

Critical Microethnography: The Search for Emancipatory Methods

Debra Mayes Pane & Tonette S. Rocco

Key words: critical microethnography; alternative education; classroom research; oppressive educational practices; marginalized youth; social practices; literacy learning; USA

Abstract: This article entails an audit trail recounting the dilemma that drove the lead author to search out teaching and research methods that recognized the reconceptualization of what she had always believed to be true about education. First, we include a segment of her auto/biography as a White Southern female teacher of marginalized youth that drove her to take risks, challenge the status quo, and finally close the door on institutionalized classroom practices. Then, we discuss the theoretical framework, assumptions, and rationale for a welcoming research method that seemed to mimic what she practiced in the classroom with marginalized youth to transform conditions. We have named this method critical microethnography. The article concludes with an explanation of how to conduct critical microethnography based upon a review of the literature. By understanding why and how language is used to create unjust and/or just classroom cultures, perhaps oppressive educational practices and conditions can begin to transform into caring and responsive curricula for the benefit of society.

Table of Contents

- [1. Introduction](#)
- [2. Background](#)
- [3. Problem](#)
- [4. Theoretical Framework and Assumptions](#)
- [5. Rationale for Critical Microethnography](#)
- [6. Conducting Critical Microethnography](#)
 - [6.1 Stage one—data collection for the primary record](#)
 - [6.2 Stage two—reconstructive data analysis of the primary record](#)
 - [6.3 Stage three—dialogical data generation](#)
 - [6.4 Stage four—reconstructive data analysis of the interviews](#)
 - [6.5 Stage five—high-level coding](#)
 - [6.6 Stage six—final reconstructive data analysis](#)
- [7. Conclusion](#)
- [Appendix](#)
- [References](#)
- [Authors](#)
- [Citation](#)

1. Introduction

Truth about education for the lead author originated and developed as a member of the dominant racial group and as a female from the South of the U.S. in a classroom with marginalized youth. (The second author's experience and reflections on racial dominance occurred as the result of critical incidents in history and not in the classroom. For this reason, her reflections are not shared in

this paper). For us, the perpetual dilemma of illuminating hidden social injustices, critical microethnography allows a closer look at how and why language-in-use (i.e., verbal and nonverbal interactions) can promote opportunities for literacy learning in one classroom and limit opportunities for literacy learning in another. In this paper, literacy learning encompasses any subject matter or any topic that increases one's literacy, or ability to navigate the world of hegemonic practices. [1]

Embedded in a critical ethnographic study of classroom cultures, critical microethnography is the name we gave the method of experiencing, problematizing, and transforming unjust discriminatory classroom cultures for the good of society. In a search for ways to illuminate how and why social injustice initiates and emerges at the classroom level in order to change them, a critical microethnographic method is used to answer the following questions related to disruptive classroom cultures: *What is the experience of a disruptive classroom culture? What happens in a disruptive classroom culture? How can we change a disruptive classroom culture?* Critical microethnography is an emancipatory, participatory, transformative, and perpetual action research method that necessarily initiates and evolves from one's auto/biography of participation in a disruptive classroom culture, leads to transformation of conditions of the disruptive culture, and can eventually and perpetually include interested participants in their own ongoing research of experiencing, problematizing, and transforming disruptive classroom cultures (ANDERSON, HERR & NIHLEN, 1994; HERON, 1996; HERR & ANDERSON, 2005; WHYTE, 1991; WHYTE, GREENWOOD & LAZES, 1991). This method is relevant and useful for studying classrooms that are not necessarily disruptive but (as most classrooms do) exhibit some level of problematic social and cultural behaviors that if transformed would improve the overall classroom culture. [2]

This article emerged from assumptions articulated in the lead author's (Debbie) critical auto/biography (KINCHELOE, 2005). A critical auto/biography emphasizes *conscientization* (FREIRE, 1970)—a person's realization that she or he is a creator of culture along with other humans (SHOR & FREIRE, 1987). A critical auto/biography includes self-awareness, political and cultural consciousness, and perspective gained from personal and cultural experiences (PATTON, 2002; ROTH, 2005). Debbie's experiences at an alternative education school where she grew to understand students who (when given the opportunity) challenged, resisted, and transformed their oppressive educational conditions form the basis for her raised consciousness. As a result of her *conscientization* (FREIRE, 1970), she began to "inject the cultural viewpoints of people of color, derived from a common history of oppression into efforts to reconstruct a society [with an oppressive educational system] crumbling under the burden of racial hegemony" (COELLO, CASAÑAS & ROCCO, 2004, p.13) into research and practice. DELPIT (1995) summarizes our beliefs about education:

"If we are to successfully educate all of our children, we must work to remove the blinders built of stereotypes, monocultural instructional methodologies, ignorance, social distance, biased research, and racism. We must work to destroy those blinders so that it is possible to really see, to really know the students we must teach ... I pray

for all of us the strength to teach our children what they must learn, and humility and wisdom to learn from them so that we might better teach." (DELPIT, 1995, p.182) [3]

In an effort to recount the dilemma that drove the search for teaching and research methods that welcomed the goals of reconceptualizing and transforming oppressive educational practices and conditions, the following sections cover (a) the background, (b) the problem, (c) the theoretical framework and assumptions, (d) the rationale, and (e) stages for conducting critical microethnography. [4]

2. Background

Debbie's intrigue with transforming oppressive educational practices and her own racial prejudices did not begin as a deliberate study of the interrelationships among privilege, power, and race. Rather, a silenced curiosity about racial segregation since high school bubbled to the surface during her decade of teaching at the alternative education school for disruptive and marginalized youth. She remembers standing at the color line fence in her hometown in Texas wondering why the Black kids went to a different high school, why she never saw them, and why no one talked about these things. Twenty five years later, she reflected on the color line during a job interview when the Director told her that this was a public school for juvenile delinquents and truant students who are predominantly Black. [5]

Debbie's story: I had never heard of this type of public school even though I had spent my whole life in public schools as a student or teacher. The Director and I both believed that everyone could learn if given the chance. With that basic expectation, I accepted the challenge of becoming the school's first reading teacher. When I initially walked into the dilapidated school trailers, the challenge was overridden by a foreign sense of being invisible among the mainly Black student body. I felt White for the first time in my life (CHUBBUCK, 2004). I mistook the students' language and behavior as acting wild and tried to tell them what they needed to know. My book knowledge was slowly relegated to the back burner. In its place, I learned how to listen to these students who lived at the edge of society. [6]

Even more, I learned that these students were/are historically and continuously marginalized, silenced, and segregated in U.S. schools and society (FINE, 1991; FINE & WEISS, 2005; KING, 2005; LAM, 2006; NASIR & HAND, 2006; OAKES, ROGERS & LIPTON, 2006). Over time, I realized that I do not live at the edge of society because I am a person of White privilege. A person of White privilege is part of the dominant group in society who is given choices in life by virtue of birth and takes them for granted. As a result of White privilege, we either choose or are taught to ignore oppressive conditions that "work systematically to overempower certain groups" (McINTOSH, 1997, p.296). Privilege is a misleading term; it is "widely desired without being in any way beneficial to the whole society" (p.296). I came to see that

"[w]hite privilege as an invisible package of unearned assets that I can count on cashing in on each day, but about which I ... [had for so long remained] ... oblivious. White privilege is like an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, maps, passports, codebooks, visas, clothes, tools, and blank checks" (MCINTOSH, 1997, p.291). [7]

As a teacher of these marginalized Black students, I listened over the years to how they experienced isolation and oppression (FREIRE, 1970). In school, they felt like outsiders being looked on as an Other (ROTH, 2005) who could never measure up. Their families were ignored by schools and teachers except to report behavioral or academic problems. They felt treated as if they or their families did not care about education. To inquire further, I interviewed three students about their educational goals and aspirations. My own racial prejudices were exposed by these students' stories of only staying in school because of a family member who cared (PANE, 2005). Eventually, I closed the door on mainstream society's oppressive rules about education. [8]

The students and I began opening spaces (MUTH, 2005; WILSON, 2003) for *conscientization* through experiential and dialogic problem-posing pedagogy (FREIRE, 1970). Dialogic problem-posing pedagogy involves critically reflecting on and analyzing one's lived experiences for the purpose of transforming one's situation (FREIRE, 1985). We merged what was lost in our previously segregated lives by transforming experiences from the students' realities into an authentic, lived curriculum—akin to participatory action research in our own classroom (ANDERSON et al., 1994; HERON, 1996; HERR & ANDERSON, 2005; WHYTE, 1991; WHYTE et al., 1991). For instance, after asking them what was important, the students formed a club to collect and distribute food for members of their own community because they had experienced hunger. They wanted to read about their own history and share their own experiences, such as living with the killer HIV-AIDS, through the creation of a classroom newspaper and videos. This was literacy education at its best, not focused on mandated reading tests, but instead around the language and realities of students. For the first time in their lives, students were sharing their stories and attending school regularly. [9]

3. Problem

The dilemma that drove this pursuit of research methods that would allow "real time" (ROTH, 2006, para. 5) in-depth study of how and why language is used in classrooms was the contrast between Debbie's and other teachers' practice in alternative education classrooms for marginalized students. The differences were juxtaposed at the intersection of student involvement (or lack of) in classroom activity and of student input into the purpose of curricula. The differences between Debbie and her colleagues' teaching styles troubles us, but we surmise that the dissimilar personal and educational backgrounds and experiences led some to either accept, reject, fear, or try to change poor teacher-student relationships in the classroom. For example, the other teachers complained about continual fighting between students, suspensions, poor teacher-student-parent relationships, and students' refusal to do the work. Students in other classrooms

were unhappy with their situations and often asked to join Debbie's classroom. The other teachers sent over students who they could not get to respond. When Debbie was asked what she and the students were doing, she tried to explain the concept of (even though she did not know the terminology at the time) teachers being cultural workers in a Freireian-inspired transformative literacy classroom (DELPIT, 1995; FREIRE, 1998; FREIRE & MACEDO, 1987) using student-centered, experiential curriculum (DEWEY, 1916, 1939). However, teachers were afraid to take risks, challenge the status quo, and counter educational practices that had been institutionalized in the classroom (FINDERS, 2005; GIROUX, 2001, 2005; SHOR & FREIRE, 2003). Instead, teachers continued to complain and blame students for their own social and academic failures. [10]

The status quo definition of alternative education programs is schools or separate facilities for students who are at-risk of academic failure and dropping out of school and have been expelled from mainstream K-12 schools¹ for antisocial behavior (CASH, 2004; FOLEY & PANG, 2006; VAN ACKER, 2007). Status quo solutions focus on changing the students rather than involving them "in working together with teachers to bring about environments that are conducive to teaching-learning relations" (ROTH, 2006, para. 5). After years of being in an alternative education classroom with marginalized students, it was necessary to challenge status quo definitions and solutions. Different social and academic dynamics and outcomes were the result depending on how and why language was used in the classroom. Alternative education programs are isolated and segregated places where marginalized students who have been/are historically and continuously failed academically by the mainstream educational system are sent to be disciplined or cured. Debbie came to believe that solutions needed to focus on changing the conditions that reproduce oppressive educational practices rather than changing the students (CARPENTER, RAMIREZ & SEVERN, 2006; CASSIDY & BATES, 2005; DELPIT, 1995; KING, 2005; LADSON-BILLINGS, 2006; MOJE & LEWIS, 2007). We began searching for a method that could accomplish this endeavor. [11]

4. Theoretical Framework and Assumptions

Critical social theory of literacy (FREIRE, 1970) provides the theoretical framework for critical microethnography in which language, literacy, culture, learning, and research practices are reconceptualized as social practices produced within discourses of power/knowledge (FREIRE, 1970). The focus is on how (a) people's oral language mediates their interactions around oral, written, and other texts; (b) meaning and use of texts is dialectically and culturally shaped at the local level and influenced by broader discourses; (c) literacy practices are

1 In the United States, mainstream K-12 schools are more commonly referred to as public schools, ranging from kindergarten through twelfth grades (elementary, middle or junior high, and senior high). Public school K-12 education is simultaneously controlled and funded by federal, state, and local governments. Locally elected school boards have authority over state-authorized school districts to determine curricula, funding, teaching, and other policies. State laws authorize minimum state standards and local school tax funding for school districts, primarily collected through real estate property taxes. Federal funding supports states and school districts meeting minimum federal standards.

culturally constructed, historically situated, and represent people's social identities; (d) literacy practices are produced in and shaped by power relations that maintain the status quo of social institutions; and (d) as a result, some literacies are more dominant, valued, and influential than others. [12]

Reading is looked on as a political concept. Classrooms are viewed as dynamic social systems where participants establish and re-establish meanings and relationships with others (ROGERS, 2004). Marginalized students are not viewed as powerless or helpless, but real people who resist and produce power in their experiences with others (MOJE & LEWIS, 2007). Students and teachers create, produce, and reproduce literacy, culture, and language together in their moment-to-moment interactions in the classroom (BEACH & KALNIN, 2005). Educational practices are impacted by how deeply teachers, students, community members, and the society as a whole understand each others' cultural practices—how we each live culturally (DELPIT, 1995). Research practices are also embedded in each event and, as a result, influence what is being learned, what happens, and how and why language is being used (BLOOME, CARTER, CHRISTIAN, OTTO & SHUART-FARIS, 2005). [13]

5. Rationale for Critical Microethnography

Critical microethnography is a powerful method of research for studying uses of language in alternative education classrooms or other dynamic social systems where interactions reproduce oppressive educational practices and conditions. Critical microethnography is also a powerful intervention for discovering, making visible, or getting at what is happening as it happens in the interactions (i.e., verbal and nonverbal language) between teachers and marginalized students (FAIRCLOUGH, 1995; GEE, 2005; ROGERS, 2004). Analyzing moment-to-moment interactions enables a better understanding of practices and expectations embedded in the classroom in order to create spaces to transform oppressive educational practices that maintain the status quo. Oppressive educational practices stem from traditional banking education (FREIRE, 1970), the act of depositing and withdrawing knowledge into and from the learners' heads by the authority, or teacher, as if trying to cure illiteracy, the disease. [14]

Determining how marginalized students' academic and social failures impact or are impacted by the educational system and providing statistics on the results does not get at the root of the problem. When teacher-student interactions are predominantly concerned with disruptive and/or antisocial behavior, gaining an understanding of how uses of language promote and limit positive interactions and opportunities for learning in order to transform oppressive educational practices into responsive and caring curricula is essential (CASSIDY & BATES, 2005). Caring and responsive curricula arise from caring relationships among teachers and students based on reciprocal respect, action, and determination for one's self and others. [15]

Instead of asking the extent to which marginalized students reproduce imposed conditions, questions in critical microethnographic research ask how constraining

conditions can be transformed, or produced. Reproduction occurs when participants conform to the broad societal economic, political, and cultural conditions resulting from power relations during negotiations (FOUCAULT, 1977; GORE, 1998). In critical epistemology, on the other hand, participants are viewed as agentic. Agentic participants, those with agency, may challenge, resist, and/or transform constraining conditions to produce their own conditions. Critical microethnography searches for opportunities to create influencing conditions that encourage marginalized students and their teachers to co-construct and transform the existing routines as agentic participants. [16]

In order to answer reconceptualized research questions, critical microethnography merges reflexive research methods (PATTON, 2002), critical ethnography (CARSPECKEN, 1996), and microethnography (BLOOME et al., 2005) to study the daily life of classrooms. The use of reflexive research methods reminds the researcher to continually observe himself or herself in order to remain cognizant of the origins of his/her own and the participants' "cultural, political, social, linguistic, and ideological" (PATTON, 2002, p.299) perspectives and voice. Reflexivity emphasizes how relationships, concepts, and/or meanings are simultaneously shaped by each other. [17]

Critical ethnography integrates ethnographic methods with critical epistemology. Currently transcending multiple theoretical, epistemological, and disciplinary discourses (KAMBERELIS & DIMITRIADIS, 2005), ethnographic methods are rooted in late 19th- and early 20th- century anthropological qualitative studies of intact, exotic, primitive communities to understand the natives' perspective (SPRADLEY, 1979). Informed by the field of sociology in the 1920s, ethnographers describe and interpret the behavior of cultural or social groups (CRESWELL, 1998). Ethnographic methods in sociocultural literacy research document the details of people's actions, things, and accounts to enable the researcher to describe specific language and literacy practices, events, and Discourses (GEE, 1996) in a local community rather than skills and competencies (MAYBIN, 2000). Critical ethnographic methods describe, interpret, and explain the meanings people give to their own practices and experiences through an epistemological lens that links power, knowledge, and truth (CARSPECKEN, 1996). Critical epistemology explores the different types of support, or structures that originate in everyday human communication, to understand and refine social theories of knowledge and how valid knowledge may be acquired. Research based in critical epistemology examines actions and how they are conditioned, not determined, by many things. [18]

Critical epistemology examines actions by differentiating between people's ontologies—"theories about existence making it possible to formulate diverse truth claims" (CARSPECKEN, 1996, p.20). Theories about existence are derived from (a) subjective (i.e., personal thoughts and feelings); (b) objective (i.e., observable objects and events); and (c) normative-evaluative (i.e., right, good, appropriate activities that others should agree on but usually argue about) truth claims. A truth claim is an explicit or implicit assertion that can be "judged true or false, right or wrong, good or bad, correct or incorrect" (p.59). Each type of truth

claim requires different types of support to win others' consent or agreement and to be validated. Validity claims can be derived from truth claims by focusing on the conditions that would have to be met to reach consensus among other people. Consent is gained through negotiation and results from unequal power relationships, distorting truth claims and corrupting knowledge—"the very heart of critical epistemology" (p.21). Consent is achieved by deferring to another person's socially and culturally constructed authority; as a result, personal identity is implicated. [19]

Critical microethnography focuses on how people use language and other forms of communication to negotiate consent with attention given to social, cultural, and political processes (BLOOME et al., 2005). Informed by Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA, see GEE, 2005; ROGERS, 2004), critical microethnography emphasizes how the uses of language simultaneously shape local social interactions and reproduce patterns of social relations in society. Specifically, critical microethnography originates in cultural anthropology and sociolinguistics and is "informed by discourse analysis to study the social practices of schooling" (VAVRUS & COLE, 2002, p.90). After being explored for 30 years by linguistic anthropologists, it is now widely accepted that the role of language can be more fully understood by studying the relationship between the verbal and nonverbal forms of language and the cultural practices that they help represent (DURANTI, 2004). To study this relationship, "a microethnographic approach to discourse analysis allows the researcher to attend to how people use language and other systems of communication in constructing language and literacy events in classrooms with attention to social, cultural, and political processes" (BLOOME et al., 2005, p.xv). [20]

Critical microethnography also draws from critical ethnographic methods to focus on learning processes and cycles of social reproduction (CARSPECKEN, 1996; LAVE & WENGER, 1991). Critical microethnographic methods provide qualitative, observational, cross-cultural, and ethnographic data, giving educational researchers the potential to (a) examine schools, teachers, and students within and across their community contexts (CAZDEN, 2001; RIST, 1970; SPINDLER & SPINDLER, 1994), explicitly addressing class, power, and cultural structures of that community (BOWLES & GINTIS, 1977; McLAREN, 2003; WILLIS, 1977); and (b) explain disproportional educational achievement among subgroups, particularly the disadvantaged (CARLSON & APPLE, 1999; GOETZ & LeCOMPTE, 1984). [21]

The critical microethnographic method proposed in this paper accomplishes three goals. First, the critical part of critical microethnography involves studying (a) what is being learned, (b) how and why that something is being learned, and (c) what is being socially reproduced as a result of the power relations that occur during the learning processes. Second, the micro- part of critical microethnography involves using aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis (GEE, 2005; ROGERS, 2004; ROGERS, MALANCHARUVIL-BERKES, MOSLEY, HUI & JOSEPH, 2005) to analyze how (a) people use verbal and nonverbal language; and (b) language is being used in the context of cultural, social, and political

processes. Third, the ethnographic (CRESWELL, 1998; GOETZ & LeCOMPTE, 1984; SPRADLEY, 1979) part of critical microethnography involves (a) observing participants' cultural behaviors over time, (b) interviewing participants about what happened over time, and (c) collecting relevant documents and artifacts that were produced over time. [22]

6. Conducting Critical Microethnography

This section will discuss interpretation of the sample selection and data collection and analysis (in one classroom) for critical microethnography. Sample selection occurs in two phases. The first sample selected for observation is a whole classroom of students and one teacher. The second sample selected for interviews is the teacher and a criterion sample of four or fewer students. Criteria for selection are students most involved in verbal and nonverbal language activity/interactions that constrained (disrupted) opportunities for learning during classroom observations. [23]

Data collection and analysis for critical microethnography takes place in six stages. The proposed six stages rely on CARSPECKEN's (1996) terminology and are adapted from the first three of his five stages of critical research: (a) building a primary record; (b) preliminary reconstructive data analysis; and (c) dialogical data generation through interviews, group discussions, and interpersonal process recall (what we refer to as videotape feedback interviews [BLOOME et al., 2005]). His fourth and fifth stages are a systems analysis across social sites to provide significance "in terms of macrolevel social theory" (p.206), covered in detail in his first ethnography (CARSPECKEN, 1991) and in other ethnographies, such as WILLIS (1977) and McLAREN (1999). CARSPECKEN's first three stages were adapted for the following reasons. First, as a doctoral student (lead author) attempting to clearly and concisely explain the how and why of this research design, his terminology simultaneously incorporated critical social theory and epistemology with "the 'how-to' of doing fieldwork and analysis within a social site" (JUNGCK, 1996, p.623). Second, CARSPECKEN (1996) recommended the practicality of using his first three stages for dissertation research, which validated this choice. Third, our understanding of CARSPECKEN's (1996) emphasis on the first three stages (and de-emphasis of the fourth and fifth stages) of critical research differs from JUNGCK's (1996) in her review of CARSPECKEN's book, noting a dichotomy in the field and further presuming that "it seems easier to conduct and talk about low-inference, descriptive fieldwork than it is to do, or convey to others how to do, high-inference, analytical theory construction" (n.p.). Thus, Debbie (with the assistance of the second author and others) adapted CARSPECKEN's first three stages (into the six stages proposed in this paper) to clarify how she would proceed with her dissertation research due to the dire lack of literature about how to conduct critical social research in the field of K-12 education. This lack of literature also applies to alternative education, prison, welfare to work, and other marginalized populations. Table 1 provides a summary of the adapted six stages of data collection and analysis.

| Stage | Steps | Data Source |
|---|--|--|
| Stage One—Data Collection for the Primary Record | | |
| | Passive Observations of the Case | Classroom Observations |
| | Building a Primary Record | Classroom Observations, Videotapes |
| Stage Two—Reconstructive Data Analysis of the Primary Record | | |
| | Initial Meaning Reconstruction | Primary Record Transcripts |
| | Pragmatic Horizon Analysis | Videotapes, Primary Record Transcript Portions |
| | Validity Reconstruction | Videotapes, Primary Record Transcript Portions |
| Stage Three—Dialogical Data Generation | | |
| | Subsession One—Depth Interviews | Participants |
| | Subsession Two—Videotape Feedback Interviews | Participants, Videotapes corresponding to Primary Record Transcript Portions |
| Stage Four—Reconstructive Data Analysis of the Interviews | | |
| | Initial Meaning Reconstruction | Participant Interview Transcripts |
| | Pragmatic Horizon Analysis | Participant Interview Transcripts |
| | Validity Reconstruction | Participant Interview Transcripts |
| Stage Five—High-level Coding | | |
| | Support with Matches | Participant Interview Statements, Exemplary Horizon Analyses from Primary Record Transcripts |
| Stage Six—Final Reconstructive Data Analysis | | |
| | | Raw Codes from all Transcripts |

Table 1: Summary of data collection and analysis stages [24]

The next section explains the six stages delineated in Table 1. [25]

6.1 Stage one—data collection for the primary record

Stage one—data collection for the primary record consists of passive observations, documented with videotapes, primary record notes, and field journal notes, followed by a process referred to as building a primary record (CARSPACKEN, 1996). [26]

6.1.1 Passive observations

Passive observations are conducted to document language activity during classroom lessons. Passive observations are conducted by an uninvolved passive observer who builds up a primary record "through notetaking and ... if desired, videotaping" (CARSPACKEN, 1996, p.41). In this article, language activity is defined as linguistic behavior (i.e., verbal and nonverbal interactions). Language activity is not the traditional notion of *a language activity* going on only in a language arts class, but rather *how the teacher and students use language during interactions with each other* during any classroom lesson (LEWIS, ENCISO & MOJE, 2007). All students in the class and the teacher are observed during the classroom lessons. The unit of analysis is linguistic behavior taking place between the students, teacher, and all others involved. All others involved includes anyone else the teacher and students communicate with during classroom lessons. For example, the teacher and students may communicate on a face-to-face level with paraprofessional staff members who provide assistance when disruptions occur during classroom lessons. They may also communicate on a tacit level with textbook publishers or authors of novels, poetry, and short stories that are read during classroom lessons. [27]

6.1.1.1 Videotapes

A videographer videotapes each classroom observation. The teacher introduces the researcher as an observer who is interested in how students and their teacher do classroom lessons. The teacher also introduces the videographer and answers students' questions. The first hour of passive observations is allotted as a practice run for the videographer and the researcher and is not used as data. The first hour is also used as time for the participants to get used to the presence of the researcher and videographer as well as lose interest in the video camera (BERKENKOTTER & THEIN, 2005; BOGDAN & BIKLEN, 2003). [28]

6.1.1.2 Primary record notes

To augment data from the videotapes, the researcher writes detailed notes during each passive observation in a section of a large notebook referred to as primary record notes (CARSPACKEN, 1996). Primary record notes include (a) "highly detailed accounts of observed activity that include all speech acts in verbatim form and many observations of body movements and postures" (p.53); (b) the date, with time noted frequently, (c) classroom contextual information (e.g., posters on the wall); (d) diagrams of how the classroom is set-up; and (e) observer comments [OC], bracketed to speculate meaning of interactions.

The following is an example of primary record notes, using CARSPECKEN's (1996) format for primary record notes. The sample scenario, script, and observer's comments [OC] were *created by the researcher* based on Line 1 of a randomly selected transcribed classroom "discussion about calculating differences in height" (CAZDEN, 2001, p.50). *Researcher-fabricated* sample transcripts (to exemplify how I envision data analyses) embody years of personal experiences with uses of language in the classroom with marginalized students are provided.

10:00 am

[1] Gabriela: [OC: *Gabriela seems overjoyed that the teacher just asked her to share how she would solve this math problem.*] She looks my way as she saunters to the board. She has to weave around scattered desks to get to the board. One of the guys who always teases her makes a mooing sound. [OC: *I wonder if she feels embarrassed when the guys moo at her especially when I am here or does she even consciously think about me being here. The teacher ignores the moo sound.*]

[2] (Silence)

10:02 am

[3] Teacher: *Well, go ahead, Gabriela. We're listening. What did you say?* [OC: *as if this was a regular occurrence in the classroom. This is the first time I have heard the teacher request a student to share knowledge with others in the class.*] [29]

6.1.1.3 Field journal notes

After each passive observation, 15 to 20 minutes is set aside to self-debrief (WENGRAF, 2004) about the experience in a separate section of the large notebook referred to as field journal notes (CARSPECKEN, 1996). Self-debriefing is "free associative flow" (WENGRAF, 2004, p.143) writing that includes memories, ideas, feelings, content, or anything about the experience. The field journal notes are then reviewed and a contact summary sheet (see [Appendix 1](#), Contact Summary Sheet) is filled out (MILES & HUBERMAN, 1994). The contact summary sheet includes questions helpful in summarizing information received from the observations as well as any new or remaining questions and concerns to guide fieldwork. Field journal notes are not transcribed and are used to augment and compare transcribed data analyses with additional contextual information for the researcher's interpretation. [30]

6.1.2 Building a primary record

"Building a primary record prioritizes the objective validity claim: claims open to multiple access [it] is a sort of massive claim to represent what took place in a manner any observer or participant would report under ideal conditions" (CARSPECKEN, 1996, p.87). To build a primary record, the videotape of each passive observation is viewed a minimum of three times. The first viewing takes place within a week to include "theoretical memos" (WENGRAF, 2004, p.210) in the field journal notes. Theoretical memos are notes about the experience, based on ideas and memories, provoked to produce initial interpretations. Each videotape is viewed at least two more times to transcribe the observations

verbatim, determine meaningful utterances, and include linguistic behaviors (e.g., speech acts, body movements, postures) and objective validity claims (i.e., possible meanings) about observed linguistic behaviors. [31]

Verbatim transcriptions based on meaningful utterances go beyond traditional conversational analysis of turns at talk (GEE, 2005). Turns at talk are defined as changes in who talks and although important to acknowledge "do not provide a sufficiently integral unit of conversation to use as a basic unit of analysis for the purpose of understanding the social construction of conversational meaning and action" (BLOOME et al., 2005, p.22). Meaningful utterances, on the other hand, are part of a series of actions and reactions that are tentatively determined by what went on before and after each moment in the event. Meaningful utterances are often defined in terms of breath or other pauses from the perspective of what the speaker wants to accomplish (i.e., illocutionary perspective). [32]

Each utterance is meaningful only if and when it communicates a "*who-doing-what*" (GEE, 2006, p.23). A *who* does not necessarily mean people but involves identity-building and can be multiple and overlapping (i.e., heteroglossic, BAKHTIN, 1981). Making *who-doing-what* visible requires more than tabulating the turns at talk and analyzing the utterances made in language. It requires a study of how *who-doing-what* is recognized through language and interaction with others in particular situations and locations (i.e., linguistic behaviors observed). Meaningful utterances are consecutively numbered throughout each transcript (see Table 2). All sample transcripts involve researcher-fabricated non-dominant students and their teacher (based on years of teaching experience with non-dominant students and with other teachers in the same school) and are based on building a primary record format (CARSPACKEN, 1996). Scenarios, scripts, and interpretive comments are researcher-created from Line 1 of a randomly selected transcribed classroom "discussion about calculating differences in height" (CAZDEN, 2001, p.50).

| Speaker | Meaningful Utterances |
|---------------|---|
| | Linguistic Behavior Observed |
| [10] Gabriela | <i>I said.</i> |
| | Loud voice as if irritated or impatient. |
| [11] | <i>How much does Paulo have to grow?</i> |
| | Pointing to the board with finger as if teaching someone. |
| [12] | <i>SO</i> |
| | As if enjoying the attention AND/OR as if she knows she has the right answer. |
| [13] | <i>37 plus 3 more is ... 40</i> |
| | Points to each digit slowly and methodically while looking at the teacher. |

Table 2: Sample verbatim transcript of meaningful utterances and linguistic behaviors observed, Lines 10-13 [33]

In Table 2, italicized words entered in Lines 10-13 represent meaningful utterances by the speaker, Gabriela. Non-italicized words represent nonverbal linguistic behavior. The linguistic behaviors observed are nonverbal actions and interactions that describe how the words were spoken. For example in Line 10, Gabriela spoke with a loud voice *as if* irritated or impatient. *As if* is used to recognize that this observation is only one perspective to which others may disagree. [34]

Truth claims (i.e., assertions) are interpreted by considering the related validity conditions. Validity conditions or claims are based on what needs to be done or said to gain the consensus or understanding of any cultural group. Consensus involves negotiating, agreeing to, challenging, and/or transforming what is happening in a setting. Per critical epistemology, truth claims will never be final (CARSPACKEN, 1996), but all possible claims suggested by an act or interaction are articulated (see Table 3).

| Speaker | Meaningful Utterances |
|---------------|--|
| | Linguistic Behavior Observed |
| | [Validity Claims Articulated] |
| [10] Gabriela | <i>I said.</i> |
| | Loud voice as if irritated or impatient. |
| | [I am impatient with you guys who always tease me.] |
| [11] | <i>How much does Paulo have to grow?</i> |
| | Pointing to the board with finger as if teaching someone. |
| | [I am trying to teach you guys to act right and listen in class AND/OR I want the teacher to see how to teach these guys.] |
| [12] | <i>SO</i> |
| | As if enjoying the attention AND/OR as if she knows she has the right answer. |
| | [This feels right when I have the right answer and get good attention you guys and the teacher too.] |
| [13] | <i>37 plus 3 more is ... 40</i> |
| | Points to each digit slowly and methodically while looking at the teacher. |
| | [I want this good moment when no one is teasing me in class to last so maybe the teacher will help me out next time I get teased.] |

Table 3: Sample transcription with objective validity claims about linguistic behaviors observed articulated, Lines 10-13 [35]

In Table 3, bracketed words represent possible validity claims. Gabriela has offered to share her answer (i.e., truth claim or assertion) during math class to the question, "How much does Pablo have to grow?" Usually teased by the guys in the class with little retreat offered by the teacher, Gabriela impatiently begins to

share what she knows in lines 10-13. Translating truth claims into validity claims entails describing the linguistic behaviors Gabriela exhibits. Having observed how Gabriela is always teased in class, what Gabriela may be explicitly or implicitly thinking as she shares how she got the answer to the math problem is bracketed as possible validity claims. [36]

All participants have open access (i.e., or multiple access which means anyone in the room who was listening or looking could hear or see the interaction or object) to objects, spoken words, and observed linguistic behaviors. However, reaching agreement on observable truth claims, objects, and/or events depends on the cultural themes participants use to defend (i.e., negotiate) each claim and/or argument. For this reason, the researcher's interpretations and analyses of objective data are compared with subjective data (i.e., participants' personal perspectives with privileged access) subsequently collected in stage three during participant interviews. [37]

After the primary record has been built, primary record notes, field journal notes, and contact summary sheets are reread and compared. Linguistic behaviors and/or validity claims that augment the primary record are included. [38]

6.2 Stage two—reconstructive data analysis of the primary record

Stage two—reconstructive data analysis of the primary record takes place immediately after the primary record has been built (CARSPECKEN, 1996). Reconstructive data analysis is the inductive process of interpreting tacit cultural and subjective material, that is, "meanings of interactions in the primary record" (p.93), into explicit discourse. Reconstructive data analysis consists of (a) initial meaning reconstruction; (b) "pragmatic horizon analysis" (p.103); and (c) validity reconstruction. [39]

6.2.1 Initial meaning reconstruction

Initial meaning reconstruction is conducted to gain a holistic picture of routines or irregular events (i.e., continuity in settings and/or change or shifts in settings) in everyday life (CARSPECKEN, 1996). [40]

6.2.1.1 Holistic picture of routines constructed

First, the primary record and field journal notes are read to holistically picture possible underlying meanings. Initial meaning reconstructions provide illustrations and tentative explanations about what is happening in the setting (i.e., classroom) based on observations. Explanations in initial meaning reconstructions are derived holistically by inferring possible meanings of what was observed—and would probably be agreed upon by all participants—into words. [41]

6.2.1.2 Low-level coding conducted

Next, low-level coding procedures are conducted on the primary record to construct categories that name types of interactions. Low-level coding references "mainly objective features of the primary record" (CARSPACKEN, 1996, p.147) that are open to multiple access which means anyone in the room who was listening or looking could hear or see the interaction or object (see Table 4).

| General Code Category and Codes | Level of Objectivity |
|---|----------------------|
| <i>Ways of getting attention by Gabriela</i> | Slight |
| 1. <i>I said</i> | Medium |
| 2. <i>SO</i> | Very |
| 3. <i>Pointing to the board</i> | Very |
| <i>Ways of keeping conflict to minimum by teacher</i> | Slight |
| 1. <i>Ignoring derogatory remarks</i> | Slight |
| 2. <i>Scattered desks</i> | Very |

Table 4: Sample of low-level (objective) coding, noting objectivity levels of codes, from Table 3, Lines 10-13 [42]

In Table 4, italicized words represent general code categories; non-italicized words represent codes. Both category heading codes are slightly objective since slight interpretation was used in their construction. Low-level codes are open to multiple access which means anyone in the room who was listening would probably agree that it happened. Medium objectivity of the low-level code, *I said*, means some interpretation was used to determine the code. Slightly objective low-level codes (e.g., ignoring derogatory remarks) involve slight interpretation. Low-level codes with slight and medium levels of objectivity will be supported through horizon analysis and validity reconstruction procedures. For example, Lines 10-13 could be selected for explicit, initial meaning reconstruction because the segment does not follow the patterns or routines of other phases of the math lessons. [43]

6.2.1.3 Representative portions of routines selected

Based on the low-level coding, several portions from the primary record that represent language activity patterns/routines and irregularities (i.e., continuity and change) are selected for explicit, initial meaning reconstruction. Each chosen segment is copied into a new file and named by whether it represents continuity or change in language activity as co-constructed (negotiated) by the participants in the classroom lessons (e.g., Continuity #1, Change #1). The original primary record is preserved. [44]

6.2.1.4 Possible intentions inferred

To complete explicit initial meaning reconstructions in each chosen segment, possible underlying meanings [M] of the interactions are inferred hermeneutically and articulated in brackets line by line. The hermeneutic process of

"putting words on meanings that might be read from the timing, tone, gestures, and postures of each act ... [is possible] simply because the researcher is a communicative being and can imagine herself within the situation being analyzed as a first-, second-, or third-person party to the events" (CARSPACKEN, 1996, p.98). [45]

Hermeneutic inferences are not gained by multiple access but by noting possible intentions of actions, how actions are monitored by the actor, and how others understand the act. Hermeneutic inferencing requires the ability to take positions (i.e., intersubjectivity) and to recognize, reflect on, and explicitly examine and differentiate between personality and cultural typifications (i.e., intricacies in settings) of participants and others such as the researcher (CARSPACKEN, 1996). See Table 5 for a sample transcription with inferences of possible underlying meanings.

| Speaker | Meaningful Utterances |
|---------------|---|
| | Linguistic Behavior Observed |
| | [Validity Claims Articulated] |
| | <i>[Possible underlying meanings]</i> |
| [10] Gabriela | I said. |
| | Loud voice as if irritated or impatient. |
| | [I am impatient with you guys who always tease me.] |
| | <i>[M: Gabriela is always trying to gain control so the guys will not tease her anymore and so her teachers will give her attention that the disruptive guys usually get. It is like this at home too with her five brothers who get all the attention.]</i> |
| [11] | How much does Paulo have to grow? |
| | Pointing to the board with finger as if teaching someone. |
| | [I am trying to teach you guys to act right and listen in class AND/OR I want the teacher to see how to teach these guys.] |
| | <i>[M: She does not really care how much Pablo has to grow but is trying to show how smart she is to a group of people who only see her getting teased all the time. As a result of her standoffish behavior to the teasing guys, most people think she is not smart at all. (AND/OR) She really does care about how much Pablo has to grow and wants the guys who tease her to know she loves math even though she never admits it when they tease her about loving math.]</i> |
| [12] | SO |
| | As if enjoying the attention AND/OR as if she knows she has the right answer. |

| Speaker | Meaningful Utterances |
|---------|--|
| | [This feels right when I have the right answer and get good attention you guys and the teacher too.] |
| | <i>[M: With the whole room quiet for once, she is getting all the attention she wants and feels like she has the control she only wishes she could keep in real life.]</i> |
| [13] | 37 plus 3 more is ... 40 |
| | Points to each digit slowly and methodically while looking at the teacher. |
| | [I want this good moment when no one is teasing me in class to last so maybe the teacher will help me out next time I get teased.] |
| | <i>[M: This is the finale and she wants it to end just like this with her in control and the teacher learning from her how smart she really is, but she knows real life of teasing from the guys is just around the corner. Teachers never learn how to control the teasing guys.]</i> |

Table 5: Sample transcription of possible underlying meanings (M), Lines 10-13 [46]

In Table 5, bracketed italicized words represent possible underlying meanings of the interactions. A possible underlying meaning is that Gabriela may be enjoying the one moment of control she has gained during math class possibly because she never gets control and/or because she loves math but will not admit it to the guys who tease her. The teacher has allowed her to express her ideas about how to solve a math word problem (i.e., literacy learning). Gabriela may be feeling like she never has any attention in school except for teasing from the guys who have been in her school life for years. She mentioned in an earlier class that no teachers have been able to corral these guys. As a result of the attention that is usually given them from disruptive behavior, literacy learning and positive attention for Gabriela and other students is limited during most math classes. This moment of literacy learning is an anomaly that Gabriela could be trying her best to make last as long as possible by her long drawn-out words and motions. This may be the only way she can show she loves math without admitting it outright to the guys who tease her. [47]

6.2.1.5 Inference levels checked

Explicit, initial meaning reconstructions on selected segments of the primary record are conducted with three peer debriefers to check inference level of the low-level codes and to support and/or challenge the researcher's articulated validity claims, biases, and cultural typifications. Peer debriefers provide hermeneutic inferencing from other possible positions the researcher may have omitted. [48]

Peer debriefer training is conducted by the researcher and audiotaped for facility in checking researcher inference levels after the session. To prepare for the training session, the researcher chooses a videotape segment of five minutes in length from one of the selected primary record portions and prints out four copies

of the matching transcription of possible underlying meanings conducted by the researcher. To begin the training session, the researcher and peer debriefers-in-training discuss real-life examples of imagining oneself in a situation and analyzing it (usually implicitly) as a first-, second-, or third-person party to the event. To check the researcher's inference levels, the researcher and peer debriefers first view the chosen videotape segment together to discuss possible meanings of what was observed—and would probably be agreed upon by all participants. Then, the matching transcription is read aloud line-by-line to solicit additional possible underlying meanings from the peer debriefers that the researcher may have omitted. [49]

Peer debriefers can be selected from a peer group of doctoral students or other colleagues. In the specific situation for this research study, the peer groups are part of a larger dissertation group of about 20 doctoral students who meets every six weeks to review each other's work and discuss pertinent information about the dissertation writing process. All meetings are facilitated by the same professor (second author), who is also the dissertation chair or co-chair for each student in the dissertation group. [50]

Since initial meaning reconstruction is based only on observations and researcher-articulated possible validity claims, pragmatic horizon analysis and validity reconstructions are needed to analyze subjective and normative-evaluative claims. Subjective and normative-evaluative claims are of privileged access, existing in each person's individual opinions, understandings, beliefs, and/or consciousness. [51]

6.2.2 Pragmatic horizon analysis

Pragmatic horizon analysis involves the articulation of the communication structures or linguistic behavior (i.e., pragmatic meaning units) within the interactive classroom context (i.e., semantic meaning units) of lessons over time and space (CARSPECKEN, 1996; FAIRCLOUGH, 2003). Pragmatic horizon analyses of linguistic behaviors are conducted on the selected representative portions (based on the low-level coding conducted in initial meaning reconstruction) of the primary record. In pragmatic horizon analysis meaning reconstruction, actions—rather than perceptions—are the key to understanding experience (HABERMAS, 1981, 1987). A pragmatic horizon, or field of meaning, consists of temporal and paradigmatic axes. The temporal axis relates to shared awareness about past and future events. The paradigmatic axis relates to communication structures and "validity inferences at various levels of foregrounding" (CARSPECKEN, 1996, p.110). [52]

Borrowed from phenomenology, a horizon of meaning encompasses how one perceives an entire experience, the equivalence of seeing a particular object in clear view with the background objects visible but out of focus. Pragmatic horizon analysis contrasts the idea in focus (i.e., foreground object) with where the idea originated (i.e., background experience or understanding). For example, Gabriela (see Table 5) who was given a rare chance to share how she solved a math

problem with the class may have pointed to the board (i.e., foreground) to gain the attention of the class based on her background experiences in school (i.e., teachers usually use the board as an object for gaining attention of the students) even though she may not be able to verbalize that understanding (i.e., background). The idea or action of pointing to the board becomes understandable as a meaningful action when explicit and culturally shared linguistic behaviors are analyzed in reference to communication structures over time and space. [53]

In other words, when Gabriela's act of pointing to the board (i.e., foreground) is considered in reference to the perpetual teasing of the guys, it can be further understood through the conjecture of possible underlying meanings (i.e., background). By pointing to the board, Gabriela may be trying to gain control of her life by taking on the role of a teacher or trying to model for the teacher how to get the guys to stop teasing her in the classroom. For a moment in time, the power of her action entranced even the guys who perpetually tease her. However, even though this scenario stops at this point, the power relations of this moment could shift in the next moment if the guys negotiate her role as teacher with more teasing. The group will ultimately decide (co-construct) by negotiating whose claim becomes legitimate (i.e., what will happen next). [54]

Pragmatic horizon analysis is accomplished with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)—"a method of analyzing a wide variety of different types of spoken and written language within social practices" (GEE, 2005, p.294). Analyzing specific communication structures that are used as tools to accomplish particular goals in interactions is an inductive process and can never fully determine the meanings expressed but can represent a range of potential meanings for a moment in time. Five theoretical tools for CDA are used for pragmatic horizon analysis (BLOOME et al., 2005): (a) contextualization cues; (b) boundary-making; (c) turn-taking patterns; (d) thematic coherence; and (e) intertextuality (FAIRCLOUGH, 2003). Multiple products resulting from the CDA are used for subsequent validity reconstructions (i.e., transcripts). [55]

6.2.2.1 Contextualization cues

Contextualization cues are ways people make their intentions known as they interact with others in the event (BLOOME et al., 2005). People act and react to contextualization cues in a particular situation depending on past, present, and future understandings. Contextualization cues include (a) verbal (i.e., register and syntactical shifts); (b) nonverbal (i.e., gesture; facial expression and direction; eye movement, gaze, and contact; posture, postural configurations, and distancing; body movement and style of body movement); (c) prosodic signals (i.e., volume, tone, and rhythmic shifts; stress, stress patterns, and stress shifts; velocity shifts; pausing; intonation patterns and shifts); and (d) artifact (i.e., chairs, homework, books) manipulation. A "reflexive view of the relationship between language and context" (GEE, 2004, p.29) is maintained during the process. In this context, reflexive means that utterances influence the meaning of the context as the context simultaneously influences the meaning of the utterance. [56]

While simultaneously viewing each videotape and reading the corresponding primary record segment to augment interpretations, contextualization cues are analyzed (see Table 6). Transcription symbols (see [Appendix 2](#), Transcription Symbols Key) are inserted into the transcripts to make contextualization cues visible (BLOOME et al., 2005; BERKENKOTTER & THEIN, 2005).

| Speaker | Meaningful Utterances |
|---------------|--|
| [10] Gabriela | <i>*I said*</i> . |
| [11] | <i>How much does Paulo have to grow?</i> ↑ |
| [12] | SO |
| [13] | <i>37 plus 3 more is</i> ↑ ... 40 |

Table 6: Sample of a contextualization cues transcript, Lines 10-13 [57]

In Table 6, punctuation is used to mark speech delivery, not grammar. For example in Line 10, the asterisk transcription symbols surrounding **I said** show the boundaries of a change in voice, pitch, or style. Also in Line 10, a period indicates a stopping fall in tone after Gabriela said, *I said*. The upward arrow in Line 11 means a rising intonation at the end of an utterance. In this case, the rising intonation signified a question. In Line 12, SO is in all capital letters, meaning stress given to the word. Finally, the upward arrow in Line 13 signifies a rising intonation after the word *is*. In this case, rising intonation followed by a pause is a request for attention to the subsequent answer to the math problem. [58]

After all primary record segments have been analyzed for contextualization cues, boundary-making analyses of message unit boundaries, interactional unit boundaries, and phases of lessons are conducted. [59]

6.2.2.2 Boundary-making

Boundaries are socially constructed interactional behaviors that are given meaning when participants propose, maintain, and/or resist them together (BLOOME et al., 2005). The message unit, or "smallest unit of conversational meaning" (p.19) is identified and interpreted by how participants act and react to the contextualization cues. Message units are not necessarily turns at talk, meaningful utterances, or complete sentences. Rather, message units are defined as linguistic behaviors that hold shared meaning within the context of an event based on how the behavior impacts listeners. While simultaneously viewing each videotape and reading the corresponding selected primary record segment, message unit boundaries are identified and interpreted (see Table 7).

| Speaker | Message Unit |
|---------------|--|
| | Contextualization Cues used to Identify Message Unit [Interpretation of Message Unit Boundaries] |
| [10] Gabriela | <i>*I said*</i> . Stress on I said [indicates the beginning of message unit and claim to speaking rights]; loud tone and flat intonation pattern [maintains claim for next turn-at-talk] |
| [11] | <i>How much does Paulo have to grow?</i> ↑ Stress on How [signals the beginning of message unit]; rising intonation pattern [signals question]; lack of pause at end of question [maintains next turn-at-talk]. |
| [12] | SO Stress on SO [signals beginning of message unit]; loud and continuous intonation pattern [maintains the floor and next turn-at-talk] |
| [13] | <i>37 plus 3 more is</i> ↑ ... 40 Shift in tone [signals new message unit]; rising intonation pattern and pause after <i>is</i> [suggests that more is definitely coming or speaker is maintaining the floor]. |

Table 7: Sample of a transcript identifying/interpreting message unit boundaries, Lines 10-13 [60]

In Table 7, a new message unit and claim to speaking rights is identifiable by stress on the first word in Line 10 followed by a loud and flat intonation pattern to maintain the floor. Line 11 also begins with a stress on the first word signaling a new message unit followed by a rising intonation to indicate a question but no pause maintaining the floor again. Line 12 indicates a new message unit with a stress on "SO" followed by a loud and continuous intonation pattern to maintain the next turn-at-talk. Finally, a shift in tone indicates a new message unit in Line 13 followed by a rising intonation pattern and a pause after *is* to suggest that definitely more is coming or to maintain another turn-at-talk. [61]

Larger segments of conversation, known as interactional units (BLOOME et al., 2005), are tied by several message units. Interactional units are the "smallest units of joint social activity ... [involving] the actions and reactions of people toward each other" (p.26). Interactional unit boundaries are graphically represented by a vertical line drawn across the page above and below the interactional unit and its number, written in caps to easily distinguish it from other words in the transcript (e.g., INTERACTIONAL UNIT 1). Closure (i.e., the end of the interactional unit) of interactional units depends on intonations and contextualization cues during the conversation. When closure is determined, a vertical line is recorded below this point. To augment interpretations, interactional units are identified while simultaneously viewing each videotape and reading the corresponding selected primary record segment (see Table 8).

| Speaker | Message Unit |
|---------|--|
| | Contextualization Cues used to Identify Message Unit [Interpretation of Message Unit Boundaries] |

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 5

[10] Gabriela **I said**.

Stress on I said [indicates the beginning of message unit and claim to speaking rights]; loud tone and flat intonation pattern [maintains claim for next turn-at-talk]

[11] *How much does Paulo have to grow?* ↑

Stress on How [signals the beginning of message unit]; rising intonation pattern [signals question]; lack of pause at end of question [maintains next turn-at-talk].

[12] SO

Stress on SO [signals beginning of message unit]; loud and continuous intonation pattern [maintains the floor and next turn-at-talk]

[13] *37 plus 3 more is* ↑ ... *4+0*

Shift in tone [signals new message unit]; rising intonation pattern and pause after is [suggests that more is definitely coming or speaker is maintaining the floor].

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 6

14] Guy 1 *40 moos* | (*laughs*)

Different speaker [low volume signals a claim to begin a side conversation]; 40 slightly overlaps 4+0 [suggests that 4+0 was interpreted as the floor was open or that Gabriela has violated the rules for maintaining the floor or that Guy 1 has violated the rules for claiming the floor]; laughter [not a signal for claiming or maintaining the floor]

Table 8: Sample of a transcript indicating interactional units, Lines 10-14 [62]

In Table 8 during a math word problem lesson, the beginning of INTERACTIONAL UNIT 5 is proposed with a new speaker, Gabriela, stating, *I said*. A line is drawn above this message unit to denote the beginning of the interactional unit. Closure of INTERACTIONAL UNIT 5 is dictated by a different speaker, Guy 1, initiating a side conversation. A line is drawn below this message unit to denote closure of INTERACTIONAL UNIT 5 and initiation of INTERACTIONAL UNIT 6. [63]

Several interactional units comprise phases of lessons, and several phases of lessons constitute the entire event (BLOOME et al., 2005). Phases may be explicitly introduced by the teacher; however, some phases are not planned for in advance (i.e., student interruptions); interactional units, phases of lessons, and entire lessons are culturally constructed prominent changes in interactional patterns signaled by linguistic behaviors and participation structures of group

members. Phases are recorded numerically and by name (e.g., PHASE 1, INTRODUCTION) on the primary record with a double vertical line before the phase begins and after the phase ends. If more than one lesson occurs in the transcript, each lesson is differentiated with a bold line across the transcript before and after each lesson. While simultaneously viewing each videotape and reading the corresponding selected primary record segment to augment interpretations, phases of lessons and complete lessons are identified (see Table 9).

| Speaker | Message Unit |
|--|--------------|
| Contextualization Cues used to Identify Message Unit [Interpretation of Message Unit Boundaries] | |

MATH WORD PROBLEM LESSON

PHASE 1, INTRODUCTION

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 1

| | |
|--------------|---|
| [1] Teacher | <i>OK +</i> |
| [2] | <i>Today, I want to start our lesson with each of you sharing how you got the answer to our math word problem from yesterday.</i> |
| [3] | <i>Remember? ↑</i> |
| [4] Students | <i>No, I don't know.</i> |
| [5] Teacher | <i>How much does Pablo have to grow?</i> |

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 2

| | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|
| [6] | <i>Gabriela, would you begin? ↑</i> |
|-----|-------------------------------------|

PHASE 2, SHARED TEACHING

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 3

| | |
|--------------|----------------------|
| [7] Gabriela | <i>uh-huh</i> |
| [8] | <i>How much does</i> |

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 4

| | |
|-----------|------------------------|
| [9] Guy 1 | <i>Moos (laughs)</i> |
|-----------|------------------------|

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 5

| | |
|---------------|------------------|
| [10] Gabriela | <i>*I said*.</i> |
|---------------|------------------|

Stress on I said [indicates the beginning of message unit and claim to speaking rights]; loud tone and flat intonation pattern [maintains claim for next turn-at-talk]

| Speaker | <i>Message Unit</i> |
|---------|---|
| [11] | <i>How much does Paulo have to grow?</i> ↑ |
| | Stress on How [signals the beginning of message unit]; rising intonation pattern [signals question]; lack of pause at end of question [maintains next turn-at-talk]. |
| [12] | SO |
| | Stress on SO [signals beginning of message unit]; loud and continuous intonation pattern [maintains the floor and next turn-at-talk] |
| [13] | <i>37 plus 3 more is</i> ↑ ... <i>4+0</i> |
| | Shift in tone [signals new message unit]; rising intonation pattern and pause after is [suggests that more is definitely coming or speaker is maintaining the floor]. |

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 6

| | |
|------------|--|
| [14] Guy 1 | <i>40 moos</i> (<i>laughs</i>) |
| | Different speaker [low volume signals a claim to begin a side conversation]; 40 slightly overlaps 4+0 [suggests that 4+0 was interpreted as the floor was open or that Gabriela has violated the rules for maintaining the floor or that Guy 1 has violated the rules for claiming the floor]; laughter [not a signal for claiming or maintaining the floor] |

Table 9: Sample of a transcript indicating phases of lessons, Lines 1-14 [64]

Table 9 indicates the beginning of a MATH WORD PROBLEM LESSON. The boundary for PHASE 1, INTRODUCTION was initiated in Line 1 when the teacher said, *OK*. PHASE 2, SHARED TEACHING was introduced in Line 10 when Gabriela said, *uh-huh*, indicating her willingness to share how she got her answer. The full transcript would include the conclusion of this and other lessons. [65]

6.2.2.3 Turn-taking patterns

Turn-taking as simple tabulations of when and how often a person speaks is not interpretable unless defined within the social institution in which an event occurs and analyzed within the participation structure as socially constructed by the participants (BLOOME et al., 2005). A common traditional classroom participation structure is the Initiation-Response-Evaluation/Feedback (I-R-E/F) sequence (CAZDEN, 2001). In I-R-E/F, the teacher initiates a question/statement, the student responds, and the teacher evaluates the response via explicit or implicit feedback about the correctness of the answer/repeating a response. Participation structures are used by participants to decide whether and how to interpret and participate or not in an event. I-R-E/F sequences usually limit students to short prerequisite answers and may limit generative, transformative thinking and learning. In addition, cross-cultural differences between students and the teacher may result in unshared expectations about how to participate in various phases of lessons/events (DELPIT, 1995). While simultaneously viewing each videotape and reading the corresponding selected primary record segment to augment

interpretations, I-R-E/F turn-taking patterns and/or anomalies are identified by noting whether the linguistic behavior is an initiation, response, evaluation, or feedback (see Table 10).

| IRE Sequence | Speaker | Message Unit |
|--------------|-------------|---|
| Teacher I/Q | [1] Teacher | OK + |
| Teacher I/Q | [2] | <i>Today, I want to start our lesson with each of you sharing how you got the answer to our math word problem from yesterday.</i> |
| Teacher I/Q | [3] | <i>Remember? ↑</i> |
| Student R | [4] | <i>No, I don't know.</i> |
| Teacher E/F | [5] | <i>How much does Pablo have to grow?</i> |

Table 10: Sample of a transcript with I-R-E/F sequences indicated, Lines 1-5 [66]

Table 10 is an example of a traditional I-R-E/F participation sequence. In Line 1-2, the teacher initiates the lesson with a statement announcing the planned lesson content. In Line 3, the teacher asks a question, seeking a response from the students. The students respond in Line 4 with, "No, I don't know," to which the teacher provides feedback by providing the math word problem. A typical I-R-E/F sequence occurred in which the students and teacher have similar expectations of how to participate in the lesson. [67]

6.2.2.4 Thematic coherence

Thematic coherence is defined as how meanings are organized and/or negotiated during an event through ideas, interactions, and/or texts (BLOOME et al., 2005). Participants decide whether an event has thematic coherence by asking what is going on in the event and what everyone is talking about. Not all events have thematic coherence, while some events may have multiple overlapping themes at multiple levels. Other events have little thematic coherence, noticeable when participants question and/or contest what is happening either through verbal or nonverbal interactions. Themes can be declared by any participant and agreed upon or not by the others involved. Themes are analyzed by determining what is and/or assumed to be forefronted (i.e., focused on) and what and how themes are shifted and negotiated during the lesson. While simultaneously viewing each videotape and reading the corresponding selected primary record segments to augment interpretations, thematic coherence is analyzed (see Table 11).

| Speaker | Message Unit | Theme | | |
|--------------|---|-------|----------|-------|
| | | Math | Literacy | Other |
| [1] Teacher | OK + | ↓ | | |
| [2] | <i>Today, I want to start our lesson with each of you sharing how you got the answer to our math word problem from yesterday.</i> | ↓ | ↓ | |
| [3] | <i>Remember?</i> ↑ | ↓ | | |
| [4] Students | <i>No, I don't know.</i> | ↓ | | |
| [5] Teacher | <i>Read it in your math book. How much does Pablo have to grow?</i> | ↓ | ↓ | |
| [6] | <i>Gabriela, would you begin?</i> | ↓ | ↓ | |
| [7] Gabriela | <i>Uh-huh</i> | ↓ | ↓ | |
| [8] | <i>How much does</i> | ↓ | ↓ | |
| [9] Guy 1 | <i>Moo (laughs)</i> | | | ↓ |

Table 11: Sample transcription with thematic coherence indicated, Lines 1-9 [68]

Table 11 is a transcription of a math lesson with an assumed theme of math instruction. The teacher confirms this assumption in Line 1 when she introduces the planned content for the math lesson. Students agree to the math instruction assumption, sitting in their chairs waiting for the lesson to begin. The teacher implicitly overlaps a literacy theme in Line 2 with the math theme when she mentioned the word problem. Word problems in math include words and numeric symbols in the question and often ask for answers that also include words and numeric symbols. The teacher openly overlaps the math theme with the literacy theme again when the teacher mentions reading the math problem in the book in Line 5 and continues until Gabriela begins to read the word problem in Line 8, overlapping a literacy theme again. However, in Line 9, the math/literacy theme is broken when Guy 1 interrupts Gabriela with an unrelated side conversation and laughter. [69]

How overlaps or interruptions are negotiated, confirmed and/or resisted with the other students and the teacher determines which theme will continue by agreement of the participants or whether thematic coherence is or is not achieved. For example, if interruptions become the focus of the class, thematic coherence of the lesson would be traditionally negotiated either by consensus (e.g., all students enter into the side conversation) or dissolution (e.g., teacher halts the lesson to call for the security guard). Nontraditional negotiation of thematic coherence occurs if the teacher builds on linguistic behaviors and sociocultural theories of literacy learning (see Table 12).

| Speaker | Message Units | Theme | | |
|--------------|---|-------|----------|-------|
| | | Math | Literacy | Other |
| [1] Teacher | Who is taller than me? | ↔ | | |
| | | ↓ ↓ | | |
| [2] Students | Everyone, Miss. | ↔ | | |
| | | ↓ ↓ | | |
| [3] Gabriela | You know the answer, Miss, but this is a trick, yo. You always ask us questions that get turned upside down. | ↔ | | |
| | | ↓ ↓ | | |
| [4] Guy 1 | Yeah, last you asked us if we had ever seen our shadow, and somehow we ended up going outside to look at the trees and write poems about them after we measured them. Moo (laughs) | ↔ | | ↔ |
| | | ↓ ↓ | | |
| [5] Students | (laugh) | | | ↔ |
| [6] Teacher | Guy 1, you are too funny with your moos. And you have too good of a memory. (laughs) But really, how do you know everyone is taller than me? | ↔ | | |
| | | ↓ ↓ | | |
| [7] Gabriela | There's that how question. You wanna know how and why all the time ... that's why we're all so smart in here! Because ... | ↔ | | |
| | | ↓ ↓ | | |

Table 12: Sample transcription with nontraditional thematic coherence indicated, Lines 1-7 [70]

Table 12 is an alternative nontraditional example to thematic coherence, offered for contrast. In Line 1, the teacher asks a conversational question to the students. The teacher purposely asked a question that combined math and literacy and piqued their cultural interests in how people look and dress. The teachers' beliefs that students learn by being engaged together and building on what they already know are the foundation of the community feel of the classroom she shares with the students. She listens for what interests her students, their cultural themes and models with every moment in the classroom. Line 2-4 provides historical evidence of how this community of learners works together. Several students bounce off of the teachers' conversational question and each others' ideas and thoughts. Then, when Guy 1 ends his statement with *Moo*, and laughs, the reaction is entirely different than in the other classroom. Everyone in this classroom knows from experience that the teacher will acknowledge Guy 1's humor and then forge ahead with thinking questions as shown in Lines 5-7. Thematic coherence is achieved by the teacher's ability to use language to develop chains in the thinking

going on in the class. Math and literacy are part of the ongoing (i.e., temporal) classroom context and linguistic (i.e., pragmatic) behaviors that are exhibited. [71]

6.2.2.5 Intertextuality

Intertextuality occurs when two or more written, verbal, nonverbal, or electronic texts share a feature, refer to one another, or lead to another text (BLOOME et al., 2005). A traditional classroom example of intertextuality is one of students simultaneously reading from a text, writing notes, and conversing with others in the classroom. In his or her mind, the traditional teacher may isolate worksheets and/or textbooks, the traditional texts, from their production and consumption (FAIRCLOUGH, 1995, 2003). For example, the teacher may not acknowledge the publishers' ideological agenda. The teacher may not consider how students may have forgotten the lesson, or may have been talking to someone about what they did last night. Students may not be able to connect previous knowledge to the worksheet and/or textbook. While simultaneously viewing each videotape and reading the corresponding selected primary record segment, intertextualities are identified (see Table 13).

| Speaker | Meaningful Utterances | IP | IA | IR | SC |
|--------------|--|----|----|----|----|
| [1] Teacher | OK + | | | | |
| [2] | <i>Today, I want to start our lesson with each of you sharing how you got the answer from our math word problem yesterday.</i> | X | | | |
| [3] | <i>Remember? ↑</i> | X | | | |
| [4] Students | <i>No, I don't know.</i> | | | | |
| [5] Teacher | <i>Read it in your math book. How much does Pablo have to grow?</i> | X | | | |
| [6] | <i>Gabriela, would you begin? ↑</i> | | R | R | |
| [7] Gabriela | <i>uh-huh</i> | | C | | |
| [8] | <i>How much does</i> | | | | |
| [9] Guy 1 | <i>Moo (laughs)</i> | NT | | | |

Table 13: Sample transcription with traditional intertextualities indicated, Lines 1-9 [72]

In Table 13, C represents Confirmation; IA represents Intertextuality Acknowledged; IP represents Intertextuality Proposed; IR represents Intertextuality Recognized; NT represents New Topic; R represents Request; and SC represents Social Consequence. [73]

In Table 13, the teacher proposes intertextuality by referring to a math word problem from the day before, assuming the students will acknowledge and/or recognize the proposal. However, the students may or may not take up her

proposal, depending on whether they remember or want to remember yesterday's math lesson. She accentuates her proposal with the question, *Remember?* in Line 3. Students do not acknowledge/recognize the proposed intertextuality in Line 4 saying they do not remember or know what she is talking about. The teacher pursues the proposed intertextuality again in Line 5 with a reminder to look in their math book, an assumed storage place for math knowledge. This teacher does not believe, and thus, does not propose that heteroglossic intertextualities exist between what is in the math book, the math problem, on television or other media, and/or the students' background knowledge in order to hold a conversation around the topic. Gabriela acknowledges and recognizes the teacher's proposed intertextuality in Lines 7-8 by saying, *uh-huh*, and beginning to read the question. In Line 9, Guy 1 initiates a new topic with a side conversation and laughter, not acknowledging or recognizing the proposed intertextuality. [74]

In this paper, however, heteroglossia (BAKHTIN, 1981), defined as interactions among heterogeneous texts (i.e., television, math books, conversational text), is acknowledged and recognized using a three-dimensional framework for CDA of text, discourse practice, and sociocultural practice (FAIRCLOUGH, 1995). Within this framework, intertextualities are defined as socially-constructed interactions among texts, contexts (i.e., intercontextualities), and discourses (i.e., interdiscursivities) with social consequence (FAIRCLOUGH, 1995). Intertextualities, intercontextualities, and interdiscursivities are proposed, acknowledged, recognized, agreed upon, or contested among those involved based on "bits and pieces of prior discourse that index social, cultural, and historical contexts" (BERKENKOTTER & THEIN, 2005, p.203). See Table 14 for a sample transcription of a nontraditional classroom with intertextualities indicated. After pragmatic horizon analysis is accomplished, validity reconstructions are conducted.

| Speaker | Message Unit | IP | IA | IR | SC |
|--------------|---|----|----|----|----|
| [1] Teacher | <i>Who is taller than me?</i> | X | R | R | R |
| [2] Students | <i>Everyone, Miss.</i> | | C | | |
| [3] Gabriela | <i>You know the answer, Miss, but this is a trick, yo. You always ask us questions that get turned upside down.</i> | | C | | C |
| [4] Guy 1 | <i>Yeah, last you asked us if we had ever seen our shadow, and somehow we ended up going outside to look at the trees and write poems about them after we measured them. Moo (laughs)</i> | X | C | C | |

| Speaker | Message Unit | IP | IA | IR | SC |
|--------------|---|----|----|----|----|
| [5] Students | <i>(laugh)</i> | | C | C | C |
| [6] Teacher | <i>Guy 1, you are too funny with your moos. And you have too good of a memory. (laughs) But really, how do you know everyone is taller than me?</i> | | R | | |
| [7] Gabriela | <i>There's that how question. You wanna know how and why all the time ... that's why we're all so smart in here! Because ...</i> | | C | C | C |

Table 14: Sample transcription of nontraditional intertextualities indicated, Lines 1-7 [75]

In Table 14, C represents Confirmation; IA represents Intertextuality Acknowledged; IP represents Intertextuality Proposed; IR represents Intertextuality Recognized; NT represents New Topic; R represents Request; and SC represents Social Consequence. [76]

In Table 14, the teacher proposes nontraditional intertextuality in Line 1 with the question about who is taller than she is, simultaneously requesting that the students acknowledge, recognize, and understand the social consequence of her question. Students confirmed the acknowledgment of intertextuality by answering, *Everyone is, Miss*. The teacher knew it took background knowledge related to multiple texts (e.g., math textbook, measuring stick) to come up with this answer even though the students may not recognize the origin of their answer. Line 3 is a confirmation that Gabriela acknowledges intertextualities in this context. She acknowledges that the teacher often asks known questions to get them to think, inferring that answers are in multiple places in the world, an implicit social consequence for non-dominant students who have typically failed math in their past. [77]

Guy 1 continues the confirmations remembering how they usually end up finding answers in the most unlikely places and even writing in math class, insinuating the social consequence of being a thinker and agent in your own learning. He proposes a new intertextuality with the word, *Moo*, out of context, and laughter. The class members acknowledge and recognize the intertextuality, and thus, humor of the word, *Moo*, in the same conversation as who is taller than the teacher, and value the social consequence of being able to have fun together during a math lesson. The students may not explicitly recognize the social consequence of being able to hold think-tank-type of math lessons, however, as the teacher does. The teacher skillfully recognizes and values Guy 1's humor and then continues by requesting recognition of the intertextuality of her original question with, *How do you know?* This is an implicit request to recognize that

knowledge comes from various places in our world, particularly from the students' background knowledge. Finally, Gabriela acknowledges, recognizes, and sees the social consequence of how the teacher gets them to think. She will continue to give evidence of her recognition as noted by *Because* ... followed by the ellipsis. [78]

6.2.3 Validity reconstructions

Validity reconstructions provide insights into a culture by attending to the "validity claims routinely employed in the construction of meaningful action" (CARSPACKEN, 1996, p.110). "Validity reconstructions make the analysis of setting shifts and negotiations more precise" (p.117). Articulating validity claims entails reconstructing possible subjective, objective, and normative-evaluative claims and simultaneously distinguishing between various levels (i.e., highly, immediate, less, remotely) of foregrounded and backgrounded claims. Validity reconstructions get at the meaning of meaningful acts that are typically tacit, or backgrounded, in nature. Validity reconstructions attempt to articulate the reasons a participant would use to defend an action or reaction and/or clear up a misunderstanding. These reasons, or validity claims, are differentiated in the final step of stage two analyses. While simultaneously viewing each videotape and reading a copy of the corresponding primary record segment, validity reconstructions (CARSPACKEN, 1996) are conducted (see Table 15).

| Speaker | Message Unit |
|-------------|---|
| [1] Teacher | OK + |
| [2] | <i>Today, I want to start our lesson with each of you sharing how you got the answer to our math word problem from yesterday.</i> |

Possible subjective claims

Foregrounded, Immediate

"I want to teach you." "I want to help you remember what you learned yesterday." "I want you to learn how to do math word problems." "I want you to think of this as your math lesson too."

Less Foregrounded, Less Immediate

"I am a good math teacher (identity claim)." "I am thinking of new ways to teach you."

Possible objective claims

Very Foregrounded, Very Immediate

"The principal is coming to visit today and he likes to see sharing."

Highly Backgrounded, Remote

"This is a school, the principal is boss, we are the teacher and students who follow school rules and expectations." AND/OR "Teachers get fired and students fail if they do not do as expected."

Possible normative-evaluative claims

Quite Foregrounded, Quite Immediate

"It's right for the teacher to do as expected by the principal."

Less Foregrounded, Less Immediate

"The principal knows best."

Backgrounded, Remote

"Teachers are responsible for their students' success and failure." "Teachers want parents to think they are good teachers." "Bad teachers do not follow the rules."

Table 15: Sample of validity reconstructions, Lines 1-14 [79]

Table 15 provides validity reconstructions of possible reasons the teacher could give to defend her actions when she said to the students that the lesson would begin by having each one of the students share how he or she got the answer to the math word problem from yesterday. Subjective reasons revolve around being a good teacher by doing something different and making it seem like the lesson belongs to the students too. Objective reasons deal with the fact that (in the researcher-fabricated scenario based upon experience) the principal is coming to observe today and she knows that principals are the one in charge and teachers do get fired and/or students do fail if the teacher is *bad* by objective standards. Normative-evaluative reasons take for granted that it is good for the teacher to follow the rules because they are responsible for students' successes. More obvious is the notion that it is right to do what the principal expects. [80]

The validity reconstructions in Table 15 provide a more precise idea about what is happening in this classroom. Setting negotiations are begun sporadically and/or stopped midstream by the teacher due to the possible fears of being caught by an authority figure in the act of not being a good teacher or not following the rules. This teacher is possibly agitated yet swayed, by the dominant ideologies about school, giving reverence to categorizations and hierarchies. Her attempts to do something different in the classroom are usually thwarted by interruptions and other conflicts in the classroom. Interactive power relations are implicated throughout validity reconstructions. After validity reconstructions are accomplished, stage two procedures—reconstructive data analyses of the primary record are complete. Next, dialogical data are generated to prioritize subjective and normative-evaluative truth claims. In other words, participants' perspectives are solicited. [81]

6.3 Stage three—dialogical data generation

Dialogical (i.e., conversational) data is generated to democratize the research process (FREIRE, 1970) and provide additional contextual knowledge from the participants' perspectives (CARSPECKEN, 1996). Stage three—dialogical data generation consists of interviews conducted in subsessions (WENGRAF, 2004), facilitated by an interview protocol and documented with a digital recorder and

field journal notes. Dialogical data is collected in two subsessions through lightly-structured depth interviews and videotape feedback interviews. Immediately after all depth interviews are completed, videotape feedback interviews are conducted. [82]

6.3.1 Subsession one—depth interviews

Subsession one—depth interviews are conducted to gain participants' perspectives on school in general. Lightly-structured depth interviews (WENGRAF, 2004) stimulate in-depth exploration of a topic by providing a space for each participant's voice and using participants' vocabulary (SCHENSUL, SCHENSUL & LeCOMPTE, 1999). A criterion-based sample of students who were involved in the portions of the primary record selected for stage two—reconstructive data analysis and the teacher are interviewed. Depth interviews take place in a space separate from the classroom. Participation is voluntary; interviews are stopped if requested by the participant. [83]

6.3.1.1 Interview protocol

The researcher constructs a lightly-structured interview protocol (see [Appendix 3](#)) to facilitate the depth interviews and use for recording notes if necessary. The same three peer debriefers provide feedback on the protocol prior to the study. Lightly-structured interview protocols allow "maximum flexibility during the interview process" (CARSPECKEN, 1996, p.156) and draw out implicit theories comprising people's actions, rather than asking interviewees to talk about particular theories. Interview protocols also organize thoughts into headings and give "information about starting the interview, concluding ideas, information on ending the interview, and thanking the respondents" (CRESWELL, 1998, p.126). [84]

The interview protocol includes an open question and possible follow-up questions in an effort to anticipate potential directions for more elaborate responses during the interview (CARSPECKEN, 1996; WENGRAF, 2004). The open question may pertain to a concrete event, such as a typical day in class at school (GEE, 2006). Possible follow-up questions from the domains of life and society (GEE, 2006) are included in an effort to anticipate potential directions for more elaborate responses during the interview (CARSPECKEN, 1996; WENGRAF, 2004). Life questions pertain to students' lives, homes, communities, interests, and schools. Society questions solicit more academic explanations and opinions about societal issues such as racism (GEE, 2006). Depending on the dialogue level, active follow-up questions and probes are improvised during the interviews (WENGRAF, 2004). [85]

6.3.1.2 Digital recorder

To begin each interview, the format is explained to the interviewee so she or he feels comfortable with the situation. The presence of a digital recorder with a microphone is discussed and then placed between the researcher and interviewee. Cognizance of power relations and anxiety which are strongly

affected by the "histories and social roles of those involved" (WENGRAF, 2004, p.42) in research interviews are prioritized during the interview. [86]

6.3.1.3 Field journal notes

Immediately after each interview, 15 to 20 minutes are set aside to self-debrief about the experience in the field journal notes section of the large notebook preferably in the same room to advance understanding and analysis (WENGRAF, 2004). Field journal notes are then reviewed, and a contact summary sheet (see [Appendix 1](#)) is filled out to summarize the interview (MILES & HUBERMAN, 1994). [87]

6.3.2 Subsession two—videotape feedback interviews

Subsession two—videotape feedback interviews—are conducted to gain participants' perspectives on what happened and why during the videotaped lessons. Participants' perspectives are solicited to augment initial data analysis and meaning reconstruction. When a discourse analysis is not part of a larger ethnographic study, dialogical data can also be generated with videotape feedback interviews (BLOOME et al., 2005; CARSPECKEN, 1996). Videotape feedback interviews are conducted by sharing videotape data and preliminary interpretations of it with one or more of the participants who are also asked "about contextual knowledge that might better inform the interpretations" (BLOOME et al., 2005, p.184). The same criterion-based sample of students who participated in subsession one—depth interviews and the teacher are interviewed in subsession two—videotape feedback interviews. Videotape feedback interviews take place in a space separate from the classroom. Participation is voluntary; interviews are stopped if requested by the participant. [88]

6.3.2.1 Interview protocol

The researcher constructs a lightly-structured videotape feedback interview protocol (see [Appendix 4](#)) to facilitate the videotape feedback interviews and use for recording notes if necessary. To use in conjunction with the interview protocol, videotapes from the primary record segments selected for stage two—reconstructive data analysis are compiled into a DVD using *Moviemaker* or other similar computer software. The videotape feedback interview process consists of "playing videotapes of interaction back to the [participants] and allowing them to comment on any portion of the events they choose to ... elicit articulations of tacit cultural material as well as for stimulating the expressions of subjective material" (CARSPECKEN, 1996, p.163). The interviewees are told that they will be viewing a DVD of some video clips from the recent classroom observations. The interviewees are invited to view and stop the DVD when any one of them wants to discuss what is happening and why during the lessons. Researcher's interpretations of the clips are also shared with the interviewee after all of their interpretations of what is happening and why have been offered. A comparison and discussion of both versions takes place so that the interviewee's viewpoint is clearly understood by the researcher to incorporate in the analysis. [89]

6.3.2.2 Digital recorder

The digital recorder procedures for the videotape feedback interview sessions are treated in a similar fashion as the digital recorder procedures for the depth interview sessions. [90]

6.3.2.3 Field journal notes

Field journal notes procedures are conducted in the same manner as the journal notes during depth interview sessions are treated. [91]

After stage three—dialogical data generation has been conducted to prioritize subjective and normative-evaluative truth claims (i.e., participants' perspectives on class in general and what happened and why in the lessons), stage four procedures for reconstructive data analysis of the interviews are conducted. [92]

6.4 Stage four—reconstructive data analysis of the interviews

Stage four—reconstructive data analysis of the interviews adheres to the same logic and procedures of stage two—reconstructive data analysis of the primary record (i.e., initial meaning reconstruction, pragmatic horizon analysis, and validity reconstructions). After all interviews have been analyzed using stage two procedures, stage five—high-level (i.e., abstract) coding follow. [93]

6.5 Stage five—high-level coding

After stage four—reconstructive data analysis of the interviews has been completed, stage five—high-level coding procedures are conducted. High-level coding is based on data other than the primary record. Each high-level code is supported by matches between interview statements and exemplary pragmatic horizon analyses. "High level codes are dependent on greater amounts of abstraction" (CARSPACKEN, 1996, p.148) than low-level codes which are used in initial meaning reconstruction and to select portions of the primary record for intensive analysis. Each high-level code "should be backed up with an exemplary horizon analysis ... [and] ideally ... match statements made by participants during the interviews ... of stage three" (p.148). High-level codes are needed to "generalize findings that emerge from ... validity reconstruction, horizon analysis, and the analysis of interactive power" (p.148). [94]

High-level coding produces general categories and many different codes under each category (i.e., raw codes). After high-level codes and categories are produced by the researcher (see Table 16), the same three peer debriefers provide feedback in a similar manner to the feedback provided with the low-level codes.

| General Code Category and Codes | Level of Abstraction |
|--|----------------------|
| <i>CC: Reproduction of dominant ideology</i> | |
| 1. T#, p#: class runs by remote formal turn-taking | Very high |
| 2. T#: unwritten rules for abiding by I-R-E/F sequence | High |
| 3. Teacher T#, p#: <i>Today, I want to ...</i> | Very high |
| 4. Teacher I: <i>I do not want to get fired.</i> | High |
| <i>CC: Resistance of dominant ideology</i> | |
| 1. Teacher T#, p#: attempt at nontraditional lesson | Very high |
| 2. Students T#, p#: <i>(laugh)</i> | High |
| 3. Gabriela, Guy 1 T#, p#: autonomous presentations | Very high |
| 4. Guy 1 I: <i>I like to challenge the rules.</i> | High |

Table 16: Sample of high-level coding supported by matches between interview and primary record analyses [95]

In Table 16, CC represents code categories, and numbered items represent codes. Codes are specified by Table (T) number and page (p) number of transcript. One high-level category heading code, *Reproduction of dominant ideology*, is abstracted from stage two data analysis. Highly abstracted examples of *Reproduction of dominant ideology* consist of the class running on the I-R-E/F participation structure as if by remote and a quote from an interview with the teacher about not wanting to get fired. A very high level code is the taken-for-granted formal turn-taking rules in place evidenced by the way the teacher makes requests to claim the floor or asks students to take their turn. A second very high level code is when the teacher introduces how she wants to begin the lesson, announcing she was trying out something new. [96]

A second high-level heading code, *Resistance of dominant ideology*, is exemplified with two high level codes: short interruptions of laughter during an academic lesson with formal turn-taking and a quote from an interview with Guy 1 about how he likes to challenge the rules. Two very high level codes to support the *Resistance of dominant ideology* category include the teacher's attempt to try out a new type of lesson and the autonomous presentations from students, such as when Gabriela used a loud voice to gain the attention of the students or when Guy 1 says *Moo*. After high-level codes have been developed and matched, final reconstructive data analysis follows. [97]

6.6 Stage six—final reconstructive data analysis

Multiple, detailed, redundant, and overlapping emergently developed raw heading categories and codes will exist at this point. These raw heading categories and

codes are reorganized to focus the final analysis. First, "certain codes will be grouped together into a few large categories" (CARSPACKEN, 1996, p.151) according to the goals of the research study. The resulting large categories and accompanying codes are organized thematically for patterns and meanings. Thematic analyses are reread and regrouped into many intermediate categories. Then, intermediate categories are regrouped into final larger categories, comprising the analytic emphases of the study that address the questions of the study. [98]

7. Conclusion

This article recounted the dilemma that drove the search for teaching and research methods that would reconceptualize institutionalized educational practices and conditions. In particular, this paper discussed critical microethnography as a powerful method for describing, interpreting, and explaining how uses of language shape opportunities for literacy learning in an alternative education classroom. As an intervention, critical microethnography focuses on changing oppressive educational conditions rather than students. Understanding how and why language is used in classrooms in order to transform oppressive educational practices and conditions into caring and responsive curricula is essential for the benefit of our society and schools. [99]

During the course of describing the critical microethnographic stages, a second dilemma surfaced as follows. There may appear to be a contradiction between the critical framework and method and the somewhat traditional approach provided in this paper. However, novice researchers may need a heuristic for three reasons. First, a heuristic helps one to visualize and walk through a new journey into critical research that holds the promise of transforming conditions in classrooms by encouraging all participants to dialogue about what is happening. Second, we wanted others to be able to visualize and walk through the process if they desired. Third, we believe it is necessary to initiate a cogenerative dialogue about and with the critical microethnographic method as proposed in this paper if oppressive conditions in classrooms are to be transformed. ROTH (2006) explains that

"cogenerative dialoguing, which literally means making sense together in and through democratic dialogue form, as praxis of making sense together with students, new teachers, regular teachers, university supervisors of new teachers, and other researchers who together had participated in a lesson. We established a heuristic consisting of a list of items that we could use—in real time—to check whether all participants in a cogenerative dialogue had equal opportunities and took equal responsibility in making these dialogues democratic forums in the construction of understanding of the events that we had lived together in the classroom" (para. 5). [100]

Recognizing, acknowledging, and pursuing dilemmas in education is necessary for conducting cogenerative dialogic and critical research. Even though difficult, a better understanding can occur if we openly discuss ethical issues that arise

(ROTH, 2006) as we become familiar with the processes and subsequently conduct critical research. [101]

Appendix

Appendix 1: Contact Summary Sheet for Observations and Interviews

Contact Type: _____ Site: _____
 Observation _____ Date: _____
 Group/Individual Videotape Feedback Interview _____

1. What were the main concerns during this contact?
2. Summarize the information received or not received on each target question for this contact.

| | |
|----------|-------------|
| Question | Information |
|----------|-------------|

3. What else was interesting, informative, or important during this contact?
4. What are some new or remaining target questions for the next contact?
5. What are additional concerns after this contact?

Appendix 2: Transcription Symbols Key²

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| (.) | Untimed pause barely noticed < .2 seconds |
| >fast< | Noticeably faster talk |
| <slow> | Slower than surrounding talk |
| Under | Indicates emphasis |
| .,?! | Punctuation used to mark speech delivery, not grammar. A period indicates a stopping fall in tone; a comma means continuing intonation; a question mark means rising inflection; an exclamation point means animated or emphatic tone |
| <i>(laugh)</i> | Indicates laughter (outright laugh, something is funny) |
| CAPITALS | Talk that is noticeably louder than surrounding talk |
| ho:me | Colon indicates an extension of the sound or syllable that it follows |
| .hh | Audible inbreath |
| hh | Audible outbreath (often with laughter) |
| ^ | Marked rising shifts in intonation in the talk immediately following |
| [coughs] | bracket enclose transcriber' s descriptions of nonspeech sounds |

2 BERKENKOTTER and THEIN (2005, p.205), BLOOME, CARTER, CHRISTIAN, OTTO and SHUART-FARIS (2005, p.245).

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| [bell rings] | other features of talk |
| () | Talk that is noticeably quieter than surrounding talk |
| (undecipherable) | uneasy or agreeable mumbling, or talking to themselves |
| | Short pause |
| | Long pause |
| ⌋ | Interrupted by next line |
| ┌ Line 1 └ Line 2 | Overlap |
| Vowel + | Elongated vowel |
| *words* | Boundaries of a voice, pitch, or style change |
| Italics | Verbal behavior (meaningful utterances, i.e., talk) |
| OC: | Observer comments |
| Student | Unidentified student speaking |
| Students | Many students speaking at once |

Appendix 3: Lightly-Structured Depth Interview Protocol

Introduction:

Hello, we are going to have an interview session together. I will use this digital recorder to record what we say. I will place it between us so everything we say will be heard clearly. You may say anything you wish, nothing you say will leave this room. You will not be penalized for anything you say. You will be anonymous when I write up my research report (discuss what anonymous means). You may also stop the interview at any time. Do you have any questions?

Open questions:

Please tell me about what an ordinary school (teaching, administrators, security personnel's) day is like for you.

Optional questions:

Please tell me about an ordinary school (teaching, administrators, security personnel's) day for you from when you get up in the morning until you get back home at night.

Please tell me about a recent event in the classroom (or one that just happened during observations). Be as detailed as you can about the event.

Here is diagram of the selected classroom(s). Can you tell me about it (them), what things are used for, what people do in this classroom?

Follow-up life part probing questions related to literacy:

What does school (teaching, administrating, being security personnel) have to do with your life outside of school?

What does school (teaching, administrating, being security personnel) have to do with your life at home?

What does school (teaching, administrating, being security personnel) have to do with people in your community?

How does school (teaching, administrating, being security personnel) relate to your interests?

How does school (teaching, administrating, being security personnel) help you with your educational (life) goals?

Can you tell me more?

Follow-up society part probing questions related to literacy:

Who makes good grades in our society?

Where do the rules and tests used in school come from?

Who are grades, rules, and tests in school for?

How do these things (e.g., grades, tests, rules) affect different people because of issues (racism, sexism) in the world?

Concluding ideas:

Do you have anything else to add?

Closure: Thank you very much for your opinions and ideas!

Appendix 4: Lightly-Structured Videotape Feedback Interview Protocol

Introduction:

Hello, we are going to have an (do something different in the next part of our) interview session together. I will use this digital recorder to record what we say. I will place it between us so everything we say will be heard clearly. You may say anything you wish, nothing you say will leave this room. You will not be penalized for anything you say. You will be anonymous when I write up my research report (discuss what anonymous means). In fact, your ideas may help change schools for the better. Your thoughts will assist me so I can compare what you think was happening and why to what I think was happening and why. You may also stop the interview at any time.

I have brought a 20-minute segment for you to watch from the videotapes that were taken in your classroom a few days ago. I have my own thoughts about what is happening and why in this segment. But I would like to hear your version,

or your story, of what was happening and why. While we watch the segment, feel free to stop the videotape and talk about something that is happening and why. You can also talk about what you were thinking, feeling, or doing and why.

I may also stop the videotape at certain parts where I have questions and tell you what I think was going on and why in that part. I would like for us to compare my version and yours so I can understand better what is happening and why during class. Do you have any questions?

Concluding ideas: Do you have anything else to add?

Closure: Thank you very much for your opinions and ideas!

References

- Anderson, Gary L.; Herr, Kathryn & Nihlen, Ann S. (1994). *Studying your own school: An educator's guide to qualitative practitioner research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (edited by M. Holquist, translated by Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Beach, Richard & Kalnin, Julie (2005). Studying value stances in institutional settings. In Richard Beach, Judith Green, Michael Kamil & Timothy Shanahan (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives: On literacy perspectives* (2nd ed., pp.209-242). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Berkenkotter, Carol & Thein, Amanda (2005). Settings, speech genres, and the institutional organization of practices. In Richard Beach, Judith Green, Michael Kamil & Timothy Shanahan (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives in literacy research* (2nd ed., pp.179-208). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Bloome, David; Carter, Stephanie P.; Christian, Beth M.; Otto, Sheila & Shuart-Faris, Nora (2005). *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events: A microethnographic perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bogdan, Robert C. & Biklen, Sari K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (4th ed.). New York: A & B.
- Bowles, Samuel & Gintis, Herbert (1977). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic.
- Carlson, Dennis & Apple, Michael W. (Eds.) (1999). *Power/knowledge/pedagogy: The meaning of democratic education in unsettling times*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Carpenter, Dick M.; Ramirez, Al & Severn, Laura (2006). Gap or gaps: Challenging the singular definition of the achievement gap. *Education and Urban Society*, 39(1), 113-127.
- Carspecken, Phil F. (1991). *Community schooling and the nature of power: The battle for Croxteth comprehensive*. New York: Routledge.
- Carspecken, Phil F. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide*. New York: Routledge.
- Cash, Terry (2004). Alternative schooling. In Jay Smink & Franklin P. Schargel (Eds.), *Helping students graduate: A strategic approach to dropout prevention* (pp.165-176). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Cassidy, Wanda & Bates, Anita (2005). "Drop-outs" and "push-outs": Finding hope at a school that actualizes the ethic of care. *American Journal of Education*, 112(1), 66-102, <http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/toc/aje/current> [Date of access: 1/26/09].
- Cazden, Courtney (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Chubbuck, Sharon (2004). Whiteness enacted, whiteness disrupted: The complexity of personal congruence. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 301-336.

- Coello, Helena M.; Casañas, Jorge A. & Rocco, Tonette S. (2004). Understanding critical race theory: An analysis of cultural differences in healthcare education. *rt-image*, 17(49), <http://www.rt-image.com/1206critical> [Date of access: 1/26/09].
- Creswell, John W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Delpit, Lisa (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Dewey, John (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, John (1939/1963). *Freedom and culture*. New York: Capricorn.
- Duranti, Alessandro (Ed.) (2004). *A companion to linguistic anthropology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Fairclough, Norman (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge.
- Finders, Margaret (2005). "Gotta be worse": Literacy, schooling, and adolescent youth offenders. In Jennifer A. Vadeboncoeur & Lisa P. Stevens (Eds.), *Re/constructing "the adolescent": Sign, symbol, and body* (pp.97-122). New York: Peter Lang.
- Fine, Michelle (1991). *Framing dropouts*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Fine, Michelle & Weiss, Lois (Eds.) (2005). *Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, and gender in United States schools* (rev. ed.). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Foley, Regina M. & Pang, Lan-Sze (2006). Alternative education programs: Program and student characteristics. *The High School Journal*, 89(3), 10-21.
- Foucault, Michael (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage.
- Freire, Paulo (1970/2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, Paulo (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Freire, Paulo (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Freire, Paulo & Macedo, Donald (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Gee, James P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis.
- Gee, James P. (2004). Discourse analysis: What makes it critical? In Rebecca Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp.19-50). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gee, James P. (2005). Critical discourse analysis. In Richard Beach, Judith Green, Michael Kamil & Timothy Shanahan (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives in literacy research* (2nd ed., pp.293-318). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Gee, James P. (2006). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed.). NY: Routledge.
- Giroux, Henry A. (2001). *Theory and resistance in education: Towards a pedagogy for the opposition*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Giroux, Henry A. (2005). *Doing cultural studies: Youth and the challenge of pedagogy*, <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/courses/ed253a/Giroux/Giroux1.html> [Date of access: 1/26/09]
- Goetz, Judith P. & LeCompte, Margaret D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. New York: Academic.
- Gore, Jennifer M. (1998). Disciplining bodies: On the continuity of power relations in pedagogy. In Thomas S. Popewitz & Marie Brennan (Eds.), *Foucault's challenge: Discourse, knowledge, and power in education* (pp.231-251). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1981). *The theory of communicative action, volume one: Reason and the rationalization of society*. Boston: Beacon.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1987). *The theory of communicative action, volume two: Lifeworld and system, a critique of functionalist reason*. Boston: Beacon.

- Heron, John (1996). *Co-operative inquiry: Research into the human condition*. London: Sage.
- Herr, Kathryn & Anderson, Gary L. (2005). *The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jungck, Susan (1996). Review of the book *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide*. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 27(4), 623-624.
- Kamberelis, George & Dimitriadis, Greg (2005). Focus groups: Strategic articulations of pedagogy, politics, and inquiry. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp.887-907). London: Sage.
- Kincheloe, Joe (2005). Critical ontology and auto/biography: Being a teacher, developing a reflective teacher persona. In Wolff-Michael Roth (Ed.), *Auto/biography and auto/ethnography: Praxis of research method* (pp.155-176). Rotterdam: Sense.
- King, Joyce E. (2005). A transformative vision of Black education for human freedom. In Joyce E. King (Ed.), *Black education: A transformative research and action agenda for the new century* (pp.3-18). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U. S. schools. *Educational Researcher*, 35(7), 3-12.
- Lam, Wan S.E. (2006). Culture and learning in the context of globalization: Research directions. *Review of Research in Education*, 30(1), 213-237.
- Lave, Jean & Wenger, Etienne (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, Cynthia; Enciso, Patricia & Moje, Elizabeth B. (2007). Examining opportunities to learn literacy: The role of critical sociocultural literacy research. In Cynthia Lewis, Patricia Enciso & Elizabeth B. Moje (Eds.), *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power* (pp.15-48). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Maybin, Janet (Ed.) (2000). *Language and literacy in social practice*. Philadelphia: The Open University.
- McIntosh, Peggy (1997). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. In Richard Delgado & Jean Stefancic (Eds.), *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror* (pp.291-299). Philadelphia: Temple University.
- McLaren, Peter (1999). *Schooling as a ritual performance: Toward a political economy of educational symbols and gestures* (3rd ed.). New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- McLaren, Peter (2003). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education* (4th ed.). New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Miles, Matthew B. & Huberman, A. Michael (1994). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moje, Elizabeth B. & Lewis, Cynthia (2007). Examining opportunities to learn literacy: The role of critical sociocultural literacy research. In Cynthia Lewis, Patricia Enciso & Elizabeth B. Moje (Eds.), *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power* (pp.15-48). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Muth, William R. (2005). Literacy learners in prison: Finding purpose in the "second space". In Patricia E. Linder, Mary B. Sampson, Jo Ann R. Dugan & Barrie A. Brancato (Eds.), *Building bridges to literacy: The 27th yearbook of the college reading association* (pp.19-34). Bryan, TX: Texas A & M University-Commerce.
- Nasir, Na'ilah S. & Hand, Victoria M. (2006). Exploring sociocultural perspectives on race, culture, and learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(4), 449-475.
- Oakes, Jeannie; Rogers, John & Lipton, Martin (2006). *Learning power: Organizing for education and justice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Pane, Debra M. (2005). Shifting our gaze to the strengths of alternative education students. In Masha Plakhotnik & Sarah Nielson (Eds.), *Proceedings of The Fourth Annual College of Education Research Conference*, Miami, FL: Florida International University, http://coeweb.fiu.edu/research_conference [Date of access: 1/26/09].
- Patton, Michael Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Rist, Ray C. (1970). Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy and ghetto education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 40, 411-51.

- Rogers, Rebecca (Ed.) (2004). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rogers, Rebecca; Malancharuvil-Berkes, Elizabeth; Mosley, Melissa; Hui, Diane & Joseph, Glynis O. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), 365-416.
- Roth, Wolff-Michael (Ed.) (2005). *Auto/biography and auto/ethnography: Praxis of research method*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Roth, Wolff-Michael (2006). Editorial: Responsibility, solidarity, and ethics in cogenerative dialogue as research methods. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 7(2), Art. 45, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0602459> [Date of access: 1/26/09].
- Schensul, Stephen L.; Schensul, Jean J. & LeCompte, Margaret D. (1999). *Essential ethnographic methods: Observations, interviews, and questionnaires*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Shor, Ira & Freire, Paulo (1987). *A pedagogy for liberation: Dialogues on transforming*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Shor, Ira & Freire, Paulo (2003). What are the fears and risks of transformation? In Antonia Darder, Marta Baltodano & Rodolfo D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp.479-496). New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Spindler, George & Spindler, Louise (1994). What is cultural therapy? In George Spindler & Louise Spindler (Eds.), *Pathways to cultural awareness: Cultural therapy with teachers and students* (pp.1-33). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Spradley, James P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Van Acker, Richard (2007). Antisocial, aggressive, and violent behavior in children and adolescents within alternative education settings: Prevention and intervention. *Preventing School Failure*, 51(2), 5-12.
- Vavrus, Frances & Cole, KimMarie (2002). "I didn't do nothin'": The discursive construction of school suspension. *The Urban Review*, 3(2), 87-111.
- Wengraf, Tom (2004). *Qualitative research interviewing: Biographic narrative and semi-structured methods*. London: Sage.
- Whyte, William F. (1991). Introduction. In William F. Whyte (Ed.), *Participatory action research* (pp.7-18). London: Sage.
- Whyte, William F.; Greenwood, Davydd J. & Lazes, Peter (1991). Participatory action research: Through practice to science in social research. In William F. Whyte (Ed.), *Participatory action research* (pp.19-55). London: Sage.
- Willis, Paul (1977). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wilson, Anita (2003). Researching in the third space: Locating, claiming and valuing the research domain. In Sharon Goodman, Teresa Lillis, Janet Maybin & Neil Mercer (Eds.), *Language, literacy and education: A reader* (pp.293-307). Trent, UK: Trentham.

Authors

Debra Mayes PANE is a Ph.D. Candidate in Curriculum & Instruction (Language, Literacy, and Culture) at Florida International University in Miami, Florida.

Contact:

Debra Mayes Pane

Florida International University
Tamiami Campus, Miami, Florida, 33199 USA

E-mail: debra.pane@fiu.edu,
debrapane@gmail.com

Tonette S. ROCCO is Associate Professor and Graduate Program Director in Adult Education and Human Resource Development at Florida International University in Miami, Florida.

Contact:

Tonette S. Rocco

Florida International University
Tamiami Campus, Miami, Florida, 33199 USA

E-mail: roccot@fiu.edu

Citation

Pane, Debra Mayes & Rocco, Tonette S. (2009). Critical Microethnography: The Search for Emancipatory Methods [101 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 10(2), Art. 12, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0902129>.