Southern Illinois University Carbondale
OpenSIUC

Dissertations | Theses and Dissertations

5-1-2010

Making the Significant Significant: A Discourse Analysis Examining the Teacher's Role in Negotiating Meaning of Text with Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students

Keith Standiford Wheeler
Southern Illinois University Carbondale, kwheeler@semo.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/dissertations

Recommended Citation
Wheeler, Keith Standiford, "Making the Significant Significant: A Discourse Analysis Examining the Teacher's Role in Negotiating Meaning of Text with Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students" (2010). *Dissertations.* Paper 120.

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact opensiuc@lib.siu.edu.

MAKING THE SIGNIFICANT SIGNIFICANT:
A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS EXAMINING THE TEACHER'S ROLE IN NEGOTIATING MEANING OF TEXT WITH CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE STUDENTS

by

Keith S. Wheeler

A.A.S., East Central College, 1993
B.A., Southeast Missouri State University, 1999
M.A., Southern Illinois University Carbondale, 2002

A Dissertation
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Doctor of Philosophy degree.

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
in the Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
May 2010

Copyright by Keith S. Wheeler, 2010
All Rights Reserved

DISSERTATION APPROVAL

MAKING THE SIGNIFICANT SIGNIFICANT: A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS EXAMINING THE TEACHER'S ROLE IN NEGOTIATING MEANING OF TEXT WITH CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE STUDENTS

By

Keith S. Wheeler

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the field of Curriculum and Instruction

Approved by:

Marla H. Mallette, Chair

Lynn C. Smith

D. John McIntyre

Kathy Hytten

Janet M. Fuller

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
March 23, 2010

AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF

Keith S. Wheeler, for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Curriculum and Instruction, presented on March 23, 2010, at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

TITLE: MAKING THE SIGNIFICANT SIGNIFICANT: A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS EXAMINING THE TEACHER'S ROLE IN NEGOTIATING MEANING OF TEXT WITH CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE STUDENTS

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Dr. Marla H. Mallette

This study reports data from a three-month discourse analysis of a fifth-grade teacher's language used to negotiate meaning of text with linguistically and culturally diverse students. Specifically, I use Gee's (2005) discourse analysis methodology to examine the teacher's language-in-use for seven building tasks of language—significance, activities, identities, relationships, politics (the distribution of social goods), connections, and sign systems and knowledge—in a micro level analysis for eight teaching episodes covering reading and/or social studies instruction. In doing so, I conceptualize categories and subcategories of language use for each of the language building tasks. I find that the teacher used instructional language overwhelmingly to build significance (almost two-thirds of the coded data) and that in building significance the teacher used reproduction of meaning (including repetition, paraphrase, and citation), prosodic devices, questions, overt attention, life connection, and adjective labeling. In a macro level of analysis, I examine the content of the meanings the teacher negotiated, and find that situated meanings in her discourse often allude to issues of power that implicate a discourse model of a critical outlook on social studies and social issues that appear in social studies, reading and other texts. I end with a discussion of how these findings might be of practical use for educators and suggestions for future research.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to Rhonda Brandman, whose love, patience, support, and not-so-gentle nudging made its completion possible.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge Stephanie Solbrig for her dedication, work, and inspiration as an educator. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Marla Mallette, friend and mentor, for her tireless work and guidance on the entirety of this dissertation.

PREFACE

The purpose of this study was to examine the teacher's role in negotiating meaning of text with culturally and linguistically diverse students and to describe the process. Discourse analysis was used as a research tool, which involves transcriptions of audio data. The following brief explanation of transcription units and conventions may be of some help in interpreting transcribed examples in the study: Each line represents a tone unit—a set of words said with one uniform intonational contour (said as if they "go together"). Macro-lines (1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, etc.) are used to tie two or more lines into something akin to a sentence. Stanzas are "clumps" of tone units that deal with a unitary topic or perspective, and which appear to have been planned together. A double slash ("//") indicates the tone unit is said with a "final contour"—a rising or falling pitch of the voice that sounds "final," as if a piece of information is "closed off" and "finished." Two periods ("..") indicates a hearable pause. Three periods followed by a number ("…(7)") indicates an extended pause in seconds. CAPITALIZED words are emphatic (said with extra stress). A colon (":") following a vowel indicates that the vowel is elongated (drawn out). "Low pitch" means that the preceding unit was said on overall low pitch.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

ABSTRACT.....i

DEDICATION..... ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

PREFACE.....iv

LIST OF FIGURES vi

CHAPTERS

CHAPTER 1 – Introduction.....1

CHAPTER 2 – Review of Literature.....6

CHAPTER 3 – Methodology.....34

CHAPTER 4 – Findings 48

CHAPTER 5 – Discussion.....163

REFERENCES 185

APPENDICIES

Appendix A – Questions About Building Tasks of Language 194

Appendix B – Units and Transcriptions……...195

VITA 200

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE PAGE

Figure 1 196

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

Providing a setting for English language learners to negotiate meaning in daily instructional interactions is a key component of the development of language and content learning. *Negotiation of meaning* is the process by which participants arrive at understanding one another. It "is the collaboration needed in conversations or discussions to express needs, ideas, thoughts, and intentions; it also involves helping others extend and refine their communication skills" (Hernández, p. 131). Meaning negotiation is central among research issues that emerge from text and classroom context in the sociocognitive model of reading (Ruddell & Unrau, 2004).

In recent decades the number of English language learners (ELLs) attending schools in the United States has increased dramatically. Between 1990 and 2000 the percentage of ELLs attending schools increased 105 percent (Kindler, 2002), while total school enrollment increased only 12 percent (Fitzgerald, Amendum, & Guthrie, 2008). ELLs spend most or all of their school day in regular classrooms (General Accounting Office, 2001, February), and almost 43 percent of teachers have one or more ELLs in their classes (Zehler, Fleischman, Hopstock, Stephenson, Pendzick, & Sapru, 2003; cited in Fitzgerald, Amendum, & Guthrie, 2008). Reading education for ELLs has gained prominent attention in both policy and practice (August & Shanahan, 2006; Slavin & Cheung, 2005), and there is evidence of a significant gap between the reading achievement of ELLs and that of native speakers (Fitzgerald, Amendum, & Guthrie, 2008). Examining meaning negotiation is important because the process is critical, not

only for teachers and English-language-learning (ELL) students to understand each other, but for these learners to develop their English-language abilities in an instructional setting.

Meaning and Meaning Negotiation

Meaning and meaning negotiation can be conceptualized through both cultural and acultural perspectives. While acultural perspectives focus on individual cognition and linguistic interaction focused on the form of a message, cultural perspectives highlight the social interaction involved in arriving at shared meaning. The extant research on second language reading predominately has been conceptualized using acultural accounts of meaning. However, this perspective fails to consider the important role of culture in meaning negotiation. For example, as suggested by Gee (1996), no meaning is fixed, meaning is always in flux. Meanings, and the cultural models that compose them, are ultimately rooted in negotiation between different social practices with different interests. Power plays an important role in these negotiations. The negotiations, which constitute meaning, are, according to Gee, limited by values emanating from communities. Meanings, then, are ultimately rooted in communities. Thus, the negotiation of meaning is a social and cultural practice.

Teachers and students negotiate meaning through speech, both spoken and written. Speech is a psychological *tool*, a means by which one acts on one's environment (Smagorinsky, 2001). Just as the same sign may represent different meanings to different readers or no meaning at all to other readers, the same implement may serve as a different tool for different users, no tool at all for other users, or a different tool for the same user in different situations, depending on how (or if at all) it is conceptualized. The manner in

which it is conceptualized is a function of *culture*.

Culture is the recurring social practices and their artifacts that give order, purpose, and continuity to social life (Smagorinsky, 2001). Bruner (1966) considered literacy a cultural artifact because it acts as a "cultural amplifier;" it amplifies memory and increases "the capacity to organize and communicate information and knowledge" (p. 60). A culture's more experienced members will instruct its novices in ways that are didactic or deliberate and through *prolepsis*. Society embeds its assumptions in daily social practice, thus codifying the world in particular ways and suggesting the naturalness, appropriateness, and often inevitableness of conventional ways of living within it. The world thus coded typically establishes authoritative ways of reading meaning into signs that privilege one perspective over another. Prolepsis works in the service of the traditional culture of school in which canonical texts make up the curriculum and the analytical written text is prized as the highest form of interpretation. These cultural practices, facilitated by a limited tool kit of mediational means used to produce a limited set of textual form, restrict students in terms of the meaning available for them to construct. Furthermore, because the cultural practices drawn on most resemble those found in the homes of middle-class students, school success is less likely for those whose home cultures provide them with a different tool kit, a different set of goals for learning, and different notions of what counts as an appropriate text (Smagorinsky, 2001). For this reason, it is very important for literacy researchers and educational researchers to understand the dynamics of meaning negotiation between teachers and culturally and linguistically diverse students taking place in the classroom.

Problem and Purpose

Zehler, Fleischman, Hopstock, Stephenson, Pendzick, & Sapru (2003) found that 43 percent of teachers have one or more ELLs in their classrooms, and that number can be expected to increase in the coming years. The meaning negotiation process that takes place among classroom teachers and ELLs is critical in order for teachers and ELLs to understand one another, as well as for ELLs to develop their English-language abilities in an instructional setting. Furthermore, there is evidence of a significant gap between the reading achievement of ELLs and that of native speakers (Fitzgerald, Amendum, & Guthrie, 2008). Therefore, it is vitally important to examine the teacher's role in negotiating meaning of text with culturally and linguistically diverse students. This study has the potential to inform the practice of teachers and educate prospective teachers on how this meaning negotiation process takes place in order to better understand their role in the process, as well as what components of the process increase the likelihood of success and what elements may lead to a breakdown in meaning negotiation. The purpose of this study was to examine the teacher's role in negotiating meaning of text with culturally and linguistically diverse students and to describe the process.

Research Question

Understanding and describing the teacher's role in negotiating meaning of text with culturally and linguistically diverse students was undertaken by attempting to answer one central research question: How does a teacher with culturally and linguistically diverse students negotiate meaning of text with her students?

Importance of the Study

Most of the extant research on classroom text meaning negotiation by nonnative

speakers has been approached from a psycholinguistic rationale. Stephen Krashen's (1985) monitor model provided the idea that the development of learners' interlanguage is stimulated by comprehensible input. If learners are to internalize the L2 (second language) forms and structures that encode a message, comprehension of the message meaning is necessary. Michael Long's (1996) update to his interaction hypothesis proposed that in order to comprehend input the learner's selective attention and L2 processing capacity resources are most usefully brought together during negotiation for meaning. Although much work still needs to be done on the study of language learning through negotiation, most negotiation research has stemmed from this cognitive perspective.

Sociocultural theory is also concerned with the development of cognitive processes. Where it differs from traditional cognitive approaches is in its foreshadowing of the social dimension of consciousness and its de-emphasis of the individual dimension. When learners appropriate socioculturally meaningful artifacts and symbolic systems, most importantly language, as they interact in socioculturally meaningful activities, they gain control over their own mental activity and can begin to function independently. How a learner makes use of the L2 in interaction with other people and artifacts may be examined as distributed cognition. It is through this lens that I wish to examine how teachers with culturally and linguistically diverse students negotiate meaning about text since the study of classroom meaning negotiation using a sociocultural perspective represents a gap in the literature.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This review of the literature is organized by first examining meaning and meaning negotiation from both acultural and cultural perspectives. Following this overview, I review the research on classroom text meaning negotiation by nonnative speakers (NNS), starting with studies of meaning negotiation strictly among learners that include studies that include only NNS participants and a study that includes a mix of native speaker (NS) and NNS participants. Then I review studies of meaning negotiation among NS teachers and NNS learners. Next I reexamine those studies in the light of the theoretical frameworks that guided the data collection and analysis of the studies in order to provide insight into understanding how the studies were conceptualized and thus how their findings were framed. Following that, I review five related studies, not specifically examining classroom meaning negotiation among ELLs, which may help to inform the research nonetheless. Finally, I report on a very recent review of discourse analysis studies used in literacy research in education over the past 10 years.

Acultural Accounts of Meaning

From a linguistic perspective, understanding a text is the process of understanding the author's communicative intent (Koda, 2005). Comprehension involves far more than reading lines. It involves reading between lines (Gray, 1960). All reading is done in a particular context that includes the form of the text itself, the information presupposed by the writer, and the background knowledge already possessed by the reader. It is by drawing on this context that successful reading takes place (Martin, 1991).

The background knowledge of the reader is used to make meaning through

inference when the text itself does not provide all the relational information necessary to make the text meaningful. *Inference* may be defined as "information that is activated during reading yet not explicitly stated in the text" (van den Broek, 1994, p. 556), "text based arguments and propositions that were not explicitly in a message" (Singer, 1994, p. 480), or "encoded (non explicit) features of the meaning of a text" (McKoon & Ratcliff, 1989, p. 335).

Singer (1994) used the following simple example to illustrate how a reader uses inference based on background knowledge to make meaning from text: *The tooth was pulled painlessly. The dentist used a new method* (p. 487). The two sentences are not explicitly related. The reader uses background knowledge to realize that the tooth was pulled by the dentist. Inferencing is used by readers to expand and elaborate on explicit text information. The reader's success is based on the extent to which content-relevant knowledge is readily available during text processing (Long, Seely, Oppy, & Golding, 1996).

Several variables may affect the ability to make inferences during text processing. Working memory is necessary for mental computation and temporary storage of segmental information (Koda, 2005). Inference generation is also affected by text structure, since specific ways text information is presented initiate particular processing procedures (Singer, 1994). Information that is presented as thematic, rather than peripheral, is higher in the structural hierarchy in the text and more strongly linked with other elements in the text. Thematic information remains in working memory longer than peripheral information (Koda, 2005). Background knowledge, as a variable in the ability to make inferences, may be the variable most specific to difficulties ESL readers may

have in getting meaning from text. Singer (1994) related background knowledge to how readers use discourse structure in differentiating thematic information from peripheral information in text. What is considered thematic information is heavily influenced by the background knowledge of the reader in appraisals of the comparative significance of ideas presented in text.

It seems intuitive that a text is better understood when its content is familiar to the reader. But background knowledge may be examined from different aspects. One aspect of background knowledge is abstract knowledge structure, or schema. One's schema does not detail individual instances, but generalizes information from a variety of instances. Schemata are structured in such a way that they denote relationships among components, which provides scaffolding for organizing and interpreting new experiences (Anderson & Pearson, 1984). The schema may be seen as responsible for suppressing the activation of irrelevant information, causing the reader to interpret text in certain ways (Koda, 2005).

Another aspect of background knowledge is domain knowledge. Knowledge of content of any given text strongly influences what meaning can be extracted from that text (Anderson & Pearson, 1984). Schema may not always compensate for lack of specific domain knowledge of the content of a text.

A third aspect of background knowledge is formal knowledge of a text's structural organization. Koda (2005) noted that languages have systems for signaling a text's structural organization by indicating the connections among its components and their relative significance. Readers become aware of the specific ways information is arranged in order to make the text coherent.

Acultural Accounts of Meaning Negotiation

Most of the second language acquisition (SLA) research on classroom meaning negotiation rests on Krashen's (1985) idea that the development of learners' interlanguage is stimulated by comprehensible input. This psycholinguistic rationale holds that comprehension of message meaning is necessary if learners are to internalize second language (L2) forms and structures that encode the message.

The work of Michael Long has guided negotiation research (Pica, 1994). In Long's (1996) update to his interaction hypothesis, it was "proposed that environmental contributions to acquisition are mediated by selective attention and the learner's developing L2 processing capacity, and that these resources are brought together most usefully, although not exclusively, during *negotiation for meaning*" (p. 414). Long believed that not only must input be comprehensible for acquisition to occur (Krashen, 1985), but when native speakers (NSs) make global linguistic and conversational adjustments, comprehensibility for nonnative speakers (NNSs) is improved. "*Negotiation for meaning*, and especially negotiation work that triggers *interactional* adjustments by the NS or more competent interlocutor, facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways" (Long, 1996, pp. 451-452). This negotiation work involves semantically contingent speech (utterances by a competent speaker that immediately follow learner utterances and maintain reference to their meaning) and includes repetitions, extensions, reformulations, rephrasings, expansions, and recasts.

Pica (1994) reviewed insights into L2 learning revealed by "over a decade of research on the social interaction and negotiation of L2 learners and their interlocutors"

(p. 493). Theoretical perspectives on learner-oriented conditions for SLA include the necessity of comprehension of message meaning if learners are to internalize L2 forms and structures that encode the message, as well as the necessity of learner production of modified output to achieve L2 mastery (Swain, 1985). A third learner-oriented condition is the necessity of attention to L2 form as learners attempt to process meaningful input and attempt to master the structural features that are difficult to learn inductively because they are relatively imperceptible in L2 input or overlap with structures in the learner's first language (L1).

Theoretical perspectives on language-oriented conditions for SLA include that positive L2 input must be available to serve the learning process; that enhanced L2 input, which makes subtle L2 features more salient for learners, can assist their learning process; and that feedback and *negative input* that explicitly indicates that the form used is incorrect are needed to provide learners with metalinguistic information on the clarity, accuracy, and/or comprehensibility of their interlanguage and with structural information that may help them notice non-target-like forms in their interlanguage that are difficult to detect from positive input alone.

Pica found considerable evidence for the role that negotiation plays in bringing about comprehension. There are more input modifications during negotiation for meaning than during other learner interactions, and there is "evidence that negotiation modifies the L2 in ways that help learners comprehend its meaning" (p. 506). However, in Pica's review relatively little negotiation was seen in the language classroom context. Pica related this to "matters of teacher and student power, to traditions in language teaching, and to expectations about the language classroom" (p. 521).

Cultural Accounts of Meaning

The way in which a specific language categorizes things might influence how speakers of that language conceive of things. Sapir (1949) stated, "The fact of the matter is that the 'real world' is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group" (p. 162; cited in Johnstone 2002). Johnstone (2002) gave the following example:

> . . . In English, experiencing something is sometimes treated, grammatically, as if it were the same as possessing something: a person can *have* a hat (a possession) or *have* a headache (an experience). Because of this, people who speak English might tend to think of, and maybe treat, headaches and other illnesses as if they were possessions. (We *give* diseases to other people, for example, and they talk about *getting rid of* headaches as if they were objects that could be thrown in the trash.) (p. 33)

The idea that the ways in which people categorize things in the world are affected by the ways in which their language categorizes things grammatically has become known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (Johnstone, 2002). Whorf identified a tendency in English to reference imaginary entities the same way as concrete objects. This emerges in the patterns of English pluralization, quantification, and time expressions. Temporal cycles are treated as if they were concrete objects; for example, the treatment of temporal duration as if it were a spatial entity (a *length* of time) (Lucy, 1995). " . . . There is no question but that speech habits are among the determinants of nonlinguistic behavior, and conversely" (Hymes, 1995, p. 251). Language functions not only as a device for reporting experience, but as a way of defining experience for its speakers (Hoijer, 1954).

The most widely held version is that categories of language influence, but do not necessarily determine, how people construe the world (Johnstone, 2002).

Smagorinsky (2001) used concepts and terminology of activity theory and semiotics to set up a theoretical framework for considering meaning. Fundamental to this framework are the concepts of sign, text, tool, and culture. A *sign* is viewed as a relation of referring back, where something stands to somebody for something else in some respect or capacity. What the sign, or configuration of signs, stands for resides at the heart of meaning. How a sign comes to mean is a function of how a reader is enculturated to read.

Gee (1996) pointed out that what one means by a word depends on which other words are available and which other words the use of the word (e.g., "sofa") is meant to exclude or not exclude as possibly also applying (e.g., "sofa" excludes "settee," but not "couch"). The meaning of a word is (in part) a matter of what other words one's use of a given word in a given situation is intended to exclude or not exclude as also possibly applicable. This *exclusion principle* implies that speakers of the same (social) language mean different things by the words they use. People can only make judgments about what others mean by a word used on a given occasion by guessing what other words the word is meant to exclude or not exclude. This is called the *guessing principle*, and people who belong to the same or similar social groups, who speak the same or similar social languages, make better guesses about each other. People can only make good guesses about what other words a given word is meant to exclude or not exclude as applicable on a given occasion by consideration of the context of the communication. If one were shown a comic book, a magazine, and a hard-cover novel, and asked to "pick out the

book," one would probably select the hard-cover novel. On the other hand, if one were shown a radio, a table, and a comic book, and asked to "pick out the *book*," one would select the comic book. Guesses about what words mean are always relative to assumptions about what the relative context is, and, thus, change with assumptions about the context. This is called the *context principle*. Taken together, these three principles imply that words have no useful meaning in and of themselves and by themselves apart from other words. They have meaning only relative to choices and guesses about other words, and assumptions about contexts.

The basis for our choices and assumptions in the use of words is the beliefs and values that we hold. This social theory that forms the basis of such choices involves assumptions about models of simplified worlds. Gee (1996) termed them *cultural models*. People conventionally take these simplified worlds to be the *real* world, or act as if they were. Dominant cultures have the power to define their vision of reality as reality, thus establishing their values as authoritative and sovereign and as a framework for future relationships. That those with the greatest cultural capital can sanction meaning has implications for the meaning of texts (Smagorinsky, 2001).

A configuration of signs that provides a potential for meaning is a *text* in Smagorinsky's framework. Texts are codified and conventional and are produced as part of the ongoing development of a genre—which includes both text features and social practices—and is read by a reader who is enculturated to understand texts in codified and conventional ways. Attributing meaning to the text alone simply assigns to the text an officially sanctioned meaning, often one so deeply presumed that other interpretations inevitably are dismissed as incorrect or irrelevant.

Cultural models are variable, differing across different cultural groups in a society speaking the same language. They change with time and with other changes in the society, but we are usually quite unaware we are using them and of their full implications (Gee, 1996).

Cultural models have deep implications for the teaching of language and literacy to people new to a culture and to non-mainstream students who wish to master the standard, dominant cultural models in the society, despite the fact that many of these models marginalize non-mainstream people. As Heath (1983) and others have pointed out, the cultural models of non-mainstream students, rooted in their homes and communities, can conflict seriously with those of mainstream culture.

The contexts of reading can invoke particular conventions for reading, the *ground rules* for participating appropriately. The reading conventions that teachers endorse for discussing literature have official sanction and therefore render other ways of reading texts less authoritative. If it is true that there are cultured and gendered ways of reading and producing texts, and that some of these practices are out of step with the established and authoritative ways of conceiving and considering texts in school, then school becomes a much more hospitable and rewarding experience for some groups than for others (Smagorinsky, 2001).

Gee (2005) states that language used alongside action, interactions, non-linguistic symbol systems, objects, tools, technologies, and distinctive ways of thinking, valuing, feeling, and believing is used to build things. When one speaks one always builds seven areas of reality. These seven building tasks of language include significance, activities, identities, relationships, politics (the distribution of social goods), connections, and sign

systems and knowledge. One uses language to make things significant; to get recognized as engaging in a certain activity, or as taking on a certain identity; to signal what sort of relationship we have or want to have with our listeners or others about whom we are communicating; to convey a perspective on the nature of the distribution of social goods (what is taken to be normal, right, good, correct, proper, appropriate, valuable, the way things are, the way things ought to be, high status or low status, like oneself or not like oneself, etc.); to render things certain connected or relevant or not to other things; and to make certain sign systems and certain forms of knowledge and belief relevant or privileged or not. Different tools of inquiry can be used to analyze the workings of these building tasks.

An utterance has meaning only if it communicates a *who* and a *what*. The *who* is the kind of person one is seeking to be and enact at the present time—a socially situated identity. People build identities and activities by combining language, actions, interactions, ways of thinking, believing, valuing, and using various symbols, tools, and objects--what Gee (2005) terms Discourses--to enact a particular sort of socially recognizable identity. The *what* is a socially situated activity that the utterance helps to constitute. People use different styles or varieties of language, what Gee terms "social languages," to enact and recognize different socially significant identities and different socially meaningful activities in different settings, as well as engage in other building tasks.

To be a particular *who* doing a particular *what* requires that one act, value, interact, and use language in coordination with other people and various objects at appropriate locations and at appropriate times. Gee (2005) believes the key to Discourses

is recognition. If you put language, action, interaction, values beliefs, symbols, objects, tools, and places together in such a way that others mentally recognize you as a particular identity engaged in a particular type of activity then you have successfully pulled-off a Discourse.

Social languages constitute the language component of Discourses. Speakers (and writers) design their utterances to have patterns in them that allow listeners (or readers) to attribute situated identities and specific activities to them. These patterns are called "collocational patterns" because various sorts of grammatical patterns co-locate with each other. However, meaning is not simply a matter of decoding grammar. It is also a matter of understanding which of the inferences that one can draw from an utterance are relevant, a matter closely tied to context, point of view, and culture. In fact, the utterances of social languages have meaning only because they are embedded in specific social discussions.

Cultural Accounts of Meaning Negotiation

The meanings of words, when looked at in their actual contexts of use, are not general. Words have different meanings in different contexts and vary across different social and cultural groups (Gee, 2005). These situated meanings arise because particular language forms take on specific meanings in specific contexts. There is a reflexive relationship between language and context. An utterance influences what we take the context to be, and context influences what we take the utterance to mean.

Humans recognize certain patterns in their experience of the world. These patterns make up one of many situated meanings of a word. More than patterns, for adults, situated meanings of words involve a hypothetical *explanation* (or theory) of these

patterns. These theories are largely unconscious, not easily articulated, often incomplete, and rooted in the practices of the sociocultural group to which one belongs. They have been referred to as cultural models (Gee, 1996). However, since they are connected to specific Discourses (specific socially and culturally distinctive identities people can take on in society), Gee (2005) prefers the term "Discourse models." Discourse models do not only reside in the individual mind. They are often shared across people, books, other media, and various social practices. As well, situated meanings reside not only in the individual mind. Very often they are *negotiated* between people in and through communicative social interaction.

Most of the extant research on negotiation of meaning has been conducted from an acultural point of view, which includes cognitive or psycholinguistic perspectives. From this perspective, reading is done in a particular context that includes the form of the text itself, the information presupposed by the writer, and the background knowledge already possessed by the reader. In this framework readers use their background knowledge in order to make inferences to gain meaning from text.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, meaning is closely tied to cultural models (or discourse models). Cultural models are simplified worlds that people conventionally take to be the *real* world, or act as if they were. It is only relatively recently that literacy researchers and second language acquisition researchers have begun to look through the lens of sociocultural theory to understand how people make meaning from text.

Research on Classroom Text Meaning Negotiation by Nonnative Speakers (NNS)

NNS Learner vs. NNS Learner

Foster (1998) and Foster and Ohta (2005) focused on meaning negotiation in NNS

learner-NNS learner exchanges. Both quasi-experimental studies used information exchange tasks. Foster (1998) studied 21 part-time students from a variety of L1 backgrounds in an intermediate English as a Foreign Language (EFL) class at a large municipal college in Britain. The researchers used dyads and small groups to perform four tasks. The dyad tasks included a grammar-based task where students were required to compose questions to elicit answers with which they were supplied, as well as a picture-differences task where each student was given a sheet of line drawings, some identical and some with slight differences, and then were required to establish which drawings were the same and which were different. The small group tasks included a discussion task where the students were given a problem and several possible courses of action to follow and were required to reach a consensus, as well as another discussion task where the students were given an identical map of a seaside area plus individual cards for each student that contained tourist information that the others did not see. The group had to agree on how to spend the weekend. Foster asked the following research questions:

> *Language Production*: Does the obligation to transfer information during a task cause students to talk more? Is there a difference in the amount of language produced by students working in groups compared to those working in dyads?
>
> *Comprehensible Input*: To what extent do students in dyads and groups negotiate for meaning (i.e. use comprehension checks, confirmation checks, and clarification requests) in order to make input comprehensible? Is the obligation to transfer information associated with a greater incidence of negotiation of meaning? Is such negotiating more likely to occur in groups or in dyads?

> *Modified Output*: To what extent do students in dyads and groups modify their language to make it comprehensible to others? Is the obligation to transfer information associated with a greater incidence of modified output? Are such modifications more often observed in groups or in dyads? (p. 5)

Foster and Ohta (2005), using discourse analysis, studied 20 young adult part-time students from a variety of L1 backgrounds in an intermediate-level English class at an adult college in London and 19 American college students in a third-year Japanese class at an American university. The Japanese L2 learners worked in dyads and triads interviewing each other using a list of prompt questions designed to elicit opinions and plans regarding study abroad in Japan. The English L2 learners worked in dyads interviewing their partners using a list of prompt questions designed to elicit impressions of studying in England. The researchers asked the following research questions:

> How often do learners initiate negotiation for meaning during the task, and how much modified output do they produce as a consequence?
>
> In the absence of overtly signaled communication problems, what interactional processes occur which might be useful for SLA [second language acquisition]? (p. 415)

Both Foster (1998) and Foster and Ohta (2005) found little evidence of modified output during meaning negotiation. When problems in communication arose students rarely if ever signaled there was a problem and even more rarely modified their output as a result. NNS students rarely even attempted to negotiate meaning among themselves at all. Foster (1998) speculated why these students do not negotiate meaning. One reason is that to delay an interaction each time there was a problem utterance in order to make a

repair is frustratingly slow and laborious. Another reason is that students feel incompetent each time they must point out their incomprehension to others. A third reason is that a natural communication strategy used by all of us is to pretend we understand and hope that a future utterance will clear things up for us. "What is clear . . . is that uncoached negotiation for meaning is not 'alive and well' in the classroom, and given the minute number of syntactically modified utterances, is much too fragile to bear the weight of the SLA theory that researchers like Pica have built upon it" (p. 19).

NS/NNS Learner vs. NS/NNS Learner

A mix of native speaking (NS) and NNS learners were participants in another quasi-experimental study, using reading conditions with both unmodified and modified input and collective and pair negotiation conditions, involving learner-learner meaning negotiation of written input. Van den Branden (2000) asked the following research questions:

> Does negotiation of meaning promote comprehension of Dutch written input by primary school pupils . . . ? [and,]
>
> . . . Under what conditions does negotiation of meaning optimally promote the comprehension of written input in the context of the real-life language classroom? (p. 431)

Van den Branden found negotiation of meaning improves comprehension of written input "if the learners themselves are actively involved in signaling their problems and in trying to solve them" (p. 438). The design of the study may provide clues as to why Van den Branden found meaning negotiation to be taking place in the classroom while Foster (1998) and Foster and Ohta (2005) did not. Van den Branden used 151 ten-

to twelve-year-old Flemish primary school children (92 NSs of Dutch and 59 NNSs [mostly children of Moroccan immigrants]) while the other two studies were conducted with college-age students. The younger children were motivated to understand the detective story Van den Branden used. During pair negotiation these children were allowed to work with a friend. Interestingly, Van den Branden found that comprehension scores were higher for students who cooperated with a peer of a different level of language proficiency than for students who cooperated with a peer of a similar level of language proficiency. Interlocutors may negotiate the meaning of something one of them said or wrote . . . , or they may negotiate the meaning of something said or written by a third party. The latter typically happens in classrooms, for instance, when teachers and their students discuss the meaning of difficult words in a text from the coursebook (p. 429).

Other research focuses on teacher-learner (rather than learner-learner) negotiation of meaning.

NS Teacher vs. NNS Learner

In a descriptive study using classroom discourse analysis, instructor survey, and course/instructor evaluations, Musumeci (1996) studied 48 students and 3 instructors in three social geography third-semester L2 Italian classes at a large U.S. university. The researcher wanted to know, in general, who speaks, how much and when, and about what? Specifically, Musumeci asked how is failure to comprehend signaled and how are messages modified, and, in particular, who signals and who modifies?

Musumeci found sustained meaning negotiation occurred very rarely between NS teacher and NNS learner in a content-based classroom. Neither students nor teachers

asked for clarification when meaning was unclear. “Factors like noise and inaudible speech results in requests for repetition of utterances. Signaling non-understanding for other reasons appears to be a risky business, risky enough that students prefer to do it in private and teachers not at all” (p. 320). Rather than ask students to expand their responses, teachers provided rich interpretations.

The data reveal that the teachers in the third semester content-based Italian course speak more, more often, control the topic of discussion, rarely ask questions for which they do not have answers, and appear to understand absolutely everything the students say, sometimes even before they say it! (p. 314) Musumeci’s research attempted to shed light on why these patterns of interaction persist. Overall lack of linguistic negotiation is attributed to teachers' and learners' expectations for appropriate classroom behaviors, teachers' sensitivity to affective variables in second language learning, power relationships, and time management considerations.

Musumeci (1996), Foster (1998), and Foster and Ohta (2005) all found little evidence of negotiation for meaning occurring in the classroom. Walsh (2002), using conversation analysis of classroom audio recordings, attempted to discover how teachers, through their use of language, could increase opportunities for learner involvement and learning. Walsh asked the following research questions:

> In what ways do teachers, through their choice of language, create opportunities for learning?
>
> How can teachers, through their use of language, increase opportunities for learner involvement?
>
> What evidence is there that teachers "fill in the gaps" or "gloss over" learner

contributions to create a smooth-flowing discourse, but reduce opportunities for learning? (pp. 6-7)

Eight experienced EFL teachers in Belfast each made two 30-minute audio recordings of their classes.

Teacher-language features which facilitated learner involvement and constructed potential for learning included direct error correction, content feedback, checking for confirmation, extended wait-time, and scaffolding (latched modeling). Teacher-language features which hindered learner involvement and restricted or obstructed potential for learning included turn completion (latching), teacher echo, and teacher interruptions. Walsh concluded that teachers' ability to control their use of language is at least as important as their ability to select appropriate methodologies.

In the previous section I examined the extant research on meaning negotiations through the lens of the language backgrounds of the participants and the teacher. In the following section I will explore some of the findings of these studies by situating them in the theoretical frameworks that guided the data collection and analysis of these studies. This additional analysis provides insight into understanding how these studies were conceptualized and thus how their findings were framed.

Cognitive Approaches vs. Sociocultural Approaches

Most research focused on classroom negotiation for meaning (e.g., Foster, 1998; Musumeci, 1996; Van den Branden, 2000; & Walsh, 2002) used a psycholinguistic framework. Moreover, Foster and Ohta (2005) employed quantitative analysis using a cognitive (psycholinguistic) rationale and qualitative analysis using a sociocultural rationale. They described cognitive approaches to SLA as focused on the cognitive

abilities of the learner and their interaction with processing and acquiring a second language.

> For sociocultural approaches on the other hand, language development is essentially a social process. These approaches view mind as distributed and learning as something inter-mental, embedded in social interaction. This means that individuals and environments mutually constitute one another and persons are not considered to be separable from the environments and interactions through which language development occurs. In this view, knowledge is not owned solely by the learner, but is also a property of social settings and the interface between person and social context. Language development can be studied by examining distributed cognition—how a learner makes use of the L2 in interaction with other people and artifacts. Development is visible through microgenetic analyses of lessons of interaction, as the learner demonstrates increased independence (Ohta 2001; Hall and Verplaeste 2000). Researchers are also interested in processes of attention and memory and how these are revealed in learner engagement in L2 interaction. Learner perspectives are a rich source of data (Kanno 2003). For researchers, preserving the integrity of environments and the people and interactions embedded in them are critical, as these work to form any development that occurs. (Foster & Ohta, 2005, p. 403)

Foster and Ohta acknowledged the two approaches have different strengths and weaknesses and are based on different assumptions regarding the basics of human communication and learning. It has only been in the last 15 years that the SLA field has expanded from a largely cognitive orientation to include sociocultural approaches

(Zuengler & Miller, 2006).

Van den Branden (2000) attempted to tie the psycholinguistic conceptual framework of Krashen, Long, Pica, and others, to sociocultural theory, noting similarities between Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development (ZPD) and the input hypothesis (*i + 1*) of Krashen's (1982) monitor model (as does Crawford, 2003). Dunn and Lantolf (1998) however, argued that their "analysis clearly shows that the ZPD and *i + 1* are not commensurable constructs, not only because the terms themselves lack shared meaning, but also because . . . the contents of the theories from which they ultimately derive their respective meanings are non-translatable" (p. 428).

In their quantitative analysis, based on a cognitive (psycholinguistic) approach, Foster and Ohta (2005), as discussed previously, asked how often learners initiate negotiation for meaning during the task, and how much modified output they produce as a consequence. They found that signaling communication problems was uncommon, and for some participants non-existent. Moreover, modifications arising from these negotiation moves were even more infrequent.

In their qualitative analysis, grounded in sociocultural theory, Foster and Ohta (2005) asked what interactional processes occur which might be useful for SLA, in the absence of overtly signaled communication problems? "The qualitative analysis of the data [finds] ample evidence of the learners from both data sets giving and receiving assistance in a variety of ways, using co-constructions, self-corrections, other-corrections and continuers to build their discourse" (p. 421). *Co-construction* is the joint creation of an utterance, whether one person completes what another has begun, or whether various people chime in to create an utterance. *Self-correction* is self-initiated, self-repair, and

occurs when a learner corrects his or her own utterance without being prompted to do so by another person. *Other-correction* involves a peer correcting his or her partner. *Continuers* function to express an interlocutor's interest in what the speaker is saying and to encourage the speaker to go on. The researchers note that obtaining completely comprehensible input appears to be of lower priority than maintaining a supportive and friendly discourse.

Other Sociocultural (and Similar-Type) Research on Text Meaning Negotiation

The following four studies, sociocultural in nature, are not specific to ELLs, but provide insight into text meaning negotiation from the theoretical lens of sociocultural theory:

Patthey-Chavez and Clare (1996) describe ways in which reading lessons in a transitional bilingual fourth-grade classroom that were designed to facilitate discussions to enhance student reading comprehension turned into an anchoring activity for the negotiation of joint meaning. The researchers used a sociolinguistic theoretical framework that highlighted the process of "constitutive indexicality," the idea that social activities and related discourse are mutually constitutive phenomena that reflect and mediate one another.

> Thus learning to use language means coming to understand when particular choices are appropriate and implicitly learning and accepting rules and values about language choices that originate in the larger community of speakers. For example, the English-speaking caregivers in Ochs's (1992) and Schieffelin and Ochs's (1986) studies tended to guess the meaning of an unclear utterance; Western Samoan caregivers, on the other hand, expected the other to clarify their

> own utterances. These typical reactions express different *stances* about communicative responsibility, about who is supposed to do what to avert a misunderstanding, and these different expectations can lead to miscommunication . . . (p. 517).

Using quantitative applied linguistic analysis of writing that focused on fluency, emerging syntactic complexity, and lexical variety, as well as a more qualitative methodology of discourse analysis, Patthey-Chavez and Clare found that the instructional conversations that they analyzed served to display a number of important literacy processes and "served as a springboard for joint exploration and the generation of intersubjective and co-constructed ideas that bridged the worlds of home and school" (p. 515).

Alvermann, Young, Green, and Wisenbaker (1999), using critical discourse analysis as an analytical framework, investigated

> how adolescents' perceptions and negotiations of after-school talk about a variety of texts in a public library setting were shaped by (and helped to shape) the larger institutional and societal contexts that regularly influence young people's actions and interactions with peers and adults. (p. 222)

In a similar vein to sociocultural theory, Alvermann, Young, Green, and Wisenbaker, in their research of peer culture, used the theme of the importance of communal activity—the interactions that occur as adolescents negotiate, reinvent, and jointly create their "lifeworlds" [quotations added] with others of their own age and with the adults who share their worlds—as a theoretical framework. The participants in the study consisted of 22 adolescents, European American, African American, and Korean, each assigned to

one of four read and talk clubs that included an adult researcher.

The researchers found that in negotiating discursive practices associated with membership in the read and talk clubs, the participants called attention to typically unmarked and invisible ways of doing literacy, gender, adolescence, and adulthood that position individuals differently. The negotiations also called attention to existing and shifting power relations and the tensions they created relative to what kinds of texts would be read, how they would be discussed, and whose voices would be heard. Although this activity occurred outside the formal context of schooling, participants' practices were shaped by the larger institutional and societal discourses that constituted them and through which they were interpreted.

Alvermann, Young, Green, and Wisenbaker (1999) concluded that the public library setting offered a unique opportunity for adolescents to interact with peers and adults in negotiating literacy practices that were themselves traceable to larger social institutions, such as schooling. They also concluded "that the public library provided a climate of acceptance . . . in which adolescents who like to read could experience both the welcoming of other readers like themselves and the shutting out of those who would taunt them for being avid readers" (p. 255). (The researchers, themselves, point out the limitation of the self-selected nature of the participant group.) Moreover, the researchers concluded that the participants were adept at creating informal out-of-school social networks that served their needs. "However, the conditions that made such social networks possible are not easily, if ever, replicated in formal school settings" (p. 255).

Alvermann, Young, Green, and Wisenbaker (1999) state the implications of their study for further research include how such inquiry might be conceptualized. Within the

literacy community, the approach to studying text-mediated practices has broadened in terms of its willingness to consider a sociocultural framework.

> Within this broader theoretical orientation, a call has gone out to researchers to look at changing views of meaning: "What meanings *are*, where meanings *come from*, what *authorizes* particular meanings; and at changing notions of how we treat or handle texts as far as meanings and meaning-making are concerned." (p. 259; [Lankshear, 1997, p. 3, citing Gee]).

Using constant comparative analysis as well as discourse analysis as analytical frameworks, Southerland (2005) studied the meaning-making of six 16-year-old black girls as they studied text in their high school English class, examining their identity representation and construction. From a sociocultural perspective, as people read, write, and talk about text, those practices shape how people think about themselves and their place in the world.

Participants used conversation about the fictional characters and events of the Morrison novel, *The Bluest Eye* (Morrison, 1994), as a tool for analyzing their own experiences as black females. The research illustrates the interconnectedness of literacy and identity as the participants made meaning of an assigned text by revisioning their own life experiences and shaping their identities in the process.

The study examines boundaries from the theoretical perspectives of social positioning and identity and illustrates how literacy practices enabled negotiation of those boundaries. Southerland identified two predominate themes that connected the participants' life stories: a Eurocentric view of beauty acts as a boundary in black women's lives, and others' assumptions about who they are—thus how they will and

should behave—acts as a boundary. Southerland concluded that literacy and identity are inextricably intertwined and noted ethical considerations given what transpired in the study.

> In their teacher preparation programs, English teachers may study African American women's literature alongside texts from the traditional canon, but they are not necessarily taught to approach that literature any differently. A White female teacher reading a Toni Morrison novel takes up the text from her position as a White female (as well as other intersecting positions). If she is to teach African American students using that novel, what does she need to understand about how they might take it up differently than she does? (p. 397)

Positioning theory was also used as a theoretical framework in Yoon's (2008) study that examined regular classroom teachers' views of their roles with regard to English language learners (ELLs) and the relationship between their teaching approaches and the students' reactions and positioning of themselves in the classroom. Yoon noted that teachers can intentionally or unintentionally position students in more positive or more negative ways through their teaching approaches. Using case study methodology, Yoon examined the teaching practices of three regular classroom middle school language arts teachers.

Yoon found

> that the teachers' pedagogical approaches and their interactions with the ELLs were based on their positioning of themselves as teachers for all students, as teachers for regular education students, or as teachers for a single subject. The teachers' different approaches were connected to the ELLs' different participatory

> behaviors in the classroom contexts that positioned them as powerful, strong students or powerless, poor students. (p. 515)

A close examination of classroom dynamics is essential, Yoon notes, as a simple discussion of ELL issues without it is incomplete.

Handsfield and Jiménez (2009) report data from a year-long ethnographic case study of a third-grade teacher's literacy instruction for her culturally and linguistically diverse students. The researchers used Bourdieu's (1991, 1998) social practice theory to examine the teacher's linguistic and literate habitus and how the discourses of the field converge in her use of cognitive strategy instruction (CSI), an approach to teaching reading comprehension strategies. In a case study, the researchers focus on two cognitive strategies taught by the teacher—making connections and questioning—in her culturally and linguistically diverse classroom. In reference to this cognitive approach, Handsfield and Jiménez comment that

> . . . while a "sociocultural turn" in literacy research may have already occurred, popular interpretations of cognition and learning (Davis & Sumara, 1997) as well as materials for preservice and practicing teachers (McVee et al., 2005) still rely on traditional cognitive and social constructivist understandings of reading. (p. 165)

The question guiding the research of Handsfield and Jiménez (2009) was how did the teacher's use of CSI reflect her linguistic and literate habitus and the prevailing discourses of her field? The researchers focused their analyses on making connections and questioning because these strategies were the most frequently observed in her reading instruction. They found that the teacher's practice regarding these strategies revealed that

> only particular ways of engaging with and thinking about texts were sanctioned: making text-text, text-self, and text-world connections, but not self-other connections; asking questions of self or text, but not of others; and heavily prescribed and surveilled uses of these two strategies. In some cases, the use of these strategies appeared to be more about skills display than reading comprehension. (p. 187)

A Review of Discourse Analysis in Literacy Research

Rex et al. (2010) reviewed research employing discourse analysis conducted by scholars interested in issues related to literacy over the past 10 years. The researchers discerned that a common theme was understanding how literacy education of all students can be successfully accomplished. Analytic approaches investigated two questions: Whose literacies count? Which literacies count? Contributions made by these studies were organized by five questions: What are literate identities, how are they constructed, and by whom? How are disciplinary knowledges, discourses, and identities constructed? How can schools provide students with access to school-based literacies? What are the shifting roles of literacy teachers and learners within and outside of school? How does discourse analysis research address movement within and across literacy sites and practices in a contemporary, globalized, and increasingly digitally influenced world? The researchers conclude that the dimensions represented by the above questions as a footprint of discourse analytical literacy research will change, as will the forms of discourse analysis designed to meet them.

Conclusion

Most of the extant research on classroom text meaning negotiation by nonnative

speakers has been approached from a psycholinguistic rationale. Krashen's (1982) Monitor Model, which included his input hypothesis (*i* + 1), provided the idea that the development of learners' interlanguage is stimulated by comprehensible input. If learners are to internalize the L2 forms and structures that encode a message, comprehension of the message meaning is necessary. Long's (1996) update to his interaction hypothesis, proposed that in order to comprehend input the learner's selective attention and L2 processing capacity resources are most usefully brought together during negotiation for meaning. Although "much work still needs to be done on the study of language learning through negotiation" (Pica, 1994, p. 521) most negotiation research has stemmed from this cognitive perspective.

Sociocultural theory is also concerned with the development of cognitive processes. Where it differs from traditional cognitive approaches is in its foreshadowing of the social dimension of consciousness and its de-emphasis of the individual dimension. When learners appropriate socioculturally meaningful artifacts and symbolic systems, most importantly language, as they interact in socioculturally meaningful activities, they gain control over their own mental activity and can begin to function independently (Zuengler & Miller, 2006). How a teacher makes use of situated meanings in language-in-use and other artifacts may be examined as distributed cognition. It is through this lens that I examined how teachers with culturally and linguistically diverse students negotiate meaning about text.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In sociocultural approaches, language development is essentially a social process in which the mind is viewed as distributed with learning inter-mentally embedded in social interaction. Individuals and environments mutually constitute one another, and learners are not considered separable from the environments and interactions through which language development occurs. Preserving the integrity of environments and the people and interactions embedded in them is critical (Foster & Ohta, 2005).

In qualitative research, "research questions are not framed by operationalizing variables; rather they are formulated to investigate topics in all their complexity, in context" (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p. 2). I entered into this research with no hypothesis to test, only a *how* question to be examined, "to explore a topic, to develop a detailed view, to take advantage of access to information, to write in expressive and persuasive language, to spend time in the field, and to reach audiences receptive to qualitative approaches" (Creswell, 1998, p. 24).

Peshkin (1988) characterizes qualitative inquiry as "notably suited for grasping the complexity of the phenomena we investigate" (p. 416). The study I conducted suggests a realist perspective since my goal was to find out "what's really going on in the real world" (Patton, 2002, p. 91), in my case, the classroom.

Research Purpose

The purpose of the study was to understand the teacher's role in negotiating meaning of text with culturally and linguistically diverse students.

Research Question

How does a teacher with culturally and linguistically diverse students negotiate meaning of text with her students?

Research Design

Discourse Analysis

In the language-rich environment of the classroom, much of the language takes shape in the form of talk about knowledge, ideas, and texts. Luria (1976) reported that schooled individuals showed both a "willingness and ability to operate with linguistic objects and linguistically created reality," but non-schooled individuals invoke "nonlinguistic, practical experience in their reasoning" (cited in Wertsch, 1985, p. 35), while Cole (1996) found that people who are formally schooled differ from those who are not in the use of "fluency manipulating concepts in and through language" (cited in Florio-Ruane & Morrell, 2004, p. 47). Analyzing the nature, content, and purposes of the classroom's instructional conversations is one way to study educational discourse within school settings. Oral discourse may be analyzed within those situations and activities where written text and literate practices are central to classroom talk and activity—what Heath (1983) called "literacy events." Bloom, Carter, Christian, Otto, and Shuart-Faris (2005) define events as bounded series of actions and reactions that people make in response to each other at the level of face-to-face interaction.

Gee (2005) approaches discourse analysis as a method embedded in a theory of language-in-use in culture and society. Language-in-use is a tool used to design or build things. According to Gee, when speaking or writing we construct seven areas of "reality:" significance, activities, identities, relationships, politics (the distribution of

social goods), connections, and sign systems and knowledge. Using these seven building tasks of language, a discourse analyst can ask seven different questions about any piece of language-in-use:

1. How is this piece of language being used to make certain things significant or not and in what ways?

2. What activity or activities is this piece of language being used to enact (i.e., get others to recognize as going on)?

3. What identity or identities is this piece of language being used to enact (i.e., get others to recognize as operative)?

4. What sort of relationship or relationships is this piece of language seeking to enact with others (present or not)?

5. What perspective on social goods is this piece of language communicating (i.e., what is being communicated as to what is taken to be "normal," right," "good," "correct," "proper," "appropriate," "valuable," "the way things are," "the way things ought to be," "high status or low status," "like me or not like me," and so forth)?

6. How does this piece of language connect or disconnect things; how does it make one thing relevant or irrelevant to another?

7. How does this piece of language privilege or disprivilege specific sign systems (e.g., Spanish vs. English, technical language vs. everyday language, words vs. images, words vs. equations) or different ways of knowing and believing or claims to knowledge and belief? (pp. 11-13)

Discourse is seen as "ways of combining and integrating language, actions,

interactions, ways of thinking, believing, valuing, and using various symbols, tools, and objects to enact a particular sort of socially recognizable identity" (Gee, 2005, p. 21). It can be seen as a "kit" made of words, things, values, attitudes, etc., from which one can build meanings in specific social lives.

Language always simultaneously reflects and constructs the situation or context in which it is used. Discourse analysts are interested in analyzing situations in which language is used. Those situations are

> an activity or related set of activities . . . in which people take on certain sorts of identities or roles . . . , contract certain sorts of relationships with each other . . . , and use certain sorts of sign systems and forms of knowledge . . . . In such a situation people and things take on certain meanings or significance . . . ; things are connected or disconnected, relevant or non-relevant to each other in various ways . . . ; and various sorts of social goods are at stake in various ways . . . . (Gee, 2005, p. 97)

Gee's approach to discourse analysis may be categorized as critical discourse analysis (Rogers, 2004; Gee, 2004). It uses the analytic tools of social languages, situated meanings, cultural models, and Discourses. "A social language is a way of using language so as to enact a particular socially situated identity …" (Gee, 2004, p.41). Social languages have meanings that are specific and situated in the actual contexts of their use. These situated meanings within social languages trigger cultural models in terms of which speakers and listeners give meaning to texts. Cultural models help people determine what counts as relevant and irrelevant in given situations. A Discourse is a way to use language with other things, such as distinctive ways of thinking, being, acting,

interacting, believing, knowing, feeling, valuing, dressing, and using one's body to enact a particular type of socially situated identity (Gee, 2004, 2005). (Gee uses a capital D to distinguish this meaning of discourse from discourse that means simply "language in use.")

Bloom, Carter, Christian, Otto, and Shuart-Faris (2005) use an approach that combines attention to how people use language and other systems of communication in constructing language and literacy events in classrooms with attention to social, cultural, and political processes. That people are situated—they act in terms of the situation in which they find themselves while simultaneously creating that situation—is central to their approach that focuses on events. They use several theoretical tools for analysis of those events, including contextualization cues, boundary-making, turn-taking, negotiating thematic coherence, and intertextuality.

Students learn their primary discourse through socialization within the family and later are exposed to a secondary discourse in the classroom with language and literacy learning in which text is central, and talk serves instructional, curricular, and assessment purposes. Educational talk is a system of sociolinguistic identification partly created by teachers and students in their day-to-day interactions and partly constrained by social, historical, cultural, and political factors and forces. It is through this process that shared meaning is possible, and educational talk is a medium for the negotiation of meaning by speakers within the school setting (Florio-Ruane & Morrell, 2004).

Dressman and McCarthey (2004) note that the epistemological axis on which assumptions about knowledge and knowing hinge in discourse analysis is language. A strength of this "view of research anchored in language is the power it gives a researcher

to pinpoint precisely and concretely where learning occurs or breaks down within an instructional event" (p. 339).

While the use of discourse analysis by sociocultural researchers is relatively recent, there is good reason why the combination of discourse analysis and sociocultural theory can be a powerful means for understanding how teachers negotiate meaning about text with culturally and linguistically diverse students. According to Gee (2004), "the approach to learning that is most compatible . . . with discourse analysis is one that defines learning as changing patterns of participation in specific social practices" (p. 38). Sociocultural theory proposes that instruction entails cognitive, social, cultural, affective, and communicative aspects. Discourse analysis allows one to examine those aspects as they occur in real time and in naturalistic settings (Forman & McCormick, 1995).

In the field of literacy research, traditional reviews of literature focus on previous empirical studies related to a research topic. However, within qualitative methodologies in recent years what are typically referred to as "theoretical frames" have become another source of assumptions about how the world is known and what constitutes knowledge (Dressman & McCarthey, 2004). The question of what is the teacher's role in negotiating meaning of text with culturally and linguistically diverse students was examined through a theoretical frame which consists of the work James Gee (1996, 2004, 2005), a sociocultural researcher in the fields of discourse analysis, literacy, and linguistics.

Dressman and McCarthey (2004) take the position that theoretical frames represent a trans-methodological innovation because they "can help to expand the significance and implications of a research project beyond its immediate practical boundaries so that the project is comprehensive within, and more relevant to, the context

of broader theoretical, social scientific issues" (pp. 340-341). Other benefits in the use of theoretical frames are that they provide an external source of comparison and contrast for the analysis of data, as well as the opportunity of researchers to contribute to the building of "grand" theories of human social behavior.

I used Gee's (2005) model of discourse analysis, which is built around using situated meanings and Discourse models as tools of inquiry. Discourse models are an important tool because they mediate between the local interactional work done in carrying out the building tasks of language and how Discourses create the complex patterns of institutions and cultures across societies. Discourse models are supported by the concept of prototypical simulations. It is because we share ways of looking at things with other members of our various social and cultural groups that we have the capacity to form these simulations we run in our minds in order to help us think about things and to prepare ourselves for action in the world. Prototypical simulations are the sorts of simulations you run in your head when you take the situation to be "typical." For example, if one is told that he will be attending a wedding, he will run a prototypical simulation of a wedding based on his social and cultural experiences. If then one is later told that the bride and groom and their families are Latino, then he adapt his simulation for that specific circumstance.

> Since we take the prototype simulations to capture what is "typical," we often use these prototypes to judge features of our more special-purpose simulations, the ones adjusted for special cases, as "non-normal" or "deviant" in some sense. This is a danger. We can often thereby translate "difference" into "deviance" by moving from "typical" (which we too often take to mean "normal," "acceptable," and

> "right") to "less typical" (which we then take to mean "non-normal," "not acceptable," and "not right"). (p. 76)

Gee (2005) describes three general types of Discourse models: (1) espoused models—models which we consciously espouse; (2) evaluative models—models which we use, consciously or unconsciously, to judge ourselves and others; and (3) models-in-(inter)action—models that consciously or unconsciously guide our actual actions and interactions in the world.

> Furthermore, Discourse models can be about "appropriate" attitudes, viewpoints, beliefs, and values; "appropriate" ways of acting, interacting, participating, and participant structures; "appropriate" social, Discourse, and institutional organizational structures; "appropriate" ways of talking, listening, writing, reading, and communicating; "appropriate" ways to feel or display emotion; "appropriate" ways in which real and fictional events, stories, and histories are organized and end, and so on and so forth. (p. 83)

Setting and Participants

Classroom settings were initially chosen based on accessibility and locality, as well as the availability of culturally and linguistically diverse students (purposeful sampling). Three teachers were initially chosen from a school disctict in southern Illinois. Formally, culturally and linguistically diverse students at Clark School (pseudonym) were placed in one classroom in each grade level (4th and 5th), as appropriate. However, in the academic year of my study they were divided among three classrooms, one fifth grade, and two fourth grade. I chose fourth- and fifth-grade classrooms because the level of reading materials could potentially provide rich

opportunities for meaning negotiation. For the 2007/2008 school year Clark School had 240 students enrolled, 72.5 percent non-white and 1.7 percent limited English proficient (Illinois State Board of Education, 2008).

Data Collection

Data were collected primarily using digital audio recording, along with simultaneous observation and note taking. I initially planned to observe each classroom twice weekly during reading instruction and twice weekly during content instruction that involved potential text meaning negotiation. This process was to continue throughout the fall semester until I felt I had reached a point of saturation.

Written permission was obtained from each teacher and from as many students and their parents as was possible. Data collected incidentally that could be attributed to nonparticipants were not transcribed.

During my observations I did not participate in classroom activities, rather, I sat in the back of the room and took it all in (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003), metaphorically. I began by volunteering in the three classrooms (one fourth-grade with one teacher and one teaching fellow, one fourth-grade with one teacher, one fifth-grade with one teacher) several hours each week while waiting on official approval for the study from the school district administration. Once the study was approved, I collected data from November until March. Data collection in the two fourth-grade classrooms were problematic for two reasons: I was only able to obtain parental and child consent from two of six students that comprised the combined ELL population of the classrooms. Also, after a review of field notes and a preliminary analysis of audio data it became apparent that very little real meaning negotiation about texts was taking place between the fourth-grade

teachers and their ELL students, or their students in general. This was due to teachers relying heavily on teacher's manuals to conduct lessons (i.e., scripted comprehension questions), frequent round-robin reading, and an abundance of time spent on behavior management in the classrooms during my data collection. Therefore, I chose to focus my study on the classroom in which meaning negotiation was occurring.

The fifth-grade classroom was remarkable for the amount of extended discussion of text that took place during my observations. While meaning negotiation generally was not targeted to culturally and linguistically diverse students in particular, extended meaning negotiation of text took place involving the class as a whole, which benefited ELLs. Also, I was able to obtain parental/student consent from six of seven of the ELL students in the class, as well as seven of the twelve native speakers. For this reason I decided to focus my study on the fifth-grade teacher's role in negotiating meaning of text with her students, which included linguistically and culturally diverse students. The fifth-grade teacher, Ms. Stevens (pseudonym), was informally interviewed at least twice monthly in order to confirm or clarify my ideas that emerged from observation and transcription analysis.

Data Analysis

The classroom teacher's role in meaning negotiation about text with culturally and linguistically diverse students was the unit of analysis. All audiotapes in which meaning negotiation was evident were transcribed until I reached a point of saturation. Transcription used lines (based on intonational contours—also called "idea units" or "tone units"), macro-lines (two or more lines tied into something akin to a sentence using syntactic resources), and stanzas (a set of lines devoted to a single topic, event, image,

perspective, or theme).

Data analysis was recursive and ongoing. I chose data that speaks to or illuminates how this teacher negotiated meaning about text with her class, including the culturally and linguistically diverse students. I began this preliminary analysis by selecting key words and phrases in the data and asking myself what situated meanings were in the data, given what I knew about the overall context. I thought about what Discourse these situated meanings appeared to implicate, and the social languages and Discourses that seemed to be relevant to the data. I also thought about what Conversations (when the teacher's or students' words alluded to or related to themes, debates, or motifs that were the focus of much talk and writing in some social group with which they were familiar or in our society as a whole) were relevant.

As I thought about social languages, Discourses, and Conversations, I thought about what and how social activities and socially situated identities were being enacted and/or recognized in my data. As I thought about all these things, I looked closely at my data, and asked myself what linguistic details for how situated meanings, Discourse models, social activities, socially situated identities, social languages, and Discourses were being "designed," enacted, or recognized in my data. These linguistic details were examined using language-context analysis.

In language-context analysis it is recognized that situated meanings arise because particular language forms take on specific or situated meanings in specific contexts. "Context" refers to a set of factors that accompany language in use, including the material setting, the people present, the language that comes before and after a given utterance, the social relationships of the people involved, and their ethnic, gendered, and

sexual identities, as well as cultural, historical, and institutional factors. This type of discourse analysis takes on a reflexive view of the relationship between context and language, where, at one and the same time, an utterance influences what we take the context to be, and context influences what we take the utterance to mean.

After initial reflection on these matters, I selected a few questions from a compiled list (see Appendix A) to ask myself about building tasks of language (as well as any other pertinent questions I could think of). I took notes and reflected on my answers to these questions, guided by my research question, but paying attention to any others that seemed to emerge. I paid particular attention where answers to several different questions seemed to converge on the same point or theme.

As I thought about the points or themes that emerged from the questions noted above, I related them to my research question. Then, I organized my analysis so that the material I developed spoke to, argued for, and illuminated the final main point(s), theme(s), or issue(s) I chose to address. (See Figure 1 for a breakdown of language building tasks, their categories and subcategories, and their occurrence in the data.)

Role of the Researcher

I appealed to a variety of linguistic details in my analysis and addressed different building tasks to begin to achieve some degree of trustworthiness in regard to convergence. A discourse analysis is more trustworthy the more the answers to the questions asked about the building tasks of language converge in the way they support the analysis, or the more the analysis offers compatible and convincing answers to many or all of them.

I extended my analysis to other parts of my data to begin to achieve some degree of

trustworthiness in regard to coverage. The analysis is more trustworthy the more it can be applied to related sorts of data. This includes being able to make sense of what has come before and after the situation being analyzed and being able to predict the sorts of things that might happen in related sorts of situations.

I used member check interviews with the participant teacher to begin to achieve some degree of trustworthiness in regard to agreement. Answers to questions about language building tasks are more convincing the more "native speakers" of the social languages in the data and the "members" of the Discourses implicated in the data agree that the analysis reflects how such social languages actually can function in such settings. In addition to occasional informal discussions with the participant teacher about emerging data, Ms. Stevens read preliminary findings on her use of language to build significance, and later she read the entirety of the findings for her use of language for all building tasks. In an informal, semi-structured interview, her comments reflected that she was unaware of how she used language from that perspective, but very interested in the micro level of analysis of her use of language to negotiate meaning about text with her students. She did later feel compelled to offer specific comments concerning a macro level of analysis of her language (presented in the discussion).

Finally, to make the analysis more valid, it was tied to details of linguistic structure. The grammar of any social language is composed of specific forms that are "designed" to carry out specific functions. Part of what makes a discourse analysis valid is that the analyst is able to argue that the communicative functions being uncovered in the analysis are linked to linguistic devices that manifestly can and do serve these functions, according to the judgments of "native speakers" of the social languages involved and the

analyses of linguists (Gee, 2005).

Tools of inquiry.

As stated earlier, lines, macro-lines, and stanzas are important because they represent how speakers tie together structure and meaning. The way I, as an analyst, broke up a text in terms of these units represents my hypothesis about how meaning is shaped in the text. As such, those units are among my tools of inquiry. When I asked myself where I thought these units existed in the text, based on intonational, syntactic, and discourse features in the language of the teacher and students that I analyzed, and what I knew about the speakers' possible meanings from other sources, I made these structural decisions based partly on my emerging ideas about the overall themes and meaning of the text. I then used the structures that emerged in my analysis to look more deeply into the text and made new guesses about themes and meaning.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

During the course of the 2008-2009 school year, I conducted observations of Ms. Stevens' instruction. During each observation, I recorded the instruction and wrote field notes. I conducted the discourse analysis after each session. Through the ongoing data analysis it became apparent that by February I reached a point of saturation. That is, in reading through the transcriptions, there were no new categories found in the building tasks related to how Ms. Stevens negotiated meaning with her students. Although I continued to conduct observations, record discourse, and write field notes for the remainder of the school year, the results will focus on eight teaching lessons that occurred from November through January. They comprise a total of about 5 hours of instruction which when transcribed was 260 pages of discourse. Further, in my analysis, there were 2613 coded units of language building tasks.

The purpose of this study was to understand how this teacher negotiated meaning with her ELLs. Thus, rather than present the data through instructional units, I chose to focus on the building tasks of language as through the examination of each one, along with the subcategories that emerged within each, to provide a richer and more detailed understanding of this phenomenon. The discourse analysis focuses on the following teaching lessons: *Encounter*, *Columbus Day*, *Spanish Empire*, *How Many Days to America*, *Julie* (2 events), *The Ch'i-lin Purse*, and *I Have a Dream*.

The lesson labeled *Encounter* centers on the book *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996), about the first meeting between Columbus and the indigenous peoples of San Salvador (the

Taino) through the eyes of a young native boy. *Encounter* consists of five transcriptions: a prereading activity, the reading of the book by Ms. Stevens (with embedded discussion), a postreading activity focused on point of view, a postreading activity focused on author's purpose, and postreading activity focused on source perspective.

The lesson labeled *Columbus Day* consists of three transcriptions: primary source readings with discussion, continued discussion of Columbus Day, and a class debate. Primary source readings came from the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005).

The lesson labeled *Spanish Empire* consists of two transcriptions: a prereading activity focused on Cortez, and a social studies textbook (Banks et al., 2005) reading with discussion.

The lesson labeled *How Many Days to America* centers on *How Many Days to America: A Thanksgiving Story* (Bunting, 1990). It consists of one continuous transcription with a prereading activity on Cuba (three stanzas), and the reading of the book by Ms. Stevens (with embedded discussion; one stanza).

The lessons labeled *Julie* center on *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972). They consist of one full transcription and half of another transcription. I will refer to them collectively. *Julie* consists of four prereading activities of one stanza each (flashback, vocabulary, comprehension questions, and setting), two readings of sections of the book (with embedded discussion; each one stanza), and a postreading activity on wolf behaviors (one stanza).

The lesson labeled *The Ch'i-lin Purse* loosely centered on "The Ch'i-lin Purse" (Fang, 2008). It also makes extensive use of *Illinois Daily Practice Book* (Reading Street, Grade 5, 2008b). *The Ch'i-lin Purse* consists of half of one transcription with

prereading activities on compare and contrast homework review, vocabulary, vocabulary strategy, and a picture walk (one stanza each). Also placed under this label is a stanza dedicated to word structure, and an interesting stanza that occurred chronologically at the beginning of the transcription.

The lesson labeled *I Have a Dream* consists of one single-stanza transcription centered on "I Have a Dream: The Childhood of Martin Luther King, Jr." (Lewis, 2000, Jan.), in which the class rehearses for a production of the play, reading it through for the first time, with class discussion embedded.

It should be noted that utterances often perform more than one building task of language and often fall into more than one subcategory of a building task. For that reason, frequency of data given in percentages may not total 100 percent in any language task, category, or subcategory.

Significance

I begin with the language building task of significance since it appeared in the data 1711 instances, more than any other language building task. In fact, data representing the use of language to build significance comprised 2/3 of the entirety of the coded data. For this reason, "significance" as a category is given equal footing with "other building tasks of language." "We use language to make things significant (to give them meaning or value) in certain ways, to build significance" (Gee, 2005, p. 11). Ms. Stevens built significance in a large variety of ways in her Discourse model.

I shall provide examples of how Ms. Stevens built significance using different categories to group the types of techniques she used in roughly the order of frequency in the data. The broad categories of Ms. Stevens' techniques to build significance are

reproduction of meaning, prosody, questions, overt attention, life connection, and adjective labeling. These categories are my own conceptualization of the data that emerged.

The examples I provide are representative of the data in each category. As stated earlier there were 1711 instances of coded data representing the use of language to build significance. In order to keep the number of examples limited to a reasonable amount, my goal was to ideally use around 10 percent of the data as examples. When providing 10 percent of data in a category would have resulted in more than 15 examples, I only used 5 percent of data in that category as examples. Any category of data had at least five instances of coded data and was represented by at least one example, which, in categories with relatively low frequency (less than 10 instances) coded data, resulted in the use of more than 10 percent of the data for that category being used as an example for that category. In all, 125 examples are provided to represent data coded for the use of language to build significance.

Reproduction of Meaning

Reproduction of meaning builds significance because when one reproduces ideas that have previously been presented by oneself or others, or specifically cites the source of those ideas, it is for a reason. That reason is to ensure that those ideas receive attention, and that gives them value. This category applied to approximately 1/2 of utterances used to build significance. Reproduction of meaning can be further broken down into three subcategories noted in the data: repetition, paraphrase, and citation.

The data that represented reproduction of meaning could have been categorized in different ways. For instance, I could have used self reproduction and other reproduction,

or reproduction of spoken meaning and reproduction of written meaning. However, I found it to be more intuitively meaningful to categorize the data based on the form of meaning reproduction rather than the source or form of the originally produced meaning, since the reproducer of meaning (the teacher) is the unit of analysis.

Repetition.

Repetition is the first category of reproduction of meaning I examined. It applied to approximately 1/3 of the data that reproduced meaning. Repetition is further broken down according to the source of the original producer of meaning into other repetition and self repetition.

Other repetition.

Other repetition is quoting others. Other repetition was found in 180 instances of data that indicated repetition. There were two forms of other repetition noted: quoting the spoken utterance of students and quoting written text.

Quoting students.

Ms. Stevens quoted her students in 108 instances, which served as a means of validating their statements. In the following example taken from the *Encounter* lesson, Ms. Stevens was teaching a reading lesson in which she was demonstrating the importance of the author's purpose when reading a text. Ms. Stevens wrote "Author's Purpose" at the top of the blackboard, and under that "Compare" on the left, and "Contrast" on the right. Under that, and over to the left, she wrote "Encounter" and underneath that "SSB" [social studies book]. She then stood in front of the blackboard and read the book, showing the class the illustrations as she read. (See Appendix B for an explanation of transcription units and conventions.)

Example 1

Ms. Stevens

[reading] *The moon was well overhead, and our great fire had burned low. A loud clap of thunder woke me from my dream. All dreams are not true dreams, my mother says. But in my dream that night, three great-winged birds with voices like thunder rode wild waves in our bay.*

1 What's voices like thunder?//..

2 Voices like thunder?//..

Sarah

3 Simile//

Ms. Stevens

4 Simile//

In lines 1-2 Ms. Stevens asks a display question to the class. Sarah answers in line 3, and Ms. Stevens repeats Sarah's answer in line 4, validating her answer.

In the next example Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing point of view in *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996).

Example 2

Ms. Stevens

5a Whose.. whose point of view

5b is this told from?//

Student

6 The descendent of the Indians?//

Ms. Stevens

7 Yeah.. fro:m..

8 Who who's telling this story?//

Student

9 A kid//

Ms. Stevens

10 A kid//

In lines 5 and 8 Ms. Stevens asks the class from whose point of view the story is told. A student answers in line 9, and Ms. Stevens repeats the answer in line 10.

In Example 3 Ms. Stevens asks about person in the book.

Example 3

Ms. Stevens

201a First person..

201b because we see WHAT

201c all over the place?//

Student
202 I//
Ms. Stevens
203 I//..

In line 201 Ms. Stevens asks the class how they know the story is told from the first person. In 202 a student answers, and Ms. Stevens repeats the correct answer in 203.

In the next two examples, from the *Spanish Empire* lesson, the students are following along in the textbook (Banks et al., 2005) while listening to an audio CD of the text. Ms. Stevens periodically stops the audio to ask questions or make comments.

<u>Examples 4 and 5</u>
Ms. Stevens
180.. Okay//
181 So when they get all
182a When all the native people of that region die out..
182b either
183 What were the two things that killed them?//
Student
184 Disease <u>and overwork</u>//
Ms. Stevens
185 <u>Disease and</u>..overwork//
186 Everybody understand what I mean by overwork?//
187 Working people to death//..
188 Basically//
189a So when they ran out of.. uh native people to use
189b where did they go?//
Student
190 Africa//
Ms. Stevens
191 Africa//

In lines 182 and 183 Ms. Stevens asks what killed the indigenous population. In 184 a student answers, and Ms. Stevens echoes the student's answer, overlapping the utterance. Next Ms. Stevens asks from where labor is brought after the native population is decimated (line 189). A student answers in 190, and Ms. Stevens repeats the answer in 191.

In Example 6 Ms. Stevens is reading *How Many Days to America: A Thanksgiving Story* (Bunting, 1990) to the class.

Example 6
Ms. Stevens
[reading] *My mother cried. "Leave all my things? My chair, where I sat to nurse our children? The bedcover that my mother made, every stitch by hand?" "Nothing," my father said.* My money—*"Just money to buy our way to America."* [shows picture]
125 [unintelligible] one change of clothes//
126 So why were the soldiers there?//
127a Why do you think the soldiers were there..
127b in there in the house?//
128 Miguel.. what do you think?//
Miguel [ELL]
129 To get them?//
Ms. Stevens
130 To what?//
Miguel [ELL]
131 To get them//
Ms. Stevens
132 To get them//

In lines 126-128 Ms. Stevens asks Miguel, an English Language Learner [ELL], why Cuban soldiers might have been in the family's house in the story. Miguel answers, and after a clarification request, Ms. Stevens repeats Miguel's exact utterance (line 132).

In the next example Ms. Stevens is preparing to read and discuss *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972) with the class. She begins by reviewing the literary device, flashback.

Example 7
Ms. Stevens
1 Okay//
2a And now we're gonna kinda go back into what.. what's that.. um..
2b F-word.. that talks about will we.. um..
2c discover or uncover what happened earlier
2d that gives meaning to where we are right now in the story//
3 Enrique.. what do we call that?//
Enrique [ELL]
4 Flashback//

Ms. Stevens
5 The flashback//

Ms. Stevens briefly describes the meaning of flashback in line 2 and then asks Enrique (ELL) the name of the device (line 3). Enrique responds correctly (line 4), and Ms. Stevens repeats Enrique's answer in line 5.

In Example 8, from *The Ch'i-lin Purse* lesson, Ms. Stevens and the class were using the workbook (Reading Street, 2008b) for the reading series (Reading Street, 2008a), comparing and contrasting knights and samurai.

<u>Example 8</u>
Ms. Stevens
223 And the knights wore..
Enrique [ELL]
224 Heavy metal//
Ms. Stevens
225 Heavy metal//

Ms. Stevens inquires what knights wore (223), Enrique responds (224), and Ms. Stevens repeats his answer (225).

In the following example Ms. Stevens is again reading and discussing *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972)) with the class.

<u>Example 9</u>
Ms. Stevens
1078 <u>How</u> can you win a fight?//
1079 With.. with what?//
1080 Yes//
Adriana [ELL]
1081 If you wanna surrender..
Ms. Stevens
1082 Yes//
1083 If you wanna surrender what do you do?//

Ms. Stevens asks how wolves may win fights (1078-1079). Adriana (ELL) responds, "If you wanna surrender," and then pauses (1081). Ms. Stevens uses Adriana's utterance to reformulate the question (1083).

In the final example Ms. Stevens is still reading and discussing *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972) with the class. Cecilia (ELL) asks how to recognize a simile.

Example 10
Cecilia [ELL]
1569 How you kno:w when it's a simile?//
Ms. Stevens
1570a Simile uses like or as
1570b as comparing two different things..
1570c using like or as//..
1571a The playground was speckled with bleached bones..
1571b like tombstones in graveyard//
1572a So you see the little.. bones
1572b all over the ground..
1572c white bones..
1573a And it reminds Miyax..
1573b of.. tombstones in a graveyard//
1574a Two different things
1574b but that's a simile..
1574c using like or as//
1575 Okay?//
1576a You compare the two things
1576b and say they're the same//
1577 All right?//
1578 Are bleached bones and tombstones the same thing?//
Cecilia [ELL]
1579 No//
Ms. Stevens
1580 No//
1581 But does it make a really cool picture in your mind?//
1582 That's what similes are for//
1583 Is to make a really cool picture in your head//

Ms. Stevens explains what a simile is and how to recognize one, using an example from the text. She then asks Cecilia in line 1578 if bleached bones and tombstones are the

same thing (her text example). Cecilia responds simply, “No” (1579), and Stevens repeats her answer (1580).

These first 10 examples were of quoting students, a type of other repetition. The next group of examples are of quoting text.

Quoting text.

Quoting text is another type of other repetition seen in the data in 72 instances. In the first example Ms. Stevens is doing a prereading activity for *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996). She reads the back cover teaser to the class.

Example 11
Ms. Stevens
36a This one
36b on the back says
37a The credible and moving story
37b provides a closely woven fabric
37c of revisionist history
37d and superlative storytelling//

Ms. Stevens often quoted text when asking a display question during reading. In Example 12 she is again reading *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996) to the class.

Example 12
Ms. Stevens
[reading] *The moon was well overhead, and our great fire had burned low. A loud clap of thunder woke me from my dream. All dreams are not true dreams, my mother says. But in my dream that night, three great-winged birds with voices like thunder rode wild waves in our bay.*
1 What’s voices like thunder?//..
2 Voices like thunder?//..

Ms. Stevens also quoted text to direct students’ attention to idiomatic phrases that might cause confusion to ELLs and other students, and interfere with meaning comprehension. In the next example Ms. Stevens is reading *How Many Days to America: A Thanksgiving Story* (Bunting, 1990) to the class.

Example 13
Ms. Stevens
[reading] *"A part is broken that cannot be fixed,"* my mother told my—*my father told my mother, and her face twisted the way it did when she closed the door of our home for the last time.*
156 What's that mean?//…(3)
157 Her face twisted//..
158b What does it look like
158c when your mom's face [unintelligible] twisted?//

Ms. Stevens also quoted text to point out the significance of a phrase to the meaning of a passage. In the next example she is still reading from *How Many Days to America* (Bunting, 1990).

Example 14
Ms. Stevens
[reading] *Our family got two papayas and three lemons and a coconut with milk that tasted like flowers.*
213a Two papayas..
213b three lemons..
213c and a coconut with milk//

Sometimes Ms. Stevens repeated text before it was read orally. In Example 15 Ms. Stevens and the class are listening to an audio recording of *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972) as they follow along in their books. Ms. Stevens quotes text before restarting the audio, building significance by indicating the importance of following along.

Example 15
Ms. Stevens
858 Um.. so they hear a motorboat approaching//
859 The sound grew louder..
[Audio] *The sound grew louder, then shut off at the beach.*

Often Ms. Stevens quoted text when asking a comprehension question to ensure students understood the meaning of a passage. In the next example Ms. Stevens and her students are still reading, listening to, and discussing *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972).

Example 16
Ms. Stevens
1074a Um.. I want you to look
1074b in the second paragraph..
1074c to the end//..
1075a There she crouched
1075b among the oil drums//
1076 What's an oil drum?//..

Sometimes Ms. Stevens quoted text for something as simple, but important, as directions, as in Example 17, from *The Ch'i-lin Purse* lesson.

Example 17
Ms. Stevens
812 Read the following passage//
813 Then answer the questions below//…(4)

The last seven examples represented quoting text, a type of other repetition, similar to quoting students, of which I produced examples earlier. Other repetition validates what is being spoken or written because it draws attention to the utterance, giving it value. Other repetition is one of two categories of repetition, which is used, along with paraphrase and citation, to reproduce meaning. The other category of repetition is self repetition.

Self repetition.

The other type of repetition seen in the data, besides other repetition (quoting students or text), was self repetition, which occurred 161 times. In the first example, in a prereading activity, Ms. Stevens is introducing the book *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996).

Example 18
Ms. Stevens
10a This book was written by Jane Yolen
10b and the illustrations are by David Shannon//
11a Now I don't know
11b if you guys know David Shannon//
12 David Shannon//

In line 10 Ms. Steven states the name of the illustrator and repeats it in lines 11 and 12.

In the next example, from the *Encounter* lesson, Ms. Stevens uses self repetition to provide parallel structure to her utterance.

Example 19
Ms. Stevens
24a So.. we're gonna talk about
24b how THIS story
24c and how.. THIS story
24d are alike.. and also how they are.. different//
25 Okay?//
26a Some of us prefer to hear a story.. told like THIS
26b and some of us prefer to hear a story told like this/
27a Let's let's see how they compare
27b and how they are different//

Structural parallelism in her utterance is used to demonstrate the parallel nature of the compare and contrast task.

In the next example Ms. Stevens is asking the class about grammatical person during a story discussion.

Example 20
Ms. Stevens
30 What person is this told in?//
31 I I I//..
32 First person.. second person.. third person?//

In 31 Ms. Stevens self repeats to emphasize the significance of the word "I" to first person singular.

In the next two example Ms. Stevens and the class are again reading and discussing *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996).

Examples 21 and 22
Ms. Stevens
[reading] *The stranger made a funny noise with his mouth, not like talking like the barking of a yellow dog.*
89 What's that?//
Student

90 [inaudible]
Ms. Stevens
91 Like like like
Students
92 Similes//
Ms. Stevens
93 Similes similes.. all over the place//
94a Using all kinds of similes

Line 91 is similar to the previous example in that Ms. Stevens repeats the key word to listen for. In 93 and 94 Ms. Stevens repeats the answer to the display question she asked.

In Example 23 Ms. Stevens is doing a postreading activity comparing *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996) to the social studies textbook (Banks et al., 2005).

<u>Example 23</u>
Ms. Stevens
23a Almost all the stories that you'll hear in here
23b are to:ld from..
23c the perspective of the colonists//
24 Okay?//
25a And and our social studies book I think
25b is trying to get other stories
25c in there//..
26a But it still ends up being..
26b what happened to the Europeans?//
26c what happened to the Europeans?//
26d what was the result FOR the Europeans?//

Line 26c is a repetition of 26b, where Ms. Stevens relates the significance of the point of view of a textbook authors.

Ms. Stevens and her class are continuing the discussion in the next two examples.

<u>Examples 24 and 25</u>
Ms. Stevens
35a Sarah.. I appreciate your hand up
35b but class I need other people working..
35c other people working//
36a What's..
36b why why why is that social studies book..
36c what is that chapter written for?//..

In line 35c Ms. Stevens repeats the need for full class participation ("other people working"). In 36b she repeats the word "why," due to its significance in understanding point of view of an author.

Sometimes Ms. Steven repeated a question or part of a question to build its significance, as in the next example.

<u>Example 26</u>
Ms. Stevens
39 What does ENCOUNTER mean?//
40 What does encounter mean?//
41a I should have talked about that
41b before we started reading//..
43 Encounter//..
44a I need some hands
44b up in the air.. guys//
45 What does ENCOUNTER mean?//
46 Sophia.. what do you think?//..
47 Encounter//..

The question is repeated in lines 40 and 45, and the word "encounter" in lines 43 and 47.

Often Ms. Stevens would use self repetition when evaluating a student's response to provide encouragement, as in Examples 27and 28, from the Encounter lesson.

<u>Examples 27 and 28</u>
Ms. Stevens
167 Okay//..
168 Okay//
169 Good.. [Nonparticipant]//
170 Good.. [Nonparticipant]//
171 Good//
172 Good to use your book like that//

Ms. Stevens repeats "okay" in 168 (probably more of a floor-holding device than an actual evaluation), and repeats "good" at the beginning of the next four lines (169-172).

In the next example, from the *Spanish Empire* lesson, Ms. Stevens uses self repetition to build significance of a photograph of Mexico City in the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005).

Example 29
Ms. Stevens
98 This is an amazing picture children//
99 This is an amazing picture//

Occasionally Ms. Stevens would self repeat but translate to Spanish in the process as in Example 30, where Ms. Stevens is going over vocabulary as a prereading activity during the *Julie* lesson.

Example 30
Ms. Stevens
304 Enchanted?//
305 Encantada?//
306 Encantado?//..
307 um.. Enchanted?//
308 Okay?//
309 Okay?//
310 Enchanted is really.. lovely//

In line 304 Ms. Stevens is asking if anyone in the class knows the meaning of "enchanted." Line 305 is the feminine form of the Spanish translation, and 306 is the masculine form. Line 307 is a repetition of the original English.

In Example 31 Ms. Stevens repeats a verb to emphasize something done for a long duration. In this example she is describing the main character during the *Julie* lesson.

Example 31
Ms. Stevens
1767a Uh many hours later
1767b she opens her pack//
1768 So she's walking walking walking//

The last 14 examples illustrated the use of self repetition, a category, along with other repetition, of the broader category of repetition, used in the reproduction of meaning in order to build significance. The next category of reproduction of meaning, similar to repetition, is paraphrase.

Paraphrase.

Another type of reproduction of meaning found in data is paraphrase. Like repetition, paraphrase draws attention to the meaning of an utterance to reproduce meaning. Paraphrase was used approximately 567 times in the data that represented reproduction of meaning. The two types of paraphrase noted in the data are other paraphrase (i.e., paraphrasing someone or something other than self) and self paraphrase, broken down according to the source of the original producer of meaning, in a way similar to the categorization of repetition.

Other paraphrase.

Other paraphrase represented approximately 1/2 of the data demonstrating paraphrase. I have subdivided other paraphrase into paraphrasing students and paraphrasing text.

Paraphrasing students.

Paraphrasing students was noted 61 instances in the data representing other paraphrase. In the first example from the *Spanish Empire* lesson, Ms. Stevens and her class were discussing similarities between *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996) and their social studies text (Banks et al., 2005).

<u>Example 32</u>
Ms. Stevens
130 Anything else?//
131 Shawn//

Shawn
132 um the..
133 When the Europeans came to America//
Ms. Stevens
134 Okay//
135a They both talk about..
135b okay they both talk..
135a acknowledge that that was the first visit of the Europeans
135b to Amer.. the Americas//

In 135 Ms. Stevens paraphrases Shawn's response (133).

In the next example the class has moved on to differences between the two texts.

Example 33
Ms. Stevens
173 Shawn.. what else?//
Shawn
174 What was different?//
Ms. Stevens
175 Yeah//
176 How are they different?//
177 How are these books different?//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases her original question (173) and Shawn's interpretation of the question (174) in line 176 and again in 177.

In the next example Ms. Stevens and her class are discussing Columbus Day.

Example 34
Ms. Stevens
18a Do you think that this AUTHOR..
18b would be behind..
18c taking the day off for Columbus Day?//
Students
19 [shake heads "no"]
Ms. Stevens
20a Probably not..

In line 20 Ms. Stevens paraphrases her students' gestures.

In the next example Ms. Stevens and her class continue to discuss Columbus Day.

Example 35
Ms. Stevens

24a Does anybody want to say anything about that
24b before we get into this?//
25 Adriana.. go for it//
26 Really loud//

Adriana [ELL]

27a You know.. um..
27b some people think that we're..
27c that we have to..
27d supposed to.. uh celebrate Columbus Day
27e but some don't//
28a Maybe the person that
28b want to celebrate Columbus Day
28c don't know much of Columbus//
29a And they just think that he was good//
29b and yet..
29c and he found land..
29d but the land was all ready found
29e by other people//
30 And.. so.. my mom doesn't celebrate it//
31a She just makes like special food
31b and that's it//
31c for my dad//
32a And some people make
32b a big huge feast//
32c for Columbus Day//
33 So..

Ms. Stevens

34 Okay// [low pitch]
35a So you say that..
35b you think that.. um..
35c the people who do acknowledge Columbus Day
35d maybe they just don't really..
35e that they don't know that much about it..
35f and say that well.. you know..
35g the government says it's a day off..
35h so.. you know..
35i he.. he must be a great guy and..

Ms. Stevens summarizes Adriana's [ELL] utterance.

In Example 36 Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972).

<u>Example 36</u>

Ms. Stevens

915 That's where she's supposed to be going//..
916a You think that Kapugen is gonna be of a mind
916b to send her there?//
Student
917 No//
Ms. Stevens
918 Definitely not//

Here Ms. Stevens paraphrases her student's response (917) to make it more emphatic (918).

In the following example, from *The Ch'i-lin Purse* lesson, Ms. Stevens is soliciting from the class differences between knights and samurai.

Example 36
Ms. Stevens
187 Uh.. Sarah//
Sarah
188a The samurai.. followed a..
188b er.. were bushido
188c and the knights followed chivalry//
Ms. Stevens
189 Chivalry//
190a The the samurai were bushido..
190b the knights were chivalry//

Ms. Stevens' utterance (189) overlaps Sarah's (188c), and then Ms. Stevens goes on to paraphrase Sarah's response (190).

These last six examples were of paraphrasing students, a type of other paraphrase. The next examples are of paraphrasing text.

Paraphrasing text.

Paraphrasing text is another type of other paraphrase, noted in the data 246 times,

In the first example Ms. Stevens, in a prereading activity, reads the back cover teaser of *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996) to the class.

Example 38
Ms. Stevens

36a This one
36b on the back says
37a The credible and moving story
37b provides a closely woven fabric
37c of revisionist history
37d and superlative storytelling//
38 Now the:re's some big words// um
39 That's a review//
40 Somebody wrote a review
41a and it basically is saying
41b this is good history
41c put in a children's.. um.. format//
42 Okay?//
43a It's accessible book
43b to a child//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases the text she read in lines 40-43.

In the next example Ms. Stevens was again reading and discussing *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996) with the class.

Example 39
Ms. Stevens
[reading] *They were not like any birds I had ever seen, for sharp, white teeth filled their mouths.*

A little later Ms. Stevens paraphrased the above text.

Ms. Stevens
29 He sees them as great winged birds with hu:ge tee:th//..

In the next example a student reads a text about Columbus.

Example 40
Shawn
98 [reading] *Columbus Day is a celebration of diversity and of the time when the people of the Americas first met people from Europe. Over the time each learned from the other. The unique American culture that was produced by the blending of many different cultures. These are things we can all be proud of. Columbus showed courage and spirit of adventure and a . . .*
Ms. Stevens
99 Curiosity//
Shawn
100 [continues reading] *. . . curiosity about the world that I greatly admire.*

Later Ms. Stevens paraphrases the text.

Ms. Stevens
116 Yeah//
117 He says Col.. you know..
118a Whatever he was..
118b He was courageous//
119a He was more courageous
119b than anybody had been
119c up to that time
119d in terms of crossing.. the.. water..
119e FROM Europe..
119f at that time//
120 He was curious//

The next example is from a classroom discussion of Columbus Day.

Example 41
Cecilia (ELL) has just orally read the following text by Irene Vernon, Director of the Center for Applied Studies in American Ethnicity at Colorado State University, to the class:

Many good things came to America as a result of Columbus's voyages, but he isn't a person we should be celebrating with a national holiday. We should pick people to honor that all Americans can agree on and respect. Columbus wiped out many cultures. His ties to Spain influenced the development of Latin America and the southwestern United States but had less influence on [unintelligible].

Later Ms. Stevens paraphrases.

Ms. Stevens
18a There are a lot of people
18b in this country..
18c and in the Americas
18d that might think
18e that that is a really bad idea//
19a That that.. see him as somebody that
19b wiped out all of their culture//
20a There are still lots of native.. people
20b around the country that..
20c would be.. um..
20d that that that see him as having.. um.. been detrimental//
20e been hurtful to their culture//

In the next example Ms. Stevens and her class are discussing the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005). The students are listening to an audio of Ms. Stevens reading the text as they follow along in their books.

Example 42
Audio of Ms. Stevens
Lesson Three: The Spanish Build an Empire.
Build Background: The Spanish conquistadors had conquered the powerful Aztec and Inca Empires. Difficult years followed for the Indians in the new Spanish colonies. Many Indians had reason to remember a song by a Native American ruler of the 1500s named Nezahualcoyotl: "Even jade is shattered, even gold is crushed, even quetzal plumes are torn."
Ms. Stevens
159 Talking about the destruction of all of their culture//
Audio
Spain's Empire Grows.
After Spain's defeat of the Aztec and Inca Empires, other conquistadors spread through much of North America and South America. They hoped to win more land and find more riches for Spain. As they traveled to the north and south the Spanish claimed more Indian lands.
Coronado Searches for Gold.
An African scout named Estevanico, and a Spanish priest called Fray Marcos de Niza, were shipwrecked off the coast of Texas. As they returned to Mexico they heard stories about seven cities built entirely of gold.
Ms. Stevens
160 Rumors//

In lines 159 and 160 Ms. Stevens paraphrases portions of the text.

In Example 43 Ms. Stevens and the class are reading *How Many Days to America* (Bunting, 1990).

Example 43
Ms. Stevens
162 [inaudible]
[reading] The woman made a sail by knotting—*the women made a sail by knotting clothes together and when they pulled it high I saw my father's Sunday shirt blowing in the wind.*
163 They made a sail//
164 Do you guys know what a sail is?//
Students
165 Um hum//
Ms. Stevens

166a The piece of cloth..
166b that's at the top of the boat..
166c that helps to catch the wind..
166d and let it direct//
167a They made a sail
167b ou:t of their clo:thes
167c off of their backs//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases in 163 and 167.

In the following example Ms. Stevens and the class are reading along as they listen to an audio of *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972).

<u>Example 44</u>
Ms. Stevens
[reading] *She saw this, but she was not sad. She was divinely happy going somewhere alone with Kapugen. Occasionally he climbed the cliffs and brought her eggs to eat; occasionally he took her in his arms and leaned against a rock. She slept at times in the warmth of his big sealskin parka. They walked on. She did not know how far. Later, Kapugen's Aunt Martha told her that he had lost his mind the day her mother died. He had grabbed Miyax up and walked out of his fine house in Mekoryuk. He had left his important job as manager of the reindeer herd, and he had left all his possessions. "He walked you all the way to seal camp," Martha told her. "And he never did anything good after that."*
528 Mekoryuk.. is like.. um.. a gussak city//
529 Mekoryuk is on Nunivak Island//
530 And it's a city//
531 Like a modern city here//
532 Where Aunt Martha lives//
533 Aunt Martha is Kapugen's aunt//
534 It's.. it's Julie's great aunt Martha//
535a And on the day that.. Kapugen got.. uh..
535b Kapugen's wife died..
535c Julie's mom dies..
535d Miyax's mom..
535e He.. leaves//
536 He leaves Mekoryuk//
537a He turns his back
537b on the modern ways..
537c and he goes back to seal camp//

In lines 528-537 Ms. Stevens paraphrases the text.

In the next example Ms. Stevens and the class are comparing and contrasting knights and samurai during *The Ch'i-lin Purse* lesson.

Example 45
Ms. Stevens
207 What did the knight wear?//…(4)
208 It's the very last sentence//
209 Of the..
210 Of the t..
211 Of the reading//
Student
212 [unintelligible]
Student
213 It says it right there//
Ms. Stevens
214 Oh it says it down there//
215 Oh.. the.. oh//
216 Thank you//
217 Sorry//
218 Didn't see that//
219 Samurai wore leather gear..
220 You guys know what leather is?//
221 It's what your shoes are made of//
222 So the whole thing would be of leather//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases the text in line 222.

Ms. Stevens paraphrases text from the reading series workbook (Reading Street, 2008b) in the next example from *The Ch'i-lin Purse* lesson.

Example 46
Ms. Stevens
621a Um.. Greek and Latin roots
621b are used in many English words//
622a For example the Latin root..
622b bene..
622c means we:ll or good//
623 This root is used as benefit.. benefactor.. and beneficial//

In the next example in paraphrasing text Ms. Stevens is still reading from the reading series workbook (Reading Street, 2008b) as the students follow along.

Example 47
Ms. Stevens
[reading] *I always wanted to be a singer, and I worked very hard. I was grateful to be able to do something that I loved. However, it was difficult to make enough money to pay for lessons. One day, I was singing in a procession to celebrate the holidays. Afterwards, my mother found me and she was very excited. "This is Mrs. Kazarian. She is a benefactor for young artists and wants to pay for your lessons at the school of music," my astonished mother said. "I'd like to recommend a teacher who works with young singers," Mrs. Kazarian told us. A month later, I was practicing with my new teacher. Each day, I am filled with gratitude that I am the beneficiary of Mrs. Kazarian's generosity. Without her support, I would not have had this chance.*

In explaining the word "gratitude" Ms. Stevens later paraphrases the text (878).

877 That was the mom//
878a The mom was like
878b oh I can't can't believe this is happening to us//
879 Gratitude//
880 Super grateful//

In Example 48 Ms. Stevens paraphrases text from *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972) referring to the character Julie.

Example 48
Ms. Stevens
1225 She goes to Pearl's house//
1226 She gets a whole buncha stuff//
1227 She gets all the tools that she needs for survival//

The next example is from the same story (George, 1972), referring to a wolf named Jello, a character in the story.

Example 49
Ms. Stevens
1600 So what'd he do?//
1601 He's.. crushed her house//
1602 Her sod house//
1603 He took all of her food//

In the last example of paraphrasing text Ms. Stevens and the students are practicing a play titled "I Have a Dream: A Story from the Childhood of Martin Luther

King, Jr.” (Lewis, M., 2000, Jan.). Ms. Stevens paraphrases a section just real aloud by students.

Example 50
Ms. Stevens
160a He’s been like walkin’ around
160b in this little bubble
160c that everything is..
160d is.. fine
160e and that he doesn’t
161a He’s not even awa:re
161b of discrimination//
162a You know..
162b in his little world
162c that just hasn’t really been int
163a Well he’s seen it..
163b in the way his parents interact
163c but not in his own life//
164a And you can tell
164b when he’s talkin’ to Mrs. Conner
164c he’s incredulous//
165 He’s like.. NO//
166a Mrs. CONNER..
166b THEY”RE RIGHT THERE//
167a Any of you guys
167b gonna play ball today?//
168a And Mrs. Conner..
168b you know she’s about
168c to come undone.. with him..
168d even bein’ in her house//

The last 13 examples represented paraphrasing text, a type of other paraphrase, similar to paraphrasing students, of which I produced examples earlier. Like other repetition, other paraphrase validates what is being spoken or written because it draws attention to the utterance, giving it value. Other paraphrase is one of two categories of paraphrase, which is used, along with repetition (examined earlier) and citation, to reproduce meaning. The other category of paraphrase is self paraphrase.

Self paraphrase (rephrasing).

Apart from other paraphrase (paraphrasing students or paraphrasing text), the other type of paraphrase identified was self paraphrase, noted 260 times in the data representing paraphrase. The first example is from a prereading activity in *Encounter*.

Example 51
Ms. Stevens
6a And so what I want you to do
6b is think about
6c the author's purpose
6d in the social studies book
6e the person that wrote the social studies book
6f or the group of people that put the social studies book together
6g what was their purpose when they wrote that?//
7 versus Encounter//
8 And they might have the same purpose//
9 but what was the purpose of the person that wrote this book?//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases line 6 in line 9.

In the next example, from *Encounter*, Ms. Steven asks about the narrator's point of view.

Example 52
Ms. Stevens
5 Who's.. who's telling this story?//
Student
6 A little boy//
Ms. Stevens
7 A little.. a a person a child?//
Student
8 The kid?//
Ms. Stevens
9 That lives where?//
10 Or that who.. who is
Student
11 [unintelligible] Indian?//
Ms. Stevens
12 He's an Indian//
13 Yeah//
14 They would be a native//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases line 12 in line 14.

After reading the story, Ms. Stevens again brings up point of view.

Example 53
Ms. Stevens
5a Whose.. whose point of view
5b is this told from?//
Student
6 The descendent of the Indians?//
Ms. Stevens
7 Yeah.. fro:m..
8 Who who's telling this story?//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases line 5 in line 8.

In Example 54 Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005) during *Encounter*.

Example 54
Ms. Stevens
2 Okay//
3 We're teaching about history//
4 Good//
5 Showing the history//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases line 3 in line 5.

The next example is also from a discussion of the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005).

Example 55
Ms. Stevens
29 We have a LO:T of information here//
30 But.. this this takes one part of that story really//
31 Really blows it up//
32 And um.. yeah
33a And tells us a lot more about the Taino
33b than this does in.. in several pages//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases line 29-31 in line 33.

The next example is again from a discussion about Columbus Day using the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005).

Example 56
Ms. Stevens
1 All right//
2a Let's go ahead and turn the page..
2b children//
3a I wanted to talk um..
3b on page one-twenty-six
3c and one-twenty-seven///
4 This is Columbus Day//..
5 And it's.. it's.. it's…(3) a debate//
6a It sets the stage
6b for a debate about
6c whether or not
6d we should celebrate Columbus Day//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases lines 4-5 in line 6.

In Example 57, from the *Columbus Day* lesson, Cecilia (ELL) has just orally read a text by Irene Vernon, Director of the Center for Applied Studies in American Ethnicity at Colorado State University (Banks et al., 2005), to the class.

Example 57
Ms. Stevens
1 Okay.. so what's her point of view?//
2 What is she saying?//.. u:m
3 Adriana//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases line 1 in line 2.

In the next example Ms. Stevens is organizing a class debate during the *Columbus Day* lesson.

Example 58
Ms. Stevens
19a How many PEO:PLE..
19b would be WI:LLING..
19c to A:RGUE..
19d the SI:DE..
19e and you can raise your hands

19f for both of these things
19g that I'm about to ask..
19h would be willing to argue the side that
19i Columbus.. Day
19j should not be celebrated?//
20a How many people..
20b would be.. willing to argue that side?//..

Ms. Stevens paraphrases line 19 in line 20.

In the next example a nonparticipant has read an excerpt from the social studies book (Banks et al., 2005), a primary source from Bartolome de las Casas, during the *Spanish Empire* lesson.

Example 59
Ms. Stevens
13a What was his opinion..
13b about the people..
13c that the Spanish took over?//
14 What was his opinion?//
15 What was his evaluation of them?//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases line 13 in line 14 and again in line 15.

In the next example Ms. Stevens is reading and discussing *How Many Days to America* (Bunting, 1990) with the class.

Example 60
Ms. Stevens
[reading:] *My mother cried. "Leave all my things? My chair, where I sat to nurse our children? The bedcover that my mother made, every stitch by hand?" "Nothing," my father said.* My money—*"Just money to buy our way to America."* [shows picture]
125 [unintelligible] one change of clothes//
126 So why were the soldiers there?//
127a Why do you think the soldiers were there..
127b in there in the house?//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases line 126 in line 127.

In Example 61 Ms. Stevens and the class are going over vocabulary words as a prereading activity for *Julie*.

Example 61

Ms. Stevens

27a Okay some of these words are going to be really straight forward
27b and some of them are going to be more difficult//
28 Let's read 'em together//
29 Deserted//

Students

30 Deserted//

Ms. Stevens

31 Do you know what that means?//
32 To be left//
33 To be abandoned//
34a The pack deserted the den
34b after it was discovered by man//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases a synonym for "deserted" in line 32 with another synonym in line 33.

In the following example Ms. Stevens is going over her students' answers to a homework assignment in the reading series workbook (Reading Street, 2008b) during *The Ch'i-lin Purse* lesson.

Example 62

Ms. Stevens

48 And.. on that note//
49 Let's look at seventy three//
50 One of these compare and contrast things//
51 This was a toughie//
52 I will give you that//
53 This was a:.. you know//
54 You're..
55a They're talking about
55b two or three different
56a Don't have a lot of familiarity with.. um
56b the bushido code
56c of the Samurai warrior..
56d and the:..
56e chivalry code of the knights//
57 Of Europe//
58 So we were looking for similarities//
59a I'm really curious to see what you fou:nd..
59b that..
60a What did you find

60b about both.. kinds.. of people?//
61a What did you find..
61b that both had to be what?//
62 Gimme somethin' u:m.. Shawn//
63 What'd you get?//

Ms. Stevens asks a question in line 60 and then rephrases the question in line 61 to make it more specific.

In the final example Ms. Stevens and the class are rehearsing the play, "I Have a Dream" (Lewis, M., 2000, Jan.).

Example 63
Enrique [ELL]
[reading] *Mrs. Conner says that her boys can't play ball with me anymore. She says it's because I'm colored.*
Katrina
[reading] *I'm sorry, Martin. I should have warned you. It was bound to happen sooner or later.*
Cecilia [ELL]
153 What is bound?//
Ms. Stevens
154a It was..
154b it was destined//
155a It was gonna happen
155b sooner or later//
156a It was..
156b it was..
156c it was inevitable//
157 It.. it means..
158 It it was no way it wasn't gonna happen//

Ms. Stevens answers Cecilia's request for a definition (153) in line 154 and then self paraphrases in line 155 and again in 156, and once again in line 158, in order to negotiate meaning with Cecilia, an ELL.

The last 13 examples illustrated the use of self paraphrase, a category, along with other paraphrase, of the broader category of paraphrase, used in the reproduction of

meaning in order to build significance. The last broad category of reproduction of meaning I examine (repetition and paraphrase were discussed earlier) is citation.

Citation.

Citation was the last type of reproduction of meaning found in data that illustrates language used to build significance. Repetition and paraphrase draw attention to the meaning of an utterance to reproduce meaning. Citation is somewhat different in that it draws attention to the speaker or writer of an utterance whose meaning has all ready been produced, thereby reinforcing the significance of the utterance. Citation was by far the least used type of reproduction of meaning seen in the data. In a way similar to the other types of reproduction of meaning, citation was broken down into two types: citation of text (author or title) and citation of students.

Citation of text (author or title).

Citing text was noted 26 times in the data representing citation. In the first example, while reading and discussing *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996), the word "hammock" comes up.

<u>Example 64</u>
Ms. Stevens
[reading] *I left my hammock*
34 Hammock?//
[reading] *and walked to the beach. There were my dream birds again.*
Student
35 What's "hammock?//
Ms. Stevens
36 Hammock//
37 Remember we read that?//
38 That's in here//
39 It's on page one eighteen//
40a There's a picture of a hammock
40b right there//
41 See?//..
42 You know what it is now?//

In an intertextual reference, Ms. Stevens cites Banks et al., 2005, (visually, rather than orally) in line 38, and she cites the page in line 39.

In another example, Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing the celebration of Columbus Day.

Example 65
Ms. Stevens
68 Good//
69 Henrietta Mann//
70 She's a professor//..
71a She's a Native American..
71b of Native American studies
71c in Montana//
72 She was interviewed//
73a This is an excerpt
73b from her interview//

Ms. Stevens cites the author of a text (69-71) before it is read to give significance to the meaning of the text.

The last two examples were of citation of text. The next and final type of citation noted in the data was citation of students.

Citation of students.

Citation of students was noted only eight times in the data representing citation. I will provide one example.

Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing Columbus Day as part of a social studies unit. Cecilia (ELL) has just orally read a text (Banks et al., 2005, p. 127) by Irene Vernon, Director of the Center for Applied Studies in American Ethnicity at Colorado State University, to the class.

Example 66
Ms. Stevens
1 Okay.. so what's her point of view?//
2 What is she saying?//.. u:m

3 Adriana//

Adriana [ELL]

4a um.. She's saying that.. um..

4b Columbus destroyed a lot of.. cultures?//

Ms. Stevens

5 Right//.. uh.. uh..

6 Enrique?//

Enrique [ELL]

7a She thinks.. we we shouldn't uh.. uh..

7b celebrate.. um.. Columbus Day?//

Ms. Stevens

8 Right//

9a She thinks we shouldn't

9b but why.. Honey?//…(3)

10 Why?//

11a He wiped out a lot of cultures..

11b like Adriana said..

In line 11b, Ms. Stevens cites Adriana as the source of information presented earlier.

Up to this point I have discussed three broad categories of reproduction of meaning: repetition, paraphrase, and citation. As stated earlier, there were other methods of using language to build significance noted in the data besides reproduction of meaning. The next major category of language use to build significance is prosody.

Prosody

Prosody (the rhythm, stress, and intonation of speech) can be used to make things significant (to give them meaning or value) in certain ways. Changing one's normal voice patterns and sounds calls attention to those changes in the listener. Calling attention to spoken utterance indicates the utterance is somehow significant. This broad category was found 331 times. I will discuss four types of prosodic manipulation of voice patterns and sounds in this section in order of frequency noted in the data. These prosodic data are vowel elongation, stress, extended pause, and low pitch.

Vowel elongation.

Vowel elongation is a durational parameter of prosody. Labov (1972) discusses vowel elongation as an intensification device. Speakers call attention to key words by lengthening stressed vowels. Vowel elongation was noted in 178 instances of the data representing the use of prosody to build significance. In the transcriptions, a colon (":") following a vowel indicates that the vowel is elongated.

In the first example, Ms. Stevens and the class are reading and discussing *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996), and Ms. Stevens is showing an illustration from the book (illustrated by David Shannon) to the class.

Example 67
Ms. Stevens
96 Is everybody able to see the pictures okay?//..
97 What is the ha:nd holding?//
Student
98 A sword?//
Ms. Stevens
99 A sword//

Ms. Stevens elongates the vowel in "hand" in line 97 in order to call attention to the significance of that element of the illustration.

In the next group of examples Ms. Stevens uses four instances of vowel elongation in the transcript provided. After reading *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996), Ms. Stevens read the author's note at the end of the book. The exact text is in italics, text she chose not to read is crossed out.

Examples 68-71
Ms. Stevens
Columbus called the ~~tribespeople~~ people *"Indians" ~~mistaking the land for~~* because he thought he was in *India. In his journal, he wrote that they were "well made, with fine shapes and faces; their hair short, and coarse like that of a horse's tail, combed toward the forehead, except a small portion which they suffer to hang down behind . . . ." The Taino gave the sailors balls of cotton thread and*

fish darts and parrots in friendship. In turn, the sailors gave them ~~Venetian~~ glass beads, little brass bells, and red caps. They asked in sign where the natives' gold rings and armbands came from. It was the go:ld that interested them the most. Columbus carried away ten young Taino men and women ~~(or six, according to different sources)~~ from the various islands they visited, carting them back to Spain as slaves. Later when the islands were colonized by the Spanish, the native religions, languages, and lifestyles were changed forever.

Ms. Stevens [still reading]

1a Though there were originally
1b some three hundred THOU:SAND..
1c native islanders..
1d in fifteen forty eight…(7)
2 There were three hundred thousand islanders//
3a by: .. fifty years later
3b in fifteen ninety eight
3c there were five hundred//…(7)
4 Today there are no: full blooded Taino//…(5)

In the examples, Ms. Stevens' first use of vowel elongation is seen in the text broadly transcribed (in italics). She chose to elongate the vowel in "gold" (*It was the go:ld that interested them the most.*) to call attention to the Spanish greed for gold in the New World. In the narrow transcription in line 1b Ms. Stevens elongates the vowel in "thousand" to call attention to the immensity of the number of original inhabitants. (She also uses stress in "thousand," another type of prosodic device used to build significance which will be discussed later.) In line 3a, "by" is elongated. This vowel elongation seems to be used to call attention to the relative short length of time she is discussing. In line 4, Ms. Stevens elongates the vowel in "no" in order to call attention to the absolute decimation of a people. The transcription is interesting in that Ms. Stevens uses a variety of prosodic devices: vowel elongation, as well as stress and extended pause, which will be discussed later. Also note the use of other paraphrase in the transcription.

The next example is from the *Spanish Empire* lesson. Ms. Stevens is referring to the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005).

Example 72

Ms. Stevens

31 Okay//
32 On page one-forty-one//..
33a Paintings by Diego Rivera//
33b who is a very fa:mous Mexican artist//

Ms. Stevens elongates the vowel in "famous" (line 33b) to call attention to the prominence of the artist, thereby building significance.

In the next examples Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing Cuba as a prereading activity during the *How Many Days to America* lesson.

Examples 73-74

Ms. Stevens

28a And um.. one thing about Cuba is that..
28b it has long been under the control
28c of a dictator named Fidel Castro//
29a Whose daughter actually just
29b vi:sited here..
30a uh to talk about what it was like
30b to grow up under.. um.. his rule//
31a And um.. he.. he um.. instituted a lot of
31b very harsh policies for his people//
32a And there were a lot of folks there
32b who were political prisoners
32c who did not agree with the way Fidel..
32d um.. ran the country//
33a And.. if they tried
33b to speak out
33c they would be.. imprisoned//..
34 And u:sually that doesn't happen in this country//

In line 29b, "visited" is elongated in order to build significance by stating that Castro's daughter was recently in the same town in which the students live. In line 34, Ms. Stevens elongates "usually" to indicate that civil rights violations do indeed happen in the United States.

In the last example, Ms. Stevens and the class have been discussing *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972). Ms. Stevens is about to start an audio recording of the next section of the book for the students to listen to while they follow along in the books.

Example 75
Ms. Stevens
489 Okay//..
490a The wind..
490b the empty sky..
490c the deserted earth//
491 Are you ready?//
492 Everybody get rea:lly comfortable…(7)
493 Okay?//
494a On your mark..
494b get set…(10)

In line 492 Ms. Stevens elongates the vowel in "really" to emphasize the fact that she doesn't want her students restless, but comfortable and focused while reading.

The last nine examples were of vowel elongation. The next type of prosodic device noted in the data used to build significance is stress.

Stress.

In English, stress is used to mark saliency. By definition, salient words or phrases are significant. Gee (2005) notes that stress is not a physical concept, but psychological. It is "marked by a combination of increased loudness, increased length, and by changing the pitch of one's voice . . . on a word's primary ('accented') syllable" (p. 121). Ms. Stevens used stress as a prosodic device to build significance 112 times. In the transcriptions, words uttered with extra stress (emphatically) are CAPITALIZED.

In the first example, Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing the meaning of the title of *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996) as a lead-in to a more general discussion about author's purpose.

Example 76

Ms. Stevens

81 Okay//
88 It's talking about encounters
89a It's the MEETING
89b between the TAINO people..
89c the Indians..
89d the.. the.. Native.. Americans..
89e the first people..
89f that were living.. in the..
89g in the Americas..
89h meeting the first Europeans
89i that came over this way//

Ms. Stevens stresses "meeting" in line 89a to emphasize it as a synonym for encounter. In line 89b she stresses "Taino," perhaps to draw attention to the recently learned term.

In the next example Ms. Stevens is setting up a class debate over the celebration of Columbus Day. She is explaining the concept of a debate.

Example 77

Ms. Stevens

4a A debate is where.. you.. um..
4b like.. half the room takes one position
4c and half the room takes another position//
5a A:nd like um..
5b one position in this debate would be that
5c we believe that
5d we should celebrate Columbus Day..
5e the other half would say..
5f we don't believe we should celebrate Columbus Day//
6a And then you have to come up with..
6b A:RGUMENTS.. to support your position//..

In line 6b, Ms. Stevens stresses "arguments" to emphasize that statements must be supported with reasoned ideas. Note that Ms. Stevens also makes use of vowel elongation in the same word.

In the following examples Ms. Stevens is discussing the political situation in Cuba with the class as a prereading activity during the *How Many Days to America* lesson.

Examples 78-79
Ms. Stevens
58b Many Cubans have reacted to Cuba's government
58c by emigrating to Florida//
59 Here is a sample of a boat.. that..
60a And these people a:ll
60b are LEAVING Cuba.. in secret..
60c and at great risk to their lives//
61a And this is a really nice boat
61b that they were able to..
61c or a much nicer boat//
62a But LOTS of people end up dying
62b in that passageway from Cuba.

In line 60b Ms. Stevens stresses "leaving" to emphasize the fact that many do not wish to stay. In 62a Ms. Stevens stresses "lots" to emphasize the number of deaths. (Also note the vowel elongation in 60a.)

In the next example Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972). Ms. Stevens asks a display question and self-paraphrases the question to assess the comprehension of the students of an important part of the story.

Example 80
Ms. Stevens
771a Who comes to the.. mc.. um..
771b to Nash Harbor
771c in the summer time?//..
772a Only Sarah
772b in this whole room knows.. guys?//
773 Come on//..
774 Who comes.. who comes..
775a Jesus.. who comes to.. Nash Harbor?//..
775b In your own words//
776a Who comes to Nash Harbor..
776b besides the Eskimo people?//..
777 The people from the city come//

778 What in..
779 What language do they speak?//..
780a Do they speak.. the:
780b Inuit Eskimo language?//
781 Or do what what language to do they speak?//..
782 COME ON GUYS//
783 COME ON//

In lines 782 and 783 Ms. Stevens reaches a point of frustration that members of the class are not focused, and uses stress to emphasize her dissatisfaction with the lack of effort.

In the last example, from *The Ch'i-lin Purse* lesson, Ms. Stevens is soliciting students to name vocabulary words from the reading series (Reading Street, 2008a) that they are unsure of the meanings.

Example 81
Ms. Stevens
393 Le' me hear from.. Shawn//
Shawn
394 Astonish//
Ms. Stevens
395 ASTONISH//
396 What do you think astonish means?//
Shawn
397 Like to..
Ms. Stevens
398a I was ASTONISHED to learn..
398b that he got arrested//

In line 395 Ms. Stevens used stress to emphatically repeat (other repetition) "astonish" in order for the class to focus on the word brought up by Shawn. In 398a she again stresses "astonish" in order for the students to focus on the word used in a sentence.

The last six examples were of stress. The next type of prosodic device noted in the data used to build significance is extended pause

Extended Pause.

Although not all lengthy pauses are used to build significance (one might simply be searching for a word or train of thought), pauses which are longer than expected for a given location in an utterance may be highly significant to the speaker(s) and listener(s) (Edwards, 2001). Extended pause was noted in the data 33 instances as a means of using of prosody to build significance. In the transcriptions, three periods followed by a number ("…(7)") indicates an extended pause in seconds. (Two periods ("..") indicates a hearable pause less the two seconds in duration.)

The first example was used earlier to show examples (68-71) of vowel elongation. I now want to use the same transcript to illustrate the use of extended pause as a prosodic device to build significance.

<u>Example 82</u>
Ms. Stevens [still reading]
1a Though there were originally
1b some three hundred THOU:SAND..
1c native islanders..
1d in fifteen forty eight…(7)
2 There were three hundred thousand islanders//
3a by: .. fifty years later
3b in fifteen ninety eight
3c there were five hundred//…(7)
4 Today there are no: full blooded Taino//…(5)

In lines 1d, 3c, and 4, Ms. Stevens uses extended pauses to capture the attention of her students in order to indicate the significance of the total decimation of a civilization in a short period of time.

In the next example Ms. Stevens and the class are reading and discussing *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996).

<u>Example 83</u>
Ms. Stevens

[reading] *Our chief said to us, "See how pale they are. No one can be that color who comes from the earth. Surely they come from the sky." Then he leaped before them and put his hands up, pointing to the sky, to show he understood how far they had flown. "Perhaps they have tails," said my older brother. "Perhaps they have no feet." Our young men smiled, but behind their hands so the guests would not feel bad.*

106a Trying very hard
106b to be polite
106c and not show how strange
106c that they think
106d that they are//

Then they turned around to show that they had no tails. [shows picture]

107a So this is the impression…(5)
107b that the.. um.. native people had…(3)
107c perhaps//

In line 107 Ms. Stevens twice uses extended pause to focus the class on the significance of the mindset of the Taino in the story.

In the last example Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing the celebration of Columbus Day. Ms. Stevens poses the overarching question.

<u>Example 84</u>
Ms. Stevens
14 And we.. we've talked a little bit about Columbus//
15a And.. um.. why do you think that we take.. a holiday..
15b on Columbus Day?//…(5)
16a What does that mean?//..
16b that we take a.. a day.. off?//
16c that you guys get a day off on Columbus Day?//

In line 15b Ms. Stevens uses extended pause after her overarching question to indicate the importance of the question and that is worth consideration.

The last three examples have been of the use of extended pause to build significance. The final prosodic device used for building significance I examine is low pitch.

Low pitch.

Lowering the pitch of one's voice during an utterance is another prosodic device that calls the attention of the listener to the message. Low pitch was noted eight times in the data representing the use of prosody to build significance.

In the example provided, Ms. Stevens and the class are reading and discussing *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996).

Example 85
Ms. Stevens
[reading] *I ran then and found our chief still sleeping in his hammock. "Do not welcome them," I begged him. "My dream is a warning." But it is our custom to welcome strangers, to give them the tobacco leaf, to feast them with the pepper pot, and to trade gifts.*
53 And that's their custom// [low pitch]

At first glance it would be tempting to propose the Ms. Stevens lowered her pitch in line 53 to signal a switch from her reading text to making a comment about the text. However, while switching from reading text to commenting was quite frequent in the data, low pitch was very rare. In the example Ms. Stevens seems to be focusing on cultural difference, and uses low pitch as a prosodic device to build its significance.

I have discussed four categories of prosody: vowel elongation, stress, extended pause, and low pitch. The next broad category of building significance that was noted in the data I shall discuss is the use of questions.

Questions

Questions may be used to make things significant. Asking a question draws the attention of the listener to the meaning of the question and requires some thought in order to answer the question. The fact that the question is posed indicates that its meaning must be significant. This broad category applied to 201 utterances used to build

significance. Questions have been divided into two categories: comprehension checks and display questions.

Comprehension checks.

Comprehension checks (in this context) are questions that ask the learner if they understand the meaning of text (spoken or written). The fact that the teacher wishes to know if a student understands something means that something is somehow significant. Comprehension checks were noted 141 instances in the data representing the use of questions to build significance.

The first example, from *Encounter*, is an example of perhaps the simplest and probably most frequently used comprehension check.

Example 86
Ms. Stevens
1 All right//.. um
2a This is a telling of the story
2b the same story
2c that we read on Thursday//
3 We read about the Taino//
4 Okay?//

In line 4 Ms. Stevens asks the class, "Okay?" She is asking if the students understood what she said in lines 1-3.

In the next example Ms. Stevens and the class are reading and discussing *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996). The word "hammock" appears in the text.

Example 87
Student
35 What's "hammock?//
Ms. Stevens
36 Hammock//
37 Remember we read that?//
38 That's in here//
39 It's on page one eighteen//
40a There's a picture of a hammock

40b right there//
41 See?//..
42 You know what it is now?//

In line 42 Ms. Stevens asks the students if they now understand the meaning of "hammock."

In the next examples Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing the meaning of the word "encounter."

Examples 88-89
Ms. Stevens
88 It's talking about encounters
89a It's the MEETING
89b between the TAINO people..
89c the Indians..
89d the.. the.. Native.. Americans..
89e the first people..
89f that were living.. in the..
89g in the Americas..
89h meeting the first Europeans
89i that came over this way//
90 Okay?//
91 That's what encounter means?//
92 All right//

Line 90 is another example of the ubiquitous "okay?" followed by a specific question in line 91 to check the students' comprehension.

In the next example, from the *Columbus Day* lesson, Sarah reads an excerpt from an interview with Henrietta Mann from the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005, p. 126).

Example 90
Sarah
80 [reading] *Columbus Day should not be a holiday out of respect for Native American peoples. When Columbus arrived in 1492 we lost an entire continent. Out land, religious beliefs, and many ways of living were taken from us. We need a holiday that will celebrate the many different customs and cultures that Americans have, and show respect for them.*
Ms. Stevens
81 Everybody understand that?//
82 Everybody follow that?//

In lines 81 and 82 Ms. Stevens asks the class if they understood what Sarah has just read.

In the following example the students are engaged in a debate about the celebration of Columbus Day. A nonparticipant in the study has just spoken.

Example 91
Ms. Stevens
130 Okay//
131 Respond to her?//
132 Everybody hear what she said//
133 Enrique.. did you hear what she said?//
134a Okay I want you to process that..
134b think about that..
134c digest that..
134d and respond to what she said//..

In line 133 Ms. Stevens asks Enrique [ELL] if he heard what was spoken.

The next example is from the *Spanish Empire* lesson.

Example 92
Ms. Stevens
86 They call this whole thing the growth of the Spanish empire//
87 Do you understand why they call it that?//

In line 87 Ms. Stevens directly asks a question to check her students' comprehension of a concept.

In the following example, from the *Spanish Empire* lesson, Ms. Stevens and the class are listening to an audio recording of the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005). The students listen and follow along in the book. The subject being discussed is slavery in New Spain.

Example 93
Ms. Stevens
183 What were the two things that killed them?//
Student
184 Disease and overwork//
Ms. Stevens
185 Disease and..overwork//
186 Everybody understand what I mean by overwork?//

In line 186 Ms. Stevens checks the comprehension of her students by asking them if they understand the term "overwork."

In the next example Ms. Stevens and the class are reviewing vocabulary as a prereading activity during *Julie*.

Example 94
Ms. Stevens
258 Miraculous//
259 Like a miracle//
260 Okay?//
261 Like.. yeah//..
262 Everybody understand miraculous?//..
263 Milagro?//

We see the common comprehension check, "okay?" in line 260. In line 262 Ms. Stevens uses a comprehension check for the meaning of "miraculous." Interestingly, in the next line she utters the Spanish translation of the word for the benefit of her ELLs. I will address building significance for sign systems and knowledge in a separate section.

In the next example is a rather lengthy transcription of Ms. Stevens explaining a section of *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972). The students are following along in the book as they listen to an audio of the text.

[Audio] *To Miyax the years at seal camp were infinitely good. The scenes and events were beautiful color spots in her memory.*
Ms. Stevens
554a Just on this
554b I don't know//
555a It it.. this part might be a little confusing
555b so I want to explain it//
556a She remembers things in colors.. and
556b she remembers scenes and pieces
556c and you all have memories like this//
557a I have a memory..
557b of when we lived in Minnesota
557c and I would have been like two or three years old//
558 And we lived in a trailer//
559a But I remember my bedroom..

559b as being like this most beautiful blue color//
560a I'm sure it wasn't.. like.. you know..
560b all that//
561 It was just like paint from the local paint store//
562 But it was just like this sky blue//
563a That who:le place
563b that we lived in
563c I remember that..
563d there were big tall.. pine trees
563e out back
563f and I could see those
563g out the window//
564a But that whole scene
564b is kind of blue://
565 With green in the background//
566a I'm not sure that it's even real..
566b but I think..
567 Think about your own childhoods now//
568a Think about some of those memories
568b that are mo:st stuck..
568c in your head//
569a And the colors..
569b maybe the smells..
570a If.. sometimes when you walk down
570b into a new place
570c and you smell a smell
570d it'll.. [snaps fingers] take you back to..
570e a time long ago//
571a Every time you smell that smell
571b it reminds you of a certain
571c time in your life
571d that was remarkable in some way//..
572 Does everybody kinda know what I'm talkin' about?//
573 Everybody kinda got that?//
574a That's what she's gonna be doin'
574b for the next several pages//
575 Okay?//
576a Is talkin' about these.. these memories of hers
576b that are just.. crystallized//
577a Galvanized in her mind
577b as.. as something so extraordinarily special//
578 To Miyax.. the years at seal camp//

Ms. Stevens goes to great lengths to explain the sentence, "The scenes and events were beautiful color spots in her memory." This use of figurative language is potentially

problematic not only for ELLs, but for many fifth-grade students. After an extensive explanation using a personal example, Ms. Stevens uses a comprehension check in lines 572 and 573.

In the next example Ms. Stevens and the class are again listening and following along in the text to *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972).

Example 96
[audio] *Then she knew that was wrong;*
Ms. Stevens
1612 Don't do that//
[audio] *she must not give in. Hand tightening on the antler club, brandishing it, growling, she flung herself upon him and bit the top of his nose. His eyes widened, his ears and body drooped, and his tail went back between his legs. He groveled on his belly and came up to her smiling, head lowered humbly.*
Ms. Stevens
1613 Got it?//
1614 She like.. totally dominated the situation//

In line 1613 Ms. Stevens uses the comprehension check, "Got it?" This indicated that the passage is worth "getting," that what has happened is significant.

In the next example Ms. Stevens and the class are rehearsing the play, "I Have a Dream" (Lewis, 2000, Jan.).

Example 97
Student
[reading] *Martin, doesn't it make you proud to see your father standing so tall be for the*
76 con.. gregation?//
Ms. Stevens
77 Congregation//
78 Do you know what a congregation is?//
79 All the people in the church//

Ms. Stevens uses a comprehension check in line 78 to indicate that the meaning of the word is significant.

The last 12 examples have been of comprehension checks. The other type of questions noted in the data that are used to help build significance is display questions.

Display questions.

A display question is “a question to which the asker already knows the answer” (Lightbown & Spada, 2006, p. 198). Cazden (2001) differentiated teachers' display questions from exploratory queries. Display questions have specific and generally agreed-upon answers, while exploratory talk is speaking "without the answers fully intact" (p. 170). Display questions, like comprehension checks, can help build significance. If a question is being asked, it is generally for a reason. The question itself indicates that its answer must in some way be significant. Display questions were noted 60 times in the data representing the use of questions to build significance.

In the first series of examples Ms. Stevens and the class have just begun reading and discussing *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996).

Examples 98-100
Ms. Stevens
[reading] *The moon was well overhead, and our great fire had burned low. A loud clap of thunder woke me from my dream. All dreams are not true dreams, my mother says. But in my dream that night, three great-winged birds with voices like thunder rode wild waves in our bay.*
1 What’s voices like thunder?//..
2 Voices like thunder?//..
Sarah
3 Simile//
Ms. Stevens
4 Simile//
[reading] *They were not like any birds I had ever seen, for sharp, white teeth filled their mouths.* [shows picture]
5 Who’s.. who’s telling this story?//
Student
6 A little boy//
Ms. Stevens
7 A little.. a a person a child?//
Student

8 The kid?//
Ms. Stevens
9 That lives where?//
10 Or that who.. who is
Student
11 [unintelligible] Indian?//
Ms. Stevens
12 He's an Indian//
13 Yeah//
14 They would be a native//

Ms. Stevens asks a display question in line 1 (and uses self repetition in line 2 and other repetition in line 4). In line 5 she asks another display question (and uses other paraphrase in line 7). She asks a third display question in line 9 that she immediately begins to rephrase in line 10.

The final series of examples representing the use of display questions are from *Encounter*.

<u>Examples 101-104</u>
Ms. Stevens
64a Are.. are
64b were there really birds in this story?//
Student
65 [inaudible]
Ms. Stevens
66a Okay what did..
66b what did the birds rep..
66c what.. what.. what was he thinking were birds?//..
66d in his dream?//
67 What were the birds?//
Student
68 The ships//
Ms. Stevens
69 The ships//
70 Who was on the ships?//
Student
71 People?//
Ms. Stevens
72 What people?//
73 Which people?//
Students

74 Indians//
Ms. Stevens
75 The Indians were on the ships?//
Students
76 Europeans//
Ms. Stevens
77 The Europeans were on the ships//
78 Where were the Europeans from?//
Students
79 Spain//
Ms. Stevens
80 Spain//

In line 64 Ms. Stevens asks a display question and in lines 66-67 another display question. In line 70 she asks a third display question and makes the question more specific in 72-73. Line 75 seems more of a clarification request than a display question, but she goes on to ask a fourth display question in line 78.

The last seven examples have been of display questions asked by Ms. Stevens, which along with comprehension checks, represent the use of questions to help build significance. The next broad category of building significance that was noted in the data I shall discuss is overt attention.

Overt Attention

Ms. Stevens used a variety of language to build significance by overtly drawing the attention of her students to text. I have labeled this broad category "overt attention." This overt attention to text indicates that the text is significant in some way. This broad category applied to 148 of the utterances used to build significance. I have divided overt attention into four categories noted in the data: definition, direct attention, importance, and imperative to remember.

Definition.

Providing a definition to a word or phrase calls direct attention to its meaning, thereby building significance. Definitions were noted in 92 instances of the data representing overt attention.

In the first example Ms. Stevens are reading and discussing *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996).

Example 105
Ms. Stevens
[reading] *Our chief gave the strangers balls of cotton thread to bind them to us in friendship. He gave them spears that they might fish and not starve. He gave them gum-rubber balls for sport. He gave them parrots, too—which made our young men laugh behind their hands all over again, knowing it was out chief's little joke, that the strangers looked like parrots. But the strangers behaved almost like human beings, for they laughed, too, and gave in return tiny smooth balls, the color of sand and sea and sun, strung upon a thread.*
108 Beads//

Ms. Stevens, in one word in line 108, provides a definition to the "tiny smooth balls" in the text.

In the next example Ms. Stevens and the class have finished reading *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996) and are about to discuss the author's purpose.

Example 106
Ms. Stevens
88 It's talking about encounters
89a It's the MEETING
89b between the TAINO people..
89c the Indians..
89d the.. the.. Native.. Americans..
89e the first people..
89f that were living.. in the..
89g in the Americas..
89h meeting the first Europeans
89i that came over this way//

Ms. Stevens, in line 89a, gives the definition of the book's title. Also note the use of stress.

In the following example Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing the celebration of Columbus Day. An excerpt is about to be read with the word "legacy" in the title.

Example 107
Ms. Stevens
54 Legacy//
55 Columbus's legacy//
56 That means.. um..
Student
57 [unintelligible] story//
Ms. Stevens
58a all that has happened..
58b because of Columbus//
59a Everything that followed
59b because of his journey//
60 His legacy//
61a Everything that happened
61b as a result of his journey//
62 Because of.. his leg
63a And it usually means the good things that have happened
63b because of his.. journey//

Ms. Stevens provides a definition in line 58, self paraphrases in 59 and 61, and provides a secondary definition of legacy in line 63.

In the next example Ms. Stevens is setting up a class debate on the celebration of Columbus Day.

Example 108
Ms. Stevens
4a A debate is where.. you.. um..
4b like.. half the room takes one position
4c and half the room takes another position//

Ms. Stevens defines "debate" in order to explain the activity.

In the next example, from the *Spanish Empire* lesson, Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing the Spanish Conquest.

Examples 109-110

Ms. Stevens

185 Disease and..overwork//
186 Everybody understand what I mean by overwork?//
187 Working people to death//..
188 Basically//
189a So when they ran out of.. uh native people to use
189b where did they go?//

Student

190 Africa//

Ms. Stevens

191 Africa//
192 And this is how Africa comes into play//..
193 Uh everybody point to where it says African captives//..
194 Captive is another word for slave//

In line 187 Ms. Stevens defines "overwork." In line 194 she defines "captive."

In the following example Ms. Stevens and the class are reading and discussing *How Many Days to America* (Bunting, 1990).

Example 111

Ms. Stevens

[reading] The woman made a sail by knotting—*the women made a sail by knotting clothes together and when they pulled it high I saw my father's Sunday shirt blowing in the wind.*

163 They made a sail//
164 Do you guys know what a sail is?//

Students

165 Um hum//

Ms. Stevens

166a The piece of cloth..
166b that's at the top of the boat..
166c that helps to catch the wind..
166d and let it direct//

Ms. Stevens defines a "sail" in line 166.

The next example, from *How Many Days to America*, is a common example of Ms. Stevens and the class going over vocabulary words as a prereading activity.

Example 112

Ms. Stevens

27a Okay some of these words are going to be really straight forward

27b and some of them are going to be more difficult//
28 Let's read 'em together//
29 Deserted//
Students
30 Deserted//
Ms. Stevens
31 Do you know what that means?//
32 To be left//
33 To be abandoned//
34a The pack deserted the den
34b after it was discovered by man//

In lines 32 and 33 Ms. Stevens provides a definition of "deserted."

In the last example, from *Julie*, Ms. Stevens is again providing a definition in the context of vocabulary words, but this time she does it in a more detailed and personal way.

<u>Example 113</u>
Ms. Stevens
1332 Um.. niche//
1333 Niche.. niche//
1334 Different people say it different ways//
1335 It means like.. your special place//
1336a For an animal.. their special niche
1336b is like their role//
1337 In the.. in the life cycle//
1338 In
1339 Or in the food chain//
1340 Niche means..
1341a If you have a special niche..
1341b um.. it's like your..
1342 My spe
1343 My niche in.. teaching is probably social studies//
1344 That's my favorite thing//
1345 It's the thing that I:.. do:.. the best//

Ms. Stevens provides an extended definition of "niche" (lines 1335-1339) and then gives a personal example of her own niche in lines 1343-1345.

The last nine examples have been of the use of definition. The next category of overt attention I examine is direct attention.

Direct attention.

Direct attention is simply pointing out text to which to pay special attention. If special attention is required then the text must somehow be significant. Direct attention was noted in 33 instances of the data representing overt attention.

In the first example Ms. Stevens and the class are comparing *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996) and the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005) for similarities.

Example 114
Ms. Stevens
150 Oh.. look at that//
151 Sure enough//
152 Look at that//
153 There's a zemi right there//..
154 Right//
155 there's a zemi right there//..
156 So we see the zemi…(6)
157 Okay//

Ms. Stevens directs the students to an illustration in line 150, and again in 152-153. Also note the self repetition in 155.

In the second example Ms. Stevens is playing an audio of the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005) during the *Spanish Empire* lesson. A part is coming up that describes African slaves who escaped from the Spanish and were not captured.

Example 115
Ms. Stevens
204 Oh this is a great story//
205 Listen to this//

Ms. Stevens directs the students' attention to the upcoming audio.

In the last example Ms. Stevens and the class are reading and discussing *How Many Days to America* (Bunting, 1990).

Example 116
Ms. Stevens

[reading] *At last we got the boat turned in the right direction. "How many days to America now?" my little sister asked. "More, my small one," my father said and he held us close. I saw him look at my mother across our heads.* [shows picture]
179a You can see the sail

Ms. Stevens directs the students' attention to an element in an illustration (David Shannon).

The last three examples have been of direct attention. Next I will give examples of another type of overt attention: importance.

Importance.

In data representing the category of importance, Ms. Stevens tells the students that some element of text is important. Data in this category were noted 17 times, in the data representing the broader category of overt attention.

In the example provided, Ms. Stevens and the class are reading and discussing *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996).

<u>Example 117</u>
Ms. Stevens
96 Is everybody able to see the pictures okay?//..
97 What is the ha:nd holding?//
Student
98 A sword?//
Ms. Stevens
99 A sword//
100 Okay?
101a That's..
101b you think that's important?//
Student
102 [unintelligible] just on top of it//
Ms. Stevens
103 Yeah//
104a Why do you think the author
104b made such a point to include that
104c in the picture..
104d of the two hands touching?//..
105 um.. Somethin' to think about.. huh?//

Ms. Stevens points out the importance of the hand holding the sword in lines 101 and 105.

Imperative to remember.

The final category of data representing overt attention noted in the data was an imperative to remember. In this type of data Ms. Stevens directly tells the class to remember something. If something is important enough to remember, it must somehow be significant. Imperative to remember was noted 6 times in the data representing overt attention.

In the example provided Ms. Stevens and the class are reading and discussing *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972).

<u>Example 118</u>
Ms. Stevens
729a She's got this.. thing
729b hangin' off of her belt//
730 Seal fur and blubber is like fat//
731 It's an ignotide//
732 They'll she'll say it better than me//
733 She said.. it's a nice spirit for you//
734 So I want you to remember that word//
735a It's gonna come up again
735b later in the book//

In line 734 Ms. Stevens directly tells the students to remember the word "ignotide."

I have discussed four categories of overt attention: definition, direct attention, importance, and imperative to remember. The next broad category of language used to build significance that I will address is life connection.

Life Connection

In data that fits under this broad category, Ms. Stevens found ways to connect text to the lives of her students. Since students' lives are greatly significant in their thinking

of what is of use in text, this type of language used by Ms. Stevens helps build significance. This type of data was noted 35 times in the data representing language used to build significance. Life connection is divided into three smaller categories: family, purpose, and institutional value.

Family.

Ms. Stevens would occasionally relate text to family (that of the students or her own). Since family is significant in almost everyone's lives to some degree, relating text to family can help build significance. Relating text to family was noted in 18 instances of the data representing the broader category of life connection.

In the example Ms. Stevens and the class are having a debate about whether or not the school should be in session on Columbus Day. The debate has been going along for a few minutes when the bell rings for recess.

Example 119
RECESS BELL RINGS
Ms. Stevens
249 I want to hear this//
Katrina
250a because what if your parents
250b know something good about Columbus..
250c and.. the other people really don't..
250d and.. like..
Ms. Stevens
251a Do your parents know.. stuff
251b that your teachers don't know?//
Student
252 Yeah//
Ms. Stevens
253 Most definitely//
254 Yeah//
255a Do we learn just as much at home
255b or more?//
256 Yeah//

Katrina has brought up a point that kids might learn something about Columbus from their parents if they are at home, rather than at school. In lines 251-256 Ms. Stevens points out to the students that parents can be a source of knowledge about Columbus or any other subject, often more than their teachers, thereby relating the spoken text concerning texts they had read earlier, to family.

Purpose.

The next category of life connection is purpose. Ms. Stevens occasionally directly related to her students that a text had a specific purpose in relation to them. This category was noted in nine instances of the data representing life connection.

In the example, from *Encounter*, Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing the authors' purpose for writing the section of the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005) that the class had recently read.

Example 120
Ms. Stevens
31a What what do you think the author's purpose is
31b in our social studies book?//
32 What's the point of writing this?//
33 What are they trying to teach you about?//
34 Or what are they trying to give you?
35a Sarah.. I appreciate your hand up
35b but class I need other people working..
35c other people working//
36a What's..
36b why why why is that social studies book..
36c what is that chapter written for?//..

In line 31 Ms. Stevens directly asks the class the purpose of the author. She asks a more specific question about the purpose in line 33, this time relating the purpose to the students. She again asks the authors' purpose in a slightly different way in line 36.

Institutional value.

The last category of the broader category of life connection that I will discuss is institutional value. Ms. Stevens occasionally seemed to infer that some text had an institutional (normally school) value. Since her students were members of that institution, this may be used to build significance. This category of data was noted 8 times in the data representing life connection.

In the example Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing Cuba as a prereading activity during *How Many Days to America*.

Example 121
Ms. Stevens
26 This is Cuba//
27a I think you guys talked about it
27b this morning in your DOL [Daily Oral Language]//

Ms. Stevens points to Cuba on a map, and then in line 27 she points out that the subject is also covered in another text/activity. This is also an example of intertextuality, in which she relates two activities and texts used by the institution (school) of which the students are members.

I have discussed three categories of life connection. The next and last category of using language to build significance I shall discuss is adjective labeling.

Adjective Labeling

I occasionally noticed Ms. Stevens labeling text with adjectives that seemed to make the text more significant. This type of data was noted 54 times in the data representing using language to build significance. The adjectives most noted were *interesting*, *unusual* or *different*, *dangerous*, and *real*, or close synonyms. Other

adjectives were also noted that seemed to serve the purpose of building significance, but less frequently.

Interesting.

The use of the word "interesting," or a synonym, was noted in the data 12 times. The example is from *Julie*.

Example 122
Shawn
830 What was.. um.. Julie mom name?//
Ms. Stevens
831 I don't..
832 It's..
833 I nev..
834 It's never says//
835 It never says//
836 And I think that's interesting//

After answering Shawn's question, Ms. Stevens states in line 836 that the answer is interesting.

Unusual or different.

Labeling text as unusual or different, or a synonym, was seen 11 times. In the example Ms. Stevens is introducing *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996) to the class before reading it to them.

Example 123
Ms. Stevens
1 All right//.. um
2a This is a telling of the story
2b the same story
2c that we read on Thursday//
3 We read about the Taino//
4 Okay?//
5a So this is that same story.. um
5b told.. in a different way//

Ms. Stevens labels the way in which the story is told as "different" in line 5b.

Dangerous.

Labeling text as dangerous, or a synonym, was noted 5 times. The example is from a prereading activity during *How Many Days to America*.

Example 124
Ms. Stevens
58b Many Cubans have reacted to Cuba's government
58c by emigrating to Florida//
59 Here is a sample of a boat.. that..
60a And these people a:ll
60b are LEAVING Cuba.. in secret..
60c and at great risk to their lives//
61a And this is a really nice boat
61b that they were able to..
61c or a much nicer boat//
62a But LOTS of people end up dying
62b in that passageway from Cuba.
63 They drown or..

In lines 60, 62, and 63 Ms. Stevens uses language like "great risk to their lives," "people end up dying," and "they drown."

Real.

The last category of adjective labeling for which I provide an example is the label "real." "Real," or a synonym, was noted in the data on five occasions in the data representing adjective labeling. In the example Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing some vocabulary as a prereading activity during the *Julie* lesson. The word they are discussing is "reindeer."

Example 125
Ms. Stevens
222a Reindeer.. is..
222b a reindeer//
223 They're real//
224 They don't just pull a sleigh//
225a They are..
225b they're real animals

In line 223 Ms. Stevens tells the class that “reindeer are real,” and in line 225 that they are real animals.

Other adjectives.

Ms. Stevens used other adjectives to label text that helped to build significance, but these words or phrases were noted less frequently than the adjectives previously discussed. Those labels include: detailed, big words, new, first, exciting, useful, serious, controversial, logical, intense, funny, and famous.

Significance Summary

In this section of Findings, I have discussed and provided examples of Ms. Stevens use of language to build significance as a way of meaning negotiation about text. I began with reproduction of meaning (types and subtypes of repetition, paraphrase, and citation), and continued with prosody (vowel elongation, stress, extended pause, and low pitch), questions (comprehension checks and display questions), overt attention (definition, direct attention, importance, and imperative to remember), life connection (family, purpose, and institutional value), and ended with adjective labeling (interesting, unusual/different, dangerous, real, and other adjectives). I have provided 125 examples as a representative sample of language-in-use to build significance. In the next section I examine of building tasks of language, besides significance, used by Ms. Stevens to negotiate meaning about text with her students.

Other Building Tasks of Language

Besides significance, Gee (2005) proposed six other building tasks of language. These include relationships, connections, sign systems and knowledge, activities, identities, and politics (the distribution of social goods). One or more of these six

building tasks of language were noted in 902 instances, 1/3 of the entirety of the coded data. (As stated earlier, language used to build significance comprised 2/3 of all coded data.) I present each building task (and their subcategories) in roughly the order of frequency noted in the data. My goal was to provide representative examples of each category of data with at least 5 percent of the coded data in that category. Any category of data had at least five instances of coded data and was represented by at least one example, which, in categories with relatively low frequency (less than 20 instances) coded data, resulted in the use of more than 5 percent (sometimes up to 20 percent) of the data for that category being used as an example for that category.

Relationships

"We use language to signal what sort of relationship we have, want to have, or are trying to have with our listener(s), reader(s), or other people, groups, or institutions, about whom we are communicating; that is, we use language to build social relationships" (Gee, 2005, p. 12). Ms. Stevens used language to build, or try to build, a variety of relationships with her students. Language used to build relationships was noted 373 times in the data.

Teacher/student(s).

Ms. Stevens used language to build the type of generic teacher/student relationship seen in almost all classrooms, characterized by the teacher as an authority figure who directs the activity in the classroom. This type of relationship building was noted 174 times in the data representing the use of language to build relationships.

In the first example, from *Encounter*, Ms. Stevens is speaking to the class about author's purpose.

Example 126
Ms. Stevens
6a And so what I want you to do
6b is think about
6c the author's purpose
6d in the social studies book
6e the person that wrote the social studies book
6f or the group of people that put the social studies book together
6g what was their purpose when they wrote that?//

Ms. Stevens is explicitly giving her students directions to follow, indicative of a traditional teacher/student relationship.

In the second example, again from *Encounter*, Ms. Stevens and the class are again discussing author's purpose. She has asked the class their thoughts on the authors' purpose of the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005).

Example 127
Ms. Stevens
35a Sarah.. I appreciate your hand up
35b but class I need other people working..
35c other people working//

Ms. Stevens tells the class that they need to work harder.

In the next example Ms. Stevens is setting up logistics for a class debate on the celebration of Columbus Day.

Example 128
Ms. Stevens
62 One.. Jacob two.. Adriana three.. Daniel four.. Jesus five.. Miguel six.. Enrique seven..
63a Can I get one more
63b to a:rgue
63c that we shou:ld come to schoo:l on Columbus Day?//
64a Shawn.. you remember..
64b we let people speak for themselves//

In line 63 Ms. Stevens divides the class into two sides. In line 64 she takes control when Shawn is attempting to influence the division of the class.

In the following example, from the *Spanish Empire* lesson, Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing the Spanish Conquest as part of a social studies unit.

Example 129
Ms. Stevens
6 Cortez.. learned.. about.. Aztec.. gold//…(3) u:m
7 What happened as a result?//
8 In a nutshell//…(4) u:h
9 Somebody else that hasn't been raising their hand all morning//

This example is somewhat similar to Example 127. Ms. Stevens asks a display question, and the usual suspects are the only ones raising their hands to answer. In line 9 Ms. Stevens makes clear that she expects more members of the class to participate.

In the next example, again from the *Spanish Empire* lesson, Ms. Stevens and the class are preparing to listen to an audio recording of the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005) while following along with the written text.

Example 130
Ms. Stevens
155 On your mark.. children//..
156 Get set//
157 Everybody point//..
158 Lesson three the Spanish build an empire//…(5)

In line 155 Ms. Stevens pauses before using the word "children," indicating adult authority. In line 157 she requires of her students a physical action, another display of teacher authority.

In Example 131 Ms. Stevens and the class are in the midst of reading *How Many Days to America* (Bunting, 1990). Ms. Stevens is distributing handouts along with an illustration.

Example 131
Ms. Stevens
108 Okay//..
109 Just hold it//
110 Just.. yeah//
111 There's one for every group//
112 Just hold it//
113a When it gets down here just hold it//..

114a [Nonparticipant].. you want to pass that down.. Honey..
114b so people can see the boat?//..

Ms. Stevens uses her authority as a teacher to direct students on how to divide the handouts in lines 109-112 and instructs another student in line 114 to share the illustration with others.

In the next example, as a prereading activity during *Julie*, Ms. Stevens asks the class one of the ways the Inuit consider themselves wealthy.

Example 132
Ms. Stevens
107 It has to do with your personality//
108 What are the qualities?//
109 Yeah//
110 Say it if you know it//

In line 110 Ms. Stevens gives permission for students to give an answer without raising their hands.

In the following example Ms. Stevens and the class are orally reviewing a section of *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972) for the benefit of a student (nonparticipant in the study) who was absent when the section was read in class. Part of the reading dealt with one of the characters being teased by a peer for not having had sexual relations with his wife (Julie), a potentially embarrassing topic for fifth graders. Up to this point the students were catching up the student who had been absent.

Example 133
Ms. Stevens
1192 And Daniel comes in//..
1193 And..
1194 Does anybody wanna do this?//..
1195 You want Teacher to do this part?//
1196 Okay//
Student
1197 Yes//
Ms. Stevens

1198 Teacher'll do this part//

In line 1195 Ms. Stevens volunteers to address the topic due to its embarrassing nature. Interestingly, Ms. Stevens refers to herself in the third person as "Teacher," and again in line 1198. This was the only instance this overt labeling of herself as "Teacher" was noted in the transcribed data. This is a very obvious use of language to build a teacher/student relationship. The implication may be that Ms. Stevens, a bit uncomfortable, used third person to distance herself a little more from the text.

In the last example Ms. Stevens is setting up the class to rehearse "I Have a Dream" (Lewis, 2000, Jan.).

<u>Example 134</u>
Ms. Stevens
12 Okay//..
13 Best thing I know to do..
14a Best thing I know to do..
14b shh..
14c is just read through this puppy..
14d and…(3) we'll also need a um..
14e somebody to introduce the scenes//
15a I guess that'll probably be
15b one of our narrators//

Ms. Stevens tells the class her opinion of the best procedure and proceeds, signaling a teacher/student relationship. Also note her using teacher authority in line 14b to quiet the class.

The last nine examples have illustrated the use of language in building a generic teacher/student(s) relationship. Next I will discuss and provide examples of the use of language to build a teacher/good student(s) relationship.

Teacher/good student(s).

Ms. Stevens used language to construct a teacher/good student(s) relationship. This was noted 113 times in the data.

The first example is from the *Encounter* lesson.

Example 135
Ms. Stevens
16 Okay//
17 Somebody's having a dream//
18 That's
19 Okay Sarah did want to add something?//

In line 19 Ms. Stevens indicates that Sarah may have something to "add" to the discussion, building a teacher/good student relationship.

The next example illustrates probably the most common way Ms. Stevens used language to build teacher/good student(s) relationships. This also comes from the *Encounter* lesson.

Example 136
Ms. Stevens
109 Okay they both talk about Christopher Columbus//
110 Good//
111 What'd you say about it?//
Adriana [ELL]
112a They.. they.. they..
112b Christopher Columbus crew went to Sal.. Salvador?//
Student
113 San Salvador//
Ms. Stevens
114 San Salvador//
115 Good//
116 Good//
117 Very good//

In line 110 Ms. Stevens evaluates a previous response by Adriana (ELL) as "good," and later in line 115 she evaluates the answers of Adriana and another student as "good."

The next example is from the *Columbus Day* lesson. Ms. Stevens is setting up a class debate.

Example 137
Ms. Stevens
31a I need about.. eight or nine..
31b strong..
31c that.. that can.. step out of your ski:n..
31d even if it's not what you thi:nk..
31e step out of your comfortable skin..
31f and for the sake
31g of bringing intelligent thoughts to light..

In the example Ms. Stevens indicates that students in the class have the capability to express intelligent thoughts.

In the following example, from *Julie*, Ms. Stevens has given an extended response to a comment made earlier by Shawn. The example is of the end of that response.

Example 138
Ms. Stevens
705a No part of the animal
705b goes to waste//…(3)
706a Even the bladder.. has.. you know..
706b symbolic.. importance//..
707 Does that get.. answer your question?//..
708 What what's do you wanna get in deeper?//
709 What did..
710 What are you really asking me?//..

In line 708 Ms. Stevens asks Shawn if he wishes to delve deeper into an issue about the story, indicating a teacher/good student relationship.

The next example is from *The Ch'i-lin Purse* lesson.

Example 139
Ms. Stevens
237a So when you use contrast
237b when you show differences
237c I want you to really nail it//

In line 237c Ms. Stevens asks the students to "really nail" the use of contrast, building a teacher/good students relationship.

The last example is from the *I Have a Dream* lesson.

Example 140
Enrique [ELL]
[reading] *I don't have any reason to lie, Medgar. The other day I hit a homerun off Wallace. It cleared the fence right over there.*
Ms. Stevens
125 Good job.. Enrique//..

Ms. Stevens praises Enrique (ELL) after he reads his part during the play rehearsal, building a teacher/good student relationship.

The last six examples were of Ms. Stevens use of the use of language to build teacher/good student(s) relationships. Next I will provide examples of her use of language to build trusted teacher/student(s) relationships.

Trusted teacher/student(s).

Ms. Stevens used language to build relationships with her students that builds trust among her and her students. This was noted in the data 37 instances.

The first example is from the *Julie* lesson. Ms. Stevens would occasionally express self-doubt of knowing all the answers. This example is typical of examples of Ms. Stevens allowing students to know her limitations.

Example 141
Ms. Stevens
805a So I'm wondering..
805b if her mom might have been..
Student
806 English//
Ms. Stevens
807 A what?//
Student
808 Gussak//
Ms. Stevens

809 A gussak//
810 I'm wondering//..
811 I don't know//
812 I don't know//
813 It never ever says//
814a And I've never really thought about it
814b until this year//

In lines 811-812 Ms. Stevens tells the students that she doesn't know the answer, and in 814 she tells the students that she had never thought about it before. This willingness to express her own imperfections is way of building trust with her students by being honest about her own limitations.

The other example I shall use is rather long, but a clear example of building a trusting relationship with her students. It comes from the *How Many Days to America* lesson. Ms. Stevens is reading the story to the class, and is nearing the end of the book.

Example 142
Ms. Stevens
[reading] *The sea was rough that night and my father's song lost itself in the wind. I said the words as the stars dipped and turned above our heads. "Tomorrow comes, tomorrow comes, And we shall all be free."* [shows picture] *It was the next day, the tomorrow that we sighted land again. I was afraid to hope. A boat came. My mother clasped her hands and bent her head. Was she afraid to hope too? The boat circled us twice and then a line was thrown and we were pulled toward shore. There was such a silence among us then, such an anxious, watchful silence. People waited on the dock. "Welcome," they called. "Welcome to America."*
[11-second pause while Ms. Stevens weeps silently]
That was when our silence turned to cheers.
[4-second pause]
214 [whispering:] Sorry//
[emotional voice:] *"But how did they know we would come today?" my father asked. "Perhaps people come every day," my mother said. "Perhaps they understand how it is for us."* [shows picture] [emotional voice:] *There was a shed, warm from the sun on its tin roof. There were table covered with food. Though the benches were crowded there was room for all of us. "Do you know what day this is?" a woman asked me. She passed me a dinner plate. "This is the coming-to-America day," I said. She smiled. "Yes. And it is special for another reason, too."* [voice breaking with emotion:] *Today is Thanksgiving.* [normal voice:] *"What is that?" My little sister was shy, but not too shy to ask her*

questions. "Long ago, unhappy people came here to start new lives," the woman said. "They celebrated by giving thanks." My father nodded. "That is the only true way to celebrate." [shows picture]

While reading an emotional passage, Ms. Stevens weeps openly in front of the class for 11 seconds, is able to continue one sentence, and then is forced to pause four seconds before she can go on. She apologizes in line 214 and then continues reading. As she finishes the story her voice breaks with emotion as she struggles to hold back crying again. This willingness to share with her students her human emotions in response to the text, to cry in front of her students, was a poignant example of building trust in the their relationship. As I observed this take place, I was astonished by the reaction of her students: no smirking or immature reactions one might expect from fifth grade students in that circumstance, and no looking away in an attempt to ignore what was happening, but expressions of empathy with Ms. Stevens while quietly focusing on her reading of the text.

The last two examples provided were of the use of language to build trusted teacher/student(s) relationships. Next I will provide examples of Ms. Stevens building disappointed teacher/student(s) relationships.

Disappointed teacher/student(s).

Occasionally Ms. Stevens expressed disappointment with her students' efforts, and used language to build a temporary relationship that expressed that disappointment. This was noted in the data 28 times.

The first example is from the *Julie* lesson. The class is listening to an audio recording of the text while they follow along in their books.

Example 143
Ms. Stevens

743 Okay//
744 Katrina.. can you summarize what we just read?//..
745 Honey.. what are you doin'?//..
746a It's like all we can hear
746b is you flippin' through your papers//
747 What are you needin'?//..

Ms. Stevens notices Katrina's apparent lack of focus on the text, and expresses her disappointment.

The other example I provide is from the *Julie* lesson on a different day from the previous example. Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing wolf behaviors.

Example 144
Ms. Stevens
1067 The leader sleeps above the others//
1068 They fight for dominance//..
1069 Am I talkin' to myself?//
Students
1070 No//…(3)
Ms. Stevens
1071 Look alert//
1072 Look smart//
1073a Use a posture
1073b that looks smart and alert
1073c all the time//

In line 1069 Ms. Stevens uses language that expresses her displeasure in her students' lack of participation and apparent lack of focus on the discussion, building a temporary disappointed teacher/student(s) relationship. In lines 1071-1073 she directs the students to behave in a manner that will begin to neutralize that relationship.

The previous examples were of a disappointed teacher/student(s) relationship. Next I shall discuss and provide examples of a loving teacher/student(s) relationship.

Loving teacher/student(s).

Ms. Stevens sometimes used language to build a relationship with her students that expressed love for her students. This was noted in the data in 21 instances.

The first example is from the *How Many Days to America* lesson. Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing Cuba as a prereading activity.

Example 145
Ms. Stevens
71a So you can take a look at THIS boat
71b and compare to the boat that they have in our story//
72 Yes Babe//

An ELL student has raised her hand to ask a question, and Ms. Stevens calls on her using a term of endearment. This was by far the most common way Ms. Stevens used language to help build a loving teacher/student(s) relationship.

The other example I provide of the use of language to build a loving teacher/student(s) relationship also uses terms of endearment. This example, from the *Julie* lesson, is interesting because it incorporates an earlier example (143) of a disappointed teacher/student relationship.

Example 146
743 Okay//
744 Katrina.. can you summarize what we just read?//..
745 Honey.. what are you doin'?//..
746a It's like all we can hear
746b is you flippin' through your papers//
747 What are you needin'?//..
Katrina
748 [inaudible]
Ms. Stevens
749 What other..
750 You mean pa.. pages from your book?//..
751 All right//
752 Just look off of [Nonparticipant]'s book//
753 Okay?//..
754a And.. Honey when somethin' like that happens
754b just raise your hand
754c so we can get you
754d the help that you need//

Ms. Stevens begins by expressing disappointment with Katrina. She embeds a term of endearment ("Honey") in line 745 to distinguish between her disappointment with Katrina's behavior and her love for Katrina as her student. Ms. Stevens continues to build a loving teacher/student relationship with Katrina by asking her if she needs something (line 747). Ms. Stevens again addresses Katrina as "Honey" in line 754, and expresses her willingness to help her if a similar situation arises in the future.

The last two examples have been of Ms. Stevens' use of language to build loving teacher/student(s) relationships. Prior to that I provided examples of other types of relationship building by Ms Stevens: teacher/student(s), teacher/good student(s), trusted teacher/student(s), disappointed teacher/student(s), and loving teacher/student(s). Next I shall discuss and provide examples of Ms. Stevens' use of language to build connections.

Connections

"We use language to render certain things connected or relevant (or not) to other things, that is, to build connections or relevance" (Gee, 2005, p. 12). Ms. Stevens used language to build a variety of connections. Language used to build connections was noted 309 times in the data. The types of connections noted were connections with other text (written and spoken), with culture, with events, with facts, with memories, and with artifacts.

Text.

Ms. Stevens used language to render things connected to text. Language used to build connections to text was noted 127 times in the data. I categorized connections to text into connections to written text and connections to spoken text.

Written text.

Ms. Stevens used language to render things connected or relevant to written text in 89 instances. The first example, seen earlier, comes from the *Encounter* lesson. Ms. Stevens reads the back cover (Yolen, 1996) to the class.

Example 147
Ms. Stevens
36a This one
36b on the back says
37a The credible and moving story
37b provides a closely woven fabric
37c of revisionist history
37d and superlative storytelling//
38 Now the:re's some big words// um
39 That's a review//
40 Somebody wrote a review

In lines 39-40 Ms. Stevens connected the text to a review of *Encounter*.

The next example is from the *Spanish Empire* lesson. Ms. Stevens and the class are reviewing a section of the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005).

Example 148
Ms. Stevens
42 Growth of the Spanish Empire//..
42 Um this is where we see the name.. uh Francisco Coronado//
43 Everybody point to where it says Francisco Coronado//
44 The purple//..
45 He explored much of the American Southwest in search of the rumored cities of gold//
46 Okay// [pulls down map]
47 Just kinda take a picture as we go around.. the map//
48 This is the Southwest//
49 Arizona.. uh New Mexico.. those areas//.. um..

In lines 47-49 Ms. Stevens connects the textbook text to the wall map.

The next example is from the *How Many Days to America* lesson. Ms. Stevens and the class are doing a prereading activity.

Example 149

Ms. Stevens

37 Did you guys read about Fidel?//

Student

38 Um hum//

Ms. Stevens

39a You CERTAINLY read about Cuba//

39b I know//

40 How many people read about Cuba in your leveled reader?//

41 It was the o:ne that.. yeah//

42 Sophia.. does that ring a bell to you?//..

43a That's the..

43b that's the drag about everybody not reading the same story//…(3)

44 um.. I think it was this one//

45 Was it A Nation of Many Colors?//

Student

46 Yes//

Ms. Stevens

47a I'll pass..

47b I'll pass these around while I'm reading the story//

48 And you can see some pictures of.. Cuba [Spanish pronunciation]//

Ms. Stevens connects the text they are about to read (Bunting, 1990) to another text in lines 37-45. She then connects the story with pictures she distributes (lines 47-48).

In the following example, from *Julie*, Ms. Stevens connects text previously read by the class to text they will soon read.

Example 150

Shawn

41 What about what her name changed into//

42 Um.. Miyax//..

Ms. Stevens

43 That.. you'll find that out today//

44 That doesn't have anything to do with deserted though//

45 Is that what you're trying to say?//

Shawn

46 No I'm talking about.. um..

Ms. Stevens

47 Yeah//

48a At this part of the story

48b She's been referred to as Miyax//

49 We're.. but she goes by..

50 She has another name Julie//

51a We're figure that all out..
51b today and tomorrow//

Ms. Stevens connects the name "Miyax" (known to the students) to her future name in the text (Julie).

In the final example Ms. Stevens and the class are doing a prereading activity using the *Illinois Daily Practice Book* (Reading Street, Grade 5, 2008b).

Example 151
Ms. Stevens
91 Looking at the text..
92 Just look at the text//
93a What would you say
93b they both had to be//
94 Sophia did you put somethin' down?//
95 Besides that?//
96a What'd you put
96b that they BOTH had to be?//..

Ms. Stevens connects the workbook with the text (Reading Street, Grade 5, 2008a), an obvious connection with an intended co-text.

The last five examples were of Ms. Stevens' use of language to render things connected to written text. Next I provide examples of her building connections to spoken text.

Spoken text.

Ms. Stevens used language to render things connected or relevant to spoken text in 38 instances. The first example is from the *How Many Days to America* lesson.

Example 152
Sarah
138a They're there because.. um..
138b because they.. they tried to protest
138c or [unintelligible]
Ms. Stevens
139 Maybe.. yeah//
140a Maybe the mother

140b or the father had talked against the government//
141a And somebody reported..
141b what they had said and.. um..
142 Like the kinds of things
142b I talk to you about in here..
142c would not be allowed//..
143 Just to talk about different ideas//
144a How we talk about different ideas.. you know..
144b behind the election//..
145 It wouldn't be allowed//
146a Castro's been.. in power for.. decades.. and decades//
147 They don't have elections there//

Ms. Stevens connects the text to spoken text from earlier times in the classroom.

The last example is from *The Ch'i-lin Purse* lesson. Ms. Stevens and the class are reviewing vocabulary in a prereading activity.

Example 153
Shawn
394 Astonish//
Ms. Stevens
395 ASTONISH//
396 What do you think astonish means?//
Shawn
397 Like to..
Ms. Stevens
398a I was ASTONISHED to learn..
398b that he got arrested//
399 Our governor//..

Ms. Stevens connects the vocabulary word with an example of usage to spoken text concerning the then-recent arrest of the Illinois Governor by federal authorities. She connects to what Gee (2005) terms "Conversations," when we allude or relate to themes, debates or motifs that have been the focus of much talk with which we are familiar in society.

The last two examples were of building connections to spoken text, and prior to that were examples of building connections to written text. Next I will discuss and provide example of Ms. Stevens building connections to culture.

Culture.

Ms. Stevens used language to render things connected to culture. Language used to build connections to culture was noted 129 times in the data.

The first example comes from the *Encounter* lesson.

Example 154
Ms. Stevens
[reading] *And many of them had hair growing like bushes on their chins. Three of them knelt before their chief and pushed sticks into the sand. Then I was even more afraid.* [shows picture]
64a um.. the native people..
64b that were living here
64c were not as hairy as the European people//
65a A lot
65b European people had facial hair
65c and lots of body hair//
66a And then the..
66b that was just something so foreign to them//
67 And the color of their skin too//
68a Their skin was much more pale
68b than anything they'd ever seen//

Ms. Stevens connects the text to the Taino culture to negotiate meaning with her students.

The next example is from the *Columbus Day* lesson. The students are reading interview excerpts from the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005). The example begins with Sarah reading an excerpt of an interview with a professor of Native American studies (p. 126).

Example 155
Sarah
80 [reading] *Columbus Day should not be a holiday out of respect for Native American peoples. When Columbus arrived in 1492 we lost an entire continent. Out land, religious beliefs, and many ways of living were taken*

from us. We need a holiday that will celebrate the many different customs and cultures that Americans have, and show respect for them.

Ms. Stevens

81 Everybody understand that?//
82 Everybody follow that?//
83 Okay//
84a She says we should
84b instead of having Columbus Day..
84c we should not honor that
84d because a lot of cultures were destroyed..
84e we should.. have.. a day
84f that celebrates all the different cultures
84g of our country..
84h and honors and respects them//
85 Emanuel Alfano//..
86 He's an Italian-American//
87 Now where was Columbus from?//

Students

88a Spain//
88b Italy//
88c Spain//
88d Italy//

Ms. Stevens

89a H:e was PAID for by Spain..
89b but he was..

Students

90a European//
90b Italian//

Student

91 He was Italian//

Ms. Stevens

92 He was Italian//
93 Okay he was an Italian//
94 Um but his journey was financed by Spain//
95a So Emanuel Alfano
95b is an ITALIAN-American..
95c service organization..
95d um.. or that's where he works..
95e in New Jersey//

Ms. Stevens paraphrases the point that cultures were destroyed and that a day should be celebrated that honors all cultures. In introducing the next interview excerpt Ms. Stevens

points out that the interviewee and Columbus were both Italian, and she emphasizes that he works for an Italian-American service organization, connecting the text to culture.

The next example comes from the *Spanish Empire* lesson. Ms. Stevens and the class are reviewing conquistadors.

Example 156
Ms. Stevens
61 Vasco Nunez de Balboa [Spanish pronunciation]//
62 He traveled across Central America to become the first European to see the Pacific ocean//..
63 Okay?//
64a He traveled across Central America
64b so he was the first one to lay eyes
65a Oh.. look//
65b There's more water over there//
66a And that
66b he was the first to to recogni
66c or first European.. of course
67 You know lots of people already knew that was there//
68a but.. he was the first European to acknowledge it
68b and bring that news back home to.. his rulers//..

Ms. Stevens connects the text to culture by explicitly pointing out that Vasco Nunez de Balboa was the first "European" to see the Pacific Ocean, rather than the first "person."

The next example comes from the *How Many Days to America* lesson.

Example 157
Ms. Stevens
[reading:] *It was nice in our village. Till the night in October when the soldiers came.* [shows picture] *My mother hid my little sister and me under the bed. When I peered out I could see my mother's feet in their black slippers and the great, muddy boots of the soldiers.* [shows picture]
95a Why do you think the soldiers might
95b be there at the house?//
Student
96a um.. They probably not allowed have
96b kids in the countries over [inaudible]
Ms. Stevens
97 Well they're allowed to have kids//..
98 Why would there be soldiers in the house?//..
99 Okay Castro//

100 It certainly would be Castro's soldiers//

Ms. Stevens connects the text to the culture of Cuba.

The next example is from the *Julie* lesson. The students are following along in their books as they listen to audio.

Example 158
Ms. Stevens
1117 Pay really close attention to this//
[Audio] *One day as she walked home across the snowy town she caught up with her schoolmates, Judith and Rose. Their boots squeaked in the cold and their voices sounded far away, for the temperature was far below zero. Judith invited her into her house and the three of them huddled close to the oil stove. Judith and Rose chatted, but Julie's eyes wandered around the room and she saw for the first time a gas cooking stove, a couch, framed pictures on the wall, and curtains of cotton print.*
1118 You understand?//
1119 Those are a:ll GUSSAK things//
1120 A cot.. you know..
1121 Cause she's used to cooking over a fire//
1122 You know?//
1123a Using skins and.. you know..
1123b animal parts to decorate your house//
1124a A couch is a very..
1124b gussak kind of thing//..
1125a Are these girls Eskimo
1125b or are they.. like white?//
Student
1126 White//
Ms. Stevens
1127 They're Eskimo//
1128a They're Eskimo
1128b but they have.. English names
1128c and they have.. um..
1128d American.. ways//
1129 Okay?//
1130 So.. understand that as we read//

Ms. Stevens connects the text to differences in Eskimo culture and white American culture to negotiate meaning with her students.

The next example is also from the *Julie* lesson, but on a different day. Again, the students are following along in their books as they listen to audio. Ms. Stevens stops the audio to pose a question.

Example 159
Ms. Stevens
1503a And my question here is..
1503b by page one twenty one..
1503c how has Miyax's attitude
1503d toward her PEOPLE.. changed..
1503e since the beginning of the book//
1504 Toward her people and her culture//..
1505a At the beginning of the book..
1505b how would she describe her.. people?//
1506 And all of those customs//
1507 Raising your hands to the sky//
1508 Giving thanks before.. um.. eating//
1509 What does she think about those customs?//

Ms. Stevens connects text to culture by asking her students to consider the protagonist's attitude toward her native culture.

The last example comes from the *I Have a Dream* lesson. Ms. Stevens comments on a scene from the play where the young Martin Luther King, Jr. is speaking with his white friends' mother.

Example 160
Ms. Stevens
164a And you can tell
164b when he's talkin' to Mrs. Conner
164c he's incredulous//
165 He's like.. NO//
166a Mrs. CONNER..
166b THEY'RE RIGHT THERE//
167a Any of you guys
167b gonna play ball today?//
168a And Mrs. Conner..
168b you know she's about
168c to come undone.. with him..
168d even bein' in her house//

Ms. Stevens connects text from the play to the white culture of late-1930s Atlanta.

The last seven examples have been of Ms. Stevens building connections with culture. Next I will provide examples of her building connections with events.

Event.

Ms. Stevens used language to build connections with events in 22 instances in the data. I shall provide two examples. The first example comes from *The Ch'i-lin Purse* lesson. In a prereading activity Ms. Stevens and the class are reviewing vocabulary.

<u>Example 161</u>
Ms. Stevens
382 Procession//
383 What is a procession?//..
384 Yeah//
Student
385 It's like a parade//
Ms. Stevens
386 It's like a para:de//
387 That's very good//
388 That's very good//
389 Yeah//
390a It's.. um..
390b when the um.. President Obama..
390c uh President Elect Obama..
390d uh.. gets inaugurated
390e there'll be a procession//
391a And he'll be.. in car
391b and there'll be cars behind him
391c and there'll be the Secret Service
391d and then all kinds of dignitaries
391e and.. other officials
391f and they'll.. they'll go through the town
391g and.. it'll be so cool//

Ms. Stevens connects the vocabulary word "procession" to the upcoming inauguration of President Obama.

The last example is from the *I Have a Dream* lesson. Ms. Stevens is discussing racism, an issue brought out in the play.

Example 162

196 And then.. when you talk about World War II..
197a World War II we were fighting..
197b the German..
197c the Germans..
197d and the Japanese..
198a And.. um..
198b and the.. dictator of
198c Italy too
198d was Mussolini//
199 He was on the side of Hitler//..
200 When we..
201a When Japan attacked us..
201b we took Japanese people//
202 And put them in internment camps//
203 Japanese citizens//
204a People who had been living here
204b for generations//
205a Anybody that loo:ked
205b Japanese..
205c or had Japanese heritage
205d got booted..
205e outta their business..
205f lost their homes..
205g got separated from their families..
205h da da da da da..
205i got moved over to camps..

Ms. Stevens connects the text to historical events.

The last two examples were of Ms. Stevens using language to build connections to events. Next I will provide an example of her building connections to a fact.

Fact.

Ms. Stevens used language to build connections to facts 11 times in the data. The example comes from the *Julie* lesson. Ms. Stevens is explaining what significance the Korean War has in the novel.

Example 163

Ms. Stevens

959a If your number came up..
959b It was like a lottery//..

960 Lot's of people went to war//
961a It's not like it is today
961b where.. you know
961c they.. they.. have a lot of people
961d in the National Guard//..
962a Every.. every young man
962b that was eighteen
962c had to register with the draft//

Ms. Stevens connects the text to the military draft system in the United States.

Memory.

Ms. Stevens used language to build connections to memories. This occurred in the data eight times. The example is also from the *Julie* lesson.

Example 164
Audio
To Miyax the years at seal camp were infinitely good. The scenes and events were beautiful color spots in her memory.
Ms. Stevens
554a Just on this
554b I don't know//
555a It it.. this part might be a little confusing
555b so I want to explain it//
556a She remembers things in colors.. and
556b she remembers scenes and pieces
556c and you all have memories like this//
557a I have a memory..
557b of when we lived in Minnesota
557c and I would have been like two or three years old//
558 And we lived in a trailer//
559a But I remember my bedroom..
559b as being like this most beautiful blue color//
560a I'm sure it wasn't.. like.. you know..
560b all that//
561 It was just like paint from the local paint store//
562 But it was just like this sky blue//
563a That who:le place
563b that we lived in
563c I remember that..
563d there were big tall.. pine trees
563e out back
563f and I could see those
563g out the window//

564a But that whole scene
564b is kind of blue://
565 With green in the background//
566a I'm not sure that it's even real..
566b but I think..
567 Think about your own childhoods now//
568a Think about some of those memories
568b that are mo:st stuck..
568c in your head//
569a And the colors..
569b maybe the smells..
570a If.. sometimes when you walk down
570b into a new place
570c and you smell a smell
570d it'll.. [snaps fingers] take you back to..
570e a time long ago//
571a Every time you smell that smell
571b it reminds you of a certain
571c time in your life
571d that was remarkable in some way//..

Ms. Stevens connects the text to her own memories and asks her students to consider their own memories and connect them to the text.

Artifact.

Ms. Stevens also used language to build connects to artifacts. This was noted in the data six times. The example comes from a vocabulary prereading activity for *Julie*.

Example 165
Ms. Stevens
147 Caribous' don't have tusks//
148 They have antlers//
149 But it's very much like an antler//
Student
150 A walrus//
Ms. Stevens
151 A walrus has tusks?//
152 We're gonna actually carve walrus tusks later this.. this.. in the next two weeks//
153 It's called scrimshaw//
154 We're gonna carve scrimshaw//
Students
155 [unintelligible]

Ms. Stevens

156 Mostly real//
157a Mostly real
157b like our campfire was real//

Ms. Stevens connects the text to both a future classroom artifact (scrimshaw) and a past artifact (campfire).

Other connections.

Ms. Stevens also used language to build connections to both the senses and pop culture on rare occasions.

I have discussed and provided examples of Ms. Stevens using language to build connections to text (written and spoken), culture, events, facts, memories, and artifacts. Next I will discuss another building task of language used by Ms. Stevens: sign systems and knowledge.

Sign Systems and Knowledge

"We can use language to make certain sign systems and certain forms of knowledge and belief relevant or privileged, or not, in given situations, that is to build privilege or prestige for one sign system or knowledge claim over another" (Gee, 2005, p. 13). I shall examine Ms. Stevens' language use in relation to sign systems and then her language in relation to knowledge.

Sign systems.

Sign systems include languages, language varieties, and communicative systems that are not language. I shall examine Ms. Stevens' use of language to make certain languages relevant or privileged, and then I shall examine her use of language varieties.

Languages.

Ms. Stevens used language as a building task to make certain languages relevant or privileged. These languages include Spanish, English, and non-European Languages.

Spanish.

Ms. Stevens used language to make Spanish relevant 15 times in the data. In the example, from *Julie*, Ms. Stevens and the class are reviewing vocabulary as a prereading activity.

Example 166
Ms. Stevens
299 Ridiculous//
300 Do you guys know ridiculo?//
Student
301 Stupid [whisper]//
Ms. Stevens
301 Ridiculous?//
302 Yes stupid//
303 Yeah//…(6)
304 Enchanted?//
305 Encantada?//
306 Encantado?//..
307 um.. Enchanted?//

Ms. Stevens makes Spanish relevant by using Spanish translations of "ridiculous" and "enchanted."

English.

Ms. Stevens uses language to make English relevant or privileged five times in the data. The example is from *Julie*. Cecilia (ELL) has asked why a group of "Americanized" Eskimo girls are not using their own language.

Example 167
Ms. Stevens
1175 It's.. it's leaving//
1176 It's leaving them//
1177 They're leaving it behind//

1178 This is a choice that they're making//
1179 Their parents may not even speak it in the home//..
1180 You know?//
1181a Because if.. if they don't think
1181b that that's a path to success..
1181c and to being..
1182a It depends on their parents' attitudes
1182b very much too//..
1183a So if it's not spoken in the home
1183b then they have no reason
1183c to practice it//..
1184a And do you think these girls
1184b would be speaking English
1184c or do you think they'd be speaking Inuit?//
1185 To each other?//..
1186 English//
1187 Most definitely//..

Ms. Stevens makes English relevant by explaining that the girls have chosen to speak English rather than Inuit.

Non-European languages.

Ms. Stevens used language to make non-European languages relevant nine times in the data. The example is from *Encounter*. Ms. Stevens and the class are doing a postreading activity on author's purpose, comparing *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996) with the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005).

<u>Example 168</u>
Ms. Stevens
137 What else?//
138 [Nonparticipant]//
Nonparticipant
139 [response]
Ms. Stevens
140 CANOES//
141 Okay they talk about canoes//
142a Is..
142b that was a word that.. um..
142c we got.. um..
142d the Taino people//..

Ms. Stevens makes the language of the Taino relevant by explaining that the English work "canoe" was borrowed that language.

I have discussed and provided examples of Ms. Stevens' use of language to make certain languages relevant or privileged. Next I shall examine her use of language to make language varieties relevant or privileged.

Language varieties.

Ms. Stevens used language as a building task to make certain language varieties relevant or privileged, or not. These language varieties included informal language, adult language, child language, and other varieties.

Informal language.

Ms. Stevens used language to make an informal language variety relevant eight times in the data. The example comes from the *I Have a Dream* lesson. Ms. Stevens is preparing the class for their first rehearsal of the play.

<u>Example 169</u>
Ms. Stevens
13 Best thing I know to do..
14a Best thing I know to do..
14b shh..
14c is just read through this puppy..
14d and…(3) we'll also need a um..
14e somebody to introduce the scenes//

Ms. Stevens informally refers to the play as "this puppy," making informal language relevant.

Adult language.

Ms. Stevens used language to make an adult variety of language relevant or privileged seven times in the data. The example comes from the *Spanish Empire* lesson. Ms. Stevens and the class are doing a prereading activity about Cortez.

Example 170

Ms. Stevens

36 You got
37 I mean I know you know it//
38 I just want you to.. get some juicy words//..
39 What does an army do when they want something?//
40 What do they do?//

Student

41 Rest?//

Jesus [ELL]

42 They kill?//

Ms. Stevens

43 Yeah//
44 Okay?//
45 Uh what's the big C-word that we learned that that goes with it?//
46 A fancy word for defeating//
47 What's the fancy C-word that we learned that goes for defeat?//..
48 Uh.. someone I haven't heard from yet this morning//
49 C O//..
50 [Nonparticipant]//

Nonparticipant

51 [response]

Ms. Stevens

52 Conquered//

Ms. Stevens places importance on what she refers to as "juicy words." In referring to the word "conquered," she refers to it as "big" and "fancy," making adult language relevant and privileged.

Child language.

Ms. Stevens used language to make a child variety of language relevant six times in the data. The example is from a prereading activity in the *Encounter* lesson.

Example 171

Ms. Stevens

40 Somebody wrote a review
41a and it basically is saying
41b this is good history
41c put in a children's.. um.. format//
42 Okay?//
43a It's accessible book
43b to a child//

Ms. Stevens tells the class that the language of the book written for children is both "good history" and "accessible," thereby making it relevant.

Other varieties.

Ms. Stevens rarely, but occasionally, used language to make other language varieties relevant. These varieties included teacher language, brief language, oral language, and grammatically-correct language.

Knowledge.

These forms of knowledge include academic knowledge, non-European knowledge, and other forms of knowledge.

Academic knowledge.

Ms. Stevens used language to make academic knowledge relevant or privileged nine times in the data. The example comes from the *Columbus Day* lesson. Ms. Stevens and the class are reading and discussing excerpts from interviews in their social studies text (Banks et al., 2005).

Example 172
Ms. Stevens
69 Henrietta Mann//
70 She's a professor//..
71a She's a Native American..
71b of Native American studies
71c in Montana//
72 She was interviewed//
73a This is an excerpt
73b from her interview//

Ms. Stevens notes that the interviewee is a professor of Native American studies, making her knowledge relevant and possibly privileged in the discussion of the celebration of Columbus Day.

Non-European knowledge.

Ms. Stevens used language to make non-European knowledge relevant seven times in the data. The example comes from the *Encounter* lesson. Ms. Stevens and the class are doing a postreading activity on point of view.

Example 173
Ms. Stevens
23a Almost all the stories that you'll hear in here
23b are to:ld from..
23c the perspective of the colonists//
24 Okay?//
25a And and our social studies book I think
25b is trying to get other stories
25c in there//..
26a But it still ends up being..
26b what happened to the Europeans?//
26c what happened to the Europeans?//
26d what was the result FOR the Europeans?//
27 Okay?//
28 So this book kind of disrupts that//
29a It takes us into.. into the child's..
29b into the the the: Native people's.. um.. world.

Ms. Stevens emphasizes the importance of perspectives other than Eurocentric, in this case a Native American perspective.

Other forms of knowledge.

Ms. Stevens rarely, but occasionally, used language to make other forms of knowledge, including adult knowledge and knowledge of pop culture, relevant.

I have discussed and provided examples of Ms. Stevens' use of language as a building task to make certain sign systems (languages and language varieties) and knowledge (academic knowledge and non-European knowledge) relevant or privileged. Next I shall examine Ms. Stevens' use of language to build activities.

Activities

"We use language to get recognized as engaging in a certain sort of activity, that is, to build an activity here-and-now" (Gee, 2005, p. 11). Besides the obvious activity of teaching in a classroom, Ms. Stevens used language to build activities, including debate, reading, class discussion, and prereading activities.

Debate.

Ms. Stevens used language to build class debate in 39 instances in the data. Both examples (and all the data) come from the *Columbus Day* lesson.

Example 174
Ms. Stevens
1a Do you guys..
1b would you be interested in
1c having a debate in here?//

Ms. Stevens simply introduces the idea of a class debate.

Example 175
Ms. Stevens
4a A debate is where.. you.. um..
4b like.. half the room takes one position
4c and half the room takes another position//
5a A:nd like um..
5b one position in this debate would be that
5c we believe that
5d we should celebrate Columbus Day..
5e the other half would say..
5f we don't believe we should celebrate Columbus Day//

Ms. Stevens gives a brief explanation of the procedure of debate and the topic for debate.

Reading.

Ms. Stevens used language to build the activity of reading 14 times in the data. The example is from the *Julie* lesson.

Example 176
Ms. Stevens

477 He:re we go//
478 Nine fifteen//
479 We're in..
480 All is well//…(19)
481 Seventy five//
482 Here we go//…(5)
483a When you're ready
483b I'm ready//..
484 You guys ready?//..
485a The wind..
485b the empty sky..
486 Let me find the place where we are//…(15)
487a El viento..
487b el cielo vacio..
487c la tierra [unintelligible] desierta..
488 [inaudible Spanish]
489 Okay//..
490a The wind..
490b the empty sky..
490c the deserted earth//
491 Are you ready?//
492 Everybody get rea:lly comfortable…(7)
493 Okay?//
494a On your mark..
494b get set…(10)

Ms. Stevens prepares the class for the activity of reading by giving the page number (line 481), asking them to focus (483-484, 491), orally reading the beginning phrase (485, 490), translating it to Spanish (487), and prompting the class to begin (494).

Class discussion.

Ms. Stevens used language to build the activity of class discussion eight times in the data. The example comes from the *Encounter* lesson.

<u>Example 177</u>
Ms. Stevens
24a So.. we're gonna talk about
24b how THIS story
24c and how.. THIS story
24d are alike.. and also how they are.. different//

Ms. Stevens simply states that the class will talk about a topic.

Prereading.

Ms. Stevens uses language to build prereading activities five times in the data. The example comes from the very beginning of *The Ch'i-lin Purse* lesson.

Example 178
Ms. Stevens
12 DPBs [Daily Practice Books] should be out//
13 And open to seventy.. three//…(14)
14a While you're waitin' on me.. um..
14b you can be looking over
14c your vocabulary words//
15 On seventy two//
16 Okay?//
17a Be lookin' at those
17b and be tryin' to figure out
17c what these.. synonym analogies are//
18 Okay?//
19a I've got all of your.. vocabulary words
19b worked into some analogies here//
20a So I want you to be thinking about..
20b good words..
20c to create synonyms//

Ms. Stevens instructs the class to prepare for a prereading activity involving vocabulary.

I have discussed and provided examples of Ms. Stevens' use of language to build activities, including debate, reading, class discussion, and prereading activities. Next I shall examine her use of language to build identities.

Identities

"We use language to get recognized as taking on a certain identity or role, that is to build an identity here-and-now" (Gee, 2005, p. 11). Ms. Stevens used language to build certain teacher identities. Furthermore, as a teacher she used language to help her students construct their own identities.

Teacher identity.

Besides the obvious classroom teacher identity, Ms. Stevens built identities as a culturally-sensitive teacher and as a good teacher.

Culturally-sensitive teacher.

Ms. Stevens used language to build her identity as a culturally-sensitive teacher 13 times in the data. The example is from the *I Have a Dream* lesson. Ms. Stevens is responding to a question by an African-American nonparticipant concerning racial issues of non-black racial minorities in the South at the time of the play.

<u>Example 179</u>
Ms. Stevens
174 O:h//
175 I see what you're sayin'//
176 Well.. Baby in.. in.. like this part of the world..
177 Yeah//
178a People of color..
178b people of color..
178c definitely had experienced discrimination//..
179a And still do..
179b to this day//
Nonparticipant
180 [response]
Ms. Stevens
181a Like Asian people
181b and.. Native Amer..
181c Native Americans//
182 You know what happened to them//
183a I mean and that was..
183b that was..
183c certainly race based//

Ms. Stevens answers the student's question forthrightly, and notes that racial discrimination still exists.

Good teacher.

Ms. Stevens used language to build her identity as a good teacher 9 times in the data. The example is from the *Julie* lesson. Ms. Stevens and the class are discussing wolf behaviors.

<u>Example 180</u>
Ms. Stevens
1340 Niche means..
1341a If you have a special niche..
1341b um.. it's like your..
1342 My spe
1343 My niche in.. teaching is probably social studies//
1344 That's my favorite thing//
1345 It's the thing that I:.. do:.. the best//

Ms. Stevens builds her identity as a good teacher by stating that teaching social studies is what she does best.

Other identities.

Ms. Stevens rarely, but occasionally, used language to build an identity as an experienced teacher. She also rarely, but occasionally, built an identity as a curious person.

I have discussed Ms. Stevens' use of language to build her own teacher identities. Next I will examine student-identity building by Ms. Stevens.

Student-identity building.

Normally people use language to build their own identities. I contend that Ms. Stevens used language to help her students build their own identities as students.

Good student(s).

The building tasks of building a teacher/good student *relationship* and helping a student build a good student identity often overlap. However, I believe the language used

in helping students build good-student identities goes further, though the difference may be subtle. This was noted in the data 15 times. The example comes from the very beginning of *The Ch'i-lin Purse* lesson, as Ms. Stevens prepares to start the lesson.

Example 181
Ms. Stevens
34a Apparently
34b you guys are blowin' the scores
34c like.. off.. the.. you know
34d blowin' the.. roof off the house [inaudible]//
35 So.. super growth//
36 You worked here yesterday
37 They'll come and find you today//
38 [unintelligible] at some point//
39 But that..
40a Everybody is showin'
40b like tremendous gains//
41 So.. whatever..
42 Somethin'.. we're doin' is working//
43 I don't know what it is//
44 But.. it's very very exciting//
45 It's very very exciting//
46 So just.. keep trying//

Ms. Stevens very enthusiastically compliments her students on their achievement. Although this does build teacher/good students relationships, it goes beyond that to actually co-construct good student identities.

Other student identities.

Ms. Stevens also rarely, but occasionally, helped her students build identities as a good reader or good writer.

I have discussed and provided examples of Ms. Stevens' use of language to build identities, both her own and her students'. Next I shall examine the last building task of language—politics.

Politics (the distribution of social goods)

"We use language to convey a perspective on the nature of the distribution of social goods, that is, to build a perspective on social goods" (Gee, 2005, p. 12). Social goods may be thought of as "what is taken to be 'normal,' 'right,' 'good,' 'correct,' 'proper,' 'appropriate,' 'valuable,' 'the way things are,' 'the way things ought to be,' 'high status or low status,' 'like me or not like me,'" (Gee, 2005, p. 12), etc. Ms. Stevens used language to convey a perspective on the nature of the distribution of social goods in a variety of ways. I have divided her perspectives into those that have a positive connotation and those that have a negative connotation.

Positive.

Ms. Stevens' use of language to convey a positive perspective on the nature of the distribution of social goods is divided between the use of the word "cool" and the use of the word "good" or a synonym.

Cool.

Ms. Stevens' use of the word "cool" to convey a positive perspective on the nature of the distribution of social goods was noted in the data eight times. The example comes from *The Ch'i-lin Purse* lesson. In a prereading activity, Ms. Stevens and the class are reviewing vocabulary words.

<u>Example 182</u>
Ms. Stevens
382 Procession//
383 What is a procession?//..
384 Yeah//
Student
385 It's like a parade//
Ms. Stevens
386 It's like a para:de//
387 That's very good//

388 That's very good//
389 Yeah//
390a It's.. um..
390b when the um.. President Obama..
390c uh President Elect Obama..
390d uh.. gets inaugurated
390e there'll be a procession//
391a And he'll be.. in car
391b and there'll be cars behind him
391c and there'll be the Secret Service
391d and then all kinds of dignitaries
391e and.. other officials
391f and they'll.. they'll go through the town
391g and.. it'll be so cool//

Ms. Stevens conveys a positive perspective on the upcoming inauguration of President Obama using the word "cool" (line 391g).

Good.

Ms. Stevens' use of the word "good" (or a synonym) to convey a positive perspective on the nature of the distribution of social goods was noted in the data five times. The example comes from the *How Many Days to America* lesson, during a prereading discussion of Cuba.

Example 183
Ms. Stevens
55 I remember Sophia//
56a I think it was Sophia that had the
56b beautiful paragraph that was written about it
56c that's up there//..

Ms. Stevens uses the word "beautiful," in the sense of well formed, to convey a positive perspective on Sophia's (ELL) writing. Note that this utterance also serves to build a teacher/good student relationship, build a connection to written text, make well-formed writing a relevant and perhaps privileged sign system, and co-construct a good student and good writer identity for Sophia.

Negative.

Ms. Stevens' use of language to convey a negative perspective on the nature of the distribution of social goods is divided between the use of the word "bad" (or a synonym) and the use of the word "wrong" (or a synonym).

Bad.

Ms. Stevens' use of the word "bad" (or a synonym) to convey a negative perspective on the nature of the distribution of social goods was noted in the data seven times. The example comes from *The Ch'i-lin Purse* lesson. In a prereading activity, Ms. Stevens and the class are reviewing vocabulary words.

Example 184
Ms. Stevens
393 Le' me hear from.. Shawn//
Shawn
394 Astonish//
Ms. Stevens
395 ASTONISH//
396 What do you think astonish means?//
Shawn
397 Like to..
Ms. Stevens
398a I was ASTONISHED to learn..
398b that he got arrested//
399 Our governor//..
400 What does that mean?//
Shawn
401 He was?//
Ms. Stevens
402 He was//
403 Our governor was arrested//
404 I'm very sorry about that children//
Student
405 [laughing:] he was bidding off the
Ms. Stevens
406 He is..
407 He is..
Students
408 What?//

409 What's [unintelligible]
410a They said they need [unintelligible]
410b for a million dollars//
Ms. Stevens
411 Dirty dog//
412 Dirty..

Ms. Stevens refers to the infamous governor as a "dirty dog," a definite negative connotation.

Wrong.

Ms. Stevens' use of the word "wrong" (or a synonym) to convey a negative perspective on the nature of the distribution of social goods was noted in the data five times. The example comes from the *How Many Days to America* lesson during a prereading discussion of Cuba.

Example 185
Ms. Stevens
31a And um.. he.. he um.. instituted a lot of
31b very harsh policies for his people//
32a And there were a lot of folks there
32b who were political prisoners
32c who did not agree with the way Fidel..
32d um..ran the country//
33a And.. if they tried
33b to speak out
33c they would be.. imprisoned//..
34 And u:sually that doesn't happen in this country//
35a And during our last administration we had.. um..
35b less freedoms regarding
35c freedom of speech//
36a But Cuba really does not..
36b has not.. enjoyed freedom of speech for..
36c many decades..
36d during the whole time that
36e Fidel was in power//..

Ms. Stevens uses words and phrases such as "harsh" (31b), "political prisoners" (32b), "imprisoned" (33c), "less freedoms" (35b), and "not enjoyed freedom of speech" to

convey a negative perspective. Ms. Stevens used language to convey a perspective on the nature of the distribution of social goods in other ways less frequently, including the use of the words "illegal," "normal," and "valuable."

I have discussed and provided examples of Ms. Stevens' use of language to convey a perspective (positive or negative) on the nature of the distribution of social goods.

Other Building Tasks Summary

I have discussed building tasks of language other than significance in this section. These building tasks include relationships, connections, sign systems and knowledge, activities, identities, and politics. I have provided 60 examples as a representative sample of language-in-use for these building tasks.

Conclusion

This chapter has presented findings of a discourse analysis conducted of a fifth-grade classroom teacher whose students were composed of seven Latino English language learners, five African-Americans, four European-Americans, and three native speakers of English of other ethnic backgrounds. The unit of analysis was the teacher. The research question initially proposed was how do classroom teachers negotiate meaning about text with culturally and linguistically diverse students? After initially observing, collecting field notes, and recording audio data on three principal teachers, I realized that frequent, real meaning negotiation was occurring with only one of those teachers, Ms. Stevens. I also noted that her use of language to negotiate meaning with culturally and linguistically diverse students could not be parsed from meaning negotiation with her class as a whole. For this reason, the research focus evolved into

how this teacher, who effectively uses the building tasks of language, negotiates meaning of text with her students, many of whom are culturally and linguistically diverse.

The analysis begins with discussion and examples of Ms. Stevens using language as building tasks. Building significance was analyzed first and separately from the other building tasks since data representing language used to build significance comprised almost two-thirds of the entirety of the coded data for all building tasks.

Language used to build significance was analyzed and divided into categories. The first of these categories was reproduction of meaning, which was further divided into the subcategories of repetition (other repetition [quoting students and quoting text] and self repetition), paraphrase (other paraphrase [paraphrasing students and paraphrasing text] and self paraphrase), and citation (citation of text and citation of students). The other categories of language used to build significance were prosody (vowel elongation, stress, extended pause, and low pitch), questions (comprehension checks and display questions), overt attention (definition, direct attention, importance, and imperative to remember), life connection (family, purpose, and institutional value), and adjective labeling (interesting, unusual/different, dangerous, real, and other adjectives).

The analysis then addressed the other building tasks of language: relationships (teacher/student(s), teacher/good student(s), trusted teacher/ student(s), disappointed teacher/student(s), and loving teacher/student(s)), connections (text [written text and spoken text], culture, event, fact, memory, artifact, and other connections), sign systems (languages [Spanish, English, and non-European languages] and language varieties [informal language, adult language, child language, and other language varieties]) and knowledge (academic knowledge, non-European knowledge, and other knowledge),

activities (debate, reading, class discussion, and prereading), identities (teacher identity [culturally-sensitive teacher, good teacher, and experienced teacher] and student identity building [good student(s) and other student identities]), and politics—the distribution of social goods—(positive [cool and good], negative [bad and wrong], and other politics).

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

A fifth-grade classroom teacher, Ms. Stevens, was observed (field notes were recorded) and audio recorded during eight teaching lessons during the 2008-2009 school year. The class of 19 students was composed of seven Latinos, five African-Americans, four European-Americans, and three native English-speaking students from other ethnic backgrounds. Thirteen students consented to participate in the study, composed of six Latinos, three African-Americans, one European-American, and three other native speakers of English from other racial backgrounds. The discourse of Ms. Stevens was analyzed using Gee's (2005) methodology involving building tasks of language (significance, activities, identities, relationships, politics, connections, and sign systems and knowledge), resulting in 2613 pieces of coded data, for how she negotiates meaning about text with her students.

The percentage of the coded data of each building task of language follows:

Significance	65%
Relationships	14%
Connections	12%
Sign Systems and Knowledge	3%
Activities	3%
Identities	2%
Politics	1%

In a micro-level analysis of the discourse of Ms. Stevens, it was revealed that she used situated meanings in her classroom discourse for the purpose of building significance far more than any other building task of language.

Discussion

Discourse analysis in the field of literacy may be viewed as both a methodology and a theoretical framework. Rex et al. (2010; citing Gee & Green, 1998) view discourse analysis as “a theoretical conceptualization of a phenomenon, an epistemological approach to understanding and representing it as well as a methodology, or logic of inquiry, for answering a wide variety of literacy-related questions” (pp. 95-96). The study employs Gee’s (2005) model of discourse analysis, which is built around using situated meanings and Discourse models as tools of inquiry. Discourse models are an important tool because they mediate between the local interactional work done in carrying out the building tasks of language and how Discourses create the complex patterns of institutions and cultures across societies. For this reason, Gee's approach can be viewed as sociocultural in nature.

According to Gee (2004, 2005), social languages have meanings that are specific and situated in the actual contexts of their use. These situated meanings within social languages trigger cultural models in terms of which speakers and listeners give meaning to texts. Cultural models help people determine what counts as relevant and irrelevant in given situations.

Relevant and *significant* are closely related terms. Gee (2005) explains significance as a building task of language by stating that "we use language to make things significant (to give them meaning or value) in certain ways, to build significance"

(p. 11). In teaching and learning, significance plays an important role since learners are exposed to a multitude of texts (written and spoken) and a multitude of utterances within those texts. It is up to the teacher to help students separate the relevant from the irrelevant in relationship to their learning and their lives. Significance is especially important in the context of ELL literacy. Jimenez (2001) suggests that one of the reasons schools are not successful supporting the literacy development of Latino students is that school literacy envisions forms of literacy that these students do not recognize as significant.

The fact that the data coded in the study were overwhelmingly coded as language-in-use in the task of building significance is shown by the fact that nearly two-thirds of the coded data were coded for significance. However, the analysis of the data goes much deeper.

The study examines not only which building tasks of language are employed by the teacher, and to what extent, but *how* the teacher goes about using language in the building tasks. Other researchers have extrapolated the functions of language besides Gee (2005). Halliday's (1985) functional categories use the categories of instrumental, regulatory, interactional, personal, heuristic, imaginative, informative, and divertive to classify the use of language, and these categories have been used to study the language of children in the classroom (Peregoy & Boyle, 2008). Gee (2005) has a less grammatical approach and views language-in-use as a tool used to build "reality." This study focuses on the "nuts and bolts" of how the teacher used language to build things, most importantly significance, not from a grammatical analysis, but from a broader perspective.

The analysis uses a categorization within building tasks in order to closely examine how the teacher builds reality. In the case of significance, categories of language use were devised in order to closely examine exactly how the teacher goes about building significance. Reproduction of meaning, prosody, questions, overt attention, life connection, and adjective labeling were all found to be in the teacher's repertoire for making text significant to her learners. The other building tasks of language were subcategorized in a similar manner.

As stated earlier, one conclusion from an examination of the findings is that Ms. Stevens used the language building task of significance in her classroom discourse far more than any of the other building tasks. This is important because it demonstrates that the teacher in the study invested most of her discourse in helping children separate the relevant from the irrelevant in the meaning of written and spoken texts. The building tasks of relationships and connections were used to a moderate extent, and the remaining building tasks were used much less, but significance building was far and away the building task used by the teacher to create "reality."

It should also be noted that during the initial observations, collection of field notes, and audio recording of the other initial teachers in the study, little real meaning negotiation was noted with their students. Almost all instruction was centered on scripted instruction with traditional activities such as round-robin oral reading, worksheets, and initiation-response-evaluation interchange between teachers and students. Also observed in these classes were numerous behavior problems (off-task talking to neighbors, throwing objects across the room, insulting or threatening other students, disengagement

from in-class assignments, etc.). No discussion of social issues relations to power, dominance, and oppression were ever observed or recorded.

On the other hand, extended meaning negotiation was observed and analyzed in Ms. Stevens' classroom. Students generally appeared focused on learning, and no overt behavior problems were noted. Class discussion of issues relating to power, dominance, and oppression were observed, recorded, transcribed, and analyzed on several occasions for extended periods of instructional time.

Bloom, Carter, Christian, Madrid, Otto, Shuart-Faris, et al. (2008) differentiate micro level analysis from macro level analysis. They suggest that the micro level focuses on face-to-face interactions in immediate situations. However, at the macro level the focus is on the emphasis of "broad social, cultural, and political processes that define social institutions, cultural ideologies, and all that happens within and across them" (p. 20). Further, they suggest that it is not always practical to attempt an equal analysis at both levels, yet it is important to recognize both levels. While the analysis presented in the findings section was at the micro level, contextualizing this analysis at the macro level truly aids in understanding the building tasks of language (Gee, 2005). That is, from the micro level analysis, there is a detailed description of how Ms. Stevens' negotiated meaning with her students. Yet, it is equally important to explore the content of the meanings she negotiated. Ms. Stevens did not simply negotiate surface level meaning of stories from a core reading series; rather she situated text within a social, cultural and political context. In the following section, I will discuss the eight teaching lessons at the macro level to consider how the negotiation of meaning was not only

important in the ways in which she used the building tasks of language, but also in the *what*, that is, of what she was negotiating meaning.

Macro Level Examination of Teaching Lessons

Often noted in the data are situated meanings that allude to issues of power that implicate a Discourse model of a critical outlook on social studies and social issues that appear in social studies, reading, and other texts. The social languages used by Ms. Stevens seem to be used in a Discourse in which the teacher and students comprise a community of learners who view textbooks critically where they think and believe that issues of dominance and oppression are relevant in our society. It was to this end that Ms. Stevens often coordinated her use of the seven building tasks of language.

Encounter.

This lesson, centered on the book *Encounter* (Yolen, 1996), is about the first meeting between Columbus and the indigenous peoples of San Salvador (the Taino) through the eyes of a young native boy. The focus of this lesson was to help her students understand multiple perspectives on historical events. The question arises as to why she chose to make this text significant to her students. It seems clear that she felt the need to convey the concept of a complete decimation of an indigenous group by the Europeans. Further, in addressing the idea of point of view, Ms. Stevens skillfully coordinated building tasks of language (mostly significance and connections) to convey the idea that textbooks are written from a Eurocentric point of view. Ms. Stevens continued building significance (using reproduction of meaning and prosody) to drive home the idea that the Europeans' motivation was mostly driven not by friendship, but by greed.

Columbus Day.

Ms. Stevens' discussion of the celebration of Columbus Day and her subsequent debate activity reflects her commitment to social issues. Ms. Stevens weaves the building tasks of significance and connections, as well as the relevance of academic knowledge, to help her students think critically about the status quo of celebrating Columbus Day as a national holiday. Throughout this lesson, Ms. Stevens continued to build significance and connections to convey the idea that although the celebration of Columbus Day is uncomfortable to many indigenous peoples and descendants of indigenous peoples, we continue to celebrate as a nation this Eurocentric holiday.

The fact that Ms. Stevens chose to utilize a debate as a technique to further reflect on a Eurocentric perspective illuminates her skill in engaging her students in issues of power and dominance. Katrina (an African-American girl) had stated that students can learn at home, in addition to learning at school. Ms. Stevens, realizing public school curriculum and classroom routines reflect white, middle-class values (personal communication, Nov. 17, 2008), expanded Katrina's statements to convey the idea that learning that takes place in the culture of the home is as valuable as that which occurs in the institution of public school.

Spanish Empire.

In the *Spanish Empire* lesson Ms. Stevens continued to use situated meanings in her model of Discourse that often alluded to issues of power and dominance in sixteenth-century Latin America. Following a reading of a primary source from Bartolome de las Casas in the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005) by a nonparticipant, Ms. Stevens used various types of language to build significance (primarily reproduction of meaning and

prosody) to convey the meaning that the indigenous peoples of the Americas were extremely competent, even by the standards of an educated Spaniard, and that they were not in need of help from the Europeans. Her goal appeared to be to shine light upon the excuse used by European civilization to exploit the resources of the New World. Again, this Discourse model alludes to issues of dominance and oppression.

Ms. Stevens immediately followed the discussion of the primary source from Bartolome de las Casas with an examination of murals by the Mexican painter Diego Rivera. In her comments she used various devices, such as reproduction of meaning, prosody, overt attention, and adjective labeling, to build significance for issues relating to dominance and oppression of the indigenous peoples of the Americas by Europeans.

A little later Ms. Stevens makes a telling comment during the discussion, using prosody (pauses) to build its significance: "Don't bring stones and arrows to a gunfight," appears to be a sarcastic comment on the domination of the indigenous peoples of the Americas by the Europeans through the use of advanced weaponry such as armor (seen in an illustration in the social studies text (Banks et al., 2005, p. 133).

While listening to an audio recording of the social studies text while following along in the textbook (Banks et al., 2005), Ms. Stevens commented on the drastic decrease in the population of the indigenous peoples of the area now called Mexico using a large variety of techniques (reproduction of meaning, questions, overt attention, and prosody) to build significance for the concept of the decimation of the indigenous peoples of the Americas, the cruelty with which they were decimated, and the replacement of their servitude with slaves from Africa.

Ms. Stevens continues a short time later, commenting on a rebellion of African slaves, calling it "a great story." She used language to build significance (adjective labeling and overt attention) and also to convey a perspective on politics (the distribution of social goods), reflecting a critical examination of issues of dominance and oppression.

Ms. Stevens' comment at the end of the discussion ("I don't know. God and gold. Something definitely screwy there.") culminates her broader discussion that illustrated a skillful weaving of the building tasks of significance, connections, sign systems and knowledge, and politics to help her students critically examine issues of power and oppression in sixteenth-century Latin America.

How Many Days to America.

The lesson, centered on the book *How Many Days to America: A Thanksgiving Story* (Bunting, 1990), is a fictional presentation of the perilous voyage of a group of Caribbean refugees to the United States. The focus of the lesson seemed to be to help students understand the lack of political freedom in some countries compared to others and the extreme risks and sacrifices people will endure in order to gain greater political freedom.

Ms. Stevens discussed Cuba as a prereading activity, providing context for the story, in which she built significance and connections to help her students understand the relative lack of political freedoms in Cuba. She also conveyed a perspective on freedom of speech in the United States.

During the reading of the story Ms. Stevens stopped to ask the students why they thought soldiers were in the house of the family in the story. The resulting exchange was unusual for Ms. Stevens' classroom discourse model, in that while still building

significance, her language-in-use was even more focused on building connections. For example, an idea proposed by a student was that soldiers were in the family's home because someone in the family had spoken out against the government. Ms. Stevens connected the idea of speaking openly about political and social issues to "Like the kinds of things I talk to you about in here would not be allowed." The use of language to build connections even more than to build significance in the exchange demonstrates that Ms. Stevens' classroom discourse model is not a static model focused only on building significance, but flexible in nature in order to accomplish both long-term and immediate goals in her teaching.

When Ms. Stevens read to the class the climax and resolution of the story, when the imperiled boat refugees were rescued by authorities and brought to the shore of U.S. soil, something remarkable happened. Ms. Stevens read, "People waited on the dock. 'Welcome,' they called. 'Welcome to America.'" At that point Ms. Stevens was forced to pause for 11 seconds while she silently wept. As she struggled to finish the story she was forced to pause again to collect herself, and acknowledged that to the class ("sorry"). As she finished the final few sentences her voice often had an emotional quality, at times breaking.

This was not the result of the planned use of prosodic devices to build significance. Rather, it represents a deep emotional commitment on the part of Ms. Stevens to the issues of social justice portrayed in the story. The fact that she would allow herself to cry openly in the presence of her students, when the family in the story escapes tyranny and oppression, demonstrates that commitment. As I reflect on the demeanor of the students during this lesson, I can think of no single use of language by

Ms. Stevens more effective in building significance. Her students were extremely focused on her reading, with no nervous smiles or laughter, no looking away in embarrassment. It struck me as a fifth-grade class with the temporary emotional demeanor of educated adults.

Julie of the Wolves.

The teaching lessons centered on the book *Julie of the Wolves* (George, 1972) and were recorded on two different dates. I will analyze them sequentially.

In a prereading activity where Ms. Stevens described the setting of the section of the novel they were reading, she discussed the relatively recent statehood of Alaska. Ms. Stevens used language (primarily reproduction of meaning) to build significance for the idea that statehood for Alaska may not have been the result of noble intentions for the people of Alaska, but for monetary gain. She asked, "What's always the answer in social studies, children?" indicating that monetary motives in government policy may have been discussed at some length in the class before.

In a discussion of the character Julie's adjustment to living in a white-culture community after years of living at an Eskimo seal camp, Ms. Stevens commented on issues of cultural and linguistic power and dominance using the language building tasks of sign systems and knowledge, significance, and connections. She noted the difficulty Julie had maintaining her native culture in her new environment. Cecilia, an English language learner who speaks Spanish in the home, asked about the Eskimo girls not speaking their native language, something she seemed to find strange. Ms. Stevens offered an explanation based on the linguistic dominance of English over other languages ("if they don't think that that's a path to success").

The Ch'i-lin Purse.

The lesson was loosely centered on the short story "The Ch'i-lin Purse" (Fang, 2008). The initial focus of the lesson seemed to be explicit teaching of vocabulary and vocabulary building strategies (in this case, the use of morphology to help get at the meaning of a word).

In a prereading activity reviewing vocabulary for the story, Ms. Stevens used the vocabulary word "astonished" in a sentence: "I was astonished to learn that he got arrested. Our Governor." Ms. Stevens skillfully tapped into what Gee (2005) terms Conversations—public debates, arguments, motifs, issues, or themes. In the lengthy discussion that ensued from the example sentence for a vocabulary word, Ms. Stevens skillfully wove her language to build significance (primarily through reproduction of meaning and prosody), to build connections, to convey a perspective (a negative perspective) on politics (in the sense of "politics" as a building task of language), and to build a loving teacher/students relationship, in order to lift the level of discussion from the simple meaning of a word in one context to a discussion concerning democratic principles and ideals and how our elected representatives sometimes fail us in upholding those ideals, as well as addressing issues of abuse of power in government as she encouraged her students to continue to look at authority with a critical eye.

I Have a Dream.

The lesson was centered around the play "I Have a Dream: The Childhood of Martin Luther King, Jr." (Lewis, 2000, Jan.). The initial focus of the lesson was for Ms. Stevens and her students to orally read the play for the first time. During the reading, the play reached a point where young Martin (read by Enrique, an English language learner)

was told by his white friends' mother (read by Katrina, an African-American girl) that her sons could not play with him because he was "colored." Katrina read the line, "I'm sorry, Martin. I should have warned you. It was bound to happen sooner or later." It was at this point that Cecilia, an English language learner, asked the meaning of the word "bound." In answering her question, Ms. Stevens went from the simple meaning of the word to what the word meant in the context of the play to what the play meant in the context of 1940s Atlanta by using language to build significance, primarily through the use of reproduction of meaning and prosody, in order to speak about racism in the United States during that time period.

Immediately an African-American girl (a nonparticipant in the study) asked about discrimination of other racial groups besides African-Americans. Ms. Stevens delayed finishing the rehearsal for several minutes to address and discuss issues of racism. She skillfully built significance (using prosodic devices alone in 29 instances), connections, and relationships, and even used language to make academic knowledge (that gained from Dr. Grant Miller, Southern Illinois University Carbondale) relevant to the discussion. Ms. Stevens felt that the racial issues addressed in the play, and the examination of those issues, were more important than the theatrical rehearsal of lines for an upcoming class production (personal communication, January 20, 2009).

Summary of macro level analysis.

In each teaching lesson are seen situated meanings that allude to issues of power that implicate a Discourse model of a critical outlook on social studies and social issues that appear in social studies, reading, and other texts. Ms. Stevens used social languages in a classroom Discourse model that illustrate a community of learners who view texts

critically and fearlessly examine issues of dominance and oppression relevant in society. The building tasks of language, used skillfully and effectively, were a means to that end.

Perspective of participant teacher on macro level analysis.

Ms. Stevens, after reading the discussion of her use of language in the classroom for a macro level of analysis offered very supporting comments during an informal interview on February 22, 2010. Concerning her focus on issues of social justice and critical literacy with her students, she stated,

> The origins are in my history, in my academic encounters. What you heard wouldn't have sounded the same before Kathy Hytten and Grant Miller. I think that's really important. It's in everything. If you're there for math, if you're there for . . . . It's, like, more than anything. (personal communication, February, 22, 2010)

Her response to the passage in the discussion, *the social languages used by Ms. Stevens seem to be used in a Discourse in which the teacher and students comprise a community of learners who view textbooks critically where they think and believe that issues of dominance and oppression are relevant in our society*, was "That's very true." In responding to *it was to this end that Ms. Stevens often coordinated her use of the seven building tasks of language*, she said, "That's very, very astute."

We discussed a specific transcription of her language:

1a Though there were originally
1b some three hundred THOU:SAND..
1c native islanders..
1d in fifteen forty eight…(7)
2 There were three hundred thousand islanders//
3a by: .. fifty years later
3b in fifteen ninety eight
3c there were five hundred//…(7)

4 Today there are no: full blooded Taino//…(5)

To my analysis that *Ms. Stevens uses a variety of prosodic devices (and reproduction of meaning) to build significance. The question arises as to why she chose to make this section of text significant to her students. A plausible answer is that she felt the need to convey the concept of a complete decimation of an indigenous group by the Europeans*, she stated, "That's exactly what went down there."

In commenting about the overall findings and analyses, Ms. Stevens said,

> Like now somebody's going to know that that's important. It does matter. . . . Especially if there aren't any [culturally and linguistically diverse students in the classroom]. It's more important for the classrooms that don't look like mine. It's profoundly important. I mean, I think it goes right to the core of how we are so divided as a country today. Like people that don't have any exposure to anything. You're in an all-white classroom . . . . [Groups that have power] have to be exposed to it. (personal communication, February, 22, 2010)

She continued,

> You've captured it. That's what happened to me. I mean I was always kind of there, but, like, it was Kathy Hytten and Grant Miller that gave it, like a voice. A vocabulary. Like dominance and oppression, I didn't really know what it was that I . . . . It was just like wrong, and there were bad guys and good guys. I think that's what I used to use is the good guys and the bad guys. But, you know, systems, you know, how there can be only good guys and there can still be people really, really suffering. (personal communication, February, 22, 2010)

Later Ms. Stevens wondered aloud about the experience of her fifth-graders after they are

promoted to a more traditional sixth-grade classroom:

> I mean I was kind of wondering, like, what's going to happen to my fifth graders when they go to sixth grade and they don't have this experience of questioning the textbook itself. Maybe they're too young to start having their world, you know, blown apart. But I don't know. Grant asked me that over and over again. He's like, "Well, do you . . . ," I mean, "Does this work to do this at your level?" And I said, "Well, if it's right, if it's more truthful than not doing it, then I have an obligation." And I think the kids get it. (personal communication, February, 22, 2010)

Later Ms. Stevens commented on building significance:

> If there's anything I give my time to, it's making it, like, why. The "so what" of everything. I've had parents say that their kids have said, "One thing about Ms. [Stevens] is she makes sure we know why we're learning something." [Significance] is the only thing that matters. . . . [Making things significant or relevant] was primarily in the back of my mind. It's always "so what" for them. Why would they want to sit through that? (personal communication, February, 22, 2010)

Toward the end of the interview Ms. Stevens gave an interesting observation concerning her teaching philosophy and high-stakes testing:

> I don't really follow the social studies curriculum, and I kind of have unofficial permission for that because social studies isn't tested (on ISAT). The ironic thing

is that since ISAT isn't counting social studies as important, I get to do something really meaningful. (personal communication, February, 22, 2010)

Practical Implications for Educators

The results of this study demonstrate that, for this teacher, meaning negotiation about text in a classroom that included culturally and linguistically diverse students employed the use of language that built significance far more that other building tasks of language. This is an important concept for teachers, especially teachers with culturally and linguistically diverse students, to understand. Teachers and pre-service teachers should realize not only the importance of using language in the classroom that builds significance when negotiating meaning about texts, but just what that language looks like in reality.

Language is by far the primary conduit for teaching. An understanding of how language works on a practical level is very beneficial, in my view, for teachers. But this metalinguistic awareness should be accessible to educators without the necessity of detailed study in linguistics. Halliday's (1985) functional categories of language are not widely taught in the field of education, nor do they seem especially practical in nature. Gee's (2005) building tasks are easily understood, and this study demonstrates that they can be broken down into further discrete parts to provide a window on how a teacher who effectively uses the building tasks of language weaves those building tasks in order to negotiate meaning about texts. In the case of Ms. Stevens, a primary goal was an examination and understanding of issues related to power, dominance, and oppression in society, but a teacher could use an understanding of the building tasks of language in the negotiation of meaning about texts for other goals as well.

An effective method of teaching an awareness of the use of language to educators might be to begin with an explanation that language is a tool for building reality. Then a closer look at Gee's (2005) seven building tasks of language could be undertaken with examples from instructional language. For example, language used for building relationships could be examined by the brief analysis of examples of language that build specific types of teacher/student(s) relationships, such as teacher/good student(s), trusted teacher/student(s), loving teacher/student(s), and examples of language that might go toward less positive classroom relationships. Language used for building connections could be examined by the brief analysis of examples of language that builds connections with text, culture, events, memories, artifacts, and other connections.

The bulk of effort in teaching a metalinguistic awareness to teachers should be spent on language that builds significance, since helping students to separate the relevant from the irrelevant is extremely important in negotiating meaning about texts with students. Examples should be presented followed by discussion on reproduction of meaning (including types of repetition, paraphrase, and citation), prosodic devices, types of questions, types of overt attention, life connection, and adjective labeling.

While a single exposures to these concepts might not be extremely beneficial to educators over the long term, since we tend to forget what we are not reminded of from time to time, a metalinguistic awareness based on the results of this study, and other studies pursuing the goal of a linguistic understanding of classroom meaning negotiation from a practical and accessible standpoint, should be incorporated into broader study of pedagogical instruction, as well as teacher assessment and self assessment.

Limitations of the Study

This is a study of one teacher in one classroom with one participating group of students over eight teaching lessons. Had this study utilized a participant teacher whose primary goals did not necessarily include an examination and discussion of issues of power, dominance, and oppression it might have yielded different results. The teacher in this study, during an informal, unstructured interview even wondered aloud what differences their might be in her use of language to build significance with the goal of understanding those social issues had her class been composed of overwhelmingly European-American children.

This study utilized a language-context analysis in which it is recognized that situated meanings arise because particular language forms take on specific or situated meanings in specific contexts. This type of discourse analysis takes on a reflexive view of the relationship between context and language, where, at one and the same time, an utterance influences what we take the context to be, and context influences what we take the utterance to mean. Had this study included a form-function analysis of correlations between structure and meaning in language, based primarily on Halliday's (2004) work in functional grammar, in which different grammatical forms or structures have the meaning potential for different functions, a more grammatically detailed, albeit not necessary more pragmatic, analysis of data would have come to light.

Suggestions for Future Research

Directions for future research designed to expand upon ideas brought to light in this study seem, to me, almost limitless. Similar studies of other educators in different types of classrooms, with different types of students, with differing cultural and linguistic

backgrounds, at different levels of education could be undertaken. Longitudinal studies that examine changes in patterns of language in meaning negotiation over time with experience and further education could be attempted. Studies designed to determine whether overt instruction in practical methods of using language to build significance in classroom meaning negotiation has pedagogical value could be undertaken. Studies designed to determine the value of the metalinguistic knowledge discussed in this study for teachers using critical pedagogy could be attempted. A study of this sort could combine Gee's (2005) discourse methodology with McCafferty's (2002, 2004) sociocultural view of the interrelationship of thought, speech, and gesture in second language acquisition to gain a broader understanding of classroom meaning negotiation about texts with culturally and linguistically diverse students.

A particularly fascinating line of research stemming from this study would be to examine the effects of teachers negotiating meaning about texts using Gee's (2005) methodology, and its further analysis of significance building in this study, by combining it with knowledge gained from studies by Cook and Bassetti (2005), and others, who look at the effects of prior literacy in languages with writing scripts other alphabetic (such as English) in acquiring literacy in English. Most of what researchers know about literacy is based on studies involving the Roman alphabet, rather than morphemic or syllabic writing systems. Knowing particularly useful ways to negotiate meaning about text with biscriptals (those literate in a second language writing system [L2WS]) might prove extremely useful since neurologists have documented evidence that when reading in an iconic script we use different areas of out brain than when reading in an alphabetic script. This is at least partially due to the fact that monolingual readers of a phonemic writing

system (such as English) read by sound, while monolingual readers of a morphemic writing system (such as Chinese) read by sight. Readers in different writing systems differ in the way they read, write, and think about their writing systems. Once the process of learning to read in an L2WS is over, L2 users of a writing system still differ from native users of the same writing system in the way they read, write and think about this writing system, and may even differ from native users of their L1 writing system in the way they use or think about their L1 writing system (Bassetti, n.d.). How to negotiate meaning about text with these students is, to the best of my knowledge, an untapped field of research.

Conclusion

As stated earlier, most of the extant research on classroom text meaning negotiation by nonnative speakers has been approached from a psycholinguistic rationale (Pica, 1994). This work, to a large extent, was guided by Long's (1996) update to his interaction hypothesis, which was an extension of Krashen's (1982) Monitor Model.

Sociocultural theory differs from traditional cognitive approaches in its foreshadowing of the social dimension of consciousness and its de-emphasis of the individual dimension. When learners appropriate socioculturally meaningful artifacts and symbolic systems, most importantly language, as they interact in socioculturally meaningful activities, they gain control over their own mental activity and can begin to function independently (Zuengler & Miller, 2006). How a teacher with culturally and linguistically diverse students made use of situated meanings in language-in-use and other artifacts to was examined through the lens of Gee's (2005) approach to discourse analysis.

This study is unique in its practical approach to how a teacher who effectively uses the building tasks of language can build significance for her learners. Rex et al. (2010), in a review of research employing discourse analysis conducted by scholars interested in literacy issues over the last 10 years, found that the central research questions reverberating in the studies "were two implicit questions: Whose literacies count? Which literacies count?" (p. 97). These questions, those extremely relevant, are more esoteric in nature than the question addressed in this study. Other studies have used different approaches (principally cognitive/psycholinguistic) and/or have focused on the speech of the students in meaning negotiation, rather than that of the teacher. Therefore, this study represents a valuable contribution to the field of literacy research.

REFERENCES

Alvermann, D. E., Young, J. P., Green, C., & Wisenbaker, J. M. (1999). Adolescents' perceptions and negotiations of literacy practices in after-school read and talk clubs. *American Educational Research Journal, 36*, 221-264.

Anderson, R. C., & Pearson, P. D. (1984). A schema-theoretic view of reading comprehension. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, & P. B. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. I, pp. 255-291). New York: Longman.

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.) (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Banks, J. A., Boehm, R. G., Colleary, K. P., Contreras, G., Goodwin, A. L., McFarland, M. A., et al. (2005). *Our nation*. New York: Macmillan/McGraw-Hill.

Bassetti, B. (n.d.) Second language writing systems. *Subject Centre for Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies good practice guide*. Retrieved February 28, 2008, from http://www.llas.ac.uk/resources/gpg/2662

Bloom, D., Carter, S. P., Christain, B. M., Madrid, S., Otto, S., Shuart-Faris, N., et al. (2008). *On discourse analysis in classrooms: Approaches to language and literacy research (an NCRLL volume)*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bloom, D., Carter, S. P., Christian, B. M., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005). *Discourse analysis & the study of classroom language and literacy events—A microethnographic perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1966). On cognitive growth. In J. S. Brunner, R. R. Oliver, & P. Greenfield (Eds.), *Studies in cognitive growth* (pp. 225-256). New York: Wiley.

Bunting, E. (1990). *How many days to America: A Thanksgiving story*. New York: Sandpiper.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd ed.) Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cook, V., & Bassetti, B. (Eds.) (2005). *Second language writing systems*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Crawford, A. N. (2003). Communicative approaches to second-language acquisition: The bridge to second-language literacy. In G. G. Garcia (Ed.), *English learners: Reaching the highest level of English literacy* (pp. 152-181). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Davis, B., & Sumara, D. (1997). Cognition, complexity, and teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*, 105-125.

Dressman, M., & McCarthey, S. J. (2004). Toward a pragmatics of epistemology,

methodology, and other people's theories in literacy research. In N. K. Duke & M. H. Mallette (Eds.), *Literacy research methodologies* (pp. 322-346). New York: Guilford.

Dunn, W. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (1998). Vygotsky's zone of proximal development and Krashen's *i + 1*: Incommensurable constructs; incommensurable theories. *Language Learning, 48*, 411-442.

Edwards, J. A. (2001). The transcription of discourse. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis*, pp. 321-348. Malden. MA: Blackwell.

Fang, L. (2008). The ch'i-lin purse. In *Reading street, grade 5*, pp. 190-203. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Fitzgerald, J., Amendum, S. J., & Guthrie, K. M. (2008). Young Latino students' English-reading growth in all-English classrooms. *Journal of Literacy Research, 40*, 59-94.

Florio-Ruane, S., & Morrell, E. (2004). Discourse analysis: Conversation. In N. K. Duke & M. H. Mallette (Eds.), *Literacy research methodologies* (pp. 46-61). New York: Guilford.

Forman, E. A., & McCormick, D. E. (1995). Discourse analysis: A sociocultural perspective. *Remedial & Special Education, 16*, 150-158.

Foster, P. (1998). A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics, 19*, 1-23.

Foster, P., & Ohta, A. S. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics, 26*, 402-430.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Gee, J. P. (2004). Discourse analysis: What makes it critical? In R. A. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 19-50). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Gee, J., & Green, J. (1998). Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: A methodological study. *Review of Research in Education, 23*, 119-170.

General Accounting Office (2001, February). *Meeting the needs of students with limited English proficiency*. Washington, DC: Author.

George, J. C. (1972). *Julie of the wolves.* New York: Harper & Row.

Gray, W. S. (1960). The major aspects of reading. In J. Robinson (Ed.), *Sequential development of reading abilities* (Vol. 22, pp. 8-24). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hall, J. K., & Verplaeste, L. S. (2000). *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *Spoken and written language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (2004). An introduction to functional grammar (3rd ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.

Handsfield, L. J., & Jiménez, R. T. (2009). Cognition and misrecognition: A Bourdieuian analysis of cognitive strategy instruction in a linguistically and culturally diverse

classroom. *Journal of Literacy Research, 41*, 151-195.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Hernández, A. (2003). Making content instruction accessible for English language learners. In G. G. Garcia (Ed.), *English learners: Reaching the highest level of English literacy* (pp. 125-149). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Hoijer, H. (1954). The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. In H. Hoijer (Ed.), *Language in culture* (pp. 92-105). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hymes, D. H. (1995). The ethnography of speaking. In B. G. Blount (Ed.), *Language, culture, and society: A book of readings* (2nd ed.), pp. 248-282. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Illinois State Board of Education (2008). eReport card public site: Lewis School. Retrieved May 28, 2008, from http://webprod.isbe.net

Jiménez, R. T. (2001). "It's a difference that changes us": An alternative view of the language and literacy learning needs of Latina/o student. *The Reading Teacher, 54*, 736-742.

Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kanno, Y. (2003). *Negotiating bilingual and bicultural identities: Japanese returnees betwixt two worlds*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kindler, A. E. (2002). *Survey of the states' limited English proficient students and available educational programs and services: 2001-2002 summary report*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs. Retrieved Aug. 4, 2008, from

http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/policy/states/reports/seareports/0001/sea0001.pdf

Koda, K. (2005). *Insights into second language reading: A cross-linguistic approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications. New York: Longman.

Lankshear, C. (with Gee, J. P., Knobel, M., & Searle, S.) (1997). *Changing literacies*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lewis, M. (2000, Jan.). I have a dream: The childhood of Martin Luther King, Jr. *Storyworks, 7.*

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long, D. L., Seely, M. R., Oppy, B. J., & Golding, J. M. (1996). The role of inferential processing in reading ability. In B. K. Britton & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), *Models of understanding text* (pp. 189-214). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego: Academic Press.

Lucy, J. A. (1995). Whorf's view of the linguistic mediation of thought. In B. G. Blount (Ed.), *Language, culture, and society: A book of readings* (2nd ed.), pp. 415-438.

Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Luria, A. R. (1976). *Cognitive development: Its cultural and social foundations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Martin, L. (1991). *Entre lineas: A strategy for developing reading skills* (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

McCafferty, S. G. (2002). Gesture and creating zones of proximal development for second language learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*, 192-203.

McCafferty, S. G. (2004). Space for cognition: Gesture and second language learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 14*, 148-165.

McKoon, G., & Ratcliff, R. (1989). Semantic association and elaborative inferences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition, 15, 326-338.*

McVee, M., Dunsmore, K., & Gavelek, J. R. (2005). Schema theory revisited. *Review of Educational Research, 75*, 531-566.

Morrison, T. (1994). *The bluest eye*. New York: Plume/Penguin.

Musumeci, D. (1996). Teacher-learner negotiation in content-based instruction: Communication at cross-purposes? *Applied Linguistics, 17*, 286-325.

Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing in gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 335-358). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Patthey-Chavez, G. G., & Clare, L. (1996). Task, talk, and text: The influence of

instructional conversation on transitional bilingual writers. *Written Communication, 13*, 515-563.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. F. (2008). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL: A resource book for teaching K-12 English learners*. Boston: Pearson.

Peshkin, A. (1988). Understanding complexity: A gift of qualitative inquiry. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 19*, 416-424.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning, 44*, 493-527.

Reading street, grade 5. (2008a). Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Reading street, grade 5. (2008b). *Illinois daily practice book*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Rex, L. A., Bunn, M., Davilia, B.A., Dickinson, H. A., Ford, A. C., Gerben, C., et al. (2010). A review of discourse analysis in literacy research: Equitable access. *Reading Research Quarterly, 45*, 94-115.

Rogers, R. A. (2004). An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. In R. A. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 1-18). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ruddell, R. B., & Unrau, N. J. (2004). Reading as a meaning-construction process: The reader, the text, and the teacher. In R. B. Ruddell & N. J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (5th ed.) (pp. 1462-1521). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Sapir, E. (1949). *Selected writings of Edward Sapir in language, culture, and personality* (Ed. D. G. Mandelbaum). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. In B. Siegel (Ed.), *Annual Review of Anthropology* (pp. 163-191). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Singer, M. (1994). Discourse inference processes. In M. A. Gernsbacher (Ed.), *Handbook of psycholinguistics* (pp. 479-516). San Diego: Academic Press.

Slavin, R. E., & Cheung, A. (2005). A synthesis of research on language of reading instruction for English-language learners. *Review of Educational Research, 75*, 247-284.

Smagorinsky, P. (2001). If meaning is constructed, what is it made from? Toward a cultural theory of reading. *Review of Educational Research, 71*, 133-169.

Southerland, L. M. (2005). Black adolescent girls' use of literacy practices to negotiate boundaries of ascribed identity. *Journal of Literacy Research, 37*, 365-406.

Swain, M. K. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 236-244). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Van den Branden, K. (2000). Does negotiation of meaning promote reading comprehension? A study of multilingual primary school classes. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35*, 426-443.

van den Broek, P. (1994). Comprehension and memory of narrative texts: Inferences and coherence. In M. A. Gernsbacher (Ed.), *Handbook of psycholinguistics* (pp. 539-588). San Diego: Academic Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 6*, 3-23.

Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Yolen, J. (1996). *Encounter*. San Diego, CA: Voyager Books.

Yoon, B. (2008). Uninvited guests: The influence of teachers' roles and pedagogies on the positioning of English language learners in the regular classroom. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*, 495-522.

Zehler, A., Fleischman, H., Hopstock, P., Stephenson, T., Pendzick, M., & Sapru, S. (2003). *Descriptive study of services to LEP students and LEP students with disabilities, Volume IA: Research report*. Development Associates, Inc. Retrieved January 15, 2004, from http://www.devassoc.com/pdfs/vol_1_text.pdf

Zuengler, J., & Miller, E. R. (2006). Cognitive and sociocultural perspectives: Two parallel SLA worlds? *TESOL Quarterly, 40*, 35-58.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Questions About Building Tasks of Language

1. Situated Meanings

a. Words and phrases

b. Places, times, bodies, people, objects, artifacts, and institutions

c. Intertextuality

d. Discourse models

2. Discourses

a. (re-)Produced or transformed

b. Relevant to activities, identities, relationships

3. Activity (or set of activities)

a. Sub-activities

b. Actions compose these sub-activities and activities

4. Identities (roles & positions) & Social relationships

a. Stabilized or transformed

5. **Social goods (e.g., status, power, aspects of gender, race, and class**)

a. Relevant (and irrelevant)

b. Connected to the Discourse models and Discourses operative

6. Language

a. Sign systems

b. "National" languages like English or Spanish

c. Systems of knowledge and ways of knowing

d. Social languages

Appendix B

Units and Transcription

Each line represents a tone unit—a set of words said with one uniform intonational contour (said as if they "go together").

> The intonational contour (or intonation unit) is all the words that precede a pitch glide (pitch movement) and the words following it, over which the glide continues to move.

Macro-lines (1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, etc.) are used to tie two or more lines into something akin to a sentence.

Stanzas are "clumps" of tone units that deal with a unitary topic or perspective, and which appear to have been planned together.

A double slash ("//") indicates the tone unit is said with a "final contour"—a rising or falling pitch of the voice that sounds "final," as if a piece of information is "closed off" and "finished."

Two periods ("..") indicates a hearable pause.

Three periods followed by a number ("…(7)") indicates an extended pause in seconds.

CAPITALIZED words are emphatic (said with extra stress).

> Stress is physically marked by a combination of increased loudness, increased length, and by changing the pitch of one's voice on a word's primary ("accented") syllable.

A colon (":") following a vowel indicates that the vowel is elongated (drawn out).

"Low pitch" means that the preceding unit was said on overall low pitch.

Figure 1

Building Tasks of Language – Coding and Occurences in Data

1. **SIGNIFICANCE** (1711)
    a. **Reproduction of Meaning** (942)
        i. **Repetition** (341)
            1. ***Other repetition*** (180)
                a. *Quoting students* (108)
                b. *Quoting text* (72)
            2. ***Self repetition*** (161)
        ii. **Paraphrase** (567)
            1. ***Other paraphrase*** (307)
                a. *Paraphrasing students* (61)
                b. *Paraphrasing text* (246)
            2. ***Self paraphrase*** (260)
        iii. **Citation** (34)
            1. ***Citation of text*** (26)
            2. ***Citation of students*** (8)
    b. **Prosody** (331)
        i. **Vowel elongation** (178)
        ii. **Stress** (112)
        iii. **Extended pause** (33)
        iv. **Low pitch** (8)
    c. **Questions** (201)

i. **Comprehension checks** (141)

ii. **Display questions** (60)

d. **Overt Attention** (148)

i. **Definition** (92)

ii. **Direct attention** (33)

iii. **Importance** (17)

iv. **Imperative to remember** (6)

e. **Life Connection** (35)

i. **Family** (18)

ii. **Purpose** (9)

iii. **Institutional value** (8)

f. **Adjective Labeling** (54)

i. **Interesting** (12)

ii. **Unusual/different** (11)

iii. **Dangerous** (5)

iv. **Real** (5)

v. **Other adjectives** (21)

2. **RELATIONSHIPS** (373)

a. **Teacher/Student(s)** (174)

b. **Teacher/Good Student(s)** (113)

c. **Trusted Teacher/Student(s)** (37)

d. **Disappointed teacher/Student(s)** (28)

e. **Loving teacher/Student(s)** (21)

3. **CONNECTIONS** (309)
    a. **Text** (127)
        i. **Written text** (89)
        ii. **Spoken text** (38)
    b. **Culture** (129)
    c. **Event** (22)
    d. **Fact** (11)
    e. **Memory** (8)
    f. **Artifact** (6)
    g. **Other Connections** (6)
4. **SIGN SYSTEMS AND KNOWLEDGE** (77)
    a. **Sign Systems** (57)
        i. **Languages** (29)
            1. ***Spanish*** (15)
            2. ***English*** (5)
            3. ***Non-European languages*** (9)
        ii. **Language varieties** (28)
            1. ***Informal language*** (8)
            2. ***Adult language*** (7)
            3. ***Child language*** (6)
            4. ***Other language varieties*** (7)
    b. **Knowledge** (9)
        i. **Academic kinowledge** (9)

        ii. **Non-European knowledge** (7)

        iii. **Other knowledge** (4)

5. **ACTIVITIES** (67)

    a. **Debate** (39)

    b. **Reading** (14)

    c. **Class Discussion** (8)

    d. **Prereading** (5)

6. **IDENTITIES** (46)

    a. **Teacher Identity** (28)

        i. **Culturally-sensitive teacher** (13)

        ii. **Good teacher** (9)

        iii. **Experienced teacher/other identities** (6)

    b. **Student identity Building** (18)

        i. **Good student(s)** (15)

        ii. **Other student identities** (3)

7. **POLITICS (The Distribution of Social Goods)** (30)

    a. **Positive** (13)

        i. **Cool** (8)

        ii. **Good** (5)

    b. **Negative** (12)

        i. **Bad** (7)

        ii. **Wrong** (5)

    c. **Other** (5)

VITA

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University

Keith S. Wheeler Date of Birth: December 18, 1957

501 W. Mohan, P.O. Box 232, Cambria, Illinois 62915

k_wheeler@yahoo.com

East Central College
Associate of Applied Science, Nursing, May 1993

Southeast Missouri State University
Bachelor of Arts, English, December 1999

Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Master of Arts, TESOL, May 2002

Special Honors and Awards:

The James D. and Nancy L. Quisenberry Scholarship, 2006
College of Education and Human Services, Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Dissertation Research Assistant Award, 2008-2009
Graduate School, Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Dissertation Title:

Making the Significant Significant: A Discourse Analysis Examining the Teacher's Role in Negotiating Meaning of Text with Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students

Major Professor: Marla H. Mallette