over and
63. takes something from Robert's desk] (2) Ok. Andrew come up
64. and show the class how you figured that out or tell the class
65. you don't have to show them but come and tell them I'll help
66. you with words OK
67. An: well I had [looking at board]
68. T: (1) Ok (.) well who are you () to sweetie?
69. An: [faces class giggles] I uh a seven and I () every time I
70. took away () and it was so (say said on there)
71. T: So how did you do it exactly? (1) you ha:d
72. An: eleven um (1) eleven and then um um thirty cents (for each)
73. time so I had-
74. T: // you actually times eleven by how many
75. An: thirty?
76. T: Andrew times thirty times eleven (1) and that's how he got it
77. cause there was actually very good Andrew thank you that was
78. excellent (.) and that was to tough guys. but what the question
79. was um if I had eleven kilograms (1) K. (.) eleven of um and
80. each one cost me thirty cents I have to add thirty to itself how
81. many times (1) Jenny?
82. Je: eleven times
83. T: // eleven. and then you would get the answer (.) yeah so
- 192 84. good job Andrew

The scenario opens immediately after the class has watched a film on measurement.

The attention paid to the film by the class has been variable. T has reviewed the concepts from the film with the class and is in the process of extending the information from the film to a math problem when she is interrupted.

In line 1 T has started to reformulate the problem to the cohort. At line 2 and 3 the reason for the reformulation of the problem is apparent, T feels that the problem is a *really hard question*. She begins to formulate the question again in line 3, but is interrupted and excuses herself from the room, leaving the students the task of attempting the problem. She details the specifics of the problem verbally and on the board one more time and leaves the room. It is not known whether T's original intent was to jointly work through the example with the class, or use it as an individual assignment. The interruption of line 4 disrupts the pace of the lesson.

12. Pe: thirty! forty one!
 [hands go up waving and gesturing]
13. T: Who knows (2) how much would it cost to buy eleven
14. kilograms of apples Peter.
15. Pe: forty (.) one .
16. T: forty one cents?
17. Pe: Yeah
18. T: K does any one else have a guess.
19. An: uh um I still have to figure it out
20. T: anyone else have a guess if you still have to do go ahead Mary?

Lines 13 -18 demonstrate the start of the bids to answer the question. On her return to the classroom, T frames the request for answers as *guesses* (line 18) and does not respond to Peter's unsolicited answer as she enters the room. The pattern of eliciting guesses continues until line 28, when Andrew repeats his comment of line 19 a second time and T terminates the exchange at line 42.

42. T: Ok (.) I wanna show you guys how to figure that out that was
 43. above your heads I just gave you guys that question so I could
 44. go to-
 45. An: // I know it I know it
 46. T: Andrew.
 47. An: (just give me a second)
 48. T: (4) well you know what Andrew actually that's ok. I-I think that
 49. if you keep-
 50. An: // thirty six?
 51. T: thirty six?
 52. An: () three dollars (.) three dollars and thirty cents
 53. T: (4)
 54. An: I got it?
 55. T: [moves to board gives Andrew a check] (2) Way to go ! come
 56. over here round of applause for Andrew that was tough
 57. [isolated clapping] (3) Good job round of applause for
 58. Andrew [better applause] K I'm gonna wait Andrew for
 59. everyone to recheck their positions and then I would like you to
 60. come up and explain to the class how you figured that out that
 61. was a very very hard question to figure out k. (.) Mary (.) very
 62. nice Susan good job (4) very nice (1) Steven [walks over and
 63. takes something from Robert's desk] (2) OK. Andrew come up
 64. and show the class how you figured that out or tell the class
 65. you don't have to show them but come and tell them I'll help
 66. you with words Ok

At line 42, T once again refers to her judgement that this question was *above their heads*. This utterance functions as a clarification for the cohort that the assignment was too difficult and they were not expected to succeed. The second part of the utterance, offers the beginning of an account for why she gave the class this question. Andrew interrupts T's account of why she gave the class this question with *I know it* at line 45. This is the start of the transition from a lesson to a sequence of events that leads to the acknowledgement of Andrew's academic competence. Lines 46 to 50 document a reproach sequence directed at Andrew's unsolicited answer, with line 50 providing an

answer that T does respond to in line 51. Andrew then clarifies / expands his answer at line 52. That the answer is correct is reinforced by T's silence of line 53, followed by Andrew's confirmation of his success at line 54, and the lack of a reformulation or correction device by T at line 55. Rather, the correct answer is confirmed by the awarding of a check next to Andrew's name on the board, a physical reminder for the rest of the day of his good job. The remainder of the segment details the consequence of Andrew's success, and ends with lines 76 -78 with a repeat of the acknowledgement of Andrew's work, and a repeat to the class that the question was tough.

The segment above documents an event that is remarkable because of the unanticipated nature of the event and the ad hoc nature of the social organization of it's resolution. The ad hoc quality of the structure was generated because a student was able to answer a question that T anticipated would be too difficult for the class. The question was in fact an ad hoc creation itself, developed out of the necessity to be out of the room for a few minutes unexpectedly. In this segment there is an unexpected transition from a lesson structure to an acknowledgement structure at lines 52-54. It is at this point that T recognizes that the problem is not necessarily too difficult for the whole cohort, and takes the opportunity to assist Andrew in his explanation.

Opportunities to Display Competent Membership

There are a number of opportunities during the day for students to display their competence as a matter of the routine course of events. The most common practice is in the bidding for and answering of questions designed to elicit information about what the

students know. Examples of this are scattered throughout the data set, and reflect the routine acknowledgement of student effort embedded in the social organisation of lessons. This opportunity to display skills and competencies is certainly not unique to this classroom, and for that reason will not be examined in this study. Many of these opportunities are available in the non-instructional activities of the day as well. By non-instructional activities I mean, those that are meant primarily to find out what is known rather than what is taught, and in this classroom are often situated in game like or competitive activities such as *Around The World*. A third category of structured opportunity available for the students to display competence is presented below for discussion.

This segment was taped of three students sitting at the window table working on printing tasks. T1 is monitoring this group, as T2 is monitoring the remainder of the students. The students have been hard at work for fifteen to twenty minutes, and the classroom is quiet.

Segment 13

4: B: 4:

- 207 1. T1: Susan you did not finish another page all on your own
 2. () did you?
 3. Su: (yeah)
 4. T1: Well blow me over () and look at the printing I'm too
 5. impressed (to be true)
 6. T2: How are those kids doing over there Tee?
 7. T1: Well (1) really fine () just
 8. T2: // uh huh
 9. T1: working totally independently using her
 10. T2: // huh and not even asking?
 11. T1: // and not
 12. asking.
 13. T2: Excuse me (.) thrilled really [high five to Susan] (.) and how's

14. this man doing { points to Alex]
 15. T1: Well (1) the printing thing again he's just look at he's just (
 16. unreal and Mary's done like (.) probably five million pages
 17. T2: // hhu! all by himself?
 18. T2: Ma:::ry (.) whoa
 223 19. Al: // that's a lot of pages
 235 20. T2: Jenny are you on a roll ? (1) Mrs.T? I can't even keep up with
 21. this girl the smoke's coming out of her so fast (4) what a
 22. worker Ok you guys I'm gonna give you a couple of more
 23. minutes and we're gonna start on something else here [Ss
 continue work]
 243 24. T1: [to Alex] most excellent again.

The scenario begins with T1 and T2 visiting with students doing individual printing and handwriting tasks. Although straight forward, this segment demonstrates the public acknowledgement of success or progress collaborated on by T1 and T2. It starts with the teacher's remarks on Susan's work at lines 1 and 2. This provides Susan with the opportunity to acknowledge her competency in the public view in line 3. T1 continues with the acknowledgement, with the consequence that T2 asks for an elaboration and expansion of the compliments at lines 6 and 7. At line 9, T1 expands the acknowledgement from the quality and amount of the work completed to Susan's display of appropriate work habits. This acknowledgement was not elicited by the student and as all talk, is multi-formative and multi-consequential. The acknowledgement serves a number of functions as follows:

1. The reference makes available to the cohort knowledge of Susan's success, and makes her visibly competent to the whole cohort.
2. The sequence defines for the cohort what constitutes an acceptable level of work for the purpose at hand.

3. In addition, the cohort is advised of what the criteria for competence are for all practical purposes.

This public acknowledgement is different from private acknowledgement in that it confirms to the cohort the students status as a competent member of the classroom. The acknowledgement is expanded to Alex and Jenny by T2 at lines 13 to 21, with the same consequences for the cohort. In the acknowledgement sequence of lines 15 and 16 of lines 20 and 21, a common theme emerges, that of what constitutes a sufficient amount of work. This combined with the theme of line 1 and lines 9-12 (working independently) specify for the cohort the two main criteria for the successful completion of the task.

Summary: Expectations And Acknowledgements

The last three sections have demonstrated the structures used by teachers and students in defining the expectation of what *counts as work*. The definition of work establishes expectations for the class for the routine performance of academic tasks, and forms the base for the evaluation of each student on their ability to be visible as academically competent. In addition a baseline is formulated for the class that allows the completion of tasks as expected to stand as a mark of progress. The acknowledgement and public reference to the academic skills and progress of the cohort, and of individuals members function not only to publicly confirm an individual's status as a competent member, but also define for the cohort what constitutes competent membership.

Through the public acknowledgement of student work, the cohort develops an understanding of what *counts as work*, and teacher expectations of classroom

performance. In addition, these public acknowledgements function as an instructional mechanism through which T is able to define, teach and reinforce competent classroom behaviour. In all the segments discussed, the common organizational structure used by the teacher is a lesson format. The teacher uses her authority in the classroom primarily to formulate the structure under which the activity will proceed, and selectively controls where and when acknowledgements to students are made. The direct instruction of what visibly counts as work is a way of translating an abstract concept, work, into practical action.

A number of competence acknowledgement practices are visible in the data and encompass verbal and non verbal utterances. These structures function to advise the cohort of success and failure and assist in the student's ability to define themselves as competent classroom members. The importance of public acknowledge is twofold. First it provides confirmation of the status of the student as a competent member, and second it offers the teacher an opportunity to instruct the class on what counts as academic progress.

Peer Interactions

To this point in the chapter I have been examining events that occur in the public view and are available to all members of the cohort simultaneously, with different relevance for each member. The use of the public domain has been documented as a mechanism through which a number of functions can be performed with each utterance. The following segments document interactions that occur out of the view of the majority of the cohort,

and the teacher. The analyses in this section are focused on the task negotiation sequences within small groups of students. It is important to keep in mind that there is a broad range of ability across each skill component in this class. These tasks provide a venue in which positive and negative self evaluations are made visible.

Working Together

Segment 14

3: B: 3

- 130 1. T: oh! isn't that nice Jenny? () and Mary maybe you
 2. can work with the girls too (2) you can (1) make up a game
 3. with those
 [break in videotaping, girls start up the game]
 4. Je: [to Susan] (go back to your seat) isn't this fun huh?
 5. Su: ()
 6. Ja: Ok (1) this is a hard one I bet no one ll get it (.) exercise
 7. Su: * exercise *
 8. Ma: (3) E E (2) [Jenny points to board] *Execi* ()
 9. Je: right. now you go all the way back to your se:at
 10. Ma: (I don't believe it)
 11. T: // are you (guys) playing around the world?
 12. Je: ye::ahh
 13. T: neat
 14. Je: (3) K good try (1) now.
 15. T: // I like the way that the girls are getting along
 16. and Peter and Steven are together a::nd ()
 143 17. Ma: X-ray
 18. Je: x
 19. Su: x
 20. Je: r a y
 21. Ma: right! [students change places]
 22. Je: Mary you have to come over here ()
 23. Ma: ox
 24. Je: o x
 25. Su: ummm O::
 26. Ma: [points to Jenny] (she) got it
 27. Je: (gonna go all the way back to my seat) I made it (1) Now
 28. Mary says the words (for) me and you K. Mary?

29. Ma: ummm (1) spell exam.
 30. Su: *Exam* (3) e x c l u s i v e
 31. Je: // *Exam* (2) e x c l u s i v e [looks at Susan. They both laugh]
 32. T: Jenny?
 33. Je: yes?
 34. T: What does exam end in?
 35. Je: I don't know
 36. T: wh- what sound
 37. Je: E
 38. T: Say the whole word (.) ends in
 39. Je: // exam
 40. T.: (1) What's at the very end..
 41. Je: mm sounds like a m
 42. T: // (What does)-
 43. T: Yeah it is an m (3) so which word is exam.
 44. Je: I don't know
 45. T: Which one ends with a mmm [Susan and Mary move to look
 46. at board]
 47. Je: I don't know I can't oh *Exam* K go [girls all regroup]
 48. Ma: exercise
 49. Je: oh e x c e r r c I s e { giggles}
 50. Su: // e x c e r c I s e [giggles]
 51. Ma: Jenny.
 52. Je: Oh you say go (()) { giggles} go back to your seat?
 53. Su: No I gotta sit here (I gotta sit here)
 54. T: // O k can? I have my kids um (.)
 55. back in your
 56. Je: I made it around
 57. T: desks please. just leave everythin-
 165 58. Je: // the world T made it around the world
 [Break in segment. Announcements are made and the group returns after
 announcements Carolyn joins the group. The game is in progress as the video
 tape starts]
 169 59. Je: No actually I got it
 60. Ca: No I got it no let's do it again
 61. Je: It was a tie sort of yeah (yeah)
 62. Ca: ()
 63. Je: Ok this is a hard one ok Mary you can do it (3) Excuse
 64. Ma: umm (a) (e) (x e x c l u s i v e)
 65. Ca: //uh um E ()
 66. Je: She got it right she beat you
 67. Ca: No she said l v e
 68. Je: [goes to board] Mary?

69. Ca: // I got it
 70. Je: No just a minute (.) Mary [writes on board] see (1) [to Ca]
 71. she didn't
 72. Ca: // I got it
 73. Je: know that's an I
 74. Ca: No let's do it again [Susan rejoins group]
 75. Je: no (.) it's Susan's here Susan and you
 76. Ca: // K
 77. Je: Exclusive exclusive
 78. Su: // e x c l u s I v e
 79. Ca: // e x c l u s i v e [both girls giggle]
 80. Ss: [giggles] Tie
 81. Je: (3) maybe a hard one or an easy one for you guys
 82. Su: moxies
 83. Ma: easy one (1) easy
 84. Je: ()
 85. Ma: e x c e r I s e
 86. Ca: // r c I s e [giggles]
 87. Je: [points to Ca] you didn't say all the word you started right
 88. here [points to card] r c I s e
 89. Ca: No I started (.) here but I caught up to her
 90. Je: No::
 91. Ca: Let's do it again do it again do it again
 92. Je: (she beat you by a second)
 93. Ca: Yeah just by a second (hundreths of a second)
 94. T: // Can I have everybody back in
 95. their desks please
 96. Je: ()
 97. Ca: I n c h
 98. Su: box
 99. Ca: (B)ox
 100. Je: I didn't say anything (1) (b)oxes (.) Boxes . Boxes [as
 101. everyone walks back to their desks]
 102. Ma: m o x i e s

As this segment begins, three students are sitting at a side table working together as a group on their X words. The format for this work time has not been specified by the teacher, but the students have been brought together by Jenny, who has initiated the game. The students are sitting at a table located next to the blackboard within easy view of the

day's X words printed on the board.

Lines 1 to 3 demonstrate that the teacher is aware that a game is being formulated by the group. The utterances of lines 1 - 3 act as permission for the students to continue with the game despite the status of the session as a work session.

6. Je: Ok (1) this is a hard one I bet no one ll get it (.) exercise
 7. Su: * exercise *
 8. Ma: (3) E E (2) [Jenny points to board] *Execl* ()
 9. Je: Right. now you go all the way back to your se:at
 10. Ma: (I don't believe it)
 11. T: // are you (guys) playing around the world?
 12. S1: ye::ahh
 13. T: neat
 14. Je: (3) K good try (1) now.
 15. T: // I like the way that the girls are getting along
 16. and Peter and Steven are together a::nd ()

Lines 6 -16 demonstrate Jenny's status as director and arbitrator of the rules of the game. Her choice of the word to be spelled, the order and her assessment of the difficulty of the task are not questioned. Her decision to assist Mary in spelling her word correctly is not challenged by Susan. It is interesting to note the strategy that Jenny uses to help Mary. She directs Jenny with a non-verbal hint to the spelling on the board and accepts the answer as correct despite the fact that it was not generated solely through Mary's intellectual efforts. This has the effect of allowing Mary to win that particular contest with Susan. In short, Jenny has assumed an element of the teacher's authority within the group. Jenny answers for the group at the teacher's question of line 11 and she resumes control of the game in line 14. The teacher's utterance's of lines 15 and 16 reinforce her acceptance of the group's organization to complete the task. It also functions as an

example to the cohort of alternative and acceptable activity structures. Jenny continues to direct the organization of the game, and nominates herself as the winner in line 27 with the utterance *I made it*. At this point, Susan allows Jenny to give Mary a less challenging role in the game, that is, of questioner. Mary accepts both Jenny's and Susan's mis-spelling of the next word (lines 30 and 31). It is at this point that T intervenes in the activity.

30. Su: *Exam* (3) e x c l u s I v e
 31. Je: // *Exam* (2) e x c l u s I v e [looks at Susa they both laugh]
 32. T: Jenny?
 33. Je: yes?
 34. T: What does exam end in?
 35. Je: I don't know
 36. T: wh- what sound
 37. Je: E
 38. T: Say the whole word (.) ends in
 39. Je: // *exam*
 40. T: (1) What's at the very end..
 41. Je: mm sounds like a m
 42. T: // (what does)-
 43. T: Yeah it is an m (3) so which word is exam.
 44. Je: I don't know
 45. T: Which one ends with a mmm [Susan and Mary move to look
 46. at board]
 47. Je: I don't know I can't oh *Exam* K go [girls all regroup]

This fragment demonstrates the first intervention in the game by the teacher (at line 32). She directs her questions about the answer given to Jenny as opposed to all three parties, and engages in an instruction process which results in Jenny understanding her error. Susan is left out of this process for reasons that are not made apparent within this segment. The game resumes at line 47 with Jenny still in authority and continuing to clarify and direct the rules of the game.

54. T: // O k can? I have my kids um (.)

55. back in your
 56. Je: I made it around
 57. T: desks please. just leave everythin-
 165 58. Je: // the world T made it around the world

At line 54, T terminates the activities of the whole class and Jenny makes her claim of winning, that is, making it back to her seat. As an added measure of reinforcement Jenny advises the teacher of this fact at line 58. It is interesting to note that the use of the term winning is not used here, instead Jenny refers to the processual element of the game, that is, *I made it around the world*.

This segment demonstrates, through the mutual acceptance of mis-spelled words and the tolerance for the flexible use of the rules, that the students were not engaged in this game to practice spelling but to play the game. As an earlier discussion of the game of *Round The World* demonstrates, the objective of the students and the teacher differ. The teacher exercises little control in this version of the game, once the students have her agreement that the game is an acceptable practice at this time. Further, the teacher has not set out rules or expectations leaving this gap to be filled collaboratively by the members of the group. The student's rules include:

1. A collaboration to allow Jenny to direct and maintain the leadership and authority for the duration of the game.
2. The tolerance of the group to sheltering Mary from publicly and openly losing the game. Susan collaborates in this strategy despite the personal consequences, through the lack of challenge to Jenny's authority.
3. Allowing Jenny to adapt the rules and to make decisions unchallenged as the game

progresses.

In the student's version of the game, the correct "turn-taking procedure" is the procedure that offers the best chance to shelter Mary from failure. The questions raised by this segment relate to the relationship between assuming and maintaining authority, and winning. In this segment the students work together to produce success for all of the members, and in so doing minimize the visibility of specific learning disabilities. These sequences demonstrate the ability these students have to work together as peers in the completion of a task, despite the divergence between the goals of the members.

The second section (lines 59 to 95), illustrates the impact on the negotiation of group authority, with the addition of new members of the group. It points to the ad hoc and tenuous nature of the student's social organization. The teacher has completed her announcements, and advised the cohort that they have a few minutes to complete the work they were doing with X words. A new student joins the group. The first few lines of this session are not retrievable because of the noise level in the classroom as all the students organize themselves again. The students have regrouped as T is completing the task and have started the game again as the tape becomes hearable. There is no indication that the existing group have filled in the new members on their adaptations to the rules. These rules remain *the seen-but-unnoticed* background features of the interaction.

- 169 59. Je: No actually I got it
 60. Ca: No I got it no let's do it again
 61. Je: It was a tie sort of yeah (yeah)
 62. Ca: ()
 63. Je: Ok this is a hard one ok Mary you can do it (3) Excuse
 64. Ma: umm (a) (e) (x e x c l u s i v e)
 65. Ca: // uh um E ()

66. Je: She got it right she beat you
 67. Ca: No she said l v e
 68. Je: [goes to board] Mary?
 69. Ca: // I got it
 70. Je: No just a minute (.) Mary [writes on board] see (1) { to Ca }
 71. she didn't
 72. Ca: // I got it
 73. Je: know that's an I
 74. Ca: No let's do it again [Susan rejoins group]
 75. Je: no (.) it's Susan's here Susan and you
 76. S4: // K
 77. Je: *Exclusive* exclusive
 78. Su: // e x c l u s i v e
 79. Ca: // e x c l u s i v e [both girls giggle]
 80. Ss: [giggles] Tie

Jenny's authority is challenged immediately by Carolyn at the start of the segment. Jenny is required to openly and publicly state her status as winner in the first round, as opposed to the previous segment when Mary confirms her status for her. At Carolyn's challenge, Jenny acknowledges her claim as possible and agrees to it being a *tie sort of yeah*. Carolyn's response is inaudible however it results in Jenny taking the winner's role and asking the next question. A second challenge appears at line 66 when Jenny determines Mary has won. Carolyn immediately challenges the decision and forces Jenny to account for her decision to allow Mary to be the winner. In line 68 we can see the initiation of the account and despite Carolyn's objections the account is completed at line 73. Carolyn agrees and suggests that they do the turn over. At this point we can see Jenny and Carolyn's unspoken agreement to let Mary win, or at the very least not lose. An alternative way of viewing Carolyn's acquiescence to Jenny's decision to account for Mary's inability to spell the word, is that Carolyn is accepting Jenny's authority. Neither

alternative is clearly indicated by the subsequent discourse. For whatever reason, Carolyn's response to Jenny's account of lines 66-73, is enough to avoid a further expansion of the contest. Even Jenny's refusal to be flexible on the *turn over* suggestion made by Carolyn in line 74, does not precipitate a confrontation. With the acceptance of Jenny's accounting, Carolyn allows Mary to maintain the leadership role in the group. This is made visible by Jenny's decision in line 75 that Carolyn compete against Susan rather than Mary in the next turn. Mary is removed from the central activity of the game until line 83 when she is "heard" when she displays a preference for an easy word. The last challenge to Jenny's authority comes at line 89 with Carolyn again disagreeing with the arbitration of the question. This is the third challenge to Jenny's position of authority in twenty lines, and once again Jenny refuses to accept the challenge (line 90). However she mediates the effect of Carolyn's loss with the utterance of line 92, that is, that Mary only *beat her by a second*. This utterance serves to minimize the impact of the loss and provide material for the account formulated by Carolyn. At this point the game is terminated by T as she brings the cohort back to order.

This segment demonstrates the ad hoc fluid nature of the maintenance of authority and leadership in small student groups. In the first segment Jenny is able to hold the floor and protect Mary without a challenge. Indeed Jenny and Susan collaborate to ensure Mary has success in the game. The introduction of a new member to the group demonstrates the organization of the work of protecting Mary from failure. In contrast to the classroom version of the game where this opportunity to adapt the rules is not as available to the participants, this structure allows for the ongoing adaptation of the rules to suit the needs

of the group . This is because, this game is not in the public view, and therefore not a candidate to operate as an instruction vehicle. This raises interesting points about the supports peers can give to one another. The student's use of a number of the familiar strategies both to protect authority, and to ensure that Mary is publicly seen as successful in the activity. In the first segment (segment 14) Jenny and Susan collaborate to ensure Mary, at least in the public view, achieves success in the game. Susan does not challenge Jenny for authority. The second segment is more complex. With Carolyn's immediate challenge to Jenny's practical authority, Jenny uses strategies of: the refusal to compromise, the provision of accounts and the minimization of loss to maintain both her authority and protect Mary in the interaction. Variation in ability to provide that support may be dependent on the organizational structure of the activity, and the use of authority structures to create organizations where disabilities can be minimized.

The next segment was videotaped over a five day period, representing two out of three sessions captured, documenting an attempt by two students to complete a group work assignment. There are sections in this data set that are not transcribed completely because of high noise levels in the classroom, but sufficient data remains to document the process. The students were teamed up for the project by the teacher and, at the point at which this segment starts, have had previous opportunities to work on the project. The students have gathered written resources and should have the basic outline of their project completed at this time.

Segment 15

3: B: 5:

- 160 1. Pe: What's that
 2. Ro: What do ya mean.
 3. Pe: (what's that word)
 4. Ro: I'm not writing
 5. Pe: ()
 6. Ro: I can't write I can read it () weighs about four
 7. hundred and fifty pounds four hundred and fifty pounds a large
 8. (.) female (1) is (.) about
 9. T: (4) Does anybody need a little bit of help? ()
 10. Pe: Oh yes [raises hand]
 11. T: K I'll come around then
 12. Pe: [turning pages] Ohh man I went through this whole book
 13. Ro: Well (). a larger female is about [James
 14. leans over to look] (8) that's eight eight feet long and-
 15. Pe: // (that's not what it says
 16. eight feet!) oh yeah eight feet
 17. Ro: Well I don't know about that (.) but
 18. Pe: Yeah eight feet (have) eight (.) feet (.)
 19. T: (Do you guys need some help?)
 20. Ro: What's that word ? right there?
 21. T: That's a toughie cause it doesn't play fair the gh you
 22. Ro: // eight
 23. T: can't hear it yah you're right say it again
 24. Ro: eight
 25. T: eight
 26. Ro: that's what I thought it was
 27. Je: eight feet long
 28. T: doesn't play fair
 29. Ro: eight feet long about three hundred and fifty pounds (that a
 30.) like the male weighs (lots)
 31. Pe: [grabs the paper] We're supposed to be writing down
 [Both students are leafing through the books. The next section is hard to hear
 as the noise level in the classroom is high. Robert picks up the paper and starts
 to compose the report]
 195 32. Ro: A tiger (1) can-
 33. Pe: I'll get another () [gets up to leave]
 [Robert continues to write and peter leaves the area.Peter returns and sits
 down. He opens the book and starts in a sing song voice]
 206 34. Pe: me::e:o:o:ow ow ow [reads] () [leans over to Robert]
 35. (did tigers smell very bad?)
 36. Ro: [Robert continues and ignores Peter] (so that cats can
 39. Pe: umm tigers (.) have (.) sharp (.) teeth
 [Robert continues to copy from his own book]

40. T: I really really (.) like the way that Peter and Robert and Jenny
 41. and her group are really working together as a group
 42. Pe: [leaning over to Robert] tigers have very sharp teeth
 43. Ro: I'm writing something (own)
 44. Pe: ()
 45. Ro: [continues to write]
 222 46. Pe: () put down tigers have sharp teeth

The segment opens with Peter and Robert sitting across from each other at a small table at the back of the room. The classroom is noisy and busy with groups of students working on projects scattered throughout the room. Robert is engaged in reading a book about Tigers, the subject of the report, and Peter is sitting and watching him read. The teacher has outlined the necessity for each group to work together, and advised them of the time constraints for completion. There is no visible evidence of written work on the table.

This first part of the segment documents the conflictual nature of the attempt of these two students to work together. Lines 1 to 8 outline the conflict including Robert's declaration in line 4 that he is *not writing* and his negative self evaluation of line 6: *I can't write I can read it*. Peter does not respond to this comment. It is possible that the issue of who will write has been raised before, and not resolved, or perhaps this is a pre-emptive move by Robert.

Robert's decision to access help from T at lines 9, 10 and 11 is interesting. Peter and Robert do not discuss the decision to ask for help. As such the rationale for the help request is not clear at this point. Robert continues with his reading aloud until line 14 when Peter contradicts Robert's decoding of a word. This conflict ends at line 19 just

prior to the arrival of the teacher to help as requested. This issue becomes a rationale or reason for the request for help despite the fact that the issue had not yet been raised at the time of the request at line 10. Teacher assistance is not elicited to help with the organizational problems faced by the students. The interaction with the teacher of lines 19 to 29 re-establishes what both students have acknowledged, that Robert had indeed read the text correctly. After a brief instructional phase and with the resolution of the problem, T leaves. The pattern of conflict resumes at line 30 as T leaves. There is an attempt by Peter at line 32 to remind Robert of the task at hand, however the reminder does not result in activity. Robert follows up by starting to write down some information about tigers. At this point Peter terminates his involvement in the activity by leaving the table (line 34). On his return the conflict continues for the remainder of the session.

The notable aspect of this segment, in contrast to segment 14 above is the absence of leadership to complete the task at hand. In Segment 14, Jenny maintains authority and leadership throughout and manages to orchestrate the student version of the task to completion. In contrast in this segment, the task is never jointly addressed by the participants, nor by the teacher. Even the availability of the teacher at the request of the students has not helped Peter and Robert socially organize themselves to complete the task. In this segment, both students inability to organize themselves for a sustained effort at the task completion become visible within the structure of the interaction. This interaction is characterized by a lack of a mutually agreed to and collaborated goal. In segment 14, Jenny and Susan collaborated on Mary's success. There is no such objective in this interaction.

Segment 16

4: A: 7:

504

1. Pe: I stuck my tongue out at it
[both reading books and writing Peter starts to beat a song out on the table]
2. Ro: What are you doing Peter? Now (they) won't (be) (.) able to
3. understand it
4. T: I'm gonna come around with the stapler right now
5. Pe: ()
6. Ro: Here why don't you just (.) erase everything that we've just
7. write (it all) down
8. Pe: (3) I think it's that ()
9. Ro: [picks up sheet puts it on chair next to him] well (.) Peter (1)
10. let me put it this way you're not helping very much
11. Pe: (looks like Robert) I'm trying to (2) cause I don't know what
12. we're working on now
13. Ro: We're supposed to be wr (.) writing our report we're supposed
14. to write down what they do what w-what a lot of stuff (really)
15. we know about
16. Pe: (what do we know about?)
[Robert leans over to next group and gets a new book which he starts to look through. Peter starts to leaf through book as well for about 34 seconds]
17. Pe: tigers () (1) tigers
18. Ro: // that's (not) a fact
19. Pe: No what they do. You said what they do
20. Ro: That's not enough you're supposed to write down what we
21. know about them (1) tigers () tigers wait (2) tigers are the
22. biggest member of the cat family they (1) they (1) they're they
23. are also heavy ()
24. Pe: They're big cats?
25. Ro: ()
26. T: Excuse me guys can everybody claim the stuff on the floor your
27. webs and everything cause I'm coming around I wanna see if
28. you have all the stuff necessary (1) to be complete so get all
29. your stuff even if you're not using your webs right now (2)
30. Everything on the floor you need to take you need to take it if
31. it's yours it's all on the floor in the middle
[Peter and Robert continue looking through books. Robert leaves and Peter sits at the table waiting]
32. T: Hey here's lots of peoples stuff down here (.) Steven Susan
33. right here
[Peter is talking to himself playing games with the paper. Robert is still wandering around then sits down and takes the paper from Peter]
34. Ro: (need to have a pencil) [leaves again as Peter starts writing]

- 620 35. Pe: Here you can use my pencil
 36. Ro: What?
 [James is still muttering and looking at books. T comes to the table as Robert sits down again.]
- 658 37. T: Ok what do you guys have done here where's your fact sheet
 38. where's your web?
 39. Pe: uhhm he (erased) some of the fact sheet
 40. T: where's your webs
 41. Pe: webs?
 42. Ro: it's on my desk
 43. T: you should have two webs
 44. Ro: I did it and somebody stole it that from me that's what happened
 45. to me
 46. T: Well you need to make another one then (1) and you need to
 47. make a fact sheet and have a (.)
 48. Ro: // I did have a (.) that is our fact sheet right there.
 49. T: Well you need to have a web so you can check off what you
 50. found
 51. Ro: ahhh
 52. T: K so you both need to make a web please (1) ok? (.) *Excuse*
 53. me (.) if you have a problem with that you can go outside and
 54. deal with it K?
 [boys leave the table go off in different directions?]

This second segment was taped on a different day and occurs sequentially later than the previous segment. Additional trials at task completion by these students were not documented as they occurred at a time outside of the taping schedule. Once again Peter and Robert are sitting at the back table. They are both aware of the camera during the start of this segment at least as evidenced by Peter's reference to sticking his tongue out at it (line 1). The decision was made to tape this segment because of the conflictual nature of the first segment. I was curious to see if the students would organize themselves to complete the task. At the start of the segment both students are reading from books and writing information down. Peter erases some of the written information on the communal writing sheet. As this is the final session for the completion of the project, T is making

arrangements for each group to have paper clips and is bringing the stapler around so the various pieces of information required for the project completion do not get misplaced. She has given direction to the class as to what components of the projects are to be submitted.

The segment opens on an openly conflictual note at lines 2-3 and 6-7. Peter's response in line 8 generates Robert's response in line 9. This is the first attempt at the definition of the organizational problem, that is, *you're not helping me very much*. At line 11 Peter accounts for Robert's definition of the problem, and expands the problem definition with his version of the problem, which is his lack of knowledge about what it is they are *supposed to be working on now*. At lines 13-16, Robert attempts to formulate the task for Peter but this attempt is met with a question, at line 16, that shifts the responsibility for *what we do know about*, back onto Robert. At this point Robert does not assume a leadership role, but continues with his reading. He rebukes Peter's attempt at line 17 to generate some discussion. The parallel work organization engaged in by these students continues until line 26.

Lines 26 to 31 document T's availability and assistance and define what information will be required to be seen as she visits each group. Robert has left the work area, and returns briefly. He leaves again in search of a pencil. During this time Peter sits at the table. There is no evidence, to this point in time, that these students have worked out a resolution to the problem of working together. At this point T comes to the table to monitor the progress.

658 37. T: Ok what do you guys have done here where's your fact sheet

38. where's your web?
 39. Pe: uhhm he (erased) some of the fact sheet
 40. T: where's your webs
 41. Pe: webs?
 42. Ro: It's on my desk
 43. T: You should have two webs
 44. Ro: I did it and somebody stole it that from me that's what happened
 45. to me
 46. T: Well you need to make another one then (1) and you need to
 47. make a fact sheet and have a (.)
 48. Ro: // I did have a (.) that is our fact sheet right there.
 49. T: Well you need to have a web so you can check off what you
 50. found
 51. Ro: ahhh
 52. T: K so you both need to make a web please (1) ok? (.) *Excuse*
 53. me (.) if you have a problem with that you can go outside and
 54. deal with it K?

This segment is somewhat similar to segment 4 discussed earlier (page 109) in that the teacher chooses to selectively accept students accounts, or in this case only generates an account from one student. T starts the visit with the use of the term *guys* in line 37 and listens to Peter's account regarding the fate of the fact sheet. When Peter disavows any knowledge of the *webs*, T addresses the rest of the reproach sequence to Robert, who has acknowledged that the document is *on his desk*. With this utterance he appears to implicate himself as the responsible party. The reproach sequence continues until line 52, and it is at this point that Robert escalates the conflict with T by a challenge to her authority. As T leaves the area, both Peter and Robert leave the work on the table and leave the area.

What is apparent in this segment is that Peter and Robert are unable to organize themselves into a task resolution structure rather than a conflictual structure. At no point

in either of these segments does either student make a concerted effort at assuming responsibility to complete the task. In this segment the students difficulties with organizing themselves are made visible by the inability to complete the task. This is in contrast to Segment 14 where despite differences in ability, the students are able to resolve their differences and complete the task. The difference appears to lie in the ability of the members to resolve the initial conflict and collaborate on the decisions required for one student to establish leadership in the task resolution.

What is of interest in this segment is the inability of the students to resolve their conflicts and complete the task despite the advantages of being out of the public view. They have the opportunity to adapt the directions provided to them without the public accountability risk. In addition, any negative self evaluation that might be made visible by the lack of progress is minimized . At a point in both segments the teacher was available for assistance, or to clarify the task. In Segment 14, the members replaced the authority of the teacher with the acceptance of the authority of a group member. In these segments there is no attempt to replace the authority of the teacher. The differential treatment of the students in both Segment 14 and this segment makes visible the differing assumptions about the abilities of the students, and makes visible the deficits of other students by virtue of their protection.

The last two segments illustrate a number of the collaborations required for the students to successfully complete group tasks, and points to the diverse abilities of the students in this classroom to accomplish a collaborative effort. The private realm provides an opportunity for students to accomplish changes to the normative practice of the

classroom, to a moral organization suited to the objectives of the students rather than the teacher and the cohort as a whole. Without this collaboration, the task becomes a reason for potential conflict rather than success. The question of gaining and maintaining authority within the group is critical as it points to the need of the group to organize around a structure. In segment 14, Jenny organizes her authority using similar strategies as the teacher does when teaching the cohort. In segment 15 and 16, no authority structure is assumed by either student to organize the management of the task.

Making Problems Visible:

There have been a number of examples in this chapter of task organization and structures that serve to intensify or minimize the visibility of specific difficulties, whether learning difficulties or attention deficits. The public acknowledgement of a specific competence of a student not only acknowledges progress or improvement, but may function to make a problem visible to the cohort. Authority contests and reproaches, although routine events in the classroom, often make remarkable an unremarkable event. The definition of what counts as work point to potential breaches in the normative expectations of the teacher for classroom performance. The next segment documents a more specifiable difficulty: a student's reading difficulty.

Segment 17

4: B: 3:

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|---|
| 118 | 1. | T: | That's a hard word I'll give you that (.) capitalize |
| | 2. | Cm: | capitalize all ((stumbles over word)) |
| | 3. | T: | What's in the <u>middle</u> darling ? (4) what's in the very middle (1) |
| | 4. | | of that word?(12) what's in the middle of <u>that</u> word Matt? |

5. Cm: ()
6. T: Good how does that sound (together)
7. Cm: ()
8. T: go::od (.) now what's at the beginning?
9. Cm: ()
10. T: (6) Can anyone help Cam on that word (1) (Jake)
11. Ja: (street)
12. T: streets capitalize all the streets. Very good reading Cam Who
13. would like to read the next sentence(1) Who would like to give
14. it a try (.) Peter
15. Pe: (3) um (.) look r I (1) write (1) them (1) in (1) the (1) space
16. T: spaces good. Who'd like to read the next sentence good reading
17. (2) Carolyn
18. Ca: Help Penny find her way to ()
19. T: Ok so what do they want to do here can anyone tell me ? (2)
20. Can anyone tell me what they want us to do there? (4) What do
21. they want us to do?
- [walks over and takes something away from Jake]
22. (6) Do you have a guess (.) of what they want us to do there?
23. (.) Jake? (.) Do you have a guess
24. Ja: (umm find the)
25. T: Ok umm actually what they want us to do is what are some
26. things that we always put a capital (.) on? always We've talked
27. about this before what are some things we always put a capital
28. on. Andrew?
29. An: names?
30. T: names what else (1) Cam
31. Cm: uh ()
32. T: Yes! and we do put it on streets too we put it on ci:ties on
33. names (1) and we are gonna put it on streets (.) so number one
34. says garden street What do I have to change there so that it
35. would be correct? What do I need to change there. Jake
36. Ja: (change the)
37. T: Good? Change the G to a capital and change the S to a capital
38. (1) and then where would you write it (.) where would you put
39. it Jenny
40. Je: (by number one)
41. T: beside number one does everybody get that? [Ss nod and
42. mutter yes] OK let's go to the next page (.) Ivan the ice cream
43. man-

The segment opens with T sitting in the centre of the closed end of the horseshoe ring

of desks. She is sitting on top of the vacant desk in clear view of the students and has organized the structure of the lesson so the students read through the directions for some study sheets prior to independent work. T has settled on a student reading sequence starting from the top left side of the horseshoe. Cam is the first to read, and immediately, he experiences difficulties reading the segment. T assists him with the first word (line 1) with an account for Cam's difficulties provided. That is, it is a *hard word*. Lines 2 to 10 demonstrate Cam's continuing difficulties with the reading despite assisted given by T.

A change in the nomination process is made in line 10. The reading nomination process is now voluntary, with the elicitation by T for assistance for Cam. Cam's difficulty is viable to all students at this point. So is the information that some other student in the room can help Cam. The *hard word* has been proved to the cohort by T. The new word appears not to be of the same degree of difficulty. Although it is Jake who reads the word correctly, T commends Cam on his reading in line 12. This acknowledgement is in contrast to what has happened and has been visible to the cohort. It functions as a repair sequence for Cam's lack of ability to read what Jake can read, and in additional it serves to remind the cohort that Cam's inability at this specific time is not reflective of his ability at large. This is later reinforced with a second opportunity given to Cam to answer correctly and the subsequent resolution of the repair process in line 32:

25. T: ok umm actually what they want us to do is What are some
 26. things that we always put a capital (.) on? always we've talked
 27. about this before What are some things we always put a capital
 28. on. Andrew?
 29. An: names?
 30. T: names what else (1) Cam
 31. Cm: uh ()

32. T: Yes! and we do put it on streets too we put it on ci:ties on

Here we can see the sequence of repair undertaken by T as a strategy to minimize the visible evidence of Cam's reading difficulty. It stands as evidence of a reading disability, or counts as a disability because it stands despite all the mediating backgrounded features of this class such as T's organization of elicitation, intimations, responses, evaluations and repair work. There is a comparative aspect because of the success of the remainder of the cohort at this task which intensifies the visibility of Cam's reading difficulties.

This segment has a unique characteristic for this particular data set. It is one of only a few segments in this data set, in which the teachers use of prompts, implications and / or mediation fails to assist the student in producing a correct answer. In addition the use of what turns out to be a skill comparison strategy (lines 10 and 11), focusses the cohort's attention on Cam as he struggles to read the word. This publicly noted and observed difficulty produces a number of repair sequences from T (lines 12, 30, 32 and 35). These serve to advise the cohort that Cam's difficulty is restricted to only these one or two words at only this particular time. On the balance, Cam has answered more questions correctly than incorrectly. Cam's initial public failure, however, has an impact on the types of questions given to him to subsequently answer (Hood, McDermott and Cole, 1980). Rather than decoding questions, Cam is nominated to provide comprehension information. He is not nominated to decode a word a second time in this sequence. It is in this segment that an individual difficulty is made publicly available to the cohort.

This segment has documented specific events in the daily classroom routine, that

function to accomplish the visibility of learning disabilities experienced by a student in this classroom. Throughout this chapter, a number of potential issues have been raised through the examination of a selection of the data generated in this study. The first section of this chapter documented the routine nature of all aspects of the academic and social organization of this classroom. There are no significant deviations from the normal classroom routines in the data. The second section has documented the constitutive elements of self esteem. A number of organizational structures that by their nature and use make visible breaches of the moral order or normative expectations in this classroom have been discussed. When viewed under the assumption of the nature of talk as multi-consequential and multi-formative, routine events such as; acknowledgements, authority contests, reproach sequences, nominations, elicitation, implications, prompts and evaluations all serve, at a minimum, a dual function in the classroom. They maintain the organizational structure and they all make visible all types of breaches of the moral order of the classroom by the cohort. The public and emergent definition of what counts as work; being in a partnership, showing respect, having appropriate behaviour while teaching and using problem solving skills, whether embedded in an academic lesson or presented as a lesson, serve a number of functions as well. They alert the cohort to the expectations of the normative order, and serve to organize the lesson as a manageable event for both the teacher and the cohort. In addition these utterances serve to account for the events, and provide a background feature against which reproach sequences and authority contests emerge.

The direct instruction of a number of expectations that are difficult for the cohort to

meet, is an interesting feature of this classroom. These lessons can be seen as an enrichment of the standard curriculum, and in themselves point to the types of difficulties the cohort as a whole may or may not be having. The lesson structure, that is the presentation of the information from the teacher to the cohort as a whole, and the student's search for individual relevance, is a method of dealing with the difficulties that a number of the cohort may experience on a routine basis, yet it does not make visible individual difficulties. Instead these lessons become part of the routine daily activities in this classroom. Although the lessons are background expectancies in this classroom, they are intentionally made to be foregrounded features in this class as a part of the curriculum of things the cohort should learn. In summary, in this classroom the organization and structure of the lessons functions to teach all academic and curriculum lessons, or the specifics of what this cohort needs to know to be competent members of this classroom and to advise the cohort, through the use of the formal lesson structure the importance of the lessons to be learned. The organizational structure of the classroom functions to manage the cohort in order to meet the goals of the teacher. The use of strategies such as the public acknowledgement of success function in a different way. They inform the cohort of the normative order in the classroom, and make visible breaches of this order so that they can be resolved. Both the organizational structure and the strategies are reflexive and structuring of the events in progress, and collaborated on, in their production by all members of the classroom.

The efficacy of the structuring of this classroom is apparent in the minimal visibility of specific learning and attention problems in the routine events of this classroom. Within the

organizational structure of this classroom learning and attention difficulties remain predominantly as backgrounded features of the interaction. When the moral order of this classroom is breached, the organizational structure formulated by the cohort serves to minimize the visibility of the problem in two ways:

- 1. The context and content of the breach become visible as both subject and object in the lesson. As a consequence of this visibility and the public reparation, all breaches stand as routine daily activities in this classroom.**
- 2. The structure of lessons in this classroom ensures that opportunities for student display of competence are available in both the public and the private realms. This becomes apparent when the publicly accomplished organizational structure is examined, in contrast to the privately accomplished organizational structure.**

The first area of comparison is in the objectives of the interaction. Throughout this data set, T's objectives appear to be consistent and clear. That is, the primary objective is the resumption of the lesson, that is the normative order of the classroom. This is accomplished through the use of a number of strategies by the teacher. There is a parallel of sorts within the student's agenda as well. However the agenda is the playing of the game, not the maintenance of the formal rules. Inherent in the notion of playing the game is the moment by moment accomplishment of rules embedded in the sequence itself.

Cohort interaction and peer interaction can be compared as well. There is consistency in the structure and organization of the teacher-cohort interaction throughout the entire data set. This is not the case in the organization and structure of the peer activities. In the discussion of segment 14 the collaboration of the group on a specific structure to play the

game, and to protect another student from failure was noted. In the following two segments, the students were unable to collaborate on an effective or, for that matter, an ineffective organizational structure, other than to organize conflictual issues. What characterizes task completion in the segments offered for examination is the collaboration on an authority structure to facilitate the organization of the activity.

What this data demonstrates is not that learning and attention difficulties do not cause organizational problems in the classroom, but they are managed by the organizational structure used by this teacher in such a way that they remain, with the exceptions of a few events, as backgrounded features of this classroom. A collateral question, which cannot be addressed in this project, is the question of whether or not the routine events in this classroom are different than the routine events in any other classroom. What is certain however, is that the daily events and constitutive elements of any event arises out of the routine nature of the organization of that event.

The visibility of specific learning disabilities or attention deficit disorders has been very hard to locate and make visible in this data. The only incident that can be documented with any degree of certainty is segment 17. In this segment, it can be seen that, as a consequence of the structuring activities and organization of the reading lessons, an individual's failure becomes visible to the cohort. This is not to say that these types of events do not occur more frequently in the classroom, but in the data available for this analysis, this is the only such event. This is a function of the social organizational structures utilized in this classroom that minimize the visible consequences of these disabilities. Again, this is not a claim that these children do not have learning or attention

difficulties, but that the social organization in this classroom does not often allow for these deficits to be made visible. In other words, the opportunity for the deficits to be exhibited is constrained by the social organization of the cohort. This is particularly true in the public arena. Assessment practices, academic testing, and examinations, and other academic histories of individual children do not form part of the public view in this classroom. The specific organizational strategies and structures utilized by the teacher are the backgrounded features that constrain the visibility of specific learning and attention difficulties of the children of this classroom. There is no doubt that the classroom teacher knows and adjusts expectations continually to compensate for the deficits and learning challenges of each child.

Throughout the data set, issues that are visible because of the breach of the backgrounded features of the social and academic organization of this class, come to be foregrounded features in that they are openly addressed, discussed and defined. School placement procedures, specific leaning disabilities and attention disorders remain largely hidden from view, or themselves become just a routine part of the day. What evidence there is of specific problems tends to be found more frequently in the relationship between peers, rather than in the social organization of the cohort. Peer relationships are characterized by unique collaborations to protect members from public failure.

The children in this classroom all know they have some sort of learning disability, and/or attention problems, and they all know that everyone else in their class has difficulties as well. Having a learning disability or attention difficulties is part of the normative structure of this classroom. It's all part of the daily routine and as such, the difficulties are

embedded and accounted for in the classroom. This routinization of learning disabilities is accomplished in predominantly two ways in this classroom. Elements of self-esteem are taught as a constitutive part of all the lessons in the classroom, and the skills required to become a competent member of the class are taught specifically as a topic of instruction. This study is not about assessing academic and social change in LD / ADD children; rather it is about the social organization of self-esteem and its instruction within the confines of classroom lessons.

CHAPTER FIVE: A SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

This analysis started with the intention of focussing on the process by which student competence and self-esteem are managed within the classroom. Of particular interest is the relationship between classroom competence and self-esteem, and the structuring practices and activities that organize the normative classroom expectations for student performance and behaviour. This is an analysis of the work that teachers and students do in defining, maintaining and displaying themselves and other members of the cohort as competent members of the classroom. The investigation of how member interaction does the work of structuring opportunities to acknowledge and display competence and the elements of self-esteem has been achieved through the detailed analysis of the transcription of videotapes of the routine activities of a classroom of children with learning and attentional difficulties. In this discussion, I have examined and documented how what counts as self-esteem for all practical purposes in the classroom, is inextricably linked and dependent on the reflexive and indexical nature of the routine discursive practices of the classroom. This study is about the constitution of a student as a competent and therefore esteem-able member of the classroom

The motivation for this study came in part from the conventional literature. There are numerous studies that attempt to describe the characteristics of children with LD/ADD, but are not successful in integrating this information successfully with the context in which these diagnoses have a practical consequence or meaning. The use of correlational studies

to address the impact of individual characteristics on social settings has as a central problematic feature. That is the “problem” is not only separated categorically from the context and site of the organization of the event as “problematic” but in addition, the solutions or resolutions to the classroom difficulties documented in the conventional literature as being a product of the difficulty of the child, are not examined *in* and *as* both topic and resource in the analysis. The result of this problematic focus is the generation of data about atypical learners in isolation of the site of the production of the difficulties they experience.

The primary barrier to the use of aggregate data in the description of the impact of individual characteristics in social settings is the role that categorization and typification play in the organizational practices, through which services for atypical students are assigned and regulated (Mehan et al, 1986; Goode, 1979, 1990). As a consequence of the process of typification the child, rather than interacting as a member in the setting within a intersubjective context, is glossed as likely to exhibit certain characteristics. The child’s difficulty is seen as patterned or determined from a source outside of the interaction, rather than as created in the setting and events accomplished by members through the moment by moment, sequentially unfolding talk and interaction in the classroom. The use of aggregate characteristics as defining criteria for the assessment and expectations of behaviour is indicative of a philosophy that objectively quantifies interaction. This is in contrast to a philosophy that visualizes the accomplishment of setting, context, definition and situation in social interaction.

The conventional literature, however, does provide insight about what counts as self-

esteem for all practical purposes, in the classroom. In Chapters Three and Four self-esteem is discussed as a multi-dimensional concept, not a specific personality characteristic or social fact, which mediates school performance and success. Using an ethnomethodological perspective, the elements of what counts as self-esteem, for the purpose at hand, is a collaborative achievement of the members, rather than a causal, predictive or antecedent variable in school performance. The constitutive elements of what counts as self-esteem in the classroom are elements in which students need to be seen as competent to be considered as successful participants in the classroom. These elements include knowing, using and reflexively creating the classroom rules (the normative order) competently; demonstrating a number of social and academic skills including problem solving , communication, self regulatory and cooperative learning skills, showing progress in these areas and successful peer relationships. The visibility of specific learning and attention disorders to the cohort impacts the level of competence accorded to learning and attention disordered students in the classroom, and leads to on-going questions about ability and competence.

A number of key ethnomethodological concepts are of particular importance in the analysis of this data. These concepts were discussed in detail in Chapter Three, but are important to the discussion of the conclusions arising from this analysis. The concept of competent membership is vital to the analysis as classroom competence is a key constitutive element in what counts as self-esteem. What is important to consider in the question of both membership and competence is the status of the student as competent member *for all practical purposes*. That is what counts as self-esteem and what counts as

classroom competence count for the purpose at hand. The practical purpose of the classroom is reflected in the demands and practices of that particular institution, not a universe of classrooms and institutions. With this perspective the moral organization and lesson structure of a particular class determine what counts as self-esteem for an individual child.

The moral order of the classroom is constituted by and through the “ rule governed activities of everyday life” (Garfinkel, 1972: 1-30). What is critical in this view of the moral order is the application to the normal and routine events in the classroom as firstly moral facts (Garfinkel, 1970), and secondly the status of the moral facts as common-sense and taken for granted by the cohort. The implication for this analysis is that the jointly constituted moral order forms the background features of the classroom discourse, and becomes visible only in the breaching of this order. At this point, the order becomes foregrounded, that is, codifiable through public definition, discussion and instruction. The organizational structure of this classroom serves to maintain specific student disabilities as backgrounded features ensuring that difficulties are often dealt with, without the use of so-many- words.

The status of the classroom as an institution has a definite consequence for the analysis of what counts as self-esteem in that this analysis deals in large part with institutional discourse. As discussed in Chapter Three, institutional discourse reflects the moral organization of the classroom and as well operates as an indexical and reflexive structuring element of that organization. The standardized and standardizing discourse in the classroom makes visible the moral order. An important consequence is that the ideological

assumptions, that is “ the fundamental assumptions, concerns, vocabularies” of the members become visible as well (Miller, 1994).

Both in Chapter Three and in the analysis of various elements in Chapter Four, I refer to the background and foreground features of talk in the classroom (Cook-Gumperz, 1975; Heyman, 1982). These features are a critical discursive element in this classroom as the status of an event as a foregrounded feature makes the event remarkable, codifiable, open for discussion and visible to the cohort. This status of visibility is the status that makes personal academic and social deficits noticeable within the cohort, with the possible questioning of classroom competency.

A Summary of the Findings

In Chapter Four a number of the constitutive elements of self-esteem were examined as they were made visible within the routine classroom interaction. Although there is a discussion of the findings provided within that chapter a brief review of the key points is provided here.

The first section of the chapter documented the typical nature of this classroom. Building on the findings of earlier classroom studies, the routine events in this classroom were analysed for significant departures from common organizational practices and structures in other analysed classroom populations (Leiter, 1979; McHoul, 1978; Macbeth, 1991; Mehan, 1979 and Payne and Hustler, 1980). A number of the elements of organizational structures particular to classrooms were documented using the data from this classroom including: the organization and structure of classroom lessons (Segments 1

and 2); the use of teacher authority in sequences of contest and reproach both in the public and the private realm (segments three and four); and the use of *if / then* contingency sequences (segment 5). These segments demonstrated among other things, the routine nature of this particular classroom. It is important to note that there are no major deviations in organization, structure or in the use of teacher authority in this classroom. This finding is important in that the members of this classrom have been diagnosed with learning and attention difficulties that are sufficiently severe that they have experienced significant enough difficulties within a public school system to have been placed in a special segregated school program. What this study has demonstrated is that the structure and organization of the lessons in this classroom, are available to students in both atypical and typical classrooms, through the specific organizational structure of the classroom. A second implication of these findings is that the use of routine organizational classroom and lesson structures facilitates the schooling of children deemed to have atypical characteristics, and points to the question of what is it in this classroom that mitigates the effects of the educational challenges these children face.

The question of the constitution of a number of the elements of self-esteem is addressed in segments 6 and 7. These segments demonstrate features such as the function and effects of the public and private acknowledgement of classroom competence and effort. In addition, these segments demonstrate that the organizational structures that allow for the accomplishment of the display of student competence is in the exercise, by the teacher, of the asymmetrical right and privileges of the teacher. The public acknowledgement of work and effort is multifunctional. It serves to define what counts as

effort and work, and provides opportunities for students to find the relevance of the lesson for themselves. In addition, the reflexive nature of this public acknowledgement of competence maintains the structuring activities of the classroom. It is through the accomplishment of teacher authority that the moral order of the classroom emerges and is maintained.

The direct instruction of specific skills and competencies as embedded in routine curriculum instruction and as curriculum topics is documented in segments 8, 9 and 10. There are a number of findings of note in these segments. The first lies in the use of both the authority structure and the lesson structure, in the transformation of a student problem solving structure into a formal lesson on problem solving (segment 8). This transformation functions to restore a sense of classroom order to the event and to create an opportunity for the direct instruction of a competency skill. In addition, the cohort is reminded of the desirability of the formal or instructed problem solving mechanism. This segment documents the distinction between the structure of the public lesson, and the structure of non-academic activities in the classroom. Of note as well is the dual nature of the organization of lessons about competency issues. In some instances these lessons are provided as embedded within the structure of academic tasks. These lessons are also provided as free standing units. In either case a standard lesson organization is used by the teacher. The function of the lesson is the same, what differs is the intensity of the visibility of the topic of the lesson.

A number of opportunities for students to display competence are documented in segments 11, 12 and 13. Routine acknowledgements of competence function to advise the

cohort of the status of individual students as visibly competent. In addition the sequences provide to the cohort information as to what constitutes competence, *for all practical purposes*. The designation of a student as publicly competent also acts as a vehicle in which deficits are made visible as well. The difference lies in the use of public acknowledgements, in which the status of competence is available to the cohort for each student to find a unique relevance rather than in the structure of private acknowledgements in which the information given makes deficits more visible. The public definitions of elements that count as self-esteem in the classroom not only establish expectations, but they form a base for the self evaluation process of the students. In all these sequences the teacher structures the activity in the classroom either on an ad hoc or intentional basis to instruct students in skill areas that are components of competent membership in the classroom. The direct instruction of the components of self-esteem is a way of translating an abstract concept into practical action.

What is apparent in the segments demonstrating peer interactions in the completion of work tasks in the classroom is the impact on the task of the organizational structure collaborated on and accomplished by the students. In the private realm, the realm in which the organizational structure is determined and maintained by the students, there is opportunity for students to collaborate on a moral organization that emerges from a less formal pattern of lesson structure. The sequences analysed in this study point to the need for an emergent leadership structure in the group to complete the task as it is understood and operationalized by the students. As demonstrated in segments 15 and 16, tasks can become the vehicle for conflict rather than completion.

Throughout the segments analysed, specific learning and attention difficulties are not routinely made visible by either the organizational or lesson structure in this classroom. The exception in this data set is segment 17. As remarked on earlier in Chapter Four, this segment is the only sequence of audible videotape in which the use of a skill comparison process during a routine classroom activity resulted in the public display of a learning difficulty specific to a single individual. What is typically organized and maintained as a background feature of an individual's academic performance is foregrounded through the use of a comparative question and answer structure. The repair work done by the teacher may or may not mediate the effect of the failure of Cam to read what other students can and do read. The visible consequence of the breach in the moral organization of the classroom by the teacher is the opportunity given to Cam to answer questions correctly, but these questions are of a different type, which is also visible to the cohort.

The sequences analysed and documented in Chapter Four demonstrate that the elements of what counts in the classroom as self-esteem are embedded in the routine organizational structures of the classroom, and are made visible within and as a consequence of that structure. What is glossed in the conventional research literature as indicators of poor or good self-esteem and competent membership are visibly and reportably accomplished, within the routine events in the classroom. The analysis has documented a number of discursive events visible in the classroom routine including:

1. Events that function to mediate the visibility of learning and attentional difficulties;
2. Events that function to acknowledge and make public competent membership;
3. Events that teach elements of classroom competence as curriculum topics or

embedded in and part of the structure of other lessons.

In addition this data has documented the dual nature of the social organization of lessons in the private and the public realm, and the impact and function of teacher authority on the organization and management of the cohort and the structure and function of classroom lessons. The consequence of the teacher's structuring of classroom lessons is found in the invisibility of the specific learning disabilities and attention disorders in the public realm of this classroom. These segments clearly demonstrate the manageability of these disorders through the management of the organization of the classroom.

Concluding Remarks And Implications

Out of the analysis of Chapter Four a number of conclusions can be drawn. The most obvious conclusion is that what counts as self-esteem in the classroom can be and is both an instructional topic and resource in this classroom. The primary mechanism or structural element used in the instruction of the elements of self-esteem and classroom competence in this classroom is the judicious and intentional exercise of the asymmetrical rights and privileges of the teacher. The compelling evidence for the status of self-esteem as instructed is made visible in the lesson structure common to all activities in this classroom. The constitutive elements of self-esteem are not only visible as instructional content, but in the moral organization of the classroom. This is evidenced by what constitutes a breach in the moral order, and the subsequent clarification and instruction that follows the breakdown of the classroom order.

The role of teacher authority as intentional practical action is important to the

understanding of the capability of lesson structures to mitigate the effects of learning and attentional disorders on the perceived competence level of students. As the practical evidence of teacher authority is found in the management of the structure of lessons and the teacher's authority is displayed in the organization of classroom talk (Macbeth, 1991: 281-313), then the site of the production of that authority is also found in the structure of the lessons and the organization of classroom talk.

A second conclusion is generated from this study. The most puzzling and obvious characteristic of this analysis has been for me, the almost complete absence of any evidence of specific learning disabilities or attention disorders in this classroom. It is at this point where the intellectual exercise of what I know or we all know about the difficulties that LD/ADD children experience in the classroom collides with the lack of visible, observable and reportable evidence of learning challenges. Simply put, the learning disabilities have remained and been maintained and organized through the structure of the classroom and lessons as backgrounded features. They are features of the interaction which we all know and take for granted, and do not have to be spoken about in-so-many-words. The impact on student self-esteem of this organizing structure is significant. There is no public discussion or reminder generated through the organizational structures or through the structure of lessons and discourse of individual and personal learning deficits. This is not a comment on the individual emotional states of the students, but a comment on the ability of the teacher to use her authority in the classroom to ensure that individual difficulties remain backgrounded features of the interaction wherever possible.

There are important implications for professional practice in this research project. The

teacher in the classroom studied uses the organization of the classroom and lessons to do a number of things including acknowledging social and academic competence, and instructing the cohort in deficit areas. The cohort benefits from the impact of teacher authority in their assessments of themselves and of other students. All of the work done by the teacher in this classroom, including the mundane affairs of the instruction of the elements of competence, and the definition of what counts as competent membership, are all a consequence and a function of the teacher's authority as practical action, that is, the constitutive practices that result in the *unremarkable* routine of the classroom. In this classroom, what is *unremarkable* are the individual learning problems. This speaks to the inherent authority and ability of the teacher to manage the organizational structure of the classroom in such a way so as to maintain learning deficits as backgrounded characteristics of the interaction rather than as foregrounded events.

In summary, in this classroom difficulties are made visible just as they are in other classrooms, that is, through the practical organization of the lessons by the teacher. The teacher uses: routine acknowledgements of competence, sequences of reproach, structures of elicitation, evaluations, nominations and the direct instruction of curriculum topics to structure the cohort as competent and esteem-able students. What is *remarkable* about this classroom is the intentional maintenance of what we all know about atypical students as backgrounded features in the classrooms. There are a number of features that facilitate this structure including the fact that the students share an educational world in common. They are all educationally challenged, and this fact is part of the shared classroom context. There are no opportunities for the members of this class to compare themselves routinely

with typically achieving students. The focus in this classroom is centered on personal growth and achievement. In addition the elements of self-esteem; classroom competency, problem solving skills, appropriate classroom behaviours and definitions of classroom expectations are directly and specifically instructed as embedded in routine lessons or as routine lessons. With the maintenance *by the cohort of* the moral organization of the classroom comes the decrease in visibility of breaches in that order. There is evidence within this data set of the extension of the moral order of the classroom as collaborated on by the cohort, into the moral order of the private realm. However, an extensive discussion of this issue requires additional data which is not available within this collection of data. The question of the applicability of the specifics of this study to a classroom of typically achieving students is the work of a separate research study.

These conclusions point to the perspective that self-esteem should be viewed as a *teachable* and *learnable* component of the educational routine of atypical students rather than as a variable to be examined as in the positivist tradition, in the study of the factors affecting school performance. Self-esteem in the academic setting is both a production and function of the specific organizational structures used commonly in classrooms and as such, it is within the ability of those structures to produce competent members in the academic community. The evidence detailed in this study demonstrates that the constitutive elements of *what counts as self-esteem for all practical purposes* in the classroom is *teachable* within the routine lesson structures in the classroom. Further, it demonstrates that through the intentional organization of teacher authority, learning disabilities and attention deficits need not be *remarkable* within the classroom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, J.C. 1982. *Positivism, Presuppositions and Current Controversies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Alexander, J.C. 1987. *Twenty Lectures: Sociological Lectures Since World War II*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Alexander, Jeffrey C. and Paul Colomy. 1990. "Neofunctionalism Today: Reconstructing a Theoretical Tradition." Pp. 33-67 in *Frontiers of Social Theory*, edited by George Ritzer. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Alexander, Jeffrey C., Gieson, Bernhard, Munch, Richard and Neil J. Smelser. 1987. *The Micro-Macro Link*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Alley, G. and D. Deschler. 1979. *Teaching the Learning Disabled Adolescent: Strategies and Methods*. Denver Co: Love
- Attewell, Paul. 1974. "Ethnomethodology Since Garfinkel." *Theory and Society* 1: 170 - 210.
- Atkinson, J. and John Heritage. (eds). 1984. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, Carolyn and Jayne Keogh. 1995. "Accounting For Achievement in Parent-Teacher Interviews." *Human Studies* 18: 263-300.
- Baldus, Bernd. 1990. "Positivism's Twilight." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 15 (2): 149-163.
- Bar-Hillel, Y. 1954. "Indexical Expressions." *Mind* LXIII.
- Battle, J. and J. Blowers. 1982. "A Longitudinal Comparative Study of the Self-esteem of Students in Special Education Classes." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 15:100-102.
- Bellack, A.A., Kliebard, H.M., Hymen, R.J. and F.L. Smith. 1966. *The Language of The Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bender, William N. 1985. "Differences Between Learning Disabled and Non-Learning Disabled Children in Temperament and Behavior." *Learning Disability Quarterly* 8:11-18.

- Bender, William N. and Lorri B. Golden. 1988. "Adaptive Behavior of Learning Disabled and Non-Learning Disabled Children." *Learning Disability Quarterly* 11:55-61.
- Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor.
- Bingham, Grace. 1980. "Self-Esteem Among Boys With and Without Specific Learning Disabilities." *Child Study Journal* 10: 41-47.
- Bittner, Egon. 1973. "Objectivity and Realism in Sociology." Pp. 109-125 in *Phenomenological Sociology: Issues and Applications*, edited by G Psathas. New York: Wiley.
- Black, F.W. 1974. "Self-Concept as Related to Achievement and Age in Learning Disabled Children." *Child Development* 45: 1137-1140.
- Boden, Deirdre. 1990. "The World as it Happens: Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis." Pp. 185-214 in *Frontiers of Social Theory*, edited by G Ritzer. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Boden, D. And D.H.Zimmerman. (eds) 1991. *Talk And Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bruininks, V.L. 1978. "Peer Status and Personality Characteristics of Learning Disabled and Nondisabled Students." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 11: 484-489.
- Bryan, T.S. 1974. "An Observational Analysis of Classroom Behaviors of Children With Learning Disabilities." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 7: 26-34.
- Burns, R. 1982. *Self-Concept Development and Education*. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Burr, Wesley and Clark Christensen. 1992. "Undesirable Side Effects of Enhancing Self-Esteem." *Family Relations* 41 (4): 460-64.
- Bursuch, W. 1983. "Sociometric Status , Behavior Ratings and Social Knowledge of LD and Low Achieving Students." *Learning Disability Quarterly* 6: 329-338.
- Button, Graham and John R.E. Lee (eds). 1987. *Talk and Social Organisation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Byrne, B.M. 1984. "The General / Academic Nomological Network: A Review of Construct Validation Research." *Review of Educational Research* 54: 427-56.

- Cantwell, Dennis P. 1975. *The Hyperactive Child*. New York: Spectrum Publications Inc.
- Chapman, James W. 1988. "Learning Disabled Children's Self-Concepts." *Review of Educational Research* 58 (3): 347-71.
- Chapman, J.W. and F.T. Boersma. 1979. "Academic Self-Concept in Elementary Learning Disabled Children: A Study With The Student's Perception of Ability Scale." *Psychology in the Schools* 16: 201-206.
- Cicourel, Aaron V. 1964. *Method and Measurement in Sociology*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- _____. 1968. *The Social Organization of Juvenile Justice*. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
- _____. 1972. "Basic And Normative Rules in The Negotiation Of Status And Role. Pp. 259-79 in *Studies In Social Interaction*, edited by David Sudnow, New York: The Free Press.
- _____. 1973. *Cognitive Sociology*. London: Penguin
- _____. 1974. "Some Basic Theoretical Issues in the Assessment of the Child's Performance in Testing and Classroom Settings." Pp. 300-51 in *Language Use and School Performance*, edited by A Cicourel. New York: Academic Press Inc.
- _____. 1974. "Interviewing and Memory". Pp. 51-82 in *Pragmatic Aspects of Human Communication*, edited by Colin Cherry. Dordrecht-Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Cicourel, Aaron V. and John I. Kitsuse. 1963. *The Educational Decision-Makers*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc.
- Cicourel, Aaron V. and John I. Kitsuse. 1977. "The School as a Mechanism of Social Differentiation." Pp. 282-292 in *Power and Ideology In Education*, edited by Jerome Karabel and A.H. Halsey. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cicourel, A.V., S.M.H. Jennings, K.H. Jennings, K.C.W. Leiter, Robert MacKay, Hugh Mehan and David Roth. 1974. *Language Use and School Performance*. New York: Academic Press Inc.
- Collins, Randall. 1977. "Functional and Conflict Theories of Educational Stratification." Pp. 118-136 in *Power and Ideology in Education*, edited by Jerome Karabel and

- A.H. Halsey. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1981. "On the Microfoundations of Macro Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 85 (5): 984-1014.
- _____. 1984. "Statistics Versus Words." *Sociological Theory* 1: 329-362.
- _____. 1985. *Three Sociological Traditions*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1988. "The Micro Contribution To Macro Sociology." *Sociological Theory* 6: 242-253.
- Cook-Gumperz, Jenny. 1975. "The Child As Practical Reasoner." Pp. 137-162 in *Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Use*, edited by M. Sanches and B.G. Blount. New York: Academic Press.
- Coopersmith, S. 1967. *The Antecedents of Self-Esteem*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.
- Coser, Lewis. 1974. "Two Methods in Search of a Substance." *American Sociological Review* 40: 691-700.
- Coulter, Jeff. 1973. "Language and the Conceptualization of Meaning." *Sociology* 7 (2): 173-189.
- Coulthard, Malcolm. 1977. *An Introduction To Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Deci, Edward L., Rosemary Hodges, Louisa Pierson and Joseph Tomassone. 1992. "Autonomy and Competence as Motivational Factors in Students With Learning Disabilities and Emotional Handicaps." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 25: 457-471.
- Douglas, Jack D. 1971. *Understanding Everyday Life*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Endler, Norman E. and Harold A. Minden. 1971. "Anxiety, Conformity, And Self Perception as Related to Learning Disabilities." York University.
- Fine, Gary Alan. 1979. "Small Groups and Culture Creation: The Idioculture of Little League Baseball Teams." *American Sociological Review* 44: 733-745.
- Fleming, J.S. and B.E. Courtney. 1984. "The Dimensionality of Self-Esteem: II Hierarchical Facet Model For Revised Measurement Scales." *Journal of Personality*

- and Social Development* 46: 404-21.
- Flicek, Michael. 1992. " Social Status of Boys With Both Academic Problems and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder." *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 20 (4): 353-367.
- Forman, Ellice Ann. 1988. "The Effects of Social Support and School Placement on the Self-Concept of L.D. Students." *Learning Disabilities Quarterly*. VII (2): 115-124.
- Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, translated by A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon.
- _____. 1980. *Power / Knowledge*, edited and translated by Colin Gordon. Brighton, England: Harvester.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 1963. " A Conception of and Experiments With "Trust" as a Condition of Concerted Stable Actions." Pp. 187-238 in *Motivation and Social Interaction*, edited by O.J.Harvey. New York: Ronald Press.
- _____. 1964. " The Studies of The Routine Grounds of Everyday Activities." *Social Problems* 11: 225-50.
- _____. 1967. *Studies In Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- _____. 1972. "Studies of The Routine Grounds of Everyday Activities" Pp. 1-30 in *Studies In Social Interaction*, edited by David Sudnow. New York: The Free Press.
- _____. 1974. " On The Origins of The Term 'Ethnomethodology'." in *Ethnomethodology*, edited by Roy Turner. Hammondsworth, England: Penguin.
- _____. 1988. " Evidence for Locally Produced, Naturally Accountable Phenomena of Order, Logic, Reason, Meaning, Method etc. in and as the Essential Quiddity of Immortal Ordinary Society: An Announcement of Studies." *Sociological Theory* 6: 103-109.
- Garfinkel, Harold and Harvey Sacks. 1970. " On Formal Properties of Practical Action." Pp. 338-66 in *Theoretical Sociology*, edited by J.C. McKinney and E.A. Teriyakian New York: Appleton - Century - Crofts.
- Gergen, K.J. 1985. " Social Constructionist Inquiry: Content and Implications" in *The Social Construction of The Person*, edited by K.T. Gergen and K.E. Davis New York: Springer-Verlag.

- Giddens, Anthony. 1981. *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*. Berkely: University of California Press.
- _____. 1984. *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, Anthony and Jonathan Turner (eds). 1987. *Social Theory Today*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gilbert, G.N. and M. Mulkay. 1984. *Opening Pandora's Box: A Sociological Analysis of Scientist's Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goode, David. 1979. "The World of the Congenitally Deaf-Blind: Toward the Grounds for Achieving Human Understanding." Pp. 381-397 in *Qualitative Sociology*, edited by Howard Schwartz and Jerry Jacobs. New York: The Free Press.
- Goode, David. 1990. "On Understanding Without Words: Communication Between a Deaf-Blind Child and Her Parents." *Human Studies* 13 (1): 1-38.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. 1975. "Sociology and The Everyday Life." Pp. 417-32 in *The Idea of Social Structure*, edited by Lewis A. Coser. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Greene, Lawrence J.[1982] 1987. *Learning Disabilities and Your Child*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.
- Gresham, Frank M. 1992. "Social Skills And Learning Disabilities: Causal, Concomitant or Correlational?" *School Psychology Review* 21 (3): 348-60.
- Griffin, Margaret and Frank Humphrey. 1978. "Talk and Talk." in *Functional Language and Education in the Early Years*, edited by R. Shuy and M. Griffin. Final Report to The Carnegie Corporation of New York. Arlington, Virginia: Centre For Applied Linguistics.
- Griffiths, A.N. 1970. "Self-Concept in Remedial Work With Dyslexic Children." *Academic Therapy* 6:125-133.
- Grossmann, Reinhardt. 1984. *Phenomenology and Existentialism: An Introduction*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Gumperz, J.J. 1964. "Linguistics and Social Interaction In Two Communities." *American Anthropologist* 166: 6.
- Gurney, Peter. 1987. "Self-Esteem Enhancement in Children: A review of Research Findings." *Educational Research* 29 (2): 130-136.

- Halechko, A.D. 1977. "Self-Esteem and Perception of Parental Behavior in Children With Learning Disabilities." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 38:359B (University Microfilms No. 77-15, 246.)
- Hallahan, D. and J. M. Kaufman. 1986. *Exceptional Children: Introduction to Special Education*. (4th. ed.) Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentive-Hall.
- Hammersley, Martyn. 1992. *What's Wrong With Ethnography?* London: Routledge.
- Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. 1983. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. London: Tavistock.
- Hatch, Evelyn and Michael H. Long. 1980. "Discourse Analysis, What's That?" Pp1-40 in *Discourse Analysis in School Language Research*, edited by Diane Larson Freeman . Rowley Ma: Newbury House.
- Haynes, Norris and James Comer. 1990. "The Effects of a School Development Program on Self-Concept." *The Yale Journal of Biology And Medicine*: 208-11.
- Heap, James. 1980. *What Counts as Reading: Limits To Certainty In Assessment*. Unpublished ms., Depts of Sociology, Ontario Institutes For Studies in Education and University of Toronto.
- _____. 1985. *Discourse In The Production of Classroom Knowledge: Reading Lessons*. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Heap, James L. and Phillip Roth "On Phenomenological Sociology." *American Sociological Review* 42: 854-867.
- Heritage, John. 1983. "Accounts In Action." Pp. 117-31 in *Accounts and Actions*, edited by G.N. Gilbert and P. Abell. Aldershot, England: Gower Press.
- _____. 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- _____. 1987. "Ethnomethodology." Pp. 224-272 in *Social Theory Today*, edited by Anthony Giddens and Jonathan H. Turner. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Heyman, Richard D. 1980. "Ethnomethodology: Some Suggestions For Sociology of Education." *Journal of Educational Thought* 14 (1):44-48.
- _____. 1983. "Clarifying Meaning Through Classroom Talk." *Curriculum Inquiry* 13: 23-42.

- _____. 1990. "The Problem of Locating Ethnicity in Talk." *Sociolinguistics* 19.
- Heyman, Wendy B. 1990. "The Self-Perception of a Learning Disability and Its Relationship to Academic Self-Concept and Self-Esteem." *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 23 (8): 472-475.
- Hilbert, Richard A. 1990. "Ethnomethodology and The Micro-Macro Order." *American Sociological Review* 55: 794-808.
- Hood, Lois, Ray McDermott and Michael Cole. 1980. "Let's Try To Make It A Good Day." *Discourse Processes* 3: 155-168.
- Hunter, E.J. and L.C. Johnson. 1971. "Developmental and Psychological Differences Between Readers and Non-Readers." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 4:572-577.
- Husserl, Edmund. 1970. *Logical Investigations*. Translated by J.N.Findley 2 Vols. New York: Humanities Press.
- Jackson, D. 1984. *Self-Esteem and Meaning: A Life Historical Investigation*. Albany, New York: SUNY Press.
- Knorr-Cetina, K. and A. V. Cicourel. 1981. *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- LaGreca, A.M. 1987. "Children With Learning Disabilities: Interpersonal Skills and Social Competence." *Journal of Reading, Writing, and Learning Disabilities International* 3:167-85.
- LaGreca, Annette M. and Wendy L. Stone. 1990. "L.D. Status and Achievement: Confounding Variables in the Study of Children's Social Status, Self-Esteem, and Behavioral Functioning." *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 23 (8): 483-490.
- LaGreca, A.M. and S. Vaughn. 1992. "Beyond Greetings And Making Friends: Social Skills From a Broader Perspective." In *Intervention Research With Students With Learning Disabilities: An International Perspective*, edited by B. Wong, New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Labov, William and David Fanshel. 1977. *Therapeutic Discourse*. New York: Academic Press.
- Landau, S., and L.A. Moore. 1991. "Social Skill Deficits in Children With Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder." *School Psychology Review* 20:235-251.

- Landau, Steven and Cecile McAninch. 1993. " Young Children With Attention Deficits." *Young Children*. May 1993.
- Lasen, S.C., R. Parker and S. Jorjorian. 1973. " Differences in Self-Concept of Normal and Learning Disabled Children." *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 37: 510.
- Leiter, Kenneth C.W. 1974. " Ad Hocing in the Schools: A Study of Placement Practices in the Kindergartens of Two Schools." Pp. 17-75 in *Language Use and School Performance*, edited by A. Cicourel New York: Academic Press Inc.
- _____. 1980. *A Primer on Ethnomethodology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lemert, Charles C. 1979. *Sociology and The Twilight of Man*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Levinson, S.C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyon, Mark and Nan T. MacDonald. 1990. " Academic Self-Concept As a Predictor of Achievement For A Sample of Elementary School Students." *Psychological Reports* 66: 1135-42.
- Macbeth, Douglas H. 1991. " Teacher Authority As Practical Action." *Linguistics And Education* 3: 281-313.
- _____. 1992. " Classroom Floors: Material Organizations as a Course of Affairs." *Qualitative Sociology* 15 (2): 123-150.
- _____. 1994. " Classroom Encounters With The Unspeakable: Do You See Danelle?" *Discourse Processes* 17: 311-335.
- MacKay, Robert. 1974. " Standardized Tests: Objective / Objectified Measures of Competence" Pp. 218-47. in *Language Use And School Performance*, edited by A. Cicourel. New York: Academic Press.
- Marsh, H.W. 1986. " Global Self-Esteem: It's Relation to Specific Facets of Self-Concept and Their Importance." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51: 1224-36.
- Marsh, H.W. 1990. " Causal Ordering of Academic Self-Concept and Academic Achievement: A Multiwave , Longitudinal Path Analysis." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 82:646-56.
- Maslow, A.H. 1970. *Motivation And Personality* (2nd. ed.) New York: Harper and Row.

- McHoul, A.W. 1978. "The Organization of Turns at Formal Talk in The Classroom." *Language and Society* 7: 182-213.
- _____. 1982. *Telling How Texts Talk: Essays On Reading And Ethnomethodology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- McKinney, J.D., S. McClure, and L. Feagans. 1982. "Classroom Behavior of Learning Disabled Children." *Learning Disability Quarterly* 5:45-52.
- Mehan, Hugh. 1974. "Accomplishing Classroom Lessons." Pp. 76-142 in *Language Use And School Performance*, edited by A. Cicourel New York: Academic Press.
- _____. 1979. *Learning Lessons*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 1983. "The Role of Language and The Language of Role in Institutional Decision Making." *Language In Society* 12: 187-211.
- _____. 1990. "The Schools Work in Sorting Out Students." Pp. 71-90 in *Talk and Social Structure*, edited by D. Boden and D.H. Zimmerman. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Mehan, Hugh. and Houston Wood. 1975. *The Reality of Ethnomethodology*. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Mehan, Hugh, Alma Hertweck and J. Lee Meihls. 1986. *Handicapping The Handicapped*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Mercer, C.D. 1987. *Students With Learning Disabilities*. (3rd. ed.) Columbus, Oh: Merrill.
- Merry, Sally Engle. 1990. *Getting Justice and Getting Even*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, Gale. 1994. "Toward Ethnographies of Institutional Discourse." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 23 (3):280-306.
- Molotch, Harvey and Dierdre Boden. 1985. "Talking Social Structure." *American Sociological Review* 50: 573-88.
- Morvitz, Edward and Robert W. Motta. 1992. "Predictors of Self-Esteem: The Roles of Parent Child Perceptions, Achievement, and Class Placement." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 25 (1): 72- 80.
- Murtaugh, Michael. 1988. "Achievement Outside the Classroom: The Role of

- Nonacademic Activities in the Lives of High School Students." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 19 (4): 382-95.
- Natanson, Maurice. 1973. "Introduction" in A. Schutz *Collected Papers I: The Problem Of Social Reality*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff: xxv-vlvii.
- O'Malley, J. and L. Eisenberg. 1973. "The Hyperkinetic Syndrome." *Seminars in Psychiatry* 5:95-103.
- Parker J. G. and S.R. Asher. 1987. "Peer Relations and Later Personal Adjustment: Are Low Accepted Children At Risk?" *Psychological Bulletin* 102: 357-59.
- Payne, G. And D. Hustler. 1980. "Teaching the Class: The Practical Management of a Cohort." *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. 1: 49-66.
- Peck, David G. 1981. "Adolescent Self-Esteem, Emotional Learning Disabilities and Significant Others." *Adolescence* xvi: 62.
- Pollner, Melvin. 1975. "The Very Coinage of Your Brain: The Anatomy of Reality Disjunctures." *Philosophy of The Social Sciences* 4: 35-54.
- _____. 1987. *Mundane Reason: Reality In Everyday and Sociological Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Potter, Jonathan and Margaret Wetherell. 1987. *Discourse and Social Psychology*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Priel, Beatrice and Tamar Leshem. 1990. "Self-Perception of First and Second Grade Children With Learning Disabilities." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 23 (10): 637-642.
- Rawls, Anne Warfield. 1987. "The Interaction Order Sui Generis." *Sociological Theory* 5: 136-49.
- Renick, Mari Jo. 1987. "Measuring the Relationship Between Academic Self-Perceptions and Global Self-Worth: The Self-Perception Profile for Learning Disabled Students". Paper presented at the Society for Research in Child Development. Baltimore, M.D.
- Renick, Mari Jo and Susan Harter. 1989. "Impact of Social Comparisons on the Developing Self-Perceptions of Learning Disabled Students." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 81 (4): 631-638.
- Ribner, S. 1978. "The Effects of Special Class Placement on the Self-Concept of

- Exceptional Children." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 11:319-323.
- Rist, Ray C. 1977. " On Understanding The Processes of Schooling: The Contributions of Labeling Theory." Pp. 292-305 in *Power and Ideology in Education*, edited by Jerome Karabel and A.H. Halsey. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ritzer, George (ed). 1990. *Frontiers of Social Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ritzer, George. 1992. *Sociological Theory* (3rd.ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Rogers, C.R. 1951. *Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications and Theory*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, H., and D.H. Saklofske. 1985. "Self-Concepts, Locus of Control and Performance Expectations of L.D. Children." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 18:273-278.
- Rosenthal, J.H. 1973. "Self-Esteem in Dyslexic Children." *Academic Therapy* 9:27-39.
- Roth, David. 1974. " Intelligence Testing as a Social Activity." Pp. 143-217 in *Language Use And School Performance*, edited by A.Cicourel New York: Academic Press.
- Rubin, Rosalyn A., Jeanne Dorle and Susanne Sandidge. 1977. " Self-EsteemAnd School Performance." *Psychology In The Schools* 14 (4): 503-507.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1972. " An Initial Investigation of the Usability of Conversational Data for Doing Sociology." Pp. 31-74 in *Studies in Social Interaction*, edited by David Sudnow New York: The Free Press.
- _____. 1974. " On the Analyzability of Stories by Children." in *Ethnomethodology*, edited by Roy Turner. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.
- Sacks, Harvey, E. A. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. 1974. " A Simplist Systematics for the Organisation of Turn-Taking for Conversation." *Language* 50: 696-735.
- Sater, G.M. and D.C. French. 1989. "A Comparison of the Social Competences of Learning Disabled and Low Achieving Elementary Aged Children." *Journal of Special Education* 23:29-42.
- Schegloff, E. A. 1987. " Between Micro and Macro: Contexts and Other Connections." Pp. 207-234 in *The Micro-Macro Link*, edited by Alexander et al Berkely: University of California Press.

- _____. 1991. 'Reflections on Talk and Social Structure.' Pp. 44-70 in *Talk and Social Structure*, edited by D. Boden and D.H. Zimmerman. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. and Harvey Sacks. 1973. "Opening Up Closings." *Semiotica* 8 (4):289-327.
- Schlechty, Phillip C. 1991. *Schools for the Twenty-First Century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Schurr, K.T., R.C. Towne and L.M. Joiner. 1972. "Trends in Self-Concept of Ability Over Two Years of Special Class Placement." *The Journal of Special Education* 6: 161- 166.
- Schutz, A. 1962. *Collected Papers I: The Problem of Social Reality*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff
- _____. 1964. *Collected Papers II*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- _____. 1966. *Collected Papers III*. The Haque: Martinus Nijhoff.
- _____. [1932] 1967. *The Phenomenology of The Social World* translated by G Walsh and F. Lehnert, Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.
- _____. 1970. *Reflections on the Problem of Relevance*, edited, annotated with introduction by Richard M. Zaner. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Schutz, Alfred and Thomas Luckmann. 1973. *The Structure of The Life World*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.
- Schwartz, Howard and Jerry Jacobs. 1979. *Qualitative Sociology*. New York: The Free Press.
- Serafica, Felicisima C. and Norman I. Harway. 1979. "Social Relations and Self-Esteem of Children With Learning Disabilities." *Journal Of Clinical Child Psychology* 3: 227-33.
- Shavelson, R.J., J.J. Hubner and G.C. Stanton. 1976. "Self-Concept: Validation of Construct Interpretations." *Review of Educational Research* 46: 407-41.
- Shavelson, R.J. and R. Bolus. 1982. "Self-Concept: The Interplay of Theory and Methods." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 74: 3-17.

- Sharrock, W. and R. Anderson. 1986. *The Ethnomethodologists*. Chichester, Eng.: Ellis Horwood.
- Silverman, David. 1987. *Communication and Medical Practice*. Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.
- _____. 1989. "Six Rules of Qualitative Research: A Post-Romantic Argument." *Symbolic Interaction* 12 (2): 215-20.
- Silverman, R.G. 1978. "An Investigation of Self-Concept in Urban, Sub-Urban and Rural Students With Learning Disabilities." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 38:5398A, (University Microfilms No. 78-01, 877)
- Sinclair, J. McH. And M. Coulthard. 1975. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Siperstein, G.R., M. Bopp and J. Bak. 1978. "Peers Rate LD Children on Who is the Smartest, Best Looking and Most Athletic." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 10:98-102.
- Smith, Joel. 1991. "A Methodology for the Twenty-First Century." *Social Forces*. 70 (1): 1- 17.
- Stewart, M., F. Pitts, A. Craig and A. Dieruf. 1966. "The Hyper-active Child Syndrome." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 36: 861-67.
- Stone, W.L. and A.M. LaGreca. 1990. "The Social Status Of Children With Learning Disabilities: A Reexamination." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 23:32-7.
- Streitz, Jean A. And Tulita P. Owen. 1992. "School Activities and Work: Effects on Adolescent Self-Esteem." *Adolescence*: 27: 105
- Sudnow, David. 1972. *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: The Free Press.
- Synder, Eldon E. and Elmer Spreitz. 1992. "Social Psychological Concomitants of Adolescents' Role Identities As Scholars And Athletes. A Longitudinal Analysis." *Youth And Society* 23 (4): 507-22.
- Vandenberg, Donald. (1990). *Education as a Human Right*. New York: Teachers College Columbia University.
- Vaughn, S. and L.M. LaGreca. 1988. "Teaching Social Skills to LD Students" in *Learning Disabilities: State of The Art and Practice*, edited by K.A.Kavale. San Diego:

College Hill Press.

- Veroff, J. and J. B. Veroff. 1980. *Social Incentives*. New York: Academic Press.
- Walker, Elaine. 1991. "Changing Self-Esteem: The Impact of Self-Esteem Change on At Risk Student's Achievement." Newark Board of Education. N.J. Office of Research, Evaluation and Testing.
- Wagner, Mary 1990. "The School Programs and School Performance of Secondary Students Classified as Learning Disabled: Findings From the National Longitudinal Transition Study of Special Education Students." A paper presented to Division G, American Educational Research Association annual meeting Boston: Mass.
- Weller, C. 1980. "Discrepancy and Severity in the Learning Disabled: A Consolidated Perspective." *Learning Disability Quarterly* 3:84-90.
- Wender, Paul H. 1987. *The Hyperactive Child Adolescent and Adult*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Werry, J. 1968. "Developmental Hyperactivity." *Pediatric Clinic of North America* 15 (3): 81-99.
- Wieder, D.L. 1974. *Language and Social Reality*. The Hague: Mouton
- Wilson, Thomas P. 1971. "Normative and Interpretive Paradigms in Sociology." Pp. 57-80 in *Understanding Everyday Life*, edited by J. Douglas. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- _____. 1990. "Social Structure and The Sequential Organization of Interaction." Pp. 22-43 in *Talk and Social Structure*, edited by D. Boden and D.H. Zimmerman. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Winzer, Margaret. 1993. *Children With Exceptionalities*. Scarborough: Prentice Hall Canada Inc.
- Zimmerman, D. H. 1978. "Ethnomethodology" *American Sociologist*. 13: 5-15.
- _____. 1988. "On Conversation: The Conversation Analytic Perspective" *Communication Handbook* 11: 406-432
- Zimmerman, D. H. and D. Lawrence Wieder. 1971. "Ethnomethodology and The Problem of Social Order: Comment to Denzin." Pp. 285-98 in *Understanding Everyday Life*, edited by J. Douglas. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Zimmerman, Don H. and Melvin Pollner. 1971. "The Everyday World as a Phenomenon"
Pp. 80-104 in *Understanding Everyday Life*, edited by J. Douglas. London:
Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Zimmerman, D.H. and Dierdre Boden. 1990. "Structures in Action" Pp. 3-21 in *Talk and
Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*, edited by
D.Boden and D.H. Zimmerman. Cambridge: Polity Press.

APPENDIX

Segment 1.

1: B: 2:

- 034 1. T: Got a deal for ya
 2. Ss: ((ya::h what::))
 3. T: Did a good job here (1) Do you want to play round the world
 4. () add and chis together?
 5. Ss: Yeah
 6. T: and then you can play heads up seven up for a while ()
 7. Ss: // (yeah yay)
 8. An: // it's ten o'clock
 9. T: // you guys
 10. deserve it
 11. An: It's ten o' clock
 12. T: ok ? so
 13. An // it's ten o'clock
 14. T: Who read the time first?
 15. An: // me
 16. T: // Robert? (1) oh who was it
 17. Ss: Andrew Andrew
 18. T: Andrew reading that clock good job ok whose ready
 19. let me see here Jake you can touch Robert's desk and we'll
 20. Ja: // no:::o
 21. T: // go around
 22. this way
 23. Ja: It's gonna be (tough)
 24. T Ready? It's gonna be either *add* or *chis* it's gonna be a
 25. surprise (1) give me the sound at the top of the front stairs
 26. Ja: ee
 27. Ro: //ee
 28. T: Jake
 29. Ro: // ((a::h:::))
 30. T: ten times four
 31. Al:
 32. Ja: forty
 33. T: *Jake.*
 34. Ja: I beat him?
 35. T: Give me a windy sound
 36. St:
 37. Ja: wh:: wh::
 38. T: Ja:ke
 39. S?: be careful

40. S?: // be careful about (her)
 41. T: five times three
 42. Ca: fifteen
 43. Ja: // I knew something was gonna happen
 44. T: six times zero
 45. Ca: zero
 46. Su: (1)// zero
 47. Ss: ((general noise and excitement))
 48. T: give me a- (.) oh Excuse me I can't hear myself think over
 49. here, give me a quiet tip tapper.
 50. Su: t t t
 51. Ca: // t t
 52. T: Su::sann I need a sound at the top of the back stairs
 53. Su: oo::
 54. Ma: // um oo
 55. T: Susan
 56. Je: // good job
 57. T: // give me the sound in the basement
 58. St: umm:
 59. Su: // a
 60. St: // ah
 61. T: Susan.
 62. S?: // yeah Su:: san
 63. Ja: yeah fo:rr ()
 64. Ca: // Susan
 65. T: give me (.) a nose sound
 66. Ca: (1) n nn:
 67. Su: (1) n n
 68. T: tie give me a quiet skinny sound
 69. Cm: // sh::
 70. Su: // sh
 71. T: tie six times zero
 72. Cm: zero
 73. Su: // zero
 74. Ss: // Cam's got (it)
 75. T: Cam just by a hair
 76. Cm: // now don't (give me)
 77. T: two times four
 78. Cm: ummm: ummm:
 79. An: // eight. I can't believe that
 80. T: Andrew
 81. An: // I can't believe that ()
 82.. T: nine times one

83. An: nine
84. Al: // nine
- 056 85. T: just by a hair (.) nine times three
[giggles and chatter]
86. Ja: twenty seven [laughter and looking at times table chart]
87. An: // twenty seven [jumping around and pushing]
- 057 88. T: that's getting a little out of hand guys
89. Su: hey take off the ()
90. T: thanks good problem solving Susan [to boys] you need to
91. use your chis not that () Jake. We'll give them
92. another one (3) nine times four
93. Ja: um: thirty seven
94. T: go Andrew
95. An: // twenty seven (.) I mean thirty six
96. T: yep
97. An: ye::ss
[general noise in the room T looks at T2 and addresses the next remark to her]
98. T: and Jake just let's it let's it uh affect him huh you don't even
99. do it (1) four times zero
100. An: zero
101. Su: // zero
102. T: go Andrew (2) nine times three
103. An: umm twenty seven
104. Ca: // twent- (o:hhhh) I would call that a tie
105. T: Andrew no he got it out there before you did (2) six times
106. zero
107. An: Zero
108. Cm: // Zero
109. Ma: // Zero
110. T: Why were there three people yelling here
111. An: Cam
112. Ma: //Cam
113. Cm: I don't - I don't know (.) Mary was over there and she
114. stood in front-
115. T: ok ok (no Andrew's) and now (you're) touching Cam's
116. desk six times two
117. Cm: six times two I don't know the six times- I don't know the -
118. An: // eighteen eighteen
119. Cm: // I don't know the the six-
120. T: // you know the twos ? six
121. times two
122. Cm: eighteen
123. An: // twelve twelve

124. S?: Andrew?
 125. Ca: *Susan get him get him Susan*
 126. T: give me a noisy scraper
 127. Su: m: (()) scraper gg:
 128. An: // (())
 129. T: Andrew
 130. Ca: aw come on Robert get him
 131. An: I already made a round
 132. T: four times one
 133. An: // four
 134. T: (3) An:dr:ew round of applause for Andrew
 [round of applause]

Segment 2

1: B: 5:

- 356 1. T: forty six (.) forty eight (.) *fifty?* Clear K you guys that's the
 2. two times tables on your fingers (1) ok this is what we're
 3. doing here folks (1) We gonna do the (1) same the same
 4. thing we've done this week for math and then next week
 5. instead of updating (.) um (.) ti:me and reviewing time (.)
 6. Who thinks they can guess what we might review next week
 7. What's another biggie important one that we we'll need to
 8. remember? Jake can you think of one?
 9. Ja: ()
 10. T: Andrew.
 11. An: the six times table
 12. T: ok besides chis honey (1) not chis (2) Ok something we
 13. learned we'll review (fractions times) fractions later (.)
 14. Carolyn?
 15. Ca: division?
 16. T: We never did division yet honey (2) K try and think of
 17. something else. What was another biggie we did and we
 18. played store (over) there and stuff (1) Jenny?
 19. Je: money
 20. Pe: // money
 21. T: Mo:ney that's what we're gonna review next week
 22. Ja: oh no
 23. T: well Jake the reason- (1) I'm gonna give everybody a second
 24. to recheck themselves cause some of us are really not where
 25. we should be right now. We all know where we should be
 26. thank you (.) yes Andrew
 27. An: (can we have) umm round the world um math and time
 28. T: Well honey you know what we'll do there (.) We have reading

29. buddies next ummm what time is it? Can somebody tell me
 30. what time it is I can hardly see that clock (3) Andrew?
 31. An: It is umm (1) I Kno::w
 32. S?: // eleven forty five eleven forty five
 33. T: // O my goodness major static Andrew what time is
 34. it?
 35. An: Eleven forty five
 36. T: Is it eleven forty five?
 37. An: // no?
 38. T: // Is it eleven forty five?
 39. Ja: ten forty five
 40. An: // ten forty five
 41. T: umm Jake I'm gonna ask you I know that you know it but
 42. you need to keep it in hon great job though you guys
 43. remembering that ok. um (.) actually we don't even have
 44. time for chis today I'm just gonna quickly review the six
 45. times tables with my kids ok (1) my six times group the rest
 46. of you to be working on your time booklet's (1) ok.
 47. Su: But I'm all done
 389 48. T: Most important I'm gonna give you another one working on
 49. quarter hours

Segment 3

3: A: 3:

- 107 1. T1: () come up with some ideas you guys know what's
 2. goin on Andrew?
 3. An: ummm one page:: (1) journal.
 4. T1: Ok uh so I'll just put journal (1) K good one Andrew. Jenny
 5. Je: art?
 6. T1: K. no I want something like I said that is work after you're
 7. done three work things on here (.) then (.) like we always do
 8. you could do reading or art or drawing or whatever we have to
 9. do three (2) big things first Robert.
 10. Ro: uhh one page (1) time and (.) money?
 11. T1: Ok time or money go:od for you (3) time or money booklets?
 12. S?: (5) time or (1) can you do both?
 13. T1: Well time and yeah. Don't forget all of this means one full page
 14. (1) How many pages of corrections is one full page? (1) Jenny.
 15. Je: A booklet um one page is (2) four pages
 16. T1: Four pages of corrections is one page
 17. Je: What if you only have one page?
 18. T1: Ok we:ll (.) then you gonna have to:: (.) figure something else
 19. out you guys know that (3) actually before I continue on up

20. here (we) have some great things I'm gonna ask everyone to put
 21. your certificates away they're quite distracting to some of you
 22. (right now) umm Carolyn darling where should your eyeballs be
 23. right now honey thank you. (4) *Ok* Steven?
 24. St: ummm uh () chis and handwriting
 25. An: // oh oh oh oh oh
 26. T1: Good um (.) actually if you guys want to sit on top of your
 27. desks right now that's cool [students move to top of desks]
 28. chis (.) handwriting printing ok (4) what else. (.) Alex?
 29. Al: umm(.) umm(.) umm(.)
 30. T1: // what did you do last night for homework?
 31. Al: (2) um we uh
 32. T1: *Oh* I'm asking Alex
 33. Al: (the quiz)
 34. T1: The sheets (.) *Ok* you can work on those the compound words
 35. and all that
 36. An: I'm done that
 37. T1: What else? did we use. (.) have we not done for a while and
 38. some of you aren't done that sort of thing compound words (.)
 39. homonyms blah blah blah blah (1) member?
 40. An: (cut and glue)
 41. T1: Cut and glue there's a bunch of cut and glue books (.) booklet's
 42. back there to do with contractions compound words (1) etc.etc.
 43. Je: I finished those
 44. An: // I finished those
 45. T1: Yeah but a lot of people have a couple of pages left or whatever
 46. so cut out booklets. (6) What else could you poss ibly work on
 47. during your independent work time here. (2) Oh I'm just going
 48. (to) wait for hands up. Robert?
 49. Ro: uhh (3) (hh) umm our umm uh animal ()
 50. T1: // your animal research
 51. project. anything else you guys can think of (2) Carolyn?
 52. Ca: umm (we could ask you)
 53. T1: Nope (2) this is total independence I don't want to be involved
 54. here (1) it's all on your own except for the fact that you're lucky
 55. enough to have Sharon in the room but she ain't gonna help
 56. you
 57. An: Yes she is
 58. T1: () well she's not gonna tell you though? [to
 59. Sharon] If they're asking you a question are you gonna tell
 60. them the answer?
 61. Ss: ye::ah
 62. T1: No way

63. An: (you) said she not gonna be able to help us
64. T1: Oh? no she'll help you but she won't tell you the answer
65. T2: She'll support you
66. An: She lies
67. T1: (3) I really like the way that Alex (.) Jenny (.) Mary are really
68. keepin it together and Susan you're waiting so patiently with
69. your hand up that is great (2) that is great (.) Susan
70. Su: uhh (then maybe if you- after? maybe we're done our three
71. things) everybody () around the world of all that stuff?
72. T1: Ok? an assorted around the world we could do after ok. (1)
73. How about your environment booklets in science?
74. Ss: no no oh no::
75. T1: // Oh no whoa whoa whoa it's up to you guys you have
76. to pick three of these things and do them properly (3) K? I want
77. everybody to look up and pick your three. I don't want any
78. talking til one min- no no no in your desks
79. Je: // you said look up here-
80. T1: I didn't say come up here I said look up here
- [noise and chatter (8)]
81. Je: o::h we forgot to put phonics up
82. T1: I'm (1) I'm confused here.(1) can everyone get in listening
83. position for a minute. (2) I'm totally confused (1) Susan what
84. did I just ask everybody to do?
85. Su: get in listening position
86. T1: Ye:ah but right before that I said everybody look up here and
87. what.
88. Su: (1) (think) what you're gonna do
89. T1: ok. (.) did I say go get your stuff yet?
90. Su: No
91. T1: // No did I say get out of your desk.
92. S?: no no:::o
93. T1: // Ok so that's why I'm confused (1) K everyone in listening
94. position eyeballs up here? Giving you one minute to pick your
95. three things K? [noise] () K(.) yeah and we forgot
96. phonics yes (3) K I'm timing you now. (.) one minute (.) and I
97. want you to know so you can go and get them (3) [chatter]
98. Robert (.) and Steven you need to sit one minute isn't up yet. (.)
99. I will tell you when you can get your stuff
100. An: (5) (got up from my desk) [giggles]
101. T1: Excuse me Sharon? what? did I just say?
102. Sh: Look up on the board and get three things (you didn't say get
103. your stuff) or get your stuff or get your stuff out
104. An: You never said get

105. T1: // Someone in this room understood me it's really cool.
 106. An: She said look on the board (Sharon said) look on the board and
 107. get three things
 108. T1: Well (.) it looks like Peter is doing his job Peter () you get
 109. your three things? (1) great (.) Can you get them together
 110. darling? yah
 111. Pe: ()
 112. T1: You still have to do three things honey but you can do your free
 113. times first (3) Robert.
 114. Ro: what's this?
 188 115. T1: [gestures] K go to work

Segment 4

3: B: 7:

- 240 1. An: (you) read I write
 241 2. Ca: Ok circle (1) r n
 3. An: I know I know ()
 4. T: try not to sit by anybody else be by yourselves
 5. Ca: poor double o
 6. An: poor.
 7. Ca: yeah o-o-r o-o-r o (.) o-r
 8. An: I got another one ()
 9. Ca: umm (7) double consonant (1) passing pas - s (1) ing you got
 10. two of them again [Andrew is writing]
 11. T: You need to read to (.) gether. (1) you need (.) to (.) read (.)
 12. the (.) book (.) together folks that's part of it
 13. Ca: (oh hah) You have to read the book (together) (2) K?
 14. An: yu- you read I write
 15. Ca: Ok. [reading] cross the stream
 271 16. An: Jake having a (fun) time? (1) I'm not [gestures at Carolyn]
 273 - 281 [Carolyn continues to read]
 17. Ca: (then one man) close to () city thin thin t h
 18. An: what
 19. Ca: thin t h
 20. An: thin thhh
 21. Ca: ok ok
 22. An: DAN ? (.) having a fun time ?
 289 - 295 [Carolyn continues to read as Andrew tries to get Jake's attention]
 295 23. T: Andrew are you reading with Carolyn darling?
 24. An: I don't know how to read ()
 25. T: K well (1) Carolyn
 [Andrew gets up from his chair and moves about a metre away from T and Carolyn]

26. Ca: What.
27. T: How do you need to work (1) with (.) Andrew?
[Andrew leaves the vicinity and goes to the book corner]
28. Ca: But uh I but this is an easy book and he says he can't read it .
29. T: (3) Carolyn? (.) is everything that's easy for you easy for
30. everybody else?
31. Ca: I know but I know how
32. T: // no Carolyn is everything that's easy for you
33. Ca: // No:::oo
34. T: easy for everybody else
35. Ca: no:::oo
36. T: // K you need to look at me for a moment. so if you're in a
37. partnership what do you need to do.
38. Ca: (pick a book) both of us to read the book but I know how
39. T: // could
40. you help Andrew to read would that be a possibility?
41. Ca: I was going to but he said he didn't wanna read(.) didn't wanna
42. read.
43. T: well you need to work to help him fit in the group here ok.
44. An: [returns with book] Zoom I got one you read I read you read
45. that hot [Carolyn leans over Andrews book to help] two two
46. (in a word) in a word yay!
[Andrew starts to read and identify sounds to be written down]
47. Ca: hot?
48. An: I made this. (1) I made this one up (.) myself
49. Ca: (you made up yourself)?
50. An: yeah
51. Ca: no Andrew you did not
52. An: () this is the one I made up. (1 yeah it's it's no hot it's that
53. word in a word yay that's what I
54. Ca: // ot? ot?
55. An: made up
56. Ca: that is not a word
57. An: no (1) two ohh a word in a word
58. Ca: that's not two (.) it's no (.) it's hoot hoot. too is the other way
59. An: t-o-o
60. Ca: o (4) K um Harry H-
61. An: no I'm um double r
62. Ca: yeah double consonant
63. An: Now you read (you go) you read
64. Ca: // but-
65. An: You read it
66. Ca: // (bike bike)

67. An: Read your own book
68. Ca: We supposed to be in partnership you know we're gettin marks
69. An: Yeah so I don't care (1) you read your own book
70. Ca: (but we'll) get checks
71. An: You read your own book (1) uh double one
72. Ca: Andrew I want to get checks
73. An: You read your own book
74. Ca: Andrew.
75. An: Your own book
76. Ca: (2) Andrew
77. An: read your own book
78. Ca:
- 332 79. An: No you read (.) it's ok if you read one and I read one she
80. doesn't mind
- [both work on their own books for about two minutes]
- 345 81. An: Zoom Zoom (12) Zo:o:om two zooms (5) (word in word)
82. ye::ah I like my words in word (2) there's at in em (15) (l.l.k)
83. Ca: Andrew marry marry
84. An: K
85. Ca: marry
86. An: I know how to spell that
87. Ca: m- a- double r
88. An: m-a (2) there marry (2) marry is that marry?
89. Ca: (3) ok something from your book
90. An: K zoom another zoom
91. Ca: // (fill) fill K if you already got one zoom we
92. can't (do) zoom again
93. An: (4) Is that how you spell fill.
94. Ca: f-i-l-l
95. An: f-i-l-l K and (zoom)
96. Ca: No we already got zoom
- 373 97. An: so what?
- [both go back to individual reading]
- 375 98. An: so (1) what other word? (7) (are them)
99. Ca: come (.) come
100. An: okay (1) come (12) mmm is that how you spell come? um c-u-
101. u-m. no. c u m e (.) o m c o m e
102. An: c- o (1) m e
- 395 103. T: K guys (1) put everything away nicely just relax. and put your
104. sheets on Mrs. B's desk (5) K put everything away nicely

Segment 5

4: B: 4:

- 166 1. T1: [to Peter] Ok let's see your neatest printing darling you need
 2. to get that done K you have a great start keep it up? (.) K
 3. (3) just concentrate on your printing (slow yourself down)
 [On camera but inaudible. Jake is erasing his work]
 4. T2: [to S?] Oh man look at that printing (4) oh that is gorgeous
 5. T1: (..h)! That is most fabulous
 6. T2: Mrs. T? (2) Wol we both have a fabulous thing going on
 7. at the same time look at this writing
 8. T1: Ok
 9. T2: This is totally () yes?
 10. T1: // well just look at this printing (2) now
 11. he had r's that were floating upwards
 12. T2: Is that my Alex?
 13. T1: Yes it is (indeed)
 14. T2: // you've got to be kidding I'm thrilled really (.) hey
 15. Alex (1) give me half a one
 [number of Ss standing around and listening to the exchange between the
 teachers]
 16. Pe: Miss S?
 17. T2: excuse me [moves to Steven's desk]
 18. St: Now what should I do?
 [T2 moves to Steven's desk and glances at Jake's work]
 19. T2: Jake (.) you need to do this (again) (1) Well I'll give you
 20. a choice. (.) that (.) is not (.) your best work I need your best
 21. work
 22. Ja: ()
 23. T2: Yeah I did. Now I want your best printing on these and if it's
 24. not on there this is your choice? (1) you cannot redo it
 25. however you miss () today and you will (do it) Ok
 26. (.) whatever you choose it doesn't matter that's not the point
 27. go ahead you have a choice either you'll do that or you'll
 28. miss () capice?
 29. Ja: ()
 184 30. T2: capice.
 [T2 walks away. Jake continues with work and his level of frustration starts to
 grow visably]
 188 31. Ja: [to Steven] * is that neat?*
 32. St: ** (no)**
 33. Ja: [erases] This pencil is small Carolyn I can't write with it
 34. Ca: what?
 35. Ja: It's too small I can't write
 36. T2: // () that is not Carolyn's problem that's your
 37. problem

38. Ja: (Carolyn's the one that gave it to me)
 39. Ca: Yeah cause he didn't have a pencil
 40. T2: *Ok* (.) No Carolyn that's not your problem you continue on (.)
 41. that's Jake's problem
 42. Ja: ()
 43. T2: [turns to Peter] *Ohh* (.) that printing is absolutely gorgeous
 44. well darling could you colour that in your best coloring use a
 45. different colour for each stripe () stuff that
 46. would look great.
 [moves to Peter's desk with her back to Jake and Steven]
 47. Ja: () [glances toward T2] Oh? oh?
 206 48. T2: [to Jake] you know what Jake I didn't ()
 [Jake leaves the room]

Segment 6

1: B: 5:

- 356 1. T: forty six (.) forty eight (.) *fifty?* Clear K you guys that's the
 2. two times tables on your fingers (1) ok this is what we're
 3. doing here folks (1) We gonna do the (1) same the same
 4. thing we've done this week for math and then next week
 5. instead of updating (.) um (.) ti:me and reviewing time (.)
 6. Who thinks they can guess what we might review next week
 7. What's another biggie important one that we we'll need to
 8. remember? Jake can you think of one?
 9 Ja: ()
 10. T: Andrew.
 11. An: the six times table
 12. T: ok besides chis honey (1) not chis (2) OK something we
 13. learned we'll review (fractions times) fractions later (.)
 14. Carolyn?
 15. Ca: division?
 16. T: We never did division yet honey (2) K try and think of
 17. something else. What was another biggie we did and we
 18. played store (over) there and stuff (1) Jenny?
 19. Je: money
 20. Pe: // money
 21. T: Mo:ney that's what we're gonna review next week
 22. Ja: oh no
 23. T: well Jake the reason- (1) I'm gonna give everybody a second to
 24. recheck themselves cause some of us are really not where we
 25. should be right now. We all know where we should be thank
 26. you (.) yes Andrew
 27. An: (can we have) umm round the world um math and time

28. T: Well honey you know what we'll do there (.) We have reading
 29. buddies next ummm what time is it? Can somebody tell me
 30. what time it is I can hardly see that clock (3) Andrew?
 31. An: It is umm (1) I Kno::w
 32. S?: // eleven forty five eleven forty five
 33. T: // O my goodness major static Andrew what time is
 34. it?
 35. An: Eleven forty five
 36. T: Is it eleven forty five?
 37. An: // no?
 38. T: // is it eleven forty five?
 39. Ja: ten forty five
 40. An: // ten forty five
 41. T: umm Jake I'm gonna ask you I know that you know it but you
 42. need to keep it in hon great job though you guys
 43. remembering that ok. um (.) actually we don't even have time
 44. for chis today I'm just gonna quickly review the six times tables
 45. with my kids ok (1) my six times group the rest of you to be
 46. working on your time booklet's (1) ok.
 47. Su: But I'm all done
 389 48. T: Most important I'm gonna give you another one working on
 49. quarter hours

Segment 7

4: B: 4:

- 166 1. T1: [to Peter] Ok let's see your neatest printing darling you need
 2. to get that done K you have a great start keep it up? (.) K
 3. (3) just concentrate on your printing (slow yourself down)
 [On camera but not audible. Jake is erasing his work]
 4. T2: [to S?] Oh man look at that printing (4) oh that is gorgeous
 5. T1: (..h)! That is most fabulous
 6. T2: Mrs. T.? (2) wol we both have a fabulous thing going on
 7. at the same time look at this writing
 8. T1: Ok
 9. T2: This is totally () yes?
 10. T1: // well just look at this printing (2) now
 11. he had r's that were floating upwards
 12. T2: Is that my Alex
 13. T1: Yes it is (indeed)
 14. T2: // you've got to be kidding I' m thrilled really (.) hey
 15. Alex (1) give me half a one
 [number of Ss standing around listening to the exchange between teachers]
 16. Pe: Miss S?

17. T2: excuse me [moves to Steven's desk]
 18. ST: Now what should I do.
 [T moves to Steven's desk but glances at Jake's work]
 19. T2: Jake (.) you need to do this (again) (1) well I'll give you a
 20. choice. (.) that (.) is not (.) your best work I need your best
 21. work
 22. Ja: ()
 23. T2: Yeah I did. Now I want your best printing on these and if it's
 24. not on there this is your choice? (1) you cannot redo it
 25. however you miss () today and you will (do it) ok
 26. (.) whatever you choose it doesn't matter that's not the point
 27. go ahead you have a choice either you'll do that or you'll
 28. miss () capice?
 28. Ja: ()
 184 29. T2: capice.
 [T2 walks away. Jake continues with his work and his level of frustration
 starts to grow visably]
 188 30. Ja: [to Steven] is that neat?
 31. St ** (no) **
 32. Ja: [erases] This pencil is small Carolyn I can't write with it
 33. Ca: what?
 34. Ja: it's to small I can't write
 35. T2: // () that is not Carolyn's problem that's your
 36. problem
 37. Ja: (Carolyn's the one that gave it to me)
 38. Ca: Yeah cause he didn't have a pencil
 39. T2: *Ok* (.) No Carolyn that's not your problem you continue on (.)
 40. that's Jake's problem
 41. Ja: ()
 42. T2: [turns to Peter] *Ohh* (.) that printing is absolutely gorgeous
 43. well darling could you colour that in your best coloring use a
 44. different colour for each stripe () stuff that
 45. would look great.
 [moves to Peter's desk]
 206 46. Ja: () [glances toward T] Oh? oh?
 47. T2: [to Jake] you know what Jake I didn't ()
 [Jake leaves the room]

Segment 8

I: B: 2:

135. T: no Robert no stay where oh yeah Ok now we'll do hands up
 136. seven up so we'll have our round the world man Andrew (1)
 137. *Birthday* boy yesterday Steven a::nd I need a gi::rl our sick

138. girl yesterday Carolyn - glad to have you back. (1) K you guys?
 139. (.) go for it. head down thumbs up
 [designated students go around touching hands of students with heads down]
- 085 140. An: heads up seven up? (5) no Jenny (2) heads up whoever got
 141. touched stand up (2) ok () Mary
 142. S?: there's three up now
 143. An: ok umm just ()
 144. S?: Cam Cam
 145. Su: // Cam
 146. St: ohhh shoot
 [giggles]
 147. St: (don't) me
 148. An: // I don't know
 149. Ca: // he won't
 150. An: [giggles]
 151. S?: // cheater
 152. S?: it's Andrew
 153. St: // it's Andrew
 154. An: No::o
 155. St: It's Carolyn
 156. An: too bad .
 157. St: Was it you?
 158. An: no:: no::
 159. Ca: yes
 096 160. St: // aw shoot you're telling I told you you should've listened to
 161. ()
 [section not transcribable to much general noise in the classroom]
- 098 162. T: All Ri::ght Ms S's interrupting here Everyone
 163. Sit down
 164. An: * thanks a lot.*
 [general noise and confusion as all take seats]
 165. T: (excuse me) you need to get in listening position (5) I was busy
 166. talking to Ms T. and so I have no (.) clue what happened (here)
 167. all I know is all of a sudden things weren't working
 168. An: I know what happened?
 169. T: Well I don't want to know what happened (2) but I don't like
 170. the way it was dealt with Who figures they were using their
 171. problem solving (skills) ? Didn't sound to me like anybody was
 172. re:ally I want you all to close your eyes and think about how
 173. you could have dealt with this using (good) problem solving
 174. Je: // I didn't do anything
 175. T: I'll go through the steps if you didn't do anything ? you know
 176. what happened up there you still think of a plan (.) ready? What

177. was the problem everybody think of it in your head (1) Andrew
 178. that is not appropriate darling (1) What was the problem think
 179. about it. k? What was the plan that you did use it didn't work
 180. did it.
181. Ss: [in unison] no::o
 182. T: Good. think of another one (3) think of another plan (1)
 183. something that would have worked. K? You know what the
 184. problem was you knew that what you used didn't work (3) k?
 185. think of another plan (.) A good one and go through the steps
 186. til the end of the problem. Who? would like to share their new
 187. plan with me (3) () someone who was involved ()
 188. Cameron what's your new plan.
189. Cm: umm: (just)
 190. Je: // let them guess
 191. T: So you think we could have solved this whole thing (1) by just
 192. not telling who picked who to begin with. So in other words
 193. keeping the mouth shut unless it's your turn. (.) Who thinks that
 194. might be a good plan [several hands up] (3) We all have to
 195. work together when we're playing a game you guys K? Is there
 196. any other plans (1.) Mary.
197. Ma: Umm:: (2)don't call out (people were)
 198. T: // so in other words you could have stopped
 199. the whole situation from happening if there was just no calling
 200. out going on ok Andrew.
201. An: If the people I- if somebody got picked they should go down
 202. (2) cause that was part of the problem um: somebody picked
 203. em and somebody didn't go down and () told () she
 204. guessed you (so) she goes but it's not fair cause they called out
 205. so-
206. T: // Ok but we're going all the way back through the whole
 207. problem Andrew
208. An: // (that's the whole problem)
 209. T: // I just wanna know the new
 210. solution (1) so the new solution is if you actually touch
 211. someone's thumb when they guess your name ((pop)) you
 212. change right ?
213. An: (yep)
 214. T: Ok let me see this one more time the original three people up
 215. there let's do one round and see if you can put this in to use
 216. here. (1) heads down thumbs up
217. An: Carolyn () heads up seven up (.) Mary?
 218. Ma: Steven?
 219. St: // no::o:o

220. An: Susan?
 221. Su: (5) Steven?
 222. St: // ye::ah
 223. An: () [giggles]
 224. Je: Carolyn (2) that's how I knew
 225. An: That was too easy
 149 226. T: Very nice folks get in your desks take your shoes off

Segment 9

- 002 1. T: I'm just going to clarify something right now K [writing on
 2. board] We need to have (.) appropriate behaviour while I'm
 3. teaching ok Jake What's? appropriate behaviour? Can
 4. someone tell me while I'm teaching what's something you
 5. should be doing while I'm teaching you (.) Jenny?
 6. Je: It means (in listening)
 7. T: Stay in listening position very good that let's me know that
 8. you're (.) you're on track Robert what's another ()
 9. Ro: (X ray)
 10. T: *Ok* well
 11. Ro: (that thing)
 12. T: Sorry honey I just took a short commercial message from there
 13. and I just wanna know some of the things you should be doing
 14. while I'm (teaching you)
 15. Ro: // (stay) in listening position listening to you ()
 16. An: Eye contact
 17. T: Andrew put up your hand () Andrew?
 18. An: Eye contact ()
 19. T: Very good that let's me know you're on the ball OK now for
 20. those people who have a hard (time) getting it I'll just teach you
 21. this at recess time ok cause I don't want to waste everyone
 22. else's time unless you're really paying attention ok () so
 23. exam does everyone have their little things on their desk?
 24. S? no ()
 25. T: take em out if you have em what does the x say there(1) stick it
 015 26. up on your forehead (1) x zam

Segment 10

1: B: 4:

- 312 1. T1: K I'm gonna ask everyone to put everything down Ok don't
 2. hold anything in your hands right now (.) uh (.) thank you
 3. Carolyn inappropriate use of that right now. Thank you you're
 4. gonna lose all of your (pals) you're gonna have none (.) life's
 5. rough go put (em) on my desk

6. Ca: ()
 7. T1: Let's go oh yes it's mine (.) it's mine yeah (3) for life (1) actually
 8. I have quite a drawer full
 9. T2: // la collection
 10. T1: of stuff that I could keep for life really (.) I do. too bad I wasn't
 11. like T (who likes to keep it I could make use of it all) ok. that
 12. needs to be put away honey (.) ok? (1) thank you (5) ()
 13. everyone's waiting for you to put your stuff away (3) ok. what?
 14. (.) does listening position include most of you have all of it
 15. down pat except where should these be ? (3) Cam where should
 16. these be.
 17. Cm: (umm) on you
 18. T1: Ok (.) Why (.) can anyone tell me why I want your eyes on me?
 19. (.) Carolyn?
 20. Ca: So that we'll be listening to you
 21. T1: So I know you're listening what does does what does that show
 22. me when you're looking at me when I'm talking you're it's
 23. showing me that what (1) you're showing me what?
 24. Cm: res pect
 25. T1: res pect thank you Cameron *Do* I look at you when you're
 26. talking Cameron
 27. Cm: ya:h
 28. T1: Because I'm showing you ?
 29. S2: Res pect
 30. T1: Right the big R word K that means your hands need to be on
 31. your desk too (.) guys the hands need to () let's go very
 32. good Mary Steven Let's press twenty four everybody watching
 33. my fingers
 34.

338

Segment 11

3: A: 3:

- 107 1. T: () come up with some ideas you guys know what's
 2. goin on Andrew?
 3. An: ummm one page:: (1) journal.
 4. T: Ok uh so I'll just put journal (1) K good one Andrew. Jenny
 5. Je: art?
 6. T: K. no I want something like I said that is work after you're
 7. done three work things on here (.) then (.) like we always do
 8. you could do reading or art or drawing or whatever we have to
 9. do three (2) big things first Robert.
 10. Ro: uhh one page (1) time and (.) money?
 11. T: Ok time or money go:od for you (3) time or money booklets?
 12. S?: (5) time or (1) can you do both?

13. T: Well time and yeah. Don't forget all of this means one full page
 14. (1) How many pages of corrections is one full page? (1) Jenny.
 15. Je: A booklet um one page is (2) four pages
 16. T: Four pages of corrections is one page
 17. Je: What if you only have one page?
 18. T: OK we:ll (.) then you gonna have to:: (.) figure something else
 19. out you guys know that (3) actually before I continue on up
 20. here (we) have some great things I'm gonna ask everyone to put
 21. your certificates away they're quite distracting to some of you
 22. (right now) umm Carolyn darling where should your eyeballs be
 23. right now honey thank you. (4) *Ok* Steven?
 24. St: ummm uh () chis and handwriting
 25. An: // oh oh oh oh oh
 26. T: Good um (.) actually if you guys want to sit on top of your
 27. desks right now that's cool [students move to top of desks]
 28. chis (.) handwriting printing ok (4) what else. (.) Alex?
 29. Al: umm(.) umm(.) umm(.)
 30. T: // what did you do last night for homework?
 31. Al: (2) um we uh
 32. T: *Oh* I'm asking Alex
 33. Al: (the quiz)
 34. T: The sheets (.) *Ok* you can work on those the compound words
 35. and all that
 36. An: I'm done that
 37. T: What else? did we use. (.) have we not done for a while and
 38. some of you aren't done that sort of thing compound words (.)
 39. homonyms blah blah blah blah (1) member?
 40. An: (cut and glue)
 41. T: Cut and glue there's a bunch of cut and glue books (.) booklet's
 42. back there to do with contractions compound words (1) etc.etc.
 43. Je: I finished those
 44. An: // I finished those
 45. T: Yeah but a lot of people have a couple of pages left or whatever
 46. so cut out booklets. (6) What else could you poss ibly work on
 47. during your independent work time here. (2) Oh I'm just going
 48. (to) wait for hands up. Robert?
 49. Ro: uhh (3) (hh) umm our umm uh animal ()
 50. T: // your animal research
 51. project. anything else you guys can think of (2) Carolyn?
 52. Ca: umm (we could ask you)

Segment 12

4: A: 2:

1. T: () every kilogram of bananas you buy is gonna cost
 2. you thirty nine cents (.) now I'm gonna give you guys a really
 3. hard question here (1) If apples (.) cost (1) thirty cents (2) per
 4. kilogram (3) K. and I'll be back in a second I 'll give you a while
 5. to figure this out don't help anybody. do it all on your own use
 6. your chis or use a piece of paper (.) this is (.) How much apples
 7. cost [writes on board] how much would it cost me (1) to buy
 8. (we're) gonna make it real tough eleven kilograms of apples
 9. figure that out (.) I'll be right back. eleven kilograms of apples
 [T leaves the room room. The classroom bursts into activity and chatter as
 they all try to figure it out. The teacher comes back in and addresses the last
 child as he goes back to his desk]
10. T: were you being the teacher Cam
 11. Cm: I's just () it out
 12. Pe: thirty! forty one!
 [hands go up waving and gestulating]
13. T: Who knows (2) how much would it cost to buy eleven
 14. kilograms of apples Peter.
 15. Pe: forty (.) one
 16. T: forty one cents?
 17. Pe: Yeah
 18. T: K does any one else have a guess.
 19. An: uh um I still have to figure it out
 20. T: Anyone else have a guess if you still have to do go ahead Mary?
 21. Ma: fifty
 22. T: K fifty cents Cam don't you
 23. Ja: // one dollar!
 24. T: shh (5) Jenny
 25. Je: forty (.) two
 25. T: forty two cents
 27. Je: yeah
 28. T: K (2) any other guesses? (1) Alex
 29. Al: thirty five cents
 30. T: thirty five ok let's
 31. An: // No I'm not finished said twenty five
 32. T: twenty five?
 33. An: sixteen ()
 34. T: I love the way Steven put up his hand yes Steven
 35. St: I think it is ()
 36. T: K and one more (.) Cam
 37. Cm: I don't know but it is (thirty cents times nine) I guess it would
 38. be something (1) a hundred?
 39. T: That's a dollar?

40. Cm: ye::ah
41. An: // no I got-
42. T: Ok (.) I wanna show you guys how to figure that out that was
43. above your heads I just gave you guys that question so I could
44. go to-
45. An: // I know it I know it
46. T: Andrew.
47. An: (just give me a second)
48. T: (4) Well you know what Andrew actually that's ok. I-I think
49. that if you keep-
50. An: // thirty six?
51. T: thirty six?
52. An: () three dollars (.) three dollars a::nd thirty cents
53. T: (4)
54. An: I got it?
55. T: [moves to board gives Andrew a check] (2) Way to go ! come
56. over here round of applause for Andrew that was tough
57. [isolated clapping] (3) Good job round of applause for
58. Andrew [better applause] K I'm gonna wait Andrew for
59. everyone to recheck their positions and then I would like you to
60. come up and explain to the class how you figured that out. That
61. was a very very hard question to figure out k. (.) Mary (.) very
62. nice Susan good job (4) very nice (1) Stevonn [walks over and
63. takes something from Robert's desk] (2) Ok. Andrew come up
64. and show the class how you figured that out or tell the class
65. you don't have to show them but come and tell them I'll help
66. you with words OK
67. An: well I had [looking at board]
68. T: (1) Ok (.) well who are you () to sweetie?
69. An: [faces class giggles] I uh a seven and I () every time I
70. took away () and it was so (say said on there)
71. T: So how did you do it exactly? (1) you ha::d
72. An: eleven um (1) eleven and then um um thirty cents (for each)
73. time so I had-
74. T: // you actually times eleven by how many
75. An: thirty?
76. T: Andrew times thirty times eleven (1) and that's how he got it
77. cause there was actually very good Andrew thank you that was
78. excellent (.) and that was to tough guys. but what the question
79. was um if I had eleven kilograms (1) K. (.) eleven of um and
80. each one cost me thirty cents I have to add thirty to itself how
81. many times (1) Jenny?
82. Je. eleven times

83. T: // eleven. and then you would get the answer (.) yeah so
 192 84. good job Andrew

Segment 13

4: B: 4:

- 207 1. T1: Susan you did not finish another page all on your own
 2. () did you?
 3. Su: (yeah)
 4. T1: Well blow me over () and look at the printing I'm to
 5. impressed (to be true)
 6. T2: How are those kids doing over there Tee?
 7. T1: Well (1) really fine () just
 8. T2: // uh huh
 9. T1: working totally independently using her
 10. T2: // huh and not even asking?
 11. T1: // and not
 12. asking.
 13. T2: Excuse me (.) thrilled really [high five to Susan] (.) and how's
 14. this man doing { points to Alex]
 15. T1: Well (1) the printing thing again he's just look at he's just ()
 16. unreal and Mary's done like (.) probably five million pages
 17. T2: // hhuh! all by himself?
 18. T2: Ma:::ry (.) whoa
 223 19. Al: // that's a lot of pages
 235 20. T2: Jenny are you on a roll ? (1) Mrs.T? I can't even keep up with
 21. this girl the smoke's coming out of her so fast (4) what a
 22. worker Ok you guys I'm gonna give you a couple of more
 23. minutes and we're gonna start on something else here [Ss
 continue work]
 243 24. T1: [to Alex] most excellent again.

Segment 14

3: B: 3

- 130 1. T: oh! isn't that nice Jenny? () and Mary maybe you
 2. can work with the girls too (2) you can (1) make up a game
 3. with those
 [break in videotaping, girls start up the game]
 4. Je: [to Susan] (go back to your seat) isn't this fun huh?
 5. Su: ()
 6. Ja: Ok (1) this is a hard one I bet no one ll get it (.) exercise
 7. Su: * exercise *
 8. Ma: (3) E E (2) [Jenny points to board] *Execi* ()
 9. Je: right. now you go all the way back to your se:at

10. Ma: (I don't believe it)
 11. T: // are you (guys) playing around the world?
 12. Je: ye::ahh
 13. T: neat
 14. Je: (3) K good try (1) now.
 15. T: // I like the way that the girls are getting along
 16. and Peter and Steven are together a::nd ()
 143 17. Ma: X-ray
 18. Je: x
 19. Su: x
 20. Je: r a y
 21. Ma: right! [students change places]
 22. Je: Mary you have to come over here ()
 23. Ma: ox
 24. Je: o x
 25. Su: ummm O::
 26. Ma: [points to Jenny] (she) got it
 27. Je: (gonna go all the way back to my seat) I made it (1) Now
 28. Mary says the words (for) me and you K. Mary?
 29. Ma: ummm (1) spell exam.
 30. Su: Exam (3) e x c l u s i v e
 31. Je: // Exam (2) e x c l u s i v e [looks at Susan. They both laugh]
 32. T: Jenny?
 33. Je: yes?
 34. T: What does exam end in?
 35. Je: I don't know
 36. T: wh- what sound
 37. Je: E
 38. T: Say the whole word (.) ends in
 39. Je: // exam
 40. T.: (1) What's at the very end..
 41. Je: mm sounds like a m
 42. T: // (What does)-
 43. T: Yeah it is an m (3) so which word is exam.
 44. Je: I don't know
 45. T: Which one ends with a mmm [Susan and Mary move to look
 46. at board]
 47. Je: I don't know I can't oh Exam K go [girls all regroup]
 48. Ma: exercise
 49. Je: oh e x c e r r c I s e { giggles}
 50. Su: // e x c e r c I s e [giggles]
 51. Ma: Jenny.
 52. Je: Oh you say go (()) { giggles} go back to your seat?

53. Su: No I gotta sit here (I gotta sit here)
 54. T: // O k can? I have my kids um (.)
 55. back in your
 56. Je: I made it around
 57. T: desks please. just leave everythin-
 165 58. Je: // the world T made it around the world
 [Break in segment. Announcements are made and the group returns after
 announcements Carolyn joins the group. The game is in progress as the video
 tape starts]
- 169 59. Je: No actually I got it
 60. Ca: No I got it no let's do it again
 61. Je: It was a tie sort of yeah (yeah)
 62. Ca: ()
 63. Je: Ok this is a hard one ok Mary you can do it (3) *Excuse*
 64. Ma: umm (a) (e) (x e x c l u s i v e)
 65. Ca: // uh um E ()
 66. Je: She got it right she beat you
 67. Ca: No she said l v e
 68. Je: [goes to board] Mary?
 69. Ca: // I got it
 70. Je: No just a minute (.) Mary [writes on board] see (1) [to Ca]
 71. she didn't
 72. Ca: // I got it
 73. Je: know that's an I
 74. Ca: No let's do it again [Susan rejoins group]
 75. Je: no (.) it's Susan's here Susan and you
 76. Ca: // K
 77. Je: *Exclusive* exclusive
 78. Su: // e x c l u s i v e
 79. Ca: // e x c l u s i v e [both girls giggle]
 80. Ss: [giggles] Tie
 81. Je: (3) maybe a hard one or an easy one for you guys
 82. Su: moxies
 83. Ma: easy one (1) easy
 84. Je: ()
 85. Ma: e x c e r I s e
 86. Ca: r c I s e [giggles]
 87. Je: [points to Ca] you didn't say all the word you started right
 88. here [points to card] r c I s e
 89. Ca: No I started (.) here but I caught up to her
 90. Je: No::
 91. Ca: Let's do it again do it again do it again
 92. Je: (she beat you by a second)

31. Pe: [grabs the paper] We're supposed to be writing down
[Both students are leafing through the books. The next section is hard to hear as the noise level in the classroom is high. Robert picks up the paper and starts to compose the report]
- 195 32. Ro: A tiger (1) can-
33. Pe: I'll get another () [gets up to leave]
[Robert continues to write and peter leaves the area. Peter returns and sits down. He opens the book and starts in a sing song voice]
- 206 34. Pe: me;e:o:o:ow ow ow [reads] () [leans over to Robert]
35. (did tigers smell very bad?)
36. Ro: [Robert continues and ignores Peter] (so that cats can
37. Pe: umm tigers (.) have (.) sharp (.) teeth
[Robert continues to copy from his own book]
38. T: I really really (.) like the way that Peter and Robert and Jenny
39. and her group are really working together as a group
40. Pe: [leaning over to Robert] tigers have very sharp teeth
41. Ro: I'm writing something (own)
42. Pe: ()
43. Ro: [continues to write]
- 222 44. Pe: () put down tigers have sharp teeth

Segment 16

4: A: 7:

- 504 1. Pe: I stuck my tongue out at it
[both reading books and writing Peter starts to beat a song out on the table]
2. Ro: What are you doing Peter? Now (they) won't (be) (.) able to
3. understand it
4. T: I'm gonna come around with the stapler right now
5. Pe: ()
6. Ro: Here why don't you just (.) erase everything that we've just
7. write (it all) down
8. Pe: (3) I think it's that ()
9. Ro: [picks up sheet puts it on chair next to him] well (.) Peter (1)
10. let me put it this way you're not helping very much
11. Pe: (looks like Robert) I'm trying to (2) cause I don't know what
12. we're working on now
13. Ro: We're supposed to be wr (.) writing our report we're supposed
14. to write down what they do what w-what a lot of stuff (really)
15. we know about
16. Pe: (what do we know about?)
[Robert leans over to next group and gets a new book which he starts to look through. Peter starts to leaf through book as well for about 34 seconds]
17. Pe: tigers () (1) tigers

18. Ro: // that's (not) a fact
19. Pe: No what they do. You said what they do
20. Ro: That's not enough you're supposed to write down what we
21. know about them (1) tigers () tigers wait (2) tigers are the
22. biggest member of the cat family they (1) they (1) they're they
23. are also heavy ()
24. Pe: They're big cats?
25. Ro: ()
26. T: Excuse me guys can everybody claim the stuff on the floor your
27. webs and everything cause I'm coming around I wanna see if
28. you have all the stuff necessary (1) to be complete so get all
29. your stuff even if you're not using your webs right now (2)
30. Everything on the floor you need to take you need to take it if
31. it's yours it's all on the floor in the middle
- [Peter and Robert continue looking through books. Robert leaves and Peter sits at the table waiting]
32. T: Hey here's lots of peoples stuff down here (.) Steven Susan
33. right here
- [Peter is talking to himself playing games with the paper. Robert is still wandering around then sits down and takes the paper from Peter]
34. Ro: (need to have a pencil) [leaves again as Peter starts writing]
- 620 35. Pe: Here you can use my pencil
36. Ro: What?
- [James is still muttering and looking at books. T comes to the table as Robert sits down again.]
- 658 37. T: Ok what do you guys have done here where's your fact sheet
38. where's your web?
39. Pe: uhhm he (erased) some of the fact sheet
40. T: where's your webs
41. Pe: webs?
42. Ro: it's on my desk
43. T: you should have two webs
44. Ro: I did it and somebody stole it that from me that's what happened
45. to me
46. T: Well you need to make another one then (1) and you need to
47. make a fact sheet and have a (.)
48. Ro: // I did have a (.) that is our fact sheet right there.
49. T: Well you need to have a web so you can check off what you
50. found
51. Ro: ahhh
52. T: K so you both need to make a web please (1) ok? (.) Excuse
53. me (.) if you have a problem with that you can go outside and
54. deal with it K?

[boys leave the table go off in different directions?]

Segment 17

4: B: 3:

- 118 1. T: That's a hard word I'll give you that (.) capitalize
 2. Cm: capitalize all ((stumbles over word))
 3. T: What's in the middle darling ? (4) what's in the very middle (1)
 4. of that word?(12) what's in the middle of that word Matt?
 5. Cm: ()
 6. T: Good how does that sound (together)
 7. Cm: ()
 8. T: go::od (.) now what's at the beginning?
 9. Cm: ()
 10. T: (6) Can anyone help Cam on that word (1) (Jake)
 11. Ja: (street)
 12. T: streets capitalize all the streets. Very good reading Cam Who
 13. would like to read the next sentence(1) Who would like to give
 14. it a try (.) Peter
 15. Pe: (3) um (.) look r I (1) write (1) them (1) in (1) the (1) space
 16. T: spaces good. Who'd like to read the next sentence good reading
 17. (2) Carolyn
 18. Ca: Help Penny find her way to ()
 19. T: Ok so what do they want to do here can anyone tell me ? (2)
 20. Can anyone tell me what they want us to do there? (4) What do
 21. they want us to do?
 [walks over and takes something away from Jake]
 22. (6) Do you have a guess (.) of what they want us to do there?
 23. (.) Jake? (.) Do you have a guess
 24. Ja: (umm find the)
 25. T: Ok umm actually what they want us to do is what are some
 26. things that we always put a capital (.) on? always We've talked
 27. about this before what are some things we always put a capital
 28. on. Andrew?
 29. An: names?
 30. T: names what else (1) Cam
 31. Cm: uh ()
 32. T: Yes! and we do put it on streets too we put it on ci:ties on
 33. names (1) and we are gonna put it on streets (.) so number one
 34. says garden street What do I have to change there so that it
 35. would be correct? What do I need to change there. Jake
 36. Ja: (change the)
 37. T: Good? Change the G to a capital and change the S to a capital
 38. (1) and then where would you write it (.) where would you put

39. it Jenny
40. Je: (by number one)
41. T: beside number one does everybody get that? [Ss nod and
42. mutter yes] OK let's go to the next page (.) Ivan the ice cream
43. man-