INTERPRETATIONS OF A CLASSROOM CULTURE

by

JOYCE LOUISE DAVIES

M.Ed., The University of British Columbia, 1977

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Department of Curriculum and Instructional Studies

We accept this thesis as conforming

to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

March 1981

DE-6 (2/79)

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to investigate children's culture
in a classroom setting. The following kinds of cultural questions were
posed: How much do children reveal about the shared world they live in, in
the day-to-day routines of school? How do children learn the things neces-
sary for survival in their classroom world? The specific research questions
were: What are the commonplace routines that occur in a typical class day?
What is it that children share with each other about classroom routines and
rules for behavior? How do young children themselves interpret their own
lives in the classroom?

The conceptual framework for the study was derived from interpretive
social science, ethnomethodology, and ethnography. Techniques included field
notes, photography, establishing rapport with students, recording the insider's
view, and analyzing interrelationships of the data collected. The focus
was the whole class setting as seen from the point of view of participants.
To recover the shared meanings in the situation and to uncover how participants
constructed their reality and defined their situation, the researcher attempted
to see the operating situation as the actors saw it, to perceive the objects
as the actors perceived them, to ascertain the meanings for objects in terms
of the meanings they had for the actors, to follow the individual's lines
of conduct as they organized them, and, to take the role of the child and
see the world from his/her point of view. Ethnographic description combined

ii

with photography and the interpretive paradigm provided a new way of looking at everyday life in a classroom.

The findings of the study are related to the humaneness of classroom life as experienced by the children. Children revealed their conceptions of time, objects, and materials, their understandings of the goals of curriculum, and a consciousness of the duplicity of some of their actions. What emerged was an adult versus children's agenda for the events of the day.

The children understood the tacit rules for behavior and action but they interpreted classroom life in terms of restricted communication. While they had strongly felt needs to socialize with one another on the one hand, on the other hand, the children understood the strong emphasis the teacher placed on task completion. To reconcile this conflict the children used visual and verbal cues to communicate covertly. They spoke of manoeuvering around the rules. In summary, what emerged were shared understandings for children's actions used for survival in this classroom setting.

Further research is required to refine the use of photography as a tool to gain entry into a situation and to discover how children's and teacher's constructs overlap, the importance of secret sign languages, and the degree of children's internalizations of tacit classroom rules in relation to their observed procedures for carrying them out.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CHAPTER I

RESEARCH ON CHILDREN'S CULTURE

"Childhood" is a relatively new theoretical construct or ideology through which historians, educators, psychologists, anthropologists, and laypersons view the early years of human life. According to historians childhood defined as a distinct stage of life is a product of recent times. What is now understood to be obvious, natural, and universal about childhood can be seen to be the result of the historical and cultural conditions in which children live. What we tend to think about "childhood" has been historically shaped, based on industrialization and the growth of science and technology. Childhood seen as a separate state has also been culturally shaped: North Americans have extended and controlled childhood for a variety of social purposes. As a consequence, the institutionalization of learning in schools, the development of the concept of childhood as a time for rescue, the evolvement of a new group of ideas about child-rearing and child care, and the ideology of childhood as a discrete social experience have all appeared in the literature about children and childhood.

1

Historical and Ideological Aspects

Aries (1962) points out that in the Middle Ages children entered the adult world at age seven. They did not experience a sense of childhood as they were put to work, and social status was no barrier to this practice. There were no notions of privacy between adults and children as understood today. The popular idea of puberty rites as expounded in anthropological writings of the last two centuries were secondary in nature. This idea is inappropriately applied as of major significance to any period of western history about childhood before modern times.

Further, it is rare to find children depicted as children before the beginnings of the modern world, roughly at the time of Renaissance. Childhood was not a separate state because adults and children intermixed and lived their lives together intimately (Plumb, 1971, p. 6). Indeed, children and adults shared games, toys, and fairy stories. In medieval Europe age was associated with a village event, the arrival of emissaries, soldiers, and fairs. This means that the precision with which age is measured is a modern phenomenon because most societies grouped the young into blocks, for example, infants, non-initiate boys and girls.

By 1600 a new conception of "childhood" developed. This is attributed to the schoolmen of the fifteenth century. The concept of childhood was adopted by such educationalists of the Renaissance as Erasmus, Vives, and Mosellanus. The Jesuits adopted the concept as their stock in trade. The new attitude considered childhood the

age of innocence and the duty of adults was to preserve this innocence.
At the same time, the cult of Jesus, symbolizing childish innocence
developed. A child became an object of respect, and consequently a
special creature with a different nature and different needs.

The time 1600 to 1800 saw a major revolution in the western
world's attitudes toward the education of children. These attitudes
were tied almost inflexibly to the calendar age of children. The
eighteenth century saw the affluent classes accept the social attitudes
of concern for the innocent nature of children. By the end of the
eighteenth century the leisure and amusements of schoolboys were dif-
ferent from adults; there was the concern for the young child and
adolescent on the part of moral reformers. This concern was prompted
or promoted generally by clergymen and by particular persons; for
example, Martin Luther. Both Catholic and Protestant churchmen ex-
pressed professional concern for the welfare of children. By the end
of the nineteenth century the European upper classes excluded children
in the home and a private world for upper class children had been
created. Up to this time, however, the English working class child
continued to participate in every form of adult life; but as affluence
spread, they too began to have a separate world forced upon them by
parents who emulated the upper and middle class attitudes toward chil-
dren (Plumb, 1971, p. 11).

The growth of industrialization and the development of science
and technology required an educated, docile, and competent work force.
By the nineteenth century suggests Katz (1975), educators and laymen

were devising and revising institutions to cope with poverty, ignorance, and other forms of social distress. These influences represented social change from the top down. Katz (1975) argues that the education of children was something the better part of society did to others to make them orderly, moral, and tractable. Industrialization required docile workers and business men expressed concerns about the competence of the urban poor. The common school, it was considered, could produce tractable company men. Schools, then, became training grounds for commerce and industry. By this token, public schools were used in an attempt to effect massive and permanent social change (Katz, 1975).

Prentice (1970) suggests there were two persistent themes in the history of childhood in the three nations, Great Britain, the United States, and Canada. One theme was the compelling desire to extend and control childhood for a variety of social purposes to which Katz (1975) alluded; and the second theme was the institutionalization of learning in schools, colleges, universities, and large bureaucratic school systems. Canadians were influenced by European practices in education. The major educational influences felt first in the United States and then in Canada manifested themselves in an overwhelming movement to "rescue" children. An environmentalist view of human development took hold and was expressed by the public in concerns for bad teachers, bad parents, and bad surroundings which could contaminate the child. A whole series of good works movements attempted to rescue the child, particularly the urban poor child (Prentice, 1970, p. 57).

The developing concept of childhood as a time for "rescue"

paralleled the school movement. To ensure rescue, childhood became institutionalized (Rooke, 1977, p. 162). There was ever increasing segregation of children into a distinct social category--a separate world of children where they were protected from moral contamination and the abuses of the adult world. The idea of rescue was evident in making children dependent economically and socially--non-productive members of society. Childhood was then extended to incorporate adolescence. Children were not held responsible for their actions as members of society until the adult society deemed it appropriate for youth to take upon themselves the rights of adulthood. The age of adulthood dependency, then, can be shown to have lengthened historically from age seven to approximately twenty-one.

The vast social changes in the last century affected Canadian ideas about child-rearing and child care. According to Sutherland (1979) Canada became modernized in the years between Confederation and the end of World War One. The country's population shifted from a large rural one with life organized around farming, fishing, and lumbering, to a vastly increased urban population. As suggested earlier, the notion of childhood had its basis in the growth of science and technology in the western world. As a consequence, a longer education was required to make children competent and technically trained workers.

There evolved in Canada a new set of ideas about childhood, child-rearing, and child care. According to Sutherland, Canadians developed these to suit their growing nation. He argues that the

changed social policies about children were assembled by the 1920's

and that today we are working within the framework of these policies.

Canadians had a revulsion for child labour. They needed an

educated or at least literate work force; and the shift in family

life developed within Canadians' beliefs and practices which became

the popular ideology. The public health movement, the shift from

institutional care to family care for wayward children, and adoption

services influenced the kinds of social policies developed in the half-

century ending in the 1920's which Sutherland contends influenced our

modern day social policies.

The concept of adolescence, other writers suggest, was developed

from the early 1900's to 1950. The state of adolescence was said to

have been caused by adults who wanted to keep children out of the adult

world. The youth responded by developing their own social world,

their own morals, clothes, and leisure activities. Presently, the

period between infancy, ages four or five, to adolescence, ages ten

to fifteen, have been sharply reduced and the private world of chil-

dren even more pronounced. In other words, childhood has come to

mean a time out from adult work and responsibility.

In western society, childhood as a distinct stage of the life

cycle is a result of the vast socio-economic and cultural changes

which removed children from the world of work and placed them in age-

graded schools. The consequences have been evident in changes in

attitudes toward children as well as their treatment. Our child

labour and compulsory education laws, juvenile courts, and child

guidance clinics are evidences of our changes in attitudes and concerns. These attitudes have helped resolve the problem of the "idle child" in western society.

In our world, the ideology of childhood as a separate social experience has become ingrained in the popular mind. Childhood, then, has become a taken-for-granted perspective held by social, political, and religious groups in our society. As such, childhood as a social construct, is one of the ways in which we have come to see our world. Childhood as an ideology has become a normal way of structuring our social reality (Rooke, 1977, p. 161).

Psychological Aspects

Understanding the nature of childhood may be limited and incomplete if based solely on the concepts of developmental psychology. As a major source of knowledge about children it tends to have an incomplete view. Psychological conceptions of childhood have been based on the notion that childhood is quite separate from adult life, an entity to be examined. Within the entity there are considered to be developmental stages or gradations for children's development which have resulted in the view of children either individualistically or developmentally against some criteria of maturation or psychological/ intellectual gradings.

After surveying major theories of child development, Baldwin (1967) states that there are two main types of psychological functioning. Consensus among the theories is that the first is primitive, direct, and impulsive: essentially child-like. The second is more

controlled, thoughtful, and logical: essentially adult-like. There is also psychological agreement about the importance of ages five to seven. The reason for this agreement has been attributed to knowledge about the physical maturation which takes place in many areas of the brain during that period of growth.

The neurological and physiological internal forces upon the child's behavior are most significant when one takes the view that maturation plays the major role in developmental change. These forces are evident between ages five to seven. Although conceptions of childhood have been based on the notion that childhood is quite separate from adult life, Kagan, Gesell, Bruner, and Piaget and other developmental psychologists provide incomplete views of children because they are limited to abilities and behaviors.

For example, Jerome S. Bruner (1975) suggests there is limited systematic knowledge about what in fact happens to children during early childhood and even less on what its later effects on competence may be (Bruner, 1975). Indeed, in the current debates among psychologists it is a moot point as to what is properly meant by intellectual competence. Phillips and Kelly (1975, p. 351) argue that the "much touted hierarchical theories of development in education and psychology and their underlying assumptions have not been adequately examined." Based on reviews of Piaget and Inhelder, Kolberg, Erikson, and Gagne, Phillips and Kelly claim it is unclear as to whether developmental theories are empirically or conceptually grounded. Moreover, Phillips and Kelly (1975) argue that because of such obscurities, a good many

of the assumptions currently accepted in developmental psychology are dubious.

Cross-cultural studies of childhood have contributed to the belief that the "primitive adult" is the same as our present day western child. The irony is that there is strong historical evidence (Aries, 1975) that children become competent for the adult world at earlier ages. Unfortunately, this reasoning has not guided our notions about childhood and we continue to make children dependent and not responsible. That is to say, we continue to make children non-productive members of our society until they are approximately twenty-one. Children in other cultures who participate in the work and play of the adult world do so because there is a shift in their thinking capabilities, the result of maturation of the brain at approximately ages seven to nine.

How we come to see and understand childhood, then, depends upon the perspective, whether historical, anthropological, or psychological. When children were historically and culturally characterized as 'faulted members of society,' they were considered ". . . incomplete in their moral and intellectual development, asocial and acultural in their ego-centrism, irrational in their ability to reason, and incompetent in possessing knowledge and judgement to carry out tasks as ordinary members of society" (Silver, 1975, p. 45). However, a children's world includes social, historic, economic, and cultural influences; childhood could be understood in terms of how children themselves construct and order their social world. Children do not develop in cultural isolation, in a social-cultural vacuum; rather, their world is complex and comprises the influences of home, playground, other children's homes, the street, the church, the workplace, and the neighbourhood school. In turn,

children act upon these influences and in so doing cause their own social order.

By the mid-twentieth century, educators, psychologists, and anthropologists viewed children's activities to be directly related to their growing knowledge. It has been assumed that because children have access to knowledge about adult-like behavior they choose particular actions to emulate. Children have been judged to have acted in accordance with their knowledge of adults' competent actions. Children are admonished to 'act more grown-up'; but, adults themselves have varying degrees of competence in their efforts to be mature and adult-like. Children when viewed by adults from this perspective have varying degrees of competency in acting more grown-up.

What might have been considered to be obvious and natural about childhood: play, fantasy, child-like whimsy, can be better understood as the outcome of historical and cultural conditions. Bronfenbrenner (1974) suggests for example, that most research about children has little to do with the cultural context of daily life. One of these contexts is the school classroom where children spend long hours, days, weeks, and years living out their days as participants in a culture.

Introduction to Children's Culture Research Questions

Children interact among themselves and share rules for formal and informal activities, games, and rules for playing these games. A children's world exists without the presence of adults. Children acquire instructions from each other about how to construct and interpret the world around them. They do this in those settings where they observe and mime adults and they also interpret the world around them through their own social interactions. Socialization takes place in the school-

room and can be defined as the acquisition of interactional competencies. Sociologists study such settings as ones in which children discover the 'rules of society' from others.

Alternatively, sociologists view these settings as two cultures abiding together, adult and child, existing side-by-side, each with its own ideology for action. On the one hand there is the adult culture as expressed by the teacher in the classroom, observed and acted upon by the children as they come to know and understand it; while on the other hand, there is the children's own world which may or may not incorporate parts of the adult ideology.

While there have been many cultural studies in the educational literature, Speier (1976) concluded that a useful ". . . study would be to inspect the methods teachers and children use to construct daily class-room activities together" (p. 180) and asking the major question, "What are the commonplace routines that occur in a typical class day?" (p. 186). These routines may or may not be directly related to the teacher's presen-tation of curriculum content. What is it that children share with each other about classroom routines and rules for behavior? is the first major research question, and the second is How do young children themselves interpret their own lives in the classroom?

<u>Background to the questions</u>. Children appear to have limited ac-cess to adults' attention because they have been historically and culturally separated from the adult world, left to build their own privately shared meanings. As a result, children present themselves as helpless partic-ipants in an effort to construct interactional events with adults. When two cultures meet, defined as the interaction between members of groups from different cultures, in this case the teacher's culture vis-à-vis

the children's culture, the result can be the diffusion of cultural traits

between the two cultures involved. For example, it is usually accepted

that the adults and their culture can monitor, supervise, and question

children's competence. Adults tend to promote or sanction children's

behavior. When the two cultures make contact, usually, though not always,

it results in some modifications of both cultures. Conversely, children

have to construct their own contributions into adult or teacher drafted

topics in a classroom. There appears to exist, then, a ". . . structure

of differential attentions between children and adults" (Speier, 1976,

p. 170). In a classroom, the adult culture pervades the setting and

generates the formal classroom rules, and the difference in adult attentions

to adult drafted concerns is far greater than the attentions given to

children's drafted topics. The influence that the teacher's beliefs

have on the children's culture or shared childhood classroom meanings

requires that the researcher look at the level at which rules are learned

in a classroom. Some children ". . . may have learned about the rule,

whereas others have understood the meaning for the rule" (Spradley, 1972,

p. 21).

The foremost task, then, is to discover the world as understood

by the children, its nature, and its meanings in the classroom setting.

It is presumed that social actions--defined as the behaviors displayed

by individual children--are oriented to or influenced by social inter-

actions with others in the classroom setting. Children's social actions

in this everyday context are considered to be an interpretive rather than

a rule-governed process. That is to say, as the children gain their

social knowledge, they become part of the classroom culture.

Assumptions.   To study the shared subjective meanings that students

and teacher create during the daily activities of a class requires the

sharing of subjective meanings between the researcher and the participants

of the situation.

Furthermore, in the study, the classroom situation is assumed to be

a social cultural world that is socially constructed and shared by members

in that setting.   The interpretations of social life can be provided to

the researcher by means of descriptions based upon classroom knowledge that

is taken-for-granted by participants.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose for this study of children's culture was to examine

how young children interpreted life in their classroom and to examine

how the members of a classroom culture constituted their social world.

The focus for this study was the discovery of the underlying pat-

tern in children's actions in a classroom.   The pattern results from

the shared world of social meanings through which the children's social

actions were generated and interpreted.   Because children's actions

and their meanings are social phenomena, the study was concerned with

the nature of these social phenomena such as the kinds of routines of

interpretation and action used by classroom members;   what they regarded

as typical classroom routines;   the interpretive schemes the children used

to understand routines of classroom life;   and the sense of social struc-

ture the children relied on to make sense of the social phenomena around

them.

Definition of Terms

Culture is ". . . the acquired knowledge that people use to inter-pret experience and to generate social behavior." This definition allows educators to view children as ". . . social beings behaving in terms of a complex cultural code" (Spradley & McCurdy, 1972, p. 8).

By this definition, culture is viewed as a socially constructed reality. From this perspective the culture of childhood can be viewed as a social construct. It exists and ". . . knowledge of it (should) provide educators with the theoretical lens to see the patterning of children's culture behind the surface of children's behavior" (Silver, 1975, pp. 47-51). When adopting this perspective, educators may no longer interpret the phenomena of childhood simply in individualistic or developmental terms.

Ethnographic description is the gathering of social understandings based on systematic observations and analyses of everyday life. In the study of everyday life on its own terms ethnographic description uses methods of observation and analysis which attempt to retain the integrity of these phenomena.

Ethnographic method is the technique of ethnography, the ways of doing the work of description which are regarded as acceptable. Within any method or process of ethnographic study there are inherent potential-ities and limitations of some techniques as well as opportunities for explorations of some variants of specific techniques (Kaplan, 1964, p. 13). For example, the role of data-gathering by participant observation in ethnographic field work can be extended to include the use of photog-raphy, the camera becomes participant camera, thus overcoming one of the limitations of participant observation.

<u>Constitutive ethnography</u> studies examine the structuring activities and the social facts of education. They describe how these activities are constituted; rather than merely reporting recurrent patterns. These studies also include the rules by which data are abstracted from observed materials; they do not treat structuring separately from structure. "Constitutive studies put structuring and structure on an equal footing by showing <u>how</u> the social facts of the world emerge from structuring work to become external and constraining, as part of a world that is at once of our making and beyond our making" (Mehan & Wood, 1975, pp. 201-203). Further, constitutive ethnography aims for retrievability of data; comprehensive data treatment; a convergence between researchers' and participants' perspective on events; and, an interactional level of analysis (Mehan, 1979, p. 19). In essence, constitutive ethnography operates on the premise that social structures are interactional accomplishments (p. 17).

<u>Social action</u> is the behavior shared with others which has meaning to the individual; it is directed toward a goal. Social action is action oriented to or influenced by another person or persons; also failure to act, or passive acquiescence to the action of others. This means that in social action, the anticipated behavior of others is taken into account in the action.

<u>Social situations</u> are the phenomena as described by participants in the situation. The act of representing a phenomenon and describing it can involve such things as physical environments, social relationships, and activities (Dawson, 1979, pp. 1-12).

<u>Validity</u> of an ethnographic description is the adequacy of a description as a representation of a social situation.

<u>Social knowledge</u> is that body or corpus of knowledge which is somehow related to the activities of a culture's members. At times, the terms culture, perspective, ideology, and world view are used to mean a body of knowledge which is socially known. It is supposed that there must be some connection between what members know and what they do. Members' activities, then, can be construed by reference to some corpus of knowledge. Further, the body of knowledge itself may be viewed as being in some way associated with the group in which the participants have membership.

A <u>stock of knowledge</u> is that knowledge owned by a particular member and acted on according to his or her sets of motives; because of and in order to. This recognizes the intentionality of individual actions. By this definition a child's social knowledge is an integral feature of his social competence. His interpretation of events and actions around him is based on this social competence. An important feature of social knowledge is that some people know some things, but not everybody knows all things. Further, any event means for both the witness and the other, more than the witness can say. Knowledge is socially distributed among the members of a cultural group, characteristically, it is tacit. Members take the knowledge for granted.

<u>Interpretive procedures</u> are the descriptions of interactional activities done by people in interaction. For example, in interpretive procedures each child displays his or her social competence by describing a practical interest in his or her reality in a setting; his or her ownership of socially distributed knowledge of everyday events; thereby setting aside his/her irrelevant biographical specific meanings for events

or actions; and, his/her descriptions take the world for granted, objects are accepted for what they appeared to be on the surface. Descriptions, then comprise a schema of categories which render some approximation of what is actually out there. The structures and structuring practices used by the participants to describe situations mutually contain each other.

The kinds of interpretive procedures used by children to make sense of the objects, events, and actions around themselves are not consistent with linear, deductive, logical systems as understood by most adults because each child assigns his/her personal meanings to objects and events. These procedures can be seen as his/her attempts to evaluate and strive for a reciprocally assumed normal form of judgement of his/her perceptions. This procedure is termed searching for the normal form (Cicourel, 1971, p. 147).

Multiple realities. Realities are dependent upon social interaction: meaning cannot occur apart from some social context. If the construction of knowledge depends upon ceaseless reflexive use of a body of knowledge in interaction then each ʳreality is also fragile. It is capable of dissolution. Each participant constructs a reality around him which can be dissolved by further information. If no one reality can be called paramount then each reality as understood by each participant or member is equally real.

Interactional competence is defined in terms of effective participation or membership in the classroom culture. The competencies are the necessary requisites for communication with others, and the interpretation of language, behavior, rules, and other normative dimensions of classroom life (Mehan, 1979, p. 127). The ethnographer's competence

as a member of a society he or she is studying ". . . is indicated by
his (her) ability to interact effectively in its terms with others who
are already competent" (Goodenough, 1976, p. 4).

Limitations of the Study

Ethnographic techniques were chosen because they provided a means
to uncover these meanings of participants that define the situation.
As a result, there were sources for research limitations because there
are many ethnographic methods.   The concerns, advantages, and disadvantages
of various approaches appeared to coalesce around six major tasks or steps
for ethnographic field work: the identification of the underlying prin-
ciples of the study;   gaining entry and the establishment of a role in
the setting;   decisions about the specific field work techniques to be
used;   determination of informants in the setting, who they would be;
actual data collection;   and, data interpretation and the description
of the culture.

Summary

The idea of childhood as a state created by social interactions
among children, has been formulated by historians, psychologists, anthro-
pologists, and educators within the last one hundred years.   Other
influences which have helped society consider childhood a special time
for the young have been economic, the change from rural to industrialized
urban societies.   Childhood has come to mean a time free from adult work
and responsibility, a time to be carefully nurtured, and a time for rescue
from social ills.

The nature of childhood has also been provided to us by

psychologists, anthropologists, and others. They have documented the internal forces which are deemed to determine children's physical, intellectual, and social growth. The external forces on children's social and moral development have also been documented. These are the home, religion, family, culture, education, language, and up-bringing.

Cross-cultural studies of childhood have suggested the children's world to be enclosed in fantasy, play, and special understandings among the children themselves, exemplified in their songs and games. In their social development, children mime each other and the adults around them. The schoolroom is one of the realities children share with adults. The constitution of childhood in a primary classroom would encompass the intricacies of how children become knowledgeable of the shared meanings for objects, rules, and events.

What is this world of shared meanings--this world of children's personal games, play, and socialization? Through socialization children acquire interactional competencies. Children, through interaction with others acquire a sense of social structure. The puzzlement is how this comes about.

How can researchers enter this world and share this reality to answer the following kinds of cultural questions known only to the participants: What is it that children share with each other about classroom routines and rules for behavior? How much do children reveal about the shared world they live in, in the day to day routines of school? What constitutes childhood in a primary classroom? What social constructions do children gather about teacher expectations

from the other children and from the teacher?   Finally, how do children

learn the things necessary for survival in their classroom world?

CHAPTER II

THE STUDY OF CULTURE IN CLASSROOM LIFE

Research on classroom life in schools can be arranged in three
general categories: (1) studies in which children are subjects who are
tested and measured according to the effects of materials, their environ-
ments, or educators' methods; (2) studies in which children are not only
subjects but respondents whose learning achievements, attitudes, values,
and interactions are assessed; and (3) studies in which children are
actually interpreters of their cultural world.

Educational research which has stressed interaction analyses
studies of classroom settings use children as subjects. Studies which
use socio-psychological environmental or child developmental schema are
those in which children are not only subjects but respondents. Many
studies have been completed following these patterns. Studies of chil-
dren as participants who make known a cultural situation for inquiry,
anthropologically or sociologically, have been scant.

Children as Subjects

Interaction analysis. Interaction analysis is a way of looking at
classroom settings and daily events. This kind of analysis is the
systematic observation of teacher and student behavior, verbal or non-
verbal, in an educational setting. A multitude of observation systems
incorporate or measure aspects of the classroom on the cognitive, psycho-
logical, or social levels. Researchers attempt to isolate kinds of

interactions among and between children and adults. They have evolved

countless checklists, scales, and measures. These category, sign, or

rating scales allow researchers to judge the presence, absence, or degree

of behavior or interaction. In this context they are used to assess,

judge, or measure, the quality and kinds of events in a classroom.

The major purposes for interaction analysis studies have been: to

measure what the teacher does (means of instruction) and to examine

changes in learner behavior as a result of instruction (the outcomes of

instruction); to provide information for tenure, promotion, or salary;

to change, modify, or improve teachers' performances; to judge changes

in pupils, that is, development of character, social mindedness, creativ-

ity or integration of personality; to measure performance objectives;

and to use multiple bases for evaluation and student performance.

The greatest amount of interest and the major focus for interaction

analysis studies has been the relationship between the measures of class-

room behaviors (processes) and measures of student learning outcomes

(products). The first assumption held that variability in classroom

behavior can be tabulated. Researchers selected 'process-product'

dimensions from a narrow range. This meant that discrete instances of

behavior were plotted out of the flow and sequence of classroom events.

The second assumption has been that behaviors should agree with the

specified criteria. Researchers used 'low inference' observational

instruments which isolated teacher behaviors. The third assumption

posited a relationship between observed classroom behavior and outcome

measures. Finally, the implicit assumption was that observed teacher

behaviors have a direct effect on student outcomes. Data obtained from

direct observation of classroom interaction are seldom collected and

analyzed (Rosenshine, 1970).

Flanders' Verbal Interaction Analysis is one of the foremost and seminal classroom observation systems. The focus is teaching, rather than studenting. For example, it provided a conceptual framework for understanding teacher/pupil interactions. The underlying assumptions reflected process/product research design: specific or isolated processes carried out by the teacher would produce improved student achievement or pupil growth. A change in teacher verbal behaviors would facilitate pupil growth; a change in teacher insights about children would produce higher student achievement scores; and, a change in teachers' understandings about classrooms as places where the young are exposed to society's ways and values would produce gains in student achievement. For these purposes Flanders isolated different kinds of verbal interactions. Through this perspective, teaching was the focus rather than the social world which students constructed and which gave meaning to their daily activities. Teaching was viewed as a pattern of acts, logically related to certain perceived outcomes.

Researchers have subsequently used Flanders' scale or modifications of his categories. For example, Brown, Ober, Soar, and Webb (1967) have developed the Teacher Observation Record, the Florida Taxonomy of Cognitive Behavior and Reciprocal Category System. These provided a framework for observing and reading the cognitive behaviors of teachers and students in a classroom; for assessing the cognitive level of functioning of teachers and students in a classroom; and as a means of collecting the same kinds of information about the pupils as about the teacher (p. 12).

The research findings from studies of interaction analysis and

observation have been "non-significant," "conflicting," and "anomalous"
(Borich, 1976). It appears that researchers cannot agree on criteria,
definitions, or categories. There is no overall framework or model; no
conceptualization to guide researchers in choosing teacher and pupil
behaviors to observe. For example, the meanings for teacher-pupil
behaviors have been based on observation and not a concern for the
intentionality of the actions. The results, then, have produced iso-
lated category systems defining a very narrow and limited perspective of
classroom interaction.

Research using Flanders' categories or modifications of his cate-
gories has shown that verbal interaction occupies a great deal of time in
a classroom, and that teacher-student interactions are many and complex.
However, the sheer complexity of communication in a classroom is diffi-
cult to simplify into a fragmented view of teaching (Atkin, 1967-68).
For example, if researchers have accumulated 600 elements of teacher-
pupil interaction, 200 of which are non-recurring this means these many
elements may contribute to an observation system of 100 categories of
teacher-pupil behavior. In turn, these categories could involve 10,000
different patterns of teaching behavior and combinations of three ele-
ments could involve well beyond a million distinct teaching patterns
(Campbell & Barnes, 1969).

Findings have been conflicting because researchers have often used
locally developed instruments rather than attempting to improve existing
measures with replication studies. It appears that no two investiga-
tions have used instruments which possess the same reliability or
validity while at the same time measuring variables operationally
defined in the same way. Moreover, few studies in the literature

provide a rationale for the kinds of teacher behavior they assess.

Interaction analyses findings have been anomalous because of the emphasis on abstractions. These are groups of properties that can be abstracted from people, objects, and events. Although it is granted that most theoretical educational research deals with abstractions, this research has stressed prediction of learning based on instructional practices. Individuals have been guided by a belief in facts, methods, means, techniques, and procedures and thereby assume a direct link between teacher behavior and student learning outcomes.

In summary, the criticisms of this way of looking at or understanding classroom situations have been based on methodological concerns: global observations; manipulation and assignment or non-assignment of equal weights to insignificant variables; a search for clear cut boundaries; literal statements; and an attempt to establish categories. The perspective that teaching is a multi-dimensional act in nature is lost. Any isolated category system is by definition a very narrow and limited perspective, conceptualization, or framework for the whole range of possible teacher behaviors and teacher-student interactions.

Further, interaction analyses studies depend upon the validity and reliability of the observers and the validity and reliability of the instruments used. Researchers have reported anomalous findings because they have been constrained by observer bias. It is admitted for example, that rating scales lack precision because they are essentially subjective judgements. Raters view selectively and measure qualitatively. All aspects of an educational setting cannot be covered by observation categories. Consequently, we cannot measure success or failure in one or another aspect of the teaching process (Borich, 1976).

Finally, observational systems and interaction analyses tend to ignore the social activities of the pupil in his own situation. There is a disregard for the meanings and understandings that students may give to classroom events and teacher-student interactions. Rather, the objective for such studies has been to examine the factual properties, based upon observation accounts. This has resulted in a detached view of classroom life.

Piaget's theory of the development of knowledge. Jean Piaget presents another type of detached view of the child's world. He spent many hours observing his own children and others; however, he too has an adult ideology which pervades his epistemological theory about the development of children's knowledge about their world. His is an "assimilation of all other views of the child's world into logico-mathematic structuralism" (Silver, 1975). Because he represents the orientation of the nineteenth and twentieth century logic of science, his sentiments are not very different from the logico-positivists. As a result, his work reveals that he judged children by the ideal features of adults.

For example, when Piaget attempted to understand children's reasoning he presented them as deficient subjects seen in the shadows of adults. For his purposes he used many concrete materials with the children and posed questions to them. These questions were actually Piaget's formulations about the empirical world. The children's answers were then compared with Piaget's own "commonsense or scientific explanations, he (did) not try to pursue how the world could be understood their way" (Silver, 1975). Piaget used the manner of an adult scientist when he asked children the rules of games in order to gather the children's moral rules (Speier, 1976). This serves as a second example of his

orientation.

Further, Piaget's adult ideological view of the development of children and childhood are inherent in his disregard for interactional elements in children's games. Evidence for this is in his question-answer sessions when he overlooked the nature of adult-child interaction. In his interpretations of children's games he saw no relevance in children's cultural activities as expressed in these games. His classic psychological stance evidenced an adult ideological position. For example, the children's answers to his questions were subject to his own epistemological indicators of intellectual and social development. The fact that he used a theoretical framework before he undertook his observations is considered an "adult ideological position" (Speier, 1976, p. 172). Unfortunately, Piaget's theory of the development of knowledge has been taken by school practitioners to be a psychological theory of learning. Piaget's theory disregarded how children "mutually built social occasions" (p. 172). He did not consider the formal properties of children's interactional events (p. 172). Moreover, Piaget ignored the "interactional foundations to social knowledge and commonsense every-day life" (p. 172). Consequently, there is a lack of the social dimension in Piaget's psychological theory. It is a sociological vacuum (Sullivan, 1975).

It is granted that Piaget used commonsense resources; however, he did not make them topics of enquiry. Speiers (1976) contends that this is ironic; furthermore, Silver (1975) suggests that Piaget "violated the very life-world he sought to understand." As a consequence, Piaget has not helped us to discover how children mutually build social occasions or how the complex interactions between the world of the adult and the

child's world take place. The pitfall, then, is that we as adults and educators ascribe or judge children's actions either developmentally or individualistically against some stages of "normal" development.

Children as Respondents

Sociological/anthropological approaches. Sindell (1969) suggests there are three major sociological/anthropological ways of looking at classrooms: (1) to look at schools and their relations with the socio-cultural milieux in which they exist; (2) to describe and analyze classroom practices; and (3) to study individual educators.

The first has as its underlying principles the relationships each school system, each school, and each classroom might have with the broader social and cultural contexts in which schools exist. Generally, the school is considered only one of the enculturative agencies that affects children.

The strengths of these studies are in the interrelationships given the effects of social and cultural processes occurring in the surrounding milieux. Usually, ". . . a cross-cultural comparative framework is used when (researchers) present their findings" (Sindell, p. 595). These have included familial socialization, urbanization, and modernization (p. 593).

The methodology used is traditional sociological/anthropological studies with two emphases: field work in an educational setting, and fieldwork in the community. Some studies of Canadian issues in this mode include work in a Canadian Indian (Kwakiutl) village (Wolcott, 1967) and in a residential school serving Canadian Indian children in the Yukon Territory (King, 1969; Sindell, 1969).

Classrooms in relationship to the socio-cultural milieux. Louis

Smith's work in educational settings is an example of the anthropological approach with two emphases, school and community. In his first major work (Smith, 1967) he tried to relate the activities of classroom life to the objectives of the teachers. He described and offered explanations for classroom events in terms of outside events. For example, the kinds of relations between schools and the socio-cultural milieu in which they existed were "ripples in the classroom structure" not easily discoverable by an occasional observer. He provided the example of busing. In his efforts to describe and analyze processes in the school as a whole he spent many months in the classroom he studied and he became involved with the school in various roles. As a result, he emphasized that educators and sociologists needed to know more about educational aims and objectives as they were reflected in classroom processes.

An important finding in Smith's observations of the classroom was that a long-term pattern emerged. Not only did he discover a social system wherein individual children had both informal and formal roles, but he also found that within this system there were routines and rituals established. These appeared to be most significantly established during the first few days of the school year and they played an important part in the emergence of the social system.

The weaknesses of broad studies arise when they remain at the descriptive level; they generate sociological laws and not subjective understanding; they present their findings from the teachers' views of reality; and, they have not intentionally interacted with children. Children have not been used as key informants either formally or informally or in structured interviews. Silberman (1969) and Holt (1964)

have described classrooms but, from their own views of reality and with their own concerns for change. There are very few interactional analyses and anthropological descriptions that have asked questions about and have taken as their focus the everyday world of the classroom. Finally, there are few studies which have considered the possibility that a children's culture exists along with an adult culture in a classroom setting.

Smith and Geoffrey (1968) used anthropological techniques in an urban classroom to generate a general theory of instruction. Geoffrey, the teacher, and Smith, the researcher, comprised an ethnographic team. The two gathered extensive field notes. Geoffrey wrote and compiled notes while Smith spent much time writing "running process records" in the classroom. After school he made summary observations and interpretations. Together, they developed hypotheses and then returned to their ethnographic data to list and to elaborate.

The strength of this methodology was in Smith's "interpretive asides." These occurred as he wrote down any insights or tentative interpretations as he was observing. These then were used in developing hypotheses. These techniques can be defined ". . . as a series of studies that follow each other daily and build on each other in a cybernetic fashion" (Wilson, S., 1977).

There were criticisms launched against their approach. Sindell (1969) suggests Smith and Geoffrey did not relate anything they observed to events outside the classroom, the teachers seemed to exist in a cultural vacuum, and their findings were questionable because they asked "purely psychological questions of the data." Yet these criticisms could be deemed to be inconsequential if the interest for the study was

the social system within the classroom.

Finally, the purpose for Smith and Geoffrey's work was to generate
law statements; rather than to gather subjective understandings. Con-
sequently, there is a lack of information derived from children concern-
ing the social meaning of classroom life.

Context, setting, and analyses of classroom processes. Socio-
logical/psychological studies about classroom settings have emphasized
processes in children's socialization or efforts to recover children's
perceptions, or ratings of children's attitudes toward school, teacher,
or curriculum. Classroom studies of settings and children's socializa-
tion from their point of view are scant and varied. McKay (1973)
described Grade One children in Alberta, Canada, and their conceptions
and socialization in a school setting. Sociological studies of chil-
dren's perceptions are rare. Lightfoot (1973) assessed perceptions of
both teachers and students in an elementary classroom in the United
States; and Blandford (1977) addressed her work directly to children's
perceptions of school in Great Britain. Carew and Lightfoot (1979)
sought to describe the social contexts which surrounded the interactions
of teachers and children in three classrooms in an urban integrated
neighborhood in the United States. In their study, they interviewed
children as part of their methodology. They gathered children's per-
ceptions of the three teachers whose classroom interactions were recorded.

Studies which attempted to discover children's attitudes toward
school, teacher, curriculum, or classroom events are more common in the
literature of educational psychology. For example, Henry (1957) examined
attitude organization in elementary school children. Barker-Lunn (1969,
1972) examined the influence of sex, achievement, and social class on

these variables. Beere (1973) devised a group instrument to measure children's attitudes; while Herrman (1972) conducted research into children's classroom status as perceived by children and the relationship these perceptions had with teacher approval and disapproval.

Research about classroom processes fail to document children's responses to the classroom environment in any systematic manner. We know very little about children's perceptions of their learning experiences, and everyday social experiences. Not only do we not know how children perceive the classroom environment but we have not gathered any information about what they, the children, perceived to be salient and important in the classroom world. The lives of children are conspicuously absent from studies on classroom process. The voices of children are not heard in the research literature about school classrooms (Carew & Lightfoot, 1979, p. 4).

Studies of individual pupils and educators. Ethnographic field research used with a small group or individual as the focus for the study represent an anthropological approach to the examination of classroom settings. They are efforts to document the activities of pupils and educators. Jackson (1968) and Rist (1970) studied routine classroom events in our society; Wolcott (1973) chronicled days in the life of an individual participant; and Burnett (1969) used a field research approach.

Philip Jackson's (1968) work represents a concern for the everyday routine happenings in classrooms as he understood it to be experienced by the children themselves. Jackson's studies can be classified as cultural studies using ethnographic techniques with a small group. He extended his analyses from the classroom to schools as social institutions

based on data comprising official curricula devised by educators. He

pointed out the existence of a 'hidden curriculum' which served the social

institution called 'the schools'. He suggested that society pays a price

for the relationship between conformity--good behavior, docility, and

acquiescence to authority--as demanded by the schools, and intellectual

prowess. The results are the production of 'social scholars'.

Jackson advanced premises about everyday life in a classroom.

These included the notion that the teacher is a "gate keeper who manages

the flow of interaction"; a "supply sergeant" doling out resources; a

granter of special privileges to deserving students; the assigner of

coveted duties; and finally an "official timekeeper, one who sees that

things begin and end at the same time."

According to Jackson, the classroom world, defined as the routine,

taken for granted occurrences of everyday life, includes students who

feel they are in a cage from which there is no escape. They consider

school activities dull and repetitious. The most salient features are

delay, denial, and interruption. Jackson concluded that the "pain of

school life was a natural outgrowth of the problems of institutionalized

living and the management of social traffic" (Jackson, 1976, pp. 345-

357). Students adapted to and coped with the "mundane features of

school life" by expressing patience and resignation by "masquerading,"

masking, or feigning enthusiasm for educational affairs. They either

displayed masks of enthusiasm or masks of indifference.

Jackson's work provides an example of the adult-centrism rampant in

educational research about school settings. Although he spent three

years observing the "students' world" he overemphasized his own observa-

tion methodology with little discussion of his methods and how

interpretations and generalizations were made. He displayed bias in

studying other people's reality as he saw it--as an adult's. He was an

'outsider' to the students' world as they experienced it. Not only did

he take an external or etic (Wilson, 1976) framework but he also cate-

gorized and pushed his observations into this framework. Although

Jackson's central concern was "with action in the classroom" he deduced a

form of explanation. He began with his assured theoretical premises, he

then used empirically described facts and the conditions he found in the

classroom to substantiate these premises. His research interests were

in features he considered to be meaningful to the actors involved.

Jackson obliterated the pupils' or insiders' discriminations and neglected

the social construction of interaction because he assumed there was 'cog-

nitive consensus' among the teacher and children. This he assumed in his

studies of the patterns of action in the classroom. He suggested that

pupils discriminated between situations and actions in very nearly the

same way. In his analysis, Jackson made no discrimination between how

he, as an adult viewed the 'students' world' or 'life in classrooms', and

how the students viewed it. Because he used the etic (outside) frame-

work of normative sociology when he described the events he observed, the

events were interpreted by an outsider, Jackson, the adult.

Finally, Jackson's methodology provided educators with a perspec-

tive albeit adult, which raised questions about the intolerability of the

students' world. He was accessible to it for such a long time,--three

years--as an observer. Indeed, he came right up to the students in the

classroom; but, he did not report empathetic understanding of their world

as interpreted to him by the participants in his study. He did not gain

subjective understanding of their perspectives. The major methodological

limitation of his work is the lack of information derived from children
themselves.   There are no data about their views of the classroom.
Jackson formulated what he thought.they had experienced without validat-
ing his interpretations with the actors in the situation.   This limita-
tion to his work is important.

Rist (1970) used ethnographic procedures and studied teachers'
expectations and how they were mirrored in and magnified by the behavior
and attitudes of children in the classroom.   He pointed out that chil-
dren might reject their teacher's judgements and behave in a manner
deliberately in conflict with her expectations.   Secondly, he suggested
that if we really want to understand the influence of teacher expecta-
tions we need to explore the complicated network of relationships among
children.   Thirdly, Rist's study made a significant contribution
because he not only provided an analysis of critical factors in the
teacher's development of expectations but he documented the process by
which these expectations influenced the classroom experiences of both the
teacher and the children.   Finally, his observations underscored educa-
tional researchers' need to consider expectations that children have of
one another.   The issue at hand, then, is that expectations--teacher's
or children's or both intermeshed--develop out of the interactional
experiences of the participants in a classroom (Carew & Lightfoot, 1979,
p. 12).

Wolcott (1968, 1969) described and analyzed a school participant;
a principal was the key informant.   He used a diverse methodology which
included ". . . three kinds of materials: enumerative and census data;
protocols and field notes based on participant observation;   and inter-
views with informants" (Wolcott, 1968, 1969).   His contribution was in

the role of participant observer using several methods for data collection. The single vision of one method cannot by its own nature encompass all the important aspects of the phenomena of school life from any participant's point of view. Wolcott attempted to provide a consciousness of the motivating forces that shaped his research by reporting rich details of the setting and detailed descriptions of a small number of social events.

Burnett (1968) combined community and ethnographic procedures which used interviews and observations with both children and adults. She attempted to uncover how children and adults viewed each other and how they viewed common problems. But, Lightfoot (1979) believes that children receive many messages from teachers that go beyond or are in conflict with the interactions an observer might witness. Further, for researchers to interpret teachers' behavior responsibly they need to know the teacher's perceptions of the social structure of the classroom (Carew & Lightfoot, 1979, p. 23). Significantly, Jules Henry (1957) suggested that the most important aspect of teacher-child communication in the classroom is the transmission of teacher value orientations to the children (Henry, 1957, pp. 117-133). This means that Jackson's later (1977) warning that there are dangers in perceiving classroom experience as one that is shared equally by all children should be heeded. He points out that the perspectives of the classroom's participants are as many as there are pairs of eyes through which to view the particular environment (Jackson, 1977).

In summary, there has been a decided bias on the part of these researchers toward studying reality as adults see it. These studies portrayed the teacher as the central actor in the classroom--the maker

of the child product (Carew & Lightfoot, 1979, p. 6). This oversimpli-
fied picture of life in classrooms, one in which the teacher looms large
and imposing, has as a basic but hidden assumption that the teacher
follows some standard routine in his/her interactions with children,
much like a factory worker who follows a sequence of steps in assembling
a machine (p. 6). These studies were not objectively comprehensive in
capturing the perceptions of many different participants in the classroom
drama (p. 24).

The anthropological/sociological and psychological approaches
reviewed suggest research weaknesses: (1) there has been a bias toward
studying classrooms and cultures only as adults present it or see it;
(2) there has been an overemphasis on observational methods; (3) there
has been little empirical discussion of methods and methodology;
(4) there has been insufficient information about how the methods are
used to gather information; (5) there has been scant information about
the exact conditions in which research has been done; (6) there has not
been enough information about the interviews used; and (8) there has
been little attention given to the distinctions between outsider (etic)
and insider (emic) viewpoints.

Children as Interpreters

The examination of classroom settings by researchers whose interests
have been within the normative paradigm have been represented in the studies
using interaction analyses, the sociological/anthropological rule-governed
studies, and in Jean Piaget's work.

Studies of children's classroom life within the interpretive
paradigm are those in which the major focus is on the interactions among
the participants; the uncovering of the shared meanings for actions and

events occurring around them.   These kinds of studies which view children as interpreters of their classroom experiences have not been fully explored by educational researchers using classroom settings.

Phenomenologists.   In contrast to developmental approaches to the study of children, phenomenologists have as their interest in research the common everyday life of the child.   A specific focus would be on the children's practices for constructing meaning.   It is supposed that by exposing their interpretive understandings researchers can begin to know how children themselves organize their activities (Silver, pp. 47-51).

In contrast to Piaget's disregard for the interactional elements in children's culture, phenomenologists make an effort to preserve children's forms of reasoning.   Instead of an extrinsic epistemological framework imposed on children's thinking processes there are ways to preserve children's various forms of reasoning.   Van Manen (1978) suggests that children's talk reveals that their views of reality are different to those of adults.   Rather than Piaget's pre-formulated answers there need to be attempts to have children display their world, as it is understood and taken-for-granted by them, among themselves.   Adults will need to "cross over to the children's world in order to share their view of the world" (Van Manen, 1978, pp. 1-17).   Thus far, adults have used external divisions between what children consider to be real; therefore, children's plausible descriptions appear incomplete (Silver, pp. 47-51). Finally, children's culture needs to be thought about in ". . . keeping with its distinctive features" (pp. 47-51).

Cultural examinations.   Research about cultural events in classrooms have been derived from many sources.   These have included Speier's (1970) and Cicourel's (1971) concerns with children's

acquisition of language, Kelly's (1955) work about personal constructs and communication, studies about shared perceptions and hypothetical social constructs conceived by Berger and Luckmann (1966) based on the social construction of reality and carried out by Elliott (1975, 1976), Kounin's (1969) psychological naturalistic studies, and the ethnomethodological study of classroom life carried out by Mehan (1979).

Speier (1970) pointed out that what is classically problematic about studying children is the process of their cultural induction (p. 188). Significantly, he went further and suggested a simple definition for socialization as the acquisition of interactional competencies. Speier contended that Cicourel's studies of children's language acquisition had erroneously pre-supposed a good knowledge of children's interactional competencies. It was Speier's belief that no investigation of acquisitional processes on the part of children can effectively get underway until the concrete features of interactional competencies are analyzed as topics in their own right (p. 189). Finally, he stated emphatically that an investigation of the concrete features of competent interaction is nothing more or less than a study of what children normally and routinely do in their everyday activities.

George Kelly's (1955) work about personal constructs was essentially psychologically based. However, he investigated the way people conceptualize the important people in their lives. Kelly's work about personal constructions in communication spawned interaction studies about social constructs.

Ethnographic studies about shared perceptions and hypothetical constructs were carried out by Elliott (1975, 1976) which suggested that teachers' hypothetical constructs may or may not match the perceptions

or constructs shared by their students. These findings point to the major research question, what are the shared meanings for classroom events among teachers and children in an educational setting?

Kounin's (1969) work pointed out the complexity of events and people in individual classrooms. He stated there are four major issues for students and teachers to handle in the classroom world. The first is the dense collection of people. Indeed, Kounin suggested that the schoolroom group can be viewed as a large collectivity ". . . where scattered events come in rapid succession." The second is the rapid flow of verbal exchanges between a teacher and pupils, while the third is the easy opportunity for spontaneous expression on the part of both the teacher and the children. Finally, the program of activities planned by the teacher is managed by all participants.

Mehan's (1979) ethnomethodological study provided a significant conceptualization for examining classroom life. His research interests were in children's contributions to the classroom routines and events; a relationship between children's verbal and non-verbal behavior; a relationship between the participants' behavior to the context of the situation; and the function of language as an expression of a shared culture among classroom participants (Mehan, 1979, p. 10). The ethnomethodological approach used by Mehan attempted to overcome the difficulties inherent in the usual field ethnographies with participant observation. These difficulties are the tendency on the part of researchers to report with anecdotal data, providing only a few exemplary instances of behavior culled from the field notes; the usual habit of not providing a criteria or grounds for interpreting certain data, that is, to try to achieve typicality and representativeness and yet not preserve the materials upon

which the analysis was conducted; and the convention of not retaining

the original form of the materials (Mehan, 1979, p. 16).

Although Mehan's methodology and documentation are a major contri-

bution to studies of classroom events, the interpretation of the video-

taped sequences recorded in the classroom, and the data gathered for

further linguistic analyses of teacher and children talk, were made from the

researcher's perspective. An opportunity to take advantage of the chil-

dren's participation in the study and have them interpret the conversa-

tions and videotaped sequences of their classroom life was not evidenced

in Mehan's work.

As suggested earlier, Jackson (1968) was not alone in ignoring

children as key informants to substantiate the emic (insiders') point of

view, traditional interests in studies about children have been future

oriented rather than looking at children as they are, right now at whatever

time and place they are found to be interacting with themselves and with

adults. Researchers who have identified socialization as a major goal

for schools have overlooked the interactional foundations of group life.

"The processes by which children and adults say and do things together

has not been adequately researched" (Speier, 1976, p. 170). The kinds

of studies required are those in which the children are interactants with

adults and interactants among themselves in educational settings.

Hallowell (1976) has suggested that we in the occidental world con-

tribute to the features of a child mentality. We appear to have made

positive efforts to keep children 'childish'. Similarly, Speier (1976)

has contended that there is evidence of an 'adultcentric' bias in favor

of what a child will become. In our concerns for the child's develop-

mental process, from child to adult, we have overlooked the events of

childhood as interpreted by the children themselves.

The Interpretive Approach

The three central premises for research following the interpretive approach revolve around the suggestion that perceptions are individual. There is no best way of seeing an event as an action and subsequently describing its features other than through the documentary method of interpretation. The first premise states that actions are made up of and have their existence only through the participants' own interpretations. The second premise states that a researcher has access to these same actions as they are described to him/her only through documentary interpretation. Finally, the accounts from participants are treated as descriptions of patterns of action or of expectations or dispositions in which the researcher is interested (Wilson, T., 1971, p. 70).

Of importance within the interpretive approach are the guiding principles which recognize the standpoint of the actor and consider the three central premises; but, the researcher too strikes a reflective stance and constructs a personal description as a basis for analysis by looking through the reports of the children to identify the underlying pattern they reflect. For example, in order to overcome the methodological weaknesses of studies conducted in classroom settings, a combination of the important techniques based on the interpretive approach and ethnographic studies in educational settings as suggested by Mehan and Elliott may be developed. These include field notes, rapport with students, the insider's view, and the interrelationships of the data collected.

Ethnographic description and interpretation. Ethnographic description falls under the aegis of the interpretive paradigm because the

research orientation is the phenomenology of social understandings. Research interests associated with interpretive social science are the furthering of one's understanding of culturally produced social activities and relationships, and an interest in communication and the recovery of meanings for authentic experiences.

There is a fair degree of consensus as to what constitutes normal anthropological research. When such research is considered interpre-.tive, the theoretical principles for use (in this instance the interpretation of children's experiences in a classroom setting) may fall within a definition of a paradigm: the participants act toward things on the basis of meanings that the objects and events have for them; the meanings of such events or objects are derived from, or arise out of the social interaction that individual participants have with each other; and, these meanings are handled within and modified through interpretive processes used by participants in dealing with the things they encounter.

Further, interpretation means not to just recount the events which occur in a culture, but to say exactly what I must know to make those events maximally probable. The interpretation of the culture is not to state merely what someone did but to state precisely the conditions under which it is appropriate to anticipate that the person occupying the role will render an equivalent performance. It would be necessary to study the social construction of reality in the situation from the position of the actors--an emic viewpoint. The actions in the classroom are forged

by participants out of their perceptions, interpretations, and judgements.
I, as researcher, would attempt to see the operating situation as the
actors see it, I would attempt to perceive the objects as the actors per-
ceive them.   I would try to ascertain the meanings for objects in terms
of the meanings they have for the actors, and would attempt to follow the
individuals' lines of conduct as they organize them.   In essence, then,
I would attempt to take the role of the child and see the world from that
point of view.

To adjudicate the quality of the work done incurs the use of some
criteria or test of descriptive adequacy.   This refers to the
informants' interpretations of events and not simply to the occurrence
of events (Frake, 1964, p. 112).   The test for adequacy is found in
the kinds of activities whereby participants produce and manage the
classroom situation of organized everyday affairs and how they are iden-
tical with members' procedures for making the classroom situation
accountable.

In summary, the two principles for ethnographic descriptions are:
to recover the shared meanings in a situation and to uncover how partic-
ipants construct their reality and define their situation.

Procedures for Portrayal

The procedures for portrayal are: to assemble all the data, field
notes, identifications, interpretations, categorizations for objects and
events in a setting, all the photographs, taped interviews; to identify
the variations among the assembled range of instances; to classify data
into an articulate set of what appears to be phenomenological or observer/
justifiable types, and, to present these phenomenological instances in an

orderly labelled or named manner.

Course of assertion or telling. The course of assertion or telling includes the social interaction among participants, the objects, the individual children as actors or participants, human action, and the interconnection of lines of action. The culture may be derived, then, from what participants do. The social structure refers to the kinds of relationships derived from how participants act toward each other.

Maxims of good ethnography. The four maxims of good ethnography to be followed are: (1) to make provision for the inconsequentiality of my presence; (2) to seek not to impose a perspective on the domain, but rather, to have surface the perspective native to it; (3) to give atten- tion to techniques for gathering data which may be constitutive of the data gathered; and (4) to attend to the premise that any domain has as a leading feature the differentiated distribution of competence amongst its members. Within this context informants need to be well-informed and natives have to be entitled to speak as natives for their domain (Stoddart, 1979, p. 14).

Photography as ethnographic description.

The language used by "sociology" is frequently abstract, even enigmatic and sometimes positively incomprehensible, whereas the ethnographer displays a marked preference for concrete experi- ences which are always unique. This type of approach no doubt explains why it is traditional--or--exotic--ethnographic research which in recent years has provided the greatest number of . . . documents on man's social condition. (deHeusch, 1962, p. 27)

The procedures for photography and the inquiry into classroom cul- ture may become identical. The results are a presentation of an alter- native way of describing a situation; not only a tool for inquiry, but also as a medium of communication. As such, they may direct my observa- tions and serve to discriminate and order my data. For example, the

photographic discoveries may become more and more directed and intensive.
Finally, there are only a few lines of inquiry into everyday events.
The photographs may be made out of the classroom realities; the plans or
shooting strategies may become hypotheses about a subject, object, or
event.   These tentative hypotheses may become referential truths which
can be 'tested'.   The on-going photography and plans may be modified.
These then, are suggestions for other provisional hypotheses which in
turn become definite plans.

<u>Summary</u>

In studies involving children as subjects, the observation systems
and interaction analyses have tended to ignore the social activities of
the students in their own situations.   They have also tended to dis-
regard the meanings and understandings students may give to classroom
events.   There has been a further tendency to provide only a detached
view of classroom life.   For example, Piaget did not address either how
children mutually build social occasions or the children's interactional
foundations to social knowledge and commonsense everyday living.
Studies of this ilk are sociological vacuums which have not helped us to
discover how children mutually build social life or how the complex
interactions between the world of the adult and the child's world take
place.

In studies involving children as respondents, particular social
systems in classrooms with informal and formal routines and rituals have
been uncovered; but, these studies have not provided subjective under-
standings of either the teachers' or children's worlds.   Children have
generally not been key informants.   The possibility of a children's cul-
ture in a classroom has not been explored.   These studies have tended to

generate law statements rather than subjective understanding. There has been an overall lack of information derived from children concerning the social meaning of classroom life.

In studies of the context, setting, and analyses of classroom life the research findings have been diffuse and unrelated--rather unsystematized. From these studies we know little about children's perceptions of their learning experiences and everyday social experiences. Further, we do not know what children consider salient and important in their classroom world. Ironically, the voices of children are not heard in the reports of studies of the context, setting, and analyses of classroom life.

In studies of individual pupils, educators, and classrooms, there is evident adult-centrism, and an overemphasis on interpretation of data from researchers' perspectives rather than participants' validations for these data. The pupils' or insiders' views are neglected and the social construction of reality through interaction in the classroom is overlooked because an etic or outsiders' framework is used for data analysis. Again, subjective understanding of participants' understandings are lacking and validation of researchers' interpretations of the social situations studied with the actors in the situations are not provided.

Researchers, in studies of children as interpreters: (1) explore the complicated network of relationships among children; (2) consider expectations children have of one another; (3) use a diverse methodology when examining social situations; (4) attempt to capture the perceptions of many different situations; (5) consider interactional competencies among children; (6) look at events of childhood as interpreted by children themselves; and (7) use children as key informants about their

own social experiences in a classroom.

Mehan (1979), Elliott (1975, 1976), and Stoddart (1979) provide a basis for the development of a schema for adequate ethnographic description of classroom settings. The schema include participant observation, field notes, rapport with students, and the insider's view. It has been pointed out that quantification methods minimize the contributions students make to the organization of classroom events. Children and teacher work together to create social structure and the classroom can be seen to be socially organized. The many non-verbal contributions made to classroom events cannot be overlooked either by simple time sampling techniques which obscure the sequential flow of classroom activity, or by neglecting the social organization of classroom events. Each event is guided by normative rules, and a different rule applies to different events. Students learn the rules that apply in each situation, and on the basis of their interactional competencies they are able to recognize the differences between situations and produce the behavior appropriate to each situation.

Stoddart (1979) suggests bases for ethnographic description within the interpretive paradigm by outlining procedures for portrayal, a course of assertion or telling, and the maxims of good ethnography. Photography as a means for ethnographic description and inquiry about classroom culture has a basis for use from a long tradition of visual anthropology and documentary interpretation by visual anthropologists. Ethnographic description combined with photography and the interpretive paradigm provide a new way of looking at everyday life in a classroom.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION

The goal of this ethnographic and interpretive style of research is
to gather data which describe the interactional work participants do to
assemble the events in their setting into social structure or a class-
room culture. It is considered that each of these events is guided by
normative rules and that different rules apply to different events.
Because these rules are tacit, seldom stated in words, the research task
is to uncover the implicit rules in a particular primary classroom setting.

Conceptual Framework

According to Stoddart (1979), "The good ethnographer seeks not to
impose a perspective on the domain but to surface the perspective native
to it" (p. 3). In this study the focus was the whole classroom setting
as seen from the point of view of the participants. The reality of class-
room life, from this view, is one that is assumed to be socially constructed
by participants: the children, the teacher, and the researcher. Together
they shared varying levels of competencies, skills, and understandings about
how to conduct themselves in that setting.

It was assumed that participants make sense of their social reality
in a number of ways: how they interact and view each other; how they
learn things necessary for survival; how they become knowledgeable about
shared meanings; how they come to understand the rules for action in
their culture; how they live through an average day; what it is that

children and teacher see themselves doing; and, what it is one has to know to gain acceptability as a member, that is, ". . . how to be competent in the things the members are expected to be competent in" (Goodenough, 1964, p. 111). How participants carry out and do these things have seldom been directly examined in educational research about classrooms; rather, they have been treated as though they could not be known, or were not important links between input and output (Mehan, 1979, p. 4). We are presently lacking descriptions of the actual processes of education inside classrooms from the insiders' perspectives. In this view, then, children's interpretations of their social world direct their social actions toward goals because they share understandings provided by the milieu of the classroom. Further, children's experiences reflect their interpretations of the social world. Thus, children's accounts of their classroom life consist of interpretations of the social meanings of a classroom culture.

Based on interpretive social science, this means that routine events become significant and problematic and the study must deal with difficulties inherent in usual field ethnographies. Routine events must be brought out of the background of the setting to the foreground of the researcher's thoughts. To do this, pre-formulated research questions derived from observation of the setting and non-participant field notes were posed in two dimensions; questions of procedure and questions about the situation. As the study progressed, further questions arose from two sources: (1) answers given to the pre-formulated questions; and (2) information added sequentially by the participants to the growing corpus of knowledge about the situation.

There were matters to provide for in undertaking an interpretive

study. First, a means had to be discovered in order to document a socially constructed reality. Second, I wanted to deal with practical actions. Third, I hoped to recover shared knowledge that was taken for granted by participants. Finally, it was necessary to become part of the life of the children because the setting is viewed as self-organizing. Matched with these difficulties were the usual problems related to field methods: gaining entry; the role of participant observer; the relationship of the research study to the situation and to the subjects; and the use of an instrument, specifically a camera, as a means of portraying classroom life. To overcome these difficulties I chose to report all the data, not just exemplary tidbits; to use criteria for interpretation; to preserve materials used in analysis; and to retain the original form of the materials.

'Doing' ethnography. The first problem in doing an ethnographic study of classroom culture is the lack of a 'theoretical' or 'operational' definition. A working definition was chosen along with particular presuppositions about ways of looking at how participants in the classroom constituted their daily lives. It was presupposed that children's interpretations of the social world were a form of practical knowledge used by children in their daily lives. It was also presupposed that children's background knowledge and their daily experiences provide each child with a continually changing stock of knowledge that gives each child a means for practical reasoning. Further, it was presupposed that children reflect and act on the basis of their individual biographies and daily experiences. Such a stock of knowledge is derived from the events around children in a social milieu; from the handed down experiences of their parents; through their experiences with teacher and others; and

from an intersubjective world of reality available for children to inter-
pret because it pre-exists. They can experience it in an orderly way.

Based on these presuppositions a purposeful, careful description of
the classroom situation would include: (1) what takes place inside the
classroom; (2) what regularizes routines; and (3) what participants
envision to be an adequate description of the social organization. For
the description, the interpretive procedures used by the children to
understand the meanings in a classroom culture are assumed to be the
result of the children's understandings of a social structure and social
organization in a classroom setting. From this perspective the chil-
dren's states of existence in a classroom are ones in which they experi-
ence and interpret the many and continual impingements of daily life upon
themselves. Through systematic questioning and discussion with inform-
ants, the pre-conceived notions about the classroom can be examined; and
the superficial impressions gained can gradually be replaced with more
accurate insights. Through these processes, then, an attempt can be
made to document a socially constructed reality.

A second problem in doing an ethnographic study is that of dealing
with practical actions; what they are, how to make them accessible to study,
and what is to be learned about them (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 31). Any occasion
whatsoever in the classroom can be examined. The ethnographic purpose is
to identify children's practices of structuring or replicating practices
and effects so they can be recorded and validated (Garfinkel, 1967,
p. 31). The inquiry includes children's contributions to classroom
routines and events; the relationship between the participants' behavior
and the context of the situation; and participants' language or talk
as an expression of a shared culture among classroom participants (Mehan,

1979, p. 10). Conceptually, then, the children contributed to the organization of classroom events because they and the teacher constructed the reality by working together to formulate and construct the social organization of the classroom which they know and understand as participants.

A third problem is that of identifying the ways participants of the class invoke rules with which to define the coherent or consistent or planful. There are many organizations of common practices among members of a class creating the classroom organizational phenomena. Children work to achieve their objectives in the context of the teacher's objectives. Children provide information to the teacher and to each other verbally and non-verbally, and behave in a sequential flow of classroom activity. I needed to discover the rules for events, how different rules apply to different events; to discover and recognize differences between situations known and understood by participants; and to discover how pupils produce behavior appropriate to each situation.

A fourth problem in ethnographic studies is the self-organizing nature of the setting. This requires the use of properties which are recognized, used, produced, and talked about by participants rather than the use of a standard or rule obtained from outside. The rational properties, "efficiency, efficacy, effectiveness, intelligibility, uniformity, reproducibility of their everyday world" were sought (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 33). In the search it is is critical to establish a role which facilitates the collection of information and provides access to the children's interpretations of their world. To do this, I needed to become someone with whom participants were willing to share information. It was imperative for me to become part of the life world

that daily oriented participants.

Finally, the study attempted to overcome the difficulties inherent
in field ethnographies through the use of observation. These difficul-
ties are associated with the tendency to report anecdotal data providing
only a few exemplary instances of behavior culled from the field notes;
the lack of criteria or grounds for interpreting data; failure to
achieve typicality and representativeness by not preserving the materials
upon which the analysis was conducted; and the convention of not retain-
ing the original form of the materials (Mehan, 1979, p. 16).

In the study, 35 mm photography and tape-recorded interviews were
introduced in an attempt to preserve the research materials and thereby
allow extensive and repeated analysis. These materials can be presented
along with the analyses to document the conclusions in the study and thus
allows for alternative interpretations.

To overcome the lack of rigour suggested by the participant observer
role, all the photographs and all the transcripts can be presented. In
addition the guiding principles of what Mehan (1979) describes as
"constitutive ethnography" will be used as criteria.

Constitutive ethnography. The principles for constitutive ethnog-
raphy place structures and structuring on an equal footing, and operate
on the premise that social structures are interactional accomplishments.
In this study, an attempt is made to show how social factors of the class-
room world emerge from structuring work done by the participants them-
selves. The question of how the social facts of the classroom world do
emerge and become external and constraining is posed. If these social
facts become known as social rules in a setting they become part of the
classroom world as one of the participants' making and beyond their

making (Mehan, 1979, p. 17).

Guiding principles were adopted: (1) all data, materials gathered, photographs, interview transcripts and field notes are to be retained in their original form; (2) the entire corpus of materials will be analyzed; and (3) the cultural event or phenomenon that the researcher locates upon analysis must be a phenomenon that actually orients the behavior of participants during the course of their interaction (Mehan, 1979, p. 23).

Research Questions

The pre-formulated research questions are presented in two dimensions: questions about procedure, and questions about the situation.

1.0 Procedure

1.1 What were the physical arrangements for the setting?
1.2 How can I as researcher enter this world and share this reality?
1.3 What should I do to gain understanding of communications among children?
1.4 What was it one had to know to gain acceptability as a member, how could I become competent in the things members are expected to be competent in?

2.0 Situation

2.1 What meanings did students and teacher give to physical arrangements of the classroom?
2.2 What is it children share with each other about classroom routines and rules for behavior?
   a. What is this world of children's games, play, and socialization?
   b. How do they become knowledgeable of the shared meanings for objects, rules, and events?
   c. How much do children reveal about the shared world they live in, in the day-to-day routines of school?
2.3 How do young children themselves interpret their own lives in the classroom?
   a. What constitutes childhood in a primary classroom?
   b. What was it the teacher and children saw themselves doing?

> c. What social constructions do children gather about
>   teacher expectations from other children and from
>   the teacher?
> d. What did it mean to live out a day in a classroom?
> e. How do the children learn things necessary for
>   survival in the classroom world?

Field Work

Entry as participant observer. There is much written in the liter-
ature of sociology and anthropology about the means of doing field work
but there is less written about the problem of access or entry to a situ-
ation and how to understand the social rules of participants. Because
it is of great importance in such a study to have amicable relations with
persons in the setting, ways of establishing these good relations were
critical to the conduct of the study.

The teacher's privacy was invaded by the presence of the researcher;
therefore, the continuing conduct of the field work required reassurances
and a continuous process of maintaining and developing amicable relations.
In addition, my request for entry was the beginning of on-going negotia-
tions between the teacher and myself. For these purposes, I needed to
ensure that the teacher's freedom of action and the integrity of her
position were maintained.

Gaining entry and establishing a role that facilitated the collec-
tion of information and interpretations posed difficulties for me. For
example, my acquaintance with the school principal, who in turn arranged
for the particular classroom and teacher to take part in the study meant
that the situation was not a voluntary one on the part of the classroom

teacher. The teacher appeared to perceive the field notes being taken, the photographs taken, and my presence with a degree of wariness.

My difficulties in becoming a participant observer were partly attributable to the nature of class instruction, the desire on the part of the teacher to maintain control over the class activities of the children. The latter concern was manifested in my daily observations and the need on the part of the children--from the teacher's perspective--to be sitting quietly on task for the major part of the school day and the observations that activities were solely individual and rarely partner or group activities. These classroom characteristics contributed to my non-participant role for the first part of the study.

The children's desk arrangement was a major difficulty in adopting a participant observer's role and increased my image as 'stranger' in the setting. The desks were arranged in a diagonal fashion pointing to the classroom door. Although the spacing between the rows was wide enough for two adults to pass, I spent much of my field time seated at the back of the classroom near the sink and cloakroom. There were few opportunities offered to me to interact with any participants. However, when the teacher left the classroom--which was frequent, about every ten minutes--the children watched to see my reaction to their many communications and movements around the room. A non-reactive, non-judgemental stance on my part appeared to give the children the understanding that I did not identify myself with the teacher-role.

Another difficulty in gaining entry came about as a result of the teacher's modus operandi. She maintained a controlled discipline of the classroom to the extent that I hesitated to leave my seat at the back of the room to move into the children's grouping of desks to engage them

in either formal or informal communications. The only informal conver-
sation was with a boy seated alone, at the back of the room, near 'my
place'.

A third difficulty in gaining entry and participant-observer status
in the classroom was the need for the children to behave quietly, on task,
that is, to keep writing, crayoning, or reading. Finally, a fourth
obstacle encountered during the week of observation arose because the
children rarely did any activity with a partner and they were not observed
to work together in small groups. This meant the researcher was not able
to join any group of children either formally or informally. This last
difficulty meant that I had to devise other alternatives to gain entry to
the children's life world.

I suggested alternatives to the teacher; for example, initiating
group activities with the children (by the teacher) and I asked the
teacher to arrange for children to work on a task in a group. All of
these efforts were without result. I was an observer, an onlooker.

As a result, for a time, the kinds of observations were non-
participant. I attempted to ask questions based on observations in my
field notes that the children appeared to respond to in systematic ways
as they carried out their activities throughout a classroom day. The
focus for the inquiry and observations were the kinds of events, occur-
rences, and exchanges in the classroom setting investigated, for example,
teacher to student talk, teacher either in or out of the classroom.

However, during this time meticulous and extensive field notes
were collected. On the basis of these notes and observations I realized
that taking photographs of the classroom would increase my participation
with children. In other words, pictures provided an opportunity for

dialogue with the students. This proved useful. The role of photographer-participant-observer facilitated the collection of information about daily life routines and provided entry into the social structure of the classroom.

Participant observation. In my concern to gain the shared meanings of the group, I attempted to interpret the cultural pattern of the social group while maintaining an attitude of 'not knowing' or a suspension of beliefs and assumptions about classroom life. To do this I attempted not to impose a social order upon the situation; rather I made problematic the social order of daily life. That is to say, the social life in the classroom proceeded routinely because the commonsense ideas about what was happening in the social scenes I observed were known to the children. The activities which were carried out day by day in the classroom by the children and the teacher appeared clear to them. According to Alfred Schutz' sociological perspective the participants used 'trustworthy recipes' of shared knowledge which served their individual schemes for the interpretation of their daily activities (Schutz, 1973, p. 33). The ideas or background expectancies existed not simply in the mind of any one child but were sustained and originated in social action in the setting. In their world, the children's intersubjective or socially constructed reality, the rationality of their actions and the non-problematic nature of situations in their world is a continual accomplishment of social action. These then were their 'trustworthy recipes' of knowledge in daily life activities.

I attempted to discover these 'trustworthy recipes' which gave meaning to the participants for their day to day actions and events in the setting. I also continued the attitude of 'not knowing' and

questioned nearly everything that seemed to be unquestioned to the members

of the approached group.   I became a would-be-member of the group and not

just an onlooker.   Gradually, the new cultural pattern acquired a

particular environmental character.

The gradual cultural immersion I faced while trying to become

participant-observer can be explained on the basis of a scheme of orien-

tation.   The in-group could trust their cultural pattern to be natural;

whereas I was unable to get a starting point to take my bearings.

Secondly, the in-group saw the cultural pattern and its recipes as

representations of "a unit of coinciding schemes of interpretation as

well as expression" (Schutz, 1973, p. 35).

I as 'stranger' then, could not assume that my interpretation of

the "new cultural pattern coincided with the members of the in-group"

(p. 35).   To the in-group my manoeuvres with ambivalence between remote-

ness and intimacy, my hesitation, uncertainty, and distrust of matters

which to the in-group seemed very simple, presented two kinds of atti-

tudes on my part toward the group.   I hoped to appear objective and yet

at the same time loyal to the students and to the teacher.   The two

attitudes provided me with a degree of social tension.

Following this I, as 'stranger' needed to examine all the elements

of my growing knowledge of the classroom culture "with care and preci-

sion" while at the same time not falling into a web or "labyrinth of

meanings" in which I might have lost all sense of my bearings and orien-

tation (Schutz, 1973, p. 37).

Role of participant observer.   During the last ten days of the

study I had a more defined role given to me by the teacher as a direct

outcome of the formal interview held with the teacher;   that of teacher

aide.   This changing role was adopted as a result of the process of

participant observer and in gaining the teacher's understandings of her

classroom life.   The new role came about when I asked if I could recip-

rocate the teacher's help and cooperation for the study by doing tasks

for her each afternoon.

It was difficult for me to maintain my role while my activities

were directed by the teacher.   On the one hand, the continued access to

the classroom, the opportunities for photographing children's suggested

shots, and the further understanding that children could be excused to

help with the aim of the research more than compensated for the chores

of the teacher aide role.   At the same time, the role as teacher aide

appeared to strengthen my rapport with the teacher;   while at the same

time my rapport with the children appeared to weaken.

The teacher-directed activities given to me included carding books

in the library, helping children select books, working with a boy who had

just returned from New Zealand, making wall charts, marking arithmetic

and spelling papers, and decorating a bulletin board.

The instances wherein I tried to maintain my role as participant-

observer-photographer included a Friday when the teacher assigned me

marking while the children read silently.   Then the teacher told the

children she would be out of the room for a while and I would be there.

However, I stated staunchly, that I was "not in charge."

In another instance, I had been away from the setting for two days

because the whole school had been involved in a musical.   Children asked

where I had been, C. reminded me that it was her birthday.   I had

intended to take C's picture, but the role of teacher aide took prece-

dence because the teacher began to direct my activities.   When the

class lined up to go to the library, the teacher asked me to help with books. Later I was able to help C. select books. She kept saying that she did not like the books. It was considered that there was evidence of hostility toward me either because I had not remembered her birthday or because of my role of teacher aide.

In a final instance, the children chatted and were quite noisy while the teacher was out of the classroom. I took pictures and twice commented to the children that I was caught, in the middle, maybe they should read!

As a result, the last interview with two girls, C. and L., who knew a 'secret language' between them was not successful. They appeared indifferent toward me and made many negative comments. When I asked to take pictures of their 'secret language' it was evident that they no longer wanted to divulge too much. I took some pictures, one of which included my name which was connoted with a stuck out tongue.

Finally, another group of girls who shared a 'secret language' allowed me to take photographs. These were taken in the classroom while the rest of the class went to the library. The following day the girls identified the code in the photographs.

Data-Gathering Procedures

I planned the form of data to be collected; the settings in which I would collect these data; the participants with whom I would interact; and the questions I would ask in the interviews.

Field notes. The non-participant field notes were gathered for the first week. These were observational, chronological, and topical. They were the events I experienced through watching and listening, chronological for the events in a 'passing parade', stated

with as little interpretation as possible.   As such, they provided me

with the bases for a reconstruction of what I had observed.   Also, some

of the scenic properties in the parade of observed events became rela-

tively repetitive later in my research.   These notes were topical,

they depicted the children's and teacher's actions in the classroom

setting and provided topics for questions to be answered.

The non-participant field notes were interspersed with my theoret-

ical and procedural field notes as well.   For example, there were tenta-

tive interpretations, inferences, conjectures, and tentative hypotheses.

These notes were also interspersed with procedural notes, these were

instructions to myself or reminders to conduct some act.   The theoretical

and procedural notes were usually written after the observation sessions.

For example, I asked myself: How can I get the students to talk to me

without disrupting the routine of the classroom as perceived by the

teacher?   Should I give the boy seated alone a long yellow pencil?

Should I consider this boy a key informant because he has mumbled to me?

Other questions posed in the initial stages of the study included:

(1) What were the physical arrangements for the setting?   I suspended

a priori judgements about classroom arrangements, teacher-student move-

ments and the various groupings of materials and furniture.   The signif-

icance of these events, materials, and arrangements was questioned.   For

example, it was noted that the desks were arranged diagonally toward one

of the classroom doors, a boy was seated away from the group, against the

cloakroom door jamb, near the round table at the back of the room where I

was designated to sit.

Another question I began to pose to myself was (2) How can research-

ers enter this world and share this reality?   The observations were

interspersed with theoretical notes and possible interpretations and answers for the observed participant actions. For example, I observed in an instance, children using non-verbal language to communicate with each other. I conjectured it was to share answers. This caused a question in my field notes, (3) How could I as researcher enter the children's world? In the second instance, a boy approached me at the round table where I was seated. I used my finger over my mouth to direct him back to his seat. These instances raised two questions in my field notes: (4) What should I do to gain understanding of the communications among children? and (5) What is the children's rule for approaching an adult in their classroom?

The field notes gave me a list of what appeared to be significant physical arrangements of the setting which could be photographed (see Appendix A). Finally, the field notes provided the basis for some forty questions to be posed in some fashion to classroom participants in the attempt to discover what were the "internalized notions in the participants' minds about what is expected and allowed" (Wilson, 1977, p. 247).

Following this, the observation techniques used in the study were based on the underlying conceptualization adopted generally for use in social science. I must have a theoretical grasp of the problem in order to make relevant observations. These observations were deemed to constitute reality. In addition, I charted observations and checked on observations. These actions were founded on the idea of phenomenology and the assumption was that I possessed the necessary theoretical conceptaulization to conduct the study.

In summary, I planned and used observation field notes of a non-participant nature. Some questions were posed and subsequently answered

as more time was spent observing the participants and gaining observer status in the setting.

Still photography. Data were also collected by the use of still photography. It was decided to use photography as a way of capturing daily life activities in the classroom and to use photos as a 'display of classroom life' that provided opportunity for interaction. The photography allowed me access to events in the classroom. This meant the camera became 'participant camera'. The rationale for using photography to document events as they occurred was twofold: (1) to provide entry into the children's everyday life as interpreted by the children to the researcher; and (2) to provide a documentation of classroom events that I could share with students. The guiding principle for the photography was to uncover the important frameworks the children and the teacher used for categorizing and defining the classroom events and objects photographed.

The camera as 'participant camera' helped me as 'stranger' in the situation and resolved the entry difficulties; it provided me access to the situation; and it created a form of interaction with the 'life-world' of the students. I had entered the classroom with the intention of adopting a participant observer's role based on dialogue and personal observations. Because of the apparent controlling nature of classroom routines, my entry as stranger was difficult.

The camera as 'participant camera' resolved the entry difficulties and the shift to participant-observer status took place when I established the role of ethnographer-photographer. This role enabled me to collect information-observational field notes with camera and pen. The 'camera as participant' provided immediate access to the situation. When

photographing, I was allowed to move around the room freely, speak briefly
to students and teachers, and to organize the sequences of events I docu-
mented. The 'camera as participant' also meant that my interaction with
the class situation was visual as well as verbal. I could gather a
large enough body of information to form patterns later in the research,
including all material items, and all circumstances. These provided
a frame of reference for later in-depth interviews with children.

The selection of what was to be photographed was based on the prem-
ise that certain phenomena appear in quantities large enough to make pat-
terns of the culture surface. This meant that only the most significant
events, based on the earlier field notes, were gathered photographically
to provide a large enough body of information to form patterns during
the research process.

The first step in the photographic methodology was to make a photo-
graphic record of the events and objects in the classroom in an opportunis-
tic manner, as provided in the field notes. To do this I attempted to
adopt a position Stoddart suggests: ". .. not to impose a perspective on
a domain but to surface the perspective native to it" (Stoddart, 1978-79,
p. 3). The role of camera, then, as suggested was 'participant camera' and
I took events as they came and photographed them defined or undefined.

Later in the study when the children had divulged their 'secret
languages' the second step in the photographic methodology was programmed
sampling. When these languages were documented photographically and
when the children suggested categories to be photographed I used the pro-
grammed sampling techniques.

The final step in the photographic method was to photograph digres-
sively, that is I randomly documented ahead of understanding and awareness.

The opportunistic photographs were taken as events developed and flowed with the day. These displays of daily life consisted of rolls #1, #2, and #3. Roll #1 pictures portrayed during and after recess happenings: the children were photographed informally during recess; while the teacher was out of the classroom; the teacher beginning an arithmetic speed drill; the class working on the drill; the children working at assigned arithmetic tasks; the children getting gym strip from the cloakroom; children returning from washrooms wearing their strip; the parent volunteers helping with a fitness test; the teacher's desk; the armchair; the research desk; the boxes for language arts, arithmetic, and journals; the reserved books; and the blue carpet area.

The second roll of film taken after a recess consisted of eleven pictures depicting: two girls looking at a bulletin board; the same picture closer in; a girl talking to two boys who were in a reading chair; two pictures of two boys in the reading armchair; the teacher at the blackboard; the teacher at the student's desk; a boy standing while others in the class were seated; the class with the teacher giving out books; and, a picture of the class looking into the camera.

The third roll of film taken during the course of a single morning consisted of boys and girls at the 'reserved book' box; several shots of children and teacher at work on an arithmetic drill; and the "Super Spellers" area. These pictures were based on field notes taken in the classroom for the first week, including morning and some afternoon activities. This roll was poorly exposed when returned from processing and indicated that I ought to use more back-up shots in both kinds of pictures, colour and black and white. In addition, the flash attachment needed to be used for individual shots later in the interview sessions.

In the second week of research, I took pictures in black and white to augment the pictures taken earlier. I also arranged for interview space in the school library, and made plans to interview children the next day. I interviewed those children whose names I had learned through observation first.

In the third week of the study, the next group of procedures included photographing the children's suggested categories. The sources for these were: (1) what the children used when they sorted the earlier pictures; (2) what the children considered to be missing from an accurate portrayal of their classroom life; and (3) photographs suggested by individuals. These suggestions provided an anchor for later discussions with the children. They also provided a means for conjecture and study on my part. In total, this meant what, where, and when to shoot photographs were known in advance.

The photographs taken were of situations representative of the "various experiences of the participants" (Wilson, 1977, p. 256). In other words, these categories were based on the children's cognitive frameworks and their concepts and interpretations of what was significant in their everyday lives. An effort was made to comprehend these 'mental maps' or social constructs as they were suggested to me by the children. These "formal or informal psychic schedules and geographies of the participants" (Wilson, 1977, p. 256) were used to develop photographic sampling techniques which reflected the research interest; to discover the everyday world of the children in the field situation studied.

The photographs provided a representative sample of the classroom situation which enabled me to get at hidden or unexpressed meanings and to become involved in the participants' perspectives.

Further photographic procedures took place at the end of the third week. At this time children were again interviewed individually or in groups of twos and threes. They were asked to interpret all the photographs taken (except for the sign languages) and, furthermore, they were asked to indicate to me what it was I may have forgotten to photograph when I took the many pictures of their classroom.

The last photographic sampling procedures used in the study were digressive. This involved moving beyond the suggested categories provided by the children or the originally defined scope for the early photography and deliberately looking for the unanticipated. To do this I looked for shots beyond the situation peripheral to my attention; the novel, however incoherent and insignificant; and for the unknown. The results were a great number of photographs which were used by the children to describe their day in the classroom (Sorenson & Jablonko, 1975, pp. 154-155).

In summary, the role of photography in the study was directly concerned with uncovering the meanings for the everyday events in the classroom. When the photos were used in the interview sessions they provided a display for dialogue with students. As a result, the pictures made interviewing easier and more productive because they provided a basis for dialogue. In addition, they were synchronic, that is both emic and etic. By emic is meant the internal view or theoretical construct determined during analysis; whereas etic is meant units and classifications based on prior sampling before one begins the analysis of a particular culture (Pike, K. W., 1966). In essence it is the creation versus discovery of a system. Finally, the photographs documented events that were too complex to be identified through my observation.

Children's interpretations. The kinds of interpretations the children made of the first rolls of pictures were used to gain rapport with the children and to gain understandings of their world. The sources for the kinds of questions asked them were the non-participant field notes, the on-going identifications they made of the photographs, the on-going interpretations they made of the photographs, the answers provided by earlier interviews, and the kinds of categories the children used when they grouped photographs.

The children's interpretations of the pictures means the 'open-ended' quality of photographic opportunity was exploited for this very characteristic. There was the further opportunity to increase the validity of findings and conclusions when the photographs were shown to the participants and their answers were recorded. These descriptions were tape recorded. Finally, there was the opportunity to have children communicate to me their perspectives as 'insiders'.

The perspective of the 'insider' was provided to me when the children interpreted the photographs. I kept in mind that ". . . the social scientist cannot understand human behavior without understanding the framework within which the subjects interpret their thoughts, feelings, and actions" (Wilson, 1977, p. 249). This meant, the definition of a social situation as depicted by the photographs was how the children perceived it. This definition was a basic component of the social situation's perceived organization.

During the interview sessions I had as a main interest the search for structures of members' knowledge. An attempt was made to uncover the logic of everyday descriptions, the description by categorization, and identifications made by the children. In the search, attention was

directed to the 'competencies' the children held. These were defined as the children's practices for understanding the world and those practices which allowed children to encounter settings, to explore them, and to organize knowledge about the events, objects, and people in the settings.

Children's categorizations. In the search for the descriptions of the setting by categorizations the kinds of groups the children used to sort the photographs provided me with insights for the way participants defined the events and objects in the classroom. These were constructions and reconstructions in which both the children and I participated. This meant the validity of the inquiry was not tested against the corpus of scientific knowledge which could be derived from a setting; rather, it was tested against everyday experiences of the children. Concern was "not only in the formulations that the children made, but in the procedures they used in constructing them" (Silver, 1975, p. 51) and acknowledges the process I used to interpret social meaning.

The categories used by the children to sort the pictures were unusual, diverse, and esoteric. Because they were so atypical I came to realize the magnitude and variety within the children's groupings and categories. Each could be different for many reasons. In the context of the study, designated to be descriptive and exploratory rather than to infer causality, the diversity was accepted. Thereafter, the greater reliance was placed on the suggestions offered by the individual children about what had been missed or not included in the photographs.

During the last two days of the study I took a group of children
to the library who had been suggested by the teacher to be youngsters
who could afford to miss being in class during a ..language arts lesson.
They looked at a large group of pictures which included events, objects,
categories, and people performing actions suggested to me by other chil-
dren. The group of youngsters were set tasks for arranging the pictures
as individuals, as partners, and as a group of four.

Individually, they moved the pictures around to add and make up
what they considered to be their school day.   Then each child described
why s/he had chosen the pictures s/he did.   I coded these responses.
In partners, the children made up their day.   Here again, they could
leave out any pictures they wished.   Then they described what the photos
meant and why they had included the pictures they had.   I recorded their
responses.   In a group of four, the children made up a description or
portrayal of what it meant to live out a day in the classroom.   To do
this they were asked to describe and interpret their choices and these
were recorded.   Then the children were asked to include other pictures
if they wanted to after they had checked through all of the extra pic-
tures and the albums of the various photos which had augmented the rolls
taken initially in the study, opportunistically, programmed, and digres-
sively.   The children's 'group day' was recorded.

Interviews. The interview schedules were developed to gather informa-
tion while the children identified, interpreted, and categorized conceptu-
ally the photographs which documented their setting. The use of the photos
and the interview questions were entwined in their mutual foci, to uncover
everyday events.   Together they were used to develop the photographic
procedures, to observe, collect data, make discoveries, and to develop

provisional hypotheses.

The Children's Schedules, A. and B. (see Appendix B) were used as a starting point for the interviews; as a procedure for gathering shared meanings; as a means to discover what was allowed and not allowed in the classroom; and as a means of uncovering deeper patterns and structures underlying children's everyday actions in the setting.

The Teacher's Schedule C. (see Appendix B) was also developed to gather information about the shared meanings and rules for decisions and actions in the classroom. The photographs of the classroom were shown to the teacher when she was formally interviewed during the last days of the study. Again, the foci for the interview questions and the use of the photographs was to uncover the classroom culture as understood and shared by the participants in the setting, children, and the teacher.

The interviews with the children took place over the five week duration of the study. The first group was with ten children. The second series was with the other members of the class, some children were interviewed as many as three times during the five weeks.

The interviews were constrained by space, time, and lessened rapport due to a change in my perceived role on the part of the children. I had some constraints placed on my field work by the teacher, these were: length of time to be spent with children (it had far exceeded the 15 minute period suggested); whether the children could be interviewed a second and third time; where the children were to be interviewed; and whether particular children could be excused from the classroom.

These constraints increased by the end of the second week of the study. For example, the teacher began to limit interviews to be held during specific subject times in the classroom, e.g., mathematics and

math drill. In addition, she would not allow children who had not finished their work to leave for interviews. Finally, the three children who also shared a 'secret language' (the fourth) could not be taken out of class to have their code photographed. However, these constraints began to lessen after an interview with the teacher. They lessened further when I made my visits during the afternoons, and they were almost gone by the time I had spent the last week of the study as a teacher aide.

The basis for the interview questions was to gain further understanding of the pupils' life-world. This meant I needed to gain access to the conceptual world of the subjects so I could converse with them. While the questions were preformulated, they were neither based on other studies nor were they used with an interest in production. They were an intellectual effort to understand the descriptions and interpretations children gave for their experiences. To do this I used the etic (outsider's) framework for the formulation of the first interview questions and the selections of questions to ask in the first interviews.

I kept in mind that the devised etic framework--pre-formulated questions--impinged on the interview situation in that my own motives and interests became part of the situation. Recognizing this, I attempted to suspend my pre-conceptions, and to use "the tension between participant data and observer analysis" (Wilson, 1977, p. 250) to both refine, re-formulate, and choose questions as the interviews flowed, and merged one with the other.

In the interviews I tried to gain an awareness or an 'empathetic understanding' of the classroom culture, nearly impossible with quantitative research methods (p. 250). To do this I became gradually aware of the 'emic' (actor-relevant) categories. These included disclosures

from the children about cheating, sneaking drinks, recess activities, and what happened when the teacher was out of the room. Any bias to spontaneity was overcome by my comments that I would protect the confidences of the children and that I would not report them to anyone else.

The formats for the interview sessions during the first stages of the study were those in which I was offered particular lines of communication. These were accepted (Wax, 1971, p. 15). Further, the social vantage points through which and from which I made my observations and how I would be permitted to participate in the classroom setting was determined (p. 15). Therefore, it was during these first stages that the "character, scope, and emphasis of the research questions was determined" (p. 15).

The first interviews and the first group of methodologies explored were with ten children. Some of these youngsters were asked to look at the first group of pictures and interpret what they thought was happening in the pictures. They were asked questions according to Interview Schedule A. The sources for this schedule were as follows: field notes taken while I observed the classroom; the kinds of questions that the children's activities appeared to answer; everyday happenings questioned; and short conversations with children in hallways and on the playground.

The interpretive procedures shared by the children with me in the interviews were based on what Crowle (1971) has translated to be simply stated as "rules for speakers and hearers." He codified Schutz's model and drew on Cicourel and Garfinkel. Based on his observations, the interviews were seen as speakers and hearers abiding by specific rules. By rules for speakers and hearers it was meant that speakers spoke normally, and they assumed that the hearers understood them as meaning

the same as they would mean in the same situation.   Hearers assumed the

speakers were talking normally, that the speakers meant the same as you

would mean if you were to say the same thing in the same situation.

That if the hearers can see what is said is relevent, they use their

'knowledge' of what was said before, to interpret the meaning of what is

said at the moment.   If the hearers still do not understand they will

ask speakers to clarify what they mean and, finally, the hearers will

wait and see if what speakers said clarifies what has already been said

(Mehan & Wood, 1975, p. 116).

The first step in the use of the photographs was to have children

identify the events or objects by asking questions: What is happening?

What is it called?   The second step was to ask them what the pictures

meant to them.   The third step was to learn the children's conceptual

categories.   They were expressed in the children's own words or concepts.

Krebs (1975, p. 282) suggested these kinds of questions which were used:

Tell me about...Does that have a particular name? or Do any of them

have particular names? How would you describe that? How do you think

person X would describe that? What is happening now? What else is

related to that?

When the children had provided me with their conceptual categories

these were then used in new questions.   In each case the children cate-

gorized the phenomena of the classroom world in which they lived and

elucidated how they structured that slice of reality as portrayed in the

photographs.   The progression of questions using the photographs were

from exploratory to more detailed questions as each participant provided

new and varied interpretations for the occurrences depicted in the

photos.

Summary

The photographs served as an alternative way of describing the classroom situation as known and understood by the participants.   I observed, interviewed, and thought about the culture in photographic terms.   Then I moved to the concrete phenomena and a more focused collection of pictures.   In essence, I gathered the photographic knowledge of the situation.   Both the children's intentions and the situational events evidenced themselves in observable behavior.

The photographs served as a tool for social inquiry in phenomenological terms and presented the discussion in phenemonological structures. As a photographic observer I attempted to suspend biases and judgements and I observed and described as faithfully as possible the phenomena involved in the behavior of the individuals.   I emphasized perception and consciousness.   I was guided by the principle that phenomena shaping individual's behavior were phenomena perceived by the acting individuals. I recognized that objects existed in the situation as objective phenomena; but that their meaning for behavior on the part of the participants derived from each individual's relationship and reaction to the objects.   To do all of this, I surrendered myself intelligently to the situation without losing my identity as photographer-participant-observer. In turn, the situation surrendered its meanings to me.   In summary, the basic meanings and values were primarily derived from the situation.

The photographic data stand as a medium of communication about the classroom culture because of important elements in the construction of these data: the key shots, the participants as scenarists, and the participants as editors or constructors of the reality the photographs were interpreted to display.

There is no universal method of discovery and proof. In this study discovery and proof were in the photographs. I as photographer functioned as a social artist, the children as editors, and scenarists. To do this I borrowed Pudovkin's notion of a cinematic "keystone." Although keystoning is a cinematic term, I am borrowing the notion of key shots. These are photographs in which an important element is portrayed. From the element one can describe action which led up to the shot and from which all after clearly follows. In film social inquiry, a keystone shot can also be defined as a behaviorally observable possibility around which film data collection and photographic thinking can organize itself. Because key shots are made out of material of the social reality I could not envision anything about the situation without an intimate familiarity. In presenting the photographic data, then, there are 'key shots'. These can be easily identified and they help structure the definition of the situation as described photographically.

The children and I functioned as scenarists. A scenario is a great number of separate pieces. The situation described was shot in separate photographs, what I saw, what the children interpreted. Later the photographs served as pieces of the situation as they the children saw it. I could then <u>see again.</u> The children and I as scenarists could have written out material on paper as it appeared in the photographs. However, the actual construction of events for subjective understandings took place as shared meanings between the children and me. We built from the separate pieces and concentrated our attention only on the important element in each photograph. What the children interpreted were the 'frozen moments' in an on-going reality. This process was constructional editing, a method specifically and peculiarly filmic.

As such, the photographs were an important instrument of impression.

The construction of reality through the use of the photographs served as a means to reiterate the theme of events of everyday life in the classroom as interpreted to me by the children. This constituted the underlying theme. The message or the meaning for everyday life as shared and understood by the participants in the situation presented itself in the photographic documents developed over the course of the study. Also, the photographs in themselves provided a portrayal of everyday life.

CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATIONS AND SHARED UNDERSTANDINGS OF
A CHILDREN'S CULTURE

Introduction

The methodology for deriving children's interpretations and shared

understandings in the classroom studied incorporated non-participant

field notes, photographs of the everyday events in the classroom based

on participant field notes, photography suggested by the children them-

selves, and the children's many identifications, interpretations, and

categorizations of the photographs used in the study.

The focus for the analysis was not only to describe the situation

as interpreted by the participants, but to attempt to overcome the diffi-

culties inherent in some field ethnographies with participant observation

by providing criteria or grounds for interpreting certain data; that is,

by presenting materials upon which the analysis was conducted and by

retaining the original form of the materials (Mehan, 1979, p. 16).

The analysis of the data was undertaken to provide an understanding

of the classroom situation as one socially constructed by the children

and teacher.   It has attempted to typify the actual way in which the

children interpreted their own individual actions and the actions of

others in the situation.   The findings are both descriptive and inter-

pretive.   The description is based upon the interpretations of meaning

structures that existed within the everyday life activities of the indi-

viduals in the classroom.

The organization for the telling of the children's own interpreta-
tions and shared understandings is in five parts.   First, a pre-formu-
lated research question to do with the methodology or the situation was
posed.   Second, a question which evolved during the conduct of the study
is posed.   Third, relevant dialogue from the participants is presented.
Fourth, from these data, I give my interpretation for the meanings they
shared with me.   Finally, further questions are posed.

It is important to state at the outset that as the inquiry pro-
gressed the children's suggested categories provided a framework for more
careful examination of the earlier descriptive data.   The data were
classified into some observer-justifiable types.   To do this, I took the
interpretive procedures used by the participants to carry on their every-
day life experiences and activities in the classroom.   For this purpose
also, particular kinds of data were analyzed and presented.   These
included the later stages of still photography;   the on-going interviews
with participants;   the identifications, descriptions, interpretations,
and categorizations of photographs;   and the documentation of special
communication systems among the participants.   Finally, the validation
of these descriptions were gathered from the children in the final inter-
views and in the last photographic procedures.   All of the procedures
built more data for the adequate description of the classroom studied.

The description to follow, then, is based on notions of interpretive
social science and ethnomethodology which question the everyday life world
of these children.   Secondly, the children located themselves in daily
life according to their biographic situation or background of experience.
This meant, in essence, that every child brought to the classroom not only
shared cultural knowledge, but they took these forms and translated them

into the world of daily life in the classroom. This was done by each child in terms of his or her personal experience. Each child defined a social reality according to his or her biographical situation.

Interpretation of the data began with the question, "In what ways did members of the culture actively construct the social world they shared"? To recover these shared meanings I allowed the members to speak for themselves. As they interpreted their social world I searched the social complexities provided by the participants for simplifying structures. These were the "elucidated interpretive competencies and reality perceptions" of the participants in the setting studied (Van Manen, 1978, pp. 43-59).

This chapter then, presents a part of the cultural knowledge of some Grade Three children in a school classroom. As an ethnographic description it aims to provide the insider's point of view. The participants speak for themselves about the actions and events which occurred around them. They tell what it is they needed to know to carry on the everyday routines in the life-world of their classroom culture.

To carry out an adequate description I refined my documentation of the culture on the basis of the findings upon entry into the setting; the observation techniques used; the still photography; the interviews with photographs; and the communications among the children themselves, both verbal and non-verbal, which were gathered.

How Children Became Knowledgeable About Objects, Rules, and Events

Environmental cues. Based on non-participant field notes the first photographs were taken in the setting. These included the children and the teacher, other significant people, furniture, bulletins, and objects. All of these appeared to have some significance to

the participants. The principles for this kind of cinema verite photography was to organize the photographs around "an event, or process, or theme inherent in the people's lives, not by an artificial theory" (Temaner & Quinn, 1974, p. 54).

The classroom as portrayed by the photographs included a blue carpeted area; a large brown armchair; boxes on a window sill; a close-up of these boxes; the teacher's desk; a desk against a blackboard space filled with papers and books with a chart; two class pictures with the teacher holding long sheets of paper; two boys in the cloakroom; two pictures of the teacher aide standing near the teacher's desk while the children were seated at their desks; a picture of the aide sitting at the teacher's desk while some children were standing up, turned around, or chatting; the teacher, a man, and the children, some seated, some standing; two pictures of children only (taken from the back of the classroom) with most seated and two faces visible; a man, some children standing or moving about near their desks; a picture of some vacant desks, one girl standing looking toward the camera and a boy facing the photographer; a boy standing in the cloakroom holding runners and clothing; the teacher bending over the teacher aide at the teacher's desk, children seated, all on task; and one boy standing and holding a long paper.

Phenomenologically, the problem of participant observer is whether I can reconstruct for the reader what I did and how I came to select some things out as important. To do this meant I attempted not to impose a social order upon the situation, rather, I reasserted the problematic. The social life in the classroom proceeded routinely because the common-sense ideas about what was happening in the social scenes I observed were

known to the participants. The ideas or background expectancies existed not simply in the mind of any one child but were sustained and originated in social action in the setting. In their world, the children's intersubjective socially constructed reality, the rationality of their actions and the non-problematic nature of situations is a continual accomplishment of social action. In order to reveal these assumptions about normality I had to bring the background into the foreground; suspend my assumptions about what was happening.

From this perspective, then, the children became knowledgeable of objects, rules, and events in varying degrees depending upon their interactions with each other and how well they understood the meanings provided by the teacher.

The first question posed from the field notes was, What meanings did children share for the physical arrangements in the setting? While the substitute for the teacher worked with the class for a whole day, I began to interview the children. Those intereviewed were children whose names had come to my attention in the classroom and most particularly on the playground during the first few days of the field work. To begin, each child identified groups of photographs and then they were interviewed.

The first child interviewed mentioned these objects and events while he told what was happening in the photos:

> Art books, reserved books, games, journals, gym bags, jackets, fun and fitness, Mrs. M. in picture, poem, teacher's desk, doodle desk, reading carpet, things (for bird cages), spelling words, chair, where some of finished art is, where other books are, boxes for journals, someone's father who has come to help, pictures done a month ago, getting his stuff, where boys put jackets, blackboard work, mailbags--not whole thing home, S's desk, teacher's desk. Doing art we do these things, "our" spelling words, chair, some of us we fight to get in the chair, some of our art, some of our books. Here's our game, our journals, our math, we hand it in, reading corner, some books we read, our doodle table, papers, our art, our gym bags, here's our mailbags, finish our papers, where we put our jackets.

The validity of these identifications was confirmed by clarifying

or sharing with the student the names he gave and the meanings he gave for

specific events and objects.   I had not known that the photographed desk

with a research chart about dogs very near it was not the 'research' desk

as one could suppose, but was informally labelled the 'doodle' desk by the

first child and by other children interviewed later.   The first child

identified the armchair as the place where "some of us we fight to get in

the chair."   The race to get in the chair was corroborated by other chil-

dren in later interviews.

The physical arrangements for the setting were derived from identifi-

cations for these pictures which varied from quite literal descriptions

to lengthy interpretations.   For example, the blue carpeted area as the

'reading corner', "That's the carpet," "Carpet we read on," "That's our

carpet we sit down and read books there," and "There's a carpet and the

bottom drawers of Mrs. S's cupboard."

The children were asked what the blue-carpeted area meant and when

they could go there.   They responded at length.   "Can go to sit on it to

read and play games," "Sit down and read, sit in desks. In eclipse, [of

the sun, in order to avoid eye damage] sat on carpet, not to look what it's

all about," "Math and there are games and flash cards," "Only after lunch,

reading time," "At lunch time you can't play nothing, not games or nothing

just silent reading," "That's for if the teacher is reading us a story.

Usually at silent reading some of the kids go over there, and read over

there, but I usually stay at my desk. Mrs. B. we always do a story Tuesdays,"

"It's silent reading, just read, after recess, at lunch," "Just so you don't

have to sit on the floor when you read," "It means when you read there, and

it means 'silent reading'," "It means umm that the teacher comes and

reads you a story."

The children shared with me when it was that they went to read.
They also shared how they knew it was time to go. "After we do our work,
after lunch, everybody rushes to get in the chair. After recess if we
have finished our work," "In the morning and after lunch, when we come
back from library," "In the morning. She calls us to the reading chairs,"
"The lowest group is 'Wings of Wonder', and the second highest group is
umm 'Skies and Wings', and then there's 'All Sorts of Things', that's the
highest, have all three groups every day. Usually 'Wings of Wonder' goes
first," "In that chair, sometimes when we have substitutes they think we
read on the carpet but in (we) in reading corner, sit on the chairs,"
"If you've finished your work you can go to the carpet area. After lunch,
mostly recess, she told us at the beginning of the year, you should read."

When the children were asked why they put notebooks into boxes with
signs on them they stated: "Teacher doesn't want to get mixed up," "Our
group we have 'mini-research', stick that in with our language arts,"
"The teacher gets them from the box instead of from our desks," "So, we'll
know which one's the math box and we'll just put it in there," and "Oh,
you put notebooks into the boxes because they have to be marked and be
delivered back to you."

When the children were asked why a boy was seated by himself they
stated: "He talks too much," "Because Jimmy and Sean they play a lot,
right, fool around when the teacher's out. Do bad stuff. They don't do
their work. Supposed to be beside A. He bugs everybody," "He's always
being bad and talking. Talking to Z," "Always disturbs people," "Talks
to everyone," "Usually talks to everybody so they can't get their work
done," "Usually bad, likes to talk to people, doesn't get his work done.

He's away from people, does his work, gets it done," "Because he's mostly

talking and he's bad mostly and he umm he always has to do his correc-

tions," "He's bad . . . he's always talking to Z. and he gets out of his

desk all the time and he talks to Z."

When the children were asked what they thought it would be like to

sit alone, they stated, "Don't think it's very nice. Maybe okay, nobody

bothering you," "You can get your work done faster," "I think it's a lot

better because people are bugging you and asking you," "Don't know," "Well

you could get your work done easier without talking to other people. It's

kind of lonely, but at least you can work by yourself and get lots of work

done."

Teacher non-verbal cues. The children were knowledgeable about

objects, rules, and events from cues they derived from the teacher non-

verbally. For example, the kinds of papers provided for different

activities in the classroom were cues for events. Particular sheets

meant speed drill while others meant language arts. Children knew it

to be the only subject for which they usually used sheets of paper.

When the teacher aide was at the teacher's desk the children understood

that it was a time to do their work. Another time, because there were

no math books out, it meant the class was doing language arts. Objects

then, provided cues for subjects. Glue on the desks meant art time and

white paper also meant art.

Teacher actions or behaviors questioned about were: When does the

teacher work at her desk? What does it mean when the teacher works at

her desk? and What is usually on the end of the teacher's desk? What

kinds of papers? To these, the children pointed out that the teacher

works at her desk "Whenever we're working," "When she marks," "When

we're doing something," "When she marks work," "When silent reading, sometimes after school, when we're working," "She's working, marking papers for use for the next day," and "She works at her desk when she marks . . . and sometimes . . . reads a newspaper."

The children stated that the teacher at work at her desk meant: "Maybe she's doing report cards. Giving out detentions," "Well when she's sitting at her desk usually people . . . talking," "She throws your book on the floor," "Getting reading for substitutes," "Just go on doing your work. You shouldn't talk or anything. She's figuring out what she's going to have us do in art and stuff."

The kinds of papers at the end of the teacher's desk were: "Books, papers," "That's the doodle table, something to do. Colour mostly," "Calendars, could be for a story or picture," "Papers that you need," "Working papers for us for the next day," and "Calendars, art stuff."

Teacher verbal cues. The teacher's requests to a child to deliver a message to the office meant, "Anybody usually gets to do it. Once I did," "Lorissa usually gets asked," "Music, last time I got choosed," "Teacher just picks someone, usually when you've finished. Or if we're all working she usually takes it up herself," "Sometimes the teacher does, sometimes she gets other kids to do it. Picks person who is working hardest and who is finished," "Me cause I sit quiet and start doing my work," and "Jamie sometimes me, Steve . . . ummm Lorissa."

Other kinds of teacher verbal behaviors asked about were: Why does the teacher say L's name a lot? Why does the teacher say J's name a lot? and What does it mean when the teacher calls your name?

The teacher said L's name a lot because, "She always talks, she's

always turned around in her desk," "Because she speaks and talks to S and she sometimes has to stay in," and "Because she always gets out of her seat." In addition, the teacher said J's name a lot because, "She always talks to Eric," "They're [general response] being bad or talking," "Sometimes she talks with other people and you know when ya do flash cards. She quite yells," and the girl herself stated, "'Cause I'm having fun talking."

The children explained what it meant when the teacher called their names. "She wants you at her desk," "Either bad, in the morning if you're here or not, if you have corrections," "You have a problem, she calls you to stop talking or something," "Means she wants you to go and do something," "Could mean a lot of things. To get your book, when she marks it. Or someone needs help. When she needs you for help, with a table or something," "It means that you're bad, that you didn't listen. It means that you got umm I think that it means that ummm. When you trade desks and she tells you to trade them back. When she wants them back."

The predominant understandings the children shared with me about the physical arrangements of their classroom, teacher non-verbal and verbal cues were their needs to find ways to get the right answers from each other, their needs to find ways to get out of their desks, and their needs to work within the imposed time, space, and subject structures designated by the teacher and conveyed to the children by her verbal and non-verbal cues for appropriate actions from the children.

The children spent unmeasured amounts of time covertly communicating with each other, instructing each other, and attempting to break the monotony of the day in an environment where they were given little

responsibility for their own decisions or actions. They were expected

to comply to the regimentation and rigidity of their everyday lives.

It seems that the tyranny of the teacher's interest in control over the

children's actions was tolerable for them only because it was familiar.

The same things happened day in and day out.

How the Teacher and Children Saw Themselves

In many studies of children we have tended to subordinate children's

experiences to our own experiences. We have subordinated children's

interpretive practices to our own constructions of knowing. As a result

we have lost their forms of knowledge and have invoked a division between

what is really real and what children believe to be real. In this anal-

ysis there is an attempt to overcome this arbitrary division and allow

the children to state their world of knowledge about their daily lives.

The teacher and the children saw themselves doing school. The

children appeared to accept being treated as members of a category, pupils.

The teacher saw herself teaching. To her, curriculum content was pre-

sented, children were to learn it. The children were reminded to comply

to getting speed tests, math drills, and spelling tests done correctly,

to stay in their desks, and to remain on task for most of the five and

one-half hours they spent in the classroom.

Shared understandings. Teacher understandings shared with the

children were the tacit rules for behavior and action in the classroom.

In an attempt to understand these rules, groups of participants were

interviewed by the observer in twos, threes, and in a group of five.
The kinds of questions they were asked were designed to elicit an under-
standing of the trivial and mundane meanings in the classroom to do with
objects and events.

They got out of their desks to get paper, "When I'm writing a
story," "When you don't have a book." They went for paper towels, "When
you spill water, or if there's glue on the tables or something or when
we're painting," "We're supposed to have them when we're painting."
They passed papers forward and back so "Person doesn't have to get out
of their desk." To be a 'Super Speller' meant "You got all your words
right." The kinds of notes that went home about books were, "To pay
money for books. If you haven't brought the book back, you have to pay
for it." Finally, there was "the lost and found can" on the counter.

Other rules governing leaving the room: When can you go and get a
drink? and When can you go to the washroom? indicated children who were
not familiar with the rules would be informed by classmates because,
"We'd pass it around--that you couldn't have a drink." Other meanings
were, "She never lets us get a drink. She always says no, but umm some
people sneak 'cause there's a sink in our back of the room, right?" or
you can go to the washroom "After lunch or recess, she says no," "Supposed
to go before school, recess and lunch," "You can't do it in the morning,
after recess or after lunch because we should have gone by then, but umm
one person [can go] in between recess and lunch," and "Only at recess,
lunch, ummm sometimes she lets you."

Social constructions. The children had been observed to mark each
other's work; they were asked what this meant. They replied, "Doesn't

want you to mark it right if it's wrong," "You're not supposed to make

any mistakes. If it's right you can't mark it wrong. If it's wrong you

can't mark it right," "Don't make any changes," "It means at math you

. . . usually means like she lets you mark, like, you usually put one

tick, you put your math book on other person's desk and they pass them

behind and the back person brings his up to the front and be marked.

That's the only time, at math." And "So we don't cheat."

The physical movements allowed in the classroom centred around:

When do you go to the teacher's desk? Why do you go to the teacher's desk?

What does it mean to go and get paper? Why do you put notebooks into

boxes with signs on them? What does the blue-carpeted area mean? When

can you go there? When do you go to sit and read? How do you know you

should go?

The children went to the teacher's desk: "For reading club, to get

something marked," "Math drill, if you have some problems. Don't get

something. When you don't know what a word means," "For correcting our

work. Somebody's bugging you. Tattle. Ask for a word," "When we have

trouble, especially spelling. When you have problems. When you have to

tell on somebody," "When you don't bring it [book] to the marking box.

For corrections. What we don't understand," "Or if she calls up. Get

paper with corrections," "To get something marked or have a question to

ask," "When she calls us up to get work marked and stuff. When she

wants to ask you something or . . ."

The children's reasons for going to the teacher's desk were similar

to telling when they would go. They went because: "Don't know words,

somebody's bugging me," "For book club, get something marked," "When I

don't know what something is on paper," "If you have a problem. Usually

to pick up my papers and stuff," "If I don't know how to do something.
I'll just go up and ask her. Lot of people go up and ask."

The children's reasons for leaving their desks to go and get paper
were not many. They ranged from "That's just a doodle table, extras
left," to "It means you can't talk to anybody, you have to just go and
get the paper and go back to your seat," and "That means like when, when
they ran out . . ."

The respites the children manoeuvred for themselves were small.
Some chattered when the teacher was out of the room, a sneaked drink,
a spoken answer. Not once in the five weeks I studied this situation
did I hear laughter and the joyous voices of children happily discovering
an exciting world through learning.

On reflection, I have the unhappy idea that the children divulged
only a tiny portion of their world. After all, who was I to be trusted?
Small inklings of other perceptions they had of their classmates filtered
through some of the interviews. Suggestions that I photograph children
when they were "frustrated" or when there were shiny glistens in their
eyes (tears of frustration) heightened my curiosity and the wish that
I could uncover more layers of hidden meanings about their shared world.

How Children Interpreted Classroom Life

Restricted communication. The kinds of things the children could
not tell the teacher were: "Secrets, copying work, cheating, looking
at people's work," "Secret hand language . . . use it," "All sorts of
things. We play games. Sometimes I cheat, I cheat," "If your pencil
needs sharpening, you are not supposed to go and ask her if you can
sharpen it," "Not to say swear words, don't call them names," and "You
make lots of racket when she goes out of the room and we're not supposed

to."

Non-verbal communication. The interview question, How do you talk to your friends if you don't want to be heard? uncovered a group of sign languages used by the girls in the class. In response to the question, they replied: "Whisper," "We have a secret hand language," "Whisper, pass notes, pass messages," "With normal sign language," and "Some people do a sign language to each other."

The boys in the classroom stated they did not use a sign language to communicate when they didn't want to be heard. They indicated they "Wave them off," "When teacher isn't looking, I usually tap somebody," and "Do it four times before I figure it out." It appeared that getting the right answer prompted many of the communications among both boys and girls in the classroom which they preferred the teacher not to know about.

Gamesmanship. Some children had more understanding of the class-room rules and procedures than others. There were some children who not only understood the tacit rules but managed to manoeuvre around them. For example, when asked when they could go to the washroom, they replied, "Lunch and recess, at 9:00 a.m. if you say you didn't go at home," "Can't go right after lunch or recess," and "Sometimes in the afternoon around two o'clock or two thirty."

Three girls stated they talked when the teacher was out of the room, "Just what number we're on." They didn't pass notes when the teacher was in the classroom, "We do 'normal' sign language." They passed notes, both boys and girls, when they were down at the back of the room. When asked what they talked about mostly when the teacher was out of the room, they replied, "Just what number we're on," "Just finish doing our work," and ". . . or if we're finished we just read or something."

What Children Confirmed about Classroom Life

Living out a day. In the search for the descriptions of the setting by categories of events and happenings during a school day, the kinds of groups the children used to sort the photographs provided me with insights for the way participants defined the events in the classroom. These were constructions and reconstructions in which both the children and I participated. This means the validity of the inquiry was not tested against the corpus of scientific knowledge or quantitative mathematical formulations which could be derived from a setting; rather it was tested against everyday experiences of the children. It was contended that

> To understand the interpretive practices of children as they go
> about their routines, we cannot subordinate them to our experi-
> ences, to our construction of knowing, and to our forms of
> knowledge. Rather we are called upon to compose practices that
> reveal the child's interpretive meanings as reasonable and
> practical to their purposes-at-hand, and, in doing so, to recog-
> nize their forms of organizing the world as an alternative to
> our own. (Silver, 1975, p. 48)

The categories used by the children to sort the pictures were un-usual, diverse, and esoteric. For example, when a youngster sorted roll #3 he stated, "(1) A boy is talking and there is the teacher. (2) These two, both places where we read. (3) These two getting ready for gym. (4) These two, all the time we're sitting down. (5) Both standing up. (6) Both working hard. (7) These two, both same desks. (8) These two, in his desk, now gone. (9) These two, both places have work there." In contrast, another child categorized the same pictures as "(1) Nobody working. (2) Working. (3) Listening." Because they were so atypical I came to realize the magnitude and variety within the children's group-ings and categories. Each could be different for many reasons.

However, in the context of the study, designated to be descriptive and exploratory rather than to infer causality, the diversity was accepted. Thereafter, the greater reliance was placed on the suggestions offered by the individual children about what had been missed or not included in the photographs.

For example, I was able to take many photographs of the categories, events, and activities which were suggested to me by the children during the interviews. These included: the class out on the asphalt area outside the school building with water, brushes, paints, and paper; children going to music and while they were doing music; silent reading; art; going home; homework desk; homework; language arts and art; the social studies lesson about the forest; children receiving homework assignments; children signing their names on the blackboard because they had not finished their work; and the sink area in the classroom.

Adult versus children's agenda. What the children considered to be missing from an accurate portrayal of their classroom life were the kinds of timetable changes and movements from the classroom which cued or disrupted the monotony of staying in their desks on task. They did not feel free to speak to me while I worked in the classroom itself and I was not able to get the children to talk to me without disrupting the routine of the classroom as perceived by the teacher.

The implicit structures which involved the children and which ordered the life world of reality in this classroom were found in the practices, procedures, daily utterances, actions, and interactions which took place in the setting. An attempt was made to ground the descriptions of this reality in the immediately given, the life-world, and thereby the inherent meaning structures became intelligible.

In the data gathered it became evident that not only did the children in the setting have explicit educational knowledge and the knowledge of teacher's expectations, but also they had to behave in a purposeful, controlled, and steady manner as expressed in the teacher's concern with discipline and control.

The teacher's professed aims for the children with whom she worked were evident in the kinds of structures, procedures, and activities within the classroom. To survive in this setting children had to know the tacit rules. They were expected to mesh their behaviors with the understandings the teacher had about classroom life. They were expected to mesh their behaviors with the regularized relationships in the classroom and to mesh social experiences they had in their classroom with the teacher's own views of reality for the children in this setting.

On the one hand, there were strongly felt needs on the part of the children to socialize, while on the other hand the children understood the strong emphasis the teacher placed on task completion as an aim of much importance in the setting. To reconcile this conflict, children in the setting used a wide diversity of visual and verbal cues to help them through the realities of their everyday classroom activities. Self-initiating youngsters circumvented their everyday classroom ambiguities by checking cues with other students. For example, some girls used a sign language all day long to communicate with friends.

It would seem to follow that for the children and the teacher in this setting was a world where there is a meeting of life-worlds (Van Manen, 1978, pp.43-59). When they meet, within both there are many manifest interactions between and among teacher and children as they share the reality of this particular setting. These manifestations may take

the form of tentative expectations and planning, agreements, conflicts,
understandings, misinterpretations, tasks, responsibilities, frustrations,
and triumphs (Van Manen, 1978, pp..43-59). The life-world of the children
lay in their perceived significance of the various talk, gestures, read-
ings, exchanges, and conventions in the setting.   It would seem reasonable
to conclude that those children who better understood the structure of
the reality provided them by the teacher and who shared the meanings of
the life-world of the teacher would be more comfortable and competent
in this setting.

Summary

The study of a children's classroom culture and the kinds of inter-
pretations and shared understandings were gathered from the everyday talk
of the children in answer to pre-formulated questions and questions which
arose during the process of the study.

The study uncovered covert, shared communications, ways to circum-
vent classroom procedures, and the duplicity and cheating which took
place in the classroom outside of the classroom teacher's knowledge.

The classroom teacher's interest in control and discipline appeared
to engender and precipitate covert student actions, most particularly
shared secret sign languages among some of the girls and note passing
and whispering among some of the boys.

The classroom procedures for marking and on-task behavior appeared
to encourage children to get the right answer by any means available to
them which included cheating.

Finally, the monotony of the classroom activities appeared to
encourage children to try to enliven their lives by communicating with
sign language, note passing, and chatter whenever the teacher was out
of the classroom.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

Background to the Study

How we come to see and understand childhood depends upon the perspective adopted whether historical, psychological, or anthropological. The notion of childhood has become a taken-for-granted perspective about human life among social, political, religious, and educational groups in the twentieth century in the western world. Childhood as a separate state has become a concept sometimes manifested in the characterization of children as incomplete persons lacking in moral and intellectual development, irrational, and therefore incompetent because they lack the knowledge and judgement to act as ordinary members of our society. Nevertheless, childhood, or the children's world, includes the same sets of social, historic, economic, and cultural influences as the world of adults. Their complex world comprises the influences of home, playground, other children's homes, the street, the church, the workplace, and the neighborhood school. Young children act in the context of these influences and by so doing they create their own social order. Even young children playing in unsupervised settings will interact in groups of three or four individuals. They exercise peer competencies and they exhibit skills in regulating their relationships to one another. This constitutes a type of social order indicating that children do not develop in cultural isolation or in a socio-cultural vacuum.

99

Some psychologists have attempted to study childhood by viewing it as a series of developmental stages or gradations in children's social and emotional development. They have established particular criteria of maturation by psychological-intellectual gradings.

Anthropologists have taken a broad view of the child. In their studies of childhood in culture they have found children participating in the work and play of the adult world beginning at ages seven to nine; in Canadian culture we make children dependent non-productive members until they are approximately twenty-one years of age.

Adopting an anthropological view of a classroom suggests that there exists a culture and related subcultures, each guided by beliefs or a body of ideas, each impinging upon and influencing the others. The beliefs of the children's world may exist with or without the presence of adults while the beliefs of the teacher's world are acted upon by both the teacher and the children through daily interaction. In considering childhood as a sub-culture adults have tended to make judgements on the basis of children's supposed incomplete knowledge about adults' competent actions. Compounding the inadequacy of this perspective, comparatively little is known in educational research about children's play, fantasy, and the cultural context of their daily interactions in a school classroom.

Constructing a perspective, the classroom as a culture, teachers and children are seen to be in the process of developing their daily activities together. The adult culture seems to pervade the setting, to generate the formal classroom rules, with the teacher tending to promote or to sanction children's behavior. Teacher's beliefs can influence the kinds of shared meanings children hold about the rules of the classroom.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to discover the nature and meaning of
a classroom's social world as understood by the children in it. If the
actions displayed by individual children and groups of children are influ-
enced by interaction with others in the classroom setting, then it is
assumed that the social world of the classroom can be understood in the
ways young children interpret their daily activities. How do children
as members of a classroom culture constitute their daily lives? ` This
question of classroom life has received only passing attention in the
educational literature. Review of research revealed most studies consider
children as subjects and respondents rather than interpreters of their
cultural worlds.

Research Methods

In order to achieve the purpose of the study, certain research methods
had to be devised. The study attempted to document the events of class-
room life as interpreted by the children themselves. Procedures devised
for the study included the use of field notes, establishing rapport with
students, reporting the insider's view, and analyzing the interrelationships
among the data collected. Photography provided a means for documentary
interpretation. The ethnographic descriptions and interpretations combined
with photographs and the interpretive paradigm were the techniques used
in documenting everyday classroom life.

In an effort to make the everyday life problematic, the research
rested on certain presuppositions about children's practical knowledge;
their stock of knowledge; their practical reasoning; their reflections
and actions on the basis of their individual biographies and daily experi-
ences; and the sources for their stock of knowledge. The important

source for children's knowledge was taken to be the intersubjective world of reality which pre-exists and is available for children to interpret and experience in an orderly way. The children's knowledge about the world comes from their handed-down experiences from their parents, their experiences with their peers, and with the teacher, as well as the events which occur around them.

The specific procedures developed for the study were an outgrowth of the problems arising from field work; gaining entry, establishing rapport, and becoming participant-observer. The sequence of procedures included amassing all data in retrievable form, including photographs, interview transcripts and field notes; treating data comprehensively; analyzing the entire corpus of materials; providing provisional schema until recursive rules occurred which incorporated all the data; and achieving convergences between the researcher's and the participants' perspectives.

The methodology and data collection procedures for the study were based on the ideas of interpretive social science with emphasis on the discovery of an individual's meaning structures. It is a premise that everyday events are problematic. To attempt to document a socially constructed reality one must deal with practical actions, recover taken-for-granted knowledge from participants, and become part of the life world of a self-organizing setting. The methodology and data collection for this study attempted to describe: (1) what takes place in a classroom; (2) what regularizes the routines; and (3) what participants envisioned to be an adequate description of the social organization of the classroom.

The particular problems posed in undertaking this ethnographic study were attributable to: the difficulties encountered in gaining entry and

establishing a role that facilitated the collection of information and interpretations; the nature of class instruction; the desire on the part of the teacher to maintain control; the children's desk arrangement; the teacher's interest in control as manifested in the forms of questions; organization of the class work and reward systems; the need for children to behave quietly on task; and the fact that children rarely did any activity with a partner or in a small group. In order to overcome the effects of these features, initial observations involved the collection of meticulous field notes. Later, photography was used by the researcher to uncover frameworks important to the children and the frameworks the teacher used for defining and categorizing classroom events and objects. The camera as 'participant-camera' and a new role of photographer-participant-observer provided entry into the children's everyday life world. Photographs documented classroom events and these were shared with the children and the teacher. They in turn identified, described, interpreted, and categorized the photos when they said what the photographs meant to them. The meanings the photographs held were validations or check points in a research sequence: photos taken, photos shown to participants, photos interpreted to the researcher. The participants, then, defined the situation.

Specific camera techniques included the recording of events and objects in an opportunistic fashion; photographing children's suggested occurrences in a programmed way; and taking photographs of happenings in a random fashion. The role of the photographs in the study was to uncover the meanings for the everyday events in the research setting by providing a display to stimulate discussion with students; by defining the situation as the result of photographic choices; and by documenting events that were too complex to be identified by immediate classroom observation techniques.

This photographic record was used as the basis for individual interviews with the children. Transcriptions revealed children's identifications, interpretations, and categorizations, shared meanings for what was allowed and not allowed in the classroom, as well as their particular awarenesses for what had been missed or not included for an adequate portrayal of their culture.

Children's interpretations of the photographs displayed to them during interview sessions allowed the 'open-ended' quality of the photographic opportunity to be explored. The teacher's interview schedule focused on the meanings for events and objects as understood and shared by participants in the setting, children and teacher.

Findings and Conclusions

This study described how classroom life consists of both an adult and a children's daily agenda for patterning events. Students learned what was to go on in the classroom by being exposed to patterns ranging from formal instruction to their own informal group gossip. When the children were crowded into the classroom they found it difficult to use the kinds of skills and competencies they already had developed for regulating their relationships to one another in settings outside the school. Usually, their outside activities were related to physical things, toys, objects, spaces, and playground areas. These things helped mediate their relationships with one another and helped provide social order. When they were in the classroom they were expected to orient themselves to language encoded information, spoken or written. The children's own rules for regulating their interactions no longer applied. They were scolded for forming spontaneous groups or lapsing into play with objects at hand. The children's own agenda emphasized the kinds of timetable changes and movements

from the classroom which cued them or disrupted the monotony of staying
in their desks. Conversely, the teacher's agenda emphasized timetable
structures ordered around subjects and seatwork activities. The findings
suggest the children's agenda was part of their game for survival in the
classroom setting.

The predominant understandings participants shared about environmental
cues, teacher non-verbal and verbal cues, were related to the children's
needs to find ways to get right answers, to find ways to get out of their
desks, and ways to work within the time, space, and subject structures of
the class. The tacit rules for action in the classroom were described
by the children as the need to comply to the regimentation for the day and
to remain on task.

Physical structures and environmental cues appeared to the researcher
to limit social interaction among the children. The children themselves
provided descriptions which ranged from the literal to rather lengthy inter-
pretations of the furniture arrangements and other objects in the classroom.
These arrangements created time, space, and movement constraints on the
children stemming from what the teacher saw herself doing. By contrast,
the children shared their own understandings about the uses and purposes
for these objects and how they were integrated into the flow of events or
subject structures designated by the teacher.

Children's understandings of teacher non-verbal and verbal cues indi-
cated they used these to guide their actions. Children patterned their
lives according to the kinds of paper used in different activities; objects
which indicated subject structures; whether or not the teacher worked at
her desk; and the objects and papers on the teacher's desk. Teacher
verbal cues, calling specific children by name; teacher requests, children

asked to deliver messages; and teacher use of their names were understood by the children to be either rewards or sanctions for student behavior.

The children also shared understandings about restricted communications and non-verbal secret languages. The need to get the right answer prompted many of these communications among both boys and girls. They reported to the researcher that they cheated--looked at other children's work and copied--whispered, passed notes, sought answers from each other while the teacher was in the classroom and raised a racket when the teacher left. Girls shared secret sign languages and communicated when they were at their desks.

The basic meanings reflected in this study were primarily derived from the research situation as participants provided new and varied interpretations for the occurrences from the photographs. The study revealed that from the pupil participants' perspectives, many hypocritical actions within the children's world were carried on to satisfy the teacher. Children were observed and spoke about giving answers to math drill sheets and to provide correct spellings to each other during tests. These actions appeared to satisfy some of the children's longings to communicate, socialize, and make their own rules for the school game. The children seemed to conduct their actions among themselves to convey the why and how of what they did as bona fide members of their own culture, in the eyes of each other. The children's peer group had knowledge of codes and accounting to each other for their actions. Because they were not successful in meeting the expectations in the adult culture normatively imposed by the school system, they were forced to use subterfuge to satisfy the teacher's expectations. The dichotomy of overt and covert actions, the beginnings of an underground communication system, vis-à-vis the teacher's structures

for conduct in the setting engendered the children's need to fill in gaps

with their own culture.   They dissembled in their classroom conduct,

chattered whenever the teacher left the classroom, manoeuvered around the

tacit classroom rules.   They did this to survive--to live out a day knowing

the school game rules.

Educational Conclusions from the Study

The following conclusions may be drawn from the findings of this study.

1. The prime goal for the conduct of the school day reflected a pervasive

teacher interest in classroom discipline, order, and control.   This has

implications for the humaneness of classroom life as experienced by the

children.

2. Children structured their daily classroom activities around their own

agenda.   The question of how children perceive the teacher's subject struc-

tures and curriculum intents and whether children participate in planning

their learning processes requires further consideration.   Several implica-

tions for curriculum conceptualization and design are suggested:

(a) children conceive of time in ways other than the teacher's;

(b) children perceive objects and materials for purposes other than the

intents of the teacher; and (c) children understood the goals of curriculum

structures to be to get the right answers.   The products of their efforts

were of major concern for them rather than the kinds of processes for inquiry

and the quality of learning experiences held to be meaningful by the teacher.

These implications suggest alternatives to the classroom may be required.

For example, alternative curriculum planning would be to change the pupil-

teacher ratio, the fixed time frame, and the classroom testing so substan-

tially that the standard classroom as documented in this study would not

work.

3. The children made it known to the researcher that they cheated, sneaked, pretended, and dissembled in their efforts to get the right answers from each other by whatever means. For example, they communicated answers with secret sign languages, notes, whispers, and covert copying from each other's papers. These evidences of duplicity in children's actions in the classroom raise the question, How can schools demonstrate concerns for honesty and authenticity in children's behavior while they continue to engender the kinds of ambiguous situations wherein these behaviors not only thrive but create dissonance in children's perceptions for the primary concerns of schools?

Suggestions for Further Research

The findings from this study suggest that there is a need for further inquiry into the social culture of the school.

1. Photographs as 'participant camera' as a means of gaining easy entry to a social setting should be explored by social scientists as an extension of the participant observer's role in social settings.

2. Procedures using still photographs invite further exploration. They allow members to portray a culture in a way which is too complex for human observation methods. Insiders themselves could direct the documentary interpretation of their world were each to be provided with a camera.

3. Ways in which children's classroom knowledge constructs overlap with the adult or teacher's constructs remain to be elaborated.

4. Children's internalizations of tacit classroom rules in relation to their observed procedures for living out a classroom day constitute an important research area. A measure of the relationship between the degree of internalization on the part of individual children with their avowed procedures for conduct could be constructed.

5. Secret sign languages in classrooms suggest another avenue for research: in what kinds of school settings do they flourish? over what period of children's lives are they an important means of classroom communication? Do secret sign languages constitute a regressive form of communication among children and hamper language development?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atkin, J. M. Research styles in science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 1967-68, 5, 338-345.

Aries, P. Centuries of childhood. Trans. R. Baldluk. New York: Knopf, 1962.

Baldwin, A. L. Theories of development. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Barker-Lunn, J. The development of sex, achievement and social class on junior school children's attitudes. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 39, 64-71.

Barker-Lunn, J. The influence of sex, achievement and social class on junior school children's attitudes. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1972, 42, 70-74.

Beck, M. D. What are pupils' attitudes toward school curriculum? The Elementary School Journal, 1977, 78(1), 73-78.

Becker, H. S. Making the grade: The academic side of college life. New York: John Wiley, 1968.

Becker, H. S. Social class variation in teacher-pupil relationships. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1952, 25, 451-465.

Becker, H. S. Social Interaction. In J. Gould and W. L. Kolb (Eds.), A dictionary of social sciences. Pp. 657-658. London: Tavistock, 1964.

Beere, C. Development of a group instrument to measure children's attitudes toward school. Psychology in the Schools, 1973, 10, 308-315.

Benedict, R. Continuities and discontinuities in cultural conditioning. In A. Skolnick (Ed.), Rethinking childhood--perspectives on development and society. Pp. 19-28. Toronto: Little, Brown, 1976.

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. The social construction of reality. Garden City: Doubleday, 1966.

Blandford, G. A child's perception of the school. Educational Review, 1977, 29(3), 178-180.

Blumer, H. Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Blumer, H. Symbolic interaction. In James P. Spradley (Ed.), Culture and cognition: Rules, maps, and plans. San Francisco: Chandler, 1972.

Borich, G. D. Sources of invalidity in measuring classroom behavior.
    Texas University, Austin ERIC Document Reproduction Service,
    (ED 120 262), 1976.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Developmental research, public policy, and the ecology
    of childhood. Child Development, 1974, 45, 1-5.

Brown, B. B., Ober, R. L., Soar, R. S., & Webb, J. N. Florida taxonomy
    of cognitive behavior. In A. Simon and E. Boyer (Eds.), Mirror for
    behavior: An anthology of observation instruments. Pp. 37, 37-4.
    Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, 1970.

Bruner, J. S. Poverty and childhood. Oxford Review of Education, 1975,
    1(1), 31-50.

Bulmer, M., (Ed.). Sociological research methods: An introduction.
    London: MacMillan, 1977.

Burnett, J. Event description and analysis in the microethnography of
    urban classrooms. In F. Iann and E. Starey, (Eds.), Cultural
    relevance and educational issues. Pp. 287-303. Boston: Little,
    Brown, 1973.

Campbell, J. R., & Barnes, C. W. Interaction analysis--a breakthrough?
    Phi Delta Kappan, 1969, 50, 588-590.

Carew, J. V., & Lightfoot, S. L. Beyond bias: Perspectives on class-
    rooms. Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1979.

Case, R. Piaget's theory of child development and its implications.
    Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, 55(1), 20-25.

Cazden, C. B. The neglected situation in child language research and
    education. In Arlene Skolnick (Ed.), Rethinking childhood--
    perspectives on development and society. Pp. 149-167. Toronto:
    Little, Brown, 1976.

Cicourel, A. V. Language use and school performance. New York: Academic
    Press, 1974.

Cicourel, A. V. The acquisition of social structure: Toward a develop-
    mental sociology of language and meaning. In J. D. Douglas (Ed.),
    Understanding everyday life. Pp. 136-168. London: Routledge and
    Kegan Paul, 1971.

Cohen, Y. A. The shaping of men's minds--adaptations to imperatives of
    culture. In Murray Wax and Stanley Diamond (Eds.), Anthropological
    perspectives in education. Pp. 19-50. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Collier, J. Visual anthropology: Photographs as a research method.
    Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Crowle, A. Post experimental interviews: An experimental and a socio-
linguistic analysis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Univer-
sity of California, Santa Barbara, 1971.

Dawson, J. A. Validity in qualitative inquiry. University of Illinois
at Urbana- Champaign. Prepared for presentation at the annual meet-
ing of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco,
April 9, 1979.

deHeusch, L. The cinema and social science. Reports and papers in the
social sciences. 16. Paris: Unesco Publication.

Dewey, J. Democracy and education. New York: MacMillan, 1916.

Dexter, L. A. Elite and specializing interviewing. Evanston, Ill.:
Northwestern Press, 1970.

Douglas, J. D., & Johnson, J. M., (Eds.). Existential sociology.
Cambridge: Cambridge Press, 1977.

Douglas, J. D. (Ed.). Understanding everyday life. London: Routledge
and Kegan Paul, 1971.

Doyle, W. "Paradigms for teacher effectiveness research," Manuscript,
1977.

Dreebin, R. On what is learned in school. Reading, Mass.: Addison-
Wesley, 1968.

Dreebin, R. The school as workplace. In R. M. Travers (Ed.), Second hand-
book of research on teaching. Pp. 450–473. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Duke, D. L. Environmental influences on classroom management. In D.
L. Duke (Ed.), Classroom management, the 78th yearbook of the
National Society for the Study of Education, pp. 333–361, Part 11, 1979.

Eisner, E. On the uses of educational connoisseurship and criticism for
evaluating classroom life. Teachers College Record, 1973, 78, 354–
357.

Elkind, D. Child development in educational settings. Educational
Psychologist, 1976, 12, 49–58.

Elliott, J. Developing hypotheses about classrooms from teacher's practi-
cal constructs. Grand Forks, N.D.: University of North Dakota,
1976.

Elliott, J. Three points of view in the classroom. Ford teaching pro-
ject publication. Cambridge: Cambridge Institute of Education,
1975.

Flanders, N. Analyzing teacher behavior. Reading, Mass.: Addison-
Wesley, 1970.

Flanders, N. Interaction models of critical thinking behaviors. In E. J. Amidon and J. B. Hough (Eds.), Interaction analysis: Theory research, and application. Pp. 360-374. Don Mills, Ont.: Addison-Wesley, 1967.

Frake, C. O. Comment to Burling. American Anthropologist, 1964, 66, 119.

Garfinkel, H. Studies in ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Gearing, F., & Hughes, W. On observing well: Self-instruction in ethnographic observation for teachers, principals, and supervisors. Amherst, N.Y.: Centre for Studies of Cultural Transmission, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1975.

Geertz, C. The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic, 1973.

Glaser, B. C., & Strauss, A. L. The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Goodenough, W. Cultural anthropology and linguistics. In D. Hymes (Ed.), Language in culture and society. Pp. 36-39. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Gouldner, A. W. The coming crisis of western sociology. New York: Avon, 1971.

Gump, P. V. Intra-setting analysis: The third grade classroom as a special but instructive case. In E. P. Williams and H. L. Raush (Eds.), Naturalistic viewpoints in psychological research. Pp. 200-220. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Hallowell, I. The child, the savage, and human experience. In A. Skolnick (Ed.), Rethinking childhood--perspectives on development and society. Pp. 78-100. Toronto: Little, Brown, 1976.

Hamilton, P. Knowledge and social structure. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.

Henry, J. Attitude organization in elementary school classrooms. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1957, 27, 117-133.

Herrman, R. Classroom status and teacher approval and disapproval--study of children's perceptions. Journal of Experimental Education, 1972, 41, 32-39.

Hockings, P., (Ed.). Principles of visual anthropology. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.

Holt, J. How children fail. New York: Dell, 1964.

Hymes, D., (Ed.). Reinventing anthropology. New York: Pantheon, 1969.

Jackson, P. Students' world. The Elementary School Journal, 1966.

Jackson, P. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Jackson, P. The students' world. In A. Skolnick (Ed.), Rethinking childhood--perspectives on development and society. Pp. 368-380. Toronto: Little, Brown, 1976.

Jackson, P., & Kieslar, S. B. Fundamental research and education. In S. B. Kieslar and C. F. Turner (Eds.), Fundamental research and the process of education. Pp. 7-18. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1977.

Kaplan, A. The conduct of inquiry: Methodology for behavioral science. Scranton, Penn.: Chandler, 1964.

Katz, M. B. Class bureaucracy, and schools--the illusion of educational change in America. New York: Praeger, 1975.

Katz, M. B. The irony of early school reform: Educational innovation in mid-nineteenth century. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Press, 1968.

Kelly, G. A. The psychology of personal constructs. W. W. Norton, 1955.

Kett, J. Adolescence and youth in nineteenth century America. Journal of Interdisciplinary History, 1971, 11, 283-98.

King, R. A. The school at Mopass, a problem of identity, case studies in education and culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Krebs, S. The film elicitation technique. In P. Hockings (Ed.), Principles of visual anthropology. Pp. 283-301. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.

Lightfoot, S. L. Politics and reasoning: Through eyes of teachers and children. Harvard Educational Review, 1973, 43(2), 197-244.

Lofland, J. Analyzing social settings, a guide to qualitative observations and analysis. Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth, 1971.

Lortie, D. Observations on teaching as work. In R. M. Travers(Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching, 2nd ed. Pp. 474-497. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Lutz, F. W., & Ramsey, M. A. The use of anthropological field methods in education. Educational Researcher, 1974, 3(10), 5-9.

Malinowski, B. Argonauts of the western Pacific. New York: Dutton, 1961.

Mead, M., & MacGregor-Cooke, F. Growth and culture: A photographic study of Balinese children. New York: John Wiley, 1951.

Mehan, H. Learning lessons--social organization in the classroom. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Press, 1979.

Mehan, H., & Wood, H. The reality of ethnomethodology. New York: John Wiley, 1975.

Morgan, G. The human predicament. New York: Delta Books, 1968.

MacKay, R. W. Conceptions of children and models of socialization. In H. P. Dreitzel (Ed.), Recent sociology. Pp. 27-43. MacMillan, 1973.

MacKay, R. W. Conceptions of children and models of socialization. In R. Turner (Ed.), Ethnomethodology. Pp. 180-193. Baltimore: Penguin, 1974.

McLuhan, M. Understanding media: The extension of man. New York: Signet, 1964.

Nuthall, G. Is classroom interaction research worth the effort involved? New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 1974, 9(1), 1-17.

Olson, D. R., (Ed.). Media and symbols: Forms of expression, communication and education, Chapter 1. Pp. 1-24. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1974.

Opie, P., and Opie, I. Children's games in street and playground. London: Oxford Press, 1969.

Opie, P., and Opie, I. The lore and language of school children. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.

Phillips, D. S., & Kelly, M. E. Hierarchical theories of development in education and psychology. Harvard Educational Review, 1975, 45, 351-375.

Pike, K. L. Etic and emic standpoints for the description of behavior. In D. C. Hildum (Ed.), Language and thought. Pp. 32-39. Toronto: D. Van Nostrand, 1967.

Pike, K. L. Etic and emic standpoints for the description of behavior. Excerpted from K. L. Pike, Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior. Pp. 37-68. The Hague: Mouton, 1967.

Piaget, J. The moral judgement of the child. New York: Collier Books, 1962.

Plumb, J. H. The great change in children. Horizon, 1971, 13, 6-12.

Prentice, A. The American Example. In J. D. Wilson, R. M. Stamp, & L. Audet (Eds.), Canadian education: A history. Pp. 41-68. Toronto: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Rist, R. C. Student social class and teacher expectations. The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. Harvard Educational Review, 1970, 40, 411-451.

Rist, R. C. The urban school: A factory for failure. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1973.

Rist, R. C. Ethnographic techniques and the study of an urban school. Urban Education, 1975, 10(1), 86-107.

Rooke, P. The "child-institutionalized" in Canada, Britain and the United States: A trans-Atlantic perspective. The Journal of Educational Thought, 1977, 2(2), 156-177.

Rosenshine, B. Evaluation of class instruction. Review of Educational Research, 40(2), 279-298.

Sacks, H. "On some formal properties of children's games," Manuscript, August 27, 1965.

Schatzman, L., & Strauss, A. L. Field research: Strategies for a natural sociology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Schutz, A. Collected papers. Vol. 1. The problem of social reality. The Hague: Martinus Nijoff, 1962.

Schutz, A. Collected papers 1: The problem of social reality. M. Natanson (Ed.). The Hague: Martinus Nijoff, 1971.

Schutz, A. The frame of unquestioned constructs. In M. Douglas (Ed.), Rules and meanings. Pp. 18-20. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.

Schutz, A. The stranger: An essay in social psychology. From Collected Papers, Vol. 2. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.

Schwartz, M. S., & Schwartz, C. G. Problems in participant observation. American Journal of Sociology, 1955, 60(4), 343-353.

Silberman, C. Crisis in the classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Silberman, M. L. Behavioral expression of teachers' attitudes toward elementary school students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 402-407.

Silver, R. J. Discovering children's culture. Interchange, 1975, 6, 47-51.

Sindell, P. S. Anthropological approaches to the study of education. *Review of Educational Research*, 1969, *39*(5), 593-605.

Sitton, T., & Mehaffy, G. L. The child's culture of classrooms (and how to discover it). *Educational Leadership*, 1978, *35*, 521-525.

Smith, L. M., & Geoffrey, W. *The complexities of an urban classroom: An analysis toward a general theory of teaching.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Smith, L., & Pohland, P. A. *Education technology and the rural highlands. Four evaluation examples: Anthropological, economic, narrative, and portrayal.* American Educational Research Association. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Smith, L. M. The microethnography of the classroom. *Psychology in the Schools*, 1967, *4*, 216-221.

Sorenson, R. E., & Jablonko, A. Research filming of naturally occurring phenomena. In P. Hockings (Ed.), *Principles of visual anthropology.* Pp. 151-263. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.

Speier, M. The adult ideological viewpoint in studies of childhood. In A. Skolnick (Ed.), *Rethinking childhood: Perspectives on development and society.* Pp. 168-186. Toronto: Little, Brown, 1976.

Spindler, G. D. *Education and the cultural process.* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Spradley, J. P. Foundations of cultural knowledge. In J. P. Spradley (Ed.), *Culture and cognition: Rules, maps, and plans.* Pp. 3-34. San Francisco: Chandler, 1972.

Spradley, J. P., & McCurdy, D. W., (Ed.). *The cultural experience: Ethnography in complex society.* Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1972.

Stoddart, K. "The presentation of everyday life: Strategies for 'adequate ethnography'." Undated manuscript, University of British Columbia, 1978-79, 1-15.

Sturtevant, W. C. Studies in ethnoscience. In J. P. Spradley (Ed.), *Culture and cognition: Rules, maps, and plans.* Pp. 129-167. San Francisco: Chandler, 1972.

Sullivan, E. V. Comment: Phenomenology and structuralism: A war of the worlds. *Interchange*, 1975, *6*(4), 52-55.

Sutherland, N. The history of Canadian children: Some notes for the International Year of the Child. *CSSE News*, 1979, *6*(2), 3-8.

Temaner, G., & Quinn, G. Cinematic social inquiry. In P. Hockings (Ed.), *Principles of visual anthropology.* Pp. 53-64. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.

Tenenbaum, B. Attitudes of elementary school children to school, teachers, and classmates. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1944, 28, 134-141.

Tulkin, S. R., & Konner, M. J. Alternative conceptions of intellectual functioning. In A. Skolnick (Ed.), Rethinking childhood--perspectives on development and society. Pp. 128-148. Toronto: Little, Brown, 1976.

Turner, R., (Ed.). Ethnomethodology. Penguin, 1974.

Travers, R. M. Man's information system. Pennsylvania: Chandler Press, 1970.

Van Manen, M. An exploration of alternative research orientations in social education. Theory and Research in Social Education, 1975, 3(1), 1-28.

Van Manen, M. Languages of deep structure in curriculum inquiry. In K. Reeder and D. C. Wilson (Eds.), Language, culture and curriculum. Pp. 43-59. Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1978.

Walker, R. The sociology of education and life in school classrooms. International Review of Education, 1972, 18, 32-41.

Wax, M. L., Wax, R. H., & Dumont, R. V. Jr. Formal education in an American Indian community. SSSP monographs: A supplement to social problems, 2(4), 1964.

Wax, R. H. Doing fieldwork. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Webb, E. J., Campbell, D. T., Schwartz, R. D., & Secrest, L. Unobtrusive measures: Nonreactive research in the social sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Whaley-Klahn, M. E., Loney, J., Weisfenburger, F. E., & Prinz, R. Responses of boys and girls to behaviorally focused school attitude questionnaire. Journal of School Psychology, 1976, 14(4), 283-290.

Wieder, D. On meaning by rule. In J. D. Douglas (Ed.), Understanding everyday life. Pp. 107-135. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.

Wilson, D. C. Emic-evaluative inquiry: An approach for evaluating school programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1976.

Wilson, T. P. Normative and interpretive paradigms in sociology. In J. D. Douglas (Ed.), Understanding everyday life. Pp. 57-79. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.

Wilson, S. The use of ethnographic techniques in educational research. Review of Educational Research, 1977, 47, 245-265.

Wolcott, H. F.   A Kwakiutl village and school.   Case Studies in Education and Culture.   New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Wolcott, H. F.   Criteria for an ethnographic approach to research in schools.   Human Organization, 1975, 34(2), 112-127.

Wolcott, H. F.   Handle with care: Necessary precautions in the anthropology of schools.   In M. A. Wax, S. Diamond, and F. O. Gearing (Eds.), Anthropological perspectives on education.   Pp. 98-117. New York: Basic, 1971.

Wolcott, H. F.   The man in the principal's office.   New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

APPENDIX A

Field note questions

Questions generated by field notes

Taken sequentially

1. Why is Sean seated by himself?
2. What is it like to sit alone?
3. What kinds of notes go home about books?
4. What does it mean to be seated in way they are seated?
5. When do you pass notes to each other?
6. Why do people give each other notes?
7. What does it mean to sit in hard desks without cushions?
8. How do you talk to your friends if you don't want to be heard?
9. What is a calendar?
10. When do you go to the teacher's desk?
11. Why do you go to the teacher's desk?
12. What does it mean to go and get paper?
13. Why do you sometimes do it twice? (go for paper)
14. Who delivers notes to the office?
15. When can you go to the washroom?
16. Ask about sign language and communication while teacher is out of the room.
17. Why do you put notebooks into boxes with signs on them?
18. Why does the teacher say L's name a lot?
19. Why does the teacher say J's name a lot?
20. What does it mean when the teacher calls your name?
21. What can you do when the teacher goes out of the room?
22. What does the blue-covered area mean? When can you go there?
23. What does it mean to have a time test?
24. How does Sean get papers given to him?
25. Where does he belong?
26. What does it mean to give answers out loud, one by one?
27. Do you always start with the same person? (calling out answers)
28. How do you help each other, so you don't miss your place?
29. What does it mean to call how you did on a test out loud?
30. When does the teacher work at her desk?
31. What does it mean when the teacher works at her desk?
32. When do you go to sit to read? How do you know you should go?
33. What things can you do while a group is reading with the teacher?
34. What do you do if you don't know what to do?
35. What is usually on the end of the teacher's desk, what kinds of papers?
36. What does it mean when kid's stuff falls on the floor?
37. What kinds of things can you not tell a teacher?
38. Why does the teacher bring her coffee cup into the room after recess?
39. Who is Mrs. Bario?
40. What does it mean to be a 'super speller'?
41. What does it mean to sit and figure things out?
42. What does it mean to mark someone else's work?

APPENDIX B

Interview Schedules A, B, C

Children's interview questions<u></u>   Schedule A.

1. Why is S. seated by himself?
2. What do you think it's like to sit alone?
3. How do you talk to your friends if you don't want to be heard?
4. When do you go to the teacher's desk?
5. Why do you go to the teacher's desk?
6. What does it mean to go and get paper?
7. Who delivers notes to the office?
8. Why do you put notebooks into boxes with signs on them?
9. Why does the teacher say L's name a lot?
10. Why does the teacher say J's name a lot?
11. What does it mean when the teacher calls your name?
12. What does the blue-covered area mean? when can you go there?
13. When does the teacher work at her desk?
14. What does it mean when the teacher works at her desk?
15. When do you sit to read? How do you know you should go?
16. What is usually on the end of the teacher's desk, what kinds of
    papers?
17. What kinds of things can you not tell a teacher?
18. What are "reserved books"?
19. Who is Mrs. B?
20. What does it mean to mark someone else's work?

Children's questions   Schedule B.

(Generated again from field notes and earlier interviews)

1.   What kind of note goes home about books?
2.   What is on the counter, in the tins, erasers?
3.   When do you pass notes?
4.   What does it mean to sit on hard desks without cushions?
5.   What do you talk about mostly when the teacher is out of the room?
6.   When do you talk to other grown-ups in the room?
7.   When do you get out of your desk and get paper?
8.   Why did a boy put his notebook <u>under</u> the others in the box?
9.   When do you get up for paper towels?
10. Why do you pass papers forward and back?
11. How do you keep track as you call out the answers?
12. What does it mean when the teacher calls for the scores?
13. What does 'super speller' mean?
14. How do you talk to your friends if you don't want to be heard?
15. When can you go to the washroom?
16. When can you go and get a drink?

<u>Interview with teacher</u>   Schedule C.

1. What kinds of routines for marking do you have, I mean the boxes
    that the children put their work into?
2. What kinds of routines do you have for the washroom, drinks, and
    eating at recess and lunch?
3. What kinds of routines do you have for reading groups, and silent
    reading that I may have not gathered in the field notes?
4. What kinds of routines do the children have for music, P.E., and
    library?
5. What kinds of routines do you have for the children when they
    complete their work.

<u>Sharper focus</u>

1.   Why is Sean seated by himself?
2.   What does it mean for him to sit alone?
3.   What kinds of notes go home about books?
4.   What part of the room is the back, the front, etc.?
5.   What is the calendar job?
6.   When do the children go to your desk?
7.   What does it mean to go and get paper?
8.   What does the blue covered carpet area mean?
9.   What does it mean for the teacher to work at her desk?
10. What routines do the children have while you are working with a
     reading group?
11. What is usually at the end of the teacher's desk, what kinds of papers?
12. What does it mean to be a 'super speller'?
13. What are the routines for marking other children's work by the
     children?
14. What are the routines for notes delivered to the office?
15. Who else is involved with your class, e.g., parents, other teachers?

May I please arrange to take pictures again?
May I please arrange to have some of the children arrange the pictures to
tell the routines of their everyday life, i.e., have other children tell
me what another child means by an arrangement of pictures?

APPENDIX C

Transcripts of Interviews with Children

<u>Dominic, first child interviewed</u>

Roll #1

R.   Would you like to spread them out on the floor down here and tell me about them? Would that be a little more convenient for you?
D.   I don't care.
R.   You're sure? Okay. How about down here? As long as we have the microphone close to you. Okay, and me too. Let's have a look at these.
D.   Do I talk in there?
R.   Yes, well you don't have to worry, you know. You don't have to worry too much about getting too close because it's picking your voice up right now. I've turned the volume right up.
D.   Is that our class?
R.   Yes. You tell me something about these pictures. Have a look at them. Could you explain them to me a little bit, please?
D.   This is our reading club and umm this is the teacher's desk. And we're doing art and this is the string for these things.
R.   How do you know you're doing art?
D.   Well, because we do these things, like umm . . . we're whatever things called . . . and then . . . (hesitation) This is our spelling words.
R.   Mmm.
D.   We have to practice and do it on a sheet.
R.   Okay.
D.   Then . . . this is the chair where some us we fight to get in the chair and we read . . . and this . . . ooops.
R.   Okay.
D.   This is where um, this is where some of our art is, yeah, some of our finished work. And here's some books.
R.   What books are they?
D.   Uh, umm . . . reading books, like you can read.
R.   Mmmm.
D.   Here's where other books are. The song books and here's our games and that . . . we have when we're finished. This is the box our journals . . . yeah . . . journals. And when we go on a weekend or something we ummm. Like we tell about what we did on the weekend. We hand them in and the teacher marks them.
R.   I see.
D.   And this is reading books.
R.   What kind of reading books are they, Dominic?
D.   Oh, these are reserved. People who are reading.
R.   What does 'reserved' mean?
D.   People get a reading book, a reader.
R.   Oh, I see. Where do they come from in the first place?
D.   Oh, some are over . . . whoops.
R.   Okay.
D.   Maybe you've got a picture of them.
R.   Okay, let's check and see. Maybe we'll come to it later.
D.   Let's see if there is one picture. It would be over here.
R.   I see, what's in here?
D.   This is . . . the this is the language art . . . math, language arts. When we do our math we hand it in. In there . . . language . . . we hand it in.

R. Okay.

D. This is . . . oh, our reading corner too.

R. What kind of a reading corner is it?

D. Oh, we just . . . Here's the box I was telling you about.

R. Yes.

D. Yeah.

D. And that . . . and these are some books we read too.

R. When do you read them?

D. We read them about . . . at right after one o'clock. We read a book for half an hour, then we do art or something.

R. Okay.

D. This is our doodle table . . . oh yeah . . . we uh . . .

R. I beg your pardon?

D. This is our doodle table and then . . .

R. What is a doodle table?

D. Well the teacher has . . . well . . . ummm like . . . like we do papers and that. And she puts them in there. It's full of all different kinds of paper.

R. I see.

D. And this, our our art too.

R. What is it?

D. Art.

D. That's our art.

R. What's happening in that picture?

D. They're doing their work. They're doing their work. (Long pause) No, ooh . . . uh . . . yeah, we're going to ummm . . . what's it ummm . . . fun and fitness.

R. Who does fun and fitness with you?

D. Ummm the teacher umm and umm some of the kids in the class bring their fathers and mothers and they come and help.

R. Oh, really? Mmmm. Is this someone's father?

D. Mmmm.

R. Whose father is it?

D. La . . . father.

R. Mmmm.

D. And these are pictures we drew.

R. When did you do those?

D. I don't know, about a month ago.

R. (Laughter) Do you want to tell those guys we're recording over here?

D. Okay. (Disrupted by students in the library near corner used for taping).

R. Thanks D. Want to make sure I get your voice.

D. This is the same picture. That's when we . . .

R. Beg pardon?

D. This is the same picture, not the same but . . . This is when we were going to . . . I think . . . yeah (Inaudible)

R. Okay.

D. And here's Ga . . . ., getting his stuff.

R. What kind of stuff is he getting?

D. His gym bags to go to fun and fitness.

R. Okay.

D. This is the room where you put your jackets here and the girls here and we put our gym shoes and our gym stuff up there.

R. Does everybody have their stuff on the right shelf?

D. Mmmm.

R. How do you know?

D. Well, we just put them under there and up here.

R. I see.

D. And here. Here's our work we do our work up here on the board and over down there. Mmm, that's about it for this one. And here's our um mailbags.

R. What are they for?

D. That's for when we finished our work . . . and we do papers . . . and the teacher . . . the teacher doesn't want them . . . and when she's finished with marking them . . . and they're all right she puts them in there.

R. I see.

D. They're all correct.

R. Okay. Do you take them home sometime?

D. Yep.

R. How often do you take them home?

D. Anytime you want.

R. Oh, I see, you take the mailbag home any time you want.

D. Yeah, not the whole thing, just take the papers out of it.

R. Okay.

D. And . . . can't see anything for this picture . . . Umm this one, I think this is the morning work, the teacher tells us what to do on the board and that. This one's ummm when we just began to do the fun and fitness. We were gonna get umm our gym bags and that.

R. Mmm.

D. And they got the things to time us. And this is when we did our poem. Yeah, it's when we did our poem for mothers.

R. Oh, mother's day?

D. For mother's day, yeah.

R. Okay.

D. And we did these flowers in Mrs. Denley's class.

R. Mmm.

D. And uh this is when we umm doing umm we were umm writing, copying the poem.

R. I see.

D. I don't want to get these pictures hurt.

R. Beg pardon?

D. I don't want to get these pictures hurt.

R. That's very kind of you.

D. Um, that's the same thing here too.

R. Umm.

D. And this is when we did fun and fitness too.

R. Okay.

D. (Inaudible).

R. How do you know it's fun and fitness?

D. Because Mrs. M. is there.

R. Oh, I see, but what is this boy doing? (Rare question re a picture)

D. What? Here?

R. Mmm.

D. I think he's finishing his poem.

R. Oh, I see. What do you think the teacher is doing?

D. Talking about fun and fitness.
R. Okay.
D. And this is Ji . . . and that's . . . and umm whatever his name, I
    can't remember.
R. Okay.
D. Because I can't see him that well.
R. No, it's dark isn't it?
D. Yes.
D. This is the gym place . . . and that's S's desk.

Lamour

R.   These are pictures of the class, you can tell me what's in them if
     you like. Okay?
R.   I'm recording you too, is that okay? (Not much response)
L.   Ummm, these are paper bird cages.
R.   Okay. You can tell me what's happening in each picture. (Long pause)
R.   Did Sh. tell we were doing the secret language?
L.   Mmm.
R.   Do you mind if I find out what it is and take pictures of it?
L.   No.
R.   Okay. Do you want to put those aside for a few minutes? If you sit
     over there sweetheart and if you tell me what the signs are. And,
     ah, I'm not going to tell anybody else about this. (Laughter)
     We'll, where did I put the envelope. The envelope for the pictures?
     Oh, there it is. I'll take pictures okay? Just let me get the
     flash warmed up. You can sit over there in the light. You can tell
     me which ones are which, okay?
L.   This is "do you."
R.   Mmm.
L.   And this means "The.".
R.   Let me focus you a bit better. Yes.
L.   This means "Lor."
R.   Yes.
L.   And, this means "why."
R.   Mmmm.
R.   Oh, I've got to change my film. Just a sec. (Laughter) Do you want
     to stop?
R.   Okay, let's try again, I think you were on "why." Do you want to
     do that why again for me? That's great.
L.   This means "and."
R.   Yes.
L.   This also means "The..".
R.   Mmm. Why do you have two for The..?
L.   Because she found out. The.. found out what her name was in the
     secret language.
R.   Who did?
L.   The..
R.   Mmmm.
L.   She found out what her name was, we changed it.
R.   Right.
L.   And ummmm. This means "attention."
R.   Yes.
L.   This means "show-off."
R.   Mmmm.
L.   And, and, and then, we try to get somebody's attention, you go,
     well you ah, you're supposed to stamp your foot.
R.   I thought Cr. knew that one, so you changed it.
L.   Oh yeah, we changed it, breathing hard, going "uh."
R.   Yes, okay.
L.   And, umm, this means L... C... (tongue out).
R.   Who?

L. L... C...
R. Oh I see, that's her last name is it?
L. Yeah.
L. This means "Cry.."
R. Yes, mmmm.
L. And this means "gross."
R. Yes, mmm. Gross?
L. Yeah. And ummm, I can't think of any other things we made up.
R. That's okay, maybe you'll think of some others. Now I'll ask you
    some questions too, maybe you'll think of some others.
R. Who else knows your language?
L. Ummm. We finally told The.. our secret language.
R. But it, but there's three of you isn't there? Sharon told me there
    were three of you.
L. There's four people.
R. Four people who know?
L. Yeah.
R. Who knows the language then?
L. Lor.
R. Mmm.
L. The..   Lor, The.. and Sh..
R. Lor. me The.. You and Sh.
R. Okay, and when do you use it?
L. Ummm. We use it, all the time umm when you wanna know if a person
    is mad at you. And.
R. Yes?
L. And when.
R. Mmm.
L. When we want to see if they like somebody else.
R. Do any of the other kids know your language?
L. Umm.
L. Just.
R. Do they know some of the words?
L. Some of the people figured out a couple of the words.
R. And, do any of the other kids have any of their own languages?
L. Yeah.
R. Who else has a language?
L. Cr..
R. Mmm. Who does she have a language with?
L. With Li..
R. Yes.
L. And, umm, Sha... and Li.. used to have a language.
R. Umm.
L. And a (inaudible). That's all I can think of.
R. Do any of the boys have a language?
L. No.
R. How do you know?
L. Mmm, never see them, saying anything different or . . .
R. Mmm.
L. Or doing any sign language.
R. Mmm.
R. How long have you had this language?
L. This one? We've had it for about two months.

R. Do you keep adding new words?

L. Yeah.

R. How many words do you think you have now?

L. Umm.

R. Want to count them tonight and tell me?

L. Yeah.

R. Okay. Now the kids who don't have a language, like you do, what do they do so they can talk to each other?

L. Well, the teacher taught all of us all the letters in the alphabet. Then they can use those letters and spell words.

R. I see. Who uses those?

L. Uh.

R. Ji.. uses those doesn't she? those letters of the alphabet?

L. I think so.

R. Mmmm, mmm. I guess I've kept you long enough. If you think of any more I'll be here a whole other week yet. (Laughter)

R. And you'll see the pictures. I'll get you down to see the pictures and you can tell me what they are again, okay? Do you want me to talk to ah . . . Do you want me to talk to The..?

L. Yeah.

R. Okay, you send her down. You can just push the stop button please.

<u>Zoran</u>

Full transcript of interviews

R. Whenever you feel comfortable.
Z. Okay.
R. You tell me.
Z. Can I say the names too?
R. Sure.
Z. Te.. is talking to Ja.. I don't know what about 'cause she's just
    talking about something.
R. Okay.
Z. Oh, let's see the other one. Mrs. S. is showing Sh.. what to do.
    Not what to do, Sh.. doesn't know what to do.
R. Okay, how do you know she's doing that?
Z. Because she's right there and Mrs. S. is turning the book.
R. Oh, I see.
Z. In this one everybody's working and Dea.. is standing there like this.
R. Does he do that very often?
Z. Yeah, now and then . . . they're all just quiet working. There's
    Mrs. S. talking.
R. Mmm.
Z. Some group, the reading group. I mean our group and there's Li..
    staring this way. There's Li.. and Cry.. looking at the post cards
    here.
R. Mmm.
Z. And this one, ah, Mrs. S. is gonna hand us, me and G.., a lot of
    Tin Tin books.
R. What kind of books?
Z. Tin, Tin, one I got, the star.
R. What is she doing there again, I'm sorry.
Z. She's got a deliver Tin Tin books. Not to everybody. Well you
    know our list. Tin Tin.
R. Mmmm.
Z. Me and Ga.. got it 'cause it was our turn.
R. Oh, I see.
Z. Here are Ste.. and Ja.. and they're reading and Ja.. has his foot
    up on the seat.
R. Mmm.
Z. Here's Ste.. and Ja.. Steve's laughing and Ja.. is reading with his
    leg up on the chair again.
R. Mmm.
Z. And this is Se.. T.. He's reading his book.
R. Okay.
Z. Mmmm. Here's let's see Jeff and Dea.. No, Je.. is talking to Dea..
R. Okay.
Z. That's it.
R. Would you like to put them in piles that kind of go together?
Z. Okay.
R. Choose your own kind of piles.
Z. Have to sort them out then.
R. Sure.
Z. These are like sticky when you get them out first.
R. Mmm.

R. You're the first one in the class to see them.
Z. Okay.
R. Okay.
Z. Mmm (affirmation).
R. Which ones belong together? (Inaudible exchanges)
Z. Those three because they're, because they're working.
R. What other ones belong together?
Z. There's these two.
R. Why do those two belong together?
Z. Because they're reading groups.
R. Oh, I see.
Z. And here.
R. Okay.
Z. That's just . . .
R. Do they belong with those two?
Z. No, no.
R. Okay.
Z. Umm, these two probably here. This is a little bit far out, this is
    far out, but this is closer in, they're not as together when you see
    them a little better.
R. Oh, I see.
Z. Mmm. This . . . Mrs. S.
R. How did you put them together because they're close in?
Z. They're close and one's far out.
R. Okay. Which one is far out?
Z. This one, this one is in.
R. Oh, I see, okay.
Z. This one. This one's quite far out. This one's quite little bit in.
R. Okay.
Z. They match together because Mrs. S. is standing there and Mrs. Mc..
    she's right there.
R. Oh, there, I see. Okay. So that's kind of like the same idea as the
    other ones, okay?
Z. How come you're putting circles on them numbers?
R. So I can keep track of your answers.
Z. Oh.
R. Okay.
Z. And this is just S.. working.
R. Okay.
Z. Oh, spider webs.
R. What?
Z. Yeah, right there.
R. Wonder if I can ask you some questions now that you've looked at
    those pictures.
Z. Okay.
Z. Those all the other kids?
R. Some of them, yes.
Z. Whose is that?
R. These are the questions I'm asking you dear.
Z. Oh.
R. Okay.
R. Why, why is Se.. seated by himself, dear?

Z. Because you can't . . . see the other people 'cause you move a little bit in and you see, you see the other things but no people. Only you can see this part of the group, part of the desk, the back desk and these . . .

(Boy does not perceive Se.. to be alone, he delivers papers to him as Se.. is part of his row.)

R. That is Se.. though isn't it?

Z. Yes.

R. Why is he seated in that desk by himself?

Z. Because he doesn't disturb people. Mrs. S. tells him to move over there because he always disturbs people.

R. I see. And ah, how do you talk to your friends if you don't want to be heard?

Z. You know I know the kinda hurt you mean. You mean not like you hurt yourself not like that.

R. No, no, I meant if you don't want to be heard. If you don't want the teacher to hear you how do you talk to your friends?

Z. Silent, not silent, softly, like whisper.

R. Yes, any other way?

Z. Yeah, like you could pass messages. Get a piece of paper and write . . . pass messages.

R. What do you say on the messages?

Z. Oh, lots of things.

R. Can you tell me?

Z. Umm.

R. This is just between you and me.

R. Pardon? Just jokes.

Z. Like sometimes jokes and he passes back to me.

R. What kind of jokes?

Z. Oh, Why did, why did the turkey cross the street?

R. Umm, ummm, why did he?

Z. Because he wanted to get to the other side.

R. Oh, I see. (Laughter)

Z. To the butcher's store.

R. Are there any other ways that you pass messages in class?

Z. Yeah, we just kinda go like this, Se.., sh. Like this way, like this way, Se.. Yeah we just say that or the people .... .

R. Umm.

Z. Or we just, if somebody's close . . . just tap on the back.

R. Umm.

Z. Yeah.

R. What about?

R. What about if somebody is a long way away from you? How do you get a message to them?

Z. Oh, sometimes, but I never do this when Mrs. S. is here. Or Mrs. B.., like this. When she's at the desk, too much kids and she's blocked of her view.

R. Mmm.

Z. I just kinda get under and sneak under and get . . . and give 'em, just tell them the message.

R. Who is that, that you do?

Z. Oh, lots . . . I don't know exactly, just kids.

R. Okay, sure.

Z. And this, oh yeah, this is my desk right here . . . back in the desk.

R. Oh, mm, mmm.

Z. Yeah, right there.

R. Okay.

R. And ah, when do you go to the teacher's desk?

Z. Oh, when? Sometimes when she says don't bring it to the marking boxes.

R. I see.

Z. Just bring them to her or for corrections or tell you what to do. Or what, or what we, what we don't understand or something like that. Yeah, that's what we do.

R. Umm, mmm.

Z. Yeah, that's what we do.

R. Okay.

R. And ah, who delivers notes to the office?

Z. Notes?

R. Mmmm.

Z. Notes? Notes? Oh, notes to the office . . . sometimes Mrs. S. and Mrs. Bi.. or Mrs. B. and other umm . . . and other uh, and other substitutes? . . . um what you call them?

R. Yes, mmmm.

Z. Substitutes.

R. Mmmm.

Z. Yeah! they deliver, sometimes they ask us.

R. Okay, who does get to go?

Z. Oh, I don't know, sometimes . . .

R. Do you ever get to go?

Z. Mmm, only sometimes if we have music. Yeah, an we ask her. Last time I got choosed. Sometimes ya . . . just choose us. We don't have to ask her sometimes. Sometimes just choosed.

R. Mmm.

Z. The person.

R. And ah . . .

Z. What is those for?

R. Oh, it's for my thesis.

Z. Oh.

Z. What does that mean?

R. It's a big book that I'm going to write.

Z. Oh, oooooh.

R. You're going to be in a book. (Laughter)

Z. I don't believe it. (More questions from schedules)

Z. Is it a real book?

R. Mmmm.

Z. Ah, I sure don't believe this.

R. I'll come back and show it to you, how would that be?

Z. Okay.

R. When do you go to the washrooms?

Z. Oh, only mmm . . . let me see. Sometimes ya hafta ask and sometimes she says no. And if you just. At recess she says why did you, didn't you go at recess?

R. Mmmm.

Z. So, mmm, oh yeah and she says no and when you come back umm after mmm
    lunch or recess she says an I asked her last time and she said okay,
    but be quick.

R. I see.

Z. Yeah, that's the only time between, between, between, yeah, between
    recess and lunch. Like you go, I think so.

R. Why does the teacher say Li..'s name a lot?

Z. Li..? Because she speaks and talks to Sh.. and she sometimes has to
    stay in. Stay in.

R. And why does the teacher say Ji..'s name a lot?

Z. Mmm. Sometimes she talks with other people and you know when ya do
    flash cards. She quite yells.

R. Oh, I see.

Z. 'Bout like SEVEN. And she's quite loud.

R. I see.

R. I see.

R. What does it mean when the teacher calls your name?

Z. Sometimes, it means come and get your book.

R. Mmm.

Z. When she calls your name and sometimes she wants you or something.

R. Mmmm.

Z. And sometimes. Sometimes she marks them. Then she calls your name
    and you have to come up to the desk. An then when you're finished mm,
    she marks it.

R. Mmm, I see.

R. What does the blue-covered carpeted area mean? When can you get to
    go there?

Z. Oh, only after lunch, 'cause it's what . . . Let me see, it's called?
    Reading time, yeah, silent reading.

R. I see.

R. But, I saw some kids there when they finished their work. Can you
    go then?

Z. When you finish work? Yes, you could and at your desk you could.
    Yeah, at lunch time you can't play nothing, no games or nothing,
    just silent reading.

R. After lunch?

Z. Yeah.

Z. How many people did you do anyways?

R. I think about four people yesterday.

Z. Is this doing what I'm just . . .?

R. Mmm.

Z. What I just said now?

R. Mmmm, mmm.

Z. Oh, my god, I don't believe it. (Laughter)

R. When does the teacher work at her desk, dear?

Z. At her desk? Sometimes she works right, like notes, or something.

R. Mmm, when does she do that?

Z. Oh, I don't know exactly.

R. Okay. And ah what does it mean when the teacher works at her desk?
    What does it mean to you?

Z. Oh, it means to me. It's like she's marking something or writing
    something or with another substitutes coming or Mrs. Be.., Mrs. Be..,
    she's coming you know on the list. She puts reading group and what
    you read and page number.

R. Mmm.

Z. Yeah.

R. Mmmm.

Z. And she ah, and the book, language arts book . . . that's she gets language arts, book . . . uh on the desk . . . and she writes.

R. What is usually on the end of the teacher's desk?

Z. End, mean on this side where she sits or, oh? usually this big green . .

R. Mmmm.

Z. Yeah, when you can pick some stuff up.

R. Is it green, the cupboard?

Z. Yeah, it is. And like a little poster . . .

R. I see.

Z. About the heart, yeah.

R. I see.

Z. Like on this angle is her, the books, books. Then this chair, with two people could sit, yeah.

R. What does she put on the end of her desk for you to go and get?

Z. Uh, you know in the cupboard she puts some things for art work.

R. I see.

Z. Not art work 'xactly, it's a piece of paper. Uh, I don't know.

R. Mmm. And uh . . .

R. Just a couple more. What kinds of things do you do in the room that you can't tell anybody about? What do you do?

Z. Oh, all kinds of things, we write notes.

R. Mmm, mmm.

Z. And all sorts of things and we play games.

R. What kind of games?

Z. Oh, like scrambles.

R. Scrambles?! How does that work?

Z. Oh, just you have to pick up seven things. Sometimes, I cheat. I just look through. I just peek and you can see words on it like 'cat'. Then I just put it down and then I get a point. I cheat.

R. Is that one of the games that I saw on the shelf?

Z. Yeah, there's more games.

R. Yeah, what other games?

Z. Yeah, there's math things.

R. Do you kids have any of your own games that don't have anything to do with the shelf?

Z. Oh, we can't keep it or it has to go into the cloakroom. Or at Mrs. S.'s desk.

R. Mmm, mmm.

Z. She says, "thank you." That's what usually she says.

R. Ummm.

Z. Are you going to show these to Mrs. S.?

R. No.

Z. Oh.

R. Uh, who is Mrs. B.?

Z. Mrs. B.? Oh she's a nice teacher.

R. Mmm.

Z. And if we're just reading quiet she puts our name on the board and that means we get to go first one to go out. At lunch, or recess, or after school.

R. Mmm.

Z. Or at gym days.

R. Mmm.

Z. Tuesday and Friday.

R. Mmm.

R. And what does it mean to mark someone else's work?

Z. It means like somebody's working and they finish before anybody and they like finish before anybody and they like hurry and they get lots of mistakes, lots of mistakes done or she gets a mark . . . or . . . stands . . . it's wrong. They just hurry, they don't think what they're doing.

R. Oh, I see.

R. Okay.

R. Who do you think I should talk to next?

Z. Oh, let's see. Any group?

R. Mmm.

Z. Sh..

R. Okay. Would you like to go and get her quietly, and just send her down? Just push this stop button.

Sharon

R. How about telling me about some of them (pictures).
S. Should I just tell who I saw?
R. Just tell me whatever, just tell me about the pictures, remember, I don't know awfully much about your classroom and the people in it so how about telling me something . . . what it makes you think of when you look at the pictures.
S. Umm. In this picture Ja's holding a book.
R. Mmm. What's he doing? Where's he coming from?
S. He's coming from the carpet.
R. Mmmm.
S. He's going to his desk, I think, and there's people looking at their desks. And there's bird cages up.
R. Okay. (Long pause)
S. In this there's Ja standing on the carpet, reading his book. And again there's bird cages hanging up. And there's Z. walking to the carpet and Ji.'s working at his desk.
R. How do you know he's working?
S. I guess he's just sitting at his desk. And in this one there's St. walking from the carpet. I don't know where he's walking to. There's Ji working at his desk again. And there's bird cages hanging up.
R. Mmm.
S. In this one there's one bird cage and S. at his desk and there's the round table with two chairs.
S. This one, Mrs. S. is at her desk. And everybody else is at their desk working. And there's more bird cages. And there's a reading club chart. This one, there's more bird cages and there's some people working at their desks. And there's shelves at the back with books on them, and games. This one, Mrs. S. is at her desk.
R. Mmm.
S. And there's bird cages hanging up again. There's a reading club . . . chart. And there's people working at their desks. This one, all I see is people working at their desks. This one Mrs. S. is talking to people. I don't know who, but she's talking to some people and people are working. This one Mrs. S. is talking to people again and some people are working. And there's bird cages hanging up.
R. Mmm.
R. Okay, would you like to put them into some piles for me? The ones that belong together, do you think? (Long pause)
R. Can you tell me why you put them in those groups?
S. Okay, these two in this group because Mrs. S. is working at her desk and she's in this one too.
R. Okay.
S. And these two, these three, Ja is standing and Ja is walking on the carpet reading his book. And Ste. just got a book. So they're all about books. And this one is people working at their desks.
R. Mmm.
S. These two, these three, people are working at their desks and Mrs. S. is talking and this one is just S. working at his desk and there's only one person.
R. Okay.

S. That's all.
R. Okay.
R. Do you want to put them in that envelope for me?
S. Sure.
R. I'd like to ask you some questions if I may S.
S. Okay.
R. Why is S. sitting by himself?
S. Because he sits at the back of the room, he always sits there.
R. How come he's there?
S. 'Cause he, guess he talks too much. He used to sit behind Z.
R. This is just between you and me, okay?
S. Mmm.
R. Mmm. What about ah, what do you think it's like to sit alone?
S. I don't think it's very nice.
R. Why not?
S. Well, I guess it's kinda good 'cause you have nobody bothering you while you're working.
R. Mmm.
S. You can get your work done a bit better.
R. Any other reasons, one way or the other.
R. Any other reasons, one way or the other?
S. Ummm, I can't think of anything else.
R. Okay, and how do you talk to your friends if you don't want anybody to know you are talking to them.
S. You whisper.
R. You whisper, what else do you do?
S. Umm, sometimes when the teacher is out of the room we talk.
R. Umm.
S. I'd say every time we talk.
R. Umm.
S. And whenever the teacher is not looking.
R. Umm.
R. What do you do?
S. We ask people answers. (Laughter)
R. I see. (Laughter)
S. And we, talk about different things?
R. What things, do you talk about?
S. Things people say or if . . .
R. Mmm. Like?
S. If you like somebody, ask somebody if she's lying or not, that's about all.
R. Okay. And when do you go to the teacher's desk?
S. She calls us up to the reading club if we've finished our book. She wants us to tell about it.
R. I see.
S. She calls us up to get something marked. And if she's calling out drill to see if who got what. See if there's any problems then you've got to go up and if she calls your name. And if . . . you don't know the word in the book then you go up and ask her.
R. Okay.
S. That's about all. Or if you can't figure out a word on the paper. You ask her.
R. Mmm.

S. Or if you don't get something like, if you don't know what it means then or anything then, you go up and ask her.

R. Okay, and uh, why do you go to the teacher's desk.

S. Sometimes I don't know words in books and sometimes when somebody's bugging me while I'm working I go up to her.

R. Mmm.

S. And she's and if she calls me up to get something marked.

R. Mmm.

S. Or if she calls me up to the Book Club.

R. Mmmm. Okay, and uh, who delivers notes to the office?

S. Anybody, if she just, if somebody's working really good she just says like, usually L. is finished all the time first so she usually gets to do it.

R. I see. Do you ever get to do it?

S. Once, I did. Sometimes.

R. And ah, when can you go to the washrooms?

S. Ummm, the only time we're allowed to go is recess, lunch time, whenever we're outside or after school.

R. When are you allowed to go and have a drink?

S. Never, unless we ask her and she says something.

R. Okay, where do you get your drink?

S. Either, ummmm, the girl's basement or in the washroom sometimes.

R. Do you ever sneak any drinks?

S. No.

R. Not even when you're doing art or anything? (Laughter)

S. No, . . . some people go up to the back but I don't.

R. I see, to get a drink, I see.

S. We have to ask her if we can though.

R. Mmm, mmm.

R. And why does the teachers say L's. name a lot?

S. Cause she always talks.

R. Does she?

S. Yeah, and she's always turned around in her desk and she says, "La. turn around."

R. And ah, why does the teacher say Jil's name a lot?

S. Oh, Jil always talks to Er.

R. To whom?

S. Er.

R. Just a few more question.

S. Pardon me?

R. We just have a few more questions. (Laughter)

S. I'm missing work, we have to do ten questions.

R. Oh, I see, what kind?

S. They've changed the meaning, of a word. If the sentence book says "The monkey saw the snake," we hafto put it in a different order like, "The snake saw a monkey."

R. Oh, I see, you have to turn it around a little bit, okay.

R. What does it mean when the teacher calls your name?

S. It either means she wants you to go up to her desk, or she wants you to turn around or she wants you to stop talking. Sometimes she just looks at the person and he turns around or she turns around, whatever.

R. Umm. And ah, what does the blue-covered area mean?

S. The what?

R. The blue carpeted area.

S. Oh, that's umm, you can go and sit on it to read or play games.

R. And ah, when does the teacher work at her desk?

S. Umm, whenever we're working.

R. What does it mean when she works at her desk?

S. I don't know.

R. What do you think she's doing?

S. Maybe, doing report cards.

R. Mmm.

S. Or, I know something that she might have been doing today.

R. What's that?

S. She was giving out detentions, she puts people's names on a piece of paper.

R. Mmm.

S. Cause she said Dea's name she wrote something on a piece of paper.

R. I see.

R. And, when do you go to sit to read? How do you know when you are to go and read?

S. Well we can read, after we do our work, or we can play games, or after lunch, or when the bell rings we come inside and everybody rushes to get the chair. There's only two people allowed and then we read. For around half an hour. And, we read after recess if we've finished our work.

R. Mmm.

S. And whenever we come into school. We just come in and read for around ten or fifteen minutes.

R. Mmm. What's usually on the end of the teacher's desk? To go and pick up?

S. Books, if she calls our name we go and pick up our book or our papers.

R. Mmm.

S. Or, that's about all.

R. I have a few more questions. How do you talk? Have I asked you how do you talk to your friends when you don't want to be heard?

S. You whisper.

R. Any other way?

S. No.

R. (Sneezed)

S. We never talk out loud or she'll hear us.

R. (Sneezed again)

R. Is there anything that you do so that you can get messages to other people?

S. Well, some of the people have a secret language.

R. Do you have a secret language?

S. Yeah, me and La, and Th., and Lr. We have a secret language. And our secret sign to get each other's attention is huh (deep huff).

R. Oh, is that right?

S. We used to have stomp your feet on the floor.

R. Oh.

S. But we don't anymore because Cr. knew it so we didn't. And we just, after they do the secret sign, they do, then we just tell them what we want to.

R. Oh, I see. Can you tell me, can you show me what your signs are?

S. That's "do you."

R. Oh, I see, mm, just a sec.

R. Do you think I can take a picture?

S. Okay.

R. Okay.

S. Take a picture of all of it?

S. Sure.

R. We have lots of things. Could you sit over in the light? just a
little bit okay?

R. That's "do you."

R. Mmm.

S. This is "like."

R. Mmm.

S. That's "The..".

R. Mmm.

S. And we point to the person that you're talking about if we don't
have it.

R. Oh, I see.

S. And this is "I."

R. Just a sec.

S. This is "I."

R. Mmm.

S. This is . . .

R. Think?

S. "Hate," "I hate Th.." whatever.

R. Mmm.

S. That's "I know."

R. Mmm.

S. Mmm, oh, yeah, this is "no."

R. Mmm.

S. That's about all, I can't think of anymore. (Pause)

S. Oh, this is just "wait a minute."

R. Mmm.

S. You slam you hand on your desk for "right now." Then just wait a
minute then you go. Slam your hand and they just look at you.

R. Mmm.

R. I'll have to change my film now.

S. I think that's about all.

R. Okay, just think about it for a few minutes. See if you missed any
of them. Who else knows it?

S. The, La, and Lor, and me. Cr. knows a lot of it.

R. Mmm.

S. Oh, yeah, and Ju.

R. I haven't got the film ready yet, just a sec. We'll go through your
alphabet again. Well you know, your language, your sign language,
sorry.

S. I already know the alphabet.

R. Okay.

R. You can start from the beginning, soon's I get my flash warmed up
again. There it is okay.

S. That's "do you."

R. Mmm.

S. That's "like."

R. Mmm.

S.   This is "kind of."
R.   Mmm.
S.   This is "yes."
R.   Mmm.
S.   This is "no."
R.   Let me focus for a minute.
R.   Mmm.
S.   This is "I know."
R.   Okay.
S.   Point to the person, whoever you're talking to, if you don't have it.
R.   Mmm.
S.   And (long pause) I can't think of any. (Pause)
S.   Oh, yeah, this is "The.".
R.   Mmm.
S.   This is "The.." (different sign, girl's name has more than one version)
R.   Mmmmmm.
S.   Mmmm. (Long pause)
R.   Can you think of any others?
S.   No.
R.   Okay, Sh. I'll show these pictures to you when I get them back, okay?

APPENDIX D

Transcripts of Children's Interpretations

Terra

Interpretation

R. Okay, just go ahead.
T. Our chair in the classroom.
R. What do you do in that chair?
T. You sit and read.
R. Okay.
T. That's our classroom and she's teaching us right there.
R. How do you know?
T. She's almost to give us out some drills.
R. How do you know that?
T. Math drills. I see the papers and the papers are . . . always long.
R. I see.
T. And that one we're all sittin' to get ready for something.
R. What do you think it is?
T. Or almost to talk to somebody.
R. Almost to talk to somebody? Is that right? (Laughter)
T. (Inaudible) Lots of people are standing up doing something. Cleaning off their desks. (Long pause)
R. What's happening there?
T. Mmmm, the teacher probably telling us to . . . stop working she wants to tell something but some people are just . . . on talking.
R. Okay.
T. And that (cough) we're going to write a story.
R. How do you know?
T. Well everybody has pieces of paper. (Long pause)
R. Mmm.
T. This one he's reading no he's got a large . . . drill paper. But he's doing math.
R. Who has drill paper?
T. (Inaudible)
R. Who has?
T. His name's S. (boy alone)
R. Okay, what does he . . . he has a drill paper?
T. (Inaudible) must have a different (inaudible).
R. Mmmm.
T. And there's one of the kids talking to another person. While everybody else is sitting up. Oh, couple ah people are looking in their desks.
R. Mmm.
T. And there we are almost sitting up straight some of us, some of us are writing. That one our teacher is talking to us (pause). About something. Other one we're all reading something. And this one is all sorts of things . . . work.
R. Is it? Can you tell me about it?
T. Like, they're doing research.
R. Mmm.
T. About dogs. There's the books and there's the research, dogs. Stories "Man's Best Friend." This one the teacher went out of the class.

R. How do you know that?

T. 'Cause everybody's talking. When everybody talks the teacher is usually out of the class. And there's the books . . . we always read.

R. What are the books, T?

T. Um, all sorts of books.

R. Okay.

T. Mmm. And this one is to do with the thing what where we put our books in. Then there's the books. And down here is where we put games.

R. Mmm.

T. And that's when we're just about to do the Canadian Fitness Test.

R. How do you know that?

T. Because there's the man. With the box in his hand. I know, I see he has a box to keep your score.

R. Mmm.

T. And there's a kid getting his runners getting . . . rather getting ready for gym or taking it home. No, (pause) yeah, getting ready for gym.

R. Mmm.

T. The next one is a couple of people doing the same thing, gettin' ready for gym.

R. The other one (long pause)

R. What's that one say?

T. That's the carpet we have in the room. People sit on the carpet to read.

R. Mmm.

T. That's the teacher's desk.

R. What's that one about?

T. There's teacher's desk with lots of papers and stuff on it and there's part of the blackboard because you can see a little bit of it.

R. Mmm.

T. With spelling words. And there's a chart, the whole chart isn't printed for the reading. That's where people read and tell about the books.

R. How do they tell about their books?

T. They tell what happened in the book and stuff.

R. Oh, I see.

R. Okay, would you like to sort them into piles for me?

Steve

R. Would you like to tell me what's happening in these pictures?
S. We're writin' a story.
R. I see. How do you know that?
S. 'Cause I can tell by all these pictures and 'cause we never use paper for anything except for stories.
R. Okay.
S. And in this one we're writin' the story.
R. Just put them on the floor. I'm sorry I interrupted you.
S. We're starting to write the story.
R. Okay.
S. There's all the books we take out, they're "reserved" books, nobody can use . . . (long pause) And this is where we put our books for our teacher to mark. (Long pause) Here we're doin' our work.
R. How do you know that?
S. I can tell by the stuff up on the board. (Pause)
R. Okay. (Long pause)
S. This is where we . . . the teacher tells us what to do on the board. This is ready to go out and . . . do . . . um . . . The
R. Do what?
S. Do ummmm.
R. Fitness?
S. Yeah, the fitness test. This is when we start all our work and we start doin' it.
R. How do you know that?
S. 'Cause I can tell when Mrs. M. is there and I remember when she was there and I remember we're doin' our work. And she's there and we don't talk.
R. What does Mrs. M. do?
S. She just sits down and looks after us while the teacher is out.
R. Mmmm.
S. This is when we talked about the prime minister. And this is our teacher's desk.
R. That one? How do you know it's when you talked about the prime minister?
S. Because of the . . .
R. But what else is happening in that picture? (Long pause) Okay, let's let it go.
S. This is our teacher's desk.
R. Okay.
S. This by our fire door. And that's the doodle table, where we start drawing stuff.
R. And that's what, dear?
S. Where we, where we get some doodle paper and we draw on the back. This is everybody getting ready. And they're tryin' to look for the gym strip I think. This is when we're doin' art.
R. How do you know that?
S. 'Cause everybody has their glue. Plus, I know that we do art with white paper. This is when we're havin' a speed drill.
R. How do you know that?

S. 'Cause the teacher is handing out small strips of paper. This is
    a chair that we sit in to read books. That's our carpet we sit down
    and read books there, too. (Long pause)

S. This is when we're doing our work. And this is . . . when we're
    drawing some stuff, I think.

R. Mmm. Would you like to put them in piles that belong together?
    Then after you can tell me why you put them in those groups. Okay?

Interpretation

R. You can put them on the floor when you're finished if you like.
J. (Talking) That's the teacher's desk. And the board with writing
   on it. And a purse and the chair and a cup of coffee. And these . . .
   Deacon talking to Zoran. Jamie working, Ian looking at his desk.
   Zoran's working. Mrs. M. standing. (inaudible) This is the reading
   chair, where you sit down and read. (inaudible) Mrs. S. standing up
   explaining our work. And umm . . . (inaudible). Mrs. S., she's
   giving our speed drill out. Jeff talking to Thea. Lisa standing up.
   Gary's . . . this is Gary, taking his things out. This is a desk
   with books on it. This is Jimmy standing up and Julia. This is
   Lamour standing up and Lamour's dad.
R. Whose dad?
J. Lamour's.
R. How do you spell her name?
J. L A M O U R. And her dad.
R. How come he's there?
J. Because ummm I don't know why he's but, I think he was talking, he
   was going to help something isn't he? Jamie he's starting to get
   up. (Inaudible)
J. And this one at night?
R. No.
J. Looks like. This is a kinda a uh . . . a desk and a table and a rug.
   S. is standing up looking at his papers. And Mrs. S. is putting her
   two fingers in her mouth.
R. Pardon, who is putting two fingers in his mouth?
J. Mrs. S.
R. Where?
J. Right there.
R. Oh yeah.
J. And Mrs. M. sittin' down. Here's Jimmy going for his paper. Eric
   looking for his gym bag. We're sitting down working.
R. Okay.
J. And this is the books when we get finished. And there's the language
   arts, math, and journal section.
R. Can you slow down a sec? I'll write that down. Sorry, what did you
   say?
J. Here's the reading books that you read and umm and the language arts
   box, and the math box and the journal box section. And shelves, and
   the window, and trees (art work). Jamie's standing up. And Lamour's
   dad's there. And S. is turning around. And Sharon is getting up.
   And the books that we usually get.
R. What did you say Sharon was doing in there?
J. Getting up.
R. Mmm.
J. There's some of the books we read again and the shelves and a little
   peek of the journal box (photographic statement). That's all.
R. Do you want to put them into piles that belong together for me?
J. Pardon me?
R. You can sort them into piles if you want. (Long pause)

R. All right, can you tell why you put them in the piles you did?
J. I put these both in piles 'cause they're kinda the same.
R. How are they the same?
J. Because they're both going in the cloakroom and going out.
R. Mmm.
J. And I did this one because they're both books.
R. Okay.
J. And, I did this one because ummm they're working real quiet. But
    sometimes they talk, but they're working quiet.
J. And these ones umm are the ones that ummm stand up and talk. And this
    is the chair above the rug.
R. Do they have any other meaning to you besides? . . . Being near each
    other?
J. Well kind of because this is a chair and this is a rug. (Inaudible)
    And that's a rug. Because they sit on a chair and rug. This is just
    left alone, desk we (inaudible) And this is alone.

Interview

R. I'd like to ask you some questions too. We'll just push them back
    together again. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, categories.
J. Yeah.
R. Okay. All right. Why is S. seated by himself to work?
J. Because he's mostly talking and he's bad mostly and he ummm he always
    has to do his corrections. Well no . . . not that. He's bad . . .
    he's always talking to Z. and he gets out of his desk all the time and
    he talks to Z.
R. What's it like to sit alone, do you think?
J. Umm, I don't . . . Well you could get your work done easier without
    talking to other people. Like you be alone, right? It's kind of
    lonely but at least you can work by yourself and get lots of work
    done. Well ummm S. doesn't feel lonely because he always gets out of
    his desk and talks.
R. Mmmm. How do you talk to your friends if you don't want to be heard?
J. You talk nice, kindly.
R. If you don't want to be heard? Okay? You don't want anybody to hear
    you? How do you talk to your friends if you don't want anybody to
    know who you are talking to?
J. Whisper.
R. And what else do you do?
J. Umm you . . . some people do a sign language, to each other.
R. Sign language?
J. Yeah.
R. What for?
J. Like this is 'a' that's 'b' and . . .
R. Okay, and what else, any other language?
J. Yeah, 'c'. And we know up to z and plus . . .
R. You know up to z?!
J. With . . . in the sign language but I forget some of it. But I
    passed a test in Brownies up to z an . . .
R. Oh, I see, if I bring my camera tomorrow will you tell me what the
    different ones are and I'll take your picture?

J. Okay.

R. Who knows the sign language?

J. I think ummm me, Thea, Sharon, Larisa, mmm Lisa and that's all.

R. Anybody else know it.

J. Yeah, they know it but . . . ah . . . I think so but I don't think they do it sometimes.

R. Okay, what do you tell each other?

J. Umm, but Lamour and Sharon and Thea like they're kind of a group right?
. . . Cause they all play together. Plus they made up . . . they go, like this, that means, I think that means 'what number they're on in math'. And it means something else I think. And umm 'cause they don't want to get their name on the board I think.

R. What do you get your name on the board for?

J. For talking out loud . . . ummm, making noise.

R. Mmmm. How else do you talk to your friend if you don't want anybody to know?

J. Oh.

R. Besides the sign language, any other way? Do you spell out a word?

J. You could use your lips, but they hardly do that.

R. How do you use your lips?

J. Well, maybe some people. But they don't do it I don't think. Maybe that's a way that you could talk to your friends.

R. Mmm, okay.

J. Because, they could read your lips, right?

R. Yeah.

J. How many people have you already took?

R. Four or five.

J. Four or five.

R. Mmm, okay?

R. When do you go to the teacher's desk?

J. When? sometimes when you want marked . . . And you want to ask her a question. And if . . . to tattletale. Some people tattle on others and ask her umm something that you don't know. She'll explain it to you but sometimes she doesn't. And to go to the bathroom and some-times to get a drink.

R. When can you go to the bathroom?

J. Only at recess, lunch, umm sometimes she lets you. . .

R. When can you get a drink?

J. She never lets us get a drink. She always says no, but umm some people sneak 'cause there's a sink in our back of the room, right?

R. Who sneaks?

J. <u>Sean</u>, Zoran, and . . .

R. Any girls?

J. I do sometimes but I don't sneak but I just . . . like when we're doin' art and I'm thirsty, I don't sneak it I just take a drink, but I don't <u>always sneak</u>. I don't (inaudible) 'cause when we're doin' ellay . . . when we're doin' ellay (language arts) . . .

R. Mmm. What does it mean to go and get paper?

J. Paper?

R. Mm.

J. Means . . .

R. I saw some people going and getting paper. What does that mean?

J. That means like when . . . when they ran out . . . they umm language arts books you were writing.

R. Oh, I see.

J. Umm then you take paper because umm, they don't need to get any books. (End of year?) And I'm one of them.

R. Oh, I see. Okay.

R. And who delivers notes to the office?

J. Oh, just sometimes me, Steve . . . not notes but . . .

R. Messages?

J. Yeah, messages. And ummm Lorisa.

R. Mmm.

J. And I think Thea . . .

R. You told me when you can go to the washroom. Can you tell when you put notebooks into the boxes?

J. Oh, you put notebooks into the boxes because they have to be marked and be delivered back to you.

R. Okay, why does the teacher say Lisa's name a lot?

J. Lisa?

R. Mmm.

J. She calls her name a lot because she's always gets out of her seat. And she always calls Terra's name 'cause. But Terra's the worst, she always talks and always goes up . . . the rows and gets out of her seat. Lisa does that too.

R. Does she do that too?

J. Umm.

R. Why does she say Jill's name a lot?

J. Pardon me.

R. Why does she say Jill's name a lot?

J. Lisa?

R. No, your name, why does she say your name a lot?

J. Who does?

R. The teacher.

J. 'Cause I'm having fun talking.

R. Mmm. (Laughter)

J. This is kind of embarrassing (long pause).

R. This is kind of embarrassing?

J. Mmm.

R. I'm the only one that hears the tapes. All right?

J. Umm, and because ummm. I don't listen sometimes. And umm I think that's it.

R. Okay. Umm, what does it mean when the teacher calls your name?

J. Oh, it means, that you're bad, that you didn't listen. It means that you got umm I think that it means that ummm. When you trade desks and she tells you to trade them back. When she wants them back.

R. What do you mean trade desks?

J. Like some people trade desks right?

R. You mean they sit in them for a while?

J. Like, they sit in someone else's desk for a while. Like say, Lisa's here right?

R. Mmm.

J. At the top of our row and Terra's at the back and then Terra comes up and sits in her desk and Lisa comes back and sits in Terra's desk.

R. When can you get to do that?

J.   When Mrs. B's here, sometimes. But most of the time she says you
     umm better not do that right? And people don't listen 'cause they
     know that she's nice. And she never calls your name.
R.   I see. Okay. What does the blue carpeted area mean?
J.   It means when you read down mmm there and mmm it means oh, silent
     reading. And means umm that the teacher comes and reads you a story.
R.   Okay. When does the teacher work at her desk?
J.   She works at her desk when she marks and some umm reads a comic . . .
     newspaper sometimes. She usually (inaudible) sits at her desk but
     most . . .
R.   When do you sit to read? How do you know you should go sometimes
     to read?
J.   Oh, umm. At one o'clock you usually go and sit down and read at the
     blue carpet. And you can read in that big (inaudible) this thing
     (points to picture).
R.   Okay.
J.   You read in that chair. Only two people can sit.
     Is that tape on?
R.   I think so, is it still moving?
J.   Yep.
R.   And uh, what's usually on the end umm of the teacher's desk? What
     kinds of papers?
J.   Oh, umm oh, ummm teacher's desk?
R.   Mmm.
J.   Oh ummm uh the calendars.
R.   Mmm.
J.   And uh art stuff.
R.   Mmmm. And what kind of things can you not tell a teacher.
J.   Oh.
R.   I don't teach anymore so you can tell me what you can't tell a
     teacher, about what happens in the room.
J.   I don't know what you mean?
R.   Well you told me about your sign language. Anything else? And
     about you going into a different desk.
J.   And then mmm oh, you make lots of racket when she goes out of the
     room and we're not supposed to. Then sometimes she comes in and
     we're still making a racket. Then she goes (heaves great sigh of
     indignation).
R.   Mmm.
J.   And uh . . . She umm. When she gets out of the room, sometimes you
     can sneak a drink.
R.   Mmm.
J.   And sometimes we get out of desks.
R.   Okay, what are the reserved books?
J.   Reserved.
R.   Mmm.
J.   Oh, those are the ones that you haven't finished.
R.   And what does it mean to mark someone else's work?
J.   It means at math you . . . usually means like she lets you mark,
     like, you usually put one tick, you put your math book on other
     person's desk and they pass them behind and the back person brings
     his up to the front and be marked. That's the only time, at math.
R.   Thank you, do you want to push the 'stop' button?

APPENDIX E

Transcript of Teacher Interview

Interview with Teacher

R. Well, the first question then is "How can I help, in the afternoons, a bit more?" There are so many people in the school, volunteers and parents I get mixed up.

T. Well, I guess helping with the marking and stuff like that.

R. Okay.

T. I give them too much, is my problem I know, but a . . . And you know, print up some charts and stuff like that.

R. Sure, sure, okay.

T. Or if you prefer to work with kids I know one that needs a lot of help with his handwriting he was away when we did a lot of it.

R. Oh, sure I'd be glad to.

T. The basics of handwriting.

R. Is that L. who just came back?

T. Okay, yeah, he just got back, he could probably do with some.

R. Well that's fine.

T. You know.

R. Great.

T. Yeah.

R. Okay.

T. That's probably easier, that's something that's really hard to get to . . . individual help.

R. Okay, surely. Would you like to be able to count on me . . . for afternoons . . . to help?

T. Yeah, that might even be easier . . . to just use you that way, for a number of different things to do.

R. Okay, just great.

T. Okay, just you know, at the back table . . . whatever.

R. Right, I seem ah to get down to writing in the morning first off. I'm not as likely to umm do umm all sorts of avoidance things except getting to my work and so the afternoons would be better.

T. Yeah, okay.

R. I could just come so I'd be right here just after they've gone in. Okay. So when I come up the driveway, it's clear.

T. Okay, yeah.

R. Or even (inaudible dual exchange).

R. Sure, okay.

T. Right.

R. Okay, great.

R. That's terrific.

T. Yeah, okay.

R. And that, that leads right into one of the questions I was going to ask was what kinds of routines for marking do you have? I mean the boxes and so on.

T. Mmm.

R. If you could describe it for me.

T. Well when they finish their work they're to deliver it to the appropriate box. And the theory is that I'm supposed to try and find five minutes sometimes during the morning and whatever to try to get at those things. Yeah, and long enough to and I don't have to hunt them down. I can mark them when I've got a couple of minutes.

R. Mmm.

T. And they follow that routine very well. There're still one or two who still avoid putting it in the box because it's not done or it's not done well enough.

R. What do they do?

T. They just don't up it (indignant tone) And I don't catch it 'til the next day and I've marked and there's nothing there from so and so. It's a tough thing to watch. I'm aware of which ones they are and I tend to check them before they take off in the afternoon usually. I don't have to hunt something down so I can mark something when I have a couple of minutes.

R. You're very thorough.

T. It doesn't happen usually.

T. Oh, I keep I guess this is the first year where they have to do a whole lot of work. My expectations are relatively high. And they produce horrendous amounts of work which means a lot of marking . . . but it's better than having them doing nothing.

R. You really know what everybody's doing.

T. Yeah, I think I've got a fairly good sample on most . . . there's a few that slip by every so often but . . . slip shod work or whatever . . . but can't keep them all going.
(Laughter)

R. Okay. Is there anything special I need to know about marking?

T. No, I . . . just that I do no corrections for them, I underline or circle anything that's wrong. Don't often put 'x' on things unless it's specifically a wrong answer.

R. Mmm.

T. Oral comprehension or something that's a specifically a wrong answer, but normally I would just underline and leave things ummm put a question mark or I do no correctings of spellings or anything else.

APPENDIX F

Pictures Suggested to be taken--Children

Pictures suggested to be taken--Children

1. Lunch kits--eating.   J.
2. Journal--doing it.
3. Going home after school--that's fun.
3. Going to library.
5. Going to gym.

1. Art--happens about 2:30 to 3:00. G.
2. Half hour silent reading.
3. 10 to 3:00 p.m., ready to go home.
4. At gym, Friday and Monday, 11:30 a.m. both days.

1. Sink--painting. M.
2. When we have movies--when the girl comes to tell us about her teeth.
3. Already taken curtains--sun.
4. Policewoman Kathy--brings film from place where she works at--tells us about police dogs.
5. Coming up stairs from library--go into classroom and read.
6. When we're eating, recess, lunch time.
7. Having our detentions, or else maybe in the afternoon. Sit on hands for ten minutes. Happens when we are noisy.
8. Playing recorders--Miss Smith--sometimes in library, sometimes in classroom. Afternoon on Monday, sometimes Tuesday.
9. When we have broadcasts--last Wednesday--doesn't come back until September.
10. Take pictures of "doing math."
11. English book things--afternoon--sometimes.
12. Doing our journal.

1. Mrs. S. writing--everybody's working.
2. Close-ups--people doing work and getting frustrated.
3. People who come about costumes, 7., 6., 5., and 4's.