Georgia State University
ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

Early Childhood Education Faculty Publications | Department of Early Childhood Education

2011

Animating Talk and Texts: Culturally Relevant Teacher Read-Alouds of Informational Texts

Laura A. May
Georgia State University, lauramay@gsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/ece_facpub

Part of the Anthropological Linguistics and Sociolinguistics Commons, and the Pre-Elementary, Early Childhood, Kindergarten Teacher Education Commons

Recommended Citation
May, L. A. (2011). Animating talk and texts: Culturally relevant teacher read-alouds of informational texts. *Journal of Literacy Research, 43*(1), 3-38. doi: 10.1177/1086296X10397869

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Early Childhood Education at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Early Childhood Education Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

Animating Talk and Texts:

Culturally Relevant Teacher Read-Alouds of Informational Texts

Laura May

Georgia State University

lauramay@gsu.edu

Abstract: This article describes the classroom interactions surrounding teacher read-alouds of nonfiction texts in the classroom of a teacher who strived for cultural relevancy. Participants in this study were one European American teacher and her upper- elementary students who lived in the surrounding working-class neighborhood; all but two students identified as Latino or African American. Data were collected for two consecutive school years using ethnographic and discourse analytic methods. Analyses showed that the teacher took up three social positions (i.e., cultural advocate, facilitator of classroom interactions, and teacher of reading) by animating texts and students.

> I began to see some metaphorical concurrences between our national fiscal situation and our education situation. I am arguing that our focus on the achievement gap is akin to a focus on the budget deficit, but what is actually happening to African-American and Latino students is really more like the national debt. We do not have an achievement gap; we have an education debt. (Ladson-Billings, 2006, p. 5)

Throughout our nation's history, different groups of people have had different access to educational (and other) resources (Darling-Hammond, 1995; Duke, 2000) and different levels of input into the organization and administration of the U.S. education system (Olneck, 1995; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Although I acknowledge these larger systemic issues, in large part, this debt has also been created and sustained by language socialization (Baquedano-Lopez, 1997;

Heath, 1983; Nystrand, Gamoran, Kachur, & Prendergast, 1997; Rymes, 2001).

How students (and teachers) have been socialized into using language matters because "spoken language is the medium by which much teaching takes place, and in which students demonstrate to teachers much of what they have learned" (Cazden, 2001, p. 2). By recognizing that students bring languages and literacies into the classroom acquired in homes and communities (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992) and structuring classroom participation in ways that allow students to build on that in which they are already proficient (Au, 1980; Brooks, 2006; Lee, 2000; Moll et al., 1992; Sipe, 2000), teachers can influence student learning in powerful ways. But teachers often do not know enough about students' home languages and literacies, and this issue is growing. As Latino and African American student percentages rise and teacher percentages remain relatively steady, it becomes less likely each year that a student will share the cultural background of his or her teacher (http://nces.ed.gov/ programs/coe/2005/section1/).

Because of the distinct nature of classroom talk, in which the teacher typically has considerable power over classroom talk, "the particular beliefs and practices evident in the social spaces of the classroom" form the foundation of who has access to learning (Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995, p. 445). This close interrelationship of language, literacy, and culture underlies the teacher read-aloud. Reading is the meaning making between one reader and one text, yet the teacher read-aloud is much more complex. The reader-to-text ratio is not only dramatically different, but meaning making is filtered through the teacher, who both uses his or her voice to interpret the text and facilitates student discussion surrounding the text. Interactive read-alouds are especially important when used to create a space for students to engage in meaning making with informational texts, for it asks students to think and calls for teachers to step out of deficit

thinking about their students (Pappas, Varelas, Barry, & Rife, 2002).

Within the interactive read-alouds, "students are seen as knowers and active participants who can offer important contributions in their learning" (Pappas et al., 2002, p. 441). Based on the research literature related to language socialization and its relationship to student learning, investigations of culturally relevant teaching must attend to classroom interactions. Most descriptions of culturally relevant teaching, however, have stayed at the level of broad principles (Au & Raphael, 2000; Delpit, 1995; Foster, 1992; Ladson-Billings, 1995) rather than procedures (Jimenez & Gersten, 1999). "Despite a move toward viewing culture as an asset, very little research has investigated exactly how culture can be positively used in the classroom" (Foster, Lewis, & Onafowora, 2003, p. 265). Using ethnographic and discourse analytic methods, this article describes, analyzes, and interprets the classroom interactions surrounding teacher read-alouds of informational texts within a classroom with a teacher oriented toward culturally relevant pedagogy (i.e., an instructional approach in which teachers hold all students to high academic expectations while providing a context valuing of students and where they come from (Ladson-Billings, 1994,1995). It focuses in on one teacher because of the microanalytic nature of examining interactions.

When combining the lack of research evidence on how to best incorporate the multiple dynamic cultures (i.e., "deep structures of knowing, understanding, acting, and being in the world"; Ladson-Billings, 1997, p. 700) that all classroom members constantly navigate, we as researchers are left with a complex context (Gutierrez & Rogoff, 2003; Lee, 2008; Orellana & Bowman, 2003). The tremendous potential of the teacher to shape student learning (Au, 1980; Gutierrez, Rymes, et al., 1995; Ladson- Billings, 1995; Sipe, 2000) necessitates further examination at the level of teacher- student interactions. Because our schools are

predominantly print based (Dunn, 2001; Eisner, 1971), interactions surrounding text are especially important. This article will explore these issues by examining how one teacher, Gail Hunter (pseudonyms used throughout), engages in culturally relevant teaching at the level of classroom discourse surrounding interactive read-alouds of informational texts.

Conceptual Framework

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

Of primary interest to this study is work on culturally relevant teaching, particularly that of Ladson-Billings (1994, 1995, 1997, 2001). Culturally relevant pedagogy is defined as

> a theoretical model that not only addresses student achievement but also helps students to accept and affirm their cultural identity while developing critical perspectives that challenge inequities that schools (and other institutions) perpetuate. (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 469)

A growing body of research on culturally relevant pedagogy exists. Within this body of work, student perspectives on culturally relevant teaching have been examined. In addition to acknowledging the importance of community to their teachers, students found culturally relevant teachers caring and able to make learning fun (Howard, 2001). The helpfulness in engaging teachers in reflection that is critical in nature is a way of increasing their ability to engage in culturally relevant teaching (Howard, 2003). Furthermore, this work has examined the teaching of critical mathematical thinking through empowering students and building on student cultural knowledge (Gutstein, Lipman, Hernandez, & de los Reyes, 1997; Matthews, 2003). It also acknowledges the underrepresented voices of Black male educators in discussions on culturally relevant pedagogy (Lynn, 2006). Two threads run throughout this research: One is the importance of the teacher stance toward his or her students and their home

or community knowledge (i.e., he or she does not hold a deficit view); the second is that the critical perspective held by culturally relevant teachers is key. Interestingly, although there is considerable overlap between culturally relevant teaching and high- quality literacy teaching, these two bodies of work have not been brought together very often. Whereas research on culturally relevant teaching continues to be published in the areas of math and science education, research on culturally relevant teaching and literacy is not as prevalent in the past several years. Additionally, I am not aware of any studies that examine culturally relevant teaching within teacher read-alouds of informational texts.

So although this growing body of work on culturally relevant pedagogy exists, it has not been fully explored by educational researchers (Foster et al., 2003; Jimenez & Gersten, 1999). Examining such important issues becomes even more challenging when we consider that our nation's students do not participate in the activities of one cultural group. Located at the interstices of cultures, they traverse through home, school, and community cultures (Bhabha, 1994; Gonzales, 2001; Gutierrez, Rymes, et al., 1995), often navigating multiple positions and ways of talking as they move from place to place.

Culturally relevant teaching characteristics. Following Ladson-Billings' (1995, 2001) work, I describe culturally relevant in terms of three characteristics: cultural competence, citizenship function of teaching, and student academic achievement.

Cultural competence. According to Ladson-Billings (2001),

> Cultural competence occurs in classrooms where: the teacher understands culture and its role in education, the teacher takes responsibility for learning about students' culture and community, the teacher uses student culture as a basis for learning, the teacher promotes a flexible use of students' local and global culture, (p. 98)

The framework from which the culturally relevant teacher thinks and acts leaves him or her open to the understanding that the ways he or she is accustomed to interacting with the world are not the only ways.

How the teacher goes about selecting classroom texts provides one window into his or her cultural competence. How does he or she attend to issues of representation? Does he or she only look at inclusiveness, or does he or she also attend to the fairness of representations that are included? Multicultural literature can offer opportunities to include stories that have been excluded from school curricula (Bishop, 2007; Brooks & McNair, 2008). But at the same time, selecting multicultural literature requires a critical stance (Botelho & Rudman, 2009). High-quality multicultural literature certainly exists (e.g., Connolly, 2005; Harris, 2005). Yet multicultural literature has also been criticized for hegemonically promoting Western views (Hoffman, 1996); portraying cultural groups in bounded ways that, at times, promote stereotypes (Chang, 2005; Knoeller, 2005); and occurring with little acknowledgement of the historical narrative of the represented group (Dongen, 2005; Enciso, 1997).

Furthermore, even more important than selecting the text is how a teacher uses his or her cultural competence to interact with the books. In other words, he or she uses what Botelho and Rudman (2009) call a "critical multicultural literature" stance. This teacher acknowledges that no text is neutral; all texts work from and within specific sociohistorical places, thus "invit[ing] the reader to deconstruct dominant ideologies of U.S. society (e.g., race, class, gender, and individualism) which privilege those whose interests, values, and beliefs are represented by these worldviews" (Botelho & Rudman, 2009, p. xiv).

So the teacher is aware of students' home culture(s) and his or her own culture(s) and uses this awareness in ways that are educationally productive. But this cultural competence works only

when it is accompanied by a critical lens, the idea that not only does every person come from a certain sociohistorical place but that where one comes from affects access to opportunity. This critical lens is an integral part of the second culturally relevant teaching component related to teaching as being one way to lead the life of a citizen.

Citizenship function of teaching. Of the teacher preparation program she designed, Ladson-Billings (2001) writes, "Although elementary teacher certification was one outcome of the program, we were also asking teachers to function as change agents in a society that is deeply divided along racial, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and class lines" (p. 104). That is, culturally relevant teachers see what they do as bigger than teaching individual subject matter (e.g., teaching multiplication in math). They act beyond their own classroom walls and also work toward societal improvement both within and without their school. Teachers, members of a democracy themselves, are preparing future citizens of a democracy (Dewey, 1916). This approach necessitates teaching with a focus greater than basic skills; it requires working toward high academic achievement for all students.

Academic achievement. "Culturally relevant teaching sees excellence as a complex standard that takes student diversity and individual differences into account" (Ladson- Billings, 1994, p. 98). Academic achievement for students who leave behind themselves and their communities is undesirable. Thus, holding all students to high academic achievement requires that the teacher not have deficit beliefs about his or her students, their families, or communities.

This study addresses how culturally relevant teaching was enacted moment to moment. For this reason, it also works from interactional sociolinguistics. Moreover, interactional sociolinguistics complements culturally relevant teaching with the idea that what someone is saying should be thought of in terms of who is hearing the speaker. Furthermore, interactional

sociolinguistics provides a lens for examining teaching at a more micro level.

Interactional Sociolinguistics

This study is also guided by the interactional sociolinguistic approach to examining interpersonal interactions, an approach that educational researchers continue to find useful in their examination of classroom learning opportunities (Bloome, Beierle, Grigorenko, & Goldman, 2009). Especially important to both interactional sociolinguistics and this study is the work of Erving Goffman, as it "forces structural attention to the contexts in which language is used: situations, occasions, encounters, participation frameworks, and so on, have forms and meanings that are partially created and/or sustained by language" (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 34).

Culture and participation structures. Variation exists in the way participants are socialized into using language. As a result, effective classroom participation structures with one group of students may or may not remain effective when transferred to a different group of students (Cazden, 2001). Familiarity with talk as it is often structured in classrooms and how to gain entry, or participate, in that talk are not something with which all students have equal previous experience (Erickson, 2004; Heath, 1983; Lee, 1995; Michaels, 1981; O'Connor & Michaels, 1996; Sipe, 2000). Research spanning three decades now exists that examines discursive practices in schools and issues related to culture by focusing on participation structures (e.g., Au, 1980; Au & Mason, 1981; Boyd & Rubin, 2006; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner, 1997; Gutiérrez, Rymes, et al., 1995; Philips, 1972; 1983; Rymes, 2003). These studies are important because the way students are allowed to participate partly determines whether and how the resources they bring with them will be recognized and used to further develop learning. Although the way the talk is structured is important to understanding talk

participation, it is also important to look at the content of the talk, including the social aspects related to how participants interact.

Participant frameworks. Discarding the oversimplified notion of dividing participant roles into speaker and hearer, Goffman (1974) asks us to consider the multiple relationships each person can have to each talk segment within a participation framework. Instead of speaker, he describes the utterance production format, in which participants can animate, author, and serve as principal. The animator is the person talking. It is important to use that term instead of speaker, however, because the word *speaker* typically does not take into account where the words originate. The words originate with their author. This is clearest in the example of a person reading a text aloud; the author in the traditional sense is also the author according to Goffman's utterance production format. Author could also be a participant of the present or a previous interaction. For example, when a teacher repeats something a student has just said, the teacher serves as an animator, and the student serves as the author (assuming the student is not taking the words from yet another author). Finally, the principal role lines up most closely with social role (i.e., personal identity; e.g., woman or mother or professional or community member, etc.). A principal is

> someone whose position is established by the words that are spoken, someone whose beliefs have been told, someone who is committed to what the words say. Note that one deals in this case not so much with a body or mind as with a person active in some particular social identity or role, some special capacity as a member of a group, office, category, relationship, association, or whatever, some socially based source of self-identification. (Goffman, 1974, p. 103)

In other words, “[utterances] are heard as coming from an individual who not only animates the words but is active in a *particular* social capacity, the words taking their authority from this capacity” (Goffman, 1974, p. 105; italics in original).

In Goffman’s (1981/2001) classic chapter on footing (i.e., the way participants are socially positioned in relation to an utterance), he illustrates how quickly social roles can change by describing a 1973 press release. The release describes a press conference in which President Nixon teased reporter Helen Thomas about her attire (she was wearing slacks). During this set of interactions, the president asked Ms. Thomas to turn so he could examine her appearance, asked how her husband felt about the pants, and then told her to change. She answered his questions and did a pirouette in response to his request that she turn. Nixon’s change in footing (from an official bill-signing ceremony to casual small talk) quickly transformed Ms. Thomas’s social role from that of her profession, a reporter, to a more gendered social role.-

Social positions. Goffman’s participant roles and production format are closely aligned with footing and changes in footing. However, participant roles and social roles are not identical. “The same individual can rapidly alter the social role in which he is active, even though his capacity as animator and author remains constant” (Goffman, 1981/2001, p. 103). So mid-utterance, a person can keep the same participant roles (animator, author) while changing social positions. One person embodies multiple social selves enacted through interactions. Whether a person identifies or distances himself or herself from particular social roles depends on the context. But, as seen in the above example, it can be difficult to gain distance from a particular role because other participants in the interaction are also performing multiple roles (Goffman, 1981/2001) that may position one in particular ways. Social roles (as opposed to positions) have been characterized as “serv[ing] to highlight static, formal, and ritualistic aspects” (Davies,

2000, p. 87). Goffman's work has been criticized for those reasons. Because of these limits involved when thinking of identities as having such firm boundaries, when discussing people's selves or identities, I use the term *position* to more accurately represent the dynamic, fluid nature of social identities.

Educational research (Empson, 2003; Larson, 1999, 2002; O'Connor & Michaels, 1993) has demonstrated how participant frameworks can be used to identify how a teacher positions his or her students on the basis of the way he or she negotiates these production roles. The power (i.e., "Power is locally constituted through the various configurations of talk and interaction in the classroom"; Gutierrez, Rymes, et al., 1995, p. 446) that works within social relationships ended up being very important in these studies. For example, Empson (2003) examined how a teacher empowered two students who struggled in mathematics through animating within a socioconstructivist teaching paradigm. In another study (Larson, 2002), the participation framework allowed the researcher to provide evidence of how a literacy teacher, using materials related to "process-oriented materials and pedagogies" (p. 66), ultimately disempowered her students.

Thus, research exists that examines the relationship among culture, participation structure, and classroom interactions. Other work examines participation frameworks and classroom interactions, taking into account the social positions or identities or the participants. Still needed, however, is evidence that describes participation frameworks as related to culturally relevant teaching, particularly as it relates to the teaching and learning of literacy. Because so much of teaching and learning occurs through interaction, how teachers instantiate teaching that enables students to perform at high academic levels while simultaneously being responsive to who they are as people matters a great deal. This study addresses the following

research question: What is the nature of discourse during teacher read-alouds of informational texts in a classroom oriented toward culturally relevant pedagogy?

Method

This study works within a larger qualitative study of a 2-year data set that addressed the question, What is the nature of discourse around texts in a classroom oriented toward - culturally relevant pedagogy? This article will describe, analyze, and interpret the interactions of one teacher who engaged in culturally relevant teaching during interactive read-alouds of informational texts, exploring these practices at the level of teacher-student interactions. The data discussed in this article come from the 1st year of data collection (October to March). The primary focus of the study was on classroom discourse that occurred during teacher read-alouds. All data were collected using ethnographic and discourse analytic methods.

Participants and Setting

The study was undertaken at a school in the southwestern part of the United States that draws from the surrounding working-class neighborhood. Ninety-three percent of the students at Adams Elementary participate in the free- or reduced-lunch program. Of the 448 students, 91% are Mexican American, 8% are African American, and fewer than 1 % are White. Thirty-four percent speak a language other than English as their primary language. Because Spanish-English bilingual classrooms have 100% Mexican American students, most nonbilingual classrooms have lower percentages of Mexican American students.

During the year of data collection used for this study, Gail taught a third- and fourth- grade multiage class. Most students spoke English at home. Those students who spoke Spanish had exited from the school's transitional bilingual program by demonstrating academic proficiency in English. During Year 1, 14 students identified as Mexican American, 6

identified as African American, and 2 identified as European American.

Gail is European American and appears to have the culturally relevant teacher characteristics described by leading researchers in the area (Ladson-Billings, 1994; Moll & Arnot-Hopffer, 2005). Gail was selected using purposive sampling (Patton, 1980) for three reasons.

First, I knew both her and her teaching well. Before data collection began, I knew Gail and had been familiar with her teaching for 2.5 years. During that time, I was in her classroom peers in 2 of the 4 years preceding this study. Campus and district administrators and curriculum leaders also respond to her as a teacher of the highest quality. The principal selected Gail for the master reading teacher, a position funded by the state that compensated her for mentoring other campus teachers in the teaching of reading. Gail also offered professional development, at the invitation of administrators, to district teachers on topics related to literacy. Additionally, university faculty recognized Gail as a model for teaching literacy. At least four separate instructors had taken preservice teachers enrolled in Reading or Language Arts Methods courses to observe her teaching during the year prior to data collection. Finally, as described earlier, Gail was selected because she approaches her teaching in ways that align with the core components of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995, 2001). She displayed evidence of being culturally competent, displays of student achievement were high (including but beyond state test scores), she was active in local community events, and she frequently taught lessons that taught social justice.

Data Sources

Data were collected from the following sources: extensive participant observations, field notes, audio- and videotapes of classroom events, teacher and student interviews, and artifacts (i.e.,

student work and photographs of class-created charts). There were two types of student interviews. The first was systematic and occurred with each student at the end of the second school year. The second type was short (averaged approximately 5 min) and occurred when I wanted student insight about a classroom occurrence. For example, I would ask a student why he or she made a certain statement or what prompted a particular question. Those artifacts collected consisted primarily of student writing that occurred during lessons I observed.

My visits occurred approximately twice a week, and each visit usually lasted somewhere between 1 and 3 hr. Initially my visits were organized so that I could understand how Gail organized the day's activities across time and space. As a result, I went at different times throughout the week, making sure I understood the curricular and pedagogical practices that occurred. Next, I focused in on the reader's workshop because of my interest in those classroom interactions that were occurring around texts. By midway through the data collection, it had become clear that although manifestations of Gail's orientation toward culturally relevant teaching could be seen across subjects and times of the school day, it was especially concentrated during two speech events (i.e., community circle and teacher read-alouds). As a result, I focused the data collection to occur primarily during these two events in the last half of the first year. To reduce obtrusiveness, I did not record video or audio during the initial month. After that month, all of my observations were accompanied by both video and audio recording.

During data collection, I took on the role of an observer. According to Spradley's (1980) continuum, I observed through passive participation. 1 did not participate in class discussions and always sat only close enough to hear comments. I typed field notes on my laptop computer during all observations. Although the teacher and student talk were documented in more detail after reviewing audio- and videotape data (when I expanded my field notes), the in-class

observations allowed notation of body movement and positioning as well as occurrences outside the range of the camera (Erickson, 2004).

As soon as possible after leaving the classroom each day, I watched the video recording from that day and added details to the field notes. Theoretical, methodological, and personal notes were also added during this field note expansion (Corsaro, 1985). Day of the week, date, and time were noted in the field notes to facilitate later access to audio- and videotapes, which were organized accordingly.

I interviewed Gail formally three times during this 1st year of data collection. The initial interview contained questions related to Gail's background, teaching, beliefs about education, and pedagogical decision making. Later interview topics related to emerging hypotheses developed about her read-alouds. As a result, they focused on pedagogical decision making (e.g., unit topics, book selections) and interactions she had with parents and other community members. She was also asked to discuss each child at both an academic and a personal level (see the appendix for interview protocols). Gail was interviewed informally more frequently. These interviews occurred during the school day either at recess or when we were in the room alone. These discussions were not recorded but were documented in my field notes within an hour of the conversation. Member checking with Gail occurred after data analysis was complete but before a draft of the writing was sent to outside readers (with the exception of two debriefers).

Data Analysis

Data analysis was ongoing throughout data collection and included constant comparative (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) and discourse analytic methods (Erickson, 2004). Initially, I performed a constant comparative analysis. Specifically, this involved reading and rereading all data sources while open coding. I met regularly with an expert debriefer (i.e., a more

experienced qualitative researcher) during this phase to support trustworthiness. This initial analysis of Year 1 data with a specific focus on the teacher's interactions yielded evidence that much of Gail's talk consisted of voicing the words of others. It seemed to me that although she was the classroom participant talking, for much of her talk time, she was not offering her own opinion or taking credit for the ideas she was transmitting. Subsequently, I looked across classroom events and determined that this voicing occurred often during read-alouds. This led me to examine the expanded field notes for all discussions around texts that included the teacher (total of 24). It was clear that Gail animated others more with informational read-alouds than other types of read-alouds. Through a review of discourse analytic theories, I also selected Goffman's (1981/2001) production format for its helpfulness in focusing in on whom the talk represents. Salient in the data were that (a) when reading aloud informational texts related to a cultural group, Gail most often served as animator, and (b) there seemed to be patterns in whom she was animating.

I then selected and transcribed three read-alouds: (a) an informational picture book about Día de los Muertos, a Mexican and Mexican American cultural celebration observed by many of Gail's students; (b) excerpts from the online *Encylopedia Brittanica: Elementary Version* article "Vietnam," a country with which neither Gail nor her students had experience; and (c) two pages from the *Kids Discover* magazine edition on the civil rights movement, a historical event discussed in terms of relatives' lived experiences in many students' homes. These texts were selected for their similarities—all were informational and related to a distinct cultural group—and also for their differences— each text represented a different informational text type and related most closely to a different cultural group. Similarities provided for an examination of read-aloud events with similar formats and purposes. Differences allowed the opportunity to see

how Gail negotiated her teacher roles depending on the varied experiences with the topic of study.

I then completed two separate analyses of these transcripts at the level of turn to determine whom and how Gail animated during the read-alouds (also using constant comparative). In the first transcript analysis, using Goffman's work on footing, I examined which social positions Gail took up. The vast majority of Gail's talk could be sorted into three categories. These positions were cultural advocate—Gail served as an advocate for the group practices represented in the texts; facilitator of classroom interactions—she consistently and expertly guided the class talk in ways that tended to produce certain kinds of student talk (e.g., related to the text in particular ways, brought in information from their outside-of-school lives); and teacher of reading— Gail took advantage of opportunities within the read-aloud event to teach reading response and comprehension.

The second analysis, also performed at the level of turn, was undertaken to better understand the talk from the perspective of Goffman's participation framework. It was clear that Gail was animating others to enact the social positions just described, but several questions remained (i.e., Whom was she animating? How was she animating? What did her ways of animating obtain for her as a teacher and the students both academically and socially?). So as I went through the transcripts, I noted where her words came from and whose points of view they advocated. This second analysis of the transcripts yielded information related to how she animated the three social roles determined by the first. During these informational read-alouds, social positions were primarily fulfilled through Gail's animation of discursive resources that she had available to her. These authors of her spoken language were primarily the students and the text she was reading aloud to the class. The idea that Gail consistently animated these authors matters a great

deal because of the cultural groups with which her students identified and how Gail selected texts for read-alouds. As is further discussed, both the students and the texts represented groups, or to use Goffman's term, principals, that traditionally have not been allowed to have a voice in most classrooms.

Findings

After an initial overall description of the approach to literacy in this particular classroom, the findings are organized around two sections. In the first section, I more fully explore animating and how Gail used it to engage in culturally relevant teaching. The second section is organized around three social positions that Gail took up during the informational read-alouds. Within each social position, a description is included detailing both whom and how she animated. Throughout her teaching, Gail demonstrates a number of characteristics that align with culturally relevant teaching. I will focus primarily on discourse within read-aloud events and how the discourse reflects these characteristics.

Classroom Context

Gail's reading lessons (approximately 30 to 45 min) often taught an issue related to reading comprehension or reading response (e.g., personal connections to text, using informational text features, making inferences). These lessons were often taught within thematic inquiry units with topics linked to social justice or issues of culture. Gail also had a chapter book read aloud each day, usually linked to the theme. This read-aloud occurred at a different time of the day. Students sat together on a large rug with their response booklets she made for each chapter book on a clipboard. Gail sat on a low rocking chair, often leaning forward as she read. Her readings were dramatic and full of her own personal responses to the reading; she frequently stopped to comment and often cried at sad parts. Periodically, Gail reviewed student response booklets,

selecting quotes that she wrote on Post-its for the large language chart devoted to the chapter book read-aloud. Before she read the next day, she would read the comments she had pulled to the whole class and identified the author as she placed them in the connection-observation-wondering organization of the language chart (Roser, Hoffman, & Farest, 1990).

Animating

Although Gail was selected, in part, for her valuing of student voices, early in data collection, it became clear that her teacher voice represented a considerable portion of the classroom talk. She was almost always talking, and it was not uncommon for her to take every other turn in the talk. Gail's talk was most often directed at the whole class, although during reader's and writer's workshop she was more likely to be talking quietly with a student or small group of students. Far from a recitation script (Edwards & Mercer, 1987; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988), however, Gail used her talk to prioritize and give credence to other voices. In other words, rather than using her teacher talk to promote her own views, she animated particular groups. It is not uncommon for teachers to animate others. Indeed, this happens in every classroom. What is particularly important about Gail, however, was whom she animated.

At times, she animated students by restating their words, as in the following transcript. Please note that quoted sections indicate the teacher is reading aloud from the text.

Gail: So I'm going to start with this page and I'm going to, see that this right here gives me a little, a shorter information about the picture, the caption, right? "Their names are Azukena and Semina."

Delores: I think they're sisters.

Gail: Yeah, it says Azukena and Semina are not just sisters, they're twins.

Delores: Like me and my sister!

(lots of student talking)

Gail: It is like you and your sister. They're not identical twins. They're fraternal twins.

Chris: That means that they don't look the same as her. You have to be doing, you have to be born on the same day and um, and um, same time.

Keegan: No but sometimes, sometimes it could be like 5 minutes (...)

True to the interactive nature of this read-aloud, Gail read only one sentence before a student called out a personal connection to the text. In her first turn at talk, Gail used her talk to orient students to the text. At this time, she was most closely enacting the role of reading teacher. When Delores connected to the text, Gail kept her focus on the text but altered her focus to align with a student's interest in the book's two central figures. In this turn, Gail's agreement and expansion allowed Delores to connect even more directly with the book. After Delores's second turn, Gail animated her, repeating Delores's words with only the pronouns changed, then expanded, connecting Delores even closer to the girls in the book. Although Gail is the one talking, she used her talk in ways that privileged the talk of a particular student. Thus, while still working as teacher of reading, Gail also facilitated classroom interactions. Following this interaction, all student talk changed to align with this topic.

Gail, as emitter of the language, was animating. But it is more complicated than that. As shown in the above transcript, Gail took almost every other turn. In these turns, though, she was not necessarily voicing her own opinions. In the first turn, she read aloud or animated the text (or, more specifically, the text's author). In the next two turns, Gail used her talk to animate a student, allowing her to position this student as someone with information that could help the whole class better respond to the text.

Adding to the complexity, Gail took up different social positions as she animated others. Gail

is many things to many people (e.g., colleague, teacher, community member, family member, etc.). Some of these ways of being are taken up in the classroom. In her initial statement, when Gail said, “So I’m going to start with this page and I’m going to, see that this right here gives me a little, a shorter information about the picture, the caption, right?” she was not using “I” to refer to all of her identities. Rather, she was primarily speaking from the social position of teacher of reading. In her next turn, when she agreed with and then repeated Delores’s statement, she seemed to speak from the position of reading teacher. However, perhaps more importantly, her words provided Delores with the floor, indicating Gail’s position in facilitating classroom interactions. In other words, she was able to concurrently perform multiple social positions with this small section of talk because she animated a particular student in particular ways.

Furthermore, central to the read-aloud event is the text being read aloud. The following transcript provides another look at how Gail animated a student that better demonstrates the importance of the text. In this segment, she directly animated the text by reading it aloud and animating a student, although, in this case, in a less direct way.

Gail: “Nineteen thirty-nine to 1945, when African Americans fought courageously in segregated military units abroad and were given only the lowest paying jobs at home.” I have to read that again. I need to understand that better.

Keegan: Yeah, um I know, even though they worked, they would get paid but like they wouldn’t get paid as much as the Whites.

Gail: OK, so here at home they wouldn’t get paid as much as the White people.

Keegan was not inhibited from calling out his comment when Gail broke from reading aloud (or animating) the text. Again closely enacting the role of reading teacher, Gail was modeling a strategy that readers often use when they want to better understand the text they are reading (i.e.,

rereading). Keegan immediately joined her in sense- making, offering his interpretation of the text Gail had read by saying, “Yeah, um I know, even though they worked, they would get paid but like they wouldn’t get paid as much as the Whites.” By beginning with “yeah, um I know,” he related his talk to Gail’s comment about not understanding the text, thus indicating that he was following the teacher and possibly showing that he had initial difficulties with that particular part of the text. Rather than waiting for Gail to reread the text, however, he offered his own take on the text. In response, Gail, instead of returning to her original reading strategy modeling, altered her talk to align with Keegan’s comment with “OK, so here at home they wouldn’t get paid as much as the White people.” This animation of Keegan’s idea allowed her to both (a) continue to enact her social position of reading teacher by facilitating a discussion centered on making meaning with text and (b) position Keegan as expert reader who held a sensible interpretation of a difficult portion of the text. Although Gail was the one talking, by animating a student, she used her talk in ways that privileged student talk.

Because the text held such a prominent place in these read-alouds, the selection of texts was an important part of Gail’s enactment of the three social positions described in this article, particularly that of cultural advocate. Although Gail’s room was filled with children’s literature of multiple text types on a large variety of topics, she tended to select a particular type of text to read aloud to the class during her reading minilesson. These texts were often picture books (of a variety of text types) and often related to a historically marginalized population. The books selected for this close analysis were representative of the sort of books she read throughout the 2 years of data collection. Gail stated her interest in “being multicultural.” She often selected texts solely on the basis of the fact that they were multicultural. She was also responsive to student feedback about the text, however.

As will be seen in the second section, the teacher holds tremendous power to act as a "cultural broker" (Bartolomé & Macedo, 1997). Gail was aware of the complexity surrounding text selection (evidenced through interviews) and carefully selected the texts she read aloud. By making use of students' discursive resources and selecting texts, in part, on the basis of who authored them, she was able to navigate multiple social positions simultaneously.

Social Positions

Gail negotiated different social positions through the animating she engaged in while reading aloud informational texts. Each of the next three sections explores one social position in depth. Because classrooms are dynamic places and teachers navigate multiple roles, often enacting them simultaneously, you will notice some overlap among these social positions, but I will present and describe them one at a time. Gail used her talk in culturally relevant ways through animating texts and students, taking up three social positions: cultural advocate, facilitator of classroom interactions, and teacher of reading. First, Gail served as cultural advocate. When the class studied an issue with which a particular cultural group identified, Gail provided an environment in which classroom participants approached the topic with respect and as learners. Second, she served as primary facilitator of classroom interactions. Gail facilitated a democratic classroom (Greene, 1988; McIntyre, Kyle, & Moore, 2006), with students working collaboratively to achieve shared goals. Finally, through her position as teacher of reading, Gail modeled reading comprehension and explicitly taught vocabulary, text features, and other concepts related to reading. Table 1 provides an overview of these positions.

Social position enacted	Enacted through animating of...	Description
Cultural advocate	Text	Reading aloud or paraphrasing texts, often written by cultural insiders
	Students	Taking up the cultural insider comment of a student into the classroom discussion by voicing it
Facilitator of - classroom interactions	Students	Animating the comment of one of multiple talking students to facilitate turn taking or to help a student gain access to the conversational floor
	Text (to focus class)	Reading aloud from the text to stop discussion and to proceed with the read-aloud event
Teacher of reading	Text	Reading aloud from the text and summarizing sections of the text to model reading and responding
	Students (guiding inquiry)	Animating student questions from the class-created inquiry chart

Cultural advocate. Gail took up the position of cultural advocate for both the social groups that identified with the topics of study and the local communities of the students. Culture is often treated as static and fixed (Bhabha, 1994; Gonzales, 2001; Orellana, 2007), presuming all people who identify with a culture (or are identified) do and say things exactly the same way and share a precise belief system. As if a thick black line bounded the cultural group with no allowance for the messiness that exists in lived experience, teachers often treat culture in ways that leave no room for variance or change (Gutierrez & Rogoff, 2003). While failing to avoid a fixed notion of culture completely, Gail minimized this way of thinking about culture by animating lived experiences.

Often, those who had lived the experiences were students. When classroom participants had experiences related to a topic of study, Gail invited their experiences into the discussion and animated them immediately following. When the class read about Día de los Muertos, the students in her class with personal experiences related to the celebration became the experts.

Emanuel: In our chimney we have a fireplace, well we put an altar there.

Gail: On top of, on the mantle?

Emanuel: No, um in the fireplace.

Gail: Oh.

Emanuel: And we put like food and when our family dies, when they die, and we go trick or treating

Gail: Emanuel, will you draw us a picture of your altar and bring it tomorrow to share in the morning?

Chris: What'd he say?

Gail: His family has made an altar for Día de los Muertos at their house so he's going to draw us a picture of his altar with all of the objects that are on it and he's going to share that with us tomorrow morning. We can see what the altar looks like.

Keegan: Do the best you can.

Joaquín: Remember that we have to take out our fires so um the smoke will come out and our loved ones can come to us. Because we always turn out our fires for the smoke can go up and our loved ones can find us.

Gail: Joaquín, do you have an altar too?

(Joaquín nods.)

Gail: Would you like to draw a picture and share it with us tomorrow too?

Gail encouraged and made space for students' lived experiences (in many ways, this is reminiscent of what Gutierrez, Rymes, et al., 1995, call "hybridity" or a "third space"). This space was crucial to her ability to animate firsthand experiences. When student comments reflected a family practice that related to the text, Gail highlighted those lived experiences by animating them for the whole class. After Emanuel's initial sharing of his personal experience, Gail stopped, asked a follow-up question, and asked for more information to be brought in the next day. When another student asked what Emanuel had said, Gail revoiced Emanuel's comment, also explaining what the class would learn from Emanuel the following day. When

Joaquin voiced that he was also an expert, Gail immediately included him in the category. She acted as an advocate as she validated students, inviting insider perspectives from those living the topic of study.

In part, Gail was able to highlight students' lived experiences because she knew so much about them. She prioritized getting to know her students, in part, by having regular community circles first thing in the morning. Additionally, she sought out opportunities to get to know families. When asked how she familiarized herself with the school community, she responded,

> Well I do home visits. I try to connect with parents on a personal level rather than just talking about their kids all the time. And I try to know about them. [In the past few years I have] made much more of an effort to connect with parents than I had before. That was my whole goal [one year] and it made such a huge difference in how well I got to know the kids and how comfortable I felt in home support combined with school support. I go to baseball games and football games. When I get invited to birthday parties, I always go. If I'm invited, I always go. Those things have made a big difference, just sitting on the sidelines, talking to a parent or cheering on their kid at the same time has made a huge difference.

She was able to animate lived experiences only because she knew so much about her students' lived experience.

Another way Gail enacted the position of cultural advocate was through animating the text. Gail selected the texts she read aloud carefully. Picture books were often informational, with photographs serving as illustrations. She carefully examined information from the Internet, aware of which organization sponsored the site and who wrote the information, before sharing any one particular website with the class. This careful attention to sponsorship (Brandt, 2001) proved especially important when the class, as part of a school with no students who identified

closely with the Vietnamese population, studied Vietnam. During this study, the online postings of a Vietnamese boy living in the country were referred to as expert.

Gail also chose more traditional print sources with care. Many different types of texts were read for units of study, including a variety of representations of cultural practices (Gutierrez & Rogoff, 2003; Lee, 2008). The text being read aloud, with the full authority of the teacher backing it, was often the voice animated as expert. These cultural insiders frequently complicated the classroom discussions. As you noticed in the previous transcript, when Emanuel described his observance of Día de los Muertos, he included a reference to Halloween, viewed as separate in the books, yet merged in his family's practice. When a visiting speaker came to speak about American Indians, she included references to the importance of the commercial aspects of her life as an American Indian and her pride in being full-blooded. These topics led to class discussions that reached beyond those that came from books about the same topic. To animate lived experiences, Gail first had to find a way for those voices that had lived the experiences to have a space within the classroom walls. She did so in a variety of forms, including structuring classroom interactions to provide members of the classroom community with opportunities to share personal experiences, inviting visitors to the classroom, and selecting texts written by those who had lived the practice.

By animating multiple lived experiences, Gail both took up the social position of cultural advocate and positioned those with related experiences as experts. This achieved two ends. First, it prevented authoritative voices, such as textbooks, from silencing or marginalizing more authentic voices. Second, because multiple voices were provided a space, the possibility that a cultural practice would be represented as static or fixed was lessened.

Facilitator of classroom interactions. In addition to taking up the position of cultural

advocate, Gail worked to build community and a democratic classroom while still maintaining ultimate responsibility for student learning and safety (Greene, 1988; McIntyre et al., 2006; Weinstein, Tomlinson, & Curran, 2004). Like many of the teachers in *Dreamkeepers* (Ladson-Billings, 1994), Gail had high expectations for her students not only academically but also socially. She expected them to participate in class discussions in ways that both advanced their own and others' learning and showed respect for all classroom participants. When asked about how she saw her job as a teacher, she responded,

> I really want my kids to be thinkers when they leave me, and not just about academics but about life, and I don't necessarily need them to accomplish every skill I teach. I don't know need them to be completely successful at that but just so they can problem solve and that they can be independent and that they're compassionate. That's most important to me.

This attitude could be seen in the two ways Gail facilitated classroom interactions. First, she animated students in ways that gave them the floor. Second, she used the text in ways to facilitate classroom interactions, primarily to advance the read-aloud event by focusing or regaining student attention on the text.

Most of Gail's facilitative talk (i.e., those interactions that maneuvered the discussion to keep it academically productive and to moderate speaking opportunities among students) during the read-aloud consisted of managing turn taking. She helped students who had difficulty gaining the floor access the conversation. She also differed in how she responded to student comments. At times, she would give the whole class's attention to one student with a statement like, "I know you are so excited but everyone should hear that Keegan was talking" or "Harold has been waiting to take a turn and I think it has something to do with what we're talking about." This was especially done on behalf of students who had difficulty gaining the floor or whose

comment related to a line of inquiry related to the text or topic of study, as in the following example:

Gail: “The two major lowland regions of Vietnam are fertile river deltas.” So they have rivers and it says it’s fertile so that means that it would be like really good for farming. “In the north, the Red River delta is formed where the river enters the Gulf of Tonkin. The much larger delta of the Mekong River in the south is one of the richest rice-growing areas in the world. Vietnam has a mostly tropical climate with warm to hot temperatures and heavy rainfall.” So the temperature is pretty warm and they have lots of rain. “Seasonal winds called monsoons bring rains and occasional typhoons during the summer and autumn.”

Eugene: How is it going to be warm and they got a lot of rain.

(Several other students talking at the same time about different things)

Gail: What? (looking at Eugene)

Eugene: How is it going to be warm, warm and they got a lot of rain?

Gail: Well let’s talk about that. Why would it be warm?

Harold: Because um the sun.

Susana: Because the equator...

Eugene rarely voiced a comment loud enough for the whole class to hear. Several students were talking at the same time, yet Gail looked at Eugene and said, “What?” giving him the floor. Then she animated him by restating his question. This animation led to a lengthy discussion with multiple members of the class working together to build knowledge about climate based on previous units of study on the water cycle and latitude and longitude.

Students come to school with differing experiences with conversational strategies that relate

to gaining the floor (Erickson, 2004; Heath, 1983; Michaels, 1981). By taking up the social position as facilitator of classroom interactions, Gail positioned students as discussion participants regardless of their ability to initially get the whole class's attention. When asked about her goals for student talk during her read-alouds, Gail responded,

> I try to get kids to talk to kids and that's really hard when you're sitting at the front reading a book because it's very teacher directed. I'd like for somebody to say something and then somebody else bounce off of that and it to be more fluid of a conversation.... I wanna get them to get their talk to push them to understand the book at a deeper level. So if they say something I might back it up with "you know that also reminds me of blah, blah, blah" or "I didn't notice that so what do you think about this since you noticed that?" Basically just using their conversation to push them to understand further and to get them to realize that the things that they're noticing are things that we talk about in reading. You know, "that's a great prediction you just made" and labeling the things that we talk about and model maybe separately but they're doing it just as their natural reaction to a book so that's a part of it too.

Gail also animated the text in ways that facilitated the class discussion. The simple act of a person reading words aloud from a text is a way to animate. When Gail needed to return the class's attention back to the text or focus the discussion, she often turned to the text and began reading again. This reading (or animating the text) usually regained student attention and prevented the need for reprimanding students or lecturing the class as a whole. An example is provided in the following transcript segment:

> Harold: He is going to be the evil twin.
>
> Gail: It says, "They are fraternal twins. They were born a few minutes apart but they do not

look exactly alike the way identical twins do."

Delores: That's like me and Stephanie. We were born at the same time.

Keegan: That must be um, that might be (...)

Gail: It says, "We are ten years old and we live in Sacramento, California with our parents...."

When a student made a comment that would weaken rather than strengthen class attention to the text (i.e., "He is going to be the evil twin."), Gail directed the class back to the topic at hand by reading aloud from the text. Gail's strategy proved effective, as the students returned their attention to the text with only minor distraction. She did this again when Keegan, a student who had no trouble accessing the discussion, continued the discussion past the point of academic productivity. Again, she simply said, "It says," then began reading. This discursive act returned attention to the text.

The way Gail facilitated classroom interactions provided a foundational structure that allowed her to take up the other two social positions (i.e., cultural advocate and teacher of reading). Her animating of both students and the text allowed her to balance discussion with her read-aloud in ways that provided a space for students to connect the text to their own lives while maintaining the focus on the text and the topic at hand. By taking up this particular social position as she did, Gail was able to make productive use of limited academic time while providing an academic space for students to interact.

Teacher of reading. Gail used much of her talk to enact the social positions of cultural advocate and facilitator of classroom interactions. But the most frequent type of social position Gail took up was, not surprisingly, that of reading teacher. As Gail animated text, she was able to engage in the teaching and modeling of reading, particularly as it related to text comprehension, while

also teaching text content and text features. Additionally, through her animating of students, she guided the shared meaning making of the classroom community, often in pursuit of agreed-on inquiries. Gail flexibly guided and/or directed the topic of talk in ways that provided opportunities for her students to take up influential positions related to reading.

Reading a text aloud is animating in its simplest form. Gail animated the text in this simple form. This type of animation occurred both when she read a book aloud and when she read a student question off the inquiry chart on the wall. She also animated the printed text in other ways, however.

As a teacher who worked from the stance that reading involves making meaning with text, an important part of her position as reading teacher was to animate the text. Positioning herself as a reader in front of her students and ensuring that they were making meaning with the text during her read-aloud, however, required that she do more than animate in its most basic form (directly reading the text aloud). She frequently put the text into her own words. Gail's on-the-spot summarizations were done frequently and were often brief. For example, from the Dia de los Muertos read-aloud, Gail animated, '"This is a drawing of an ancient clay head found in Oaxaca. It shows both life and death.' So one side is life and one side is death." This kind of rewording occurred more often when the text was particularly dense, filled with words the students were unlikely to have encountered before, or especially important to the unit of study's themes. In her paraphrasing of the text, she guided her students to focus in on some parts and disregard others. At other times, she read for much longer from the text before stopping to put the author's words into her own language, drawing student attention to big ideas in the text content.

Gail often alerted students that she was transitioning from directly reading aloud the text to

putting it in her own words. She most often did this with the word *so.* Interestingly, unlike the participants who engaged in revoicing in O'Connor and Michaels' (1993, 1996) study, I did not find warranted inferences such as the word *so* to be a fundamental aspect to Gail's animating of students. She did however, use the word *so* often, especially when she animated texts. Indeed, Gail used warranted inferences much more frequently with the texts she read aloud than she did with animations of students. The warranted inferences helped differentiate her animating of the printed words with those she improvised, alerting her students to the way she made meaning with those particular informational texts. It seems that this was unnecessary when Gail began animating a student. The simple observance that she had begun talking and the student had stopped talking was enough to indicate to classroom participants that Gail was now engaging in animation.

After indicating to her students that she was about to say something in her own words that was warranted and based on the text she had just read, Gail animated the text by putting it in her own words. In addition to making the text more accessible, she also used directed student attention to specific aspects of the text. In the following transcript segment, notice how Gail focused student attention on a particular theme.

Gail: Now let's read about Rosa Parks. "Rosa Parks was a dedicated member of the Montgomery Alabama, NAACP chapter. She challenged the public library's segregation policy. On December 1, 1955, tired after a long day of work, Parks boarded a crowded city bus and sat down. When the driver told her to give her seat to a White man, she refused and was arrested. Within a few days the African Americans of Montgomery had rallied to her support by refusing to ride the buses." This is what we're talking about with the power of being in a group. Everyone, or a lot of African Americans in Montgomery, all got together

and said, “We’re not going to ride the bus anymore.”

Gail drew attention to how the text confirmed an important idea to the weeklong unit of study, thus simultaneously taking up the positions as reading teacher (working toward comprehension) and cultural advocate. The Rosa Parks story has been criticized for its depiction in classrooms and texts that often ignores the important social networks and group sacrifice that ultimately achieved the goal of bus desegregation (Kohl, 1995; Williamson, 2006). A teacher could have easily allowed a classroom discussion on poor, tired Rosa. Gail, however, used her talk to maintain focus on both the text and her overall purposes for the civil rights study.

Gail’s animations of the texts were often used to afford opportunities for teaching. As in the following transcript segment, only two sentences were read before a brief discussion occurred.

Gail: Ok, let’s keep going here. “The Court ruled that separate schools for African Americans were by their nature unequal. In the Court’s words, to separate African American students from White students ‘generates a feeling of inferiority.’” There’s that word again, *inferior*, so they’re saying that by having Black kids go to another school, that makes them feel like they’re inferior.

Seth: Like if they’re invisible.

Kristina: How do you make ’em feel like they’re inferior?

Gail: Like they’re invisible.

Seth: Like it feels like they’re nothing.

Here, Gail’s interactions with the students positioned them as readers who could both comprehend challenging texts and participate in conversations about complex issues around those texts. Although she was certainly using her talk for other purposes as well, those purposes were balanced with her goals as reading teacher. Gail speaks, at least partly, from her position as

reading teacher when she intentionally highlighted a word that was important to both the text and her goals as cultural advocate. Gail stopped animating the text to focus student attention on a particular word that she wanted them to consider (i.e., *inferior* or *inferiority).* She then attempted to help students understand the word meaning by making the context for that word more accessible. Seth, however, seemed to consider her animation of the text inadequate and took up the vocabulary focus initiated by Gail by providing a synonym (i.e., *invisible).* When another student asked, "How do you make 'em feel like they're inferior?" Gail first assumed that more was being asked about the word meaning and directly animated Seth. Seth, working from the same understanding, provided a definition of the word *inferior*.

Gail also took up the position of teacher of reading through her animating of students through shared inquiry. As a reading teacher, Gail helped students locate information in (primarily informational) texts in response to their own questions. She structured many of the thematic units around a set of questions that the students generated with her guidance. Throughout the rest of the unit, students were expected to keep the questions in the back of their mind and document answers as they were discovered.

Inquiry within literacy learning, particularly when done with a critical stance, has the potential to work positively toward both student learning and identity (Fecho, 2000). Gail, following in this tradition, facilitated classroom interactions in ways that represented student interests and social positions. Units of study generally began with an opportunity for the class to generate a list of collective questions. Charts were added to throughout the study by both teachers and students. After Gail recognized the student who contributed the question to the chart, the whole class took ownership of that question and she no longer referred to it as belonging to the original student author. Because most of these questions were student generated, however, she was still

animating students, even though she no longer named the individual student author.

Because of this shared inquiry, teacher read-alouds provided another opportunity for classroom participants to work together to respond to the questions. It was not uncommon for Gail to initiate the read-aloud with a statement like the following: “Remember that as we’re reading, we’re still kind of wondering about some of the questions that we’ve come up with. Some of the questions that we’ve come up with were . . . .” So, as Gail was reading the text on the wall chart, she was also reading student-generated words. Then, occasionally, she followed with a review of all the questions or those relevant to the current day’s read-aloud, including those that had been answered. In the following comment, Gail animates students by reminding the class of questions.

> Gail: Another question we had was who made the new law allowing Black people to have the same rights. That was a question we came up with after we read *Freedom Summer*. So we’re wondering why the law happened in 1964 saying that segregation was no longer allowed.

As students engaged with text, Gail focused their attention to one class-developed question, effectively managing the class’s attention while also positioning all class members as having ownership of the topic. These statements often began class discussions before Gail ever began reading aloud. Then, throughout the read- aloud, both students and teacher called attention to and discussed questions, both those that had previously been asked and those that developed as a result of new information from the text. At times, it was student experiences rather than the text that provided information used to discuss question responses. This especially happened during the Día de los Muertos read-aloud and is more fully discussed in other sections.

Students were expected to use information learned previously in the year to help them

understand the text. Gail often articulated this expectation through asking questions that she knew the answer to and specifically naming or prompting previous study. For example, when reading about Vietnam, Gail designed her comments in ways that prompted student comments: '"The Asian country of Vietnam is best known for the wars it fought during the second half of the 20th century.' We just learned about centuries, so the 20th century would be . . . ?" Keegan responded with, "The 1900s." At other times, students initiated comments with questions based on their own prior understanding of the topic, as in the following:

Gail: "In 1954, the Supreme Court ruled against segregation in schools in the case of *Brown* v. *the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas.* 'Brown' refers to the family of Linda Brown, shown here in her segregated classroom." So there's Linda Brown sitting up there in the front row and her family fought in court so that she would be able to go to a White school and they won that case so that's when we learned about the Little Rock Nine. After that court case—

Several students: Oooh.

Gail:—that's what happened, that's what caused White people, I mean Black people to be allowed to go to White schools. It was because of this court case.

Melinda: But didn't they say they just had to, they just picked nine kids. They had to fight?

Gail: They had to argue with using their words to say why it was important for them to get to go to a White school. Remember that we had, do you remember that court case we learned about with Homer Plessey, the man, it was in the 1800s?

Susana: Yeah.

Gail: And they said that it was OK, he was on that train, and so they went to court and they said it was OK for things to be separate as long as they were equal.

Gail strayed from the text, tying it to the Little Rock Nine, which the class had studied on a previous day. Melinda remembered learning that the nine had been selected by someone in the community, conflicting with this new information about Linda Brown's court case, and asked a question. As the class discussion continued, Gail cleared up Melinda's misconceptions by directly answering her questions.

Gail: Separate but equal. So this case, *Brown* v. *the Board of Education*, what those, what um, what Linda Brown's family did and what the people who helped her did is they went to the court and they said these things are separate, but they're not equal. Our kids who go to a Black school, they don't get the same things. They don't get the same types of schools. They don't get the same books.

Keegan: What? How could they think it was?

Gail: They, that, it took them that long and then they said something.

Melinda: What did, in the book it said that they only picked those, they didn't, they didn't have to go, it didn't say anything about them going to court.

Gail: Because, the Little Rock Nine didn't go to court. Linda Brown went to court. And her court case said ... that because they said that it was OK for her to go, that meant all Black people could go to White schools. So because of one court case, it said so that's true for everyone in the land.

Keegan: It sort of like breaked the ice.

Gail: What are you trying to say? What did you say?

Craig: Linda Brown was before the Little Rock Nine?

Gail: Yeah, she was in 1954 and the Little Rock Nine went to school in 1957 so it's 3 years later. OK?

Melinda: Three years is a long time.

Gail managed the interactions in ways that reinforced Melinda's position of sense maker, continuing the discussion by bringing in more shared knowledge, information about the Homer Plessey case that helped explain the Linda Brown case. Melinda, still unable to merge all she knew about the two events, asked the question again: "What did, in the book it said that they only picked those, they didn't, they didn't have to go, it didn't say anything about them going to court." This time, Gail responded more directly to the question differentiating between the two cases and explaining how court cases applied to the entire nation. Her explanation was followed by Craig's question, which voiced his own attempt to reconcile the two events while also illustrating why Melinda might be struggling with the information; the events had been studied out of chronological order.

Gail's use of the pronoun *we* animated the class as a whole. Rather than standing as the one who knew all, imparting information to those who knew less, Gail positioned herself as a member of a community of learners, the information she knew coming from previous shared inquiry of the group.

Thus a primary way Gail enacted her position as classroom teacher of reading was through animating the text and students. This occurred when she animated the text directly by reading it aloud to her students, animated the text by putting it into her own words, and animated students while guiding collective inquiry. Gail was able to honor her students and various social groups while exploring important topics and teaching reading. And, importantly, she did this while holding her students to high expectations.

Discussion

In this classroom, the teacher implemented culturally relevant teaching, in part, by using her talk

to foreground lived experience. Through animating students and texts within the context of teacher read-alouds of informational texts, the teacher took up three social positions: cultural advocate, facilitator of classroom interactions, and teacher of reading. This animating practice minimized static, fixed notions of culture and allowed for the privileging of student perspectives in classroom discussions. Central to these findings are the ideas that the teacher makes space for the talk of students and others who have lived the topic of study, and the teacher takes up the talk of these experts in ways that promote them, doing so while also working to facilitate classroom interactions and teach reading. By giving a bigger voice to lived experience through the talk that surrounds texts, teachers are able to hold these experts up in ways that are both educationally and socially productive for students.

Complicating Animating

It is also important to note, though, that considerable complexity exists related to animating. Animating involves appropriating the author's words, intertwining these two concepts. At times, modeling the meaning making that is reading while simultaneously animating results in the teacher interpreting for his or her students. The teacher's interpretation could easily differ from the interpretations of others. The complexity of these concepts (i.e., animating, appropriating, interpreting, meaning making) combined with the fact that the teacher speaks from a position of authority could easily be seen as problematic, especially as related to cultural relevancy. As Bakhtin (1981) wrote,

> Language is not a neutral medium that passes freely and easily into the private property of the speaker's intentions; it is populated—overpopulated—with the intentions of others. Expropriating it, forcing it to submit to one's own intentions and accents, is a difficult and complicated process, (p. 294)

Implications

Practical implications follow from these findings. First, it is not only the percentage of teacher talk that matters. The content and originations of that content are also incredibly important. Early in the history of research on classroom talk, researchers focused on the percentage of time teachers spent talking (Barnes, 1971, 1976; Bellack, Kliebard, Hyman, & Smith, 1966; Britton, 1970, 1971; Bullock, 1975; Flanders; 1970; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Most commonly described with Flanders' "rule of two thirds," the general finding was that roughly two thirds of the time, one could find someone in the classroom talking. Additionally, for two thirds of that time, the person talking was the teacher. Key findings suggested that effective teaching called for less teacher talk and more student talk.

This study does not contradict the idea that students should have more opportunities to interact surrounding topics of study. On the contrary, the way teachers make space for student talk is vital to culturally relevant teaching. Also important, however, is the idea that a focus on increasing student talk will resolve all issues. Teacher and student talk percentages will take us only so far.

Second, all teachers animate others. In the most direct form of classroom animating, teachers are handed scripts written by particular people or groups of people. These teachers then read those words aloud to the class. This type of animating can be found in programs such as Open Court and Success for All. Simply changing classroom interactional structures to those that provide students with more turns at talk does not, however, create more culturally relevant classrooms. When one is looking at classroom talk through culturally relevant lenses, it is whom the teacher animates that matters. Regardless of whether teachers are able to articulate it, anyone a teacher could animate has a stance on the relation of students' cultures to the teaching that

occurs in - an individual classroom. In some places, this orientation to student and community cultures is directly stated, as in the following passage, from a book where many of the scripted programs originate:

> Studies of young disadvantaged children force us to recognize that merely providing lower-class children with access to standard American formal schooling is not sufficient. They are still deprived of many important opportunities for cultural learning which are ordinarily provided through the home rather than through the school. (Bereiter & Englemann, 1966, p. 25)

Other classrooms are led by teachers who are well intentioned but who have adopted a particular stance toward their students that positions those students as deprived or deficit (Dudley-Marling & Lucas, 2009; Valencia, 1997). More participatory interactions could be incredibly destructive in a classroom with a teacher holding this sort of attitude toward his or her students. The teacher who takes up student and community positions to animate them as uninformed or erroneous is certainly not using talk in ways that are culturally relevant, even though he or she might be animating the students. Thus, the idea of animating cultural insiders in ways that promote them is vital.

Animating cultural insiders becomes especially important when student and teacher demographics are examined. Schools have been structured from European American ways of thinking and contain instructional materials from primarily European American viewpoints (Taxel, 1997), making the relationship between classroom interactions and cultural relevancy even more critical.

Yet, animating others is complex. First, there are practical concerns with the texts that teachers turn to for authentic voices. Bringing lived experience into the classroom is often done

through the use of multicultural literature, as could be seen with the teacher in this study. But it must also be acknowledged that although finding and endorsing multicultural literature is important, simply bringing it into the classroom is complex. First, multicultural literature has not necessarily been written by those who have actually lived the represented experiences; indeed, much of it has not. In classrooms where the teacher is from a European American background, however, the safest route seems to involve selecting multicultural literature that represents the lived complexity of cultural insiders.

In addition to the ideas that (a) just as much consideration should be given to the content of teacher talk as the percentage and (b) all teachers animate others, a third implication exists. Culturally relevant teaching rests on the fact that all teaching occurs within a specific, local context. Findings from this study only reinforce that understanding. For more important than the text selection was the idea that how the teacher interacted around the book determined how the book was used in the classroom. Looking at these interactions with the idea that a teacher has immediate access to many resources of which he or she is often unaware could help many teachers begin to modify their teaching in productive ways. Furthermore, understanding the tremendous power of positioning students as knowledgeable has the potential to transform our classroom interactions in revolutionary ways.

Limitations

Two primary limitations affected this study. First, cultural studies involve considerable complexity. Although the importance of this topic outweighs the constraints, it must be acknowledged that historically, considerable damage has been inflicted on cultural groups when European American researchers have made claims about what is best for groups of which they are not members (Valencia, 1997). Utmost care to prevent this type of harm has been taken.

However, as this study follows in that tradition, it must be acknowledged. Second, this study has all the limitations related to studying one teacher in one context. Gail simultaneously navigated core, culturally relevant teaching components, in part, through the interactive read-aloud practices described in this article. Attempts to scale up these discursive practices without addressing the complex sociocultural factors could easily prove disastrous.

Future Research Directions

Although culturally relevant teaching and instructional sociolinguistics provide useful lenses into the talk surrounding teacher read-alouds, these findings bring up more questions than they answer. How does animating look with narrative texts? How are animating and appropriating connected and intertwined? Is it possible to animate without interpreting? If so, when does an animation become an interpretation? Does the degree to which the teacher interprets other voices make a difference in the acceptability of the animation?

Appendix

Interview Protocols

Interview I

1. What was your life like growing up?
2. What kinds of jobs did the people in your town have?
3. How did you end up at [the state] university?
4. What made you decide on education as a major?
5. How did you end up in the cohort of preservice teachers with an added literacy focus?
6. How did you end up at Adams Elementary School?
7. You're seen as a leader at Adams Elementary School. How did that happen?

8. How do you see your job as a teacher? What are your primary purposes?
9. When you plan your literacy block, what are the most important things for you to attend to?
10. How do you select books for your classroom library?
11. Who are some of your favorite authors for your students to read? Or to use in your teaching?
12. How did you discover these books?
13. Are there books that you thought the students would like, but didn't? Which ones?
14. What about informational texts? How did you select them?
15. Are there informational texts that you avoid? Why?
16. How have you familiarized yourself with the community in which Adams Elementary is a part of?
17. Tell me about your relationships with your students' parents.
18. Is there anything else you want to talk about today?

Interview 2

1. Let's talk through the topical units of study your class has been engaged in and how you arrived at them.
    a. Human body
    b. European explorers
    c. Vietnam
2. Is it common for you to use chapters from the social studies and science textbooks? What sorts of supplementary materials come from these textbooks? Do you use them?
3. How much do you rely on books that were written for teachers?

4. Which teacher books do you find especially helpful?
5. I hear you using specific language for classroom management purposes. Where does that language come from?
6. Does the school or district have a classroom management system that you draw from?
7. You always have a lot of text on the wall. Why is that?
8. Which wall charts are required to be there by the school or district?
9. How do you use language charts? Why do you use them?
10. You seem to always have a chapter book read-aloud going. How do you select these books?
11. How has the state test affected Adams Elementary this year? How has it affected you as a teacher?
12. What sorts of meetings have you had this year?
13. I'm going to ask you about some of your kids now. Tell me what you know or think about them (i.e., What's [student's name] like? Now tell me about [student's name] as a student. [We went through half of the class.])

Interview 3

1. What was it like having a multiage class in the testing grades? Do you feel like it was a good situation?
2. What were the attitudes of the students' families towards the tests? What concerns did they have?
3. What were the attitudes of the people who work at Adams towards the state tests?
4. How did the students feel about how they did on the tests?
5. How much time do you spend on test preparation compared to the other teachers at

your grade level?

6. How did your students' scores compare to those of other students in the school?
7. Your read-alouds are interactive with lots of input from the students. What are your reasons for structuring your read-alouds this way?
8. What are you teaching through these discussions?
9. The books you select often relate to a social issue. Is that intentional? If so, what are your purposes for this practice?
10. You often combine reading instruction with social studies or science teaching. Why do you do this?
11. As the teacher what kinds of things do you try to do with your voice within read-alouds?
12. What do you try to do with their questions and comments as you conduct the read-aloud?
13. You also do a lot of discussion in the morning share time or community circle. What is your purpose for that time?
14. In some of the community circle discussions I watched, the students shared incredibly personal stories from their lives. How do you feel about that?
15. What impact, if any, do you think those morning discussions have on the learning that happens the rest of the day?
16. How do you feel about your ability to teach in culturally relevant ways?
17. Are there times when you don't feel like you're teaching in culturally relevant ways?
18. You taught a unit on Día de los Muertos. How did you approach that topic given that there were such varied experiences in the room with that particular practice? What was

your approach with the Vietnam unit? And with the civil rights movement unit?

19. I'm going to ask you about some of your kids now. Tell me what you know or think about them, (i.e., What's [student's name] like? Now tell me about [student's name] as a student. [We went through the other half of the class not discussed in the previous interview.])
20. So right before the semester break, there were parents who came in and taught lessons. How did that happen?
21. Is there anything else you want to say before we go?

References

Au, K. H. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 11(2),* 91-115.

Au, K. H., & Mason, J. M. (1981). Social organizational factors in learning to read: The balance of rights hypothesis. *Reading Research Quarterly, 77*(1), 115-152.

Au, K. H., & Raphael, T. (2000). Equity and literacy in the next millennium. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35*(1), 170-188.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Ed., Trans., & C. Emerson, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Baquedano-Lopez, P. (1997). Creating social identities through *Doctrina* narratives. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 5*(1), 27-45.

Barnes, D. (1971). *Language, the learner and the school.* Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Barnes, D. (1976). *From communication to curriculum.* New York, NY: Penguin.

Bartholome, L. I., & Macedo, D. P. (1997). Dancing with bigotry: The poisoning of racial and

ethnic identities. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(2), 222-246.

Bellack, A. A., Kliebard, H. M., Hyman, R. T., & Smith, F. L., Jr. (1966). *The language of the classroom.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Bereiter, C., & Engelmann, S. (1966). *Teaching disadvantaged children in the preschool.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Bishop, R. S. (2007). *Free without ourselves: The development of African American children's literature.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Bloome, D., Beierle, M., Grigorenko, M., & Goldman, S. (2009). Learning over time: Uses of intercontextuality, collective memories, and classroom chronotopes in the construction of learning opportunities in a ninth-grade language arts classroom. *Language and Education, 23*(4), 313-334.

Botelho, M. J., & Rudman, M. K. (2009). *Critical multicultural analysis of children's literature: Mirrors, windows, and doors.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Boyd, M., & Rubin, D. (2006). How contingent questioning promotes extended student talk: A function of display questions. *Journal of Literacy Research, 38*(2), 141-169.

Brandt, D. (2001). *Literacy in American lives.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Britton, J. (1970). *Language and learning.* Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Britton, J. (1971). Talking to learn. In D. Barnes (Ed.), *Language, the learner, and the school* (pp. 81-115). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Brooks, W. (2006). Reading representations of themselves: Urban youth use culture and African American textual features to develop literary understanding. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*(3), 372-392.

Brooks, W. M., & McNair, J. C. (2008). *Embracing, evaluating, and examining African American children's and young adult literature.* Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Bullock, A. (1975). *A language for life.* London, UK: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Chang, M. (2005). Daydreams of Cathay: Images of China in modem American children's books. In D. L. Henderson & J. P. May (Eds.), *Exploring culturally diverse literature for children and adolescents: Learning to listen in new ways* (pp. 54-64). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Connolly, P. T. (2005). Telling secrets and the possibilities of flight in *I Hadn*'t *Meant to Tell You This.* In D. L. Henderson & J. P. May (Eds.), *Exploring culturally diverse literature for children and adolescents: Learning to listen in new ways* (pp. 205-215). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Corsaro, W. A. (1985). *Friendship and peer culture in the early years.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1995). Inequality and access to knowledge. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 465-483). New York, NY: MacMillan.

Davies, B. (2000). *A body of writing, 1990-1999.* New York, NY: AltaMira Press.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* New York, NY: New Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Dongen, R.V. (2005). Reading literature multiculturally: A stance to enhance reading of some Hispanic children's literature. In D. L. Henderson & J. P. May (Eds.), *Exploring culturally diverse literature for children and adolescents: Learning to listen in new ways* (pp. 157-167).

Boston, MA: Pearson.

Dudley-Marling, C., & Lucas, K. (2009). Pathologizing the language and culture of poor children. *Language Arts, 56*(5), 362-370.

Duke, N. K. (2000). For the rich it's richer Print experiences and environments offered to children in very low- and very high- socio-economic status first-grade classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(2), 441-478.

Dunn, P. A. (2001). *Talking, sketching, moving: Multiple literacies in the teaching of writing.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Edwards, D., & Mercer, N. (1987). *Common knowledge: The development of understanding in the classroom.* London, UK: Methuen/Routledge.

Eisner, E. W. (1971). *Confronting curriculum reform.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Empson, S. (2003). Low-performing students and teaching fractions for understanding: An interactional analysis. *Journal of Research in Mathematics Education, 34*(4), 305-343.

Enciso, P. E. (1997). Negotiating the meaning of difference: Talking back to multicultural literature. In T. Rogers & A. Soter (Eds.), *Reading across cultures: Teaching literature in a diverse society* (pp. 13-41). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Erickson, F. (2004). *Talk and social theory: Ecologies of speaking and listening in everyday life.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Fecho, B. (2000). Critical inquiries into language in an urban classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English, 34*(3), 368-395.

Flanders, N. (1970). *Analyzing teacher behavior.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Foster, M. (1992). Sociolinguistics and the African-American community: Implications for literacy. *Theory Into Practice, 31*(4), 303-311.

Foster, M., Lewis, J., & Onafowora, L. (2003). Anthropology, culture, and research on teaching an learning: Applying what we have learned to improve practice. *Teachers College Record, 105*(2), 261-277.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Goffman, E. (2001). Footing. In M. Wetherell et al. (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice* (pp. 93-110). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (Original work published 1981)

Gonzalez, N. (2001). *I am my language: Discourses of women and children in the borderlands.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gutierrez, K. D., Baquedano-Lopez, P., & Turner, M.G. (1997). Putting language back into language arts: When the radical middle meets the third space. *Language Arts, 74*(5), 368-378.

Gutierrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher, 32*(5), 19-25.

Gutierrez, K. D., Rymes, B., & Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript, and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus *Brown v. Board of Education. Harvard Educational Review, 55*(3), 445-472.

Gutstein, E., Lipman, P., Hemandez, P., & de los Reyes, R. (1997). Culturally relevant mathematics teaching in a Mexican American context. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 28*(6), 709-737.

Harris, V. J. (2005). The Cheetah Girls series: Multiracial identity, pop culture, and consumerism. In D. L. Henderson & J. P. May (Eds.), *Exploring culturally diverse literature for children and adolescents: Learning to listen in new ways* (pp. 216-228). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Hoffman, D. F. (1996). Culture and self in multicultural education: Reflections on discourse, text, and practice. *American Educational Research Journal, 55*(3), 545-569.

Howard, T. C. (2001). Telling their side of the story: African-American students' perceptions of culturally relevant teaching. *Urban Review, 55*(2), 131-149.

Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory Into Practice, 42*(3*),* 195-202.

Jimenez, R., & Gersten, R. (1999). Lessons and dilemmas derived from the literacy instruction of two Latina/o teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 36*(2*),* 265-301.

Knoeller, C. (2005). "Not one voice, but many": Reading contemporary Native American writers. In D. L. Henderson & J. P. May (Eds.), *Exploring culturally diverse literature for children and adolescents: Learning to listen in new ways* (pp. 22-41). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Kohl, H. R. (1995). *Should we burn* Babar*? Essays on children's literature and the power of stories.* New York, NY: New Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(*3),* 465-491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1997). It doesn't add up: African American students' mathematics achievement. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 28(6),* 697-708.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). Presidential address: From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher, 35(1),* 3-12.

Larson, J. (1999). Analyzing participation frameworks in kindergarten writing activity. *Written Communication, 16(2),* 225-257.

Larson, J. (2002). Packaging process: Consequences of commodified pedagogy on students' participation in literacy events. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 2*(1), 65-95.

Lee, C. D. (1995). A culturally based cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching African American high school student skills in literary interpretation. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30(4),* 608-631.

Lee, C. D. (2000). Signifying in the zone of proximal development. In C. D. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research: Constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry* (pp. 191-225). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, C. D. (2008). The centrality of culture to the scientific study of learning and development: How an ecological framework in education research facilitates civic responsibility. *Educational Researcher, 57*(5), 267-279.

Lynn, M. (2006). Education for the community: Exploring the culturally relevant practices of Black male teachers. *Teachers College Record, 105*(12), 2497-2522.

Matthews, L. E. (2003). Babies overboard! The complexities of incorporating culturally relevant teaching into mathematics instruction. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 55*(1), 61-82.

McIntyre, E., Kyle, D. W., & Moore, G. H. (2006). A primary-grade teacher's guidance toward small-group dialogue. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41(*1), 36-62.

Michaels, S. (1981). "Sharing time": Children's narrative styles and differential access to lit-

eracy. *Language in Society, 10,* 423-442.

Moll, L. G, Amanti, C, Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 57*(2), 132-142.

Moll, L. G, & Amot-Hopffer, E. (2005). Sociocultural competence in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(3), 242-247.

Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., Kachur, R., & Prendergast, C. (1997). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

O'Connor, M., & Michaels, S. (1993). Aligning academic task and participation status through revoicing: Analysis of a classroom discourse strategy. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 24*(4), 318-335.

O'Connor, M., & Michaels, S. (1996). Shifting participant frameworks: Orchestrating thinking practices in group discussion. In D. Hicks (Ed.), *Discourse, learning, and schooling* (pp. 63-103). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Olneck, M. (1995). Immigrants and education. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 310-327). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Orellana, M. F. (2007). Moving words and worlds: Reflections from "the middle." In C. Lewis, P. Encisco, & E. B. Moje (Eds.), *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power* (pp. 123-136). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Orellana, M. F., & Bowman, P. (2003). Cultural diversity research on learning and development: Conceptual, methodological, and strategic considerations. *Educational Researcher, 52*(5), 26-32.

Pappas, C. C., Varelas, M., Barry, A., & Rife, A. (2002). Dialogic inquiry around information

texts: The role of intertextuality in constructing scientific understandings in urban primary classrooms. *Linguistics and Education, 75*(4), 435-482.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Philips, S. U. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 370-294). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Philips, S. U. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in the classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation.* New York, NY: Longman.

Roser, N. L., Hoffman, J. V., & Farest, C. (1990) Language, literature, and at-risk children. *The Reading Teacher, 45*(8), 554-559.

Rymes, B. (2001). *Conversational borderlands: Language and identity in an alternative urban high school.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Rymes, B. (2003). Eliciting narratives: Drawing attention to the margins of classroom talk. *Research in the Teaching of English,* 57(3), 380-407.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Sipe, L. R. (2000). The construction of literary understanding by first and second graders in oral response to picture storybook read-alouds. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35*(2), 252-275.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation.* Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Taxel, J. (1997). Multicultural literature and the politics of reaction. *Teachers College Record, 98*(3), 417-448.

Tharp, R., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Valencia, R. V. (Ed.). (1997). The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Weinstein, C., Tomlinson, C., & Curran, M. (2004). Toward a conception of culturally responsive classroom management. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 55(1), 25-38.

Williamson, J. A. (2006). A tale of two movements: The power and consequences of misremembering *Brown. Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 105*(2), 36-57.