DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 422 CS 212 076

AUTHOR	Randlett, Alice Schmatz
TITLE	Learning To Be Remedial: Constructing the Meaning of Literacy in High School English Classes.
PUB DATE	May 89
NOTE	49p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association (34th, New Orleans, LA, April 30-May 4, 1989).
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Ability Grouping; *Classroom Environment; Classroom Research; *English Curriculum; Ethnography; Grade 10; Group Behavior; High Schools; High School Students; Learning Problems; *Literacy; Reading Skills; *Remedial Instruction; Remedial Teachers; Self Fulfilling Prophecies; Social Influences; *Social Stratification; Student Attitudes; Teacher Expectations of Students; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS	Literacy as a Social Process

ABSTRACT

A study examined the view of literacy as a socially constructed phenomenon situated within a culturally reproductive milieu. Within the context of one medium-sized comprehensive high school in a small city in the Midwest, the focus was on the daily classroom practice in teaching and learning to read and write. Four separate classes--two low track, one average, and one anomalous group, repeaters--under the tutelage of one teacher were observed to ascertain how students and teacher socially constructed their meanings of what it means to be a literate person. Methodologies were participant observation, ethnographic interviews, and audio- and videotaping. Findings suggest that differing curricula and pedagogies for each track produced different outcomes, with lower tracks receiving less valued knowledge and less instruction in how to talk about knowledge in acceptable (in terms of schooling) ways. This insured that most students identified as remedial were taught in a way that resulted in their forever being identified that way: they learned to be remedial. (Forty-six references are attached.) (KEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED310422

Learning to Be Remedial: Constructing the Meaning of Literacy in High School English Classes

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, May 1989, New Orleans, Louisiana

by

Alice Schmatz Randlett
University of Wisconsin--Stevens Point

CS212076

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Alice S. Randlett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT..iii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION, PURPOSE, AND BACKGROUND..................1

Purpose of This Study
Description and Methodology of This Study
Background of the Problem
The Evolving Definition of Literacy
Reading Research and the Problems with Defining Reading
Schema Theory and the Shift from Text as Authority
Metacognition and Its Relationship to Literacy
Social Construction of Knowledge and Ideology
Social Class and Its Relationship to Curricula
Accomplishing the Study

II. LOOKING LIKE A LABEL; DEFINING THE WORLDS OF BASIC REGULAR, AND REPEATER STUDENTS.........................8

Presentation of Self and Literacy
Fenlea's Walls and Halls: Physical Environs and Literacy
A Day in the Life and Its Implications

III. CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION: DIFFERENT ENDS FROM DIFFERENT MEANS..17

Student Views of Curricular Differentiation
Differentiating Basic from Regular Classes
Grade Weighting
Lessons
Summary: So What's the Difference?

IV. READING AND WRITING: CREATING MEANING IN SCHOOL AND OUT..26

The Student View of Reading and Writing in School: Responses to a Questionnaire
Reading and Writing Outside of School
Ideology and Curriculum: Consequences for Literacy

ERIC

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.................................34

Theory into Practice
Literacy and Tracking: Intertwined Definitions
Social Construction of Knowledge
Ideology
Choices and Agendas
Conclusion

ABSTRACT

This study, conducted during 1985, combines the methods of participant observation, ethnographic interviews, video and audio taping to gain understanding of how all constituencies in a high school cooperated to construct the meaning of what it meant to be a member of a regular, repeater, or basic sophomore English class. It focuses on seeing literacy as a socially constructed phenomenon situated within a culturally reproductive milieu.

Issues of translating theory into practice, teaching skills versus content-based knowledge, consequences of reifying reading and writing, ideological constructs of secondary education, and the social construction of knowledge are described and interpreted. A major theme of the data is that differing curricula and pedagogies for each track produced different outcomes, with lower tracks receiving less valued knowledge and less instruction in how to talk about knowledge in acceptable--in terms of schooling--ways. This insures that most students identified as remedial will be taught in a way that results in their forever being identified that way: they learn to be remedial.

INTRODUCTION, PURPOSE, AND BACKGROUND

Purpose of This Study

Despite voluminous research studies on how to teach reading and writing (ERIC Data Base, 1967-to date), and many studies that report on the inefficacy of grouping for instruction for students below the highest groups (Hiebert, 1983; Kliebard, 1979a&b; Noland & Taylor, 1986; Oakes, 1985; Raze, 1984; Rowan & Miracle, 1982; Vanfossen, Jones, & Spade, 1987), a significant number of students are tracked and never learn to read or write much above a basic level. This study was undertaken partly to examine the paradoxes found in the background and research context of literacy remediability. It presents an examination of one teacher's adaptation of instruction to tracked high school sophomore English classes. It offers a look at the effects of differential teaching and curriculum as well as observations on how the groups constructed knowledge and meaning, both in the classroom and the world.

Within the context of one high school, this study presents an examination of daily classroom practice in teaching to read and write. Four separate classes--two low track, one average, and one anomalous group, Repeaters--under the tutelage of one teacher were observed in order to ascertain how students and teacher socially constructed their meanings of what it means to be a literate person. Theories

of ideology and the social nature of meaning-making and how they relate to teaching, learning, and researching in American education provide the underpinning for this ethnographical study of what it means to be remedial as writers and readers.

Description and Methodology of This Study

What it means to be remedial, i.e., to be identified as needing additional help in mastering school knowledge, and how that meaning is created in a cultural context is the focus of my research. Definitions of the roles that all the actors in a school play as they construct their lives and the processes that produce these definitions are examined. The setting for the investigation is a medium-sized comprehensive high school in a town of circa 20,000 in the upper Midwest. The methodology, which parallels the theoretical orientation of the study, is qualitative in nature. I acted as a participant observer so that I might see, and at times engage in, the joint on-going accomplishment of meaning in four tracked sophomore English classrooms. The method combines a close analysis of classroom events and interactions and the setting of those events into a broader societal context. The methodology allowed me to accomplish my purpose of observing and recording--in notes, audio and video recordings-- group processes involved in the differential construction of meaning in each class.

Background of the Problem

In order to situate the problematic nature of remedial teaching and learning in American education, it is necessary to examine the research in several areas. Literature regarding the definition of literacy, both in diachronic and synchronic terms; rooting the problems in a social context--as behavior and ideology; and the history and efficacy of grouping and tracking was drawn upon to focus the study.

The Evolving Definition of Literacy

Historical examinations of literacy such as those by Resnick & Resnick, (1977 or Nespor, (1987), present the changing nature over time of what literacy is. Beginning with the medieval notion of making literate persons (mostly clergy and aristocrats) who used reading and writing for specific ends; the notion of literacy has alternately expanded and contracted; sometimes it was simple skills for the many and at others complex abilities for the few. And, as seems to be the situation today, literacy has historically been marked by its ties to prevailing power and authority structures. Presently, literacy is now the study of an idealized and reified form of language, and what is most important, its definition has shifted from using reading and writing as specific social practices to the idea of literacy as a set of skills separated from use. In this view literacy many be taught independent of context, without

regard to the "intentions, interest, or background knowledge of the learner" (Nespor, 1987, p. 42).

Reading Research and the Problems with Defining Reading

Making sense of reading research is complicated by the reification of reading. Each report contains definitions of reading that are not merely descriptive but which are also evaluative. As well, different theories consist of different procedures and criteria that operationally define good and poor readers differently. Without sociopolitical grounding, without the ability to relate the goals of reading to reading methods, we continue to be without true knowledge of reading (Mosenthal, 1986a, 1986b, 1987a, 1987b).

Schema Theory and the Shift from the Text as Authority

Recent work in cognitive psychology has produced a schema theoretic view of reading based on the notion of memory as constructive rather than merely reproductive (Bartlett, 1932; Brewer & Nakamura, 1984). The text in this view is no longer an absolute authority but rather a blueprint for making meaning--merging what readers already know with what is unknown in the text (Tierney & Pearson, 1986). However, schema theoreticians have tended to talk as if various cognitive schema were acquired in total isolation from culture and ignore the shared and institutionalized nature of our knowledge (D'Andrade, 1981). Heap (1986) criticizes the notion of schemata as empirical data

structures which leaves unanswered the troublesome question of how persons come to share the same ones. Perhaps literacy research needs to take from cognitive anthropology the notions that we learn cultural programs through guided discovery, that cultural systems label good things to know as well as what is erroneous, and that we work very hard to discover what is already known.

Metacognition and Its Relationship to Literacy

Of great importance in recent reading research is metacognition, or one's ability to recognize the cognitive processes involved in an academic task (Baker & Brown, 1984). Again, what is left out of the research is the social nature of error, i.e., "Typically, cultural systems not only label what is a good thing to know or do, they also classify and label the kinds of errors people make" (D'Andrade, p.187).

Social Construction of Knowledge and Ideology

Ideologies here are constellations of beliefs, assumptions, and practices that influence our world views. Walmsley (1981) sorted ideologies by their relationships between mind and reality. In the U. S., the dominant ideology is cultural reproduction and its two main branches are the academic and the utilitarian. The academic embraces the skills, knowledge, and values appropriate to an intellectually oriented education rooted in Western culture. Contrastively, the utilitarian stresses skills, knowledge,

ERIC

and values appropriate to a vocationally oriented education. Ideological categories serve to ground sociopolitically not only reading and writing research, but instruction, choice of curriculum and curricular materials, and the evaluation of accomplishing stated goals and aims of researchers, teachers, administrators, school boards, and parents.

Social Class and Its Relationship to Curricula

Schools, embedded themselves in historical and cultural contexts, are purveyors of curricula: the methods, materials and ways of evaluating education. Recent scholarship in the sociology of knowledge and the anthropology of schooling have argued that social class background makes a difference in terms of what kinds of educational knowledge (curricula) students are exposed to (Anyon, 1981; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Kickbush & Everhart, 1985; Oakes, 1985 Rosenbaum, 1976; Kickbush & Everhart, 1985; Oakes, 1985; Wilcox, 1982). Walmsley's (1981) definition of educational ideologies implies a linkage between the academic and utilitarian branches and cultural reproduction as the dominant ideology of American Schooling (Apple, 1979; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Kohlberg & Mayer, 1972). Cultural reproduction's purpose is to pass from one generation to the next the knowledge, skills, and social and moral values of a culture that previous generations deem important for succeeding generations to acquire. There is an emphasis here on "The

desire of each generation to *control* (italics, his) the content of what is transmitted, with the purpose of maintaining a status quo or even enhancing control over specific aspects of economic, political, social, or cultural aspects of a society" (Walmsley, 1981, p. 76-77).

Accomplishing the Study

As I sifted and winnowed the accumulated data, two major questions guided my separation of wheat from chaff: (1) How did the participants cooperate to accomplish being the label that had been given them, and (2) How would I know the answer to the first question? The answer to question two lies in my observations and recording of the language and behavior of the participants. An ethnography such as this attempts to record and describe the overt, manifest, and explicit behaviors, values, and tangible items of culture, and has as its goal the description of the ways of living and working together of a social unit (Heath, 1982). The answer to question one then, lies in the report that follows.

LOOKING LIKE A LABEL: DEFINING THE WORLDS OF BASIC, REGULAR, AND REPEATER STUDENTS

Defining group membership is crucial to this study, and I originally expected to provide official definitions of each track. However, while I soon found that no official definitions existed, each constituency within Fenlea could and would give me its own. Students told me the differences in two ways, either by their views of curriculum content, or by describing the sort of person one might find in a particular class. Teachers and administrators tended to define group membership in terms of the home background of the students. How they came to their knowledge of home background intrigued me--obviously, they were not reading each other's cumulative records. The cues all groups had to use were environmental, that is, appearance and behavior. As well, all constituencies implied that a student's placement was really a matter of personal choice.

Presentation of Self and Literacy

> squids and squeedgies are gross people that have greasy hair smell like dirt and wear genaric clothes.
>
> Cool people are people that have alot of freinds dress neet don't greasy hair & don't stinck like dirt wear cool clothes and dress nice.
>
> Alchies & druggies - are people preatty much the same as a cool person all cool people drink (all that I no do.) and some are just cool people that smoke hemp.
>
> jocks & preps - these two are the same thing

> there people that go out for sports, wear ties, and think ther the best I am a cool person of course I'm not no goa dam squid.

Jenny wrote this. Tough, scared, childish, womanly, smart, cool, dopey Jenny wrote this in response to Ellen's spur-of-the-moment assignment in a sophomore Basic English class. Ellen wanted the kids to realize that they were victims and victimizers in the naming game but what Jenny told her is that some groups think they're better than the one she's in--jocks and preps--and some are worse--squids and squeegies--but she's a cool person and just right, rather like *The Three Bears*.

The kids in the various classes did dress differently. Regulars, in the words of Art Fall, English Department Chairman, did dress more modern. They were also cleaner, neater, and had more stylish and expensive haircuts. Basic boys usually wore worn grubby jeans, plaid flannel shirts, and not-so-new jackets. Basic girls were less distinguishable from their Regular counterparts but they *never* wore skirts and often carried themselves with a little swagger. The poorest of the Basic kids--squids and squeegies--wore the poorest clothes and often were unkempt. None of them appeared in the Regular classes. Repeaters were mixed in appearance but tended to look more like Regulars.

Though teachers and administrators answered formally

in terms of standardized test scores and teacher recommendations as grounds for track placement, they often, in unguarded moments, spoke of behavioral or appearance criteria as the real basis for tracking at Fenlea. Thus, in their minds, Lori, who was smart but behaved in a "hoody" way, deserved to be in Basic, while some kids who weren't so smart but came from good families were placed in Honors and Regular classes so that they could be with their friends. Much research has established (e.g., Jencks, 1972; Oakes, 1985) the connection between family income, class, race and track placement with a disproportionate number of students from the lower end of the socioeconomic scale in the lower tracks. And dress and behavior are excellent clues to what our backgrounds are (Johnson, 1982). Further, our presentation of self to the world announces and requests treatment according to that presentation (Goffman, 1975). Track placement matters to students because the curriculum content, pedagogy, and evaluation procedures are different for each track and the consequences of these differences will be seen in later chapters.

Behavior and courtesy differed markedly from track to track with the kids in Basic and Repeater groups being more hostile, noisy, unprepared, and inattentive.

Regulars' conversation often centered on grades and assignments; the lower tracks' on getting high, how dumb the assignment was, and jobs outside of school. Fights erupted most often in the Repeater class, never in the Regular. The Regulars behaved much in the manner of the middle class adults in the school community. What do these differing behavioral displays mean to teaching and learning, and how does social knowledge relate to real and perceived competence in the school setting?

A stock of social knowledge--or "what everybody knows" about the social world in which they live is the absolutely necessary background information that people must know and use in order to function as social beings (Schutz, 1962). Further, we need to understand that the world is not private, but always intersubjective. Our interpretation of the world is bound up in the common influence we have on one another. Participating effectively in school or other cultural events demands intellectual or academic knowledge as well as social knowledge. When social and academic knowledge are in tune we say that a student is competent; that is, the students gives the right answer in the right way (Mehan, 1980). In Basic classes students often knew the right answers but had difficulty in presenting them in a socially competent way and so were judged as failures.

A paradox exists in this situation in that the Basic and Repeaters' rudeness functioned as a signal to teachers, administrators, and other students that they were incompetent. On another level, however, these same behaviors demonstrated that they knew very well how to be competent members of a group labeled "Basic" or "Repeater."

Fenlea's Walls and Halls: Physical Environs and Labels

At the heart of anthropology's epistemology is the belief that different cultures may perform the same activities in various ways, and the manner of performance shapes and is shaped by culture. Therefore, the surfacely simple notion that it is possible to do things in a variety of ways takes on weight in the context of anthropology: that is, each possibility has cultural consequences and is itself a consequence of what is possible within the dominant culture.

The possibilities for room assignments and gathering places for members of the various tracks at Fenlea appeared on the surface to be random. Consistently, however, Basic and Repeater kids were given uglier, dirtier, inconvenient classrooms. For instance, one of the Basic classes met in a Physics Lab, sitting shoulder-to-shoulder in long rows facing the teacher. Studies of classroom space use (Sommer, 1969)

ERIC

indicate that this seating arrangement is counter-productive to the learning of reading and writing in that it discourages interaction in groups. And while Regular kids studied in the Resource Center attached to the English Department, or the library. Basics and Repeater were found in the Commons, smoking and goofing off.

The mod schedule--a day divided into twenty forty-minute mods in an overlapping pattern within a six-day repeating cycle--was a large and important fact of school life. In both Repeater and Basic classes there were students who left class in the middle several times a week, but no Regular student did this. Everyone but students had strong opinions about the system with Administrators liking it because it gave them fewer discipline problems to deal with. Teachers disliked it because they perceived it as helping to keep students inattentive and unfocused. The aides in the Commons saw it as something that encouraged skipping on the part of the kids who frequented it--Basics and Repeaters.

A Day in the Life and Its Implications

Typical days spent with each track show them playing out their labeled behavior. For instance, the Regulars might be found viewing a tape of "The Fall of the House of Usher," rapt and silent. Later, they would

participate in a discussion of the tape with Ellen modeling literary explication for them. By the presentation of her view of Poe, she demonstrated to a group that could conceivably make use of the knowledge, "what we say when" (Austin, 1970), talking about literature.

Ellen conceived of the Repeaters as divergent thinkers and taught them as individuals so that a typical day involved her working one-on-one with them on their writing or reading projects. Those students not thus engaged frequently were hostile to one another or her, and played annoying drop the pencil or kick the chair games.

Basic classes were marked by lots of chair throwing, book slamming and loud and profane language at the opening. Almost every day they participated in a grammar workbook correction exercise, often interrupting one another, yelling out answers out-of-turn and calling each other and themselves names--"dumb broad, jerk"--when someone got it wrong. If an assignment followed the workbook, no matter what it was, it was uniformly referred to as dumb and/or boring. The major question asked regarding assignments was "How many points is it worth?"

In all cases the students were busy displaying

their competence, both social and academic. It would be easy in conventional terms to see their and everyone el e's behavior as expected and natural. That is, the students in the various tracks were just getting and giving the kind of treatment one would expect from 1)nice middle class kids (Regulars), 2)emotionally disturbed failures (Repeaters), or 3)low-class dummies (Basics). But closer examination yields a much richer story.

The importance of physical appearance and behavior to this study lies in their relation to competence, or the requisite skill, abilities, and knowledge necessary for participation in a given community:

> Concepts of cultural, linguistic, and social knowledge have a distinctly cognitive orientation, which can lead unwittingly to the position that competence is only things in people's heads. . . (However) competence for participation in interaction is . . . an intersubjective consideration. . . .People must display what they know. The meaningfulness of behavioral displays is established by the interpretations of others (and) production and interpretation inform one another. (Mehan, 1980, p. 133).

What I've at empted to establish is the presence and importance of behavioral display--looking li.e-- to becoming a competent reader and writer.

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION: DIFFERENT ENDS FROM DIFFERENT MEANS

Chapter 2 presented an examination of how the students and their environment appeared and what the consequences of those appearances were. This chapter examines the school's culture in order to probe the uneasy tension between what people really do and what they say they ought to do (Wolcott, 1987), regarding their differing understandings of the work of the school--its curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation. What do teachers, students, and administrators say about what is learned and what is taught? If there are differences between appearance (saying) and reality (doing), do they truly make a difference?

Student Views of Curricular Differentiation

The following quotes are from taped interviews with the students. They were structured by a list of questions designed to elicit their thoughts on the meaning of schooling in their lives.

A) I think the work [in Basic] would be probably a little bit slower, you probably wouldn't read as complex materials as you would in other classes. That's really all I know. I never had to be in one. (Regular boy)

B) I think the amount of work, they give you [as a Regular] is different. And you gotta give oral reports or something like that. They do a lot of that--a lot of writing. (Basic Boy)

C) They might think that people in Basic are dumber than people in regular classes and it doesn't really mean nothing. It doesn't mean we're dumb or

anything. (Basic girl)

D) The [Basic] work is easier. Since it's easier you always do a good job on it, and get higher grades--and your parents are happy! (Basic Girl)

E) I don't know how I would really act in a Basic Class. I'm one of those people--I would be kind of embarrassed. I like to think of myself as smart rather than slow. But I think I'd probably be embarrassed because I'm around people and they're always telling me about their grades, and if I was in a Basic class that's where I was meant to be, but I would still be embarrassed. . . (Regular girl)

The assumptions that individual and institutional behavior normally represents peoples' attempts to make sense of the idiosyncratic experience of their individual worlds and that persistent patterning of behavior reflects its social sanctioning underlies this study (Smith, 1987). ". . .it is crucial then to keep in mind that schooling is a social institution with a key role in socializing children for available adult roles [and that] to expect an institution responsible for child socialization to depart radically from the needs of the culture as currently constituted is to expect a culture to commit suicide" (Wilcox, 1982, p. 271). Of prime importance in that socialization to available roles are (1) cognitive or skill requirements for different jobs, including self-presentation skills; (2) the relationship to authority at different levels of the work hierarchy; and (3) self-image and general level of work-related expectations suitable for different positions (Wilcox, 1982). In light of these assumptions, an examination of what it is like to be

ERIC

Basic or Regular is in order.

Differentiating Basic from Regular Classes

The consistent pattern of replies on how Basic and Regular (Repeater, too) are different lies in the perception of pace and complexity. All the students interviewed thought that low-track classes treat much the same material but go at a slower pace to give them more of a chance to "get it." Most think that Regulars read more--and more complex materials--but all suppose that the content is the same in any track. In fact, the content varied widely from track to track and comparisons about pace and complexity are at best arbitrary. While it should be noted that all see the work in Basic as less demanding and therefore less deserving of full credit, this too is an arbitrary judgment and the work can only be seen to be devalued in terms of society's view of the lesser worth of the utilitarian curriculum.

Grade Weighting

Fenlea's system of weighted grades for each track awarded 5 points for an A in Honors, 4 points for the same A in Regular, and in Basic 3 grade points. So even if a student got all As in the Basic track, s/he was still a C student in terms of the real world--that real world that evaluates transcripts, hires, allows into educational programs, and continues to keep us on "track." A brochure describing the grading system accompanies transcripts sent to

requestors and stresses that honors courses are designed for the superior student and offer "higher caliber reading, more research and experimentation, and more individual initiative and responsibility," while Basic courses "are designed for the student who has demonstrated some weakness in a give area . . .[and] the courses are designed to enable the student to strengthen his skill." Note that Honors students (and Regulars in that the content of their classes is much more like Honors) get more and better things to read, the chance to learn research methods, and the opportunity to practice independence but Basics get to strengthen skills. Recalling Wilcox's (1982) criteria for socialization to adult roles, it can be seen that the varying pedagogies will lead to different ends (Olson, 1977), with higher-level students being prepared for college and professional/managerial occupations and lower track kids for low skill (and pay) jobs. Fenlea's philosophy on grading and curriculum content serve to keep the gap between basics and those in higher tracks, not to close it.

The kids never expressed discontent with grade weighting. They were more concerned with pleasing parents by bringing home what appear to be good grades, and maintaining the fiction that they were just as good at schoolwork as Honors track students. As well, it allowed the school to represent what it did in tracking as helping all students

feel successful and giving them an equal chance to compete. In fact, the differential grade expectations do reflect the devalued nature of the lower track curriculum. Basics do more work in isolation and don't learn as much about reading and writing. They not only spend less time on them, they don't read or write about the same things and so their access to the store of cultural logic is less. The lack of literature in their curriculum makes them less culturally literate and ultimately less likely to succeed in the future in further education or in the job market. Whether students are aware of the differences that the varying content of the curriculum may make to them later on in l[illegible] t clear, but their statements on pace (slow=dumb), an[illegible]exity (difficult=smart), show that they might.

Lessons

In order to understand the transmission of knowledge in schools, an examination of the message systems through which it travels is required. Bernstein (1971), defines three categories of school knowledge: curriculum, which defines what counts as valid knowledge; pedagogy, which defines what counts as valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation, which defines what counts as a valid realization of this knowledge on the part of the taught. How did the various constituencies interact to shape the what and how of knowledge transmission?

ERIC

The teacher in this study--Ellen--expressed a Romantic ideology of education, in which mind drives reality. For her, learning to read and write were enriching and empowering activities. The sole curricular materials given her by the administration included a grammar workbook for the Basics, an American literature text for the Regulars, and nothing for the Repeaters. How did she join her Romantic/humanistic pedagogy to these utilitarian and academic items?

Ellen's Basic classes, despite their disparaging comments about the Daily Oral Language assignments that usually began their days, seemed to prefer them to reading and writing about literature. And, even though the literature that they read was not from standard canon (e.g., *The Outsider* rather than the Regulars' fare of *Giants in the Earth*), they ill resisted talking and writing in a way that they--products of a utilitarian education--saw as irrelevant and useless.

Regulars read whole works, not fragments or translations into plays from novels as the Basics did with *The Outsiders* for instance. They read and wrote poetry, which neither Basics nor Repeaters did. Often, the lower track classes saw the video of a work while the Regulars would see the video but also read the work. Their writing assignments included learning to write a comparison/contrast essay and evaluative responses to literature. They presented skits, shared their

ERIC

poetry, made models. In general, and in particular, the activities in this class involved the manipulation of high status knowledge which required them to have good literary skills, the ability to work alone, an abstract cognitive processes capacity and a tolerance for the unrelatedness of student's lives and the content of the school curricula. These are qualities that students in Regular classes usually bring when they come to school and the curriculum reinforces and builds their linguistic capabilities.

Repeaters, who were looked on by Ellen as divergent thinkers, were always taught on a one-to-one basis except for a solitary lesson in writing a comparison/contrast essay. I think this was a reflection of Ellen's care and respect for these kids. By terming them creative, she defused a difficult to manage social situation.

Ellen's stated philosophy of evaluation of the success of the lessons she taught were whether or not the kids felt good about it: "Usually, the kids feel good about it if there's a sense they've worked hard and they're proud of what they've done, and they feel like they've grown. I judge that by what they say, their response to an author or the amount of work in class." Obviously, emotions are open to interpretation. The school evaluated through a Sophomore-level English competency test.

Summary: So What's the Difference?

There is no room here, unfortunately, to discuss the administration's views of curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation. Suffice it to say that none of the views are consistent either within or between groups. That is to be expected: we interpret our existence, rationalize our meaning(s) from moment to moment. But, some themes do arise. Students see their track as their choice; they do not acknowledge tests, guidance faculty, or teachers when they talk about how they got where they are. The teachers, and the principal say, as well, that the choice is the students'. Other groups cite other reasons for track placement: e.g., standardized tests, teacher recommendations from the junior or elementary level. But somehow the real process remains unlockable from the data. Perhaps student choice is the answer, but the wrong word. "Fault" may be more fitting because everyone acknowledges the importance of the family from which students come in track placement, and to be Basic is to be poor and rural while to be Honors is to be rich and urban. To be Regular, presumably, is to be neither. Fault implies that the school and its personnel are not responsible; they, the students are.

Finally, what remains at the heart of differences in the tracks is linguistic knowledge: additional reading and writing were what distinguished the upper tracks. And when

ERIC

remediation was offered in terms of Basic and Repeater classes or remedial reading, it was offered up in snippets: in grammar workbooks, Daily Oral Language, shallow plays, torn up *Readers' Digests*, and paragraphs ripped out of context to teach illusory "skills." Those who most need assistance in learning the relationships among ideas, by reading stimulating books that help make connections to what they know are denied them. Instead these students get extensive practice with fragments, but no novels or poetry. "Their ability--already underdeveloped--to make meaning for themselves out of printed symbols is not exercised at all" (Robertson, 1985, p. 9).

ERIC

READING AND WRITING: CREATING MEANING IN SCHOOL AND OUT

> What is clear, however, is that literacy is a currency not only in our schools, but in our society as well, and, as with money, it is better to have more literacy skill than less (Kirsch, 1986, p. V-12).

Previously, the concept of curriculum as defining what counts as valid knowledge (Bernstein, 1971), was introduced. In this study, curriculum means not only propositional knowledge, but also contains the notion of "cultural logic" (Heap, 1985). Specifically, this means that reading and writing require more than knowledge of texts. Literacy also requires "a certain kind of cognitive orientation to a text, within a cultural context" (Heap, 1985, p.246). That is, lessons are designed not only to teach knowing that something is or can be so, but also to teach knowing how something is or can be. An important part of instruction in reading, writing, speaking, and listening is to impart a notion of responding in a culturally appropriate manner, knowing "what we say when" (Austin, 1970). At the heart of lessons is the idea that:

> Any event or phenomenon about which we can make sense, which we understand, is an event or phenomenon about which we could express our understanding. . . . Thus, cultural logic covers both 'what should be said when making sense to someone,' and 'what should be said when making sense of something' (Heap, 1986, p.78).

The behavior and responses of students in low tracks, on the surface, could be characterizable as evidence of language deficit problems and left at that; in other words, the blame

for their state could be placed on their perceived lack of verbal ability. However, something more interesting may be occurring. Many Basic students identified themselves in the course of interviews (or were so termed by Ellen) as having been part of remedial reading groups since quite early in their school careers, often since first grade. Remedial curricula most often operate on the notion of a building-block approach. That is, students receive much practice at the sound, syllable, word, sentence and sometimes paragraph level but seldom have whole texts to either read or write (Robertson, 1985). Recalling once more Olson's (1977) dictum that different means are means to different goals, not optional routes to the same goal, it can be said that students taught reading as word recognition and as good performance on vocabulary and pronunciation drills see the use of text as authority for answering questions as quite different from those whose instruction in reading moves apace to whole stories and books. What we say when talking about fragments of language is unlike what we say when talking about complete texts, whether we are reading or writing. To illustrate how strongly the differences in how to talk about text are influenced by prior instruction as a remedial or regular student, an examination of how the groups responded to a questionnaire Ellen made to find their perceptions on how good they were as readers and writers as well as what

they thought of the English curriculum is in order.

The Student View of Reading and Writing in School: Responses to a Questionnaire

1. What's one of the best books you've read? Why?

Basic students cited more magazines--*Hot Rod, Hit Parader, Farm Journal--than* books, and the reasons they gave for their liking were often expresses in terms of their use to them. As well, they expressed likings for violence and romance. Repeater students tended to mention genre--sci-fi or outdoor adventure, and to give one word evaluations. Regular students each named a different title, often from the Adolescent lit. canon, and books from the 19th century appear in their list. They don't mention newspapers or magazines and reasons for their liking are expressed in terms of characterization, action and didactics.

2. What's one book you had to read but hated? Why?

Among others, Nineteen Basics expressed hatred for *Old Yeller* and mentioned *Romeo and Juliet* several times as did the Repeaters. They characterized the books they detested as boring sick, dumb, dull, and a waste of time because they didn't make sense. The Regulars hated *Harold and Maude* largely because they found it unrealistic, but they also disliked anything by Shakespeare. When they evaluated their choices, they didn't stop at "boring" or "stupid." They "didn't understand themes" or "find the characters

ERIC

unrealistically portrayed."

3. What's the best thing about your writing?

Basics characterized what was best about their writing in terms of penmanship; Repeaters liked nothing about theirs; but Regulars talked about things like good ideas, amount of detail, and spelling. More often than not the Regulars seemed to realize that writing is something that is complex and rests on thinking, not just a mechanical and fragmented process.

4. What makes you uncomfortable about your writing?

Basics and Repeaters talked mostly about sloppiness, bad spelling and handwriting in response to this question. Regulars also mentioned spelling, punctuation, and sloppiness but they mention other causes along with them, e.g., so-so conclusions, hatred for rewriting, inability to write essays well. They imply that they know that writing is something other than reification; that it is used to accomplish other ends.

5. What would you like to learn in this class?

The Basics want to learn to spell, to pass and get credit. Repeaters mention wanting to learn to communicate and to write stories. The Regulars list includes learning to write letters of various kinds, do creative writing, writing essays and stories. Once more, the Regulars express their expectations of a richer, more varied curriculum than the

Basics.

6. What do you do when not in school?

and 7. What kind of things do you have to do after school?

Most of the Basics have jobs outside of school and some work as much as 60 hours per week often doing farm labor. They listen to rock, watch TV, go three-wheeling and party. Repeaters don't work quite as hard but do many of the same things, however, a couple also mention that they read and play sports which the Basics never do. The Regulars also work but often at housework, babysitting or a paper route. They often mention talking on the phone with friends, doing homework, taking care of pets, practicing cheerleading and other sports.

8. Is there something I should know about you as person that will help me teach you?

Students answered this question in terms of how class could be made better. The Repeaters and Basics expressed a dislike for reading and writing, found English not interesting to them, didn't want homework or to perform publicly. While the Regulars also did not want to do homework, their responses were largely asking for help from the teacher to succeed.

9. Do you have a special talent that would contribute to this class?

Basics and Repeaters wouldn't or couldn't (outside job pressures) volunteer help for the most part. When they did

ERIC

it was to draw or type. Regulars mentioned writing, typing, organizing, originating projects.

Reading and Writing Outside of School

As well as the responses to questions about their school knowledge, I elicited answers to questions about their present uses of reading and writing at home and work, and what they thought their education would be good for in the future. All groups cited the importance of school to future employment, but it was apparent that the Regulars' choices were perceived as abundant and the kind of education that they were getting seemed more appropriate to their plans. Regular students' parents read more and a greater variety of literacy materials were available in their homes. It was interesting to find how closely the at-home reading and writing of the kids lead into the kind of schooling they received, i.e., the richness and sense of purpose in these activities was present for the Regulars but not for the others.

Ideology and Curriculum: Consequences for Literacy

Defining and setting in an ideological context the purpose and content of secondary literacy programs is important to understanding how a differentiated curriculum can create unequal access to discourse and thus to becoming literate. In Walmsley's (1981) study of such programs,

cultural reproduction is identified as the major ideology of American education. Within it, learners are seen as repositories for attitudes, skills, knowledge and values seemed appropriate by the culture and is characterized by the previous generation's desire to control the content of what is transmitted to the succeeding generation and so to maintain the status quo. Within this reproductive ideology two branches may be distinguished--the academic and the utilitarian:

> The academic tradition stresses those skills, knowledge, and values appropriate to an intellectually oriented education, with particular weight given to an understanding of Western civilization, the classics, literature, and so one. In contrast, the utilitarian tradition stresses skills, knowledge and values appropriate to a vocationally oriented education, which prepares the individuals to cope with and survive in a complex society. (Walmsley, 1981, p. 77.)

Fenlea delivers an academic curriculum to students in Regular and Honors. Students in these tracks are offered wider and higher caliber reading, more research and experimentation. From their responses to the questionnaire, it can be seen that the Regulars had daily opportunity to learn "what we say when" talking and writing about literature, particularly in ways that can be used to get further education and better jobs.

Students offered a utilitarian curriculum--read Basic and Repeater--get a much less ambitious curriculum. Reading and writing in this tradition are seen as survival skills.

In their view, reading and writing are mechanical operations and not complex and useful to other pursuits. Unfortunately, that knowledge termed life or survival skills is valued less by the larger society. Balancing a checkbook, reading want ads, filling in job applications are in commonsensical terms what everyone ought to know anyway. Not only, in this sense, do Basics learn less valuable kinds of things, they have little or no opportunity to practice the kinds of reading and writing that are valued; that is, essays, poetry, novels, and short stories. The kids' impressions that the content of Basic classes is less and easier is right in that the Utilitarian curriculum is, in their minds as well, debased and devalued. They are recipients of an impoverished curriculum, and are taught and learn to be remedial.

ERIC

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the introduction, questions often neglected in the prior research on remediation of reading and writing were posed. The areas of most importance to this study are: theory to practice problems, tracking as policy, defining terms like literacy or reading, the social construction of meaning, ideology as construct and practice, the limits of choice, and the difficulties inherent in balancing people's varying agendas for themselves and others. How did each area in question relate to accomplishing literacy at Fenlea H. S.?

Theory into Practice

Why are there so many studies and yet so few solutions to the seemingly intractable problem of translating research on becoming literate into classroom practice? The roots of the problem lie in the assumption that researchers and users of research make that there is one reading or one writing. Most studies offer definitions of these terms which are as evaluative as they are descriptive. The theories on which they rest are not grounded in a social sense and this leads to the belief that any literacy curriculum can be taught independent of a particular pedagogy (Mosenthal, 1986c). This naively ignores the importance of different means of instruction leading to different goals, not being optional routes to the same goal (Olson, 1977).

ERIC

As well, the history of research in reading and writing has been largely experimental in nature, necessarily focused on individuals, which results in placing the blame on them for not learning to read or write, be they teachers or students. There is a strong need to know more about how tasks involved in literacy are accomplished jointly, using stores of non-school cultural knowledge. By examining literacy as a socially constructed phenomenon, it is possible to redress the problems inherent in a solely experimental model.

Literacy and Tracking: Intertwined Definitions

What is it to be literate and is being literate a different thing for Basics, Repeaters, and Regulars? The historical shift in using reading and writing as specific social practices to the use of language for its own sake made possible a definition of literacy abstracted from everyday use (Nespor, 1987). This view of literacy made possible its teaching independent of context and without regard for the intentions, interests, or background knowledge of the learner.

Concepts of literacy are also rooted in ideology. In the United States, the dominant ideology is one of cultural reproduction whose two main branches are the academic and the utilitarian. Fenlea offered the more valued curriculum--the academic--to Regular and Honors students, and the utilitarian

ERIC

and less valued to Basics and Repeaters, thus promoting unequal access to educational resources, to the detriment of those in the lower tracks.

What is learned and taught is always in the context of culture which legitimates our judgments about what knowledge is, whet'ʼer it is true knowledge and whether it is worth knowing. "Cultural logic" (Heap, 1986), is the term for this making sense of things and actions and making sense to persons within a social context, and it is used to decide "what should be said when" (Austin, 1970), we are communicating something to someone. Often tacit in matters of what and how information is imparted to students, cultural logic is also imparted differentially to pupils in different tracks. At Fenlea, students were the recipients of differentiated curricula in which they were taught different subject matter. The Regulars not only were taught more of the "academic" but also instruction in matters of "what we say when" were imparted differentially. Thus, their performance would always be judged more competent than their lower track counterparts.

Literacy was a different entity for each track. This was often acknowledged in the statements of students, teachers and administrators which stressed the unde . importance of linguistic knowledge as what truly differentiated tracks. The paradox here is that many Basic

and Repeater students had been identified as remedial early in their school careers. The help they were given, while acknowledging the importance of literacy, stressed the imparting of bits and pieces, fragments and skills, rather than knowledge of what is necessary to succeed in higher tracks. By the time they became high school students, they identified reading and writing as mechanical skills and rejected efforts to inculcate other more "academic" ways to read and write.

Social Construction of Knowledge

What did being called Basic, Regular, or Repeater feel and look like, and what did the label matter in terms of behavior to each other? Basic to understanding how tracking for literacy is accomplished and maintained is realizing that people must display what they know and that the meaningfulness of behavioral displays is established by the interpretations of others. As well, production and interpretation inform one another, i.e., we're always looking to others to see if we've got it right. Academic performance is judged as competent or not by the way we present our answers as well as their correctness.

Group membership is defined by appearance and behavior. Basics and Repeaters are scruffier, louder and noisier than Regulars. Low-track kids inhabited dirtier, more inconvenient classrooms. Physical clues told them how to act

towards one another: teacher to students, students to teacher, students to one another, and formed the basis for labeling. Once group membership was established, students used other people and environments as contexts for getting what they wanted. This aspect of cultural logic, of coming to understand what a label looks and acts like, is perhaps the crux of the matter. Once they knew they were a Basic, they demanded a basic and devalued education. Attempts to teach them elements of the Regular curriculum, to make them assertive, responsible, and joyful in their learning were met with stony resistance. Their teacher, mistaking this for a wholly psychological phenomenon, voluntarily reduced her expectations so that stasis was maintained. Together, they accomplished the label that had been given.

Ideology

What is the connection between ideology and literacy? "In schools, ideologies are often formed through the continuance of practices assumed to be beneficial but which serve to perpetuate the very problems they are designed to minimize: (Kickbush and Everhart, 1985, p. 282). Through the process of identifying and teaching students as "remedial," schools dispense a curriculum whose differential definition of what counts as valid knowledge leads to making sure students will stay remedial through all their days in school. Note well that tracking is done in subjects that count most

ERIC

for future success, e.g., English, history, mathematics and science. Arts and industrial arts have no honors or basic sections. The ideological notions this represents have to do with hierarchically organized institutions dispensing educational opportunities unequally, "thus perpetuating subsequent social and economic inequalities" (Kickbush and Everhart, 1985).

Choices and Agendas

The idea of choice is important in a democratic society because the notion of choice is inherent in the concept of freedom. So, the American education system must be seen to offer all the same chance to succeed. All groups at Fenlea believed to some degree that track placement was based on choice. The surprising thing is that everyone continued to believe this despite the fact that they also knew that tracking was overwhelmingly based on home background and thus socioeconomic status. The differentiated grading system served to keep students on track as well by awarding apparently equal grades for apparently unequal work. If free choice were truly operative, great mobility should have occurred. It did not. The upper range of guesstimates was 5-7%, and was most often based on social factors. In my estimation, this lack of mobility signals the great failure of tracking. Its commonly stated purpose of helping students to reach their maximum potential assumes that there is a

limit on their potential and serves to limit rather than expand opportunities (Fraatz, 1987).

Conclusion

Finally, recognition that our attempts at remediation may serve not to cure but to ensure a continuing state of being remedial is not enough: changing schools means changing society. We get the schools we deserve because the schools function to inculcate the dominant culture, including its inequities, into students. The ideological rhetoric of schooling promised that its expansion would provide greater opportunities for all, resulting in a society that would base allocation of resources on merit rather than social status or race, bur this view is not borne out in the research (Oakes, 1981). Race and class are still major influences on adult socioeconomic states as well as on levels of school attainment. Bringing about change, whether through educational innovation or in the larger society is, perhaps, possible but extraordinarily difficult.

REFERENCES

Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Review, 11,* 3-42.

Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Austin, J. (1970). *Philosophical papers.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Baker, L. & Brown, A. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research.* New York: Longman.

Bartlett, F. (1932). *Remembering.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Bernstein, B. (1971). On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In M. F. D. Young (Ed.), *Knowledge and control: New directions for the sociology of education.* London: Collier-Mcmillan.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America.* New York: Basic Books.

Brewer, W. & Nakamura, G. (1984). *The nature and functions of schemas.* (Technical report no. 325). Cambridge, MA: Bolt, Beranek and Newman. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 491)

D'Andrade, R. G. (1981). The cultural part of cognition. *Cognitive Science, 5,* 179-195.

Fraatz, J. M. B. (1987). *The politics of reading: Power, opportunity, and prospects for change in America's public schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Goffman, E. (1975). *Frame analysis.* New York: Harper & Row.

Heap, J. L. (1985). Discourse in the production of classroom knowledge: Reading lessons. *Curriculum*

Inquiry, 15, 245-279.

Heap, J. L. (1986). Cultural logic and schema theory: A reply to Bereiter. *Curriculum Inquiry, 16*, 73-86.

Heath, S. B. (1982). Ethnography in education: Defining the essentials. In P. Gilmore & A. Glatthorn (Eds.), *Children in and out of school: Ethnography and education*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Hiebert, E. (1983). An examination of ability grouping for reading instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly, 18*, 231-255.

Jencks, C. (1972). The quality of the data. In F. Mosteller & D. P. Moynihan (Eds.), *On equality of educational opportunity*. New York: Vintage.

Johnson, N. B. (1982). *Clothing and dress--symbols of stratification in schools and in society: A descriptive study*. (Revised). Unpublished manuscript. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 218 166)

Kickbush, K. W. & Everhart, R. B. (1985). Curriculum, practical ideology and class contradiction. *Curriculum Review, 15*, 281-317.

Kirsch, I. (1986). *Literacy: Profiles of America's young adults*. Princeton, NJ: National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Kliebard, H. (1979a). The drive for curriculum change in the United States, 1890--1958. I--The ideological roots of curriculum as a field of specialization. *Curriculum Studies, 11*, 191-202.

Kliebard, H. (1979b). The drive for curriculum change in the United States, 1890--1958. II--From local reform to a national preoccupation. *Curriculum Studies, 11*, 273-286.

Kohlberg, L. & Mayer, R. (1972). Development as the aim of education. *Harvard Educational Review, 42*, 449-496.

Mehan, H. (1980). The competent student. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 11*, 131-152.

Mosenthal, P. B. (1986a). Translating definitions of

reading in research into practice. *The Reading Teacher, 39,* 110-112.

Mosenthal, P. B. (1986b). Defining good and poor reading--the problem of the artifactual lamp posts. *The Reading Teacher, 39,* 858-861.

Mosenthal, P. B. (1986c). The geometries of reading. *The Reading Teacher, 39,* 968-971.

Mosenthal, P. B. (1987a). Rational and irrational approaches to understanding reading. *The Reading Teacher, 40,* 570-572.

Mosenthal, P. B. (1987b). Relating taxonomies of reading methods to taxonomies of reading. The *Reading Teacher, 40,* 810-813.

Nespor, J. (1987). The construction of school knowledge: A case study. *Journal of Education, 169,* 34-54.

Noland, T. & Taylor, B. (1986). *The effects of ability grouping: A meta-analysis of research findings.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 269 451)

Oakes, J. (1981). *A question of access: Tracking and curriculum differentiation in a national sample of English and mathematics classes* (Study of Schooling Technical Report No. 24). Los Angeles: University of California Graduate School of Education.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Olson, D. (1977). The languages of instruction: The literate bias of schooling. In R. Anderson, R. Spiro, & W. Montague (Eds.), *Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Raze, N. (1984). *Overview of research on ability grouping.* Redwood City, CA: San Mateo County Office of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 927)

Resnick, D. and Resnick, L. (1977). The nature of

literacy: An historical explanation. *Harvard Educational Review, 47*, 370-385.

Robertson, E. (1985). Entering the world of academic reading. In J. Cooper, R. Evans, & E. Robertson (Eds.), *Teaching college students to read analytically: An individualized approach.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Rosenbaum, J. E. (1976). *Making inequality: The hidden curriculum of high school tracking.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Rowan, B. & Miracle, A. (1982). *Systems of ability grouping and the stratification of achievement in elementary schools.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Sociological Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 222 864)

Schutz, A. (1962). *Collected papers: The problem of social reality* (Volume I). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Smith, D. M. (1987). Illiteracy as a social fault. In D. Bloome (Ed.), *Literacy and schooling.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Sommer, R. (1969). *Personal space: The behavioral basis of design.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Tierney, R. & Pearson, P. D. (1986). *Schema theory and its implications for teaching reading: A conversation* (Reading Education Report No. 67). Cambridge, MA: Bolt Beranek and Newman. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 281 140)

Vanfossen, B. E., Jones, J. D., & Spade, J. Z. (1987). Curriculum tracking and maintenance. *Sociology of Education, 60*, 104-122.

Walmsley, S. E. (1981). On the purpose and content of secondary reading programs: An educational ideological perspective. *Curriculum Inquiry, 11*, 73-93.

Wilcox, K. (1982). Differential socialization in the classroom: Implications for equal opportunity. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing the ethnography of*

schooling: Educational anthropology in action. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Wolcott, H. G. (1987). On ethnographic intent. In G. Spindler & L. Spindler (Eds.), *Interpretive ethnography of education: At home and abroad.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.