

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: CLASS ADVANTAGE: SOCIAL CLASS AND
KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION IN
ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS UNDER THE
NEW ACCOUNTABILITY

Philbert Aaron, Doctor of Philosophy, 2005

Dissertation directed by: Professor Steven Selden
Department of Education Policy and Leadership

This study interrogates the relationship between social class and academic achievement. It examines the ways in which social class and the new accountability policy influence teachers' and students' co-production of knowledge in the elementary school classroom. The study analyzes student and teacher talk in two elementary school reading classrooms in a mid-Atlantic state. The first school is categorized as middle-class, having less than 5% of its student body receiving Free and Reduced-price Meals (FARMs). The second is classified as working-class, having more than 60% of its students receiving FARMs.

The study draws upon the work of the British sociolinguist, Basil Bernstein. Bernstein's theory of symbolic control provides both theoretical base and method for the inquiry. Using Bernstein's frameworks for classification and framing, language data on teacher-student pedagogical interaction was collected by note-taking during classroom observation in the Spring

of 2004. These data were analyzed using a priori codes, including 'visible' (explicit or traditional) and 'invisible' (implicit or constructivist) practice.

The study finds that pedagogical practice in the middle class school incorporated both visible (traditional) and invisible (constructivist) practices, while pedagogy in the working class school is of the purely visible type. In addition, the middle class school also achieves a faster pace of learning than does the working class school. Faster pace is indicated by syntactical (elaborated) text whereas in the working class school a lexical (brief utterances) text is produced.

The study concludes that social class has unanticipated consequences for academic achievement under the new accountability. By providing identical policy tools to local schools, irrespective of student class location, the new accountability promotes a visible (traditional) pedagogy. Differences in family cultural, social, and economic capital mean that the working class school does not meet the social assumptions of a visible pedagogy and these differences manifest themselves in differentials in achievement.

CLASS ADVANTAGE: SOCIAL CLASS AND KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION IN
ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS UNDER THE NEW ACCOUNTABILITY

by

Philbert Aaron

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2005

Advisory Committee:

Professor Steven Selden, Chair
Professor Jacqueline Cossentino
Professor Francine Hultgren
Professor Marvin Lynn
Professor Jeremy N. Price

©Copyright by

Philbert Aaron

2005

PREFACE

In the United States, a significant portion of the school-aged population experiences academic difficulty. The poor and certain racial/ethnic minorities are over-represented among this group. This problem has persisted over much of the documented history of modern education and efforts to understand the causes of unequal experiences in education and to devise ways in which to ameliorate those experiences have occupied many social and educational theorists, policy makers, and practitioners.

This dissertation takes a novel approach to understanding why social class influences academic achievement. It names the hitherto invisible skills, resources, and dispositions that mediate teaching and learning and proposes that the social practices that are associated with class distribute those skills and resources unequally. It assumes that orientations to teaching are realized through varieties of a specialized language and that competence in varieties of that language is a major influence on the quality of a learner's educational experience. However, each language variety is associated with specific social practices. Each therefore has its own set of social assumptions that in turn select those who may be able to acquire it, doing so on the basis of social, cultural, and economic practices that are the classical attributes of social class. Treating social class, "as a dynamic element in daily interactions between people and institutions" (Wrigley, 2000, p. vii), this study focuses on how social class influences the construction of educational advantage by shaping the pedagogical interactions that define the technical core of schooling.

This dissertation uses a theoretical framework and method that are derived from the British sociolinguist, Basil Bernstein (1924-2000). Bernstein's models of pedagogic discourse outline the rules that are enacted by competent speakers of the languages of teaching. Competence implies understanding the social significance of teaching, recognizing the specialized utterances as well as entering into productive relationships with specialists (teachers). Bernstein distinguishes between two orientations in these rules, visible (explicit or traditional) pedagogies and invisible (implicit or constructivist) pedagogies. Visible pedagogies are oriented towards performance while invisible pedagogies are oriented towards competence.

In its failure to reverse a constant finding in the sociology of education, the association of academic achievement with social class, recent federal, State, and local education policy has reanimated debates regarding the interplay of structure and human action and the social implications of progressive and traditional pedagogy, and phonics and whole language. This study uses knowledge production as a conceptual lens through which to analyze the quality of life in classrooms. In so doing, it takes seriously the assumption that people learn by doing. If you learn what you do, then differences in classroom pedagogical discourse may have important social implications, not least among which are implications for the construction and social distribution of forms of consciousness.

The dissertation asks how and why working class and middle class students continue to score differently on academic tests even when rational educational policies aim to equalize those very scores. It investigates the new accountability policy first to determine which forms of pedagogy it promotes in middle and in working class groups.

Next, it analyzes the conditions for socially distributing those forms of pedagogic discourse. Finally, it analyzes how and why each group satisfies the differentiated requirements for acquiring competency in the languages of teaching.

The review of the literature suggests that although many researchers have investigated school failure and success in ways that imply competence in the language of teaching, Bernstein's theory has never been used in an integrated way to guide the investigation of inequalities in academic achievement by social class under the new accountability. This study, therefore, links various perspectives that seek to explain educational stratification. It focuses on classroom talk between two real teachers and their respective classrooms. Mrs. Mason is a veteran teacher at a middle class school. Mr. Randolph is a novice teacher at a working class school. The study finds that Mrs. Mason enacts both a visible (explicit or traditional) and invisible (implicit or constructivist) pedagogy with her class whereas Mr. Randolph enacts a purely visible pedagogy. These teachers arrive at their pedagogies by attending to the skills, knowledge, and dispositions that their students present in class. In setting equally high standards for all schools, the new accountability policy does provide similar policy tools from which teachers may construct their classroom practice. But pedagogic practice is not constructed solely from policy tools. In the least the teacher and students bring resources to the nexus in which pedagogy is built. Further, the school system does not operate in a social vacuum but interacts closely with a triad of institutions, namely family and work. The boundaries that insulate those institutions are constructed by social class and it is through boundary relations that macro-sociological factors impinge on the micro-social relations that are enacted during instruction. Social class therefore provides

knowledge resources to students in response to which each teacher localizes his/her practice and evolves different purposes for instruction. Mrs. Mason is preparing her students for a long educational career whereas Mr. Randolph is trying to make up for his students' policy-constructed knowledge deficits. The result is a different quality of pedagogical experience in schools. It may even be possible that the increased visibility (explicitness) of pedagogy has the unintended consequence of focusing the competitive action of some families and thereby exacerbating educational inequalities. That is, a policy that explicitly identifies the learning target without changing the distribution of capacities for realizing it may unintentionally have the effect of facilitating those who already have the resources to act on realizing their learning agenda.

Chapter I of the study poses the research question and provides the policy and social context of the case study. Chapter II presents the analytical framework and an assessment of what is known in the research literature about the interaction of social class, the new accountability policy, and academic achievement. Chapter III presents the research design and method. The research findings are reported in Chapter IV. And Chapter V provides the answer to the research question that was posed in Chapter I and discusses how educational theorists, policymakers, and educators might look at teaching in the light of the study's findings.

DEDICATION

For Olufemi Kwabna and Camara Ife Aaron

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the invaluable help provided by my wife, Kaytura who has been a partner and friend throughout this journey. Starting in my formative years, my uncle Eldon “Prof” Aaron and friend Cournelius “Otis” Hyacinth have provided constant guidance. I have always been able to rely on the steady support of my advisor, Dr. Steven Selden whose counsel is as wise as his manner is caring. My dissertation committee has given generously of its time and expertise. My colleague Shannon Bramblett Burke has helped to make me feel at home at the University of Maryland. Finally, Stephanie Goodwin, Clarissa Coughlin, and Jeanie Yerby have made this journey much less painful than it might otherwise have been.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	
Preface.....	ii
Dedication.....	vi
Acknowledgements.....	vii
List of Tables.....	xiv
List of Abbreviations.....	xv
 Chapter I: Reversing the Wastage of Working Class	
Educational Potential Through Standards.....	1
The accountability movement.....	8
Before The New Accountability.....	13
The Rise of the accountability movement.....	17
Accountability: The First Wave.....	24
Restructuring: The Second Wave.....	25
Lay Decision-making: The Third Wave and emergence of the new accountability.....	26
Federalization of the new accountability: 2002-present.....	30
Accountability: Associated Terms.....	40
Old accountability and new accountability.....	41
Educational and fiscal accountability.....	42
External and internal accountability.....	43
Process accountability and outcomes accountability.....	43
Hierarchical and lateral accountability.....	42
Key concepts in the study.....	44
New accountability defined.....	44
Challenges facing the new accountability.....	48
Issues of understandability.....	48
Issues of fairness.....	48
Issues of focus.....	48
Issues of state capacity.....	49
Issues of political stability.....	49
Theory of change.....	49
Accountability and the construction of learning opportunities in classroom.....	51
Knowledge production defined.....	51
Social class defined.....	57
Embedded notions: social class, accountability, and knowledge production.....	64
The Study.....	75
Research Purposes.....	77
Practical Purpose.....	78

Rationale.....	80
Research Question.....	85
Organization of Dissertation.....	86
Chapter II: Explication of the Analytical Framework and Assessment of the	
Related Literature.....	88
Social and cultural capital theory frameworks.....	92
The long arm of the job shapes parents' management of children's lives.....	94
Theory of Symbolic Control.	98
Language as a model system.....	102
Boundary: Foundational construct.....	103
Strong/closed and weak/open boundaries.....	104
Frames: Strong/closed and weak/open boundaries in the teaching	
message system.....	104
Theory of codes.....	105
Models of pedagogic practice.....	105
Visible Pedagogies.....	105
Invisible pedagogies.....	107
The rules.....	108
Hierarchical rules.....	108
Pacing and selection rules.....	112
Criterial rules.....	112
Explicit and implicit rules.....	113
Rules of hierarchy: Explicit and implicit	114
Rules of sequencing and pacing: Strong and weak.....	114
Criterial rules: Explicit and diffuse.....	116
The theory of educational stratification.....	117
Visible pedagogies.....	119
Differential access to the underlying code.....	119
Falling behind.....	121
Lexical and syntactical codes.....	122
Development of early reading.....	122
Sites of learning.....	124
Intersection of social class, race, and gender.....	133
Invisible Pedagogies.....	134
Remediation.....	135
Teachers and policy reform.....	136
Basil Bernstein: Contradictions, Controversy, Appreciation.....	143
Chapter III: Case Study Research Design and Discourse Analysis.....	148
Research Traditions.....	149
Study design: Collective case study.....	151
Data collection	156
Archival analysis.....	157

Allendale County.....	158
Sunnyside Elementary School MSA 2004.....	159
Fairweather Elementary School MSA 2004.....	160
Sunnyside Elementary School: Family-school relations.....	164
Fairweather Elementary School: Family-school relations.....	166
Classroom observation.....	167
Observation Guide.....	168
Classroom artifacts.....	169
Dataset for classrooms.....	171
Fairweather Elementary Schools.....	172
Negotiating Access.....	173
Limitations.....	174
Data analysis.....	177
Organization of data.....	177
Discourse Analytic Procedures.....	178
Coding.....	179
Single-Case Analysis.....	179
Analysis of Boundary-Related Codes.....	181
Emergent propositions that answer “how” and “why” questions.....	186
Cross-Case Analysis.....	186
Lines of evidence.....	187
Validity.....	187
 Chapter IV: Invisible Practice Within A Visible Practice and A Pure Visible	
Practice.....	189
Sunnyside Elementary School	191
Implementation of MSA.....	193
Visible Pedagogic Practice.....	196
Hierarchy.....	197
Teacher easily identified: central authority.....	200
Power Undisguised: Power unmasked.....	203
Rules of Social Order, Conduct, and Rewards.....	205
Homogenous Grouping.....	206
Summary: Hierarchical rules.....	206
Sequencing And Pacing.....	207
Organized temporally: Time, a scarce resource.....	207
Vary by age: Content that is increasingly abstract.....	207
Progression Is Public.....	210
Rituals of Transition.....	211
Summary: Sequencing and pacing rules.....	212
Criterial Rules.....	213
Focus on Product/Performance.....	213
Read For What Is Lacking.....	213
Learning is private, individual, and competitive	214
Difference within Students.....	214
Summary: Criterial rules.....	215

	Social class assumptions.....	216
	Access to the code.....	220
	Middle class advantage: Keeping up with the pacing rules.....	220
	Ability to read.....	220
	Sequencing and pacing rules based on reading.....	223
	Middle class advantage: Meeting rules, organizing discourse.....	223
	Middle class advantage: Exploring new realities.....	223
	Two sites of acquisition.....	225
	Knowledge of vocabulary and analogies under visible pedagogy.....	225
	Academic knowledge subject to unequal distribution through home and school.....	226
	Invisible pedagogy.....	226
	Hierarchical Rules.....	227
	Sequencing.....	233
	Criteria rules.....	235
	Summary.....	239
	Invisible pedagogies.....	239
Fairweather Elementary School.....		240
	Connection between enacted and planned curricula.....	240
	Model of pedagogic practice.....	243
	Hierarchy.....	243
	Teacher easily identified.....	244
	Power Undisguised.....	245
	Rules of Social Order, Conduct, and Reward.....	245
	Sequencing And Pacing Rules.....	246
	Progression is public.....	247
	Organized temporally.....	247
	Rituals of transition.....	248
	Criteria Rules.....	248
	Focus on product/performance.....	249
	Read for what is lacking.....	249
	Learning is private, individual, and competitive.....	250
	Social assumptions of visible practice.....	250
	Differentiated access to the code.....	251
	Fall behind on pacing rules.....	253
	Ability to read.....	256
	Failure to organize own discourse.....	257
	Possibility of organizing own discourse.....	258
	Two sites of acquisition.....	259
	Academic knowledge.....	259
	Single exposure: Reliance on school for educational knowledge.....	260
	Pacing: Lexical text.....	263
	Summary.....	264
Chapter V:	Curriculum As Trojan Horse.....	267
	New accountability promotes visibility.....	278

Effects of the new accountability: Standardization.....	278
Teachers' beliefs.....	279
Organizational factors.....	279
Efforts to engage parents in curriculum.....	280
Teaching styles.....	281
Effects of social class: Differentiation.....	283
Local knowledge of student context.....	284
Social class assumptions of pedagogic practice.....	284
Differential access to the underlying code.....	286
Sequencing rules.....	287
Pacing rules.....	288
Ability to read.....	290
Sequencing and pacing rules based on reading.....	291
Middle class advantage: Meeting rules, organizing discourse.....	291
Middle class advantage: Exploring new realities.....	291
Two sites of acquisition	292
Knowledge of vocabulary and analogies under visible pedagogy.....	293
Academic knowledge subject to unequal distribution through home and school.....	293
Single exposure: Reliance on school for educational knowledge.....	294
Invisible pedagogies.....	295
Different experiences of classrooms.....	298
Discussion: Theory goals.....	300
Model.....	300
Discourse analysis.....	301
Policy analysis.....	301
Political analysis.....	302
Testing.....	302
Dialectics.....	303
Theory of social class.	304
Education and cultural reproduction.....	305
Production and reproduction.....	307
Implications for practice.....	308
Teacher knowledge.....	308
Accountability.....	309
Teacher practice.....	309
Language of critique and language of possibility.....	318
Practice: Language and structures.....	319
Teachers' classroom practice.....	319
Policy.....	322
References:.....	325

LIST OF TABLES

Components of Maryland educational accountability system.....	36
Systems of the new accountability in Maryland.....	37
Characteristics of visible and invisible pedagogies	106
Focus of visible and invisible pedagogies	108
Explicit and implicit models of pedagogy.....	113
Involvement in home literacy activities by poverty status: US	120
School readiness by poverty status: US.....	123
Visible pedagogies: Factors causing difference.....	134
2004 Sunnyside (SES) vs. Fairweather (FES)	
Maryland School Assessment (MSA) performance in Reading.....	163
2004 Sunnyside (SES) vs. Fairweather (FES)	
Maryland School Assessment (MSA) performance in	
Reading by FARMs status.....	163
2004 Sunnyside (SES) vs. Fairweather (FES) Content Standard Scale Score	
performance in reading	163
Coding chart.....	180

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

MSA: Maryland School Assessment

MSAP: Maryland School Assessment Program

MSPAP: Maryland School Performance Assessment Program

MSPP: Maryland School Performance Program

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

REVERSING THE WASTAGE OF WORKING CLASS EDUCATIONAL POTENTIAL THROUGH STANDARDS

American public education is still in crisis (Alexander, 1996). More than twenty years after the Nation At Risk report (National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE), 1983) focused attention on the quality of American public education, many American children are still at-risk for academic failure that is due at least in part to their socioeconomic status. However, this crisis causes no general outrage. This silence is not due to any conspiracy, vast or other. It is a consequence of the subtleties of social class in contemporary America.

Social class is a touchy subject to the poor (Sennett & Cobb, 1972). Indeed, social class has even been a difficult subject of rational discourse in America. For example, a, “straightforward method for deciding exactly who was poor” (Nidiffer & Bouman, 2004, p. 38) in America only emerged in the 20th century. What constitutes the middle class is still disputed. However, today the poverty line, the threshold below which one lives in poverty is the subject of some measure of agreement in the policy world. The US Department of Agriculture’s Food and Nutrition Service and the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) determined that Maryland students who lived in households of four and earned less than \$34,000 in the academic year, 2003-2004 qualify for Free And Reduced-price Meals at school. In this study, Free And Reduced-price Meals status (FARMs) serves as a proxy for household poverty.

Socioeconomic status has implications for culture and by extension academic achievement. Socioeconomic status is included in the Maryland State Department of Education's Achievement Initiative for Maryland's Minority Students (AIMMS) (2001) report on minority achievement. In the words of the AIMMS report, "Poverty comes with its own nuances and cultural implications." Poverty, continues the report, "poses a vicious and insidious threat to many students," and is therefore, "among various factors that interrelate intricately to influence academic achievement" (AIMMS, 2001, p. 2).

Socioeconomic status also has implications for power and by extension education policy reform. Those implications may be seen through the ways in which proposals for social change that may benefit the poor are managed. Proposals to change working class citizens' relationships with established social institutions often generate political resistance among the middle class (Kohn, 1998; Schulte & Keating, 2001a, 2001b). For example, whereas the AIMMS report on "minority" achievement acknowledges, "The basic truth is that educators must change the way the system functions to address the needs of these [poor] students" (AIMMS, 2001, p. 2), elsewhere, it adds that, "Ironically even with a growing number of children designated as 'at-risk,' the reluctance to take risks for these children frequently remains firmly entrenched" (AIMMS, 2001, p. 2).

In this study, the term, 'working class,' 'low-income,' and 'poor' are used interchangeably as descriptors of individuals who live in households that are eligible for Free and Reduced-Price Meals assistance and by extension to the schools in which they form a majority of the enrollment. Poverty is prevalent in America. In 2001, poor children made up more than 15% of school-aged children nationally (NCES, 2004). Indeed, poverty is intricately interrelated with several factors that influence academic

achievement (AIMMS, 2001). Poor children are part of politically unstable school systems and school systems that lack adequate funding. Poor children occupy old and decrepit school buildings. They are segregated in ‘ghetto schools,’ that is, schools that have a supermajority of working class students (Rist, 1970/2000). They suffer coercive disciplinary measures (Ward & Anthony, 1992), lack academic engagement, and suffer academic failure. In short, working class students bear the burden of the, “soft bigotry of low expectations” (Bush, 2001) at rates and to a degree that are significantly greater than those of their middle class peers. This has implications for their academic performance.

However, inadequate funding, decrepit buildings, and ghetto schooling (Anyon, 1981; Rist, 1970/2000) are only a few of the several indicators of the social class disadvantage that British sociolinguist, Basil Bernstein (1924-2000) refers to as, “the wastage of working class educational potential” (as cited in Sadovnik, 1991, p. 1). Working class educational disadvantage affects other major social categories. It is part of the explanation of the failure rates of boys and girls, of racial/ethnic minorities and Caucasians, and students who live in rural, urban and suburban regions all across America. Social class intersects with gender and with race/ethnicity where childrearing and family-school relations are associated with job status and gender (Bernstein, 1990). Socio-economic status is therefore closely associated with the unusually high academic failure rates of racial/ethnic minorities and students who attend urban schools (Alexander, 1996; Jencks & Phillips, 1998).

That this wastage of working class potential constitutes an equity problem is clear (Alexander, 1996; Jencks & Phillips, 1998). Further, since it reflects the ineffectiveness of educational services in reaching and engaging a significant segment of the population

(NCEE, 1983; MSDE, 1989), this crisis also constitutes a problem of educational quality. All too often, however, the policy values of quality and equity are positioned as logical opposites. However, quality and equality are not always irreconcilable policy values. In health services as in education (Samoff, 1990), equity and quality are not only reconcilable they are also mutually inextricable (Aaron & Clancy, 2003; Hanushek, 1995; Seghal, 2003). Equity and quality are two sides of the same coin: quality increases equity (Hanushek, 1995). Further, education impacts people's life-chances. Moreover, if not arrested early, the economic and social costs of the wastage of working class educational potential are multiplied many times over in the form of low wages, a higher burden of disease, and greater deviance (Jencks & Phillips, 1998). Social class is therefore of interest to educational practitioners, policymakers, and theorists.

This study responds to educational authorities' argument that the time has come to investigate students in their naturalistic settings, specifically their socio-economic contexts (Apple, 2000a, 2000b; Holton, 2003; Horvat, Weininger & Lareau, 2003; Porter & Smithson, 2001; Jencks & Phillips, 1998; Sadovnik, 1991, 2001) in order to watch academic success or failure under construction. Accountability is a major effort at education policy reform that is aimed at changing the relationship between student characteristics of poverty and educational achievement (Alexander, 1996). This study addresses the social class-based test score gap in reading under the new accountability by investigating the intersection of social class, accountability, and teachers' production of knowledge in classrooms in Maryland, a state that is at the forefront of accountability reforms (Business Round Table, 1999, 1995; Education Week, 2003; Elmore, Abelman & Fuhrman, 1996; MSDE, 1998, 1999, 2000a, 2000b; U. S. Commission on Civil Rights,

2004;). Knowledge production means making sense or understanding, specifically generating technical knowledge that is related to markets and control (Apple, 1986). Accountability means responsibility, with traditional or old accountability referring to responsibility for inputs and processes, and the new accountability referring to responsibility for results based on those inputs and processes.

The selection of the new accountability as a setting is justified by the finding that over the past twenty years the policy has been implemented nationally (Finn, 2000; Ravitch, 2001, 1999, 1997). Further, the selection of the new accountability as a study setting is due to consideration of values that are held within the accountability movement itself: social class is a reference point in and a justification of the accountability movement (Cohen, 1996). Accountability may be seen to function as a pedagogy that seeks to re-socialize teachers into new ways of overcoming the barrier that social class presents to educational quality and equity. This study therefore places the story of the implementation of the new accountability policy within a theory of educational inequality.

Anticipating the findings of an empirical study by the TIMMS Mathematics Research Group (2003), Bernstein (Bernstein, 1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000; Sadovnik, 2001) identifies pedagogy or classroom teaching practice in the phase of policy implementation, not the intended curriculum within the accountability discourse, as the most important site for defining students' opportunities for learning (Porter & Smithson, 2001). Further, Bernstein attributes differences in school achievement to the consequences of the social class assumptions that underpin pedagogic practice. Therefore, this study does not so much analyze the policy discourse of the new

accountability out of context as investigate the practice that is generated and sanctioned by this discourse. It is a study not so much of curriculum as of curriculum-in-use, not so much of the intended as of the enacted curriculum. This requires clarification.

Traditionally, curriculum is defined as knowledge that is in the state of social organization for a given purpose, for example for transmission while teaching refers to the activity of transmitting knowledge that is so organized. These definitions oversimplify the reality of schools. There is no clear distinction between curriculum and teaching. Curriculum and teaching interact in subtle ways. This study may be located in classrooms but it understands that classroom teaching interacts dynamically with curriculum as well as with testing.

The enacted curriculum refers to the actual curricular content with which students engage in classrooms. The assessed curriculum is that part of the intended curriculum that is validated by high-stakes testing in this case Maryland State Assessments in reading. However, because achievement test scores measure so little and therefore tell so little of what is learned in teaching, it was also conceptually necessary to identify the learned curriculum. Measures of the learned curriculum describe the content that has been learned and the level of proficiency as validated by test scores. The intended, assessed, and learned curricula are important components of the education delivery system, “but most learning is expected to occur within the enacted curriculum” (Porter & Smithson, 2001, p. 2, emphasis in the original).

This study investigates how social class affects academic achievement by using the conceptual lens of knowledge production in classrooms. In order to do so, an object of study is constructed, namely talk or interaction both symbolic and physical between

teachers and students. In order to understand the ways in which a school's social class profile may affect teachers' production of knowledge in classrooms under the new accountability, this study analyzes classroom talk in two English Language Arts (reading and English) classrooms in two elementary schools in the same Maryland suburban school district.

The three key constructs whose interrelation organizes this study, namely social class, the new accountability, and knowledge production by teachers and students in classrooms are mutually embedded in ways that are both crude and subtle. To clarify teachers' actions in the classroom context, the conceptual lens of knowledge production by teachers and students is used because it emphasizes the societal nature of educational knowledge. That is, it expresses the view that knowledge is constructed in between individuals. Since by design, a statewide standards-based policy makes the policy context of both schools in this study similar if not identical, it is their respective social class locations that differ. Consequently, difference in ways that schools' social class profiles might influence teachers' talk in classrooms is thrown into sharp relief within this study.

Due to its acknowledged complexity (Cibulka & Boyd, 2003; Elmore, Abelman, & Fuhrman, 1996; Fuhrman, 1999), a historical account that describes the study's policy context is necessary and is presented next. This introductory chapter provides the necessary background to the entire study by foregrounding social class and knowledge production in the historical political analysis of the accountability movement. Historical reconstruction of the political decision-making processes that led to the policy is focused both on the political processes of policy formation and on the resulting formation of

policy tools which will be shown in Chapters II and IV to constitute concrete expressions of political power by symbolic means and therefore potential forms of symbolic control that regulate teachers and students' interactions in classrooms on a daily basis.

The Accountability Movement

The aim of this section is to reconstruct the history of the political decision-making processes by which the new accountability policy was formed. This political analysis seeks to highlight the articulation of the policy's numerous and highly elaborated tools, for example, standards, and tests, etc. and the role of social class in setting the policy agenda and by extension shaping educational structures even before they reach the classroom. It will be argued in this chapter and demonstrated in Chapter IV that these policy tools express power by which teachers and students' talk in classrooms is regulated. This network of policy tools, it will be shown, is a measure of social organization that is meant to foster a closer relationship between schools and their environments. The network is therefore the focal point of a culture of accountability. Identifying those policy tools therefore also helps to establish pathways of influence between policy and practice whose inter-relation will be the special province of the study.

This is a political study of curriculum. Educational systems have been conceptualized as collegial organizations and as bureaucracies. Alternatively, they have been conceptualized as political organizations and their policymaking systems have been analyzed as forms of political decision-making in which power and social movements play a critical role in policy formation (Balldridge, 1983). Bernstein's (1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000) theory of symbolic control provides a perspective that explains policy formation as political decision-making. While the present political analysis is peripheral

to the study, analysis of implementation in classrooms is central. Therefore, an introduction to the context of the study is necessary for eventually understanding implementation. However, given the novelty of the approach in this study, a traditional reconstruction of the new accountability's history using only discourses that are internal to the movement would not serve the aim of introducing the study. It was necessary to submit even the history of the movement to an analysis from outside its own discourse. Therefore, in order to ensure conceptual unity in the analytical approach to this study, the present analysis of policy formation that leads to implementation of the new accountability in classrooms is brought into alignment with the inequality theory that is at its center. Conceptual unity is attained by drawing on analytic concepts from the theory of symbolic control (Bernstein, 1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000) in treatment of all aspects of the study, and specifically in the present discussion of the origins and dynamics of educational policy change that gave rise to the movement.

The justification of policy entrepreneurs and theorists within the movement is that the new accountability is a response to changes in the economy (MSDE [Sondheim Report] [Supt.]). From the outset, the analytical framework that will be presented in Chapter II views this justification not so much with suspicion as an instance of knowledge production, that is, as the result of a particular understanding that is meant for consumption by an audience that is not necessarily the reader of this study. Therefore, it will be argued that the new accountability does not simply arise from the educational system's neutral efforts to meet the objective needs of an increasingly differentiated division of labor in society: it also incorporates efforts at maintaining the social

distribution of power and authority in Maryland. It is part of State formation. Why the movement is viewed in this way is explained next.

Justifying this interpretation of the origins of the accountability movement means justifying the political approach that is used in this study. It has already been pointed out that the object of the study is talk. Talk is therefore subjected to a micro-sociological analysis in which roles and products are analyzed for their validity in testing. Teacher talk is also placed in wider social context on a macro-sociological level involving global political movements and market events to interrogate its association with macro-social structures of class. The analysis places language data in political contexts. Therefore, it involves a text-internal analysis as well as a text-external one, that is, events that are internal and external to the text. Teacher and student talk focus on family background, educational policy, and by extension global economic and political events and as such a political analysis is justified (Scheuer, 2003).

Control is an important concept in this study. Enactment of control is primarily in the organization and functioning of school knowledge. As such, schools have relative autonomy from external forces such as the economy or the will of political elites thanks to the internal logic of educators, specifically teachers. Schools are not directly connected to the economy. Schools are primarily involved in the production of culture, specifically public school knowledge. The school as a bureaucratic organization shapes the knowledge it produces in particular ways. However, even in following its own logic, schools are still able to participate in reproducing inequality. This approach therefore integrates both disciplinary and political approaches to curriculum (Apple, 1986).

This integration of disciplinary and political approaches to curriculum may be traced to a single conceptual building block, the boundary. Boundaries attend to the construction of such categories as speakers in a dialogue, units in a curriculum, occupations in the social division of labor, and classes in the social structure. Boundary is the integrative concept, the glue to the analytic framework. Boundaries are the basic building blocks of the conceptual apparatus through and within which experience is understood, social relations are established, and identity is constructed. Bernstein's (1971) theory of symbolic control explains that social class constructs these boundaries. In other words, boundaries are both a product of power relations as well as a process by which power relations are enacted.

Classification systems include curriculum but extend to policy discourses. This means that the working of social class in the new accountability, which is the subject of this study, does not begin or end in public school classrooms. As suggested above, accountability has been justified on the emergence of changes in the processes of economic production. Those processes may have an existence outside of individual consciousness. However, these changes do not speak. To call for a revision of education systems and further for a revision through the mechanisms of standards and high-stakes testing is already to engage in the production of knowledge. Therefore, policy formation may already bear the imprint of social class power even before policies make it to the classroom. This is because social class helps to frame and set the educational policy agenda. Therefore, the theory of symbolic control provides conceptual tools through which to unpack the construction of the policy discourse of the accountability movement. This interpretation prepares the object of the study.

From the outset, the theory of symbolic control recognizes educational policy shifts as points of great sociological interest: they are prisms that reflect the interplay between power and knowledge in society. Further, the theory proposes a trend in the direction of educational change in modern industrialized society. It proposes a movement from rigid transmission systems to more flexible forms (more to less regulation), the latter seemingly to match increasingly fluid social boundaries, for example in the deregulation of classification of race/ethnicities from binaries to complex identities. Moreover, the theory explains the social origins of educational policy shifts in advanced industrialized countries including the USA since the 1960s. The impetus for educational policy change, explains the theory, arises from differentiation in the structure of knowledge, differentiation in the division of labor, the struggle over educational equality, and crisis in control. By providing a system for making sense of the historical events of the period, the theory of symbolic control therefore explains the new accountability as a response to prevailing conditions in education, work, and civil society in America and the industrialized world. For brevity, those conditions that go back to the 1970s are described next.

In the next few pages, the rise of an increasingly coordinated educational movement will be traced with focus being placed on its increasingly prominent unifying theme, namely accountability or responsibility. In this account, an indicator of the increasing level of organization in the emerging movement will be ideological unity and political consensus, specifically a growing clarity around the value of responsibility, and increasing specification of the structures by which such responsibility can be attained. In other words, responsibility becomes a hegemonic ideological value and standards are its

hegemonic political structure. Changes in categories in this indicator will be tracked to signal a transformation of the movement from accountability to new accountability to the present codification in federal law in the form of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). It will therefore be argued that from the point of view of the association of teachers' talk with social practice, NCLB is the high water mark of the movement. But first, the underlying causes of the movement are sketched, next.

Before The Accountability Movement

In the 1970s, the philosophies and achievements of critical education, Piagetian psychology, feminist theory, and the Civil Rights Movement amount to a series of sustained attacks on the structure of knowledge in general and of public educational knowledge in particular for what seemed like knowledge's complicity with power. The neutrality of knowledge is questioned within critiques of Western rationality and in the search for justice as variously conceptualized within those social movements.

In educational policy circles, curriculum integration, the community school movement, multiculturalism, Afrocentric education, and critical education would provoke a backlash among cultural conservative thinkers that would eventually have important ramifications for the accountability movement especially in terms of its approach to organizing public educational knowledge or curriculum. In responding to the attack on the structure of knowledge, E.D. Hirsch, Jr. (2000, 1998a, 1998b, 1987), Diane Ravitch (2001, 1999, 1997), Harold Bloom (1994) and others would understand the challenge in peculiar ways. They would portray the attack as an assault on the very conceptual foundations of the nation-state. Therefore, they would lift the public profile of so-called Western canonical knowledge, proclaiming its unrivaled quality and hypothesizing its

role as a uniting force in an otherwise diverse and potentially fractious nation. In other words, they would attribute to traditional forms of organizing Western knowledge the role of maintaining social solidarity in a nation whose social fabric they perceived to be under threat by tribal interests. They advocated that its codified form be positioned as official school knowledge.

The school subject or discipline and by extension disciplinary boundaries would receive much praise. Disciplinarity would be seen as a mark of great strength of educational knowledge. Working from positions of influence in government, the academy, and think tanks, that is, not from the field of production or economics but from culture and in reproduction, their agenda is realized largely in the disciplinary form (for example, English and Math) of socially organizing knowledge that can be seen at the center of curriculum frameworks (Content Standards, Learning Outcomes, Voluntary State Curriculum), standards, etc., including those of Maryland State. Accountability is therefore an embodiment of disciplinary power.

It will be shown in Chapters II and IV that the organization of school curriculum into traditional school subjects realized through highly insulating disciplinary boundaries helps to enact what Bernstein calls a collection code where code refers to the voice of a transmission and pedagogy is its message or the means by which it is delivered to students (Bernstein, 1971, 1990). By incorporating the above-mentioned defense of disciplinary knowledge, the emerging accountability movement would improve its appeal to nationalism and make it more attractive to a public that was increasingly anxious over security. However, organization of school knowledge in a way that privileges disciplinarity or school subjects and in which knowledge is seen as autonomous and

therefore to be justified on its own merits would entertain tensions with a view that is held especially by business interests within the accountability movement.

Contemporaneous with attacks on the structure of public educational knowledge, in the 1970s, pressures for re-organizing educational knowledge such that it become more instrumental are growing. The concept of skill in the American manufacturing sector where operations were atomized and control is displaced towards supervisors is shown to be woefully inadequate in the face of the competitive Japanese style of creating high-trust workers within famously flat organizations. The subsequent decline of the American car industry and the related rise of its Japanese counterpart would rally big business to seek to influence public policy formation in the policy arenas of the State. This is therefore the intersection of economic and disciplinary power. Business' goal would be to regulate education as a way of ensuring a so-called high-quality labor supply. In an alliance between economic and disciplinary power, high-quality labor would be seen as the result of high curriculum standards where standards were a borrowing or recontextualization of discourses from the world of business and industry. From this business constituency would come such appeals for critical thinking and other analytical skills and an emphasis on creativity that are reflected in process approaches to reading instruction within the Content Standards in English Language Arts. Disciplinary boundaries are not privileged when knowledge is judged for what it can do. As will be shown in Chapter IV, the strains between business and culture, between autonomous and practical knowledge, between canonical views of reading and process approaches are still unresolved in this movement.

Various social movements would also have a two-pronged impact on society in the 1970s. In addition to ideological struggles for the technical core of education, American schools were engaged in mobilizing political support and tremendous material resources for desegregating public schools. The Civil Rights Movement had used direct political action in waging a largely successful struggle to frame education as a social equalizer (Spring, 2000). In the wake of the landmark 1954, Brown v. Topeka Board of Education, schools were considered potentially unequal. Resources featured prominently in the search for remedies to educational inequality because they were a pillar for achieving institutional capacity (the system's ability to improve) and improving educational capacity (the dynamics of teaching and learning) that is at the core of academic failure (Cibulka & Boyd, 2003). Race, class, and geography would intersect in the creation of urban and suburban school systems (Boyd, 1986).

Finally, the streets of American cities were witnessing successive waves of crime that were highlighted by startling so-called race riots and the destruction of neighborhoods in several major American cities including Baltimore, Maryland's largest city. This crime wave would propel security or law and order and therefore social and political control to the forefront of the American public policy agenda. Schools, the panacea of social ills (Walker, 1977) would be seen as a site from which to rectify or reverse this perfect storm of economic, cultural, and security crises.

Social, cultural, economic, and political strains in American society would be converted into pressures on the educational policymaking structures for closer relationships between schools and their publics. By the mid-nineteen eighties, the accountability movement with its amalgam of cultural, social, and fiscal conservatives

and big business would rise quickly and helped to focus attention on teaching, and specifically on its inefficiency, particularly with the poor.

The Rise of The Accountability Movement

Crisis in American working class education is not new; it is persistent because it is systemic. Yet, in the 1970s and 1980s, the crises in knowledge, the economy, and society discussed above coalesced to push the issue of working class education to the center of the nation's discussion of education. Under the umbrella of the accountability movement, signs emerged that the American people had reached a consensus that action was needed to correct the decline of American public education. Finally, the political will to act against this crisis seemed to exist (Barton, 2004). The approach to action, however, would be new. In the last to decades of the twentieth century (1980-2000), broad grass-roots social movements had declined in effectiveness. Instead, policy, a peculiarly elite discourse when compared to broad and direct political involvement in education now seemed to be the preferred tool for remedying working class educational disadvantage. Standards moved to the center of educational policy that is geared at improving the performance of working class students.

Standards, themselves, their origins, their validity, and whether they were practical, have been controversial (Marzano & Kendall, 1996). Yet, from a historical political perspective, they have been singularly effective in shaping the discursive struggle over what education means in America in the 21st century. Thanks to the accountability movement, education is now largely conceptualized by citizens as a competition for social mobility (Labaree, 1997) by local educational authorities as an amenity that will help tip the balance in attracting desirable companies and workers, and

by the State and nation as a factor in comparative economic advantage (NCEE, 1983; MSDE [Sondheim] [Supt.]).

The conceptualization of education as competitive economic behavior has implications for action: it has produced an important blind spot in the theory of educational standards in which an important concept in this study, resources are positioned. It must be emphasized here that what is represented as the positioning of resources in the blind spot illustrates the construction of conceptual insulation or closed boundaries, part of the process of knowledge production, and a process the analytical framework attributes to the working of social class.

The accountability movement would reverse historical course by downplaying the role of economic capital resources in the nation's struggles over education. According to Cibulka, "Accountability policies of the 1990s refocused educational reform away from capacity issues, which had often been framed within the logic of equalizing educational opportunity." Elsewhere, Cibulka adds that, "Additional resources, new programs and other efforts to improve the capacity for urban schools came to be viewed as irrelevant to their productivity, or even counterproductive" (Cibulka, 2003, p. 222) because it was thought that they could distract from a focus on learning. Moreover, the policy debates over standards and education were taking place in a peculiar political context, that is the intensification of the ideological rivalry between the US and the former Soviet Union. This rivalry might have accentuated the anxiety of security-conscious Americans to levels above what had been generated by the Civil Rights struggles and the rising level of crime in major urban areas at home. In any case, the sub-text of war and the construction

of mediocrity at home as potentially creating a perfect storm in association with the “red” menace from overseas connote this anxiety.

As suggested above, for one reason or the other, in the 1980s, accountability came to be associated with the notion of “risk,” (NCEE, 1983) and by extension a danger to the most valuable public good, national security (Cohen, 1996). National security is, “one of the most enduring sources of passion in policy controversies” and, “probably the most fundamental political claim” (Stone, 1997, p. 87). Therefore, this framing of education as an economic and cultural pillar of national security raised the political stakes around school performance. In the discursive struggle over the meaning of education that would ensue, the accountability movement would produce knowledge that delegitimizes the notion that education works as a social equalizer. Rather, it would naturalize the discourse of education as a factor in national security, a value that is dear to opponents of multiculturalism, etc., many of whom argue that any multiculturalism was bound to undermine the nation’s social solidarity. Standards therefore served the ideological interests of State formation, becoming synonymous with the pursuit of high quality education as a factor in human capital development and by extension national security.

High quality implied the legitimation of the State in the consciousness of its citizens and was clearly associated with national security. A national crisis always warrants a national response. The search for standards to remedy the nation’s education ills would gain popular political support. Popular support would be associated with bipartisan political commitment. Political parties would close ranks behind standards. Henceforth, to all but a few dissenting voices, standards would be positioned as a commonsense proposition, a part of mainstream educational culture. Accountability

would become the rubric through which other reforms are argued (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001; Sacks, 2003).

In this conceptualization of education as individual competition and tool of national security, educational inequality is a recognized social injustice and therefore counts as the object of public policy action. Research findings have strongly correlated social class with school performance (U.S. Census, 2001). Nevertheless, the economic inequality of which educational inequality is a consequence fails to mobilize effective corrective policy action. The basic framing of merit in the capitalist economic sphere resists the likelihood. Currently, the standards-driven conceptualization of education sees no resources except symbolic ones, for example standards, prescriptions etc. as playing a key role either in generating or in solving the problem of education inequality. Under accountability, no longer is educational inequality to be remedied through equalization of resources that lead to educational capacity. Rather, educational equality is to be attained through ingenuity at knowledge production, that is, through symbolic means.

As a corrective for educational inequality, accountability would therefore come to mean, “using more smartly what one has, sharpening one’s focus, and increasing motivation and effort” (Cilbulka, 2003, p. 222). Competition for students, it is argued, will spur local schools to learn how to better serve working class students. This is part of the rationale behind the standards movement’s theory that schools should no longer be regulated through inputs, for example, teachers, funds, etc. Under the new accountability, only schools’ outcomes matter to regulators. States have therefore set the standards and gotten out of local schools’ way, leaving them it is argued, to exercise the flexibility that is needed to solve the problems of teaching all students better. The

education bureaucracy, having no reliable or superior instructional technology to distribute, must cede the creative role to the professionals, teachers (Hanushek, 1995). Henceforth, regulators provide symbolic or policy resources (frameworks, etc.) and steer schools towards greater focus on the bottom-line, students' test scores.

Consequently, standards, specifically higher standards came to be viewed by policymakers and citizens alike as the stand-alone solution to what is purported to be America's declining political and economic standing in the world. The working class was referenced as a factor in this decline. However, framing of working class educational disadvantage within the context of the nation's economic competitiveness has been a two-edged sword. On the one hand, the issue of working class disadvantage was given public visibility. On the other, framing the problem in security terms masks the social processes that are at the root of working class academic failure.

Policy enactment affects implementation of reform (Jones & Malen, 2001). As stated earlier, the economic justification for improving America's education is influenced by the standards movement's history. This standards-driven policy perspective is linked to the forum in which this agenda has been formed, the elite decision-making forum of the federal government and the socio-economic system of capitalism. This connection is rooted in the history of the standards movement. A key federal impetus for the search for standards was the U.S. Department of Education's National Commission on Excellence in Education's Nation At Risk (NAR) report of 1983. Interpretation of the performance of American students on international assessments provided data for that report. "Our nation is at risk," the report concluded. "Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science and technological innovation is being overtaken by

competitors throughout the world.” Had the situation that the US found itself been imposed by foreign powers, the commission argued, it might have been seen as, “an act of war” (NCEE, 1983, p. 1). NAR launched the US accountability movement. The movement would claim to offer incentives for teachers and students to learn but provided few additional material resources through which to facilitate behavioral changes in working class schools. The movement would exercise great influence in the discursive struggle over the meaning of education in America and its political ascendancy would ensure that resources remain in accountability’s blind spot.

Already in its first decade, the accountability movement had scored spectacular political successes. Soon, however, accountability as largely an educational movement that was focused on policymaking at the federal level ran its course with few successes to show other than political and symbolic ones. For example in 1989, Republican President George H. W. Bush convened a summit meeting of the nation’s State governors in Charlottesville, Virginia that set national educational goals for the year 2000. Those goals centered on higher school performance in the core disciplines, including reading. Spurred by this remarkable achievement, next the first Bush administration pushed to install voluntary national standards. That effort failed in 1991 and 1992 largely due to fears that national standards albeit voluntary at first might eventually lead to a national curriculum. A national curriculum would exceed the limited federal purview over schools. Further, national standards would impinge on states’ rights to run schools.

President Bush’s successor, though a member of the rival Democratic Party, President Clinton would pursue standards as a national educational agenda. Changing strategy only, Clinton provided funding for States to draft their own standards and tests.

These would be called “Goals 2000.” By 1996, nearly all States were engaged in drafting curriculum standards. By then, standards as the key tool in improving educational quality had been reformulated into the search for equally higher standards (as expressed through state-wide curriculum frameworks, performance targets, etc.) for all schools and student groups, irrespective of social class background. Ironically, the critical role played by resources and the devolution of responsibility that help to explain Clinton’s success regarding Goals 2000 was lost when it came to implementing standards in classrooms. State standards would be implemented mainly through symbolic or policy tools and ensured by high stakes for students (including retention), for schools (including reconstitution, loss of funds, and loss of enrollment) or accountability to test scores. No significant shift was evident in accountability’s philosophical position that ignores resources to teachers and students who implement standards. Further, teachers were hardly brought into the conversation over standards. If anything, teachers seemed to be positioned as the roadblocks to educational reform (NCEE, 1983). In spite of those weaknesses, political support for standards and testing would deepen within the national culture, attaining their high point ten years later, in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Therefore, the above argument may be summarized in the following terms. In the 1970s and 1980s, the nascent accountability movement harnesses public anxiety over security, equality, and global economic competition to place standards at the very top of the nation’s education policy agenda. Traditional school subjects as the basis of the social organization of the curriculum and an emphasis on accountability would become the hallmarks of that movement.

To make sense of those years of constant and complex educational reforms that have largely formed the present policy context of this study, education researchers agree that the movement comprised at least three waves. These so-called waves, their characteristics, and successes are presented next. The discussion above aimed to foreground the role of social practices in macro-sociological levels (culture, economics, politics, and society) in generating an educational movement, namely accountability. The discussion in this section seeks to link those social practices to linguistic practice (talk) in classrooms at the micro-sociological level through a description of the structure of accountability policy. The aim is to show that the new accountability penetrated deeply into US educational culture. This discussion accounts for the network of policy tools (Content Standards, Curriculum Standards, Performance Standards, Performance Goals, high-stakes testing) that are associated with the new accountability. It also sets the stage for analysis in subsequent chapters of the complex institutional influences that those policy tools exert on teaching and learning processes in classrooms. In short, a change of focus is carried out from macro-sociological practice to micro-sociological practice, that is, from changes in economic relations to calls for change in interactions between teachers and students in classrooms. That link is central to the justification of a political approach to the object of the study, talk. The overall goal is to show the social context of teacher talk as regulated within accountability policy that is the political achievement of a new educational movement.

Accountability: The first wave.

It will be remembered that the accountability movement seeks to create closer links between schools and society. A measure of closeness was achieved by the first

wave of accountability reforms. These early reforms focused on the policy value of accountability or responsibility and required State-wide testing of students and sometimes of teachers. They called for a change to the rhetoric of schooling from a focus on inputs, for example, teachers, instructional materials, etc. to a focus on outputs, for example, standardized test scores (Hess, 1999). The change in focus is referred to as deregulation and results from the belief that regulation failed to produce good schooling (Center for Policy Research in Education [CPRE], 1992).

As part of this early wave, first, students were tested. Next schools were tested. Eventually testing was proposed for school staff (Hess, 1999). However, this accountability-as-testing period was soon characterized as a period of ‘intensification.’ The aim was to do more of what had long been done in schools. Researchers quickly judged this first, so-called accountability wave to be an insufficient response to the calls to deeply reform American schools (Cibulka & Boyd, 20003, p. viii). From this first wave of reforms, no significant improvement in working class academic performance was perceptible.

Restructuring: The second wave.

The second wave of accountability reforms was centered on restructuring schools. It aimed to restructure schools by improving the professionalism of principals and teachers, for example, by calling for greater teacher involvement in decision-making about school activities such as curriculum (Hess, 1999). Researchers soon came to judge this wave as inadequate to the calls for deep reform. By 1990, researchers were characterizing this wave or so-called restructuring as a “piecemeal” effort (Cibulka &

Boyd, 2003, p. viii). Once again, no significant improvement in working class academic performance was perceptible from this second wave of reforms.

Lay decision-making: The third wave and emergence of the new accountability.

The third wave of reform focused on putting schools' clients in charge of important educational decision making, for example over enrollment. Policies that made it possible for clients to choose the schools that their charges would attend were enacted and community control of schools was attempted (Hess, 1999). For example, in Chicago, Illinois, parent-dominated school boards were constituted that participated in hiring staff (Sebring & Bryk, 2000).

By 2002, systemic reformers were "trying to maintain the momentum of their wave via the vast accountability movement that was coupled to state academic standards and high-stakes testing" (Cibulka & Boyd, 2003, p. viii). By then, accountability-related policymaking was largely a State-level activity. George Bush, Sr.'s political setback with voluntary national standards and President Clinton's change of strategy had sped up devolution of accountability policymaking to the States. However, the Nation At Risk report (NCEE, 1983) was having its own independent effect in State legislatures and specifically in a State that adjoins the nation's capital, Maryland.

In 1989, at least three years before the demise of the idea of national voluntary standards within the federal policymaking arena, in Maryland, Walter Sondheim, Jr. a prominent businessman would chair the Governor's Commission on Education Reform. The commission's report was an "after-shock" (MSDE, p. 1) of the Nation At Risk Report (NCEE, 1983), striking the same tone that coupled a diagnosis of dismal mediocrity in education with a dire prognosis of its social and economic consequences.

“The need to improve schools is urgent,” states the Maryland report. Elsewhere, it continues, “Schools have not changed as rapidly as have the economy and society. The proportion of youth whom schools have historically failed to educate well—minorities and the poor—continues to rise” (emphasis mine, MSDE, 1989, p. 1).

The Maryland report recommended aiming to improve all students’ ability to high skill levels in order to help prevent, “State and national decline because Americans will not be equipped to do the jobs required in the 21st Century” (MSDE, 1989, p.1).

Maryland would embark on a decade of successive reforms. Some background on the structure of State-level policymaking is necessary here if the consequences of accountability policy for classrooms are to be fully explored.

The governor of Maryland appoints the Maryland State Board of Education (MSBE). MSBE makes State policies for elementary schools. The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) administers the system. Maryland comprises twenty-four local school systems that correspond to twenty-three counties and Baltimore City. Each has its own board of education. In 2003, for example, 31% of students qualified for Free/Reduced-price Meals. This is a rate that is higher than the national average. This means that State poverty rates feature prominently in debates about student achievement in Maryland. Maryland’s poor are largely racial/ethnic minority African American and Hispanic Americans and these students’ performance lags behind those of their majority and middle class peers (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2004).

The State-level standards-based policy, the Maryland Schools Performance Program (MSPP) that took effect in Maryland in 1993 contained mechanisms for creating performance targets for all schools as a basis for assessing schools (Performance

Standards or regulation of performance levels), assessing students annually (high-stakes testing or testing that leverages sanctions or rewards), aligning State standards with State assessments (Content Standards, Maryland Learning Outcomes), academic achievement standards for all schools, districts, and student sub-groups in core areas, using school report cards that disaggregate data by sub-groups, and providing sanctions to low-performing schools, including closure, reconstitution, privatization and withdrawing funds (U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2004; MSDE).

With MSPP in 1993, Maryland State had entered the era of the new accountability. The new accountability refers to a step in standards-based reform that consists of using achievement of standards as a basis for accountability. New accountability systems differ from traditional accountability systems in one or more of seven ways: focus on performance rather than on compliance to regulation, use of schools as the unit of improvement, continuous improvement strategies, classroom inspections, many levels of accreditation, public reporting of school-level test scores, more consequences to performance levels (Fuhrman, 1999).

Success at new accountability reforms required instructional reform. Whereas under old accountability, instructional reform was leveraged through the adoption of processes such as aligning curriculum and testing, under the new accountability performance on tests would leverage instructional reform. Therefore, MSPP's high-stakes tests of the 1990s, the Maryland Schools Assessment Program (MSPAP) were the proverbial cart that drew reform of teaching under the new Maryland accountability. However, MSPAP was unique in its openness or the lack of constraint that it placed on the organization of school knowledge as realized by students. As a whole, MSPP stood

out among other State accountability systems on account of its excellent quality. MSPP was recognized by the US Congress for bringing, “stakeholders together [...] to work collaboratively toward systemic reform” (MSDE, 1999, p.1); by the U.S. Department of Education for, “high standards coupled with research-proven best practices and strong public accountability,” (MSDE, 1998, p.1); by the press with an A grade for “Standards and Accountability” (Education Week, 2003, p. 3); by business (Business Round Table), and by researchers (Elmore, Abelman & Fuhrman, 1996, p. 67). Further, the office of the State Superintendent of Schools, the chief executive of the state’s special government for education was recognized by national governors for Maryland’s, “progress toward the National Education Goals” through, “measuring and reporting on our progress to the public” (Governor’s Press Office, 1998, p.1); by business with the Harold McGraw, Jr. Prize in Education for the Superintendent’s commitment to “quality education” (MSDE, 2000, p.1); and by professional organizations for seeking “to open new opportunities for all children” (MSDE, 2000, p. 1). For nearly a decade, MSPP seemed to be well launched.

MSPP’s major innovations were open-ended constructed responses using scenarios in science, sustained writing in math, and authentic literature and rubrics as scoring tools in language arts. Rubrics, also called scales, are scoring guides that provide quantitative data on clear, selected qualitative criteria. With rubrics, the student’s performance or product is judged against written criteria or guides. Therefore, rubrics refer to portraits of quality to which weighted numeric value is assigned in descending or ascending order. In terms of their role in reforming instruction, rubrics specify criteria to schools, teachers, and parents and therefore increase direction and focus. By providing

goals, rules, and clues, rubrics promote good performance, provide good feedback, and provide targets or express expectations (Schmoker, 1999).

I spent three years (1997-2000) serving as a curriculum writer and staff developer in a not-for-profit organization that formed a curriculum-focused partnership with Baltimore City Public School System (See www.coreknowledge.org). The partnership aimed to build low-performing schools' capacity for MSPP reforms. Students, teachers, principals, schools, the local educational authority, and the State were stretched in their capacity for implementing that ambitious reform. The stress showed especially in difficulty at all levels of the system to narrow the social class-based test-score gap or the significant difference in achievement among student groups.

In 2001, President Bush took office, championing for America his educational success as governor of Texas. The fourth wave of national reform was under way and in the abstract, it would further constrict the "voice" (Bernstein, 1990) or classification of public educational knowledge and potentially the messages that were derived from it in classroom practice.

Federalization of the new accountability: 2002-Present.

A fourth wave of the new accountability is proposed here to account for the federalization of the new accountability in the wake of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. In 2002, Public Law 107-110 passed into law with overwhelming support from the 107th Congress. The law is sub-titled, "An act to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind (emphasis, mine)." Its passage registered as the high-water mark of the accountability movement. President Bush, Jr. characterized NCLB as, "the cornerstone of my administration" (2002). Others

consider it to be, “the most significant federal education law in a generation” (Archer, 2004, p. 1). NCLB would further constrain the definition of what public knowledge would be validated by Maryland State-administered testing.

NCLB “federalized” the accountability movement (Loveless, 2004, p. 2) and especially in its proposal to tighten the definition of educational knowledge through high-stakes testing, precipitated the demise of the famously open Maryland’s MSPP (Hambleton, Impara, Mehrens, & Plake, 2000). What McNeil (2000a, 2000b) refers to as the “measurability” of knowledge was made paramount by NCLB. That means that not only is one student’s test performance to be quantified, in its value it was also supposed to be comparable to another student’s, therefore standardized. Such standardization rests on the unambiguous or closed definition of knowledge, which it was proposed should be achieved through testing. Since MSPAP did not provide individual-level test scores far less comparable scores across test takers as was required by NCLB, MSPAP and its parent policy MSPP had to be scrapped. Therefore, NCLB ushered in a significantly modified successor policy, the Maryland State Assessment Program (MSAP) (Lally, 1996).

It is important, however, to highlight the nature of the changes that were ushered in by NCLB in the successor policy. An appreciable subset of the policy tools of old accountability and pre-NCLB new accountability remained, specifically content standards and learning outcomes. This means that the organization of school knowledge at the level of the curriculum could remain unchanged. However, at the level of validation of the knowledge that was received by students within the assessed curriculum, critical changes were targeted through the format of standardized testing.

Significantly redesigned in the wake of NCLB was MSAP's testing component, the Maryland State Assessments (MSA), Maryland's current generation of so-called high-stakes tests. Test administration changed dramatically from what had obtained under previous policy. Out were group-administered activities; in were assignments to individuals. By this change alone, for the first time under the new accountability, students had to account for their individual educational behavior, marking in effect, a new level of intrusiveness of the policy. It must also be noted that the lack of accountability of students prior to NCLB had been seen as a conceptual flaw by theorists (Fuhrman, 1999). No longer was the test administered only to samples of students per grade level; now the entire population of eligible students took the test. No longer was the school the smallest unit of accountability for which data were to be generated; now, every student received individual test scores.

Testing format also changed dramatically. Out were open-ended constructed responses or essays that drew on authentic forms of adolescent literacy in language arts. Out was the use of scoring rubrics or scales. In was selected response, formerly known as multiple-choice items. This machine-scorable format narrows the framing of school knowledge in reading from the range represented in rubrics or scales by eliminating mediating scores. It also firms the framing of validity or correctness of student knowledge by distinguishing between only two categories of knowledge, valid and not, that is right or wrong, or 1 and 0.

By narrowing and firming the definition of valid school knowledge at the level of testing or performance by the pupil without significantly tinkering with its definition at the level of its organization in curriculum documents or at the level of teaching, the new

policy aimed to improve the test score performance of all student groups and to target the performance of specific subgroups for accelerated improvement and thereby, “close the achievement gap with flexibility and accountability” (NCLB, 2002, p. 1). Increasingly constricting at the point of testing the definition of valid knowledge that is learned by pupils has not before now received much scholarly attention regarding the ways it may constrain teachers to constrict the definition of knowledge at the level of organization and transmission in classrooms. That is, the potential regressive effects of reframing assessed curriculum on the enacted curriculum remains unexplored. This is the case even after such constriction and constraint, what McNeil (2000) calls “standardized controls” (p. 6) were linked to damaging instruction and the widening of achievement gaps between poor and well to do or Caucasian and minority students in Texas.

To recapitulate the policy arrangement, the present policy regime, MSAP is designed to yield Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets to all schools as the basis for assessing schools, assess students annually, and strengthen alignment of State standards with state assessments through Voluntary State Standards. It is also designed to add academic achievement standards for all students (standards already existed for schools, districts, and student sub-groups in core areas), use school report cards that disaggregate data by sub-groups, and provide sanctions to low-performing schools. The aims are to strengthen test-curriculum alignment, focus on student improvement as opposed to school-wide improvement, and to comply with NCLB (U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2004; MSDE).

The constriction of valid knowledge was argued earlier. It remains to demonstrate the notion of teacher constraint under the policy. In the previous section,

change in social practice was linked to change in educational policy. In this section, change in policy is linked to change in practice. Teacher constraint is operationalized through test-curriculum alignment. Test-curriculum alignment, an important mechanism for rationalizing accountability policy had always proven elusive because it is at the very nexus where policy, teacher, and student come together. Specifically, a commissioned study (Hambleton et al., 2000) of MSAP's predecessor accountability policy had recommended that, "Evidence of when the content measured in the assessment is delivered in instruction needs to be gathered," (p. 144) and that, "more evidence is needed to document both the intended and unintended consequences of MSPAP, including evidence that supports the outcomes of MSPAP in directing instructional reform" (p. 145). Therefore, not only did NCLB have the potential effect of narrowing the definition of valid educational knowledge, it also sought through MSA to further constrain teachers to deliver that altered formulation of knowledge in classrooms. In the language of the analytical framework, NCLB sought not only to limit the range of the voice of educational transmission that was validated by tests (through standards) but also to constrain teachers to narrow the teaching message, too (through norm-referenced tests). This determination of constraints on teachers' talk in classrooms not only justifies the placing of language use within wider social contexts and the adoption of a political approach in this study but also links conceptually with the notion of rules that will be presented as part of the analytical framework in Chapter II.

MSAs assess student achievement in reading and math in grades three to eight and were first administered in 2003 in grade 5 in reading and math. Performance on MSA is categorized as Basic, Proficient, or Advanced, of which Basic and Proficient are

aggregated to constitute the category of Satisfactory. Further, school and student performance is judged against Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). AMOs increase each year to ensure AYP is met such that by 2014 all students would at least be proficient in reading and math. The specific target for each school depends on the grade make-up and may vary from the State (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2004). Therefore, in addition to spatially narrowing school knowledge and constraining teachers to this view of school knowledge, present policy also temporally presets the pace by which schools realize its transmission. It will be argued in Chapters II, IV, and V that these pressures on the organization and transmission of school knowledge have unanticipated consequences on the social distribution of school knowledge. The assumptions of the policy itself are not vastly dissimilar as is shown next.

It will be remembered that in educational policy terms, the aim of the new accountability is to close the achievement gaps in American schooling. Therefore, under NCLB, efforts to close the achievement gaps in Maryland now focus on students, teachers, and schools. Student-centered initiatives create individualized plans for general education students with low scores in state reading and math assessments. Teacher-centered initiatives include teacher preparation, pursuit of teacher education reform, tracking teacher recruitment, requiring strong academic background for new teachers along with yearlong internships at state-approved schools, and continuing professional development for experienced teachers. School-centered initiatives include judgment of schools against AYP (US Commission on Civil Rights, 2004).

COMPONENTS OF MARYLAND EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

LEVEL	SYSTEM
CLASSROOM	Student Report Card Teacher Evaluation (Internal Accountability) Curriculum Materials: <u>Literary Reflections</u>
SCHOOL	School Report Card: AMOs; AYP; Test Scores; Teacher Qualifications; Rewards & Sanctions
LEA	District Report Card, Rewards and Sanctions
STATE	State Report Card, Maryland State Assessments, Training Voluntary State Curriculum Content Standards
FEDERAL	<u>No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</u>

Schools not making AYP for two consecutive years enter phases of corrective action that last for five years. Schools that continue to fail after year three may have their staff replaced, a change of curriculum, a decrease in school-level management authority, and reorganization. After the fourth year, the school may have its status changed to that of a charter school, have its principal and staff replaced, undergo private sector management by contract or face a State take-over (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2004).

Achievement gaps persisted in almost every content area on MSPAP (Reeves, 2000) and seem to be a persistent feature of the present MSAP iteration of the policy. In fact, implementing NCLB poses a challenge in its implementation phase. For example, in year two (2003-2004), NCLB was found to be, “doing what federal laws tend to do best—focusing the attention of a large, decentralized education system on the same set of goals” (Center on Education Policy (CEP), 2004, p. v), and, “certainly seems to have quickened the pace of change and brought ‘an increased focus on the achievement of our poorest performing students’” (Center on Education Policy, 2004, p. vi). However, it was

found that, “The Act places many demands on local staff, such as requiring them to align curriculum and assessments,” yet many state departments claim to lack the capacity to do so (Center on Education Policy, 2004, p. x).

SYSTEMS OF THE NEW ACCOUNTABILITY IN MARYLAND

DESIGN SYSTEMS	
Goal of system	Every student, school and district be at least Proficient in reading and math by 2014 (3 student levels: Advanced, Proficient, Basic)
Voluntary State Standards	Focus on student improvement Close achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, choice Strengthen alignments standards-Assessments
Level of accountability	Districts: and schools (Each school has its own threshold it must meet every...) Schools: Annual Yearly Progress Targets Standards for sub-groups Reading, Math Annual Measurable Outcomes Students: Annual Assessment
Standard of Accountability	Floating till 2014
Type of Assessments	NRT
Subject Areas	Reading, Math
Grades Tested	3-8
Graduation Test	Required
Non-cognitive Index	Attention, Retention
Rewards	Cash for teachers
Sanctions/Assistance	Staff replaced, school-level management authority decreased, reorganization

In summary, in its policymaking function, accountability emphasizes the continuity of State-citizen relations, aiming to preserve or even enhance the legitimacy of the State with its citizens. At the same time, rupture is emphasized both in the processes of education and in the world outside, especially the industrial workplace. In its de-/regulatory functions, accountability comprises specifications of knowledge, tests for

realization of knowledge, standards for comparing results, a system of incentives and disincentives regarding those standards and a system for communicating attainment of those standards.

In this study, therefore, accountability connotes a tight linkage between, “schools and their environments” (Pallas, Natriello, & McDill, 1995, p. 36) and as such enmeshes the individual actor in a fabric of deep social relations and therefore has the potential to both improve his/her resources for action and/or constrain others. Its components vary depending on the place and time but two common characteristics of accountability are the search for comprehensiveness or emphasis on the system as a whole and the search for internal coherence through policy mechanisms. In theory, accountability is a product of technical rationality, representing control by educational experts, testers, measurers, etc. (Spring, 2004) and is therefore, “technically complex,” which means that it is, “not easily understood by the public, policymakers, or even teachers and administrators” (Cibulka & Boyd, 2003, p. 209). Further, policymakers, the public, and researchers lack critical understanding of teaching from the teacher’s perspective (McNeil, 2000), a potentially significant problem that is compounded by the new accountability movement’s history of contentious relations with teachers as thinkers (NCEE, 1983).

The above discussion therefore serves to illustrate the complexity of the new accountability system. Specifically, the system includes mechanisms for selecting knowledge (curriculum frameworks), for classifying and evaluating knowledge (so-called “bubble” or machine-scorable standardized tests), and for socially distributing knowledge (tracking the narrowing of the achievement gaps, AYP). In the struggle over the distribution of public educational goods, two concepts were strongly classified or

insulated within the policy, namely knowledge and resources. It will be remembered that notably missing from the system at the federal and State levels are specifications for transmitting knowledge in general education classrooms. As stated earlier, this is conceptualized as a local school district and local school matter. Further, forms of valid knowledge were narrowed, teachers' autonomy over their transmission was constrained. Also, the role of economic resources in equalizing educational opportunity was deemphasized. Overall, however, the policy's aim was to change the traditional ways in which school knowledge is organized, transmitted, and distributed. This study attributes great social significance to these policy aims. Argues Bernstein (1971, p. 2002), "Differences within" school knowledge or what may be indicated here as the achievement gap, and, "change in the organization, transmission, and evaluation of educational knowledge," the essential aim of the new accountability, "should be a major area of sociological interest," because they reflect, "both the distribution of power and the principles of social control." Prospectively, these changes are associated with the construction of forms of consciousness or identity because there is often an underlying concept to a curriculum. Interpreting the historical data that were presented above in light of this assumption leads to the conclusion that the new accountability is a form of symbolic control. In this case, symbolic control is attempted through regulation of educational knowledge. Regulation is a response to change in the structure of knowledge, economic competition, and public demands for equality and social control. The aim of this control through regulation is the generation of a new type of worker while maintaining traditional forms of citizenship. That new type of worker may be described as flexible, that is, being able to ride the shocks of a rapidly changing economy. That old

form of citizenship may be described as compliant regarding social solidarity and the legitimacy of capitalist approaches to organizing the nation-State. This recognizes Bernstein's view that, "The nineteenth century required submissive but inflexible man, whereas the late twentieth century requires conforming but flexible man" (Bernstein, 1971, p. 225). Interpreting the new accountability as such results in a disciplining of the concept, simplifying it beyond the bewildering range of associated terms, which however, should be acknowledged as is done next.

Accountability: Associated Terms

The political success of the accountability movement is indisputable: in one generation, it has been institutionalized in every State of the Union. As a plan, its comprehensiveness and internal structural coherence, which are indicators of rationality, might have favored its political success. It appeals especially to policymakers (Cibulka & Boyd, 2003; Mintrop, 1999). However, a possible casualty of the movement's political success is its core meaning. Although accountability is a complex concept that has changed over its more than two hundred-year history (Peach, 1977), it is now a much over-used word (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001) that many Americans have heard (Lewis, 1995).

Overall, accountability translates to 'responsibility.' The movement's unifying theme is that American schools should be responsible for the instructional processes that they use and for their students' performance in society. Therefore, accountability seeks to make the education system more rational but only to make it ultimately more responsible. Increased responsibility of teachers and schools is geared at correcting a cultural lag in which, as suggested by the Sondheim Report, the poor and historically

underserved tend to be trapped in schools that have not kept up with changing times (MSDE, 1989). The movement presents several pairs of terms, including old and new accountability, educational and fiscal accountability, external and internal accountability, process and outcomes accountability, and hierarchical and lateral accountability that are discussed next.

Old accountability and new accountability.

Old accountability refers to responsibility for inputs and processes of education and in terms of time period (1983-1993) refers to an earlier model of accountability systems that aimed to hold schools and teachers responsible for the inputs they received and the processes that they used in educating students. Old accountability was based on the assumption that the various systems of education did not function as a systemic whole. Integration of those disparate systems, it was proposed, would be achieved mainly by standards, specifically curriculum standards. As was stated above, the failure of old accountability to deeply reform the system as indicated by equalizing test scores ushered in the new accountability.

The new accountability refers to that new model of state and local governance comprising measures of student performance, standards for comparing such measures, and systems of rewards and punishments for improving those measures. New accountability is responsibility for results based on standards of inputs and processes (Elmore, Abelman, & Fuhrman, 1996). In terms of time periods, the new accountability succeeds the old accountability and aims to improve on its failure to deeply reform the system. This study focuses on the new accountability but recognizes as was pointed out by others (Fuhrman, 1999) that it was not preceded by a subtraction of regulations that in

principle it was meant to succeed. This is the case, for example, with the attachment to traditional forms of organizing curriculum that are inherited from the old accountability and which may impede changes in instruction.

Educational and fiscal accountability.

Today, accountability is a term whose usage in American education varies depending on, among the things, the user's unit of analysis. For example, Peach (1977) recognizes two streams of accountability, educational accountability and fiscal accountability. 'Fiscal accountability' comprises (1) input-output analysis, (2) a planning, programming, budgeting system and (3) a voucher system (Peach, 1977). 'Educational accountability' is primarily classroom-oriented. Educational accountability comprises three models: (1) accreditation, (2) behavioral objectives as an approach to teaching, and (3) performance contracting to a bidder who commits to attaining specified level of success. This study focuses exclusively on educational accountability. In this form of educational accountability, teaching by performance objectives is a key characteristic.

External and internal accountability.

External accountability refers to schools' responsibility to outside stake-holders, for example parents, business, and the State. Internal accountability refers to teachers' accountability to insiders, for example principals. These forms of accountability are presumed to be in alignment as an achievement of systemic policy. This study relies on the assumption of alignment between internal and external accountability, largely framing external accountability as the wider social practice context that enables and constrains the enactment of internal accountability or linguistic practices (talk) between

teacher and student. The use of a political approach to studying the object talk is in part justified on this assumption.

Process accountability and outcomes accountability.

Pallas, Natriello, and McDill (1995), writing about school administration, identify two forms of the stream of educational accountability (Peach, 1977), outcomes accountability and process accountability. They explain that in, ‘outcomes accountability,’ “schools are held responsible for the performance of the students they serve (often assessed through standardized test scores)” (p. 52). In, ‘process accountability,’ “schools are held responsible for the processes they use to educate children and youth (often assessed through the presence of particular curricula or school improvement plans)” (p. 51). The schools in this study are engaged in the dynamics of both outcomes and process accountability. In process accountability, they answer for the processes by which test scores are produced, being monitored on their use of standards, topics, and prescribed materials. In outcomes accountability, they answer to clients and regulators for the test scores they produce. Process and outcomes accountability are crude equivalents of internal and external accountability respectively. At minimum, accountability for processes is embedded within internal accountability whereas outcomes accountability is embedded within processes of external accountability.

Hierarchical and lateral accountability.

Lambert (1998, pp. 96-97) identifies two forms of accountability depending on who reports to whom. ‘Hierarchical accountability’ means that one is answerable to a person as for example, a teacher who is answerable to a principal. ‘Lateral accountability’ means that one is answerable to a community as in the case of a political,

geographic, or professional society. As an illustration of lateral accountability, Darling-Hammond (1997) writes of accountability to the profession of teaching, and Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery and Taubman (1995/1996, p. 165) describe curriculum itself as being accountable as well as of, “government accountability in society at large” (p.).

In the two schools in this study, teachers are hierarchically accountable to principals in the sense that they answer to principals on teachers’ processes. Teachers are also laterally accountable in that they answer to the community of teachers and to parents for outcomes. As has been shown above, the new accountability predicates success on teachers changing the way they conceptualize teaching and this change or production of new knowledge is focused on reaching the poor. This study assumes that at age twenty (1983-2004), the new accountability is an appropriate subject for investigating the realization of its equity aims. The three key concepts of the study are presented next.

Key Concepts in the Study

The study makes use of three key concepts, namely the new accountability, knowledge production, and social class that require further explanation in this introductory chapter.

New Accountability defined.

This study uses new accountability as a key construct and relies for its definition of “the new accountability” on Elmore, Abelman, and Fuhrman (1996) whose analysis of events occurring in the education policy world in 1993-1994 led them to announce the emergence of a new phenomenon within the accountability movement. They observe that:

A new model of state and local school governance is evolving that we call ‘the new educational accountability.’ The model has three major components: a

primary emphasis on measured student performance as the basis for school accountability, sometimes accompanied by other indicators of success; the creation of relatively complex systems of standards by which data on student performance are compared by school and by locality; and the creation of systems of rewards and penalties and intervention strategies to introduce incentives for improvement. (Elmore, Abelman, & Fuhrman, 1996, p. 65)

What was new about the new accountability, according to the authors, were activities that were quite narrowly focused, “less on compliance with rules,” (p. 65) as in the processes of compliance with old accountability standards, “and more on increasing learning for students” (p. 65), or performance. In short, it was an attempt to institutionalize the message that, “We don’t care how you meet these standards, as long as you do in fact meet them” (Pallas, Natriello, & McDill, 1995, p 38). New was the design change of using outcomes data, principally test scores as the basis of accountability. New, too, was reliance on State-determined performance standards or benchmarks for adequate progress as well as determination by the school-site of targets and planning for attaining those performance targets in particular domains, for example reading. Additionally, states also publicly report school test scores to which consequences were increasingly attached, including the ultimate punishment, reconstitution. Elmore, Abelman, and Fuhrman (1996) also called new accountability performance-based accountability.

Fuhrman (1999) summarized research that detailed new accountability approaches as a further step beyond developing standards for student learning and aligning student assessments to those standards, that is using the achievement of those standards as a basis of accountability. Elsewhere, the author elaborates that new accountability approaches differ from prior systems on one or more of seven factors: district/school approval is tied to student performance rather than to compliance with regulations; focusing more on

schools as the unit of improvement; continuous improvement strategies that involve planning at the school-level for attaining specific performance targets; developing new approaches to classroom inspection; more levels of accreditation are being developed; school-level test-scores are being reported; and more consequences are being attached to performance levels.

The new accountability constitutes a series of related attempts to change relationships among actors in a complex government structure, public education, and entails three types of problems relating to the new system, politics, design, and implementation. Political issues derive from the finding that the system entails a new distribution of expectations, power, and authority. Such issues include constituency pressures, resource constraints, unstable policy environments, and lack of public understanding. Constituency pressures refer to pressures on decision-makers to change or delay aspects of the system. Resource constraints refers to the finding that human and fiscal resources to do all that is required are often lacking. Political stability refers to change in political leadership, change of heart, and change in the public mood. Understanding refers to misconceptions by the public of the intent of the system and the technical challenge policymakers have in explaining them in way to inspire public confidence (Elmore, Abelman, & Fuhrman, 1996).

Design issues arise especially around the finding that design brings a demanding set of conceptual and technical issues. Conceptual issues include understanding how to measure educational performance when a change is aimed for that leaves behind the testing for recall of discrete bits of information and embraces testing whether students understand and can apply information to complex problems. Technical issues relate to

questions as to whom to hold accountable, for what level of performance, on the basis of what types of performance indicators, with what consequences. Key elements of the design include why children should be expected to perform (Elmore, Abelman & Fuhrman, 1996).

Implementation imposes new demands on policymakers and practitioners. For example, teachers are getting used to new testing regimes at the same time that they are expected to use the results of these tests to change what and how they teach. The coordination of simultaneous changes may be demanding (Cossentino, 2004a). Further, whether design on paper matches the State's ability to implement it is tested (US Commission on Civil Rights, 2004). Also, the question of incentives for student performance is raised, for example the perception of fairness of the system and States' technical capacity to improve low performers (Elmore, Abelman & Fuhrman, 1996).

It must be stated here, however, that political problems as portrayed by the authors are limited to "outsiders" of the system. While this study recognizes the politics of outsiders in the case of the new accountability, it focuses on the politics of insiders, specifically those who inhabit the technical core of schools, that is, teaching and learning. This study uses a different heuristic for categorizing design and technical issues. In other words, in this study of knowledge production, attention is being reflexively drawn to a theory of knowledge within the new accountability that constructs closed conceptual boundaries among the constructs politics, the technical, design, and implementation (Tyler, 1969). Specifically, attention is drawn to the fact that in this study a theory of power is used in which disciplinary power as enacted in matters of policy design and implementation is analyzed as part of the political processes by which knowledge is

constructed and distributed in modern society. Next, challenges to the new accountability are discussed.

Challenges Facing the New Accountability

Moving forward, Elmore, Abelman, and Fuhrman (1996) saw five challenges facing new accountability systems, namely making systems understandable, resolving issues of fairness, focusing incentives for improvement, State capacity, and political stability. Because these challenges are relevant to this study, they are presented next.

Issues of understandability.

The new systems appeared to be technically more demanding and complex than process type accountability systems. This is because the new systems characteristically required measures and systems of evaluation that led to further problems. For example, new accountability systems are difficult for even policymakers and educators to understand and call for constant revision in the early stages. It was therefore necessary to make those systems understandable to both insiders and outsiders (Elmore, Abelman, & Fuhrman, 1996).

Issues of fairness.

The new systems also raise issues of fairness that are politically and technically complex. “The central issue is the extent to which schools or districts should be rewarded or penalized for student performance, without regard for the prior knowledge or social background of their students” (Elmore, Abelman, & Fuhrman, 1996, p. 93).

Issues of focus.

The new systems potentially faced challenges of focus. An underlying belief that drives the new accountability is that States should reform their relations with schools

away from traditional oversight, which could be characterized as passive to creating incentives for improving student learning. Further, from the point of view of design and implementation, it was found that outcomes regulation (new accountability) did not replace so much as displace regulations (old accountability). Mandates to teach specific topics, for example, were retained. Moreover, the new systems featured no consequences for students and therefore were not designed to motivate students in spite of the recognition that education is co-produced by teachers and students (Elmore, Abelman, & Fuhrman, 1996).

Issues of State capacity.

The new systems faced the challenge of uncertainty of the State's capacity to maintain reform efforts. New systems were characterized as high-maintenance and therefore required technical expertise in assessment, evaluation, and assisting districts and schools in improving (Elmore, Abelman, & Fuhrman, 1996). It was not clear whether States were willing or capable of making those investments.

Issues of political stability.

Finally, the presence of stable political environments for reform posed a challenge. As stated above, new systems are technically complex. Further, they aim for long-term improvement. Therefore, they need sustained development and support. This makes political stability around them critical to their success (Elmore, Abelman, & Fuhrman, 1996). So how is the policy supposed to work?

Theory of Change

It will be remembered that accountability requires, "using more smartly what one has, sharpening one's focus, and increasing motivation and effort" (Cilbulka, 2003, p.

222). In general, the systems are presumed to work by pressing teachers to focus on student achievement. Summarizing a wide range of research, Fuhrman (1999) report:

Setting student achievement goals for a school helps provide teachers with a focus for their work and increases the energy devoted to instruction. New systems help channel teachers' work to the most important goals of the system, largely those included in the performance measure, which, in the cases we are studying, is student achievement in the core academic subjects. (Fuhrman, 1999, p. 3)

The new systems seemed to be working in the real world just as they were designed to, that is, by guiding teachers' focus on student achievement. Surveys of policy implementation in many States revealed that teachers positively valued the consequences in the system and these consequences did press them to emphasize boosting student achievement. Specifically, teachers placed a high premium on personal satisfaction for improving student achievement, professional recognition for doing a good job, and receiving a monetary bonus. Negative outcomes, for example, pressure on teachers to boost results, the fear of the label of a failing school, professional embarrassment, and loss of freedom, were also found to be motivational (Fuhrman, 1999).

The new systems were also found to have variable effects. The same surveys of State-level implementations found that teachers and schools were found to vary in their responses to accountability systems. Variation resulted from several factors, including immediate past reward or sanctions history and teachers' beliefs. Schools that had received rewards looked forward to receiving those rewards again; whereas, those that had faced sanctions dreaded the possibility of sanctions being visited upon them once more. Further, much of the school-level variation in response to new accountability systems was linked to individual and organizational capacities, specifically teachers'

beliefs. For example, teachers believed that their knowledge and skills and school conditions are key factors in helping to meet accountability goals. Principal leadership skills, opportunity for feedback on results, curriculum alignment, professional development, and sense of professional community at school were also identified as factors in the schools meeting their goals (Fuhrman, 1999).

It was found that accountability could be motivating, especially in the presence of enabling school-level organizational factors and teachers' shared beliefs regarding the importance of student performance. Specifically, teachers were motivated to reach a school's achievement goals if it seemed attainable by teacher effort, if it seemed that attainment of those goals would bring specified consequences, and teachers did value those consequences. Therefore, accountability affects how teachers perceive attainment of goals by bringing consequences that teachers value. The clarity of goals played a role in teachers' perception. The clearer and more understandable the goals were the more likely teachers were to think that they could achieve them. Therefore, not only do schools vary in their response to accountability systems, and not only is variation strongly associated with school and teacher capacities, "Individual teachers are strongly influenced by what they think their students can do," (Fuhrman, 1999, p. 10). In this way, the focus of the new systems was brought back to students.

Accountability and the Construction of Learning Opportunities in Classrooms

At best, specifically regarding its equity aims, the new accountability has a mixed record of successes. Higher standards have been associated with the closing of achievement gaps in local regions (Navarro & Natalico, 1999). In Maryland, however, the pattern of distribution of test scores to social class groups mirrors that of the nation as

a whole, that is, the performance of the poor and ethnic minorities is still lagging behind that of other groups (Rusk, 1998). As a result, questions persist about the power of the new accountability policy to disrupt the traditional connection between power and educational knowledge in which the less powerful also receive a disparately smaller share of the society's educational goods. Therefore, with standards, accountability systems, and testing in place nationally (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001), especially classroom teaching or the presentational aspect of teaching has emerged as the most likely place in which to investigate how the new accountability works. The classroom is the "final common pathway" (Stigler & Hiebert, 2004, p. 13) of educational reform and therefore the place to locate this study that looks at educational opportunities. As stated above, especially in the case of the practice of the new accountability, no clear distinction is possible between curriculum and teaching. This study's purpose is to analyze students' opportunities to learn. Teaching and learning are closely linked and are the specialized activities of teachers and students in classrooms. Therefore, the study focuses on classrooms while being ever mindful that teaching, curriculum, and testing interrelate dynamically. Making sense of practice, what in this study is referred to as new knowledge production or knowledge construction, is not only an emerging construct in the field of teacher research but is also a fundamental assumption of the new accountability and is discussed next.

Knowledge production defined.

Teachers were not always socially recognized as thinkers. At one point in the history of education research, teachers were invisible because they were not viewed as thinkers, just as technicians. This is no longer true; teachers are currently recognized as

producers of knowledge as is acknowledged in such constructs as that of 'reflective practice' (Schon, 1987), 'teachers as intellectuals' (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985), 'voice' (Bernstein, 1990; Freeman, 1996), and in calls for teachers' voices to be heard in debates regarding educational reform (Hanushek, 1995; Lipman, 1996). Further, not only do teachers reflect on their practice while they are in action, teachers now participate fully in more traditional forms of research, initiating inquiries into their own practice and partnering with outside researchers to whom they make their knowledge accessible. This study adopts current views of teachers as thoughtful actors in multiple arenas, including classrooms and complex contexts, including policy and social class (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985; Florio-Ruane, 2002).

Knowledge is produced by teachers in arenas other than the classroom, among peers, for example in teachers' lounges; while serving as consultants, for example during parent-teacher conferences; individually and at a time that is prior to presentation in classrooms, for example during curriculum planning and curriculum design (Cossentino, 2003). Therefore, it is necessary to define the specific terrain of this study. The site of the present study is very circumscribed. The arena that is of interest in this study is the classroom but the focus is on class activities that are part of teaching and learning in the strictest sense. Analysis focuses on unraveling interrelations between those actions by teachers and the various influences of the new accountability policy and the social class location of schools.

A novel approach to understanding teacher knowledge animates this study. In this study, the proposition that teachers construct knowledge means that they learn by doing their teaching (Britzman, 1991). The policy tools of the new accountability are not

the only resources from which individual pedagogic practice is built. Practice is also constructed from teachers' tools for teaching, including their own private and personal values. At base, therefore, this study acknowledges the view of the teacher as thinker or intellectual within classrooms and by extension within larger social environments, a view that is a legacy of critical curriculum studies (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985; Pinar et al., 1995/1996).

As suggested above, teacher thinking has been conceptualized in many ways. One result is that teacher knowledge is now understood to be rather complex. To the policy and teacher contexts that have been described above as resources for constructing pedagogy in classrooms, a third set of resources must be added. Bernstein (1990) writes of a "theory of reading" in what he calls 'invisible pedagogies' (indirect influence on students but direct influence on learning environments) in which the student is a 'text' to be read for evaluative purposes. It is primarily in that sense that the construct of teachers as producers of knowledge in classrooms is used here. The construct, knowledge production by teachers focuses on the evaluative role of teachers in assessing students' competence and performance and student's products but as a basis for launching appropriate pedagogical action. Therefore, by assuming new knowledge production, the new accountability calls for new forms of cultural capital, that is, new ways of understanding and being with students (Fuhrman, 1999). Further, the new accountability assumes that teachers will make such "new" cultural capital in the very context of its application, pedagogic practice (Gibbons, Limoges, Nowotny, Schwartzman, Scott & Martin, 1994). Knowledge production by teachers therefore implies integrative action by

teachers who not only build their practice from the resources that are provided by policy and their own knowledge but also by drawing on the students' knowledge base.

This study relies on the theory of symbolic control from which it synthesizes a definition of knowledge production by teachers in classrooms. The introduction to the study attempted both to justify and to specify the classroom as the site of the study and does not require further discussion here except to say that the classroom presents a context for transmission and acquisition of cultural capital or knowledge. That the subject of the study is teachers needs no further discussion except to point out that it is an analytic decision that gives focus to the study but does not conceptually undervalue the knowledge that education is co-produced by teachers and students. However, the term knowledge requires some discussion. This study draws on current uses of the term in teacher research (Florio-Ruane, 2002) in which knowledge is tacit and explicit, being done through action, both symbolic (through language both oral and written as well as through other symbol systems) and physical (management of space, learning resources, etc.). However, the analytical framework of the study uses a peculiar view of the concept.

In Bernstein (1971, 1993, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000), teaching is the central activity of the socialization function of schools where teaching is social interaction that is done through linguistic interaction that has as its aim the transmission of cultural capital. In this view, the teacher's role is that of transmitter of knowledge. Knowledge therefore includes accounts (stories, explanations, theories), affect (expectation, credibility), intention (plans, procedures), and cognition (making sense) and comprises tacit (unspecified) as well as explicit (specified) knowledge. However, not only do the

teacher's characteristics have implications for the transmission of knowledge, the analytical framework explains that the pupil acts as a selective mechanism on the type of transmission in which he can participate, and in turn the type of transmission has its own selective principle for who can acquire it. Knowledge by teachers in classrooms amounts to local knowledge, which implies acting in a manner that is appropriate to one's social and pedagogical context. In that sense, teacher knowledge encompasses more than pedagogical content knowledge, which is the individual's command of traditions by which education knowledge is transmitted, but also integrates a teacher-specific application of knowledge of students, a teacher's capacity to respond to the social and knowledge characteristics of the student as well as a critique of the tools of pedagogy.

That teacher knowledge is produced means that it embeds social ideologies or ways of seeing the social world, for example regarding the role of social class signals (for example, parental participation in schooling) in indicating student's ability to acquire certain forms of cultural capital. In this study, teachers' production of knowledge is indicated by visible (traditional) and invisible (constructivist) practice. Each practice embeds views of the social world. Analysis will focus on describing knowledge production by teachers in terms of visible or invisible practice, reading the educational ideologies they embed, and interpreting the social consequences of visible or invisible practice for confirming or transforming students' identity, regulating cognitive orientation, dispositions (in acquiring codes, principles of order are adopted), and practices in association with the local pedagogy of the home. The interrelation of student context with the home integrates yet another key concept of the study, namely social class, which is described next.

Social class defined.

This study relies on the theory of symbolic control for defining social class. This results in a definition of social class that comprises two autonomous aspects of social class, namely power and social control. The parallel concepts of power and social control and by definition social class pervade the theory of symbolic control. However, the approach to these terms is rather novel, being closest to a conceptualization of disciplinary power in which power and social control are immanent, being inscribed within the forms of transmission that Bernstein constructs, namely boundary, frame, classification, code, and modes of pedagogic practice. Power is inscribed in voice, that is, forms of organization of educational knowledge whereas social control is inscribed in the materialization of voice in the teaching relationship which is the message (Atkinson, 1985).

The embodiment of power and social control therefore constructs forms of communication. Being linguistic forms and by extension vehicles of thought, these forms of communication constitute and construct consciousness. Through their variation, forms of communication as constitutive of consciousness in turn position individuals and groups in inter-group situations. They therefore, not only regulate speakers in relation to each other but also in relation to the forms of communication in which each is positioned (Atkinson, 1985). To illustrate, as will be discussed in Chapter II, working class Samoans not only entertain difficult concrete pedagogical relations with Australian teachers, they are also disadvantaged (cut off) from and by the pedagogy (and the knowledge it makes available) that is embodied within their Australian teachers (Singh, 2001).

For Bernstein, then, power is conceived as the working of ‘boundaries’ and ‘positions’ and as the difference between ‘thinkable’ and ‘unthinkable.’ Therefore, power constructs voice or knowledge just as control shapes the message. Power is therefore a relationship, but not a simple one: it is multifaceted, diffuse, and everywhere. Power is not separate from other social relationships, for example of knowledge or production but flows within them (Atkinson, 1985).

The implication of this view is that power is tied to ideology or consciousness. This link is critical to the analytical framework’s explanation of educational inequality. The link is at the foundation of both inequality in education and in society. School and society both have a division of labor. Both divisions are constructed from boundaries of insulation between categories (curricular, social) and the boundaries are more or less continuous across both spheres. Persons occupy places in the social division of labor as a result of power’s positioning. Power, however, is encoded in language. This definition makes possible the integration of social class, race, and gender (Atkinson, 1985).

Social class therefore refers to modes of power as inscribed in voice and modes of social control as inscribed in messages that realize voice. The conditions of one’s occupation that are classically seen as constitutive of social class are thus resources for the construction of social class membership. The new middle class exercises the function of capital (control and surveillance) without being part of that capital-owning class. Independently, power and control define class relations through which groups try to monopolize resources and opportunities for their own benefit and deny the same to others, non-members (Jary & Jary, 1991).

Class fractions that control specialized principles of communication that are applied directly to the means of physical resources and those that control principles that are applied to discursive resources are distinguished. A concept of the social division of labor of symbolic control was derived from this distinction. Agents of symbolic control or production could function in the field of symbolic control, the cultural field, or economic field. Ideological orientation, interests, and modes of cultural reproduction would be related to economic functions of the agents (symbolic control or production), field location (economic, cultural, symbolic) and hierarchical position (political)(Bernstein, 1990).

In that perspective, there appears to be no individuals only processes by which subjects are selectively created and constrained in and by the process of their creation. The subject never seems to act to create meanings, purposes, struggle with beliefs, to negotiate or change the given order. It privileges transmissions, their social costs, and the basis for change but the individual is not the basic unit of analysis, rather the social relation of teacher and student is, yet it focuses on controls. The perspective focuses on the construction of rules that generate discourse (Bernstein, 1990). However, whereas the principles of description were not meant to study the, “full choreography of the interaction” in classrooms or portray the “full repertoire of arabesques of interaction” (Bernstein, 1990, p. 6) they are assumed to be capable of describing such aspects that relate to classroom interaction, their organizational context, and their relation to external agencies, for example family and work. They show how the social class background of pupils acts selectively on the form and content of pedagogy. The concepts are able to

generate fine-grained descriptions of micro-social interactions in classrooms and as well as their relation to macro-social phenomena (Bernstein, 1990).

Therefore, thanks to the insights of critical curriculum studies (Apple, 1992, 2000b; Aronowitz & Giroux, 1986; Freire, 1972) in this study, accountability, knowledge production, and social class are understood to interact in intricate ways. Social class serves as a variable that stratifies the sample in this study: of the two schools that participate in the study, one is categorized as working class and the other is categorized as middle class. It will be remembered that in this study, middle class is the designation for students who live in households whose annual income places them above the poverty line (\$34, 000 in 2003-2004). Such students may derive a relative educational advantage from their social status in comparison with their poorer peers. In concert with teachers' responses to the calls by policymakers to change their practice in order to better serve the poor, acknowledgement of the subtle cultural nuances of social class are assumed to differentiate local knowledge or spur new knowledge production by teachers in classrooms. As suggested earlier, pedagogic practice is constructed not only from policy resources and teacher knowledge but also from students' activities.

Several definitions of social class exist (Anyon, 1981; Lareau, 2000; McNeil, 2000). For example, for Anyon (1981), social class is a series of relationships to several aspects of the processes by which goods, services, and culture are produced. Social class comprises relationships to the system of ownership of physical and cultural capital, the structure of authority at work and in society, and the content and process of one's work activity. Occupational status and income do contribute to this definition. However, as Anyon describes it, each relationship is necessary but not sufficient for determining a

relation to the process of production in society. That perspective on social class as a multifaceted way of life animates this study. As such, social class is understood to shape the policymaking process, to shape organizational characteristics of schools and school-community relations, and to influence micro-social processes in the teacher-student relationship inside classrooms. In short, this view of social class makes it possible to bring knowledge production and educational policy formation into complex embedded interrelationships that are discussed next.

Embedded notions: Social class, accountability, and knowledge production.

The implications of social class for micro-social relations between teachers and students, or the politics that go on inside classrooms (as opposed to the politics of schools), are the special province of this study and will be explored more fully in Chapters II, IV, and V. However, since this study assumes that the politics of schools impact the micro-politics of classrooms, this section of the chapter sketches the policy and political contexts of schools as they pertain to the new accountability. Defining social class as a way of life, accountability as a knowledge management system, and teacher knowledge as local knowledge embeds accountability in the political dynamics of social class culture. The notion of accountability is embedded in social class power dynamics in part because accountability represents the adoption into educational culture of those social practices that evolved in modern businesses, for example forward planning, competition and tight budgeting. Social class also influences hierarchical relationships in policy formation, for example, regarding who answers to whom. This is especially relevant to teachers as public servants, that is, agents of the State. For example, the notion of knowledge production by teachers is itself in part produced by the

State's immense power to make teachers accountable. And it is not only by coercive means either. To illustrate, historically, recognizing teachers as knowledgeable, and making teachers visible in research was a step that social scientists initiated through the disciplinary power of science. Social scientists made teachers visible in order to make teachers answer to the social science community for teachers' activities in classrooms as well as to answer to the teacher education policy community, specifically the credentialing authorities (Florio-Ruane, 2002). Therefore not only does accountability derive from social class power relations between policymakers and educators but it also depends for its justification and realization on knowledge of teachers and teacher knowledge. As in modern jurisprudence, knowledge must precede responsibility.

Teacher knowledge, however, is a contested notion. For example, teacher knowledge would undergo a curious transformation in recent history. As was described earlier in this chapter, the accountability movement of the 1980s like its lesser-known antecedents would demand even greater accountability from teachers. In demanding greater accountability, however, the later movement seemed to reverse historical course by not elevating the cognitive autonomy of teachers as a principle but by submitting teacher knowledge to new forms of regulation (NCEE, 1983) that would arguably not be thinkable or politically feasible with more powerful physicians.

In the nineteen-nineties, teachers and college educators would take a classed view of the accountability movement by re-invigorating a teacher research movement in the US (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999) in part to counter what they perceived as the resurgence of elite business class control within that educational movement (Florio-Ruane, 2002). In other words, accountability, too, is a contested notion. The irony that

while the economy or production was being deregulated education or reproduction was being re-regulated seemed to justify such a classed reading of events in those two spheres (Bourdieu, 1991). Further legitimating a classed reading of events surrounding the new accountability, curriculum theorists observed that in the era of post-industrialization teachers faced the same fate as industrial laborers, deskilling (Apple, 2000b). Deskilling implies knowledge production because it involves a narrowing of the range of activities in which the teacher's cognition would be deployed, this on account of arrangements in which the role of teachers as curriculum makers as well as larger roles as intellectuals in relation to the wider society would be displaced towards others, leaving teachers discretion over a rather narrow repertoire of skills, mainly presentation. As will be argued in Chapter II, deskilling of teachers seems to damage teachers' identity, specifically their sense of self-efficacy. The intricate intersections of the key constructs of the study, accountability, social class, and knowledge production therefore acknowledge the teacher research, policy studies, curriculum studies, and sociological research traditions in American education, a mix of which defines the terrain of this study.

This study investigates the role of a policy intervention, the knowledge management system that is the new accountability whose intent is to induce behavioral change in teachers or the production of new knowledge so that social class may be overcome as a historical barrier to quality and equitable public education. Teacher change in terms of the conceptual lens of the study, knowledge production, implies teacher learning in so far as the policy seeks to extend teachers' apprenticeship in teaching beyond initial teacher preparation. Induced by the new accountability, in theory,

the teacher learns to see, to think, to speak, to act in new ways towards knowledge, its transmission, and most of all its recipients, specifically the poor. Therefore, teacher learning and teacher change are understood in this study to occur in the nexus of frames of self, students, and the policy. The notion of nexus is made possible through the concept of cosmology. Teachers have a cosmology, a unique system of principles or beliefs, assumptions and attitudes that go beyond theories of cognition or philosophies of curriculum design and into which they integrate proposals for change to practice. Cosmology includes universal questions regarding the purpose of knowledge and pedagogical questions regarding the teacher's role in linking pedagogy and philosophy (Cossentino, 2004). It is argued in this study that accountability as a whole, not so much in its aim to redo the social distribution of knowledge to working class students as in the subtle embodied ways that it expects teachers as middle class individuals to do so, touches on core values in the culture of social class in America, specifically merit and efficiency. By touching teachers' core values, accountability impels teachers to confront personal beliefs, values, identities, and practices in their cosmology with potential for deep cognitive dissonance. Thus cosmology provides a schema for integrating old and new behaviors in professional educational practice that may be subsumed under the concept of relative autonomy. Relative autonomy explains that schools have their own effects, for example by creating forms of knowledge and culture, that are not directly related to the economy or society (Apple, 1992; Bernstein, 1990).

Researchers have long described the professional socialization of teachers into unique disciplinary frames of mind as weak or shallow as compared for example to that of physicians (Foucault, 1995). Weak professional socialization probably explains why

teaching draws on dispositions regarding merit, efficiency, etc. that are widely shared within larger cultures (Stigler & Hiebert, 2004), for example social class. Teaching still enacts its unique practices of power and its forms of thinking. Cosmology does not deny that teaching is relatively autonomous (Bernstein, 1990) from other social institutions. Schools are still a specialized social institution with its own language, namely curriculum. However, as will be discussed further in Chapter II, cosmology reconceptualizes a key concept of accountability policy, namely curriculum alignment.

In this study, cosmology or conceptual unity is achieved through Bernstein's (1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000) theory, a theory that was once hailed as a harbinger of methodological integration of structure and agency and of macro- and micro-social relations (Harker & May, 1993). A theoretical discussion of the study's analytical framework is provided in Chapter II. A more specific enumeration of the goals of the study closes the present chapter.

The Study

As was stated above, social class is scarcely a topic of rational discourse in America. This study responds to a documented need to investigate working and middle class students in their educational, family, and work contexts (Apple, 1992; Holton, 2003; Jencks, 1998; Horvat, Weininger, & Lareau, 2003; Sadovnik, 1991, 2001) as a method for watching the social construction of academic achievement. More specifically, it heeds calls for research to empirically investigate the link between content and teaching and teaching and learning opportunity that has been assumed by the policy (Fuhrman, 1999; Hambleton et. al, 2000). Therefore in response, the study places the story of the implementation of the new accountability policy within a theory of educational

stratification that is derived from the British sociologist of education, Basil Bernstein (1924-2000). Bernstein's (1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000) theory of symbolic control is built up from an analysis of the central construct 'boundary,' which refers to the degree of insulation between curriculum contents and between teacher and learner. Boundaries in formal teaching may be visible (explicit or traditional) or invisible (implicit or constructivist) as opposed to the tacit relations in modeling in which a goal is seldom specified. Be they explicit or implicit, boundaries are the building blocks of the basic rules by which pedagogy is constructed, regulating whether teacher or student is at the center of teaching, how teaching is sequenced, how fast learning should be, and what counts as legitimate knowledge. Explicitness of boundaries and rules ritualizes teaching, making it visible. Implicitness fosters invisibility, the semblance of naturalness in pedagogy. Forms of pedagogy have cultural, social, and economic costs and therefore assume an arrangement of resources that only certain groups in a class society may meet. Therefore, Bernstein's theory looks not so much at representation in the content of curriculum as at, "the implicit ideological basis of the pedagogic relay itself, that is, the bias in the relay which acts selectively on those who can acquire what is relayed" (Bernstein, 1990, p. 79, emphasis in the original). Contained within the theory of symbolic control and at the center of the theory of educational stratification is a theory of pedagogic practice that provides a standard language of sociological description for the objects and processes in dialogical construction of pedagogical practice between teachers and students in classrooms. The study consists of gathering observational data on teaching in classrooms, translating them into that standard language of sociological

description, and analyzing their implications for academic performance. Visibility and performance are related in ways that are unraveled in Chapter II.

Bernstein's (1990) notion of visibility allows this study to relate outcomes accountability (or test-score accountability, policymakers steering schools by results or schools answering for students' test scores) and process accountability. Statewide high-stakes tests are administered once a year in every elementary grade level in March. Test results are released at the end of the school year in June. Therefore, test score accountability of the statewide variety may be compared to steering with one's eyes on the rearview mirror; by the time the results are published the students have moved on to another grade and teacher. Psychometric design qualities of the test itself, of the use of one test in making high-stakes decisions, of the separation of those who teach and those who test aside, William Deming (as cited in Walton, 1986) has drawn attention to the possible negative impact on quality of the following practice that is embedded in the new accountability, the delay between administration and publication of results. By not using data in real time, test accountability may be reactive; it may not make quality a systemic therefore continuous process. Rather, it seeks to improve ongoing processes on the basis of data that are collected about finished products. As suggested above, leveraging deep and sustainable behavioral change in teachers is more than a central goal of accountability reform: it is a condition sine qua non of success. Although teaching lends itself poorly to bureaucratic control, building principals, parents, teachers, and students continuously monitor teaching processes. Yet, researchers and policymakers know little about classroom-level process accountability that occurs in real-time. Their knowledge is hampered in part because of a lack of standard sociological descriptions for teaching. In

this study, the construct of knowledge production that is conceptualized with Bernstein's theory of pedagogic practice makes visible process accountability at the classroom level. As stated above, knowledge production is formulating messages. The theory of symbolic control explains the medium of teaching as a message system and the form of the message as an ideological formation that selects its receivers and creates subjectivities. If researchers know little about process accountability at the classroom level, the connection of teaching processes to test scores is even less well understood. Therefore, educational researchers want to know, for instance, how a policy that in theory works by standardization in practice leads to differential consequences by social class. Policymakers, advocates of various student sub-groups (Advocates for Children and Youth, 2003, 1999, 1998; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2004) and educators (American Federation of Teachers, 2003, 1995) seek remedial strategies. This requires conceptual tools for looking into classrooms. It is assumed that Bernstein's (1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000) theory of pedagogic practice offers these tools not only for looking into classrooms but also for making sense of the findings.

This study looks into classrooms and focuses on the patterned activities of two real teachers. Their activities are embedded in their respective classroom learning cultures. Mrs. Mason and Mr. Randolph are two fifth grade reading teachers. Mrs. Mason of Sunnyside Elementary School is a veteran teacher who has been in the field for twenty-five years. Mr. Randolph is a college-educated novice teacher. Both serve supportive principals who are aware of their skills and commitment. Both are teaching to the new state standards of Maryland. This, however, is not a study of teachers' learning the new standards although the teachers' learning to teach to the new standards (Heaton,

2000) may be inferred from their history as classroom reforms of teacher practice not of teacher preparation. This is not a study of teacher change under the new accountability although the change that Mrs. Mason has gone through may be similarly inferred. This is not a study of teachers' intentions or of departmental culture (see Bramblett, 2004).

Teachers were neither shadowed in teachers' lounges and parent-teacher-conferences nor were parents observed and interviewed in households (Lareau, 2000). This is not a study of teachers' lives in community (See Henry, 1998). Rather, this is a study of the slice of teachers' work that is their classroom practice. Specifically, this is a study of two teachers' local knowledge as created and simultaneously used in the nexus of students' knowledge base, teachers' knowledge of their students, teachers' knowledge of subject matter, teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, and teachers' knowledge of educational context, specifically accountability-related educational change. Regarding the subject of this study, Mrs. Mason put it best. In explaining to her students what she does as a teacher implementing a two year-old reform, in other words as a teacher whose context-tied and context-dependent knowledge base was developed over many years of practice is potentially invalidated overnight by a new policy context, she would tell them, "I have to do the same thing you do. They don't give this [slide on overhead projector] to me." It is evident from these words that regarding her identity as teacher Mrs. Mason considers herself a producer of new knowledge.

Mr. Randolph sees himself similarly. He is happy to talk about the newspaper reading unit he has initiated based on his diagnosis of the students' unfamiliarity with the medium. In saying, "When I teach you, I teach you standards," to dissuade an eager student from independently forging ahead with his work, Mr. Randolph is not professing

his lack of autonomy: he is placing his autonomy in the context of guidelines to which a wider community of practice seeks to adhere. It is that contextualized deployment of knowledge, of expertise as embedded in policy and social contexts (Shulman, 1987) that the eager student though well-intentioned could not possibly emulate. Therefore, the State's policy "standards" or guidelines do not negate Mr. Randolph's teaching expertise anymore than the conventions of fixed form poetry, say the sonnet or limerick that Mr. Randolph will teach later, negate the poet's originality. This, therefore, is a study of the interrelation between what is given to teachers on the one hand (policy supports, for example, Content Standards), students with their own funds of knowledge and dispositions and what on the other hand is not. Consequently, what is not given is simultaneously created and used in the context of its very application, the classroom. This is what Hanushek (1995) reads as the policy's intent. Therefore, the implication here is that these teachers are model practitioners of a pedagogy of accountability. In fact, both teachers constantly verbalize their accountability to their students, emphasizing that they think and learn just like their students do. "I have to do the same thing you do," says Mrs. Mason. "I have guidelines," boasts Mr. Randolph. On March 30, Mr. Randolph gives the following account of his efforts to get reading materials for his class. "The stores were closed this morning," he says. "So I had to go to CVS [the local pharmacy chain] but CVS only had eleven papers." This study is about what Mrs. Mason and Mr. Randolph have to do in creative conversation with students, peers, parents, community and policymakers; part listening, part following, part innovation, and part improvisation. Needed therefore was an analytical model in which teaching was context sensitive, responding dialogically for example to students' questions, interests, their

knowledge base, their capacity for regulating their own learning as well as being susceptible to long term change, for example in response to policy levers.

In Bernstein (1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000), a theory of curriculum was selected in which language served as a model system. The history of the English Language illustrates this potential of speech to be sensitive to context and amenable to externally induced change. Print, dictionaries, etc. by fixing language conventions influence continuous face-to-face conversation and technologies and policies lead to language change, for example, standardization over the long term. Speech is language-in-use. Speech is both context-sensitive and subject to external influences. In this study, therefore, language serves as a model for curriculum, voice, or forms of organizing knowledge in the abstract whereas speech serves as the model system for teaching, the message or materialization of voice.

The field of sociolinguistics models teaching as speech. In the sociolinguistic perspective, teaching is therefore context-tied and context-dependent, mediating the dialogical interaction of students, the symbolic action of families, and policymakers. Thanks to a sociolinguistic analytical framework in this study teaching is conceptualized as a form of dialogue; teaching practice is conceptualized as production of local knowledge. That it is conceptualized as a form of dialogue means that knowledge production constitutes action, both symbolic and physical. Local knowledge is embedded in and responsive to cultural context. The classroom, school building, and school system are the immediate settings in which these teachers work. However, both teachers are members of several political and cultural communities, including profession, neighborhood, social class, etc. From a linguistic perspective, membership implies

meaningful or meaning-making interaction. Specifically, this is a study of the consequences of the new accountability for shaping the conversation in class by providing some of the standard symbolic tools by which the message system is to be constructed and of social class as particularizing this conversation by contributing its own array of symbolic, social, and economic tools for the construction of pedagogy. Also contributing to the conversation is the teacher who mediates both policy and student contexts. Therefore, more than a study of curriculum, this is a study in the sociology of public educational knowledge.

As stated above, the new accountability is designed to foster behavioral changes in the ways in which teachers produce knowledge. As suggested above, it is effective in that regard. For instance, these two teachers self-monitor. “What I did last night was to type up your poetry,” says Mrs. Mason. Elsewhere, she says, “I am going to take all the Wordmasters [worksheets] because that’s what I am going to do over Spring Break.” On another occasion, Mrs. Mason comments, “Now, put on top of the pile the reflections of Secret Garden (Burnett, 1987) and One Eyed Cat (Fox, 1984),” adding, “What’s four times thirty? Am I not a good girl? I read a hundred and twenty.” In so doing, Mrs. Mason is underlining her accountability for the hours of work she puts into grading and preparation for class that would otherwise remain hidden away from the public gaze of students, parents, principals, and policymakers. In demonstrating their accountability to self, these teachers demonstrate that the very logic of accountability has penetrated the ethos of their private lives. In short, these teachers do not resist the new accountability. They appear to have been re-socialized into its habits of mind. They have learned and they have changed their teaching. Society asks that they have equally high expectations

for their students regardless of social class origin and they do. They answer to policymakers' calls: they are active members of a larger and normalized standards-driven learning community with its own largely theoretical discourse.

As part of that larger community, these teachers are mindful of their peers on the teaching staffs of their present schools. As members of a standards-driven learning community, they are mindful of the system as a whole and strive to give it coherence. Certainly, they are fifth-grade teachers but their students graduate to middle school and so they are mindful of the teachers who staff the middle schools (6th-8th grade) that their graduates will enter. Of character traits that they are studying, Mrs. Mason states, "I think it will help you next year in middle school, in reading class." As shown above, they answer to their profession, for example, subscribing to and reading education journals. They are mindful of the commitment of the principals who monitor their accountability on the processes they use, of students, their parents, community, and employers. They answer to the county/school district from which they received training in curriculum materials at the start of the year by using those teaching models including Literature Response, Grammar, and the Change Matrix. They answer to the State that provides curriculum frameworks by teaching to those content guidelines.

Yet, these teachers are part of an even smaller community, one that is constructed with and by their students with the aim of doing teaching and learning. The language of this community is pedagogy. It is constructed from rules that are hardly explicated but by which content that is off the topic is constructed, by which communication that is inappropriate to the classroom will prompt Mrs. Mason to tell her student to think of his comment further, by which a student is evaluated as being ready to learn a specific

content. To be imbued with these rules is what is meant by expertise and it is embedded not only in policy and teacher cosmology but also within the student's knowledge base. Structuring this knowledge base in a significant way is the concept of social class especially in its newer associations with control over social and cultural capital. It will be argued that disparate stocks of social and economic capital explain why these two teachers' efforts end in disparate results as measured by statewide standardized test scores. Their students had taken the Maryland State Assessment (MSA) over three days in the middle of March, 2004. Subsequently, I visited with them over twenty teaching days in March and April. Just as analysis of the data was starting, the state of Maryland released its grade level results on statewide standardized tests. The fifth grade students at Fairweather Elementary School at which Mr. Randolph taught posted significantly lower scores than their grade level peers at Sunnyside Elementary School where Mrs. Mason is a teacher. Mrs. Mason's school serves a predominantly middle class student body, whereas Mr. Randolph's school serves a predominantly working class group. Taken as representatives of their social classes, the two groups' scores are a microcosm of the wastage of working class educational potential that was presented above. It is not, however, a failing of the teachers' intentionality. Rather, this study points to a systemic flaw in conceptions of reform by educational policy that illuminates the peculiar role of resources in the theory of how education works. In the discussion of knowledge production, above, it was suggested that the practical assumption of the new accountability is that teachers simultaneously create and deploy new knowledge or new forms of cultural capital in their practice. This means that the practical costs of the new accountability in classrooms are borne primarily by teachers. Further, the analytical

model (Bernstein, 1990) suggests that pedagogical forms have social and specifically social class assumptions that to the extent they may not be met by all families may act to select schools that will enact those pedagogical forms. The contribution of this study is that it uses empirical data to illustrate those processes and effects.

This study seeks to explain this quality, equity, and security problem that is the wastage of working class educational potential (Anyon, 1981). It innovates by including the discourse of standardization of knowledge in schools but also goes beyond discourse in constructing that explanation. It draws its analytic net around teachers and students' actions in classrooms and the realities of disparities in economic and cultural resources in families, neighborhoods, and society. Unlike many studies that explain test score differentials by reference only to what goes on inside schools, this study maps the cultural sphere or what goes on inside schools onto the economic life of communities. Far from directing the gaze away from the core activities of schooling, however, that look outside only sharpens the view of what goes on inside classrooms when learning is under construction. In the final analysis, however, the approach maintains its distinctness from other sociological approaches by going from the bottom-up. The analysis begins with empirical data on the nature of the local pedagogical practice in two schools. Findings from data that are collected in classrooms then serve as map and compass in the search for data on schools, families, and work. The result is a report that draws on social science methods to illuminate curriculum as it is enacted in policy reform processes.

This study tells a story of the new accountability policy formation from the stage of interest articulation but emphasizes policy implementation, the primary site in which according to the analytic model (Bernstein, 1990), opportunities for learning are defined.

Then it presents that story within a theory of educational stratification. This study demonstrates that the new accountability is a localized response to the need to regulate labor and citizenship processes. The need for regulation emanates in the economic, cultural, and political shifts of the globe. Traditional policy and curriculum studies frame educational reform in only global and national contexts. In so doing, they perpetuate the fiction of national unity into the sphere of culture: the State bears markings of the interest of the powerful. Rather, this study implies a theory of State that portrays the public sphere as a complex zone in which social class-based interest and action are at work. Therefore, this study recognizes that social class is a force that helps to decide what issues enter the sphere of public policy, the agenda, and how it is to be pursued. However, the innovation in the design of this study is to pursue this research perspective into the technical core or pedagogical device that delivers the new accountability policy in classrooms, knowledge production by teachers and students in classrooms.

Interrogating the technical core or pedagogical device of the new accountability is innovative in the sense that it reduces a blind spot of the new accountability. Earlier, resources were presented as a blind spot of the new accountability. It was argued above that the policy hardly saw resources, specifically economic capital resources as playing a key role in its implementation. That blind spot has grave implications for the policy. The argument is that the new accountability also fails to see instruction (Cibulka & Boyd, 2003). It states that, "All children can learn," (MSDE, p.1) but the teaching strategies and the social assumptions for those strategies are not specified. The rationale for not specifying a pedagogy is that, "Available research has yielded little specific guidance on how to boost quality through standard regulatory and spending policies;" therefore,

policy should, “specify end goals, provide carrots and sticks related to them, and harness the energies of the actors in the system, but they would not specify how individual schools should achieve these goals” (Hanushek, 1995, pp. 227-228, 239). In other words, this blind spot is a rational strategy of the policy. It is a counterbalance to the heavy centralization in the policy; it is a concession to local control, flexibility, and creativity. This is how Maryland State Superintendent Grasmick explains why state accountability sees or at least specifies no instructional method:

The imperative to change may derive from national and even global forces, but it can only be achieved at the local level. ‘What we are trying to do,’ as Marshall Smith, of Stanford University, has said, ‘is develop the system so it can support really serious local creativity in the context of a common vision. (MSDE, p. 1)

This study specifies the new accountability’s blind spot even further. Not only does the new accountability not see the role of teacher cultural capital (teacher and student knowledge bases) resources in instruction, it also does not see the role of social and economic capital resources in instruction. So focused is the pressure for performance across civilian communities and governments that Pallas et al. assert, “In effect, policymakers are saying to local personnel, ‘We don’t care how you meet these standards, as long as you do in fact meet them’” (Pallas, Natriello, & McDill, 1995, p. 38). This study makes visible instruction as the technical machinery of the new accountability and specifies the cultural, economic, and social assumptions that undergird it. In so doing, first and foremost, this study contributes to theory.

Research purposes.

As stated above, the study’s primary purpose is theoretical. Research purposes are about “understanding something” (Maxwell, 1996, p. 16) and in this study, they are

applied to the theory of symbolic control. The study pursues the following theoretical purposes regarding the theory of educational stratification that the general theory of symbolic control provides to this study (Bernstein's (1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000). In the search for an explanation of the disparity between middle class and working class students described above, the theory of symbolic control was a point of departure. This selection raises problems of its own resolution of which may be organized into four research purposes: (1) systematically deriving and applying an analytical framework from Basil Bernstein's theory of symbolic control, (2) testing the theory through empirical investigation, (3) refining with a view to constructing and deploying a more transparent notion of social class within the theory, and (4) elucidating elements of a dialectical model of pedagogy that is capable of conceptually integrating a language of critique and a language of possibility, that is, domination and liberation, social reproduction and transformation. Practical purposes of the study are presented next.

Practical purposes.

Consistent with the applied tradition in education, this study also pursues a practical purpose, which is about, "accomplishing something" (Maxwell, 1996, p. 16) and includes policy and educational practice purposes. For example, Sadovnik (1991) calls for application of Bernstein's analytical model to educational policy and educational change such as the new accountability and for the need to bring the findings into the public debate on accountability. This, argues Sadovnik, would bring empirical and theoretical foundation to the debate on accountability in order to provide data to policymakers on several issues regarding the new accountability. Such are the aims of this study: deriving an analytical framework from the theory of symbolic control, and

applying that framework to the elucidation of current debates regarding the new accountability. One dominant theme regarding the new accountability is that the reform exacerbates test score disparities by social class by promoting “management pedagogies” (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985, pp. 28-29), and by promoting direct instruction (Meier, 2002). A second theme is that the new accountability deskills teachers (McNeil, 2000). Discussion points in these themes, however, touch on descriptions of the ways in which teachers transmit the knowledge that is codified in curriculum guides, for example, whether content is illustrated or explained in class. Illustrations may, for instance, bridge students’ knowledge base with prescribed content. These and other pathways to the construction of the class gap will be investigated using Bernstein’s theory of pedagogic practice.

It was shown above that the new accountability is an extremely complex organizational system. The sociological theory from which the analytical framework is derived is also known for its structural complexity. Here is how the theory will be put into practice in this study. Although the key concept code may spark notions of conspiracy or hidden messages, the policy tools of the new accountability will not be the object of final analysis in the study and especially not for the codes they embed. To do so would be to attribute the status of message to the new accountability where the analytical framework categorizes it as a voice to be materialized in concrete messages. Rather, the object of the study will be a practice or message of the accountability voice, specifically the pedagogic practice of two teachers in real school contexts. The analytical framework explains that learning opportunities are created in the message not the voice of cultural transmissions. That message and voice of the new accountability are

connected is an empirical question to be answered using real school data. This is therefore to emphasize that the object of the study, the object of final analysis on which the answer to the research question is based is the message or practice that teachers construct from the voice of the new accountability. The practice will provide data for answering a “how” question, specifically, how is knowledge and by extension learning opportunities created and socially distributed in a real school context. The answer to this “how” question will then be the object of analysis for determining why learning opportunities are distributed unequally in the real school context. These aims describe a theoretical study albeit a theoretical study that addresses urgent empirical questions.

Rationale

As illustrated in the statement of purposes above, this study responds to a documented need by authorities in the field of education (Apple, 1992; Holton, 2003; Sadovnik, 1991, 2001). Therefore, this study is interesting because it explores the nexus between power and knowledge in which knowledge is a form of power. Social class as a carrier of power and educational knowledge has had a long association in modern world history. Therefore, educational theorists, policymakers, and educators seek to understand the ways in which the new accountability policy works within specific cultural contexts (Apple, 2000a) because it is assumed here that schools help to regulate modern society. That is, schools, like hospitals and prisons, regulate belief and behavior in the modern State (Bernstein, 1971; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1995; Foucault, 1995; Turner, 1973), that they connect power and knowledge through their, “corpus of knowledge, techniques, [and] ‘scientific discourses’” (Foucault, 1995, p. 185). This is a central theoretical assumption of critical curriculum that the field must now go beyond (Liston, as cited in

Pinar et al., 1995/1996) in order to begin the more difficult work of explaining how power actually creates meaning or knowledge through curriculum. Yet, writes Apple, “Very little is known about what their [standards] effects are, especially in those schools populated by students whose achievement historically has been quite low” (2000a, pp. xv-xvi). And most poignant in this regard is that to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the launching of the Nation At Risk (1983) report, Gerald Holton (2003, p. B15), the author of the report’s famous opening, “Our nation is at risk,” identifies the very topic of this proposed study as a gap in the landmark report. Writes Holton, “We might also have dealt with an extremely difficult and important point: the interdependence among home, school, and society at large in affecting the performance of individual students, especially underprivileged ones” (). Students’ classroom experience of knowledge production in relation to the social class location of their household and school is in this study an empirical instance of what is referred to by Holton as, “the interdependence among home, school, and society” above (Holton, 2003, p. B15). This is also a recommendation by researchers (Horvat, Weininger & Lareau, 2003). Further, inequalities in job status, income, crime, and health outcomes between the rich and the poor have implications for the social integration of our democratic society.

The issue of the unequal academic outcomes of poor students and middle class students, often referred to in policy documents as “achievement gaps” is rooted in the interdependence of home and school (Holton, 2003). Test score gaps are pervasive, persistent, and subtle. They impact many areas of human activity, including health and medicine (DeWalt, Berkman, Sheridan & Pignone, 2004; Castro & Farmer, 2004). This

means that the investigation of the social construction of disparities cannot be limited to the examination of the point of delivery of those services. It must cast its investigative net widely enough to include processes that occur further upstream, for example the social assumptions of the dominant groups regarding social institutions and the social grammars of the institutions themselves.

The new accountability policy pervades the entire US, intrudes into several dimensions of education, for example, curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation and has persisted over the last twenty years. Further, as stated above, while it may be true that many Americans have heard of accountability (Lewis, 1995), its influence on learning is not fully understood. Moreover, the policy's goals are broad and sometimes self-contradictory (Apple, 2000a), further complicating understanding of its effects on learning. The following illustrates this claim of contradiction in the policy. Beyond refocusing the K-12 policy discourses on quality, the new accountability policy has redirected the neighboring discourses of teacher education towards two divergent paths, deskilling and its opposite, the postindustrial thesis among teachers and students, that is professionalization and deregulation of the teaching profession (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Murrell, 2001). The policy is also thought to relay structural transformations from the world economy to the public school classroom (Apple, 2000a) and in so doing inscribe economy-related changes on the hearts and minds of future generations of American citizens and workers. This may benefit business by contributing to the productivity of labor and therefore increase the comparative advantage of American companies. Yet, it may also raise questions about the proper role of education in a democratic society (Spring, 2001).

The new accountability policy has come under intense scrutiny because its effects on educational equity were inconsistent (McNeil, 2000). Advocates for the new accountability have argued in favor of enacting the new accountability policy on the grounds of, “equality” (Cohen, 1996, p. 101), a value that is quintessentially paradoxical in meaning. The paradox refers to the possibility that, “Equal treatment may require unequal treatment” (Stone, 1997, p. 41). Therefore, while studying large-scale policy effects is certainly a worthwhile research strategy, it is also critical that researchers understand how that curriculum actually produces those effects that are claimed for it. This understanding may then inform the practical activities of educators in the nation’s schools and classrooms.

For all the accountability movement’s scope, however, the classroom is in principle where the standards it has institutionalized make, “the most change” (Harris & Carr, 2001, p. 2). It is for this reason that the arena where its implications for change or the lack of change must be understood. Therefore, to relate the ways in which the theories and prescriptions of the new accountability are interpreted in discourse and practice within specific social class contexts and in so doing to clarify their influence on teachers’ and students’ actual practice in classrooms, the proposed study compares the principles and practices of knowledge production in two sites, one working class classroom and a middle class classroom. The methodological research literature also suggests that two classrooms offer a basis of comparison while keeping data collection manageable, thereby facilitating fine-grained analysis of data that is required by this study (Stake, 1994).

However, the decision to apply the theory was made because social class is at the center of accountability and therefore makes it a valid approach for studying the policy. As stated above, social class is a topic that is often neglected in American policy discourse. The association of social class and teaching has already been demonstrated in educational research. Social class and student scores are closely associated in America and in Maryland (MSDE, AIMMS 2001; Schulte & Keating, 2001a, 2001b). Parental involvement is associated with social class (Lareau, 2000). It is because this is already proven by prior research that this study can move on to investigate how this occurs (Rusk, 1998; AIMMS, 2001).

Several general explanations have been offered for the social class-based test-score gap. The resistance theories of Aronowitz and Giroux (1985), McLaren (1995), and Willis (1976), etc. portray students' alienation from a given educational message. This model incorporates the concept of resistance in that it discusses social status as a pathway to educational stratification. Resistance models assume a social class-based cognition that is at the root of students' alienation. Bernstein's model situates student dispositions in their material economic existence. However, whereas resistance models theorize only the message that is contained within educational structures, this model also theorizes the message system that relays that message from and in which students may become alienated (Bernstein, 1990). In theorizing the message system in relation to students' resistance, this model therefore holds promise for also generating a, "language of possibility" (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1987) or a dialectic in which the same processes of symbolic control that reproduce the social order may generate processes of change (Sadovnik, 1991).

Studies that use social capital as a lens (Croninger & Lee, 2001; Orr, 1999) focus on the nature of social bonds in education. Studies that use cultural capital as a lens (Lareau, 2000) focus on the contents and processes in relationships between school and society. However, unlike those studies, the present study conceptualizes the teacher-student relationship as a power relationship (Gore, 1993), that is, it admits the possibility of social bonds as well as of social boundaries and views relationships as mediated by a symbolic structure. Missing in theories of cultural capital is a theory of the message system or relay (Bernstein, 1990). Therefore, the theory incorporates social and cultural capital in explaining parental intervention as a pathway in educational stratification.

The result is that the model focuses on intrapsychic levels of language as a medium of thought (Cossentino, 2004a, 2004b) and effects, for example resistance, interactional processes of resistance and critical pedagogy theorists (Freire, 1972; Freire & Macedo, 2000; McLaren, 1994), incorporates institutional concerns regarding resources, school-family relations of social and cultural capital. Additionally, the model considers other questions that other models ignore, specifically the nature and functioning of the relay of educational messages and the cultural assumptions of the dominant political forces that construct them (Bernstein, 1990). The model relies on conceptualization of curriculum as a distinct symbolic structure and innovates in addressing the research question that the study addresses.

Research Question

The study analyzes the social class-based test score gap in reading under the new accountability by addressing the following question. How does social class influence academic achievement? This general question is pursued by interrogating how the new

accountability policy influences teachers and students' co-production of knowledge in local classrooms and how social class might influence teachers and students' co-production of knowledge in local classrooms.

In summary, the present chapter describes the study as an inquiry of curriculum that is enacted in classrooms undergoing new accountability-related policy reforms.

Thanks to an analytical framework in which language is the model system of curriculum, the study draws on the research methods of social science. The primary purpose of the study is theoretical and consists of investigating the possible role of the new accountability policy and social class respectively in generating a class gap in reading test scores. Central to the pursuit of its primary purpose is the proposition that the new accountability policy's practical assumption is that reform occurs when teachers produce new forms of cultural capital or new knowledge in their practice. Further, the pedagogical practice may have social class assumptions that by definition some social groups may not meet. That is, the hidden cost of the new accountability as pedagogical innovation is borne by teachers and families. Further, it is proposed that pedagogical practice has its own social class assumptions which may have the unintended consequence of selecting what schools may enact it. The rest of the chapter describes the report.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter II comprises four major sections. The first section comprises the conceptual model. Discussion of the model focuses specifically on the social class assumptions of pedagogical practice. The second is an assessment of competing analytical models. The third section comprises critical assessments of the empirical

literature that investigate the intersection of school, family, and work and education. The fourth section comprises an overview of strategies that may close the class gap. This study is informed most directly by studies that investigate the intersection of social class, the new accountability, and knowledge production by teachers in classrooms.

Chapter III comprises two major sections. The first comprises a discussion of the study's case study design. The second comprises a discussion of the study's method or the procedures by which meaning is derived in the study, namely discourse analysis.

Chapter IV is the first of two data chapters. It answers the following question. How does social class influence academic achievement? It comprises the findings regarding the power relations between working and middle class students in society and education. It evaluates the role of social class power relations in society and schools in the construction of the test score gap between Sunnyside Elementary School and Fairweather Elementary School. It contains the finding that Sunnyside Elementary School has access to greater stocks of physical and social capital and potential stocks of cultural capital than does Fairweather Elementary School.

Chapter V is the second of two data chapters. It contains a discussion of the significance of the study's findings as well as of their implications for practice, policy, and theory.

CHAPTER TWO:

EXPLICATION OF THE ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK AND ASSESSMENT OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Chapter I focused the study on the instructional act and by extension on classrooms. That focus arose from the study subject, the new accountability policy's theory of change (Fuhrman, 1999; Harris & Carr, 2001). It was suggested that the new accountability aimed to focus attention on performance and to press teachers in particular to emphasize student achievement. This focus was materialized in a number of policy tools, specifically setting student achievement goals for schools. Setting student achievement goals per school was presumed to focus teachers' work, increase motivation, and channel teachers' work on the system goals that were judged most important, specifically student achievement in reading. Further, this theory was assessed to be working because empirical studies showed that teachers were motivated, seeking to avoid the label of a failing school, professional embarrassment, and loss of school autonomy and that teachers valued the pursuit of the system's consequences, professional recognition, and personal satisfaction (Elmore, Abelman, & Fuhrman, 1996; Fuhrman, 1999).

Not all was well with the practice of the new accountability, however. There was variation in schools' responses to the policy. Variation was linked to two key factors, past reward history and teachers' beliefs. Teachers that had received rewards in the recent past seemed to be motivated whereas those that had suffered sanctions were demoralized. A second factor was teachers' beliefs. Teachers believed that their skills

and knowledge as well as school-level conditions shaped their response. A third set of factors were leadership skill of the principal and the quality of the curriculum (Fuhrman, 1999).

It was therefore argued that accountability could be motivating to teachers if the school featured enabling factors and if staff shared the belief that student performance was important. Specifically, teachers are motivated to attain student achievement goals if they believe their work will make it possible, if they believe certain consequences will follow, and if they value those consequences. The new accountability works by affecting teachers' view of goal attainment but this was not all. The clearer and more understandable the goals the more likely were teachers to believe that their attainment was possible. That is, schools vary in their response to the new accountability; variation is associated with teacher capacities, and individual teachers are influenced by what they perceive their students' capacity is (Fuhrman, 1999).

It will be remembered from Chapter I that Bernstein's (1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000) theory of symbolic control provides the analytical model for this study. This study focuses on a weak link in cultural reproduction theory, that is, the point at which micro- and macro-sociological activities are integrated. Exploration of the possession of cultural resources is rather well-developed as is explanation of the reaping of cultural profits by those who have cultural resources. It is the conversion of resources into profits that lacks explication. The theory of symbolic control brings together language, pedagogy, and social groups in order to explore this conversion. Undergirding the theory is a view of power as both freedom and constraint. Knowledge, especially educational knowledge is so constructed as are social groups.

The theory of symbolic control illustrates and extends a tradition that includes the following achievements that mirror three key assumptions of the analytic framework: curriculum and pedagogy are not neutral but contain unintended biases; knowledge is a social construction in whose formation power is a major participant; and, curriculum is a selective tradition. Taken together, these assumptions suggest that the distribution of test scores of students of pay and free/reduced priced meals status, especially in reading (See Risley & Hart, 1995) reflects the distribution of power and the principles of social control in the wider society (Bernstein, 1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000), in schools and classrooms (Bernstein 1971; Gore, 1993), and most specifically reflects the effects of micro-political relations within the discursive interactions between teachers and students (Cazden, 1986; Bernstein, 1971; Gore, 1993). Therefore, this study is grounded in strands of literature that support political and sociological approaches to curriculum (Pinar et al., 1995/1996) and socio-cultural approaches to teaching and learning.

Whereas the social-constructivist approach that is derived from the developmental psychologist Piaget frames learning as an individual activity that is merely influenced by social activity, Vygotsky-inspired socio-cultural approaches portray learning as socially situated and therefore a social process. In this study, learning as situated activity means that learning and doing are inseparable, a view that has implications for the roles of teachers and learners in relation to each other (de Cock, Slegers, & Voeten, 2004).

This study closely analyzes the roles of teachers in construction of learning opportunities in classrooms. Specifically, because this investigation regards social class as a culture, educational policy as a product that is dynamically recreated in the classroom, and school knowledge as created in between individuals, it draws on

literatures that focus on the embodiment or expression of power in small-group interactions and their causal effects on a series of outcomes (subjectivities, knowledge production, etc.) and views these outcomes as dependent variables. This chapter therefore has specific aims that are presented next.

This study seeks to analyze the interrelation among the new accountability, the social class location of the student body, and knowledge production by teachers in classrooms. First, the chapter presents an assessment of social and capital theory frameworks for investigating educational inequality. Second, it presents and assesses the analytical framework that serves as a guide to the questions, procedures, and methods in this study. Each of these two sections contains an assessment of what is already known about the interactions among these three constructs, social class, the new accountability policy, and knowledge production by teachers in classrooms. What is known about the inter-institutional linkages among a triad of institutions, namely school, family, and work as they relate to policy formation and the construction of learning opportunities is also assessed in order to map the terrain of the study and to pinpoint areas that may be explored afresh in this investigation. This chapter is organized to reflect its aims and is therefore divided into three major sections. The first is dedicated to the articulation, illustration, and justification of the conceptual orientations that together form the analytical framework of this study. The second is an assessment of alternate conceptual frameworks for studying how social context affects student achievement.

Social and Cultural Capital Theory Frameworks

The unequal educational achievement of working class students has received a lot of attention in the sociology of education and among educators and education policymakers. Within a broad class of theories that are known as reproduction theories, conceptualization of the social and theoretical problem hinges on analyzing linkages among institutions, specifically school, family, and work. This study assumes that educational inequality is not a question of values but of resources for appropriate action. At the same time, this study seeks to be conceptually sensitive to the working of human agency in social affairs. This section reviews social and cultural capital theory frameworks for explaining the class gap and reviews their strengths and weaknesses. The aim is both to justify the selection of the theory of symbolic control as well as to clarify the theory.

The theory of symbolic control is brought together with cultural capital frameworks because they blend subjectivist and objectivist modes of knowledge and integrate the dichotomies of structure and agency and micro- and macro-analysis and by extension phenomenological and structural approaches. Both are interested in reproduction. For Pierre Bourdieu:

This[social] universe is peculiar in that its structures lead, as it were, a “double life.” They exist twice: in the “objectivity of the first order” constituted by the distribution of material resources and means of appropriation of socially scarce goods and values (species of capital, in Bourdieu’s technical language); and in the “objectivity of the second order,” in the form of systems of classification, the mental and bodily schemata that function as symbolic templates for the practical activities—conduct, thoughts, feelings, judgments—of social agents. (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 7, emphasis in the original)

Therefore, for Bourdieu:

There exists a correspondence between social structures and mental structures,

between the objective divisions of the social world—particularly into dominant and dominated in the various fields—and the principles of vision and division that agents apply to it.

(Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 7)

For Bernstein (1971, 1973, 1990) as for Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 13), “Cumulative exposure to certain social conditions instills in individuals an ensemble of durable and transposable dispositions;” “symbolic systems are not simply instruments of knowledge, they are also instruments of domination” (emphasis in the original).

An important body of work (Croninger & Lee, 2001; Lareau, 2000; Orr, 1999) that is derived from Pierre Bourdieu (1991, 1977) has developed that uses the constructs of social capital (whom one knows and cooperates with in civil society to attain mutually valued policy ends) and cultural capital (what one knows) to explain how education functions in contemporary society, especially how class and other social group inequalities are perpetuated in modern education. It was recognized that this perspective enhances previous explanations of class inequality by providing conceptual tools for naming hitherto unnamed resources that mediate the economy and education. For example, the work of Lareau (2000) particularly helps to explain a constant finding in the sociology of education: why middle class parents are more involved in education than are working class parents. Explains Lareau, middle class parents have resources, not values, specifically cultural capital (including literacy) resources that keep them informed of what is going on in schools and facilitate their action towards schools.

However, teaching and learning, the core technical activities of schools, were assessed to be under-theorized in that tradition. Often lacking, also (except for example in Orr, 1999) is a realistic portrayal of the role of political power, specifically the control

of the State in education policy reform. The constructs of social and cultural capital were retained for their explanatory potential but the search continued for a framework that integrated a theory of pedagogic device or a focus on the instructional act. This work assumes that linkages between schools and their environments enhance their effectiveness.

The Long Arm of the Job Shapes Parents' Management of Children's Lives.

Lareau (2000) illustrates how, “the long arm of the job reaches inside the home and beyond, shaping parents’ management of their children’s lives outside the home” (p. 11), specifically in school. In so doing, Lareau shows how essential features of class position, namely education and jobs have unintended consequences for family-school relationships and by extension academic achievement. Varying styles of home-school relations influence students’ exposure to academic curriculum differentially.

Family-school relationships vary between working class and upper middle class communities where working class family-school relations are characterized by separation and middle class-school relations are experienced as interconnectedness. By believing that teachers are responsible for teaching, working class parents seek little information about the curriculum or teaching process and never intervene in their children’s school program. They read to, teach new words, and read their children’s papers sporadically though less than teachers would like. Middle class parents believe education is a shared responsibility, read to their children to reinforce the curriculum at home and try to compensate for the weaknesses of the school program by doing some teaching in the home (Lareau, 2000).

Lareau shows that by focusing only on parents' roles in preparing children for school, previous conceptual approaches to studying school-family relationships are deficient. A broader look would show that middle class parents try to improve their children's on-site experience in school. As a result, the purpose and meaning of parents' activities regarding schools differed between the two communities. They varied even though teachers took identical steps to involve both communities in school. Yet parents' participation varied not on account of parents' value for schooling: both communities valued their children's education. Rather, what explains the differential involvement is that the two communities differed in the skills and resources that parents had for improving their children's performance in schools or in the language of this study's analytical framework, for meeting the social assumptions of pedagogy.

Middle class parents had more education, status, and income than working class parents. This improved their competence for helping and boosted their confidence that they could do so. Moreover, middle class parents had social ties with relatives, friends, and neighbors who were educators and with the parents of their children's school peers. Therefore, middle class parents had more general information about school and specific information about their children's on-site experience than did working class parents. The concept of cultural capital improved on explanations of the differential involvement of parents by showing that middle class parents have social resources that they invest to yield educational profits for their children (Lareau, 2000).

Lareau's (2000) proposal that teachers have standards for parents' involvement in schooling is equivalent to Bernstein's (1990) proposition that pedagogies have social class assumptions. In Bernstein, social class advantage is represented in differential

access to the code, early development of reading, the use of two sites of learning (home, school), and the reproduction of middle class child-rearing practices in invisible pedagogies. In Lareau, social class advantage is reflected in stocks of social and cultural capital. The most valuable form of cultural capital in American schools is literacy, which is at the center of the reproduction of advantage in both Bernstein and Lareau. The social capital-based experience of separation and interconnection that describes family-school relations in Lareau translate into closure under visible (traditional) practice for the working class and openness under invisible (constructivist) pedagogic practice for the middle class (Bernstein, 1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000). These experiences enable the parents in Lareau to bring themselves into compliance with teachers' standards, whereas in Bernstein's language, they allow middle class parents to meet the social class assumptions of pedagogy.

However, a language of sociological description for pedagogy by which micro-educational processes (teaching) and macro-sociological structures (class) may be integrated is only implicit in Lareau (2000) where they are explicit in Bernstein (1990). It means that it leaves a key question unanswered, which is the following. How do power relationships penetrate the structure of school knowledge through the social context? In Lareau (2000), middle class parents have differential resources and skills that allow them differential access to schools and entry into classrooms but do not necessarily allow them to penetrate the structure of school knowledge. The pedagogical object is not named.

The following example from Lareau (2000) is illustrative of the conceptual problem of a lack of a pedagogic device. In explaining Mrs. Harris, Allen's middle class parent's 'educational profits,' this incident is cited in which Mrs. Harris is a volunteer in

Allen's class. "I went in one day and," says Mrs. Harris to the author, "I said, 'I can really see, because I am in the classroom, that Allen is getting behind in the spelling'" (Lareau, 2000, p. 127). After crediting parents' definition of their role in their charges' schooling and parents' literacy skills for the educational benefits that their children gain from it, Lareau adds, "The organization of the school, however, including the volunteer program, the support which the teacher gave to the enterprise, and the structure of the self-paced curriculum itself, were preconditions to their success" (p. 129, emphasis in the original). In an endnote to this proposition, Lareau concedes, "Of course it was the self-paced character of the curriculum which allowed Allen to get behind on his spelling" (p. 147).

In other words, Lareau (2000) is proposing what Bernstein (1990) does, that the rules of the code have implications for who can acquire it. Specifically, in Bernstein's theory of pedagogic practice, the self-paced aspect of the curriculum might be described as a form of strong (explicit) sequencing rules and strong pacing rules. Moreover, in Bernstein, that micro-level practice might be centered in the account and linked 'outward' to the parent's presence in the class, parents' level of education, the open character of the school as an organization, and the upper-middle class social location of Prescott Elementary's host community. In other words, it is not merely a device but an integrative device: openness of pacing in instruction is linked to openness of the school as an organization and to the interventionist practices of middle class parents. More specifically, this aspect of the study reinforces Bernstein's proposal that the academic curriculum requires two sites of learning (school, home) and that this is a social class process of selection. In summary, the self-paced aspect of pedagogy is not linked

conceptually to facilitating parental intervention. Yet, visibility (explicitness) of pacing is part of the visible structure of pedagogy and is a resource that facilitates middle class parental intervention that is mediated by literacy and other social skills. In short, Lareau refines tools for looking into classrooms by mediating job and individual action through the concepts of cultural and social capital but largely leaves the conversion process in classrooms within the proverbial 'black box.' Here pedagogical practice is unspecified. However, (Bernstein, 1990, p. 171), "Any theory of cultural reproduction must be able to generate principles of description of its own objects." The author identifies the conceptual drawback. Argues Lareau (2000, p. 179), "What is needed is a more contextually based analysis of stages of cultural transformation in the educational process," through which to move beyond associating social class dispositions and educational profits. Lareau proposes the following:

A better approach is to posit a three-part process: (a) the possession of cultural resources (or dispositions or habitus), (b) the activation and investment of these cultural resources, and (c) the attainment of social profits from these investments. (Lareau, 2000, p. 179)

The theory of symbolic control (Bernstein, 1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000) especially provides conceptual tools that elucidate processes by which cultural resources are activated and invested in pedagogical relations for social profits.

The Theory of Symbolic Control

Bernstein's (1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000) general theory of symbolic control creates a concrete object out of the network of pedagogical relations. Specifically Bernstein's code theory through its models of pedagogic practice provides the analytical framework for this study of the processes of educational inequality under the new

accountability. The theory of symbolic control is a social theory comprising a curriculum theory that is itself derived from a socio-linguistic theory. It therefore represents a peculiar sociological approach to the subject of inequality. The theory of symbolic control explains that pedagogy constructs and distributes forms of identity and that pedagogy has social assumptions that some groups may meet and others may not and therefore their social assumptions work as a selective process in influencing who can acquire these forms of pedagogical practice. As stated in Chapter I, therefore, one puts this theory into the practical use of explaining educational inequality in the following way. The social assumptions of pedagogic practice are ultimately what is analyzed to answer a “why” question regarding the nature of social class influence on academic achievement. This requires first answering a “how” question, specifically how is pedagogy constructed in real school contexts. The policy context, namely the influence of the new accountability is not investigated directly. That is, the answer to the question of why social class influences academic achievement does not come from analysis of the policy per se but from analysis of the pedagogy that it is presumed to generate in real schools.

Language is the model system of the theory, which means that schooling is conceptualized as a social activity that is done through its own specialized language, namely curriculum. Curriculum is what counts as valid knowledge, teaching is what counts as valid transmission of valid knowledge, and evaluation is what counts as valid learning of valid knowledge by students (Bernstein, 1971). Curriculum is a variety of symbolic code or transmission (voice) and is therefore enacted in various models of pedagogy (message). Each model is a variety no longer of language but of language-in-

use. Each practice is constructed by members' tacit knowledge of rules. These rules have been deduced by researchers from empirical observation of teaching practices.

At the structural root of these rules are boundaries. Boundaries are elemental techniques of power. The character of those rules shape social interaction in the classroom, in families, and at work, defining a school's local pedagogic practice and principles on which knowledge is socially distributed. In this way, not only is pedagogy or the educational division of labor linked by its common structure to the social division of labor, the social division of labor is also part of a fabric of relations that provides its members with resources for interacting in specific ways in classrooms. Stated from the perspective of the classroom, pedagogy has social class assumptions. In this way, micro-social practices within classrooms are linked to macro-sociological structures, that is, knowledge and social class power are associated (Bernstein, 1990).

It will be remembered that symbolic control integrates a linguistic, curriculum, and social theory. In the social theory, Bernstein (1990) posits that curriculum not only relays power relations and class inequalities but also forms creative subjects. The theory of symbolic control evolved from a linguistic theory which may be best known of the theories but which has been outpaced by the social theory. The linguistic theory proposes two forms of discourse, a restricted code that is the language of particularity, the local and the working class and the elaborated code that is context-free and is of the middle class. The elaborated variety includes the language of schooling, or curriculum (Bernstein, 1990).

The curriculum theory proposes a structure for curriculum (Bernstein, 1971, 1973, 1975). Like the linguistic theory from which it is an offshoot, it also theorizes the form

of curriculum as being rooted in the conditions of social class and places emphasis on the “what” or content of the message systems of education, namely the curriculum, teaching, and evaluation message systems. In that sense, the elaborated variety of language of which curriculum is a member may exist as a collection code or as an integrated code, with the integrated code being the variety of flexibility and equity and the collection code being the variety of rigidity and hierarchy.

The social theory marks a theoretical break from the linguistic and curriculum theories by focusing less on the structure of the content of educational knowledge and their origins in specific social class conditions. Instead, it explains that learning opportunities are not so much relayed passively in the nature of the structure of either social or curriculum categories as they are actively constructed by human activity in a concrete setting, namely the classroom. It is the social theory as developed by the mature Bernstein (1990) that is used here.

Structure is, however, not altogether abolished at the level of pedagogical practice that is at the center of the social theory. The social theory proposes two models of pedagogic practice, that is, two basic orientations in that one message system that is teaching, namely visible and invisible practice. Moreover, establishing a concrete linkage in inter-institutional relations among school, family, and work, the social theory proposes that pedagogy is rooted not so much in the conditions as in the assumptions of social class (Bernstein, 1990). Because the general principles of the theory of symbolic control generate the theory of pedagogic practice that embeds the theory of educational stratification, those principles are presented next.

Explication of the structure of the theory per force introduces many constructs that the reader will need to hang on to because they recur in one form or the other and generate all the descriptions in the forthcoming analysis in Chapter IV. Those constructs are summarized in several tables that are interspersed throughout this chapter. Next, the use of language as a model is discussed.

Language as a model system.

Bernstein's theory of symbolic control presents the following three formal characteristics. One, it is built around a single key construct, the pedagogical code. The pedagogical code focuses on the pedagogic device that is at the technical core of schooling and describes essential characteristics of the institutional frame of schools. In other words, the pedagogical code connects several spheres of human activity, including activities in sites of reproduction, specifically the school and family with sites of production, specifically work.

Two, it names the micro-foundations (classroom interaction) of macro-phenomena (social class), doing so through a standard language of sociological description of pedagogical practices. That language supersedes such terms as teacher-centered education, student-centered education, progressive and traditional pedagogies in theorizing anew the continuing tension between, "tradition and innovation, between showing and telling, between right and wrong" (Cossentino, 2000b, p. 464) in pedagogy.

Three, it conceptualizes change at all levels of experience within the various spheres of human activity (Arnot, 2001; Bernstein & Solomon, 1999), specifically economic (post-industrial work), political (control), and symbolic practices (classroom interaction). As stated earlier, micro-level and macro-level practices are built up from the

same construct, namely boundaries. Given that the character of boundaries is so central to determining modes of power and pedagogy, the construct boundary is described next.

It will be remembered that language is the model system of the theory of symbolic control. Voice is materialized in message systems of which there are three, namely the curriculum message system or the organization of valid knowledge, the evaluation system or determination of what is valid realization of learning of valid knowledge, and the teaching message system or what is considered as valid transmission of valid knowledge.

Bernstein's conceptualization of language owes a great deal to structuralism in linguistics, an approach that focuses on the structural features of language, on the system of meaning that is constructed by language's structural features, and an approach that seeks to analyze society as a system of signs, that is, as a system in which it is the whole system of arranged parts that makes sense. Similarly, structuralism undergirds the formal architecture of the theory with, for example, boundary being its central construct.

Boundary: Foundational construct.

Boundary refers to the degree of insulation between contents (Bernstein, 1971). To illustrate, the theory proposes that curriculum is made up of categories. For example, in the abstract, the new Maryland accountability curriculum comprises school subjects, including reading/English Language Arts. How is the discontinuity from one subject to the other, say math to reading, recognized? Most insiders can tell math from reading. That distinction is the basis of the commonplace educational technology, the schedule. The difficulty is in naming the range of practices that enact boundaries. They are linguistic, social, political, etc. But the function is clear: it is one of insulation. Boundary establishes relationships between the contents and their component units, for

example, topics and themes, keeping them apart, or letting them mix. Therefore, merely to speak of reading is to contrast it with math, therefore to enact boundaries

Strong/closed and weak/open boundaries.

As forms, boundaries have political and cultural qualities. Two basic values are ascribed to boundaries in the theory: they are strong/closed or weak/open. Boundaries that keep contents apart are ‘strong/closed’ whereas those that let contents mix are ‘weak/open.’ Boundaries also have functions that are specialized by the three message systems by which educational knowledge is transmitted, namely teaching or face-to-face interaction, curriculum or the formal organization of knowledge, and evaluation or the validation of learning.

Classification: Boundaries in the curriculum and evaluation message systems.

Specialized boundaries have specialized names with for example, ‘classification’ referring to boundaries in the curriculum and evaluation message systems. Classification is constructed by power through which voice is enacted.

Frames: Strong or weak boundaries in the teaching message system.

Boundaries that determine the relationships within the teaching message system are ‘frames.’ Frames, being the message system by which classification is materialized in instruction are constructed from the working of social control through which the message is enacted. Since they are only a specialized form of boundaries, frames like classification take up characteristics of generic boundaries that are indicated by the descriptors strong or closed (for insulation) and weak or open (for porosity).

Theory of Codes

From the nature of boundaries is built up a complex of interrelated and contrasting constructs for naming pedagogy. Where all three message systems of a transmission are tended to by strong boundaries, a collection code is enacted. An integrated code is one in which any of the boundaries, be they classification (curriculum unit) or framing (teaching, evaluation) boundaries are open (Bernstein, 1971).

Models of Pedagogic Practice

The construction of a social theory from this curriculum theory hinges on the role of boundaries. As suggested above, boundary is a knowledge category that brings contents into relationships with each other and is also a power category through which social relations (specifically teaching) are conducted. Creation and positioning of subjects are realized through two basic genres of pedagogy, the visible (traditional) and the invisible (constructivist), that are enacted in the teaching message system. In visible pedagogy, the pedagogic relation is explicit whereas in invisible pedagogy it is implicit. Key to the construction of visible and invisible pedagogies are three sets of rules. The essential structural connection between the rules of pedagogy and their social functions is the nature of the boundaries that form them. To illustrate, visible pedagogies are described more fully next.

Visible pedagogies.

It will be remembered that boundary is a power-knowledge category and that strong or closed boundaries form the rules that define visible pedagogies. Further, visibility refers to the mode of transmission of curriculum and is determined by the degree of explicitness of three basic rules regulating construction of pedagogy, namely

the rules of hierarchy, rules of sequencing and pacing, and rules of criteria. Visible pedagogies are transmissions that are regulated by explicit hierarchy, explicit sequencing and strong pacing rules, and explicit criteria (Bernstein, 1990). In explicit hierarchy, therefore, the power basis of the relationship between teacher and pupil is undisguised.

In explicit sequencing and pacing, principles of progression and learning are explicit and made public. For example, in Maryland accountability, reading/English Language Arts content is sequenced in annual increments within Maryland Content Standards and Voluntary State Standards, policy tools of the new accountability. For example, in Chapter IV, Mr. Randolph will be shown to enact explicit sequencing. In so doing, boundary will be shown to be a technique of power.

CHARACTERISTICS OF VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE PEDAGOGIES

VISIBLE PEDAGOGIES	INVISIBLE PEDAGOGIES
Explicit/Strong HIERARCHICAL RULES Power basis is undisguised Rules of social order are explicit Teacher is easily identified Student grouping is homogeneous	Implicit/Weak HIERARCHICAL RULES Power basis is hidden by communication Teacher is not easily identified
Explicit SEQUENCING/PACING RULES [Principles of progression/learning] Rules are made public in curricula Rules organized temporally Rules vary with age Rituals of transition are used	Implicit/Weak SEQUENCING/PACING RULES [Principles of progression/learning] Learning is tacit/invisible
Explicit CRITERIAL RULES Expectations are specific and known to all Focus is on product or performance Product is read for how it meets criteria Produces differences within persons Learning is individual and competitive	Implicit CRITERIAL RULES Expectations are multiple and diffuse Focus is on internal procedures Learner creates criteria Produces uniqueness Learning occurs with a lot of support

In explicit criteria, expectations are specific. In visible pedagogies, the child's product or performance is what is read by the teacher for evaluation purposes, that is, for what it is lacking or how it meets pre-established criteria. This means that visible pedagogies emphasize the performance or the text, and the degree to which it meets criteria. Socially, visible pedagogies produce difference within students. Also, given that pedagogic practice is defined by the nature of enactment in the teaching message system, reference to the organization of knowledge in the policy tools of the new accountability are therefore to an ideal state of the intended curriculum. The rule structure of the enacted curriculum is not pre-determined by the boundary structure of the intended curriculum. Rather, the two may be determined independently (Bernstein, 1990). In so doing, boundary will be shown to be a technique of power.

Invisible pedagogies are more fully described next.

Invisible pedagogies.

Weak or open boundaries form the rules that define invisible pedagogies such that invisible pedagogies proceed by organizing the context or environment so as to enable competences to develop in students. They build up from implicit rules in which hierarchy, the power basis of teaching is hidden, sequencing and pacing or the principles of progression and learning are known only by educators, and criteria or expectations are multiple and diffuse. In invisible pedagogies, the focus is on procedures that are internal to the student (cognitive, linguistic, affective, motivational) and from which procedures a text is generated. Invisible pedagogies are an intrusive form of social relations and differences reveal uniqueness; therefore, focus is on procedures/competence that all learners have (Bernstein, 1990). The pedagogical rules are presented next.

FOCUS OF VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE PEDAGOGIES

	VISIBLE PEDAGOGIES	INVISIBLE PEDAGOGIES
FOCUS	Performance/Text	Procedures internal to student that generate text
Produces:	Difference between students	Uniqueness
Emphasizes:	Performance/Product	Competence

The Rules

Of the three sets of rules that determine the form of education systems, namely the hierarchical rules, sequencing and pacing rules, and criterial rules, Bernstein proposes that, “The essential logic of any pedagogic relation consists of the relationship between three rules [hierarchical; sequencing and pacing; criterial]. And of these three rules, the first [hierarchical] is the dominant one” (Bernstein, 1990, p. 65). Because hierarchical rules are most significant for defining the pedagogical relationship (Bernstein, 1990), they are presented next.

Hierarchical rules.

Given that pedagogy is a language, therefore a potentially foreign language, induction into this speech community implies competence in its basic practices, for example the rules regulating turn-taking between teacher and pupil. Therefore, pedagogy requires normative conduct and so the first task of pedagogy is to induct members into its practices. This requires normalizing behaviors. As suggested earlier, given that learning is a situated activity in which learning and doing are inseparable, the learner is inducted into pedagogy by learning to be a learner in ways that are appropriate to the pedagogy in question. One learns to learn by doing learning. The teacher teaches the student to be a learner by inducting the student into the teacher-student relationship. Learning the

hierarchical rules above all presupposes, “acquiring the rules of social order, character, and manner which became the condition of appropriate conduct in the pedagogic relation” (Bernstein, 1990, p. 65). The pupil adopts principles of social and disciplinary order. Social order is indicated by harmonious pupil-teacher student interaction, whereas disciplinary order is indicated by what is or is not thinkable within the frames of a discipline. Invisible pedagogies therefore require self-regulation, whereas visible pedagogies call for external control. Given that the rules of hierarchy define the interactional relationship between teacher and student, they determine the acquisition of those dispositions. Therefore, hierarchical rules are put into effect not tacitly as in pure apprenticeship or explicitly, but through control of boundary relations in teaching, which makes teaching a potentially asymmetrical power relationship between a teacher and a learner. If a teacher frames transmission strongly, then the learner is placed in a subordinate power position to the teacher’s superordinate position. This hierarchical relationship may be reversed in favor of the learner. In theory, power may also be shared (Bernstein, 1990).

Hasan (2001) shows the range and depth of pedagogy’s effects on symbolic and physical behavior. Hasan explores Bernstein’s basic assumption that curriculum through its regulative or hierarchical rules generate norms of appropriate conduct by teachers and children and construct knowledge. Hasan asked whether participation in different types of discourse made a difference in how children acted in classrooms. In search of answers, investigators followed eight five-year old children in schools around Sydney, Australia making recordings of teacher and parent talk during the first four weeks of the first year of schooling. When pupil-teacher talk and mother-child talk were compared

side by side, it was found that teacher-pupil talk exaggerated maternal behavior for both working and middle class children. Hasan concludes that teachers began with a clear conception of what teaching and learning should be done and by the second or third week of school, they sought to put that definition into practice. Therefore, a definition, implicit or explicit of teaching existed in which pedagogy had specific features.

In Hasan's (2001) study, during picture talk, the child's utterance "Mummy has got some shells" (p. 74) was ignored. Others were redirected. For example, children were advised as follows: "Don't sing out until I call your name" (p. 74). By contrast, some forms of talk attracted positive reinforcement. The teachers seemed to be receptive to such qualities of knowledge as objectivity and the practice of citing sources. To that end, teachers provided the following prompt: "Well, how can we tell from the picture, that he's enjoying himself, he's having fun?" Hasan concludes what historians of education have pointed out for some time, that the regulation of conduct may be the first thing children learn at school. Hasan's research validates Bernstein's claim that pedagogy is a distinct symbolic structure and that it is set apart from everyday communication in the home, or is more strongly classified. Further, overall, Hasan concludes that pedagogy enacted strong classification and frame and speculated that strong classification of teaching was made necessary by the pressure of time, the desire of teachers not to lose face associated with the task of managing students' behavior, and teacher's desire for order within a class of twenty-five students who compete for the teacher's attention. Validation of the assertion that curriculum is a distinct message system forms a basis for assessing claims that curriculum has distinct structuring effects on the construction of educational knowledge and on social functions. Therefore,

pedagogy is distinct at least by involving management of time, face work, and the pursuit of order.

Tye and O'Brien's (2002) survey of teachers' attitudes focuses on the new accountability and reflects Bernstein's proposition that the construction of knowledge is related to characteristics of framing and boundaries. Tye and O'Brien report that in a 2001 survey of California teachers who had been teaching for up to ten years and who had left the field, most ranked the pressures of increased accountability (high-stakes testing, test preparation, standards) as their number one reason for leaving. Some explained their decision to leave through experiences of loss of autonomy over content. One teacher stated that, "With every year, I was required to teach more curriculum based on testing." "All my creative talents seemed to go by the wayside due to SAT-9 drill and kill they wanted me to be," another complained. Yet another departing teacher explained that, "I don't mind standards, but too much emphasis is placed on testing. It has taken the fun out of it and you feel like you don't have time for art, PE, music, etc," pointing to a sense of loss of job satisfaction and narrowing of the curriculum. Finally, in a statement that echoes the theme of deskilling of teachers, one teacher who opted to leave the field stated that, "I thought I'd be able to use the many lessons I'd developed, but because of increased 'accountability,' I've had to use state- and district-mandated materials" (p. 27). Accountability ranked third on the list of factors that would push those who thought of leaving over. In short, these studies refine Bernstein's theory on two proposals. One, empirical support is presented for the view that the form of educational transmission is not merely a neutral relay but rather that it shapes contents, including teachers and

students' behaviors. Two, support is presented for the view that pedagogy is dialogical. A second set of rules, selection and pacing rules, are presented next.

Pacing and selection rules.

All teaching cannot happen at once; there must be a progression in the selection and organization of contents. Pacing defines the rate of learning that is to be done by the student. Selection refers to determination and organization of content to be learned. Sequencing rules determine what contents come first, second, etc. in that progression of learning. Sequencing rules imply pacing rules that in turn determine the time that is allocated for learning the sequencing rules. Pacing and selecting rules are put into effect through power relationships that are afforded by boundary relations in teaching (Bernstein, 1990). Ability to meet the sequencing rule means that pupils have the necessary background for acquiring a given piece of knowledge. Ability to keep up with the pacing rules means that pupils do not fall behind as the learning schedule progresses. The final set of rules, which are criterial rules, are presented next.

Criterial rules.

Criteria allow the learner to tell what counts as legitimate communication, social relation, or position and establish the criteria for determining validity or legitimation. It will be remembered that curriculum, transmission, and learning all connote validation through both power and knowledge. Criterial rules are put into effect through power relationships that are afforded by boundary relations in evaluation. Criterial rules are instructional or discursive rules (Bernstein, 1990). Compliance with the criterial rules result in the evaluation of a correct response for which there is usually some private reward, often in the form of a test score.

Those three sets of rules may be organized at another more general level. A first group of rules comprising both the set of sequencing and pacing rules and the criterial rules organize the discourse's characteristics, whereas a second group comprising hierarchical rules define the social relationship between teacher and student. The first group is called discursive, whereas the second is called regulative. The regulative rules are the fundamental ones because, "All education is intrinsically a moral activity which articulates the dominant ideology(ies) of dominant group(s)" (Bernstein, 1990, p. 66). The nature of explicit and implicit rules is further explained next.

Explicit and Implicit Rules

It will be remembered that Bernstein's model of pedagogic practices turns on the degree of explicitness of the three sets of rules. Explicit rules are built up from strong or closed boundaries, whereas implicit rules are built up from open or weak boundaries.

What explicitness means for each of the rules is illustrated next.

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT MODELS OF PEDAGOGY

VISIBLE	INVISIBLE
Explicit HIERARCHICAL RULES Establish relations of clear authority.	Implicit HIERARCHICAL RULES Mask power.
Explicit SEQUENCING/PACING RULES Create clear time limits.	Implicit SEQUENCING/PACING RULES Make it hard for learner to get the logic of time.
Explicit CRITERIAL RULES Make clear what counts as acceptable communication, behavior, and knowledge.	Implicit CRITERIAL RULES Students have some freedom to create individualized criteria.

Rules of hierarchy: Explicit and implicit.

With explicit hierarchical rules, the relations of authority and conduct are immediately clear to the student and the power relations are explicitly defined. The relationship is clearly between subordinate and superordinate. For example, the student (subordinate) may need to be recognized by the teacher (superordinate) before speaking. By contrast, it is harder to identify the teacher when the hierarchy is implicit. Bernstein illustrates this situation through a photograph of students at play with no teacher in the frame: the teacher acts directly on the learning context but indirectly on the learner. This is what is meant by Bernstein's proposition that in the implicit hierarchical relationship between teacher and student, "power is masked or hidden by devices of communication" (Bernstein, 1990, p. 67). Next, strong and weak rules of sequencing and pacing are explained.

Rules of sequencing and pacing: Strong and weak.

The rules of sequencing and pacing determine both the progression of the transmission (sequencing) and the rate at which the acquirer is expected to learn (pacing). Explicit sequencing and pacing rules are expressed in syllabi, curricula, and in clear temporal demarcations of when teacher and student should proceed. Implicit sequencing and pacing rules make it difficult for the child to be aware of the temporal project. The rules are available only to the transmitter (Bernstein, 1990). Explicit sequencing rules express different expectations for the student depending on his/her age. The development of the child is clearly regulated, often by age. The student is aware of where he/she should be at a given time. Explicit sequencing rules are contained in syllabi, curricula, in rules of behavior, rules for reward and punishment, and are marked by rituals of

transition (Bernstein, 1990). By contrast, implicit sequencing rules are known only by the teacher, not by the learner.

Implicit sequencing rules are drawn from a variety of theories that share the following features: (1) they are developmental or stage theories, (2) the student participates actively in his own development, (3) learning is tacit or invisible and not subject to public regulation, (4) the child's institutional and cultural biography, save his family background, is excluded (5) the teacher as imposer of meaning is critiqued: the teacher is a facilitator. This is what is meant by the statement that they construct a "pedagogic bricolage" (Bernstein, 1990, p. 68). The theories enact implicit hierarchy. They require a "theory of reading" (Bernstein, 1990, p. 69) in which the child is a text that the teacher reads. The teacher looks for specific signs the reading of which requires complex theories. The teacher responds to the child depending on the reading and the reading depends on the theories but the learner never knows the meaning of her signs.

Schuster (2004) reflects Bernstein's basic proposition that the form of the curriculum influences its content but argues also that form also affects the social interactions of teacher and student. In a study that focuses on the influence of policy on teaching, Schuster finds that most statewide high-stakes tests under the new accountability support one stage of the writing process, namely drafting. By contrast, State academic standards broadly support the writing process, including the planning (prewriting), drafting, revising, editing, and publishing (sharing stages). However, most national and state tests support only one stage in the writing process, namely drafting. Whether this process selects social groups is not addressed in this study. It must be noted, however, that the standardization that Mabry (1999) and Schuster (2004) attribute

to high-stakes testing under the new accountability and which the authors argue damages pedagogy is also a mark of the curricular focus that is aimed for by the policy as a strategy for boosting student performance (Elmore, Abelman, & Fuhrman, 1996; Fuhrman, 1999). In supporting only one stage of the writing process, high-stake tests structure the selection and organization of school knowledge and in so doing structures students' interactions with teachers. Explicit and diffuse criterial rules are described next.

Criterial rules: Explicit and diffuse.

When criteria are explicit the learner always knows what is expected since the teacher makes the rules of legitimate expectations clear. With implicit criteria, the learner has more freedom to create his or her individualized criteria for evaluation. The rules are more numerous, more diffuse, the teacher is more of a facilitator than transmitter. "That's a lovely man but he's only got three fingers," a teacher might say of a student's drawing, pointing to what is missing in the student's text, and making the student aware of it (Bernstein, 1990, p. 70). "Tell me about it," another teacher might say of the painting illustrating implicit criteria in which the student is aware but vaguely of what is missing from his/her text. Therefore, the text's producer creates a text under minimum constraint and with lots of social support (Bernstein, 1990, p. 70).

Though working in a different conceptual framework, Mabry (1999) illustrates Bernstein's general proposition that the form of the curriculum shapes its content. Specifically, explicit criterial rules make evaluation more bureaucratic by restricting the range of students' responses that may be considered as valid learning and therefore assigned a score. In a study that focuses on the effects of accountability policy on setting

criteria for evaluation of school knowledge, Mabry describes direct assessment of student achievement in writing as judging writing skill on the basis of actual student writing. Rubrics, the author argues, work differently. Rubrics, also called scales, are scoring guides that may provide quantitative data on clear, selected qualitative criteria, thereby providing schools, teachers, and parents direction and focus (Schmoker, 1999). Scoring rubrics, notes Mabry, are pivotal in operationalizing large-scale standards-based performance assessments in writing. In principle, rubrics promote reliability in performance assessments by standardizing scoring across a wide sample of test takers. Therefore, argues Mabry, rubrics standardize writing and standardize teaching of writing, which may damage learning and understanding of writing (Mabry, 1999). This study does not address the processes by which the use of high-stakes testing may be socially selective.

Having presented the principles of the social theory of symbolic control, the theory of educational stratification that it generates may now be presented.

The Theory of Educational Stratification

The analysis of knowledge production in classrooms draws heavily on the models of pedagogic practice. Primary emphasis in this study is on the ways in which the rules of pedagogic practice regulate the pedagogic message system and define the teacher's mode of control over the student. Emphasis then shifts to the means by which the pedagogic message system and teacher's mode of control reflect essential social class assumptions about the child, the teacher, the role of the family in the child's education, and the process of learning. As stated in Chapter I, this emphasis on teaching or the enacted curriculum as opposed to the intended curriculum as the principal site of

reproduction and transformation essentially restates the positions that Bernstein (1971) had developed in the linguistic and curriculum stages of theory development where the nature of curriculum played a larger role (Bernstein, 1990; Sadovnik, 2001) in social reproduction or transformation. Bernstein's (1990) more recent work, however, places more emphasis on the "how" of the relay; that is, it closely examines the process of educational transmission and the framing rules (boundary relations between teacher and student), for, in his words, "When I refer to the inner logic of a pedagogic practice I am referring to a set of rules which are prior to the content to be relayed" (1990, p. 64). This restatement therefore moves away associating social class location and disposition with educational opportunity and instead emphasizes activity or human agency. The pathways to educational stratification that are contained within visible and invisible pedagogies are explored next.

It will be remembered that pedagogical practice is a "social form," that is a, "cultural relay" that is to be distinguished from its content. It will be remembered that the form of pedagogic practice is determined by the interaction of three sets of rules, those of hierarchy, sequencing and pacing, and of criteria that are dialogically and interactively co-constructed by teachers and students who carry on a conversation with other stakeholders through public policy. Social class helps construct an identity that shapes the pedagogy in which individuals participate. The nature of the three above-mentioned rules (form or "how" of pedagogy) act selectively on the content (the "what," "when," and "how fast") of the practice. In turn, the content (what, when, how fast) acts selectively on those who have the necessary student background knowledge to integrate it and to keep pace with it and therefore learn it. In essence, therefore, it is an analysis of

the consequences of forms of pedagogic practice and of their social class assumptions (Sadovnik, 1991).

Visible Pedagogies

It will be remembered that the collection code enacts strong boundaries in all three message systems, specifically curriculum, evaluation, and teaching. In the teaching message system, hierarchy is explicit, sequencing and pacing are strong, and criteria are explicit. Acquisition of the code provides dispositions and practices for acquiring knowledge. The rules of visible (traditional) pedagogies (in teaching dimension of collection code) disadvantage the poor because their explicit sequencing rules select and organize the enacted curriculum while their strong pacing rules determine how fast the transmission will occur and what criteria will be used to validate the assessed curriculum. In this way, the rules generate processes by which students are stratified in schools based on their learning. These processes are described next.

Differential access to underlying code.

Kindergarten or first grade may mark the child's first entry into formal education; therefore, familiarity with the collection code on entry into kindergarten clearly indicates the success of parental involvement in schooling, specifically in preparing children for formal schooling. It must be remembered that involvement with the code imparts certain dispositions, skills, and knowledge. For example, norms for recognizing the superordinate position of the teacher are transmitted by the strong hierarchical rules, clear expectations for the selection, organization, and pacing of the transmission of knowledge are taught by strong sequencing and pacing rules, and specific criteria for what is right or wrong are contained in strong criterial rules. Differential access to the collection code

means, for example, that upon first starting formal schooling, some students may not have familiarity with the strong frames of its teaching message system, specifically explicit hierarchy, strong sequencing and pacing, and explicit criteria by which the “what” and “when” of the transmission of the content is fixed.

This pathway to the construction of educational disadvantage clearly rests on a discontinuity between the local pedagogy of the home and the school. However, the simple fact of the discontinuity is not sufficient to create inequality. Rather, it is the assumption that both pedagogies will be continuous, that is, that entering pupils will have a certain profile that creates the disadvantage. It may mean that in some kindergarten settings it is assumed that pupils learn to read and write basic sight words such as “me,” “you,” etc. Not having been socialized into a local pedagogic practice in families that connects with the official pedagogic practice of the local school specifically regarding the “what” and the “when” of the content, some students will fail to meet the initial requirements of sequencing (Sadovnik, 1991). That is, they will not have the prior knowledge, specifically the ability to recognize letters of the alphabet on which to build knowledge of sight words.

INVOLVEMENT IN HOME LITERACY ACTIVITIES BY POVERTY STATUS: US

Activities	Read to		Told a story		Taught letters		Library Visit	
Year	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999
Above Poverty	82%	85%	44%	52%	57%	66%	41%	40%
Below Poverty	68%	69%	39%	42%	59%	58%	28%	24%
GAP	-14	-16	-5	-10	2	-8	-13	-16

Source: U.S. Census, 2001

Empirical findings in the US constantly show that the poor and racial/ethnic minorities are adversely affected by this organization of schooling. For example, of children surveyed who were aged three to five and not enrolled in kindergarten, in 1993 and again in 1999, 82% and 85% of those living above the threshold of poverty reported being read to in the week preceding the survey in contrast with 68% and 69% for students living below the threshold of poverty. At the dates and over the same time, 44% and 52% of middle class children reported being told a story in contrast with 39% and 42% for poor children. At the same date and over the same time, 57% and 66% of middle class children were taught letters, words, or numbers in contrast with 59% and 58% of poor children. At the same dates, 41% and 40% of middle class children visited a library at least once in the month preceding the survey in contrast with 28% and 24% of poor children. The indicators for the same activities by racial/ethnic groups revealed that Black and Hispanic children were consistently less involved in home literacy activities (U.S. Census, 2001).

Falling behind.

Students who do not meet the pacing requirements of visible pedagogy may also fall behind on the strong pacing rules relative to their peers (Bernstein, 1990; Sadovnik, 1991). With strong pacing, time is at a premium. This regulates examples, illustrations, and narratives that facilitate acquisition, regulates what and how many questions may be posed, and regulates what counts as explanation in length and form.

This is illustrated by Rist's (1970/2000) finding that in the very first weeks of schooling pupils in ghetto schools of St. Louis had already fallen behind on the pacing of instruction. Further, these students were stigmatized as "slow learners" and stratified

within the classroom, that is, assigned to spaces in the classroom which had implications for their involvement in language interaction with the teacher such that their subsequent engagement in classroom activity was negatively impacted.

Lexical and syntactical codes.

Further, strong pacing reduces pupils' talk and privileges teachers' talk. Where pacing is strong, a "lexical pedagogic code" of one-word answers or short sentences relaying facts, operations, etc. develops in the poor. The practice of rule-bound discourse and fill-in-the blank of circle-the-correct-answer and multiple-choice formats may qualify as lexical texts. A "syntactical pedagogic code" relays relationships, processes, and connections, in the middle class. Continuous writing in such genres as letters, stories, etc. may qualify as syntactical text. In summary, "The pacing rule of the transmission acts selectively on those who can acquire the school's dominant pedagogic code, and this is a social class principle of selection" (Bernstein, 1990, p. 78). In short, access to and familiarity with the code increase students' adaptation to schooling.

Development of early reading.

The explicit sequencing and strong pacing rules of visible pedagogies emphasize the knowledge of written language, therefore making early reading key to acquiring those rules. Middle class pupils are more likely to master these rules. As shown above, more middle class children participated more frequently in home literacy activities than poor children.

Home literacy activities imply parental involvement in preparing children for school. Whatever the cause, middle class children were found to read earlier than poor children. Parental involvement was therefore associated with children's school readiness

skills. Of children surveyed who were aged three to five and not enrolled in kindergarten, in 1993 and again in 1999, 24% and 28% of those living above the threshold of poverty recognized all letters in contrast with 12% and 10% for students living below the threshold of poverty. At the dates and over the same time, 57% and 62% of middle class children could count to twenty or higher in contrast with 41% and 39% for poor children. At the same dates, 53% and 56% of middle class children could write their names in contrast with 41% and 37% of poor children. At the same dates, 74% and 77% of middle class children could read or pretend to read a storybook in contrast with 64% and 63% of poor children. 40% and 45% of middle class children had three or four of those skills in contrast with 23% and 9% for poor children.

SCHOOL READINESS BY POVERTY STATUS: US

Activities	Year	Above Poverty	Below Poverty	Gap
Recognized all Letters	1993	24%	12%	-12
	1999	28%	10%	-18
Count to Twenty	1993	57%	41%	-16
	1999	62%	39%	-23
Write their names	1993	53%	41%	-12
	1999	56%	37%	-19
Read/pretend to read story book	1993	74%	64%	-10
	1999	77%	63%	-14
Three or four of those skills	1993	40%	23%	-17
	1999	45%	9%	-36

Source: U.S. Census, 2001

Again, the indicators for the same activities by racial/ethnic groups revealed that Black and Hispanic children were consistently less involved in home literacy activities. Parental involvement was therefore associated with children's school readiness skills (U.S. Census, 2001). These trends also hold for Maryland where a study of 8200 Montgomery County students entering kindergarten in 2001 confirmed that students who are poor and learning English had significantly weaker literacy skills than other students.

On entry into kindergarten, one third of students participating in the Free and Reduced-Price Meals System (FARMS) knew only 11 letters of the alphabet and fifty per cent of FARMS and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) knew 11 letters or fewer (Bridges-Cline, 2001).

Students who meet the explicit sequencing and pacing rules of visible pedagogy gain two other advantages. One, they can organize their own discourse. That is they can read or learn to learn and gain some educational independence from teachers. Two, they are likely to appreciate the possibilities that education gives them to explore new realities. In short, early reading increases students' coverage of curriculum material (Bernstein, 1990).

Sites of learning.

Visible pedagogies emphasize the academic curriculum. By being constituted from strong boundaries, academic knowledge is less like community knowledge, and its distribution is restricted to official pedagogy be it in the home or school. Therefore, the academic curriculum needs two sites, namely the school and home for effective acquisition. Requiring two sites is a social class-based process because such coordination of learning across school and family implicates resources that are classically associated with class (Lareau, 2000). It involves time, including parents' time, because the pupil does homework for which the parent ensures that there is time. It implies parental involvement which calls on cultural capital resources that are associated with education, a constitutive term within the classic definition of social class. It implies space, specifically a quiet space in the home. Coordination also implies social control because this implies that the parent must have control over the child. Two sites of learning

increase the students' exposure to curriculum materials. Data describing children's involvement in home literacy activity in so far as they imply parental involvement in preparing children for school, which is a practice that coordinates learning in both sites, support this assertion (U.S. Census, 2001). Further, that middle class parents not only are more involved in schooling than their poorer peers, but that middle class parents more often intervene in schooling to change teacher assignment, student assignment to a given room or program, secure the services of outside experts, and otherwise seek to customize the on-site learning experiences of their children is supported by empirical evidence (Lareau, 2000).

Whereas Mabry (1999) and Schuster (2004) worked independently of Bernstein but give credence to the proposition that form affects content, suggesting that the various tools of the new accountability may contradict each other, Williams (2001) compares alignment of the form of pedagogic practices of home and school. Williams (2001) set up an experiment to test Bernstein's (1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000) assertion that curriculum is a distinct communication system. Williams sought out literacy practices that link both sites and proceeded to make side-by-side comparisons between the two local pedagogies. Investigators observed children at age four and again at age six, that is during the year prior to their entry into public schools and again during the year after they had started formal schooling. Observations focused on parent-child interaction at home and reading in school respectively. Analyzing such comments by a mother reading a story to a child as, "so the thing that worked the best was making a beautiful house" (Williams, 2001, p. 41), Williams concludes that all of the mothers ensure that the children interpret text beyond its status as one specific local story. The significance of

the story being read for acquiring the code that underlies other stories is therefore emphasized. Moreover, all mothers in Williams' study enacted discourse with low boundary strength between the fictional experience and the child's personal experience. That is, children were socialized to make connections between literary characters and themselves. Williams concludes that the finding that children were encouraged to find similarities between themselves and literary events gives validity both to Bernstein's construct, boundary (degree of insulation between contents) and Bernstein's assertion that pedagogy is a form of communication that is distinct from parent-child communication. It also gives empirical support to Bernstein's (1990) proposition that learning opportunities at school are linked to parental participation in the curriculum activities of their children.

Singh (2001) uses Bernstein's model to investigate the construction of pedagogy in classrooms in relation to family and work. Singh collected and analyzed interview data from Samoan adults and students in a disadvantaged secondary school in Queensland, Australia with the aim of identifying features of pedagogy that may address the educational disadvantage they experienced. The student body was diverse in terms of language and ethnic background. However, unemployment in their communities was higher than elsewhere and in terms of median household incomes, their community was ranked statistically within the lowest 5%. Students claimed that they were disadvantaged by some of the strategies that classroom teachers used to select and organize curricular content. In other words, Singh argues, the power and control relations generating pedagogical discourse in the Australian schools might position Samoan students in a disadvantaged relation to the acquisition of school knowledge. Moreover, aspects of

Samoan culture, low socio economic circumstances, and the diversity of the student population were blamed for producing difficult teacher-student pedagogic relations. Many of the Samoan students in this Australian school resisted the pedagogic discourse or the common world of knowledge created by the teacher, using delaying tactics, introducing taboo content, and directly confronting the teacher. Therefore, by selecting and organizing knowledge, curriculum had the unintended effect of positioning some students as disadvantaged and generating difficult-teacher-student relations.

As in Singh (2001) above, that pedagogy has its social assumptions which are not uniformly met in class society is illustrated in Anyon (1981). Empirical support is provided for Bernstein's assumption that pedagogy is conversation. Teachers, it appears, have a dramaturgical relationship with students: teachers and students manage the impressions that they make. Teachers are encouraged by students who present themselves as knowing the teacher's subject matter. For example, a fifth grade teacher reports to the interviewer that, "The children in this [high poverty] school don't know anything about the US, so you can't teach them much" about Social Studies. This teacher's response seems to suggest that teachers have their own practice frames from which they decide who may be or should be educated: it is those who have the appropriate background knowledge, that is, those who meet the requirements of the rules of sequencing. Similarly, teachers are also encouraged by a show of interest in learning on the part of students. Reports one fifth-grade teacher in Anyon's study, "You can't teach these kids anything. They're not interested" (p.). In another case, students are taught differently because they are perceived to lack parental care. Once again, interest in learning seems to trigger a certain positive professional response in teachers.

Bernstein's proposal that in visible practice, development of early reading may advantage middle class students by revealing possibilities of exploring new realities that are made possible by education is also supported. Anyon finds that students may receive forms of knowledge in schools whose economic value in the real world is immediately apparent, a factor that may affect students' motivation to learn. By contrast, working class students receive forms of knowledge that are not easily marketable or valued in the contemporary labor market. This is one means by which in the language of the analytical framework, pedagogy creates subjects and consciousness. These findings are extremely relevant because they describe concrete interactional processes by which educational stratification occurs. Teachers read students' signs regarding background knowledge, interest, and parental caring and produce an appropriate behavioral/pedagogical response. Teachers keep students whom they deem unfit for learning busy with rule-governed activities, ditto sheets, etc. that is, through a visible pedagogy of the lexical type. Students who are deemed fit to learn are challenged, spoken to, supported, that is treated to an invisible pedagogy. However, there are conceptual drawbacks in Anyon that are generated by a structuralist approach in which forms of school knowledge are shown more to be arranged within the social class structure than to be actively constructed within concrete social class dynamics. The result is that the study does not so much highlight the processes by which knowledge is produced as show the arrangement of forms of school knowledge in social space. Further, the study lacks a standard language of description for pedagogical practices. Moreover, procedurally, it seems to proceed from the economy to schools without illuminating the processes by which power penetrates the structure of school knowledge.

Where Lareau (2000) emphasized the role of family in activating cultural resources for educational profits in classrooms, McNeil (2000) emphasizes the role of the long arm of the economy in selecting and organizing the cultural resources that have currency in classrooms under Texas accountability.

Machine-scorable standardized testing of the multiple choice type seemed to have damaging effects on education processes; a narrowing effect on the curriculum, a deskilling and demoralizing effect on teachers, and an undermining of the credibility of school knowledge and academic motivation. McNeil interpreted the consequences of these process-level effects on outcomes. McNeil's book-length study of Texas accountability suggested that there was cause for alarm. The negative effects of the policy fell disproportionately on poor and minority schools, teachers, and students. Therefore, the narrowing of the curriculum, deskilling of teachers, and their impact on teachers and students' motivation served as an explanation of persistent social class-based test score gaps under the new accountability. These issues were at the center of this failing in Texas: resources, bureaucratic control as a lever of school reform, and hierarchical accountability of the top-down variety. The alarm bell had been sounded: accountability, the national effort to rationalize the education system itself seemed to have gone awry.

"They may be able to figure out the right answer on the proficiency test, but they don't know anything about machines," (McNeil, 2000, p. 206). The words in the quotation above were attributed to Ms. Watts, a science teacher at a magnet school in Texas. Ms. Watts was an engineer who took a graduate degree in education and became a public school teacher. Ms. Watts' professional past is significant in that it foreshadows

the teacher's expectation that as a mark of high quality teaching, classroom science will require little change if any upon translation into real-world science outside the classroom. However, Ms. Watts' words convey an unfavorable evaluation of students' knowledge of real world science under accountability. In that sense, Ms. Watts' evaluation is representative of McNeil's (2000) findings about the effects of accountability in Texas.

In a chapter with an illustrative title, 'Collateral Damage,' McNeil summarizes her main findings on the effects of accountability on curriculum. Those findings continue the theme of the fragmentation of knowledge that results from, "instituting mechanisms of tight control in education" (Apple, 2000a, p. xvi), or educational accountability. Specifically, McNeil found that accountability damages instruction by systematically, (1) "divorcing the knowledge of the teacher from the curriculum," (2) "divorcing the knowledge and questions held by students from required content" (McNeil, 2000, p. 5), (3) "reducing physical phenomena to disembodied terminology," (4) prescribing, "what constituted a unit of study and how much time should be spent on it" (McNeil, 2000, p. 206), (5) disrupting students' engagement, "with poets and novelists in dialogic interpretations" (McNeil, 2000, p. 218), (6) "splitting the behaviors of teaching from teachers' knowledge of their subjects and of their children" (McNeil, 2000, p. 225), and (7) overall ensuring that the, "measurability [of teaching and knowledge] was paramount" (McNeill, 2000, p. 230).

Teacher knowledge is divorced from the curriculum when for instance teachers are required only to deliver content that has been selected and organized by others. This approach to curriculum reflects the paradigm of curriculum as a rational act that is comprised of stages of design and implementation respectively (Pinar et al., 1995/1996).

Students' knowledge is divorced from required content when for instance students are not consulted in curriculum or their consensus is not sought in doing curriculum. Rather, teaching-learning becomes a coercive interaction that may provoke resistance.

Terminology is disembodied from phenomena when learning is done out of context (See Applebee, 1996). Within certain pedagogies, a unit of study may be designed less from the perspectives of students or teaching and more from the point of view of institutions' needs, for example to cover certain testable content before a test. Dialogic interpretations may include subjective appreciation of text as evidenced in students' discussions.

Splitting teaching behaviors from knowledge of subjects does not recognize that dimension of the teacher knowledge base that is pedagogical content knowledge (See Schon, 1987; Shulman, 1987) or the integration of knowledge of content with knowledge of pedagogy. Measurability may refer to objectivity in terms of time and knowledge from the point of view of the learner or the teacher.

McNeil (2000) represents a largely successful attempt to integrate structure and agency within the notion of social class as applied to the new accountability. In that study, the functioning of economic structures (the new high technology economy) and educational structures (the bureaucracy) ironically widen the test score gap between working class and middle class students in Texas largely because of the knowledge the various participants find credible and the actions they take in that regard. Based on their varying social class-related material circumstances, students and teachers in working class and racial minority schools no longer find credible the knowledge they are structured to create under new accountability reforms, and the result is demoralization and resistance by both teachers and students.

McNeil (2000) had been observing teaching in those same schools prior to the implementation of Texas accountability and did so after that implementation. Her pre-and post-accountability findings present a study in contrasts. In the magnet schools that predated accountability, McNeil found curriculum, “that made authentic knowledge and varied ways of knowing accessible, even commonplace” to students (McNeil, 2000, p. 194). More specifically, according to McNeil, one school (1), “exemplified teaching and school course content that has credibility in the outside world outside schools,” while in another school, (2) “The congruence between classroom knowledge and personal knowledge, the teachers’ and the students,’ enabled teachers and students to work as co-creators of the curriculum,” and in a third school, (3) “the teachers were able to ...prepare their students for college studies in the sciences, technology, and engineering as well as liberal arts, because they and their students struck a bargain to make the school work” (McNeil, 2000, p. 194-195, emphasis in the original). Those findings by McNeil focus on pedagogical practices but without the benefit of a standard language of sociological description. To illustrate, through what object is knowledge of the curriculum divorced from teacher knowledge, student knowledge divorced from required content, physical phenomena reduced to disembodied terminology, the unit of study prescribed, students’ dialogical engagement with poets disrupted, the behaviors of teaching divorced from teachers’ knowledge of their students, and the measurability of knowledge ensured? It centers on the design of the test, namely the machine-scorable multiple-choice test but extends to the network of policy tools of accountability. It is what Apple reflecting Bernsteinian language calls, “mechanisms of tight control” (Apple, 2000a, p. xvi).

Intersection of social class, race, and gender.

Finally, it must be noted that in the theory, coordination of learning between the home and the school involves an important socializing role for mothers (Bernstein, 1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000). The involvement of mothers in schooling is associated with the structure of labor in the family. Working class families are more likely to practice gender segregation of parental roles in which family-school relationships are the exclusive domain of mothers. By contrast, middle class families are more likely to practice gender integration of labor in which family-school relations are the domain of both fathers and mothers (Lareau, 2000). The familial labor structure reflects the nature of the family's involvement in the economy. Gender-based segregation of roles in families is associated with one parent going out to work, whereas gender-based integration of roles is associated with both parents being in the labor force (Wallerstein, 1983). Further, working class jobs socialize parents into seeing work and by extension learning as a discrete activity that is bound to the context of the job site in space, time, and in terms of personnel. By contrast, some middle class jobs socialize parents into views of work and by extension, learning that portray learning as an activity that is continuous from home to school, across school periods and leisure activity, and to be done by both parents and teachers. This is especially the case in symbolic labor. Finally, race/ethnicity was closely associated with the resources for preparing students for school. Therefore, social class in this theory integrates gender and race/ethnicity. In summary, the selective functioning of the rules of sequencing and pacing regarding those who can acquire them amount to a social class principle of selection.

Invisible Pedagogies

The social class assumptions of invisible (constructivist) pedagogies advantage the symbolic fraction of the new middle class more than they do working class or poor students and therefore produce unequal outcomes. The social class assumptions of invisible pedagogies are cultural and economic prerequisites of effective acquisition and understanding of this practice. The roots of invisible pedagogies are in the middle class family structure, specifically its child-rearing practices, and in the middle class' processes of work, specifically its symbolic practices in agencies of symbolic control. The diffuse nature of the rules of invisible pedagogies are related to the integrated structure of middle class family labor. The masked and diffuse nature of hierarchical rules of invisible pedagogies are related to the middle class mode of control in their childrearing practices that emphasize internalization of authority relations as opposed to responsiveness to external control or force.

VISIBLE PEDAGOGIES: FACTORS CAUSING DIFFERENCE

WORKING CLASS DISADVANTAGE	MIDDLE CLASS ADVANTAGE
Differential access to the code Sequencing/pacing rules regulate: i. illustrations, etc. ii. questions iii. explanation Improves adaptation. So working class students: i. fail to meet sequencing rules and ii. fall behind strong pacing rules.	
	Middle class students read early, so they: i. organize their own learning ii. see new realities through education Increases coverage.
	Visible pedagogies need two sites, so: i. home and school coordinate learning Increases exposure.

On account of the middle class origins of the nature of the rules that construct invisible practices, these rules are unlikely to be met by working class students whose families may have a segregated labor structure. In terms of economic or physical space, invisible pedagogies include greater movement by students and so they are more costly. Symbolically, space, specifically cognitive and social space, is more weakly marked. In terms of economic time, invisible pedagogies presuppose a long pedagogic life. The child is constructed by implicitly held theories of instruction. Where the rules are not met by working class students, the cultural and cognitive significance of implicit pedagogical practices are likely to be misread by students. In turn, such students are misread by teachers.

Remediation.

The rules of visible pedagogies disadvantage the poor and the assumptions of invisible pedagogies perpetuate social inequalities in education. A way out of this vicious circle is theorized but it does not involve remediation because for Bernstein, remediation within visible pedagogies only constitutes another form of stratification. Therefore, viable strategies to counter students falling behind are relaxation of the pacing rule to give pupils more time to learn sequencing rules, and maintaining sequencing and pacing but relaxing quantity or quality of contents. To weaken the pacing rules would require a change in cultural and economic capital to the school because weakened pacing rules create new practice and therefore require teacher training. An additional way out, however, is acknowledged by Bernstein (1990) in the tenets of critical pedagogies, specifically its direct attention to power and its emphasis on bringing the local pedagogy

of the school into closer relation with that of families. Moreover, it is possible that a far greater range of concrete practices may have the desirable effect of closing the achievement gap than is suggested by the models of pedagogic practice. The models of pedagogic practice are simply a strategy for sensitizing the search for field data that may reveal pedagogical practices that may impact the social distribution of educational knowledge under the new accountability. In closing this section of the chapter some historical and polemical context is provided to the theory of symbolic control.

Teachers and Policy Reform

How do teachers respond to signals for change that may come from policy? Mintrop's (1999) study lends support to the analytical model's approach to the construction of pedagogic practice by concluding that teacher action and by extension teacher change occurs within a nexus of three frames, namely self, students, and policy. Employing the self-referential frame, when impelled to act on policy-induced changes, teachers engage in a process of reflection on their knowledge, dispositions, and occupational traditions. Considerations that are processed regarding self include consonance with one's cosmology, loss and gain to self, and sense of efficacy or the belief that the teacher can make a difference in the world. In this frame, teachers enact policy-induced changes when messages elicit reflection and connect to practitioners' personally held values and convictions such that policies work best when they are pedagogies. Employing the student frame, teachers are likely to enact policies that prove their utility in daily interaction with students. Policy-induced innovations work with students in the "real school" when either they increase achievement, facilitate control, mitigate teacher work loads, or boost teacher satisfaction. Teachers learn about the

usefulness and appropriateness of a policy mainly through a process of trial and error during which they receive cues from student behavior. They interpret these cues through the lens of commonsense assumptions about knowledge, students' ability, and status. The three frames are not independent of each other. Neither do they yield a consistent picture about a set of systemic policies in teachers' minds. Inconsistencies abound. What makes sense in the institutional frame may not make sense in the student frame but when frames of response overlap for teachers in the formation of responses to policy, more powerful changes reaching more deeply into practice occur (Mintrop, 1999).

In summary, the new accountability was understood to work by increasing motivation and channeling teachers' work on student achievement in reading. However, there was variation in schools' response to the policy. Variation was linked to two key factors, past reward history and teachers' beliefs. Teachers are motivated to attain student achievement goals if they believe their work will make it possible, if they believe certain consequences will follow, and if they value those consequences. The new accountability works by affecting teachers' view of goal attainment but this was not all. The clearer and more understandable the goals the more likely were teachers to believe that their attainment was possible. That is, schools vary in their response to the new accountability; variation is associated with teacher capacities, and individual teachers are influenced by what they perceive their students' capacity is (Fuhrman, 1999).

In summary, the analytical framework generates a system of relations that define a cosmology. Cosmology decenters the system of accountability such that practical change does not necessarily ensue from alignment of the self, student, and institutional frames. Rather, the greater the number of frames that are aligned, the greater the likelihood of

teacher change. This theory contributes to explanations of the workings of the new accountability as a source of teacher change by reconceptualizing the notion of alignment that is so critical to accountability policymakers, theorists, and designers. It theorizes alignment not as an inherent quality of policy structures, or internal coordination among policy products. In short, alignment is not an objective product of rationality. Rather alignment is reconceptualized as context-based, subjective, and variable. This means that a policy message may induce teacher change if it makes sense primarily in the teacher's world (Mintrop, 1996), a world that is in the nexus of self, student, and policy. It moves the teacher as reflective practitioner to the center of coherence of the new accountability system.

In summary, it has been argued in this section of the chapter that the device, code, in all its component constructs, specifically boundary, is able to explain regulation of knowledge, and of power, specifically social class power through its integration of such spheres of social life as schooling, family, and work. Also, it has been argued that the constructs of boundary, framing, classification, pedagogy and their appropriate descriptors, such as 'closed/strong' and 'weak/open,' etc. provide elements of a standard language of sociological description of pedagogy. Moreover, it is argued that the device allows for conceptualization of change in all spheres.

It will be remembered that this study uses the case of two schools in Maryland to explain a constant finding in the sociology of education, that is, why academic achievement is associated with social class. In this study, the strategy that is selected for generating this explanation is described as case study, a research tradition in which the starting point of the explanation is a priori theory that is tested and refined in interaction

with the specific findings about data in the case. For example, in setting out to explain how social class influences academic achievement, it was necessary to avoid several pitfalls of educational and social research. It was necessary to relate in a manner that is trustworthy to specialized actors or members in each social sphere the activities that take place inside and outside school. It was also necessary to reconcile the representation of both social structures and human actors so as not to overemphasize the roles of either at the expense of the other. In the search for this explanation, a point of departure was the adoption of the theory of symbolic control and the theory of educational stratification that is derived from it (Bernstein, 1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000).

The analytical model presents a language of description of the objects of pedagogy and the social context of learning in classrooms. The model relates the activities of students and teachers who are engaged in making knowledge in classrooms with the childrearing activities of their parents as well as their parents' economic activities in the work place, doing so by proposing that the form of curriculum inside schools assume that the actors inside schools occupy certain places within the social, cultural, and economic arrangements of the society. The theory therefore provides conceptual language for representing the activities and meaning of teachers, students, and policy factors inside schools. Schools are then linked to other social institutions is specifically families, and the economy. The link among those institutions in conceptualized in a rather dynamic manner, specifically through activities rather than through status or dispositions.

In support of the analytical model, a selective review of the empirical literature in the field reflects a consensus that pedagogical practice is formed in the nexus of policy,

teachers' identity, and students (Mintrop, 2000) and that this nexus is part of a triad of social institutions, namely schools, families, and work, the interaction among which may induce change in teacher practice (Mintrop, 1999; TIMSS, 20003). Pedagogy may be seen as creative conversation that regulates conduct (Williams, 2001) and defines the forms of interaction and knowledge that enter into the frame and those that do not (Hasan, 2001). Therefore, pedagogy constructs learner identities and knowledge. In addition to their own professional techniques and standards, teachers derive messages from policy and read cues from students that shape the continuous construction of practice. Teachers receive cues from policy (Anyon, 1981; Schuster, 2004) regarding the role of creativity and the structure of knowledge. However, the new accountability is a complex enterprise. Its curriculum component may send one message, for example, supporting all stages of the writing process, whereas assessment policy may send another, for example where high-stakes testing generally supports only the drafting stage of the writing process (Schuster, 2004).

Teachers may act purposively, introducing content that is appropriate to a policy purpose, but students will emit cues regarding their capacity for acquiring this knowledge in a manner that will lead teachers to adjust their pedagogical activities, transforming content, say from concepts to procedures, and purpose from presentation to review (TIMSS, 2003). Students' cues in classrooms may signal level of motivation to learn. They may signal information on the quality of their knowledge base, specifically relating to past acquisition of relevant background content knowledge which is necessary for building new knowledge. Students' cues may also additionally offer information regarding their success in meeting the social assumptions of the pedagogy that is being

constructed. Specifically, students' cues may relay information regarding parental participation in schooling (Anyon, 1981), for example in preparing students for school (Rist, 1970/2000), in developing students' skills, and exposing them to curriculum materials (Lareau, 2000). Overall, students' readiness for both the processes and the contents of instruction are shaped by their family's relation to schools (Lareau, 2000). However, family-school relations are mediated by hitherto hidden social and cultural capital resources that are associated with social class. Social class therefore facilitates families' ability to recognize and respond satisfactorily to the social assumptions of pedagogy (Lareau, 2000). By definition, location in the middle class affords those cultural social, and economic resources that facilitate interconnectedness with schools, which means that such parents may not only be informed of what is going on inside the classroom but also take action towards school, for example, in customizing their children's classroom experience. By definition also, working class families may lack the resources by which to remain informed of the goings-on inside schools or to act with confidence and skill to shape their students' experiences in classrooms such that their relation to schooling is characterized by separation (Lareau, 2000). The concrete classroom-level micro-practices on which such macro-level phenomena as activating cultural capital and drawing on social networks include teacher-student hierarchies, self-pacing of curriculum materials, and framing of criteria in assessments. Therefore, learning opportunities are created dynamically and dialectically within the dialogical interaction between teachers and students in classrooms but draw on hidden resources from the social contexts of schools. What is not fully understood, however, is how those

various activities link to form a system of transmission in the present social class and accountability policy context.

Cossentino (1999, 2004a, 2004b) focuses on that area of complexity that is defined by the nexus of teacher identity, students, and educational reform policy and investigates how real teachers make sense of its demands. The portrait that emerges is one of confusion for teachers as reflective practitioners. The level of confusion may be increased by successive waves of policy reform regimes (MSPP, MSAP) and an evolving array of policy resources (Content Standards, Voluntary State Curriculum) of which teachers have to make sense in relation to their classroom practice. Often, the teacher struggles in this context with very little targeted practice support save for broad philosophical statements about what teaching to the standards is or is not. Where pedagogical transformation in classrooms is attempted, which it will be remembered is aimed for by accountability policy, the strains may indeed prove even greater.

Cossentino (2004b) uses the lens of coaching to explore these strains. In coaching, the teacher is conceptualized as coach and the student is a worker. Coaching, notes Cossentino, marks a national culture and a teaching profession that are experiencing profound uncertainty. Illustrating her argument through Camille, a high school teacher, who attempts to make sense of the reform idea of coaching, Cossentino argues that the role of coach implies transformation of teacher identity and teaching repertoire and include “uncertainties” regarding the identity of coach and the practice of coaching itself.

Writes Cossentino:

Coaching also seems to call teachers to deploy a wide and subtle repertoire. Typically this repertoire is associated with constructivist learning theory, but less typical are clear directives for enacting specific moves. Being a coach, in other words, implies being ‘a certain kind of teacher’ (Hacking, 1986; Gee, 2001), but

exactly what such being entails remains shrouded in uncertainty (Richardson, 2002)

That uncertainty, concludes Cossentino, emerges as tensions between “tradition and innovation, between showing and telling, between right and wrong” (Cossentino, 200b, p. 464). The analytical framework explains those uncertainties as signs of social struggle between divergent social orders. It is inscribed in the spirit of Bernstein’s larger project, which is to explain how social transformation is carried out, in this case, from a society that is marked by social differences to one in which there is greater mutual interdependence.

Basil Bernstein: Contradictions, Controversies, Appreciation

That Basil Bernstein’s theories have been interpreted in, “contradictory ways” (Danzig, 1980) is a historical fact. His key construct, code has been at the center of those contradictions because codes, “were confused with dialect” (Bernstein, 2000, p. 90). Further, Basil Bernstein’s theories have been interpreted as a form of cultural deficit theory. According to that view, the theorist attributes any social disadvantage, for example relatively low academic achievement of working class students, to purported failings in their culture, specifically in their language behaviors. However, as was suggested in Chapter I, the theory explains that any construction of deficit that is attached to discourses are meanings that are attributed in inter-group context, as for example, within social class conflicts over education. In short, it is not really a language behavior but a “misunderstanding” or perception of the behavior. This perception of meaningful behavior from the perspective of teachers and students is part of what is referred to as knowledge production. Moreover, Bernstein has made an effort to distinguish among

linguistic, political, and psychological features within the theory by being directly involved in empirical testing and in reviewing other researchers' testing of his theories (Bernstein, 1990). For example, Bernstein (1975) has designed research that separates intelligence as a factor in the practice of codes and concludes that codes are neither synonymous nor correlated with intelligence. Writes Bernstein in his own defense, "the theory [of elaborated and restricted codes] at this stage (the 1970s) was considered, I think, wrongly as wholly a deficit theory" (Bernstein, 2000, p.90).

Basil Bernstein has therefore been a controversial figure (Sadovnik, 2001) within the sociology of education. Three main controversies have affected reception of the theory of symbolic control. One, Pierre Bourdieu, a founder of the construct cultural capital and of a rival theory of reproduction, blames the notion of the elaborated code for what Bourdieu refers to as Bernstein's failure to relate, "this social product to the social conditions of its production and reproduction" (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 53). This charge goes to the heart of what is claimed as the major contribution of the theory, its integration of power and knowledge through a device that relates activities in several spheres. It is assumed in this study that by virtue of the power and knowledge characteristics of the fundamental construct, 'boundary,' the pedagogical device, code is able not only to capture social conditions, specifically social class-based distributions of power and principles of social control but that knowledge as socially produced is related to those conditions through that device.

Two, it is possible that Bernstein's writing style poses such immense difficulty that it acts as a barrier to interpreters of his work. Bernstein's language is indeed difficult. This may make reading his work disconcerting, especially since one never

knows if they got what the theorist intended. Therefore, in order to ensure the reliability of the interpretations of his theories, the growing body of literature that celebrates (Morais, 2000; Weiler, 2001), interprets, and applies Bernstein's theories through empirical studies was consulted. The interpretations that are presented here reflect views of prominent Bernstein scholars (Atkinson, 1985) and collaborators, specifically Apple (1992) and Sadovnik (1991, 2001).

Three, as stated above, the theory of symbolic control has been characterized as a form of deficit theory. However, variation in academic achievement that may correlate with code varieties is a function of the social significance that is attributed to misrecognition of the social and significance of code varieties. In spite of those and other controversies, the theory was retained as the analytical model of this study because of its intrinsic conceptual attributes. Specifically, as will be illustrated in Chapters IV and V, Bernstein's theories have great explanatory power regarding a wide range of issues in education, namely curriculum as a selective tradition (Young, 1971), resistance (Giroux), and the positioning and construction of creative subjects. In short, use of the model does not constitute a fatal flaw in the design of the research. Rather, it indicates possibilities for refining the theory in areas that are identified next.

Sadovnik (1991) identifies three important areas of a future research agenda that may advance Bernstein's (Bernstein, 1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000) theory of symbolic control while the work of Apple (1992) contributes a fourth. First, the study pursues the research purpose of deriving and applying the Bernstein model.

Second, responding to Sadovnik (1991), the study pursues empirical testing of the theory. Empirical testing focuses on the relationship among the social-class composition

of schools, their local pedagogic practices, and the ways in which and why these practices relate to social class advantages and disadvantages, for example, test scores. Therefore, this study seeks to build understanding of interrelationships of the social class composition of schools as indicated by pay or free lunch-eligible students, their forms of pedagogy, and the gap in statewide standardized test scores of the students. Theory is used in the formal sense here, meaning, “a set of interrelated propositions that allow for the systematization of knowledge, explanation and prediction of social life, and generation of new research hypotheses” (Faia, 1986, p. 134 cited in Ritzer, 1988, pp. 3-4). Although several studies have successfully tested Bernstein’s key construct, code (Diaz, 2001; Hasan, 2001; Hudak, 1984; Moore & Maton, 2001; Muller, 2001; Singh, 2001; Tyler, 2001; Urevbu, 1980; Williams, 2001) they have applied those concepts in a piecemeal fashion. The notion of interrelation among social class, form of pedagogic practice, and knowledge production is central to theory. Therefore, this study systematically applies the sociolinguistic method and tests the theory of symbolic control by linking the theory’s predictions regarding local schools’ enrollments with their enrollments’ social class assumptions regarding school-family relationships and their scores on statewide standardized tests in reading.

Third, developing the previous critique by Apple (1992), Sadovnik (1991) recognizes that not only is the theory of symbolic control strong in explaining the effects of social class but that it is also particularly strong on explaining disparities between social groups. Sadovnik therefore recommends that Bernstein’s work be re-focused on constructing a more systematic theory of educational transformation; one that acknowledges that pedagogic practices are capable of deep change. Needed therefore is a

dialectical model that shows how the same processes of symbolic control that are reproductive of the social order have the potential to create the possibility of change. This is conceivable if the message system that is produced by the system may be changed from the bottom, by students.

Fourth, Michael W. Apple's (1992) critique of Bernstein's (1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000) theory of symbolic control recognizes the theory's strength in explaining the effects of social class in education. Included among its effects is domination of the working class in pedagogical relations or symbolic control. However, the theory is faulted on the processes by which its effects are realized. Apple argues that the theory: (1) lacks specification or even definition of the concept of class, (2) is opaque regarding the formation of class, (3) presents opaque processes of social class relations, (4) opaque processes of change over time, (5) opaque processes of class consciousness during social class-based struggles over education, and (6) disembodied enactment of social class conflict. As stated in Chapter I, while those weaknesses and potential areas of refinement are not the primary purposes of the study, they are addressed in the pursuit of the primary goal of the study, which is to explain why social class influences academic achievement.

In Chapter III, the design and methods for gathering and analyzing data that may answer the research question are discussed and illustrated.

CHAPTER THREE:

CASE STUDY RESEARCH DESIGN AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

This study inquires into the ways in which social class influences academic achievement by using the conceptual lens of knowledge production. In order to understand the way that social class may affect teachers and students' co-production of knowledge in classrooms under the new accountability, this study analyzes classroom talk in two reading/English Language Arts classrooms in two elementary schools in the same Maryland school district. Actual discourse practices that teachers enact under the banner of the new accountability policy are the subject of this case study focusing on the policy aim of closing the test score gap that federal, State and local policymakers have pursued through the new accountability policy.

The study uses an analytical model has been derived from Bernstein (1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000) and Bernstein-inspired work, specifically Apple (1992) and Sadovnik (1991, 2001) but also Diaz (2001), Hasan (2001), Hudak (1984), Singh (2001), Muller, (2001) Moore and Maton (2001), Tyler (2001), Williams (2001), and Urevbu (1980).

Thanks to the analytical framework, a view of the social world was presented in which continuity was found across all the relevant areas of human experience, specifically language, knowledge, curriculum, and social practice. Continuity was achieved through the concept of power and the enactment of its techniques ranging from enactment of elemental boundaries through practice of the code. Power was both generative and restrictive. It integrates structure and agency, micro and macro, race,

social class, and gender. This allows links among family, school, and work. Next, the research design is presented and justified.

Research Traditions

In its focus on how pedagogy functions in social class settings, this study pursued “how” questions, specifically the following general research question. How does social class influence academic achievement? That question is pursued in respect of working and middle class settings. “How” questions are appropriate for investigation through case study research methods (Stake, 1994) because case study makes it possible for the researcher to so narrowly focus a study that it illuminates a specific functional setting. In this case, that setting is the classroom, which is the site where knowledge, the object of the primary conceptual lens of the study is produced. That setting is also the family as it relates to coordinating the education of children with schools.

In spite of the narrow focus that was offered by case study, however, it was still possible to gather enough information systematically regarding the policy and social contexts of teacher-student talk. Analysis of data on teacher-student talk pertained to questions regarding who initiates teacher-student talk, what the content topic is, how the sequence of topics was organized, who has the greater say in dialogue, how quickly do they respond, and how elaborated the responses were. In addition to these analytic issues, data also described the social class location of the setting, for example, the FARMs rate, student mobility, zip codes, etc. of schools. These data allowed, “the researcher to effectively understand how it [that setting] operates or functions” (Berg, 1998, p. 212).

The aim of the study is ultimately to generate understanding of how pedagogy works in social context. Recognizing that the same social phenomenon may mean something different in another social class setting (Anyon, 1981) and therefore it is the whole class system that makes sense (Connell, et al., 2000) to the researcher. Comparison of at least two social class settings was necessary, and two were retained for comparison in this study.

The task of comparing how pedagogy works in two social class groups is rather complex but case study proved suitable for this task because it offered deep focus on the knowledge-producing processes of the classrooms yet drew on many sources of data: observation, field-notes, classroom artifacts, and archives of various types. Case study allowed me to do in-depth analysis of similarities and differences in the ways Mrs. Mason and Mr. Randolph constructed their pedagogical practices in their respective classrooms and made it possible to link these data to the larger social contexts where their social assumptions might or might not be met, namely families. However, the decision over traditions of research was not simple. Strains emerged early in the design process over whether case study or an ethnography was needed. The nature of the conceptual focus of the study helped to resolve this design problem. The decision was over description of a culture or interpreting function. The decision to foreground analysis of knowledge-producing processes for their possible impact on the social distribution of test scores rather than to describe the culture of social class groups eventually led to the selection of the case study method.

In designing this study, the aim was to build on a vibrant tradition in curriculum studies that interrogates pedagogy as an ideological activity. Case study turned out to be

quite suitable to this task because case study highlights issues for further conceptual and methodological pursuit (Lareau, 2000) not only because of its focus but also because it draws on the interpretive paradigm as well as analytic paradigms in generating conceptual categories and theoretical assumptions about the data.

In this study, case study is understood to be a methodological approach that incorporates a number of data-gathering techniques rather than constituting the data gathering-techniques themselves. The present study is by turns narrow in focus because the analytical model calls first and foremost for analysis of student and teacher talk in classrooms and that means focusing rather narrowly on a small-group setting where knowledge is produced. More specifically, focus is on teacher and student talk that occurs when the teacher guides the classroom in the construction of knowledge. At that point, primary emphasis is on the ways in which pedagogy defines the social relationship between teacher and student and on close examination of the processes of knowledge transmission. At that point, the study leans heavily on interactional analysis between co-producers of knowledge, namely teachers and pupils. At other points, the study also reaches out beyond the classroom and takes the broad view on social life, mapping the economic and cultural life of host communities. At this point, the study employs historical and sociological analysis of structural forces in the policy and social world. In so doing, knowledge production is embedded in social context because the study's assumption is that the form of knowledge production is more meaningful in defining students' opportunities to learn than is planned content (Bernstein, 1990; TIMSS, 2003; Lareau, 2000; Porter & Smithson, 2001).

In this study of educational stratification in which the analytical model explains unequal test scores as results of the selective working of power and social control, the form of pedagogy, rather than the content, is assumed to be suspended in broader social networks that encompass the school. This view portrays the social construction of learning opportunities as occurring in the field of reproduction that is the school but drawing on resources for action that are shaped by the interplay among the sites of reproduction that are family and school and the site of production that is the workplace. This approach is similar to Collins' (1979) notion of credentialism and Bourdieu's notion of cultural capital (Lareau, 2000; Rosenbaum, 1991). Both theorists suggest that policymakers enjoy freedom somewhat arbitrarily, interpreting and stipulating the educational needs of society. The learning agenda of the new accountability has been deemed to be so arbitrarily constructed by some of its critics (Biddle/Berliner, 19). This margin of freedom to act that is attributed to schools is what Bernstein refers to as the relative autonomy of schools from the economy (Apple, 1986; Bernstein, 1990). Conceptually, relative autonomy posits the school's freedom to operate outside of the dictates of the economy and politics and instead to have its own functional logic. In terms of design, it confers a certain flexibility in the conduct of the study, principally by demanding that the study proceed from schools outward to policy and the economy. That is, the collection and analysis of data first focus on the classroom rather than proceed from outside the classroom as seems to have been the case in the theory of correspondence (Bowles & Gintis, 1976). The analytical framework of the study therefore required a design whose focus was by turns narrow and by turns broad. The procedures for realizing such a design are presented next.

Study Design: Collective Case Study

The aim of comparing school knowledge in more than one social class location led to a collective case study. Drawing on archival data relating to the social class composition of all the elementary schools in one Maryland district, Allendale County Public Schools, a sub-sample of two schools, Sunnyside Elementary and Fairweather Elementary Schools were selected for closer investigation. Fieldwork was undertaken in two classrooms, Mrs. Mason's reading room and Mr. Randolph's reading room. Each case explored the knowledge-producing processes of these teachers and students from two perspectives, that of the participants and that of the researcher. Each perspective balanced discourse between teachers and students, action by teachers and students, and reflection-in action by teachers.

The resulting collective case study involved the extensive study of two instrumental cases rather than of intrinsic cases. Intrinsic cases are justified for selection on claims of their uniqueness. The cases are by definition instrumental because they also illustrate a larger issue, namely the connection between social class location and educational knowledge. Stake (1994) points out, however, that there is no solid line between intrinsic and instrumental cases and that in fact, "A zone of combined purpose separates them" (Stake, 1994, p. 237). For example, regulation or control is generally offered as a characteristic of the policy context of the study, the new accountability (Apple, 2000a, 2000b; Elmore, Abelman, & Fuhrman, 1996; Fuhrman, 1999; McNeil, 2000) and power is indicated in the social class structures of society. Or in the words of Ball (2000, p. 1013), "Discourse patterns are generated and lived out within political contexts, within structures and relations of power inherited by humans inhabiting a given

cultural and social time and space.” Therefore, the selection of the new accountability as the policy focus of this study is in part due to some intrinsic aspects of the setting, specifically its, “mechanisms of tight control” (Apple, 2000a, p. xvi) as well as for its illustration of the working of social class relations in education.

Most importantly, selection of these two cases was intended to offer enhanced ability to theorize about the larger collection of cases (Berg, 1998), specifically the influence of the social class location of a school’s student population on the production of school knowledge. Selected for study were two classrooms that were typical in their performance profile (working class and low-scoring on tests; middle class and high-scoring on tests). However flexible case studies may be in design, they have definite form. The form of the study is described next.

In conformity with the case study research tradition, the two cases that were retained for in depth study are bounded in space. The two classrooms are produced by clear architectural boundaries within school buildings. They are also fifth-grade reading/English Language Arts classrooms. Further, they serve working class and middle class host communities respectively. Reading ability has been known to be associated with social class location (Risley & Hart, 1995; U.S. Census, 2001). K-5 elementary schools were selected as research sites because Maryland elementary schools are neighborhood schools. Neighborhood schools draw their students from contiguous communities. The neighborhood presents a clear-cut geographic boundary. Elementary schools therefore ensured social class continuity between the host community and the school.

Schools were categorized according to exclusive categories based on their FARMs rate. Schools whose FARMs rate was 10 or less were considered middle class schools while those whose FARMs rate was more than 50% were considered working class schools. Sunnyside Elementary School presents a population of less than 5% Free and Reduced Priced Meals (FARMs) status and was characterized as middle class whereas Fairweather Elementary presents a student population of greater than 60% FARMs status and was characterized as working class or poor. As stated above, students are also ranked in the high- and low-performing categories respectively on statewide, standardized tests.

The cases are also bounded in time though in a less clear-cut manner than was possible in terms of space. The field-based phase of this study spanned the months of March and April during the Spring of year two of the Maryland School Assessment Program (MSAP), the current iteration of a twelve year-long series of accountability-type reforms in Maryland. On the one hand, a clear-cut boundary is offered by the administration of the State's high-stakes testing, the Maryland State Assessment (MSA) in March. The research literature suggests that curriculum and instruction narrow significantly before administration of state-wide high-stakes testing in order to focus teaching and learning activity on measurable knowledge in the subjects that are tested (McNeil, 2000). The disciplinary object of this study, reading-English Language Arts was so tested in 2004. It is assumed, therefore, that pacing in reading would return to normal after administration of MSA.

On the other hand, Allendale County requires that classroom research that is initiated by outsiders to the system, which is the case here, come to a close by the month

of May. A somewhat artificial and therefore blurred boundary from the point of view of the research methodology was therefore used to bring the study to a close. Allendale County does not disclose the rationale for this deadline. The result is that the start and end of the study did not coincide neatly with such classic organizational categories of the school curriculum as teaching units or courses. It was possible, however, to track the development of certain activities and topics during the period of observation.

Data collection.

As often happens with education case studies that embed schools in social context (Anyon, 1981; Lareau, 2000), the analytical model called for a multi-stage data collection procedure. Specifically, two stages of data collection were required by this study. The first stage of data collection targeted secondary data regarding performance and demographic profiles of elementary schools in Maryland, for example, FARMs and student mobility rates that were held in archives of Maryland State Department of Education. The second stage of collection focused on primary data describing classroom talk and comprised of transcriptions of language in use and of descriptions of classroom context and activities.

The setting of the study, knowledge production in classrooms as well as the discourse perspectives that guide this study provided great focus to data collection procedures. As this is a study of teaching practice, not a study, for example of individual teachers' beliefs, data collection did not include interviews. This design decision rests on a set of assumptions about what is knowable about teachers and specifically what teachers may reliably tell about their work (Freeman, 1996). Teachers have discursive consciousness, that is, what they can say or express about their own teaching but

discursive knowledge is not all the knowledge that teachers have. They also have practical knowledge, what every teacher knows and needs to know to get around the classroom (Giddens, 1984). Reliance on the language of teacher-student interaction rather than on responses that were stimulated by an investigator about teacher talk also complied with the discourse perspective (Freeman, 1996) in general and the theory of symbolic control in particular (1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000), both of which conceptualize teaching as a form of dialogue between teacher and pupils. Investigators' interviews with teachers or students would not have captured teacher-student interaction since interviewees would have been disembedded from the socio-cultural context of interest. Language data was therefore solely gathered by note-taking during observation.

As stated above, teachers and students were observed only during reading/English Language Arts lessons, which means that the boundaries of school subject constituted the major source of bounding. The sole investigator did not participate in classroom activities and did not attempt to establish membership in the teacher-student community. Discourse practices can therefore be assumed to be natural and not elicited for research purposes. First, the procedures of the data collection strategy that was executed for secondary data collection are presented.

Archival analysis.

It will be remembered that in this study of social class, Free And Reduced-priced Meals (FARMs) status was used as a proxy for household poverty. From the outset, the twenty-four Local Educational Authorities of Maryland were considered as potential study sites. Later, based on the degree of variation that was revealed in their elementary enrollments as shown in data on Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE)

websites, a subset of those school systems was retained for closer consideration because they exhibited a greater range of school performance profiles, geographic, and socioeconomic variation. Next, attempts were made to secure the cooperation of eligible school districts for closer investigation.

A sub-sample of two fifth-grade classrooms, one in each of two schools in Allendale County, Maryland was selected for observation based on the willingness of students, teachers, schools, and their district to participate in the study. Schools came from different parts of the county as represented by zip codes and no other criterion was used to select participants for this study.

The unit of analysis being the school, no data pertaining to individuals were gathered at any stage in data collection. Rather, archival analysis was used to determine whether social distribution of State-level standardized test scores in elementary schools was related to FARMs rate of schools. This strategy presents methodological limitations that will be addressed later in this chapter. Of particular interest for archival analysis was the distribution of test scores on Statewide standardized tests between two strata of schools, schools with high and low FARMS rates respectively in that county. Information in archival data point to a difference in academic year 2003-2004 between Sunnyside Elementary School (<5% FARMs) and Fairweather Elementary School (>60%FARMs) relative to this ultimate equity goal. Those and other indicators are reported next.

Allendale County

Allendale County, Maryland is consistently featured in popular magazines as a very desirable American community and the school system is considered to be one of its

most attractive amenities. It is a county that has been described as having a high and stable level of economic integration. This socio-economic diversity is due in part to a county policy that for decades required private developers of new subdivisions and apartment complexes to build a fraction of the housing for low- and moderate-income families. In the last few decades, the county's population has grown increasingly diverse in socioeconomic and racial/ethnic terms largely due to an influx of immigrants from Central and South America. A major interstate highway traverses the county from north to south, dividing the county into eastern and western halves. Historically, schools that are located on the east traditionally perform less well than do those in the more affluent west and serve a relatively large racial/ethnic minority population.

Sunnyside Elementary School MSA 2004

Sunnyside Elementary School is located in the racially and socio-economically homogeneous western half of the county where public schools are reputed to be among the best in the State. Archives of the 2004 Maryland Report Card (MSDE, 2004) show that in 2004, 74% of fifth graders at Sunnyside Elementary School (<5% FARMs) attained the Advanced Proficiency Level, 23% attained the Proficient Level, and 3% attained the Basic Level on the Maryland State Assessment in reading. Scores for 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels add up to provide the scores for 'Satisfactory' performance by schools. Therefore, in 2004, 97% of Sunnyside's fifth grade students scored satisfactorily in reading. According to the 2004 Maryland Report Card (MSDEa, 2004), in the preceding academic year, 2003, 67% of fifth graders at Sunnyside Elementary School attained the Advanced Proficiency Level, 28% attained the Proficient Level, and 5% attained the Basic Level in reading. Therefore, 95% of Sunnyside fifth

graders scored satisfactorily in reading. Over the one-year 2002/3-2003/4 period, Sunnyside Elementary School gained 2 points. Similar findings for Fairweather Elementary School are reported next.

Fairweather Elementary School MSA 2004

Fairweather Elementary School is located in the racially and socio-economically mixed eastern half of the county where public schools are reputed to be among the worst in the county. Archives of the 2004 Maryland Report Card (MSDE, 2004), show that in 2004, 64% of Fairweather Elementary School (>60% FARMs) students scored satisfactorily on MSA reading. 22% of fifth graders at Fairweather Elementary School scored at Advanced Level, 42% scored at the Proficient Level and 36% scored at the Basic Level. According to the 2004 Maryland Report Card (MSDEa, 2004), in the preceding academic year, 2003, 54% of Fairweather fifth graders scored satisfactorily in reading. 17% of fifth graders at Fairweather Elementary School scored at Advanced Level, 37% scored at the Proficient Level and 46% scored at the Basic Level. Therefore, over the one-year 2002/3-2003/4 period, Fairweather Elementary School gained 8 points.

Therefore, in 2004, the between-school gap in fifth-grade proficiency in reading is 33 points. The 2003 between-school gap was 41 points. The between-school gap on MSA reading narrowed by 8 points over the one-year period 2003-2004 when compared to the 2003 gap. This 8-point narrowing resulted from a faster 2003-2004 gain by Fairweather Elementary School (10 points) than by Sunnyside Elementary School (2 points). A significant gap persists between the schools. The present study did not seek to establish a direct link between the test scores and students in the study. At each of the two schools, only one of three fifth-grade groups participated in the study. The scores

that are released to the public in school report cards are aggregated by grade level. In spite of the study's inability to directly connect published test data and study participants, however, there can be little doubt that FARMS status is a factor in lowering Fairweather Elementary School's test score performance in reading as a quick disaggregation of the fifth grade reading score by FARMS status will show.

According to the 2004 Maryland Report Card (MSDE, 2004), in 2004, 36% of non-FARMS fifth graders at Fairweather Elementary School attained the Advanced Proficiency Level, 44% attained the Proficient Level, and 20% attained the Basic Level. Therefore, 80% of non-FARMS or pay status students scored satisfactorily. By contrast 10% of FARMS fifth graders at Fairweather Elementary School scored at Advanced Level, 41% scored at the Proficient Level and 49% scored at the Basic Level. Therefore, 51% of FARMS status students at Fairweather Elementary scored satisfactorily. This means that the in-school gap in fifth grade reading between non-FARMS and FARMS students was 29 points. At Sunnyside Elementary School, there were fewer than five students in the FARMS category and for that reason no disaggregation of scores by FARMS status was released to the public. When the between-school gap and the in-school gap by FARMS status were compared, they were nearly identical.

The scores in reading comprise Content Standard Scale Scores on three content standards that are assessed on MSA, Maryland's high-stakes tests, General Reading Processes (GRP), Comprehension of Informational Text (CIT), and Comprehension of Literary Text (CLT). GRP includes the sub-skill of vocabulary development. CIT includes the use of newspapers as a source of information. CLT includes literary analysis of elements of narrative and poetry. According to the 2004 Maryland Report Card

(MSDE, 2004), the median (50th percentile) score by fifth graders at Sunnyside Elementary School on the GRP was 463, the median score on the CIT was 425, and the median score on the CLT was 434. 384 is the scale score for Proficient.

According to the 20004 Maryland Report Card (MSDE), the median (50th percentile) score by fifth graders at Fairweather Elementary School on the GRP was 394, the median score on the CIT was 398, and the median score on the CLT was 397. Again, FARMs status impacted the general scores of Fairweather Elementary School. A gap was present between the performance of non-FARMs and FARMs students on each of the three content areas, General reading Processes, Comprehension of Informational Text and Comprehension of Literary Text. We were not able to connect these data directly to the study's participants. Other limitations apply to the data and are described next.

Maryland State Department (2001, p. 59) cautions on limitations to data that were disaggregated by FARMs status. The test regime in question at the time of this note of caution (2001) was the Maryland State Assessment Program (MSPAP), the forerunner to the current MSA, but those limitations may hold for MSA. The first limitation refers to the variation in average family income by FARMs status. States MSDE, "The average family income of FARMS participants of different racial/ethnic groups undoubtedly differs somewhat." Stating that for pay status students, the difference may be even greater, MSDE stresses that, "to the extent that family socioeconomic standing influences test achievement, differences among ethnic groups who do not participate in FARMS are expected to be large" (p. 59). The second limitation refers to the effects of the concentration of poverty status students on scores. States MSDE,

Student achievement may be depressed for students living in neighborhoods or attending schools where poverty is concentrated. Individual students participating

in the FARMS program who attend schools where relatively few pupils participate in the program may perform better than similar students attending high poverty concentration schools. (MSDE, p. 59)

MSDE did not state how those effects might be realized. Exactly how these effects may be constructed is the essential issue under investigation in this study and will be reported on in sections two, three, and four of the present chapter. But first, the data that are presented above are summarized in tables that are presented next.

2004 SUNNYSIDE (SES) Vs. FAIRWEATHER (FES) MARYLAND SCHOOL ASSESSMENT (MSA) PERFORMANCE IN READING

School/Performance	Satisfactory	Advanced	Proficient	Basic
SES	97	74	23	3
FES	64	22	42	36
GAP	-33			

2004 FAIRWEATHER SCHOOL MARYLAND SCHOOL ASSESSMENT (MSA) PERFORMANCE IN READING BY FARMS STATUS

School/Performance	Satisfactory	Advanced	Proficient	Basic
NON-FARMS	80	34	46	21
FARMS	51	10	41	49
GAP	-29			

2004 SUNNYSIDE AND FAIRWEATHER SCHOOL CONTENT STANDARD SCALE SCORE PERFORMANCE IN READING

School/performance	Median General Reading Process (GRP)	Median Comprehension of Informational Text (CIT)	Median Comprehension of Literary Text (CLT)
SUNNYSIDE	463	425	434
FAIRWEATHER	394	398	397
GAP	-69	-27	-37

At the school-level, two non-traditional measures were selected from documents found in archives and interrogated for clues to the similarities and differences in the client

families' social assumptions about their respective schools. The measures are participation in a business school-partnership and PTA activity. Giant or Super G stores run the A+BonusBucks program and all public schools grades K-12 are eligible to participate. To enroll, schools must send a letter on official school letterhead requesting that the school participate. A copy of the school's certification from the State Board of Education must be enclosed with the letter of application. Once the school is registered, customers to Giant and Super G stores designate a school to receive a portion of \$2.4 million in cash with the portion depending on the purchases at Giant and Super G stores. For every dollar spent using the BonusCard, the designated school receives one point. Giant also offers extra items that earn 50 additional points per item. At the end of each month, each school's total points is divided by the total points earned by all designated schools and then multiplied by \$400,00.00. The school receives a check for the total amount of cash earned at the end of the program. The current year ran from October 5 to April 03, 2004. In this study, cash earnings indicate social and economic capital. That it is economic capital is clear. Its value as an indicator of social capital is argued on the basis that citizens act in concert and with Giant and Super G stores achieve a desirable social effect. Effort is expended on registering the school, on designating the school, and by Giant and Super G stores to run the program and disburse the funds to schools.

Sunnyside Elementary School: Family-School Relations

During the current year, of the parents and supporters of 483 students at Sunnyside Elementary School (<5% FARMs), 164 made designations earning the school \$2,265.00. Therefore, there was one designation for almost every 3 students at Sunnyside. Each designation yielded nearly fourteen dollars to Sunnyside. Therefore,

client families at Sunnyside Elementary School may be described on the strength of this evidence to be involved in the general activities of their neighborhood school.

The focus of client families social assumptions regarding schools was also indicated by the focus of Parent Teacher Association (PTA) activity. Allendale County, home to both schools, provides the infrastructure for a website for every local school. A visit to the designated addresses of each school on March 23, 2004 revealed that the Sunnyside site was extensively built. Moreover, the vibrancy of Sunnyside's PTA may be glimpsed from the site. What is striking, however, across the activities of Sunnyside's PTA is how focused it is on curriculum activities. The mission statement of Sunnyside PTA stated that, "the complete and well-rounded development of our children is of paramount importance to the Sunnyside Community." The PTA sought to achieve this goal by, "developing united efforts between educators and the Sunnyside community," and by, "creating a closer bond between the home and school." Further, the website revealed efforts at what Lareau (2000) refers to as parents bringing themselves into conformity with the standards that teachers hold for them. The website announced that there was a Sunnyside Parents' Resource Shelf within the walls of the Sunnyside Elementary School, specifically within the, "school media specialist's office." The website contained an annotated list of more than a hundred resources that the PTA had purchased for Sunnyside families to use. Of relevance to this study are the sections, "Child-rearing/Parenting (General)," "Child-rearing/Parenting (Specific Behavioral Issues)," and "School/Education Issues." An entry under "Child-rearing/Parenting (General)" was Dinkmeyer, D and Mc.Kay, G.'s (1973) Raising a Responsible Child: How To Prepare Your Child For Today's Complex World. This title was annotated as

“a guide to raising accountable children.” Claudia Jones’ (1988) title, Parents are Teachers, too: Enriching Your Child’s First Six Years was annotated as containing, “suggested activities to foster self-esteem, learning skills and problem-solving.” The content reflects the title. The book’s premise is that families and schools collaborate in the education of the youth. Indications of social assumptions of client families in the Fairweather Elementary School catchment area are presented next.

Fairweather Elementary School: Family-School Relations

Regarding the Giant or Super G’s A+BonusBucks program, archival data from the Giant website reveal that during the current year, of the parents and supporters of 483 students at Fairweather Elementary School (>60% FARMs), 60 made designations earning the school \$660.00. Therefore, there was one designation for almost every ten students at Fairweather. Therefore, it may be asserted that client families of Fairweather Elementary School are involved in the general affairs of their neighborhood school.

Regarding Parent Teacher Association (PTA) activity, a visit to the designated address of Fairweather Elementary School (>60% FARMs) site was not built up beyond the home page; only its homepage was active. It should not be understood that Fairweather is devoid of social and cultural capital or that it does not have an active PTA. On the contrary, there is a PTA at Fairweather and it seems to be quite active. However, it may target broad family-school relations rather than curriculum-focused activities.

On June 16, 2004 an article titled, “Hard work pays off for Fairweather Elementary” appeared about Fairweather’s PTA in the Fairweather Gazette, a free bi-monthly local circulation. In an effort that, “brought the entire community together,” “in a matter of months,” the PTA had raised \$20,000.00. What was interesting was the focus

of those PTA efforts. The funds were raised to replace a playground that had been missing for two years. This is admittedly a selective look at imprecise indicators of social and cultural capital. A broader look by other means, for example, interviews may well have revealed other patterns of family-school interactions. This is not to suggest that the funds should have been spent otherwise. However, this selective look suggests that the family-school activities of client families of Fairweather Elementary School (>60% FARMs) are focused on the physical upkeep of the school. Activities that give a clearer picture of factors influencing the difference in academic achievement at both schools are revealed by looking inside classrooms for signs of families' involvement in the actual curriculum activities of students. Next, observation of the two classrooms, one in each school, was planned.

Classroom observation.

Classroom observation took place during the months of March and April, 2004 starting with five consecutive teaching days during the week of March 22 to March 26 in the high socioeconomic school, Sunnyside Elementary where Mrs. Mason taught. The following week, observations alternated between schools. The schedule of observations was interrupted on one occasion. No observations occurred from April 5 to April 14 on account of Spring Break and Easter holidays. Then, observation resumed and alternated between the schools.

Observation involves looking, listening, recording, and analyzing or interpreting and occurs on different levels. For example, description stays close to the world of sensory experience whereas interpretation connects phenomena. Field-notes were the primary means for gathering data but it was agreed that teachers could be consulted for

clarification of aspects of the lessons if the need arose. Apart from one query with Mrs. Mason regarding a passing comment on MSA, no other request for clarification was attended to. Regarding Mr. Randolph, during the brief walks to and from his classroom, communication would arise spontaneously. Such conversation was most often of the rapport-building type.

Observation guide.

For data collection, an open-ended observation guide was designed that was based on the theoretical framework and sought for example to categorize data in the field into, 'boundary,' 'strong/closed boundary,' 'strong framing boundary,' 'explicit hierarchical boundary,' 'strong sequencing/pacing boundary,' 'explicit criteria,' and 'visible pedagogy,' etc. Upon entry into classrooms, the observation guide quickly proved impractical: it was impossible to listen, to observe, to analyze and make determinations about organizing data, and write field notes simultaneously. As a result, the first day of observation, which occurred at Sunnyside Elementary School resulted in field-notes that were largely in narrative form and therefore of poor quality from a discourse perspective. The observation guide was abandoned but it had served to sensitive the investigator to the types of data that might be of value for answering the research question.

Subsequent to that first, rather unsuccessful day of data collection that was discussed above, a format for making field-notes was drawn up that kept descriptions and interpretations separate from each other. This was important for ensuring the authenticity of the data. Descriptions, interpretations, summaries, etc. were kept separate from notes on language use.

Analysis was of field notes of spoken language and records. As suggested above, the passing quality of spoken discourse was recognized in the design stage of the study. This meant that a reproduction was needed in order to examine it repeatedly. That reproduction should ideally have been a recording because theoretically verbal and nonverbal details are critical. However, negotiating entry to the research site resulted in an agreement that precluded the use of audio-recording devices. This was done in order to avoid the ethical and procedural issues of anonymity for student participants. Transcription or note-taking of language interaction was used instead. However, every effort was made to ensure that discourse was naturally occurring, and not instigated by the researcher (Wood & Koger, 2000).

During observation, field notes of teachers' interaction with students were made. Every attempt was made to write verbatim the language use of teachers. Teachers' action, tone of voice, position in the classroom, etc. were described. The aim was to give linguistic context to language use and is a requirement of the discourse analytic perspective. To gain entry into the phenomenon of teaching practice as constituted in and through talk, language data must be studied for what it is—language—and how it is presenting the world, not only what it says about the world (Freeman, 1996). This emphasizes the linguist's view of language as not simply meaning or content but also as a system for making meaning. This illustrates both the transparent view of language—language as a window, and the opaque view of language—language as object in itself.

Field-notes included visual representations of classrooms, descriptions of actions, and accounts of interaction. Each entry was labeled with notations of date, time, and place. A chronological format for transcribing data was maintained. Routines were

important: movement, for example, touch and the cultivation of distance in social relationships. Most importantly, teacher-student pedagogical relationship and student-student interactions were captured through language and other social interactions by which they are enacted. Teachers' personal consultations with individual students even when observed were not documented. Pedagogical processes were important during those interactions as were knowledge products. Focus was on discourse patterns and on who participated, how, and when. During observation, attention was paid to analytic categories that link to research questions.

Most observations in the high socioeconomic (Sunnyside) school started at 11:00AM and ended about 12:30PM leading to a total of some fifteen hours of observation. Most observations in the low socioeconomic school started at 11:30 PM and ended at 1:00PM, totaling some eleven hours over the entire schedule of observations. That data set comprises principally of language data. It is made up of hand-written field transcriptions made on-site of two fifth-grade teachers and their respective class' language interactions in reading classrooms. Field notes contained notations of time, generally at five-minute intervals, and two categories of speakers, teacher and student. Brief notes were also included regarding tone of voice, paraphrasing of language that escaped transcription, and researcher insights. All categories of data were clearly marked off from each other.

At an off-site location, hand-written field notes were then typed into Microsoft Word, a traditional word processing program. At the time of typing, additional notes were made recreating from memory salient aspects of the classroom atmosphere. Once again, this category of data was bracketed off as a means of keeping it distinct from other

data categories. Language data on classroom instruction related to timing, duration, grammar, literature, etc, sub-topics, speakers' identity, and speakers' exact utterances where possible. Classroom instruction data also provided evidence of extent, nature, degree of control, participation, and structure of discussions. No student writing samples were gathered except for students' poems that were typed up by the teacher. Field-notes on the physical environment, social environment, and literate environment (print material, notices, mission statements, word walls, etc.) of the classroom were also taken. Classroom observation data were supplemented by data from classroom artifacts.

Classroom artifacts.

Extensive classroom instruction artifacts, for example copies of overheads, texts of poems, and of other materials were retrieved from both teachers. Artifacts of classroom activities were collected during the observation period and provided records of pedagogical plans and activities. Artifacts included teachers' hand-outs to students, worksheets, assignments, and in one case a record of teacher-transcribed poems that were written by students. Artifacts were organized as were transcripts of language interaction and description of class activities, by classroom and date.

Dataset for classrooms.

During early analysis, the activities that make up reading/English Language Arts in Mrs. Mason's class are the following: Book Reports, Grammar, Literature Web, Vocabulary, Silent Reading and Writing. These activities are from the perspective of the outside investigator. The class did not always describe the break-down of activities as is presented above. The posted schedule read 11:00-11:30AM, Writing Strand, 11:30-12:30, Reading Strand.

In addition to the above-mentioned three State-level content standards that are assessed by MSA, the State's high-stakes tests, namely General Reading Processes (GRP), Comprehension of Informational text (CIT), and Comprehension of Literary Text (CLT), state-level content standards relating to writing, reading, and listening were enacted in the classroom but are not directly assessed by MSA. The enacted curriculum also includes strategies and models from county-wide curriculum: Literature Web, Change Matrix, and Grammar Pre-Assessment. Literature Web, Change Matrix, and Grammar Pre-Assessment are part of the College of William and Mary's Literary Reflections.

Fairweather Elementary School.

The first stage of analysis, organization of the dataset into broad but shallow categories, would reveal the enactment of bounded activities within the larger group of teaching activities that occur within the scheduled reading block and that make up reading/English Language Arts in Mr. Randolph's class. Those activities are the following: Newspaper Analysis for Guided Reading Journals, Poetry, Round Table Discussion, Computer Lab, Writing, and Literature Response. As suggested in the case of Mrs. Mason's room, the class may not describe the break-down of instructional activities as is presented above. The posted schedule read as follows: "11:30 Newspaper Analysis, 12:00-12:55 Reading." The enacted curriculum in Mr. Randolph's class was nearly identical to that of Mrs. Mason's class except for a class that was held in the computer lab, one lesson in which the boys and Mr. Randolph joined another fifth grade's boys and their teacher, and direct instruction in newspaper reading. Negotiation of access

to the field component of the study impacted the study's method and is therefore discussed next.

Negotiating Access

As stated above, this research comprises study and field components and therefore required collaboration with a Local Education Authority. In Maryland, the local government unit, the county is contiguous with the local educational authority (LEA) that administers local schools on behalf of the State of Maryland. However, the principal is the officer who is responsible for all policy at a school building and access to classrooms went through the building principal's office.

Teachers seemed to be fully at ease with the investigator's request for entry in part because the county central office and the principal's office had provided crucial information regarding the study and in so doing had acted as gatekeepers in recruiting study participants. Both Mr. Randolph and Mrs. Mason are highly regarded by their respective principals who showed that they were not only supportive of these teachers but were also aware of their exemplary practice. The teachers' concerns were regarding protecting their instructional time. No interview or focus group or other time was requested, which seemed to favor a positive response from teachers, students, and parents. Teachers as adult professionals signed consent forms. Students, being minors, acknowledged being informed of the purpose of the study. Parents were informed of the same. All forms were pre-approved by the university Institutional Review Board. By the time access was granted to the research sites, three benefits were noticeable. First, the research questions were reduced in number, this in order to communicate clearly with LEA, principals, teachers, students, and parents. Second, the language of practice and the

language of policy and academics were harmonized to a certain degree. For example, the term ‘accountability,’ which to this researcher was a broad term that emphasized the spirit of the reform meant simply high-stakes testing to one principal, prompting the formulation, ‘new accountability policy.’ Third, the layering of responsibility or accountability across the school system as was expressed in the successive requests for approval from the LEA, building principal, teacher, students, and parents illuminated the possibility that perspectives within the system may vary with one’s position in the organizational structure. Mirroring the working of educational accountability was the understanding that although the LEA could grant access to classrooms for conducting investigation, it took teachers, students, and parents to make this access a reality. This is not unlike the premise of the new accountability policy itself. This is also rather similar to the assumption by Bernstein’s theory of symbolic control (1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000) that the interaction of teachers and students in classrooms is the defining setting of students’ learning opportunity. In terms of its design, the study suffers from limitations that are discussed next.

Limitations

There are three limitations to this study that are worth acknowledgement and discussion. They are the schedule of observation, inability to connect students directly to their test scores, and the use of transcripts for discourse analysis rather than a recording. As stated above, observation occurred after administration of MSA testing in early March. It was hoped that a different schedule would have been possible. Observation before test administration, for example, might have helped to determine whether pacing and other aspects of knowledge production in the period observed was representative of

pacing throughout the year. The research literature suggests that in the period immediately preceding administration of high-stakes testing, curriculum is narrowed in classrooms to focus on knowledge that is likely to be tested. However, Mrs. Mason of Sunnyside Elementary School did acknowledge during a brief conference after class that class procedures after MSA were rather similar to those that occurred before MSA. The teacher's word was taken on face value and the issue was not pursued with Mr. Randolph.

Secondly, it was not possible to connect students with their demographic data, including test scores on MSA or FARMs status. Therefore, there is no basis for claiming that the students who were observed were representative of their schools' demographic profiles. This situation is the result of negotiation for access to the research site. Privacy of individual students' records was a condition of receiving access to the research site. It must be noted here that Mrs. Mason's reading class draws from the three homerooms that comprise fifth grade at Sunnyside Elementary School.

Finally, analysis of field notes of spoken language and records was carried out in place of analysis of language-in-use itself. As suggested above, the passing quality of spoken discourse was recognized in the design phase of the study. A reproduction was needed in order to examine spoken discourse repeatedly. Although reproduction should ideally have been a recording because theoretically verbal and nonverbal details are critical, negotiating entry to the research site resulted in an agreement that precluded the use of audio-recording devices. This was done in order to avoid the ethical and procedural issues of anonymity for student participants. Transcription or note-taking of language interaction was used instead. As stated above, however, discourse was

naturally occurring, and not instigated by the researcher (Wood & Koger, 2000). The procedures for analysis of data are presented next.

Data Analysis

The research question and analytical framework that guide the conduct of this qualitative study lead to analysis of data that answer the following general types of questions: What events of interest transpired? How were these events structured? Why were these purposive activities structured as they were? Events of interest to this study were both symbolic (through language) and physical interactions between teacher and pupils that were assessed as being functional to teaching and learning. The analytical framework constructs events of interest as those interactional events that function as boundaries (insulation between contents). Those boundaries had specialized purposes of enacting hierarchical rules (social relationship between teacher and pupils), sequencing and pacing rules (selection, organization of content and the time that is allotted for learning those contents that are so organized), and criterial rules (what counts as valid realization of learning on the part of the pupils) and were collectively constitutive of model of pedagogic practice. Explanations for the structure of those events related to sociological and political factors such as the management of time and interactional conflict that relate to both policy and social class contexts.

The first two “what” and “how” questions are analytical in nature whereas the third “why” question is interpretive. The analytical framework provides conceptual categories that determine the activities that are of interest in this study as well as a language for portraying the structure of those activities and interpreting their meaning. Those objects of analysis are words, phrases, sentences, and texts that have social and

political functions, specifically they enact social and political relationships that are constitutive of teaching. The essence of this study is therefore to faithfully adopt ways of seeing that are provided by an a priori theory and to use that perspective to make sense of social phenomena. The elements of that analytical framework were presented in Chapter II. Collection of data in compliance with that analytical framework was described above. The present section of this chapter explains the procedures by which data were rendered meaningful. In general, the initial steps in analysis stuck as close as possible to data and were less analytic and more descriptive. However, interpretation is different from coding and comes directly from observation. Though the present case study report includes both coded data and direct interpretation, it leans more heavily on coding than it does on direct interpretation. The stages of analysis are data organization, coding, single-case analysis, and cross-case analysis.

Organization of Data

Organization of data constituted the first phase of data analysis. During this phase, broad but shallow patterns in data were sought. For example, the dataset was divided into two color-coded file folders, one (yellow) for Sunnyside Elementary School and the other (red) for Fairweather Elementary School. In each folder were identically-themed sets of color-coded (yellow) files, for example on Mrs. Mason's classroom, Sunnyside Elementary School, and the Sunnyside host community. The Sunnyside case comprises files for classroom instruction. Yellow file folders were maintained, one for each day of classroom observation. Each day's files comprise transcripts, field notes, artifacts, complementary but separate notes that were generated using a widely available word-processing software program, and classroom artifacts.

Within each transcript (corresponding to each day of classroom observation) was a subdivision that corresponded to the activities that the teacher had established. A closer look at the collection of classroom transcripts in each case, however, revealed a finer break-down of patterned activities than the two-strand schedule on Mrs. Mason's notice board implied. In summary, the strategy for organizing data consisted of creating a classification system in which activities were distinguished one from the other. Next, the stage of discourse analysis was initiated and entailed entering the phenomenon of teacher and student talk in both classrooms.

Discourse Analytic Procedures

Discourse analysis of teacher-talk serves as the research method or means of making sense of classroom data. Discourse analysis is a member of the broad family of qualitative research designs. It tends to incorporate the following three stances towards the treatment of data: discourse analytic orientation, the analytical process, and scaffolding. Adopting the discourse analytic orientation, discourse was examined creatively in all its aspects and with an open mind to entertaining multiple possibilities of meanings in those pieces of data. The analytical process was observed that entails explaining what was being done in the discourse and how it is done, how it is structured to perform various functions. Scaffolding was observed that entails simultaneously examining utterances and linguistic contexts. This meant that an utterance was analyzed for itself and later as context for others. Analysis was provisional until a late stage in the analytic process, which was recursive and reiterative (Wood & Koger, 2000).

Coding.

In this study, coding was done by hand. In compliance with the analytical framework, the bottom-up approach guided analysis of data: analysis began with language data that came from classroom observation. A coding category is a unit of analysis that repeats. This includes words, phrases, and sentences. Observational data were analyzed by searching for and sorting verbal cues that relate to the a priori codes, including the following, 'boundary,' 'frame,' 'classification,' 'visible,' 'explicit,' and 'code,' etc.

Later, themes and clusters of codes were identified. Analysis proceeded from a focus on coding that is tied to foundational constructs in the analytical model, for example, boundary into themes and clusters of codes. For example, analysis of closed boundaries that clustered across the rules of hierarchy, sequencing and pacing, and criteria led to determination of the visible model of pedagogic practice. Analysis was organized first on a case-by-case basis and then across the two cases.

Single-case Analysis

The students and teacher in every classroom constitute a group in a sociological sense: they interact; they share expectations about each other's behavior. That means that they are really a social group that acts in coordinated ways: they have a common aim, to learn. Observation is typically of a group and this study in particular focuses on embedded settings, a group, and an activity, which make it by definition, a micro-ethnography, that is a case study that is done on a specific organizational activity (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 60). Given the embedded nature of the issues and practices

in this study, analysis of this case study was not holistic, that is of the entire case. Rather, it was by definition, embedded, or of a specific aspect, knowledge production.

CODING CHART

CODING	ILLUSTRATION
Boundary	Hands down till I go over.
Strong/closed boundary	Let's do the DOL test.
Weak/open boundary	Somebody had some opinion about that?
Classification	Reading.
Strong/closed classification	Put away your math homework. It's reading time.
Weak/open classification	What do we do now, reading or math?
Code	Curriculum + Evaluation + Teaching
Collection code	Strong Curriculum + Strong Evaluation + Strong Teaching boundaries
Integrated code	More or less open Curriculum + Evaluation + or Teaching Boundaries
Frame	Take a deep breath.
Strong/closed framing boundary	We must complete this lesson today.
Explicit hierarchical boundary	My turn, students.
Strong sequencing/pacing boundary	John, we have to move on and finish by noon.
Weak sequencing/pacing boundary	Students, should we start out studying verbs?
Explicit criterial boundary	Students, the rule is that you can only use one word from each category.
Implicit criterial boundary	Student, I like the way you are expressing yourselves.
Weak/open framing boundary	Mrs. Mason, can you please go back to the first page?
Visible pedagogy	Strong Hierarchical + Strong Sequencing and Pacing + Strong Criterial boundaries all in the teaching message system
Invisible pedagogy	Weak Hierarchical + Weak Sequencing and Pacing + Weak Criterial boundaries all in the teaching message system
Social class influence	Those of you who have finished your projects (with help from home) may move onto the next assignment.
Policy Influence	Fixed form poetry is prescribed content; multiple choice format of high-stakes test; content to be covered before March.

Analysis of boundary-related codes.

As a first step, evidence was sought of the surface structure of the local pedagogic practice in each of the two classrooms and used a priori coding categories that were presented above. It will be remembered that boundary refers to the degree of insulation between contents. Transcripts in the yellow files of Mrs. Mason were read iteratively to determine the boundaries. Single words, phrases, and utterances that functioned as boundaries were highlighted. At that point, no attempt was made to specify what types of boundaries (open or closed) were being enacted.

The following examples of teacher talk are selected at random from the twelve observations of Mrs. Mason's class. Mrs. Mason says, "Let's do the DOL test that we didn't do yesterday." Later, Mrs. Mason asks, "Somebody had some opinion about that?" "We'll come to that in a minute," she says. Elsewhere, she says, "One more time. Let's go over our assignment that is due on Friday." She uses an overhead. She also says to students, "I want you to figure this out by yourself." At one point, Mrs. Mason is talking about analogies on a worksheet and states, "You're thinking of possibilities and they're not giving possibilities. It's just what they give you." In the dialogue that is classroom talk, students also initiate inquiries, respond and seek clarification, etc.

The following examples of student talk are selected at random from the twelve observations of Mrs. Mason's class. To the invitation to do the test that had been scheduled the previous day, students engage in the physical task of preparing their writing materials. Test taking also requires a certain mode of behavior. For example, student to student cooperation that at any other time might be sanctioned is not legitimate behavior during a test that is administered to individuals. In going over that assignment

mentioned above whose deadline is drawing near, Mrs. Mason reminds students of proper conduct, saying, “Hands down till I go over.” Part of the rituals of this class is that students raise their hands to request permission to address the teacher and presumably the whole class. Finally, the student who had questions regarding proper procedures for doing analogies responds to Mrs. Mason’s laying down the rules by admitting, “I know that’s wrong now.” Those utterances and descriptions were retained as enactments of boundaries.

Next, in compliance with the discourse analytic stance (data may have multiple meanings), the highlighted boundaries were determined to be open (weak) or closed (strong). Closed boundaries increase insulation whereas open boundaries enact little insulation between contents. A random sample of strong/closed boundaries from Mrs. Mason’s class includes the following. In announcing, “Let’s do the DOL test,” Mrs. Mason is enacting a closed boundary in that she is not inviting students to participate in setting the agenda before hand. Only their compliance after the fact is relevant here and it is taken for granted: Mrs. Mason knows her students. They will comply with the agenda she has set for them. By contrast, by posing the question, “Somebody had some opinion about that?,” Mrs. Mason is not calling on a specific student but leaving to any student to contribute to the class. Further, an opinion, a particularly open form of knowledge is invited. In summary, the closed boundary of the utterance, “Let’s do the DOL test” insulates the space and time of this proposed spelling test from any other content whereas the subsequent question lowers the boundary between the content that might have preceded the invitation.

Drilling down deeper into the data, next, boundaries were determined to be enacted as frames or classification. It will be remembered that framing boundaries attend to insulation between contents in the teaching message system whereas classification boundaries insulate contents in the curriculum and testing message systems. For example, in the framing dimension, Mrs. Mason keeps on coaching the student Fatima in the art of proper oral presentation. “Go a little slower,” she says. “Fatima, take a deep breath.” In the classification dimension, Mrs. Mason advises against doing any other content but what is scheduled. “If you’re doing something else,” she says. “I hope you stop.” Elsewhere, she says, “All right. You need to put away your math homework in your math section.” In regulating testing activities in the classification dimension, Mrs. Mason says regarding rules of English Language usage, “Take off most before greatest. Capitalize first letter of first word.” Finally, regarding proper academic behavior in doing analogies, Mrs. Mason reminds the class that, “You’re thinking possibilities and they’re not giving possibilities. It’s just what they give you.”

Drilling still deeper into the data, next, the functions of frames (over selection, organization; over pacing; and over teacher or student) and of classification (between subjects and between educational knowledge and everyday community knowledge) were determined. The following are a random sampling of framing over selection of knowledge. “What does period mean?” asks Mrs. Mason. “What does dreary’ refer to?” “There’s another category of words that you’ve probably forgotten now but you know what they are. They are conjunctions.” In each of those utterances, Mrs. Mason is selecting and organizing knowledge that students are supposed to know or learn. The pacing function is evident in the following utterances. “We’ll come to that in a minute.”

“It takes thirty seconds to start working.” “I am going to give you six minutes to work by yourself.” “Let’s start our six minutes now.” “I am happy to talk about this on Monday.” In each of the cases above, the teacher is speaking and enacting boundaries over students’ talk and knowledge. On the other hand, students also enacted boundaries over teacher knowledge. For example, Mrs. Mason gives directions for writing a sentence using words that are listed under categories by parts of speech. “Is it possible?” asks a male student. This prompts Mrs. Mason’s response, “It is possible.”

To Bernstein, pedagogy is a power relationship (Gore, 1993). The model of pedagogic practice includes four rules that determine the inner logic of the practice: the rules of hierarchy; the rules of sequencing and pacing; the rules of criteria. Analysis of the rules of hierarchy provides data that answer the following question. Who has the bigger say? After analysis, the following relevant assertions were formulated. By turns, Mrs. Mason had the greater say over classroom proceedings, by turns students had the greater say. However, it was observed that Mrs. Mason directed proceedings most of the time except when students presented their Book Reports to the class.

Next, the three sets of pedagogical rules were identified and finally, a generic pedagogical practice was specified (visible, invisible). It seemed apparent that Mrs. Mason often enacted closed or strong boundaries. Selection of knowledge was strongly bounded, for example by such an utterance as “Let us do the DOL test.” Pacing was strongly bounded, for example in the utterance, “I’m happy to talk about this on Monday.” Criteria for correct and incorrect production of knowledge were strongly bounded as in the following utterances. “Only the words up here. You cannot add anything. You cannot subtract anything. This is the game. And the rule is you can only

use one word from each category.” Further, there was often no evidence that school knowledge was part of community language practices. This semblance of strangeness of school knowledge is probably what provokes the following retort to Mrs. Mason’s explication of the rules for writing sentences using words that were given. “Is it possible?” asks the young man, sounding incredulous. A similar tone of incredulity is struck by a student who submits that analogies have no existence or usage in the real world. Mrs. Mason explains that, “Everyone should look up the word analogous. You have to look at the relationship in the words they give you.” To which one student adds, “I don’t think they should do it that way.” Later, Mrs. Mason tells the class that a certain female student has just pointed out several words from the list that was used in the class’ reader. Sensing that this situation presents a teachable moment, Mrs. Mason seizes the day. “It’s a life skill,” she editorializes. This provokes the following response from a student: “There’s no analogy in life.” For a brief instant, the normal order of the class seems to hang in the balance but Mrs. Mason as experienced as she is knows this to be something other than a challenge to her authority. It is the utterance of a student who is testing out this new knowledge in the real world. “Where do you hear it?” asks Mrs. Mason. Order, seems to be restored when a fellow student, Nate displays the following piece of knowledge-making: “tour guide on vacation.”

The integrated code enacts a predominance of open boundaries. The students as opposed to the teacher seem to enact weak boundaries, especially when they were the ones initiating an exchange. “This is way off the topic,” a student would say and proceed to ask a question of the teacher that was indeed off the topic. This occurred occasionally. However, there was a systematic use of open boundaries when students presented written

or oral reports on works they had self-selected and read as part of Book Reports. These occasions presented great opportunities for seeing how the class functioned.

Emergent propositions that answer “how” and “why” questions.

Interpretive propositions were then begun that described how knowledge was being produced in each classroom. Next, interpretive propositions were written that sought connections in patterns of influence of the classroom context, and patterns of influence of the policy context on classroom teaching. Emergent propositions were then tested against data from the field. The aim was to find alternative explanations to those that would appear earlier. Finally, using these propositions as a guide, data were displayed in tables to both verify existing patterns and identify new patterns that may emerge.

Propositions that answer “how” questions were generated separately from those that answer “why” questions. After answering “how” questions relating to patterns in data regarding knowledge production, sources of influence on those findings were sought. In compliance with the analytical framework, these sources are in the social assumptions of pedagogical practice. Again, coding was used, discourse analysis carried out, propositions written, and confirmed.

Cross-case Analysis

Data and propositions from single-case analysis were analyzed to identify similarities between classroom contextual behaviors and policy elements. Analysis of these links comprises two steps. First, the links between knowledge were analyzed that produced classroom context, school, and neighborhood. Next, the links between knowledge produced and policy context were investigated. During observation, and

finally during analysis, it became clear that members of the class share a number of practices for socially constructing authority in their pedagogical relations. Assertions were subject to standards of evidence that are discussed next.

Lines of Evidence

In this study, evidence comes along five lines, specifically the chronological sequence of events, the frequency of patterns in the chronological sequence, acknowledgement in language data, parallelism, and cause-and-effect. Sequence is confirmed when influential action is followed by influence. The inverse is true. Acknowledgement involves explicit attribution of association by the agent/participant in an action who is presumed to be knowledgeable and credible. Parallelism is established when two utterances or actions are so similar as to be unlikely to be due to chance. Cause-and-effect is an interpretation of causation. Frequency assumes that consistency over time equals meaningfulness.

Validity

Validity refers to the degree to which the phenomenon that will be analyzed is the one that is named as the object of the study, knowledge-producing teacher and student practices. Taking language-in-use as the sole evidence of teacher practice reframes questions of validity in teacher research (Freeman, 1996). Whereas, validity in research that saw teachers' words as representing what was in teachers' minds meant trusting their words, in taking language-in-use as the object of study, language itself becomes the locus of study. Procedurally, this means that to study teacher practice, teacher practice with students must be observed. To elicit responses through an interview is to engage in a different instance of social language relationships, one that is not the same as evidenced

in teacher practice itself (Freeman, 1996; Gee, 1996). This means that observational data would bear the larger part of the analytic load of this study. The procedures that have been described above are a reasonable basis for systematically achieving reliable results.

In summary, the present chapter describes the study as a collective case study that focuses on two schools. Data gathering occurs in two stages, first focusing on language data regarding teacher-student interactions in classrooms, next focusing on data on schools, neighborhoods, and communities. Analysis is embedded to focus on the effects of the new accountability and social class respectively on the ways in which teachers and students co-produce knowledge in classrooms under the new accountability.

In Chapter IV, findings are presented that answer the research question that guides the design and conduct of this study.

CHAPTER FOUR

MRS. MASON'S AND MR. RANDOLPH'S CLASSROOM PRACTICE

“How are you supposed to know something like ‘denim’?”

-Boy in Mrs. Mason's English class regarding a vocabulary test item.

The present chapter is the first of two data-driven chapters and presents the research findings that answer the question that guides the study. It will be remembered that this study analyzes the social class-based test score gap in reading under the new accountability. It addresses the following question. How does social class influence academic achievement? This general research question is pursued by interrogating how the new accountability policy influences teachers and students' co-production of knowledge in local classrooms and how social class might influence teachers and students' co-production of knowledge in local classrooms. The study's analytical framework was derived from the British sociolinguist, Basil Bernstein (1924-2000).

Bernstein's (1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000) theory of symbolic control provided a meaningful framework for understanding Mrs. Mason and Mr. Randolph's co-production of knowledge with their respective classrooms as well as for understanding the social assumptions of their pedagogic practice. The theory's models of visible and invisible pedagogic practice offered a conceptual lens through which to make sense of language and other data on Mrs. Mason and Mr. Randolph's construction of pedagogical relations with their students as well as a basis for making cross-case comparison of the data. The study's focus on teachers' regulatory and discursive behaviors made it possible

to determine several factors that constrain working class students' learning and others that enhance middle class students' learning in schools. Regarding the social construction of educational inequality, the use of the idea of social class assumptions of pedagogic practice as conceptualized in the theory guided the study's focus on the role of access to the code, reading ability, parental intervention in learning, and of parenting styles in differentiating students' competences by social class. Further, the construct, boundary, made it possible to attend to issues of time and space and in so doing to analyze where and when the nature of regulatory behaviors in Mrs. Mason's class undergoes a shift from external regulation by a visible teacher to self-regulation by students. However, it was surprising to learn that all interactions and enunciations in classrooms showed signs of regulation rather than what seemed to have been suggested by Bernstein. Bernstein (1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000) suggests that regulation occurs through boundary relations between contents and between transmitters and receivers. In theory, finding that regulation is a continuous and ongoing activity is significant because it suggests an even greater organizing role for power and social control in the construction of educational knowledge. These summary findings will be presented and argued for in this chapter.

The present chapter comprises two major sections, each devoted to one of the two single cases that comprise this collective case study. The first section argues that the new accountability is implemented in Mrs. Mason's classroom at Sunnyside Elementary School. This section finds that Mrs. Mason enacts a visible pedagogy within which is contained an invisible pedagogy. A visible pedagogy is enacted in transmitting contents that State standards characterize as General Comprehension Processes, Comprehension of

Informational Text, and Comprehension of Literary Text that are assessed by the Maryland State Assessments (MSA), Maryland's high-stakes tests. A shift occurs in Mrs. Mason's pedagogic practice regarding other contents. Specifically, an invisible pedagogic practice is enacted in transmitting contents that are not directly assessed by MSA, that is, contents that State standards characterize as Writing, Listening, and Speaking. The section ends with an analysis of the social assumptions of pedagogic models and presents evidence that they function selectively. Mr. Randolph is the subject of the second section, which also comprises analyses of the purely visible pedagogic practice of Mr. Randolph as well as the social assumptions of pedagogic practice at Fairweather Elementary School.

However, before proceeding to analysis of pedagogic practice and the influence of social class and the new accountability on students' learning, it was necessary to determine that the new accountability had made it to the classrooms in question. Evidence that the statewide reform is actually implemented in either class is the basis for subsequent research findings and is therefore presented first in respect of Mrs. Mason.

Sunnyside Elementary School

In this study it was necessary to conceptually distinguish among the intended, enacted, assessed, and the learned curriculum. The intended curriculum refers to the contents of such policy tools as curriculum standards, frameworks, or guidelines, for example Maryland's Content Standards and Voluntary State Curriculum that define the curriculum that the new Maryland accountability calls on teachers to deliver and which is therefore expected to be implemented by teachers acting as servants of the State. The enacted curriculum refers to the actual curricular content with which students engage in

classrooms. The assessed curriculum is that part of the intended curriculum that is validated by high-stakes testing in this case Maryland State Assessments in reading. However, because achievement test scores measure so little and therefore tell so little of what is learned in schooling, it was also conceptually necessary to identify the learned curriculum. Measures of the learned curriculum describe the content that has been learned and the level of proficiency as validated by test scores. The intended, assessed, and learned curricula are important components of the education delivery system, “but most learning is expected to occur within the enacted curriculum” (Porter & Smithson, 2001, p. 2, emphasis in the original). As stated in Chapter I, there can be no clear distinction between teaching and curriculum. Rather, as will be illustrated in this chapter, teaching, curriculum, and testing interrelate dynamically so as to blur the lines.

A source of justification of the new accountability is the assessment that traditionally intended, enacted, learned, and assessed curricula may be decoupled. Decoupling means that the institutional environment of schooling has little influence on teaching because schools respond to changes in the environment by making only symbolic changes but decouple those changes from the classroom. Teachers do this, for example, by resisting new mandates about content and by holding onto their past lessons and favorite topics (McNeil, 2000). Therefore the policy resources of the new accountability were designed to bring coherence to the system and in so doing align the technical device in classrooms with the institutional activities of the system. As will be shown next, disciplining classroom implementation of reform is easier said than done.

Implementation of MSA

Teacher engagement with curriculum reforms is critical to their implementation in local classrooms (Mintrop, 1999). The history of education reforms suggests that instructional reforms that are not proposed by professional educators but rather arise from the elite levels of formal political decision-making in society, for example the US Congress and State legislatures are, for lack of teacher engagement, likely to remain in binders and to collect dust on classroom shelves. However, as discussed in Chapter II, policy or institutional influences are only part of the nexus of considerations in which teacher decision-making in classrooms is suspended. Teachers' actions in classrooms also reflect teachers' personal values and above all the interests of their students. Teacher participation in instructional reform varies such that teachers may initiate reform, collaborate in its design, or have it imposed on them. Mintrop (1999) argues that reforms that work like pedagogies do, engaging teachers in reflecting on their personal beliefs and values, and proving in the real world of classrooms that they are beneficial to students are likely to be implemented in classrooms even in cases where teacher involvement in design is minimal. By contrast, lack of teacher involvement may lessen the likelihood that reforms will be implemented in classrooms.

It will be remembered from Chapters I and II, that the new Maryland accountability is understood to arise out of changes in higher education, the economy, and society, not public school classrooms, and was formulated by the US Congress and Maryland State's legislature. In the words of one national report on the implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) the reform's path led, from the capital to the classroom (Center on Education Policy, 2004) and as was indicated in Chapter I, its

implementation was the focus of important policy debates and political struggle. It could, therefore, not be reasonably assumed that the Maryland School Assessment Program (MSAP) had reached the classroom. The issue of classroom implementation of planned Statewide reform was even more relevant in this study because 2003-2004 marked only the second year of the most recent iteration of Maryland State's accountability policy, the Maryland School Assessment Program (MSAP). As shown in Chapter I, the State's accountability model was reformulated in the wake of NCLB that was passed into law in 2002. The diffusion of innovations may be a lengthy process. Therefore, from the outset, an important information-type of question (Stake, 1994) regarding this State-wide reform was the following. What is the evidence that the new accountability is implemented in Mrs. Mason's classroom? The relevant findings are presented next.

Several lines of evidence, specifically the historical sequence of policy events, acknowledgement by Mrs. Mason, and isomorphism between enacted and intended curriculum structures indicate that there is a direct connection between the curriculum that is enacted in Mrs. Mason's class and the intended curriculum that is made available across the symbolic tools of the new accountability, specifically Maryland Content Standards, Voluntary State Standards, and a district-wide curriculum package that is designed by the College of William and Mary.

Mrs. Mason acknowledged the use of MSAP as a guide to her curriculum making, referring at least once to the effects of MSA on the use of time. It will be remembered, however, that the discourse perspective in teacher research advises that not only the intent that is signified in teachers' words be recognized but more importantly that their actual words be considered as indicators of action (Freeman, 1996). Heeding this advice,

additional lines of evidence were sought for proving a formal relationship between the intended and enacted curricula. Secondly, in surface structure, that is as indicated by the names of categories of topics that were covered, the cognitive demand that was made of students regarding those categories, and their modes of presentation, all classroom activities in the enacted curriculum were found to be markedly similar to the curriculum that was intended by the Content Standards, Voluntary State Curriculum, and the College of William and Mary materials. To illustrate, the novels, Secret Garden (Burnett, 1987) and One-Eyed Cat (Fox, 1984) and the strategy of Literary Reflections, and the theme of change, among others, were traced to the county curriculum where they are prescribed. Further, no enacted curriculum content was observed to be in use that could not be linked to the above-mentioned tools of curriculum policy under the new accountability. For example, the themes of fluency and change that were mapped across many topical categories in Mrs. Mason's practice were traced to Maryland Content Standards where their categories were named, their cognitive demand specified, and their mode of presentation prescribed.

Finally, the findings in this study regarding similarities between surface structure of the curriculum that is enacted in local classrooms and that which is intended in State education policy did not violate the historical sequence of known policy events. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 was passed into law in 2002. MSA was introduced in 2003. Content Standards, Voluntary State Standards, and the College of William and Mary's curriculum package all predated observation in classrooms in 2004. Influence could therefore not have been exerted in the reverse direction. A direct connection was therefore found to exist between the content that Mrs. Mason presented to her class and

the intended curriculum of the county, State, and federal governments. Therefore, the study finds that the new accountability was indeed implemented in Mrs. Mason's classroom.

That the question of whether the curriculum that was enacted in local classrooms was that which was intended by the policy was settled in the affirmative prepared the way for advancing the study by analyzing evidence that would help to determine the nature of the model of pedagogic practice that Mrs. Mason implemented in her class. This section presents analysis of the pedagogic practice of Mrs. Mason. An analysis of the social class assumptions of Mrs. Mason's pedagogic practice as well as an analysis of how and why the students at Sunnyside Elementary School (SES) meet them will follow. The elements of the pedagogic practice are presented next. It will be remembered from Chapter II, that its a priori component themes were derived from the analytical framework and are therefore hierarchical rules, sequencing and pacing rules, and criterial rules. Analysis of the social relationship within Mrs. Mason's practice being most significant, it is presented next.

Visible Pedagogic Practice

Mrs. Mason's class was found to enact what is in the language of the analytical model a visible (traditional) pedagogic practice. It will be remembered from Chapter III, that in methodological terms, visible pedagogy is a genre of pedagogic discourse whose rules are built up from analysis first of the construct boundary or the degree of insulation between contents and between teachers and pupils. Further, it must be remembered that since the analysis focused on the teaching message system, all rules were implemented in the enacted curriculum and therefore were achieved through manipulation of framing or

teaching boundaries that Mrs. Mason enacts in relation to her students and the contents that she transmits.

A conceptual problem arose early in the analysis regarding the nature of the pedagogic practice of Mrs. Mason. Once identified, the values of framing boundaries were then determined and in this case found to be, in the language of analytical framework, of both the strong/closed and the weak/open types. Finding boundaries of two values, namely strong/closed and weak/open sparked an important analytical question that would eventually influence the assertions regarding Mrs. Mason's practice. The analytical framework proposes that whereas visible pedagogic practice is constructed from exclusively strong boundaries, an appreciable effort to weaken strong boundaries marks invisible practice. An important analytic issue, therefore, was whether what was under construction in Mrs. Mason's class was an invisible practice of mixed (strong/closed and weak/open) boundaries.

Closer analysis of boundary types regarding the true nature of Mrs. Mason's boundary practices revealed that the construct offered an additional analytic benefit. As part of the organization stage of data analysis, strands or activities, for example, Speaking, comprising the enacted reading curriculum were identified. Some of the strongest boundaries were observed to cluster around the start or end of those discrete strands or activities in the curriculum. These boundaries were categorized as transitional since they managed content by enacting change from one content to a next. Through analysis of these transitional boundaries, so-called because they were particularly in evidence during places and times when the teacher transitioned from one activity

(Vocabulary, Reading, Writing, Book Report, Grammar, etc.) to the next, it was possible to attend to issues of time and space.

In these transitions, a shift from closed to open boundaries was observed in Mrs. Mason's practice. This shift was found to be a patterned and therefore potentially meaningful occurrence and therefore merited attention. Moreover, this shift seemed to occur at a regular space, specifically in transitions into and out of the presentation of the activity Book Reports. At the same time, the importance of Book Reports to this class could not be understated because as will be shown later in this section, they occupied much time and ushered a significantly different use of space and rituals. It was therefore determined that two distinct models of pedagogic practice were in evidence. This was not entirely surprising. It was a possibility that had been theorized by Bernstein (1990). However, in Mrs. Mason's class, although the shift in practices led to an invisible pedagogy during Book Reports, the visible practice was found to be dominant over time and is therefore presented first.

It will be remembered that a visible pedagogy enacts strong hierarchical, sequencing and pacing, and criterial rules and that the analytical framework constitutes a theory of practice in which those micro-level interactional activities in classrooms socialize students into a division of educational labor that may influence their eventual places in the social division of labor. Given that individuals learn by doing, construction of pedagogic practice produces subjectivities and selects those who can acquire them.

It is a widely held view in modern society that being a student is the job of schoolchildren. If this is so, the finding of both visible and invisible practices may mean that Mrs. Mason's students' learning identities are by turns powerfully constructed under

external control and self-directed under conditions of great social support from the teacher. Because of its dominance, however, the visible practice will be presented next, with a discussion of the social relationship between students and teacher. It will be remembered from Chapter II, that points of analysis in the discussion of hierarchical relations in pedagogy are the role of the teacher, the nature of the teacher's authority, and the establishment of order in classrooms.

Hierarchy

Hierarchical rules define the nature of the power relationship that is pedagogical interaction between the teacher and students. Their enactment constitutes the principal process by which values regarding the conduct of pedagogy are interiorized, reciprocity is exchanged, the group gains the sense of being a group, and trust is cultivated in classrooms. Specifically, the student learns the practices of educational transmission by participating in instruction, being inducted in those practices and dispositions by the teacher, specifically through hierarchical rules.

More often than not, Mrs. Mason enacted explicit rules of hierarchy with her students. Explicit hierarchical relations of power between teacher and student implement external modes of social control on students. This means that Mrs. Mason has a top-down political relationship with her students and they experience her control as such. This hierarchical relationship is also the political space from which the discursive rules that will be discussed later in this section are constructed. In fact, the nature of hierarchical rules is so important in determining the conditions of student learning because not only do hierarchical rules regulate the student's relationship with the teacher, they are also implicated in the enactment of sequencing and pacing and criterial rules.

The determination of explicit hierarchical rules at Sunnyside means that Mrs. Mason will occupy a central role in shaping the conduct, manner, and identity of students as well as the learning schedule and what counts as legitimate learning in her room. The nature of that role is however constructed through hierarchical rules, which are analyzed next.

Teacher easily identified: Central authority.

In visible pedagogies, it is easy to identify the teacher (Bernstein, 1990) because as is revealed in the case of Mrs. Mason, the teacher occupies the central knowledge-producing role in the class, that of transmitter of knowledge. Mrs. Mason presents knowledge to the class for the purpose of covering it, that is complying with the expectations of policy, and for discussion, that is, for students' learning.

As stated earlier, transitions between activities and strands are a rich site for observing the construction of that powerful role. During transitions between activities and strands within the reading block and between class periods from day to day, Mrs. Mason could be heard clearly setting the learning agenda, telling the class what is going to be done, when it is going to be done, and how. This imposition of control, order, and purpose from the outside can only be done through the closed boundaries of explicit rules because external control brokers a minimal margin of freedom from the learner. Three examples from Mrs. Mason's class will illustrate her use of explicit hierarchical rules in setting the learning schedule. On March 23, Mrs. Mason states, "Let's do the DOL test." On March 24 Mrs. Mason states, "Let's go over our assignment." On March 25, Mrs. Mason says, "We are going to check spelling." None of these representative boundary-enacting utterances features a rising tone of voice or inversion of the order of subject and verb that within the norms of English Language usage might indicate a question or

request. None communicates any hesitation and so none invites or admits students' choice, leaves room for doubt regarding what the learning agenda is going to be, or invites collaboration. They assume the students' full cooperation, which it will be shown later in this chapter rests on teacher knowledge regarding who these students are and what they are like.

External direction brings with it its own set of dilemmas. External direction, however, has to be periodically maintained if the teacher's legitimacy is to be preserved because it is not always taken at face value. On March 25, one student who strains against the teacher's direction is told that, "We are not going to discuss it [spelling]." In that instance, Mrs. Mason is redirecting not only that student but also the class by establishing what will not be done. Further, the student is being disciplined in the logic of visible pedagogies. It will be this way because the teacher says so, which may be because official policy says so and the teacher is a servant of the State. Explicit hierarchy is therefore continuously enacted as opposed to being fixed only at transition points. That visible pedagogy is high maintenance and is achieved through continuous regulation was a surprising finding. It had previously been understood that according to Bernstein (1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000) that regulation was a boundary activity.

That visible pedagogy is high-maintenance has implications for classroom power relations. Strains develop in the relationship between teacher and students and those strains have to be resolved from time to time if the teacher's legitimacy is to be preserved. Resolution is done by more external regulation, persuasion or by other means. Explicit hierarchy is therefore intensive: it regulates all visible behavior. In the following examples, Mrs. Mason is attending to the standards of proper behavior by which school

learning is carried out in her class, drawing attention to the need for orderly turn-taking, attention, and quiet which are values of the transmission that are to be internalized by pupils. On March 25, in one of those instances where Mrs. Mason verbalizes the hierarchical rules, she says that, “You can put your hands up or stop talking.” Later, she says, “Don’t anybody move. Just freeze. We are going to check spelling.” Similar utterances that discipline the student body into docility are a constant feature of the class where they have the function of teaching the hierarchical rules of the pedagogy. Those rules may be deduced as including the following. Do not speak until authorized to. Do not be a self-starter: wait for your task order.

In spite of the above stated rules, if pedagogy is an interactional relationship, a form of dialogue and dialectics within pedagogical practice that constructs identity, then as important as Mrs. Mason’s direction is the students’ cooperation. This assertion may be illustrated by the effect of Mrs. Mason’s enactment of authority on students’ compliance. For example, on April 02, even a tacit message is understood as if it were an explicit request to be quiet. “Can you hear each other?” asks Mrs. Mason and the students fall silent, suggesting that some of the values of this transmission are already part of the make-up of students. That is, students’ compliance with the teacher’s authority is an embodied performance. Further, the teacher may be easily identified by the space of authority that is constructed at the front, the visible podium, that small space in front of the class on which Mrs. Mason stands and from which she speaks. Linked with Mrs. Mason’s enactment of central authority as transmitter of knowledge is the undisguised character of her power, which is discussed next.

Power undisguised: Power unmasked.

Given that her students comply with Mrs. Mason's rules one may ask why this is so. In visible pedagogies, the power basis of hierarchical rules is undisguised by any masking rhetorical or other device (Bernstein, 1990) and power is unmasked. The utterance seems to always imply the unstated rule of authority that is, "Because I say so." Building on her enactment of central authority, at the critical transition points of classroom activity, when the students' natural propensity for disorder and the teacher's professional sense of purpose are two opposite forces vying for supremacy, Mrs. Mason uses plain and direct language to organize the class. She does not have to persuade, beg, or bribe: her students know how to submit to authority. The three previous examples from Mrs. Mason's class will illustrate this assertion. It will be remembered that speaking plainly, on March 23, Mrs. Mason states, "Let's do the DOL test." On March 24 Mrs. Mason states, "Let's go over our assignment." On March 25, Mrs. Mason says, "We are going to check spelling." Later that day, she says, "We are not going to discuss it [spelling]." It is important to note that in these cases, Mrs. Mason is making reference to the student, acting on the learner's body directly rather than indirectly through a structured environment. Therefore, regarding the reason students comply, it may be inferred that the teacher draws directly on her authority as such in making those requests. As such, "Let's do the DOL test" means, "Let's do the DOL test because I say so." However, it is necessary to contextualize this use of authority.

It would be a misunderstanding to perceive the use of power or authority above as being coercive. Power is a generative concept here and does not necessarily signal coercion. It must be noted for example, that never does Mrs. Mason appear to be

uncaring. More than two decades of teaching experience have left her with a great measure of self-assurance in the class and that sense of self-efficacy ensures that she never raises her voice. Mrs. Mason speaks in the mildest and most gently modulated tones: it is her authority as transmitter of knowledge and moral preceptor that never wavers. Authority, unmasked power, and caring can co-exist without contradiction in this class because a peculiar view of human social development underpins Mrs. Mason's practice. Outside and inside are distinct here. Over time, the external order of the teacher is presumed to proceed from outside (in the teacher) to the students (inside). That is, the student learns direction by experiencing direction. Mrs. Mason's exercise of authoritative authority therefore apprentices these students into inner regulation.

Once again, of equal importance is that Mrs. Mason's words are effective: students recognize their social and cognitive significance. They have learned the very first lessons of successful schooling, which is to be able to take orders. They know that they are in school, that it is class time, a period of specialized purpose and that Mrs. Mason is a professional teacher, not a parent to be redirected. Mrs. Mason also knows her students do appreciate this. As cited above, on April 02, when Mrs. Mason asks rhetorically, "Can you hear yourselves?," the tacit message to be quiet is understood without ambiguity and complied with promptly. The enactment of undisguised authority, the use of unmasked regulative language by Mrs. Mason are functional to advancing the learning agenda of the class and are part of a holistic school culture in which order is maintained by rules, some of which are unsaid and some of which are explicit.

Rules of Social Order, Conduct, and Rewards.

In visible pedagogies, there are explicit rules of social order, conduct, and rewards (Bernstein, 1990). Lights have to be up and students have to be seated and quiet before Mrs. Mason starts teaching. That is what is meant by Mrs. Mason's March 25 statement that, "You can put hands up or stop talking." Mrs. Mason's teaching activity, predicated as it is here on the students' coming to order, is understood by the students as a form of reward for comportment by the rules. To be taught in this instance is but a microcosmic reward, but a journey of many miles begins with a step and the students know it just as is suggested in this classroom mission statement on the south wall of Mrs. Mason's classroom and forever in the line of sight of the students. The statement reads as follows.

We are the fifth grade team of students and role models of Sunnyside who are here to learn and to have fun. We will pay attention and try our best. In order to succeed in life and get a good job, we will strive to accomplish this mission. We should stand up for each other and follow our dreams (emphasis, mine).

Success in life, getting good jobs, that is achieving advantageous positions in the macro-social structure is the ultimate reward for students' micro-level practices. They are committed students who never interject taboo subjects into their class except for example, on April 1st, April Fools Day. On that day, a mock-realistic notice that uses "edutalk" () to inform students of the administration of a new assessment test is posted on the door. Students attempt to place a pillow on vacant seats. They succeed now and again. Once sat upon, the pillow deflates, mimicking the sound of flatulence. April Fools Day is therefore instructive of the order and conduct that prevail in class if only because by deviating from the norm, it reinforces it. A distinctive feature of this class, therefore, is

its team-like solidarity, which is enhanced by the homogenous social organization of the class.

Homogenous grouping.

In visible pedagogies, grouping of students is homogenous (Bernstein, 1990). In Mrs. Mason's case, students of similar ability come from the three fifth grade rooms to take part in reading. In this way, Mrs. Mason's class comprises students of similar ability that are drawn from across the grade. The homogeneity of students' dispositions and knowledge base of the class therefore made it possible for Mrs. Mason to target the group constantly and teach them as such without running the risk of leaving many students very far behind. Once again, a word of context is necessary regarding students' grouping in the class. On more than one occasion, in casual rapport-building conversations with the investigator in the principal's office, the principal emphasized that students are assessed constantly, their group assignments are changed accordingly, with the result that groups are flexible, and tracking is therefore avoided. Further, Mrs. Mason maintains smaller sub-groups within the class depending on the activity. Overall, however, the students' homogeneity is indicated not only by their behavior in class but also by socio-economic status (<5% FARMs) of the school. It is a sense of sameness that defines the class.

Summary: Hierarchical rules.

In summary, regarding hierarchical rules, which it will be remembered are the most significant for determining the nature of pedagogical practice as well as the contents that are transmitted, Mrs. Mason has the greater say in how teaching and learning are constructed in her class, being the transmitter of knowledge, and occupying the superordinate position in setting the learning agenda. Teaching in Mrs. Mason's class is

largely done through talk, which is clear and direct and the rules that guide conduct are public and explicit. Rules organize talking, working, and conduct. The social environment of the classroom is therefore characterized by tight control. The nature and conduct of this social relationship are significant: they drive pedagogic discourse formation.

Sequencing and Pacing

It will be remembered that sequencing refers to the order of presentation of curriculum materials and that pacing is the time that is allotted for learning these materials. However, as opposed to the rules of hierarchy that regulate the social relationship between teacher and student, the rules of sequencing and pacing are part of the larger set of discursive rules that organize the discourse. Aspects of the sequencing and pacing rules include their mode of organization, the basis for varying them, and regulation of their progression. Mrs. Mason's enactment of explicit hierarchical rules influences sequencing and pacing whose mode of organization is discussed next.

Organized temporally: Time, a scarce resource.

In visible pedagogies (Bernstein, 1990), sequencing rules are organized temporally. Time is indeed the organizing principle in the progression of learning reading/English Language Arts in the new Maryland accountability curriculum message system. That is why there are benchmark years punctuating the progression in the State's Content Standards. In MSAP, the benchmark years are K-3, 4-5, etc. In the Voluntary State Curriculum, the smallest explicitly demarcated temporal unit is a year. Spatial boundaries insulate reading/English Language Arts. This is only the intended curriculum. However, the use of time as the basis of the organizing logic of the intended

curriculum is reflected in the management of time in the classroom, the site of the enacted curriculum. Once more, the utterances that were used above may be investigated for what they indicate about time. Attending to time lost, Mrs. Mason states, “Let’s do the DOL test that we didn’t do yesterday.” Putting an event off to the future, Mrs. Mason states, “I’m happy to talk about this on Monday.” This shows that time is explicitly managed and is a constant consideration in this class. It is part of students’ identity. They are not only fifth graders. They are “role models of Sunnyside who are here to learn and have fun” (Fifth Grade Mission Statement). And it is an identity that is under construction and undergoing constant change. Time is scrupulously managed for the purposes of efficiency: progress is of paramount importance. Theoretically, organizing content according to time may pose problems for students’ understanding as contents are not necessarily organized to emphasize connections, logical or other, but rather to maximize pacing. In this class, however, temporal organization, teacher control of sequence, and rapid pacing are not problematical. No action or utterance was ever documented that indicated that students faced important difficulties with the pacing of the transmission. Why this is so will be argued later in this section.

Further, a peculiar instance of sequencing and pacing was on display in Mrs. Mason’s room. It is called curriculum compacting. Curriculum compacting (Reis, Westberg, Kulikowich & Purcell, 2004) is a strategy by which curriculum content that students have already mastered is eliminated and more appropriate materials are substituted. It is a strategy that increases pacing and therefore increases coverage of curriculum materials. It would seem that curriculum compacting would spark resistance among students because it would entail a greater effort on the part of the students to learn

new material instead of reviewing already learned material. In other words, the attempt to compact curriculum could present an opportunity for student resistance. However, this was not the case in Mrs. Mason's class. The students complied with the request for information on which the teacher's decision to skip over learned material was made. Mrs. Mason's students are not only seasoned travelers, they pass their instructional time rather wisely, too.

Vary by age: Content that is increasingly abstract.

The logical extension of the temporally-organized learning rules of visible pedagogies is that sequencing rules vary by age (Bernstein, 1990). When Mrs. Mason asks her students to recall the meaning of a period in oral reading, they answer in very concrete terms, "Take a deep breath." Moreover, learning that was concrete in third grade is becoming more abstract in the fifth grade. Therefore, not only does the surface structure of knowledge change with time from grade level to grade level, but the deep structure of knowledge changes, too. Knowledge changes from concrete to abstract because the organizing principle descends from the surface to the depths. Deep structure refers to principles for generating new knowledge. This movement from organizing the surface to the depths is another aspect of the visible practice's view of the world and human development: it is based on a clear belief in outside and inside in which the course of development is from outside to inside. It was possible, therefore, to see students taking their first tentative steps towards generating knowledge in original ways. This occurred, for example, in discussing banking.

Progression is public.

In visible pedagogies, the above described progression is public (Bernstein, 1990) in the sense that they are published, here on MSDE website as well as the subject of public policy agreements. As stated in Chapter I, accountability is a multi-layered concept: federal, State, and local authorities regulate what students learn in neighborhood schools. Under accountability, at the State level, what is to be learned first and what is to be learned later in the school career is set out in Maryland Content Standards and Maryland's Voluntary State Curriculum. Once again, it must be remembered that the above illustrated the intended curriculum. However, in the enacted curriculum, when, Mrs. Mason says, "Remember in third grade? What does period mean?," she is referring to this progression of reading/English Language Arts content. In response to this question, a chorus of students say in unison, "Take a deep breath," signaling not only the enactment of this progression but also its internalization, its movement from outside to inside: "Take a deep breath" reflects local knowledge between teacher and students. It will also be remembered that in answering the question above of whether the intended curriculum led to the enacted curriculum, similar evidence was presented that led to an answer that was in the affirmative.

As will be discussed further later, it will be remembered from discussion of the analytical framework that this definitive and public progression of school knowledge is part of the social infrastructure by which students may be stratified in schools: reading students who do not pause at a period can be characterized as failing to master aspects of the third grade curriculum or fifth grade as the case may be. By contrast, students who

master the fifth grade's curriculum will enter middle school at the start of the next school year.

Rituals of transition.

Finally, a mark of the pacing rules of visible pedagogies are the rituals of transition (Bernstein, 1990). The marking of larger transitions involves annual high-stakes testing and other forms of evaluation that culminate in the students' promotion from a given space, the fifth grade classroom of Mrs. Mason to another room, in this case within another building in a middle school (grades 6-8). Yet, smaller markings of equally small transitions in sequencing and pacing may be observed daily in the class. There are transitions from math into reading, transitions from writing activities into reading, from group work into individual work, and from teacher talk into student talk. And throughout all those smaller transitions, one constant is the clear hierarchical, organizing role of Mrs. Mason, largely constructed through talk, specifically through strong/closed boundaries.

The above-mentioned transitions are clear-cut. The single utterance by Mrs. Mason on March 25, "You can put your hands up or stop talking," is charged with symbolic meaning regarding such rituals. The imposition of order itself is a way of ritualizing the shift from the aimless chatter that children will occupy themselves with if left to their own device to the purposive discourse of English Language Arts instruction. It also reproduces the ritual by which students are recognized in class as a forerunner to their taking turns to speak to the teacher and class: they raise their hands. Raising hands in search of authority to address the class ritualizes the subordinate position of the student in this relationship. On that occasion, all those symbolic meanings were recognized by Mrs. Mason's class. The dictionary meanings of the word "or" notwithstanding, the

students in this relationship knew clearly that no choice was being offered. The class had neither begun nor did they, as students, have the recognized authority or expertise to begin it. In a less self-assured teacher's language of control or with less well regulated students, "You can put hands up or stop talking," would be simply, "Be quiet!" The significance for the progression of learning, however, is the same: the teacher seems to be saying it is time for our old, familiar journey towards enlightenment. In the educational TV show, Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood, the affable Mr. Rogers might change into his moccasins. The stereotypical train conductor might yell, "All aboard!" In Mrs. Mason's class, it was that time again, the time for embarking once more on the journey towards enlightenment.

Summary: Sequencing and pacing rules.

In summary, regarding the rules of sequencing and pacing, the image of expert conductor of a well-oiled train and seasoned travelers may be reasonably extended here to include the dimensions of space and time. Mrs. Mason's use of clear words and caring tones ensure that the train of learning in spite of intermittent pauses keeps on moving, keeps pace, and stays on track, which is assured by sequencing and pacing rules that are made explicit by Mrs. Mason. Explicit sequencing and pacing rules also make possible and are helped by the strategy of curriculum compacting in which content that has already been learned is avoided, making time only for what is new. Sequencing and pacing of learning are therefore very tightly controlled. The nature of the criterial rules that Mrs. Mason enacts also hinges on the nature of hierarchical relations between teacher and student as is discussed next.

Criterial Rules

Criterial rules help to sensitize the students to what in terms of communication, conduct, and knowledge may be legitimate or valid within the context of instruction (Bernstein, 1990). The focus of evaluation, the criteria for evaluation, the mode of learning, as well as its aim are aspects of criterial rules that are discussed next.

Focus on product/performance: Rules.

In visible pedagogies, criterial rules focus on a product or performance (Bernstein, 1990). On March ____, Mrs. Mason states that students should compose sentences using, “only the words up here [on the overhead]. You cannot add anything. You cannot subtract anything. This is the game. And the rule is you can only use one word from each category.” In that case, the rules could not possibly be clearer: only the composition matters. It must be noted that what is referred to here, is not any hypothetical internal state of the students. Minimum social support is given for the creation of the text but rather the constraints under which the students must produce that text are highlighted: they are to add no words, take away none, but limit their use of the words to one per category or part of speech.

Read for what is lacking.

How is a text that is produced under conditions of constraint with emphasis that is placed on the product to be evaluated? In visible pedagogies, such a product or performance is “read” for what is lacking or how it meets pre-set criteria (Bernstein, 1990). Probably no strategy for pointing to deficiencies in texts is more effective than deducting points that might otherwise be gained. On March 29, in correcting a spelling test, Mrs. Mason reminds students that their spelling test ought to be written in cursive.

“You would notice,” she says, “if I didn’t count the score.” Elsewhere, on March _____. Mrs. Mason states, regarding a Grammar Pre-Assessment activity, “Just mark it right or wrong. I don’t want you to write the correct answer. Just mark it right or wrong. If you don’t have the answer I give you, just mark it wrong. We’re not going to discuss it.” Right or wrong answers mark a categorical form of educational knowledge that is constructed through strong/closed framing.

Learning is private, individual, and competitive.

In visible pedagogies (Bernstein, 1990), learning is individual, private, and competitive. On April 23, symbolic use of distance marks testing as a site of private work. “Spread out a little,” says Mrs. Mason in preparing the students to take the test. The students scoot farther away from each other. On April 15, Mrs. Mason says, “I don’t want any talking. I want you to figure this out yourself,” illustrating that in this class, learning as an accomplishment is individual. Moreover, when Mary is publicly recognized for her perfect score, there is a subtext of competitive behavior as the bar is raised higher and higher (17/20, 18/20, 19/20) until Mary stands alone in her perfect performance.

Difference within students.

In visible pedagogies (Bernstein, 1990), difference within students is produced. The pupil is expected to grow and change as a knower over time with their own past achievement as a baseline. The allusion to a class assessment above may illustrate this point. On April 23, Mrs. Mason returns test papers with scores on them. She reads the correct answers. Then she asks for a tally of high performers. Anyone scored 17 over 20? Two hands shoot up. Twelve hands go up for those scoring over 17. Nine hands

show for students scoring 18 and over. Students scoring 19 number three. Only one student scores 20 over 20. That student is Mary. “Congratulations, Mary,” says Mrs. Mason, recognizing Mary for not only achieving a perfect score but setting herself apart from the rest of the class. In recognition of that difference between themselves and Mary, the class applauds. It may be reasonable to assume that Mary’s position in class may be incorporated into her self concept and social identity.

Summary: Criterial rules.

What constitutes legitimate behavior in terms of communication, conduct or knowledge in the context of Mrs. Mason’s reading room appears to have been clear to teacher and students except on occasions that stand out because of their rarity. Two such occasions are selected to illustrate this assertion. The first was introduced in Chapter I where it illustrated other assertions. A summary-type entry in classroom data reveals the following by way of context. “Teacher asks students to use one word from each category on the slide to write a sentence. Students query. Teacher explains again.” At this point a male student asks, “Only use the words that are up here?” To which Mrs. Mason responds, “Only the words up here. You cannot add anything. You cannot subtract anything. This is the game. And the rule is you can only use one word from each category.” At which point one male student asks, “Is this possible?” In this instance, students overcome their doubts and attempt the exercise, in other words, attempt to play the game by the rules that were set. They did so even if classroom data reveal that the exercise posed great difficulty to students as is attested to by the following statement by [Oliver]. “I have one [sentence] but I don’t know if it makes sense.”

The second scenario that is selected to illustrate students' clarity regarding what counts as legitimate knowledge in Mrs. Mason's English class has also been introduced in Chapter III at which time it illustrated strong criterial rules. It concerns analogies. Mrs. Mason explains that, "Everyone should look up the word analogous. You have to look at the relationship in the words they give you." One student objects, saying, "I don't think they should do it that way." A lively discussion ensues in which several students take turns trying to explain to their classmate what really was at stake in the exercise on analogies. The tension is mild but is palpable. A break is achieved when a certain female student points out that several words from the list that were used in her reader. Mrs. Mason comments, "It's a life skill." To this, a student responds, "There's no analogy in life." It seems that the order of the class hangs in the balance. "Where do you hear it?" asks Mrs. Mason. Nate suggests, "tour guide on vacation." However, the matter is closed only when the student who started it all professes his conversion by saying, "I know that's wrong now." Criteria for what knowledge counts in class are therefore very tightly controlled. Those instances as mild as they were and as focused on learning as they were stand out in the database as the greatest challenges to Mrs. Mason's authority.

Social Class Assumptions

It will be remembered that the earlier section of the chapter described what Mrs. Mason's class made by way of school knowledge as well as how they did it. They constructed categorical academic knowledge, proceeding efficiently and quickly using such strategies as curriculum compacting. In short, they focused on performance. To capture that headlong and unrelenting progress, the extended metaphor of train,

conductor, and seasoned travelers was used to denote a learning schedule that does not veer off track but is focused by the skills of the teacher and the compliant dispositions of its middle class pupils. Why do they proceed this way? The analytical model suggests that such knowledge-making procedures are not the only way to transmit knowledge but rather may constitute the embodiment in schooling of the middle class advantage that is constructed by families that meet the social assumptions of this form of pedagogic discourse. In other words, students' identities select the pedagogy but the pedagogy also selects who can receive it, as is discussed next.

Let us therefore begin with a vignette from April 23. On that day, Mrs. Mason had just administered, scored, and returned a vocabulary test to students. Scripts were turned down on the desks next to students. Entries in field-notes give an indication of the range of emotional states that students were in: "some roar," "raised eyebrow," and "pressed lips." First, Mrs. Mason reads the correct answers out loud to the class then she asks that students by a show of hands identify themselves when a score was mentioned. There were twenty items on the test and each was worth one point. Of the twenty-five students that are present, two get a score of seventeen, twelve get seventeen points or more, nine get eighteen points or more, three get nineteen items right. Only one student shows her hand when the score of twenty is called out. The class applauds her singular achievement. An argument breaks out between two students who cannot agree on why one specific answer should be right. Mrs. Mason intervenes at 11: 55 AM.

Mrs. Mason: This is kind of important. Look at the relationship. You're thinking possibilities and they are not thinking possibilities. It is just what they give you.

The students raise a query. It is now 12:00 noon. Mrs. Mason intervenes once more.

Mrs. Mason: Everyone should look up the word 'analogous.' You have to look at the relationship in the words they give you.

Third student: I don't think they should do it that way.

Mrs. Mason discusses another item that had been on the test. It is now 12:06 PM.

First student: I know that's wrong now.

Mrs. Mason checks in with students on whether they feel more comfortable doing analogies than they did at the beginning of the year. She confers quietly with Aisha then shares the gist of the conference with the class.

Mrs. Mason: Aisha has come up to me four times to show me a Wordmaster word in her reading. It's a life skill.

Fourth student: There's no analogy in life.

Mrs. Mason: Where do you hear it?

Third student: Tour guide on vacation.

The class conversation continues. Mrs. Mason returns to the issue of analogies.

Mrs. Mason: What an analogy does, it makes something very specific very clear to the reader.

Fifth student: How are you supposed to know something like 'denim'?

Sixth student: I just found three Wordmaster words in my reading.

Mrs. Mason asks him to share those words. He does so. A seventh student speaks.

Seventh student: You can know many meanings and still not get it: you need to know the relationship.

Mrs. Mason connects to this statement by asking for students to indicate by a show of hands how many are fluent in two languages. Three or four hands shoot up. The discussion of the test items continue until 12: 27 PM. Mrs. Mason brings the class to a close with a request.

Mrs. Mason: Over the week-end, can you finish reading Secret Garden (Burnett, 1987)? Let's finish One-Eyed Cat (Fox, 1984) by Wednesday.

The above vignette is replete with related meanings. One, it reveals a certain social distribution of the knowledge of valued vocabulary items. Two, it sheds light on some of the distributive rules that lead to that arrangement of right answers. Three, it illuminates the strangeness of the knowledge product that is skill at doing analogies. It is a strangeness that is emphasized in the quotation that began the chapter. There a student expresses his bafflement at the word 'denim.' It is as if he is asking where in his advantaged middle class family and school lives must this little word have been that so eluded him. That boy's question is the microcosm of this study. In a sense that boy's bafflement reflects the essential question that guides this study. How does social class

influence achievement in reading? The three meanings that were presented above regarding the social distribution of valid answers on the vocabulary test, the principles for distributing those valid answers, and the strangeness of the words are all related in that they hinge on the nature of knowledge that is realized in this form of pedagogic transmission, namely academic knowledge.

Academic knowledge is distinct not by being practical or formal: all knowledge is formally constructed. Rather, it is the distributive laws that make it different (Muller, 2001). These students recognize the essential strangeness of the skill of doing analogies and the knowledge of terms like ‘denim’ on which it rests. They sense in their bones that this knowledge is not constructed or distributed in contexts of application, for example, during play with their friends. Rather, it is constructed and distributed through the discourses of schooling. But that is only part of the reason why this knowledge is unevenly distributed.

The aim of this section of the chapter is to analyze the distributive principles that are at work in the learning experiences of Mrs. Mason’s fifth grade reading class. It will be remembered that three general pathways are presented in the theory of pedagogic practice by which visible pedagogies disadvantage the working class in learning school knowledge. They are differential access to the code, early development of reading, and the use of two sites of learning. The dynamics of difference that are related to access to the code are analyzed next. As this is the presentation of single-case analysis, no attempt to contrast the cases will be presented here.

Differentiated Access To Code

It will be remembered that the code is a designation for a transmission and that it gives form to educational knowledge, which is “uncommonsense knowledge” whereas everyday community knowledge is “commonsense knowledge” (Bernstein, 1971, p. 215). This formulation of the code as a form of transmission sets the basis for discussing the issue of the potential unequal access. In other words, the term ‘educational knowledge code,’ ‘code’ for short, refers to, “the underlying principles which shape curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation” (Bernstein, 1971, p. 203). ‘Uncommonsense’ knowledge being a form of socially valued goods, social principles of power and social control regulate the classification and framing of public educational knowledge and in this way determine the form of this code.

It will be remembered that classification refers not to what is classified but to the relationships between contents and is underpinned by the idea of boundary strength such that classification means, “the degree of boundary maintenance between contents” (1971, p. 205). Framing refers to the, “the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, organization, and pacing of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship” (1971, p. 206). Of the two types of code, the collection type is formed where contents stand in closed relation, or where, “contents are clearly bounded and insulated from each other” (1971, p. 204). Collection codes have strong framing and strong classification. “A marked attempt to reduce the strength of classification,” (1971, p. 207) results in an integrated type code. The high insulation between contents within collection makes possible greater differences in pedagogy and evaluation than are realized by integrated codes. The surface structure refers to the particulars of subjects

whereas deep structure refers to general principles and the concepts that make these principles possible. The integrated code's emphasis on the deep structure affects pedagogy that focuses less on acquiring states of knowledge and more on how knowledge is created. By contrast, the collection code proceeds from the surface structure of knowledge to the deep structure to which only the elite has access because it is revealed late in the educational career where mainly the elite persists. The deep structure of knowledge refers to principles for generating new knowledge.

Access to the code.

The advantageous position of Mrs. Mason's students is shown in their recognition of the sequencing rules, especially regarding selection and organization of knowledge. It will be remembered that if some content comes first and others are left for later and there is some logic to the sequencing, it becomes necessary to have the necessary background knowledge on which to build new knowledge (Murphy & Alexander, 2002). Bernstein posits that the initial sequencing rules in early childhood education may disadvantage the poor. It was shown in Chapter II that poor students enter kindergarten with less knowledge of letters than middle class students. It was assumed that sequencing rules could have equally deleterious effects in fifth grade. Through socialization into collection codes and its derivative, visible pedagogic practice, "the pupil soon learns what of the outside may be brought into the pedagogical frame" and making of, "educational knowledge something not ordinary or mundane, but something esoteric" (Bernstein, 1971, p. 215). Therefore, confronted with the esoteric nature of analogies as a skill, the fourth student in the vignette above remarks, "There's no analogy in life," and the fifth student asks, "How are you supposed to know something like 'denim'?" In this case, the

selection component of sequencing rules is highlighted. They had spent the last few years in schools and still had not learned the word ‘denim.’ Cases like these are few in the database relating to Mrs. Mason’s class. Therefore, Mrs. Mason’s students’ meeting the sequencing rules is indicated by a lack of instances in which even a few students acknowledge experiencing difficulties with selection of academic knowledge and by extension with sequencing rules.

Middle class advantage: Keeping up with the pacing rules.

The advantageous situation of Mrs. Mason’s students is evident in their facility with the pacing rules. It was shown above that Mrs. Mason’s students largely meet the sequencing rules of visible pedagogies in the area of analogies. Stated otherwise, Mrs. Mason’s students enact a relatively rapid pace of instruction on account specifically of their meeting the explicit sequencing rules of visible pedagogies. Once again, the vocabulary test that is referenced in the vignette above may illustrate this claim. The items in the test were prescribed, that is strongly classified and strongly framed. The criteria for valid answers were also equally rigid: students had no margin of error for answers were either right or wrong. As suggested above, this activity seems to be the longest or activity of slowest pacing in the database regarding Mrs. Mason’s class.

Ability To Read

It follows from the previous discussion that middle class students are likely to read at an earlier age than do working class students. The implications of this relatively early literacy skill are discussed next with regard to their implications for conferring advantage in acquiring the rules of pedagogical discourse.

Sequencing and pacing rules based on reading.

The advantageous situation of Mrs. Mason's students is indicated by their facility with reading. At the end of the vignette that was presented above, Mrs. Mason shows some concern for pacing of instruction. "Over the week-end," asks Mrs. Mason, "can you finish reading Secret Garden (Burnett, 1987)?" Then she adds, "Let's finish One-Eyed Cat (Fox, 1987) by Wednesday." In setting a firm time-frame and selecting the content for the week-end activity, Mrs. Mason is enacting the explicit sequencing rules of the visible practice. However, it is the students' ability to read a juvenile novel independently that is the basis of these pacing rules. Knowing her students to be independent readers with a certain ability, Mrs. Mason is able to outsource some academic learning to the week-end when students are theoretically supposed to be at leisure.

Middle class advantage: Meeting rules, organizing discourse.

Since one is socialized into the rules of educational discourse, "discipline then means accepting a given selection, organization, pacing, and timing of knowledge realized in the pedagogical frame" (Bernstein, 1971, p. 214). In the vignette above, in asking her students to finish reading Secret Garden (Burnett, 1987) over the week-end, Mrs. Mason is also implying that they should read it independently. In other words, Mrs. Mason can count on students to organize their own reading, specifically its pacing. Mrs. Mason's request for such independent pacing and sequencing of this learning activity is due to knowledge of her students' literacy skills. That is she knows that her students are able to read/learn to learn. That assertion is further borne out in the vignette above, for

example in the case of Aisha who has come up several times to point out to the teacher words that she had seen and presumably had reinforced through independent reading.

Middle class advantage: Exploring new realities.

The ultimate mystery of a subject is, “its potential for creating new realities,” (Bernstein, 1971, p. 213), which is the unknown, the subversive. Education makes possible new possibilities, be they imagined or real, leisure or economic activity. The mission statement that is posted in Mrs. Mason’s room indicates that students can make the connection between schooling and jobs. However, more than its presence, is the fact that students act in conformity with the definition of what role models for Sunnyside would be.

In the vignette above, Mrs. Mason is actually coaching students into seeing the possibilities that education offers for perceiving new realities. Endowed with less knowledge, including professional and experiential knowledge than their teacher, the students are skeptical whether the skill of analogies may translate into the real world outside school. That is, some do not see the truth in their teacher’s assertion that, “It’s [analogies] a life skill.” In response to Mrs. Mason’s emphasis on the relationships between pairs of words that constitute possible answers, the third student resists the idea on normative grounds, saying, “I don’t think they should do it that way.” Another student comes around to seeing the new realities, admitting, “I know that’s wrong now.” Finally, a third student sees the application of analogies within the work of a “tour guide on vacation.”

Two sites of acquisition

It will be remembered that the learning schedule in Mrs. Mason's room was compared to the swift movement of a train. A significant factor in differentiating students' experience of visible pedagogy is the social assumption that learning is coordinated between home and school and therefore middle class homes that met this requirement of visible pedagogy subsidize school learning.

Knowledge of vocabulary and analogies under visible pedagogy.

Once again, in the vignette above, one student recognizes that the skill of doing analogies is in use in the tour guide's practice and shares that knowledge with the class. Here then is a case of a student reconstructing within the school everyday common knowledge from an activity that might have been conducted under the aegis of the home. The vicarious or real experience of being served by a tour guide becomes a basis upon which that student reconstructs the skill of analogies from impractical to practical knowledge. In this example, the symbolic activities and economic and cultural attributes of the home become a foundation for the construction of knowledge regarding the practical contexts in which school knowledge is applied. This recognition may not only help confirm the identity of this student and the class as knowers of the applicability of analogies skills but may quite possibly increase the significance of this skill and by extension improve their motivation for doing it.

Academic knowledge subject to unequal distribution through house and school.

If the basis for one student and eventually his class' understanding of analogies as a life skill is even in part the use of a second location of learning, the home, then the seeds of unequal learning are sown in the social reality of varying cultural and economic

attributes of households that are characteristic of Maryland and American society. In short, as the cultural and economic backgrounds of households vary, for example, regarding the desire and willingness to go on vacations or tours, so will the ability of households to subsidize school learning. To draw on a second example, that is also presented in the vignette, there is a cultural and economic assumption behind Mrs. Mason's outsourcing of students' reading. The involvement of the home presumes support from and even control by parents in realizing this activity (cultural) and the availability of time resources for reading and space for quiet contemplative activity at home. These affordances are not to be taken for granted. They are not uniformly distributed in our society. They constitute a social class basis of selection of this pedagogical orientation. In summary, the middle class derive benefits of the visible pedagogy but they also implement an invisible pedagogy.

Invisible Pedagogy

It was also found that within Mrs. Mason's enactment of a visible (traditional) pedagogy with her class an invisible pedagogy was also enacted, specifically during the activities that are related to Book Reports. The determination of an invisible pedagogy was arrived at after determining boundaries. Boundaries were determined to be open and to be enacted in the presentational or teaching message system of education. In the language of the analytical framework, these boundaries are called framing boundaries. Next, the nature of the pedagogical rules was determined. Because of the importance of hierarchical rules for defining the social relationship between teacher and student as well as shaping the nature of pedagogic discourse itself, they were determined first.

Hierarchical rules.

Hierarchical rules during Book Reports were determined to be implicit. Under implicit hierarchical rules, the analytical framework suggests that it is hard to identify the teacher (Bernstein, 1990) in part because rather than acting directly on students in the role of transmitter of knowledge, the teacher organizes the environment, acting indirectly on students in the role of a facilitator of learning. If Mrs. Mason is the ‘sage on stage’ during visible pedagogic practice, during invisible practice, she is the coach, ‘guide on the side,’ or more precisely in the back. Symbolic use of space is central to the enactment of implicit hierarchical rules. In Mrs. Mason’s classroom, symbolic spaces that are invested with varying degrees of power and authority can be observed under social construction and daily reproduction. It shows Mrs. Mason organizing the learning environment. For example, an invisible lectern, a space of authority that is a few square feet in front of the room was perceived to be socially produced and reproduced constantly during presentations of book reports. A physical description of Mrs. Mason’s classroom and its social use will make this clear.

Architecturally, Mrs. Mason’s room is a typical American classroom: it is rectangular. Were the classroom to be considered a theater, it would have a clear visual orientation. Eyes are generally trained on the front of the room. In terms of its interior design, once more, Mrs. Mason’s room is typical of American classrooms. The main staging area is at the front of the room. That is where the chalk board that is used for instruction is located. The teacher’s desk is also located there. The auditorium comprises two large rows of individual students’ tables that are kept in close lateral proximity to

others. An aisle leads from the front of the room to the back. A continuous aisle runs around the room and is formed by the students' tables and the walls.

If the architecture and interior design of Mrs. Mason's classroom are typical of American classrooms, the social and symbolic organization of the instructional space is anything but typical. For example, it is not the teacher's desk that is the position of authority in reading class. Rather, it is those two or three square feet that are located immediately in front of the teacher's desk, at the front end of the passage, and between the first row of students' tables. As will be shown later in this section, the choice of that space rather than the teacher's desk is both symbolic and functional to the class' working as an educational setting. But first, the way in which that space of authority is marked is described.

The space of authority is socially marked by being occupied by persons who engage in purposive classroom activities. Marking is by unwritten conventions that are nevertheless reinforced in many media and reproduced continually. As such the invisible lectern is unrivaled by any other social space. It is as important, however, to note how this space is not marked as well as how it is indeed marked. There is no tape, paint, or other superficial sign designating the space or specifying its function. Yet, whoever occupies that space is authorized to speak to the entire class and may reasonably expect to discharge their function without challenge and so command the attention of that class. Further, the space of authority comes with responsibilities regarding the class. He or she is expected to field questions from the class; he is the speaker to all the class. However, occupying the space of authority at the front, though necessary for exercising authority

over the affairs of the class, is not sufficient in itself. It requires the manipulation of other social symbols that are equally embodied.

One such symbol system is bodily posture. The symbolic manipulation of bodily posture reinforces the symbolic value of the invisible podium as the space of power and authority in Mrs. Mason's class. One seeks to be authorized to speak in class. Whoever seeks to be authorized to speak to the class from the invisible podium must stand on his or her feet such that standing is the posture of the deliverer of information and receiver of inquiries. It is made easier by the fact that the students of Mrs. Mason's class appear to be all in good physical health and none is afflicted with any physical defect or illness that would make this practice selective. By contrast, sitting (elsewhere in the room) is the posture of listener and questioner. However, standing is necessary but not sufficient for being endowed with the authority of classroom speaker.

One must stand at the invisible podium. By doing so, one's authority to speak is enhanced tremendously. By contrast, students stand in different spaces, sometimes at their seat or at the back in order perhaps to relieve pressure from sitting. This practice of standing elsewhere confirms that standing alone is not sufficient for being authorized to address the whole class. How does one get to the lectern?

How one gets to the invisible lectern reflects the principles of social control in this class. One is duly invited to the invisible podium by Mrs. Mason and only by Mrs. Mason. Mrs. Mason is responsible for the maintenance of that space. One is invited to that space within the context of the legitimate learning activities of the class. Once invited to that space, one must reach it by as direct a route as possible. The invitation to a student to occupy that space is an occasion on which to observe rather symbolic rituals.

When someone else is invited to the invisible podium, Mrs. Mason issues the invitation and walks away from that space of authority, ceding it to the invited guest. She walks straight down the passage and sits in back on a stool. Then, a passerby may be unclear as to who is in charge of the classroom. A student would be standing upright and in the place of power at the front, the invisible lectern, whereas Mrs. Mason would be seated albeit on a stool but in back of the room.

Once one is authorized to speak to the class, which is symbolized by standing at the invisible podium, one must show that they belong, that they are competent to speak to the class. Competence to speak is symbolized by loudness of volume, pacing, eye contact, a general physiognomy of seriousness, and relevance. One must speak loudly not so much as to command the class' attention in a way that they do not hear themselves, but rather so that the function of occupying the invisible podium is fulfilled: that the privileged speaker is heard by all. One must at the same time pace one's speech at a natural pace, somewhat akin to that of formal conversation so as to retain one's audience. This is not hard to do as will be shown later because in terms of discipline a teacher could not wish for a better class. The speaker who is at the invisible podium must make frequent eye contact with his or her audience. One must not giggle or laugh but rather appear to be serious and worthy of attention. Finally, the speaker must speak on a matter of relevance to the learning agenda. It is easy to be moved by this because to observe this practice is to see democratic citizenship under construction. This is a point of difference which will be discussed in the next section.

The class is a number of communities of meaning. The space of authority is functional to the order, function, etc. of the class between two prongs of the horseshoe,

facing students, for anyone (teacher, student, guest) in the role of deliverer of information and for the attention of all. The class presents a management situation. It is a community that has been called to order for the purpose of carrying out a socially sanctioned learning agenda. The use of the invisible podium acts as a social control tool: it enhances the management of the class. Occupying that space up front of the class gets the entire class community facing one direction; on the same page one might say metaphorically. The speaker is standing and is looked up to literally and with any competence metaphorically by the community by those who are seated before him or her. The speaker is a stately leader for a time. Eye contact, voice control, etc. enhance the behavior of the group. The podium individualizes the speaker and massifies the seated listeners, binding the listeners into a collective segment of a community of speaker and listeners.

Other symbolic activities help the class function, for example, gesture. Students who are listening raise their hands and wait to be acknowledged by the speaker. They are acknowledged by their first names, that is, as peers. Thus acknowledged, they are permitted to speak. For that moment, authority is transferred to that space in the audience. As with the speaker at the invisible podium, the speaker must show communicative competence. They must talk in a public voice, at a natural pace, appear to be serious, and speak about something that is of educational importance to the whole class and is aligned to the speaker's presentation. Once the question has been posed or the comment made, that seated member will fall silent and await a response from the speaker at the invisible podium to whom authority reverts.

The analytical framework suggests that in implicit hierarchy, the power basis of teaching is hidden (Bernstein, 1990). As if to remind the class, however, of who

embodies the ultimate authority of the class, Mrs. Mason may speak without raising her hand even when not at the podium. In speaking without waiting to be acknowledged by the speaker at the podium, Mrs. Mason shows that she embodies authority, the authority that comes with her position as a teacher at the school. Speaking without waiting to be acknowledged by the speaker at the invisible podium introduces a measure of momentary disorder. It carries risks. The authorized speaker falters. The audience does not know where to turn, to Mrs. Mason at the back or to the speaker at the front. Mrs. Mason must therefore be judicious in her interventions. She must intervene only if this is necessary, do so in order to enhance the competence of the speaker. If her positional authority as teacher empowered her to speak it is her expert authority that will be the final measure of the rightness or justification of her decision to intervene and therefore disrupt the speaker's fluency. "Slow down," she might say. Mrs. Mason spoke in that voice that communicates a manner that is reassuring to the speaker, then quickly become inaudible and invisible again. But by intervening to enhance the speaker's competence, Mrs. Mason is enacting her expert authority as someone who is farther along the learning agenda and therefore with the benefit of the authority of experience helping less traveled learners along. She exercises, therefore, the utmost sensitivity to the speaker at the podium not only as a human being and temporary authority but because Mrs. Mason knows what every good citizen knows, that authority sometimes inheres not in a person but in a position or role. Therefore, to intervene in the speaker's presentation in a way that does not enhance the speaker's competence would not only harm the student as person and learner but also diminish the position of head speaker at the invisible podium. The time eventually will arrive, however, when the speaker falls silent and walks away

from the invisible podium and Mrs. Mason will occupy that space of undiminished authority again in which her authority as an expert, the positional authority of teacher, the personal authority of caregiver, are reunited in that symbolic space.

In summary, the subtle or implicit rules of hierarchy may be seen at work during presentation of book reports in Mrs. Mason's classroom. The power basis of the teaching relation is masked by a reversal of roles between teacher and student in which posture, sitting position, and speech practices that are traditionally associated with teacher and student statuses are swapped if not suspended. The rules of social order, of conduct, and rewards are implied but adhered to. The presenter speaks. Participants listen and the teacher watches. Yet, there is silence, signals of rapt attention, and applause and other forms of acknowledgement. The role of the teacher is therefore not solely embodied in one adult but is internalized and reproduced by a room full of eleven year-olds.

Sequencing

The analytical framework (Bernstein, 1990) suggests that in implicit pedagogy, sequencing is hard to determine. The students' presentations themselves followed a scripted sequence. The teacher demarcates time and initiates the transition rituals that were described above. The student presenter, following an Oral Book Report Checklist, speaks on Plot Summary, Setting, Conflict, Description of Main Character, Theme, Opinion, Presentation, and Activity. Next the student presenter entertains questions from his/her peers. There is a patterned sequence here. However, the logic of the sequencing of the presentations is less easy to tell. It is not clear whether they cluster around themes, topics, book titles or other potential categories.

In implicit pedagogy, sequencing is known only by the teacher (Bernstein, 1990).

The analytical framework (Bernstein, 1990) also suggests that in implicit pedagogy, sequencing requires that the teacher read signs which in turn require complex theories. Further, in implicit pedagogy, sequencing requires active student participation. The teacher sits at the back while the students take to the front of the class. They read, report on their reading to their peers, and answer questions regarding their reports.

What is learned during Book Reports? The analytical framework (Bernstein, 1990) suggests that in implicit pedagogy, learning is tacit and therefore difficult to pinpoint. Presumably, the student learns to read. However, it is the student's competence that is developed. It is reasonable to expect that students learn self efficacy, self confidence, poise, comfort with public speaking, etc.

The analytical framework (Bernstein, 1990) suggests that in sequencing under implicit pedagogy, the student's institutional and cultural biography is excluded. At most, the student's family is acknowledged. On March 22, a female presenter explains that she received help collating her materials from her father but that it was "her idea." Further, in her family, she explains no one stops what they are doing until they have finished.

The analytical framework (Bernstein, 1990) suggests that in implicit pedagogy, the teacher is a facilitator who hesitates to impose meaning. On March 22, in responding to a student presenter's comment on the long time her preparation had taken, Mrs. Mason states that there is a lesson there, specifying, "We have to start early." However, even that lesson is not properly speaking a specification of meaning in the disciplinary context of reading: it could be applied to all activities. Also, on March 22, the second presenter consults with Mrs. Mason regarding an appropriate number of items for presenting to

class from her visual support. In her facilitator's role, Mrs. Mason replies, "Select two or three items." And on March 23, Fatima, presenting the book Caddie Woodlawn (Brink, 1973) asks Mrs. Mason, "Should I read the letter?," using Mrs. Mason as a consultant rather than transmitter of knowledge. Responding in the affirmative, "And let your punctuation help you," advises Mrs. Mason.

Pacing is the time that is allotted for learning. Pacing is implied by sequencing, which is the progression of materials. The analytical framework (Bernstein, 1990) suggests that in implicit pedagogy, pacing is known only to the teacher. On March 24, at 11:07, Mrs. Mason says, "I can't do five [presentations]. I don't want them to run too long." What "too long" would mean, Mrs. Mason must know but is not saying to the class. On March 23, after two presentations at 11:31, Mrs. Mason moves to the front of the class, and announcing a change of activity, states, "Sit down, please." The schedule on the wall reads, "11:00-11:30: Writing. 11:30-12:30: Reading."

Criteria Rules

It will be remembered that criteria refer to standards for what is legitimate or not in the teaching relationship. The analytical framework (Bernstein, 1990) suggests that in implicit pedagogy, the teacher proceeds pedagogically by organizing the environment in order to enable the student's competence to develop. As stated above in the analysis of space and time, Mrs. Mason ritualizes the use of space and time to create a pattern. By way of summarizing the evidence that was presented in support of that section, the classroom database reveals the following. Student participants raised their hands to volunteer to help the presenter set up presentation materials. Even those who did not raise their hands were cooperative. For example, on March 22, the second presenter

seemed quite methodical in selecting her aides. She sought gender balance and also selected a student from each aisle. It was because, she explained, she wished to call on students, “who did not raise their hands.” It is therefore argued here that this student drew from the security of the organized social environment of the class to develop her poise as a presenter as well as her ability to facilitate audience participation. Not only did students select books, it seemed that they selected their “activity,” the class’s term for visual support to their presentation. Farid presenting Washington Is Burning did artwork on a plate; boy presenting Early Thunder (Fritz, 1967) shows a green model that wows the participants; boy presenting Mr. Reeves and I did a screenplay and a poster for a movie; boy presenting The Watsons Go To Birmingham (Curtis, 1995) did a collage; Sallie presenting Cave Under the City did a “book cover,” saying, “Since it’s New York, I drew two buildings that I know.”

The following sequence illustrates how skillfully Mrs. Mason organizes the environment, scaffolding elements, challenging students to create learning. It is March 29. “Today, we’re working on a literature web,” she announces. She puts up a web on the overhead. “This is what I noticed when reading your reflections. A lot of you missed things that were similar to what happened in the book [Secret Garden].” “It’s on the chapter called “A Key to the Garden. Martha is talking to Mary,” explains Mrs. Mason. “So your question is how are you feeling onto yourself related to other.” Mrs. Mason poses a direct question to [Julia.] “Has she always thought about herself, Julia?” Julia responds, “She’s always thought about herself.” Mrs. Mason echoes what Julia said. “Okay, so now look at the question.” A moment of contemplative silence goes by. “Does anyone have any ideas how we should go about writing about it?” A boy answers,

“She didn’t believe in herself.” Mrs. Mason challenges. “Do you remember how you felt when you learned how to tie your shoes.” There is no answer. She changes tact. “Once you already know [how to tie your shoes], how do you feel?” asks Mrs. Mason. “You feel grown up,” a girl says. “You do,” affirms Mrs. Mason, asking, “Did you feel independent?” “Yeah,” the students answer in unison. Mrs. Mason has reached her goal. “Can you imagine how Mary felt?” she asks. “Your job is to answer number one.”

The analytical framework (Bernstein, 1990) suggests that in implicit pedagogy, the teacher “reads” with a view to evaluating procedure or competence. On March 23, Mrs. Mason “reads” Fatima’s presentation for procedure and finds it could be improved. “Fatima, go a little slower. Fatima, take a deep breath. Do the last one slowly,” she says. Knowing Fatima’s competence and probably to suggest that she is, Mrs. Mason says, “Remember in third grade? What does period mean?” A chorus of students say in unison, “Take a deep breath.”

The analytical framework (Bernstein, 1990) suggests that in implicit pedagogy, the teacher “reads” the performance for procedures that are internal to the student. Those procedures may be cognitive, linguistic, affective, or motivational. It was suggested above that on March 23, Mrs. Mason “read” Fatima’s presentation. Specifically, it was not the performance that Mrs. Mason read (a practice in explicit pedagogy). Mrs. Mason read the procedure, the presentation of Fatima’s report. However what did she focus on? Mrs. Mason focused on Fatima, specifically, her internalization of English prosody (that is related to the rules of punctuation). Significantly, in order to improve the procedure, Mrs. Mason references not the text but the speaker. “Fatima,” she says, “go a little slower. Fatima, take a deep breath. Do the last one slowly,” she says. On March 26,

Mrs. Mason says to ____ “read the title slowly over again,” adding, “I know you can do it.”

The analytical framework (Bernstein, 1990) suggests that in implicit pedagogy, students enjoy great freedom in creating criteria that are individualized. Part of the ritual of presentation was student participants asking and the student presenter sharing their opinion of the book in question. “How would you rate the book?” a presenter was asked on March 22. “Nine and a half,” was the response. On March 22, the second presenter illustrates freedom to create individualized criteria. After reporting that she found the book satisfying, she states, “Slaves spoke like slaves.” On March 24, boy presenting Early Thunder (1967) by Jean Fritz says, “Id’ rate it like a ten. It’s really, really good.” Elsewhere, he explains, “Jean fritz makes it so that you can relate to the characters.” On March 23, after Fatima had presented Caddie Woodlawn (Brink, 1973), a participant asked that she rate herself. “I will give myself nine and a half [over ten],” she said. And illustrating the use of individualized criteria, Fatima explains that it is, “because it took a long time.” And just to make it clear what was involved, Fatima expanded, saying, “It got all ruined and I had to do it all over again.”

On March 24, Jay presenting Mr. Reeves and I awards himself an effort grade of “nine and a half,” explaining it took him six hours. At 11:40, Mrs. Mason says thanks to the last presenter and walks to the front of the class, saying, “All right, let’s take out One-Eyed Cat (Fox, 1984) and Secret Garden (Burnett, 1987).” On March 25, the boy presenting Bud Not Buddy (Curtis, 1999) gives it “a five” because, “the author had a lot of voice.” Girl presenting Laurence Pringle’s Dog of Discovery says, “I don’t think I did well on it. I give myself an eight.” A second student who presents Bud: Not Buddy

(Curtis, 1999) says, “I’d probably give myself a ten because I worked on it like for a week.” It is 11:46 and this is the end of book reports. On March 26, Andy presenting The Watsons Go To Birmingham (Curtis, 1995) says, “This is the best book ever. It’s much better than the Harry Potter books. I’m serious.”

The analytical framework (Bernstein, 1990) suggests that in implicit pedagogy, criterial rules are multiple and diffuse. On March 26, Mrs. Mason looks back on the three weeks out of nine that they do book presentations. “We have done a lot of book reports,” she says, asking, “Are they getting easier?” A chorus of students say, “Yeah.” Mrs. Mason continues, “Are you choosing more interesting books?” “Yeah,” they say in unison. “What did you learn?” asks Mrs. Mason. “To start earlier,” supplies one student. Then, identifying things her students still need to work on, Mrs. Mason lists a number of criteria. “You still need to elaborate,” she says. “You should give more examples.” “You can elaborate on themes.” “You can elaborate on character traits.” Most of all, she says, “It will help you next year in middle school, in reading class.”

Summary

How is it that an invisible pedagogy is generated from visible products of the new accountability? It is possibly related to the organization of recursive content and cultural capital, that is, independent reading etc.

Invisible Pedagogies

Mrs. Mason’s students understand the rules of invisible pedagogies and show that understanding through symbolic action. Mrs. Mason knows that her students understands the cultural and cognitive significance of the procedures of invisible pedagogies from

which she constructs her pedagogical practice during students' book reports. She looks forward to their future.

Fairweather Elementary School

As in the case of Mrs. Mason, at the time of classroom observation, the Maryland School Assessment Program (MSAP), the latest iteration in successive State-wide reforms in Maryland, was in its second year of implementation. It could not therefore be assumed that the reform had made its way to Mr. Randolph's classroom. Therefore, implementation of MSAP in Mr. Randolph's classroom had to be determined.

Connection Between Enacted and Planned Curricula

As was the case for Mrs. Mason's class, a key information-type of question (Stake, 1994) regarding implementation of the statewide Maryland School Program (MSP) in local schools was the following. What is the evidence that the new accountability is implemented in Mr. Randolph's classroom? It was necessary to ask this question because studies of instructional reform suggest that reform proposals that have not engaged teachers are not likely to be implemented in classrooms (Mintrop, 1999). Further, the study focused on the implementation of the Maryland School Program (MSP), the latest iteration of Maryland accountability policy, which at the time would be two years old. It could not therefore be reasonably taken for granted that MSP would have reached Mr. Randolph's classroom.

Several lines of evidence indicate that there is a direct connection between the curriculum that is enacted in Mr. Randolph's class and the intended curriculum that is made available across the symbolic resources of the new accountability, specifically

Maryland Content Standards, Voluntary State Standards, and a district-wide curriculum package that is designed by the College of William and Mary.

Mr. Randolph acknowledged the use of MSA as a guide to his curriculum making. For example, on April fourteen, Mr. Randolph is teaching a small group at a table in the front of the class. The larger group of students is mostly working. It is twelve noon and some are restless. Mr. Randolph raises his head and speaks to the class about the rising noise level. “Ladies and gentlemen,” he says in his characteristically strong voice, “can you take it down a notch?” In the larger group is a particularly industrious student. Gopal is his name and he has finished his reading. Gopal is an Indian boy who is a leader in this class. Two days before, he had been so familiar with the PowerPoint program for preparing oral presentations that Mr. Randolph had assigned him to be an instructor to his peers. In the computer lab two days before, the teacher had used the following words.

Turn your computer on. Log in. Gopal, you said you were done. Do you want to help me? Can you be a tutor? It’s obvious that you have done this before. Gopal is a resource. Gopal, I’ll work with these here because they haven’t done anything.

“Okay,” Gopal replies and with a smile on his face, and eagerness in his manner, he had hopped from computer terminal to computer terminal, helping student after student.

Now, two days later in the regular classroom, that same student wanted to help himself while the teacher was occupied with a smaller group at the front of the class. He asks for three-by five-inch index cards. “What do you want them for?” asks Mr. Randolph. “So we can memorize our lines,” answers Gopal. The lines that he was referring to were the lines of a commercial that the students had to prepare as part of an

exercise in persuasive writing. Here then is a student who is self-regulated seeking to mark some independence in his learning career. However, the teacher has a different idea. “What standard is it going to meet?” asks Mr. Randolph, adding in quick succession that, “when I teach you something, I teach you on standards. I have guidelines. It’s on grade level.” Gopal has to wait. MSP is not acknowledged by name here but standards are. It will be remembered that standards are a very visible symbol of the new accountability and by extension confers its name on the whole accountability movement. Secondly, all classroom activities were found to be markedly similar in surface structure to Content Standards, Voluntary State Curriculum, and the College of William and Mary materials. Contents resembled the accountability curriculum in terms of names of topic categories, cognitive exposure, and manner of presentation. On April 27, Mr. Randolph is teaching writing, evaluating student submissions. Mr. Randolph approves of the use of the phrase, “first of all,” in Pablo’s work and calls on the authority of his county-level professional development trainers to applaud Pablo. In so doing, Mr. Randolph acknowledges implementing the county-wide curriculum. “When I went to the William and Mary training,” he says, “half of the class did it the way you did. You stuck to hamburger [writing model]. You said, ‘First, next, and then lastly.’ And then you expanded. That’s acceptable.” No teaching material was observed to be in use that could not be linked to the above mentioned sources of curriculum influence and support of the new accountability. Finally, the findings did not violate the historical sequence of policy events. The No Child Left behind Act of 2001 was passed in 2002. MSA was introduced in 2003. Content Standards, Voluntary State Standards, and the College of William and

Mary's curriculum package all predated observation in classrooms in 2004. In summary, there is a direct connection between the planned and the enacted curricula.

Once the above-stated information-type question regarding implementation of MSA in Mr. Randolph's classroom was answered in the affirmative, substantive questions regarding the quality of the implementation were pursued. This section presents the description of Mr. Randolph's pedagogic practice. It will be followed by an analysis of the social class assumptions of the pedagogic practice and how and why the students at Fairweather Elementary School (FES) do or do not meet them. The elements of the pedagogic practice are presented next.

Model of Pedagogic Practice

In the language of the analytical model, Mr. Randolph's class enacts a pure model of visible pedagogy. In conformity with the analytical model (Bernstein, 1971), the determination of the pedagogic practice in Mr. Randolph's class was made from the bottom up, that is, from classroom-level data relating to rules of hierarchy, sequencing and pacing, and criteria. All rules were implemented in the enacted curriculum and therefore were achieved in framing or teaching boundaries. In the language of the analytical framework, framing boundaries were determined to be overwhelmingly of the strong type. It will be remembered that a visible pedagogy enacts explicit hierarchical, sequencing and pacing, and criterial rules.

Hierarchy

The nature of the teacher-student relationship is defined by three sets of pedagogical rules and students gain competence in the language of schooling by taking part in its essential activities of schooling. More often than not, Mr. Randolph had a top-

down relationship with students and explicit hierarchical relations of power between teacher and student that implement external control over students. This means that Mr. Randolph must constantly attend to the social relationship between teacher and student while at the same time ensuring the coverage of curriculum materials. The nature of hierarchical rules is of great importance in the teaching relationship because it not only defines the social relationship between the actors but also shapes the action of teaching. This means that the central role that Mr. Randolph occupies in relating to students will also shape the management of the learning agenda. It will be remembered that the three rules of pedagogic discourse constitute themes for discussion.

Teacher easily identified.

In visible pedagogies, it is easy to identify the teacher (Bernstein, 1990) because as is shown in the case of Mr. Randolph, his role in learning is central: he is the transmitter of knowledge. Two examples from Mr. Randolph's class will illustrate. The teacher may be easily identified by the space of authority that is symbolically constructed at the front, the visible podium, on which Mr. Randolph stands and from which he speaks. On March 30, Mr. Randolph announces, "Ladies and gentlemen. You are looking for two articles. One is for your in-class work. The other is for your homework." Later in the day, he redirects the learning schedule, saying, "You're going to read some Shakespeare for me." And elsewhere, he adds, "Tomorrow, you're going to write your limerick." The following day, March 31, he brings learning activities in the computer lab to a close, saying, "All right, ladies and gentlemen, please save and log off." On April 19, Mr. Randolph asks students to, "Tell me about the character. Specific

traits.” Not once during my observation period did a student set the learning agenda. Mr. Randolph’s clear role is made possible through equally clear enactment of power.

Power undisguised.

In visible pedagogies, the power basis of hierarchical rules is undisguised (Bernstein, 1990) because no diffuse rhetoric mediates the deployment of power. Chaos is contained by Mr. Randolph’s ability to manage the classroom, which he does with the help of closed/strong boundaries. Two examples from Mr. Randolph’s class will illustrate. On March 30, Mr. Randolph states, “Ladies and gentlemen. You are looking for two articles. One is for your in-class work. The other is for your homework.” On March 24 Mr. Randolph states, “Let’s go over our assignment.” On April 14, Mr. Randolph says, “No sports for homework. No sports for class work.” Authority, power, and clear roles are part of the explicit culture of Mr. Randolph’s classroom. This is in no way to suggest that Mr. Randolph is cold or uncaring to his students. On March 30, when one small working group was about to break from its activities and another group’s quiet could be disrupted, the almost paternal caring of Mr. Randolph is perceptible in his appeal to the group, “Please don’t disrupt the groups that were working quietly while you were working with me.” The group returned to their seats and no longer was there any need for such appeals by Mr. Randolph. It is, however, a classroom culture in which conduct is closely regulated by rules.

Rules of social order, conduct, and rewards.

The analytical framework (Bernstein, 1990) states that in visible pedagogies, there are explicit rules of social order, conduct, and rewards. Two examples from Mr. Randolph’s class will illustrate. On April 14, Mr. Randolph says, “Ladies and gentlemen,

can you take it down a notch.” Mr. Randolph addresses the class with a formal and respectful tone, more often than not referring to them as, “ladies and gentlemen.” They do not necessarily address him that formally in return. An informal, “Yeah,” is often the mode of address in this class. However, the social processes of class are rather clear. Mr. Randolph is the teacher and they are the students. There is also a behavior management system in Mr. Randolph’s class by which each student has a blue card that may be kept on his desk while he is at work. Behavior that is judged disruptive can fetch a write-up.

Summary.

The hierarchical rules in Mr. Randolph’s class are explicit and clear. They emphasize Mr. Randolph as the central figure in teaching and learning in his class. Mr. Randolph is the transmitter of knowledge and he is not likely to be confused with students. He speaks in a strong voice and it is that voice that is often heard in this class. It is often heard because Mr. Randolph acts directly on his students through language rather than arranging a learning context through which to influence his students.

Sequencing and Pacing

It will be remembered that sequencing refers to the order of presentation of materials and pacing is the time that is allotted for learning the materials. Sequencing therefore implies pacing. Mr. Randolph’s use of strong boundaries to establish a superordinate-subordinate relationship with his students influences sequencing and pacing, which are public, vary by age, organized on the basis of time, and punctuated by rituals of transition.

Progression is public.

In visible pedagogies, progression is public (Bernstein, 1990). The policy tools of the new accountability, namely the Maryland Content Standards and Voluntary State Curriculum, and the curriculum package from the College of William and Mary make sequencing public. Two examples of explicit sequencing from Mr. Randolph's class will illustrate the sequencing rules of the new accountability. On March 30, Mr. Randolph urges his students on because, "You should have three articles selected today." Later that day, he informs students that, "You're going to read some Shakespeare for me." A few minutes go by and Mr. Randolph informs his students that, "tomorrow, you're going to write your limerick." On April 14, Mr. Randolph announces that, "We will be working on your commercial tomorrow." On____, Mr. Randolph announces, "Test. Next Wednesday." On April 29, Mr. Randolph says, "Next week, for thirteen days we will do poetry."

Organized temporally.

The analytical framework (Bernstein, 190) suggests that in visible practice, sequencing rules are organized temporally. On April 27, Mr. Randolph is teaching strategies for persuasive writing and encounters a concept map but he does not know whether his students are aware of the strategy. "There is another strategy," he says to the class, "and I don't know if you know because I wasn't your fourth grade teacher. Look at this. It's called a concept map." Mr. Randolph does not know this because knowledge of persuasive writing strategies are organized temporally and concept map, he says, belong to the fourth grade curriculum. His fifth grade students have therefore moved on beyond the sequencing of school knowledge.

Rituals of transition.

As stated above, in visible practice, progress is highly valued as is time. Movement then is constant but clearly marked. In visible practice, there are rituals of transition (Bernstein, 1990). For example, reading/English Language Arts class transitions from a short break. At about 11:05AM, students gather in the corridor outside the bathrooms in the main building. For a few minutes, they sit or stand in line while those who need to use the bathrooms and the others who remain in the corridor read. “Fifth grade, up!” Mr. Randolph might say and students stand and start walking down the corridor and into the portable class in a single file. Whole-class instruction ritually begins with the address, “Ladies and gentlemen,” and is followed by directions, for example to look for article for reading. Time is generally counted down during the activity and once the allotted time has elapsed, Mr. Randolph may say, “All right ladies and gentlemen, please go back.” Small-group activity also begins without much preamble except for the announcement of the activity and the request to, “Come to see me.” The end of small-group work may be signaled by the request, “Okay, head back to your seat.” In this class, also, turn-taking in teacher and student talk is regulated by the ritual of raising a hand and waiting for recognition from the teacher.

Criterial Rules

Criterial rules are explicit in Mr. Randolph’s practice. For example, on March 01, Mr. Randolph assigns a text for literary reading, the novel Secret Garden and requests that students highlight the points of change that are illustrated in the text. He has previously distributed handouts on which the criteria for what constitutes a point of change are specified. “Take your sticky notes and highlight points of change,” he

explains. “We talked about the influence of change. Something that fits our five criteria.” These criteria focus on students’ reading performance as a private activity. Later that day, Mr. Randolph asks his students to, “Write down what model of change it fits.”

Focus on product/performance.

The criterial rules that Mr. Randolph enacts with his students focus on the product rather than on students. On March 01, Mr. Randolph distributes copies of that day’s Washington Post and asks students to clip two articles, including “one for in-class work.” From the onset, some students are having difficulty. Resistance to the exercise is building and Mr. Randolph addresses one student. “You haven’t read it [the article],” says Mr. Randolph, adding, “and you say it’s boring.” Supposedly the boredom refers to an internal state of the student and reflects in some way the student’s relationship with the material. However, the focus on the performance of reading is clear in Mr. Randolph’s response. The student’s reaction elicits only recognition on the part of the teacher and no more. It may be argued that what is being offered up for assessment and possible treatment by the student is the student’s own subjectivity but the teacher passes up the opportunity. The performance of reading is what elicits treatment in the class. This assertion is confirmed when later on another student gets the teacher’s attention. “That’s the same article,” says Mr. Randolph to a student who does not quite know where one newspaper article ends and another begins.

Read for what is lacking.

In the visible practice of Mr. Randolph, the product or performance is “read” for what is lacking (Bernstein, 1990). Or in Mr. Randolph’s own words, “When I teach you

something, I teach you on standards. I have guidelines. It's on grade level." In persuasive writing, this means that writing is done in generic format and according to the rules of English grammar as is emphasized by Mr. Randolph on March 20. "We just finished writing to persuade," says Mr. Randolph, adding, "You wrote in the proper format." The student reiterates, "introduction, first reason, second, third, conclusion." Mr. Randolph agrees. "Good. That's the format," he adds but then he poses an important question. "What if tomorrow, I marked you for spelling. How would you feel?" he asks. The student counters, "You said main points." Mr. Randolph explains, "You're trying to say the content's more important than the conventions." Conventions, stresses Mr. Randolph are very important.

Learning is private, individual, and competitive.

In Mr. Randolph's visible practice, learning is individual, private, and competitive (Bernstein, 1990). The students know by now what this entails but Mr. Randolph emphasizes the way in which one becomes responsible for academic work. On March 01, when the allotted time for the newspaper analysis activity is over, Mr. Randolph reminds the students that, "I will collect your newspaper analysis at the end of the period," explaining that, "this is an individual activity."

Social Assumptions of Visible Practice

As with Mrs. Mason's teaching, the pedagogic practice of Mr. Randolph assumes certain things about the social life of his students and as will be shown next when these assumptions are not met, teaching can prove difficult.

Differentiated access to the code

This is a study of the fifth grade, not of kindergarten or first grade. Therefore, it is not the kindergarten sequencing rules that the fifth graders fail to meet but rather fifth grade sequencing rules. Mr. Randolph's students' difficulties with the sequencing rules of visible pedagogies are evident during the unit on newspaper analysis and on other sequencing strategies that he uses.

On March 30, I joined Mr. Randolph and his class in the aisle of the main building. From there, we walked in a single file towards their classroom. As soon as we had entered the room and the students had settled into their seats, Mr. Randolph announced the session's learning agenda. "Ladies and gentlemen," he said, "you are looking for two articles. One is for your in-class work." Mr. Randolph was about to use the authentic literacy medium of the newspaper as a teaching tool. Illustrating his accountability to his students, he recounts his efforts to secure those materials. "The stores were closed this morning," he begins. "So I had to go to CVS [the pharmacy chain] but CVS only had eleven papers." Then, he turns his attentions to directions.

Mr. Randolph's second guiding utterance (after telling them how many articles they were to cull) indicates that he is targeting the nature of the difficulty that his students are experiencing with this genre of informational text. "Once again," Mr. Randolph reminds them, "make sure we get complete articles." Guidelines must be enacted in order for students to fail to meet them. This is the case with sequencing. Maryland State's Content Standards for Language Arts is organized by benchmark years, K-3, 4-5, etc. The typical preamble to those benchmarks are as follows, "By the end of grade ___, students know and are able to...", indicating a clear progression in the social organization

of school knowledge. The content standards contain Content Standards, Indicator Statements, and Objectives, with objectives being the most specific guides to classroom teaching. Objective number six of indicator statement 1.3.1, “Concepts of Print and Structural Features of Text,” of benchmark years K-5 specifies that students, “recognize and use common text features including headings” (MSDE, 2000, Content Standards, p. 5). These also refer to newspaper reading. The Voluntary State Curriculum, “defines what students should know and be able to do” and “is the document that aligns the Maryland Content Standards and the Maryland Assessment Program” (MSDE, VSC, 2003, p.1). A footnote states that this Content Standard is, “foundational and should be addressed and achieved well before the end of grade three” (MSDE, 2000, p. 2). Newspapers would qualify as an “assigned print,” “informational text” under Content Standard 2.0. (Comprehension of Informational Text) which requires that students use transition words, titles, captions, organizational and graphic aids, and text features that facilitate understanding. This is an expression of explicit sequencing, a component of visible pedagogies. As will be argued next, some of Mr. Randolph’s students fail to meet this requirement of the explicit sequencing of the knowledge of the structure of informational materials, specifically newspapers.

The students need close supervision at this point. “This paper and this article go together,” states Mr. Randolph to one student who is having difficulty culling a complete article. The difficulty relates to the structure of the newspaper. As opposed to pagination in chapter books, newspaper articles may begin on one page and continue not on the next page but possibly many pages later. This is the case here and it challenges the students’ knowledge base. “The rest of the article is on D7. National news is yes, A Section,” says

Mr. Randolph who has instructed the students to use scissors to cull the articles. This, however, is not the only student who is experiencing difficulties with the task. “Let’s go, ladies and gentlemen,” he says. “You should have two articles selected today.” The selection process would have been easier if more students understood the structure of newspaper genre, elements of which are shared with other print formats. “You haven’t read it and you say it’s boring,” says Mr. Randolph to one student who is exhibiting mild resistance to the activity. However, other students need the teacher’s help.

Mr. Randolph goes around to another table and addresses Pablo. “Go to B9 and read the rest of that article,” he tells Pablo, referring to Section B and page 9. To yet another student, Mr. Randolph poses essentially the same question, “Where’s the rest of that article?” The following fieldnotes further illustrate the extent of the problem.

Teacher: You’ve got the same article. You need two articles. Got to find one for home.

[To student 1] You’ve got both articles?

[To student 2] You’ve got both articles?

[To student 3] You’ve got both articles?

Their specific knowledge of newspapers is lacking. Their general knowledge of the structure of similar genres, for example magazines, is also lacking, which poses a major problem for them to meet the timing of instruction in that genre. However, it is not only timing that poses a problem but time also, as will be shown next.

Fall behind on pacing rules.

Sequencing implies pacing. On March 30, having stumbled over the structure of newspapers, some of the students in Mr. Randolph’s class fall behind in pacing in reading of newspapers. Here is an account of how this occurred. At the start of class, at about 11:17 AM, Mr. Randolph announces a target of culling two articles, “One is for your

class work. The other is for your homework.” Shortly before 11:30AM, Mr. Randolph reminds them that, “You have about seven minutes to choose your article and have them taped into your workbook.” At 11:35AM, he tells them, “You have two minutes.” Next, he says, “All right, ladies and gentlemen, about thirty seconds.” The assigned time for culling and reading the articles has elapsed and it is on to something else because, “We are going to start our study of poetry today.” Mr. Randolph reminds them of what most have not done. “Remember your newspaper analysis is seatwork. But we are not working on it now because we have to do this. [to one] I am going to ask you one more time to put your newspaper away.” Elsewhere, he says, “I will collect your newspaper analysis. This is an individual activity.”

The above-stated examples illustrate the connection between sequencing and pacing, or timing and time. Independent reading of the newspaper, although potentially a recursive activity that may continue over benchmark years K-3 and 4-5, is timed for that period. Newspaper reading calls for and challenges a rather concrete piece of reading skill, directionality. In the English language tradition, print proceeds from top to bottom, left to right, and from the front cover to the back. Lacking that foundational knowledge when it is called for as the basis of a more abstract activity, selection and reading of an article, some of Mr. Randolph’s students fail to meet this sequencing rule. Their challenges with this pacing rule slow down their progress. The minutes that are allotted for this activity go by and some students are not through with it. However, Mr. Randolph expects it by the end of the period. It remains to be shown that these challenges are socially constructed, that is, they are related to the functioning of visible pedagogies. This is discussed next.

It will be argued here that visible pedagogies' sequencing rules, by tightly regulating illustrations, examples, and questions that may facilitate understanding, and explanations help to create the disadvantaged status of the students. That some students lack knowledge of the newspaper format has been demonstrated. The assertion that their disadvantage is socially constructed does not deny that lack. Rather, it focuses on the arbitrary processes by which these students are disadvantaged. The issue of these students' socioeconomic status will be discussed later. The focus here is on the construction of discursive relations within this pedagogical practice. First, it must be pointed out that students entered this period not meeting the pacing rules on the structure of print and exited falling behind on a reading assignment and preparation for homework. The word arbitrary was used earlier regarding social processes. The use of this term should be justified now. Locating knowledge of the structure of newspapers within K-3 years as is done by Maryland's Content Standards is what the analytical model posits as arbitrary. Its location is not necessarily a function of the intrinsic qualities of the structure of this format. It is so by convention, which does not mean that is not reasonable to do so. The point is that it is by reference to this sequencing that these students lack required knowledge and are therefore constructed as disadvantaged.

The above-stated assertion of arbitrariness in the sequencing rules may be clarified by a negative example. It is not known whether Mr. Randolph had instructed students in the structure of newspapers. The question, however, is this. Why didn't he repeat instruction in the structure on March 30? Why were there no demonstrations and limited explanation? The analytical framework suggests that it may be due to time. Time is at a premium in visible pedagogies. Time is of great concern to Mr. Randolph and he

strives to manage it well. He keeps the time, counting down the minutes, “seven minutes,” “two minutes,” “thirty seconds.” His tight management of time is part of the logic of visible pedagogies: it keeps the lesson moving forward. This causes another difficulty, which is discussed next.

Tight management of time regulates the interaction with students that might have alleviated their difficulty with this activity. “Remember your newspaper analysis is seatwork. But you’re not working on it now because you have to do this [poetry].” Tight control on time therefore limits explanations. And the teacher’s justification for moving on is that poetry has to be done. The teacher’s judgment is not in question here. Rather, attention is shifted by the analytical framework to the encroaching boundary of another content, namely poetry. One might wonder whether students who experience hardships with the structure of the newspaper are likely to be familiar with the form of poetry. The logic of bounding the structure of the newspaper with the form of the limerick, however, seems to fall elsewhere, in the authority of the new accountability’s Content Standards, Voluntary State Standards, and aligned county-wide curriculum.

That in explaining tight management of timing in the above example, attention is turned to the authoritative curriculum frameworks of the new accountability, however, needs to be justified. Otherwise, the teacher might be stripped of his agency. His knowledge of pedagogical content may be challenged. In his defense, however, Mr. Randolph knows that his students have difficulty with the structure of print. On April 19, Mr. Randolph calls a small group of students to the half-moon table at the front. “Chris Van Allsburg wrote this book and added very little writing for it,” he tells them. “All we have are fifteen cues. Could you as a group decide what is the correct order?” The

fifteen panels of the book are pictures with one-line captions. Mr. Randolph is targeting their knowledge of story structure for much needed improvement. It is narrative in structure, believed to be the most familiar form of discourse but this group is having difficulty with the genre. “I get papers from you that are like that,” he tells them. “Makes no sense. No beginning.” The students propose a sequence for the book. Mr. Randolph calls another group to the half-moon table at the front. They have the same task. Before long, a boy says, “This one goes last.” “Why does this one go last?” asks Mr. Randolph. The boy falls silent, offering no answer. “This is how I feel when I read your papers. What’s going on?” The challenges that these students faced are linked to another difficulty, reading ability, which will be discussed next.

Ability To Read

As was shown above, Mr. Randolph’s students experience difficulty acquiring the rules of sequencing and pacing. Sequencing and pacing rules are based on reading ability. Therefore, it will be argued in this section that Mr. Randolph’s students’ difficulties with sequencing and pacing rules are related to their difficulty with reading.

Failure to organize own discourse.

Mr. Randolph’s students’ have difficulty reading. On March 30, during Newspaper Analysis, Mr. Randolph himself made that assertion to me. He had done a survey of reading, he told me, and reading activity was down. Evidence from language data confirms Mr. Randolph’s assertion. “This paper and this article go together,” he tells one student, adding that, “The rest of the article in on D7.” A student with better reading skills would have used the same cues that were available to the teacher and made

the same sense of how the text was organized, at least that is what the Content Standards specify. “Go to B9,” he tells another.

Mr. Randolph’s students’ difficulty with reading creates a vicious cycle for their learning schedule. It means that they do not function independently but rather depend heavily on Mr. Randolph for organizing their learning. Mr. Randolph carries out many tasks in that regard. He is a curriculum planner, a thinker, selecting text that is appropriate for the students’ learning. He is a procurement officer, acquiring those materials. He uses language to set and impose the learning agenda, requesting that the students cull two newspaper articles for analysis on March 30. He is a behavior manager. “Kenny, sit down,” he says. He is a timekeeper, marking the passage of time at numerous intervals. He is an evaluator, setting the criteria. One student asks if a certain article is okay for analysis. “What section?” asks Mr. Randolph. “Style,” says the student. “Yeah,” says Mr. Randolph. But this latter explication of the criteria is a form of redundancy, potentially a waste of time. At the start of the class, Mr. Randolph had implied that all sections were legitimate subjects of analysis, even sports, which was allowed that week and would not be allowed the following week. In short, some of Mr. Randolph’s students have difficulties reading/learning to learn and that is why they need support at home, an audience, for example in reading newspapers. To that end, Mr. Randolph reminds them on March 30, “Remember, you need to read [the other article that is for homework] aloud to a parent or an older brother or sister.”

Possibility of organizing own discourse.

Mr. Randolph’s students have difficulty appreciating any new realities that education makes possible. Some students are locked within their own world. On March

30, during newspaper analysis, Mr. Randolph says, “You haven’t read it [newspaper article] and you say it’s boring.”

Two Sites of Acquisition

Visible pedagogies enact strong boundaries between school knowledge and everyday common knowledge and in so doing construct academic knowledge. Academic knowledge may fail to interest working class students who do not see its utility.

Academic knowledge.

As discussed above, on March 30, Mr. Randolph bought nearly a dozen copies of the Washington Post newspaper and brought them into class to be used for the construction of school knowledge. Newspapers are an interesting genre. The average American newspaper is written on a fifth-grade reading level. The events they cover, from style to weather, are current and local. They are an informational text and are therefore practical. On the face of it, Mr. Randolph’s knowledge production regarding the selection of instructional materials seems reasonable. Middle class individuals read the newspaper quite often, if not daily. The use of an authentic genre as opposed a basal is interesting. Yet, Mr. Randolph makes a critical decision about the pedagogical use to which he will put the text. He transforms it from a text that is read in silence to a text that is to be read aloud, “to a parent or an older brother or sister.” Also, he makes it the subject of an analysis, a peculiarly academic form of thinking or knowledge production. By constructing his practice explicitly, Mr. Randolph accentuates academic knowledge in his classroom. No wonder then, that students find it so boring that they dare not even do it. Further, the newspaper may be more suited to the local pedagogic practices of certain families than of schools. If this is the case, not only is Mr. Randolph making

problematical assumptions about the familial culture of newspapers but he is also reversing historical course by socializing families into newspaper reading through their students.

Single exposure: Reliance on school for educational knowledge.

Homework traditionally mediates the coordination of learning between home and school. However, this coordination has social class assumptions. It will be remembered for example that such coordination depends on several factors, including, (1) the type of control families exert over students' learning activities and the type of social resources (economic, social, cultural capital) that families can activate (which reflect the degree of labor integration or specialization in the home), (2) social assumptions about school, (3) boundary types of the school's local pedagogic practice such that the school may select influences from the home (Bernstein, 1990).

Mr. Randolph is dissatisfied with his students' reading performance and designs an ongoing unit on informational reading in order to strengthen their reading skills. Mr. Randolph designs a reading journal comprising printed pages in which students are to report on the routine that he is trying to socialize them into, reading the daily newspaper. However, the activity seems not to be going quite well to Mr. Randolph. On March 30, Mr. Randolph purchased eleven copies of the Washington Post newspaper. He distributes the copies to pairs of students mostly along with instructions and encourages them on with explicit exhortations. Mr. Randolph tells his students, "Remember you need to read aloud to a parent or an older brother or sister." "In an effort to transfer the culture of newspaper reading into homes, Mr. Randolph advises, "You need two articles. Got to find one for home." Seen through the lens of Bernstein's theory of symbolic

control, this request for participation of working class parents in their children' schooling, as laudable as it may be, raises important questions regarding the economic and cultural attributes of the home and the assumptions that teachers make about them. Is there a space in the family home for the requested activity? Do students, parents, and siblings have the time and disposition for this intergenerational activity? Do students exert the kind of social control on parents and older siblings to make them their listening audience? Do parents have the cultural capital necessary (knowledge of English language, content of newspaper articles, information regarding the requested activity's place in school learning) to meet the assumptions behind Mr. Randolph's request?

A hint of an answer begins to appear later. Mr. Randolph has been encouraging students to read to family members. At one point, Mr. Randolph asks about parents' reactions to the reading journal. Isaac responds. "My mom likes the idea. She thinks I'll learn from it," Isaac says. Isaac says only that his mother sees the value of the idea. Does she participate in making the idea a reality? Isaac does not say so. However, Isaac's submission prompts a fellow student to comment on the local pedagogic practices in his family. That student provides a counterpoint to Isaac's contribution. "My mom thinks I read too much," he says. Another student says, "I don't like when my mom reads to me."

The testimonials keep coming. "My mom is busy. My father is watching TV so I read to her when she's cooking," another student says. From the above-cited exchanges, is formed a portrait of students whose opportunities for learning academic knowledge depend heavily on schools. However, the sources of that constraint are the resources (time) that parents have for this kind of activity.

This is not to suggest that no parent at Fairweather Elementary School is involved in their children's reading. One student says, "My mom helps me. She helped me with this article." Mr. Randolph seems moderately satisfied. "So Mom's involved," he says. "Yes," replies one student. "Good," says Mr. Randolph. Another student speaks. "So this is a case of you liking nonfiction?" asks the teacher. "My mom likes it," says the student, "because we see what's going on in the news." This is a positive example of what it takes to pursue this activity. This parent sees the reality that is made available by the newspaper: it opens a vista on the contemporary world. That one must have a certain degree of investment or integration in the world to bother to look upon it through newspaper articles is hinted at in Mr. Randolph's recollection. Mr. Randolph models his ideal reading behavior by giving some autobiographical information. "I kept a scrapbook," he says, explaining that, "My dad was in the newspaper a lot." "About what?" asks a student eagerly. "A little confusing," he says. "You have to understand politics," and probably sensing that they did not have the requisite understanding of politics to continue, Mr. Randolph brings that day's reading journal activity to a halt. "Alright, ladies and gentlemen," he says. "Time is up. Return them [the journals] to the bin in the back."

Through a range of daily efforts in the classroom, even a casual observer might get the impression that Mr. Randolph is trying to get his students to read. Elsewhere, he rhapsodizes about the joys of reading, reading of a variety of texts. "What I am trying to do is hear the fire without the reading. Bring the characters to life. We're talking about change. All the groups are working on change. Notice if there is a correlation, if there is a match. You are going to write the connection pieces," he says, referring to the practice

of relating events in one's life to events that are represented in print. Mr. Randolph illustrates what they should know, which is, "When do we know when the characters change?" and to use this knowledge to show that, "Somehow you are connected to this book."

On April 24, Mr. Randolph rhapsodizes once more on the occasion of receiving a New Book Program. "Not because they're thin that they're kids' books. The nice thing about these books, you can take them home. They're very expensive so you cannot lose them. Even though you have family life you're to be responsible [accountability] for reading until chapter twenty by Monday. Keep up the reflections. Every thirty to fifty pages, you do a reflection. The questions will be coming this week. I did get them from off the computer."

Pacing: Lexical Text

The quality of teacher and student talk in Mr. Randolph's class may be indicated by what may be referred to as lexical text, by which is meant that exchanges and others types of utterances are not elaborated but are restricted to a few words or short sentences. The quality of text may best be seen through activities that center on (1) oral presentations, (2) the themes of change, (3) and of courage, and (4) the topic of poetry. Before analyzing the production of text that relate to these topics, it must be remembered that the primary aim of the visible pedagogy of Mr. Randolph is improving language arts performance or product. Secondly, Mr. Randolph aims for fluency in reading and speech performance and elaboration or details in writing performance.

Summary

Bernstein's (1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000) theory of symbolic control therefore provided a meaningful framework for understanding both schools and families' local pedagogic practice and for analyzing their social class assumptions. Language data were shown to enact boundaries of the strong/closed and the open/weak types, to enact strong and weak rules of hierarchy, sequencing and pacing, and of criteria, and therefore to constitute visible and invisible forms of pedagogic practice. It was possible to use teachers' regulatory and discursive behaviors to identify factors that constrain working class students' learning and others that enhance middle class students' learning in classrooms, for example (1) access to the code, (2) reading, (3) parental intervention in learning, and (4) parenting styles in differentiating students' competences by social class and in this way to differentiate pedagogy and academic achievement. It was surprising to learn that all interactions and enunciations in classrooms showed signs of regulation rather than what seemed to have been suggested by Bernstein. Bernstein (1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000) suggests that regulation occurs through boundary relations between contents and between transmitters and receivers. In theory, finding that regulation is a continuous and ongoing activity is significant because it suggests an even greater organizing role for power and social control in the construction of educational knowledge. In Chapter V, the framework will be shown to have also offered a basis for making cross-case comparison of the data.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

CURRICULUM AS TROJAN HORSE

This study interrogated possible relationships that might exist between social class and academic achievement by examining the way in which the new accountability policy and social class influence teachers and students' co-production of knowledge in the elementary school classroom. The research strategy consisted of investigating knowledge production under the new accountability for the processes by which it selects who can participate. The new accountability is a rational reform strategy that aims to increase the internal coherence of the education system as a whole (regulatory, administrative, and professional arenas). Coherence is presumed to provide focus for all activities, specifically teaching and learning. Teachers therefore focus on achievement by pursuing academic goals. As clarity and understandability of the goals increase so too does teacher belief that they can attain these goals. Belief in teachers' capacity for attaining these academic goals is also enhanced by organizational factors within the school, for example supportive principal leadership and especially teachers' perception of students' capacity (Elmore, Abelman, & Fuhrman, 1996; Fuhrman, 1999).

It will be remembered that the classic tools for attaining this internal coherence include annual high stakes testing, content standards, and State curriculums. Content standards and State curriculums specify the topical content, its scope, and the sequence in which it is expected to be taught, the curriculum that is to be assessed by State tests, and specifies the alignment of curriculum with assessment. It works by making pedagogic practice visible. Further, whereas the State-level iteration of the new accountability

policy sees no instruction, the local educational authority as a matter of policy provides district-wide teaching materials that are assessed to be in alignment with the State-level policy. The result is that as a whole federal-, State-, and local-level iterations of the policy create a deep and comprehensive system in which teachers and students answer for the educational processes that they use as well as for the social distribution of the test score outcomes that they produce. The overall aim is to improve the performance especially of historically underserved populations. However, whereas the policy does not see resources, pedagogy is understood by teachers to have its own social class assumptions, specifically cultural and economic practices.

In order to explain the class gap, the study drew upon the work of the British sociolinguist, Basil Bernstein whose theory of symbolic control (1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000) provided both theoretical base and method. Using Bernstein's frameworks for classification and framing to sensitize the investigator, language data on teacher-student pedagogical interaction in two schools were collected by note-taking during classroom observation in the months of March and April, 2004. Sunnyside Elementary School has less than 5% of its student body qualifying for Free And Reduced-priced Meals and is categorized as a middle class school whereas Fairweather Elementary School, 60% of whose student body qualify for Free And Reduced-priced Meals is categorized as working class.

Next, language and other data on teacher and student talk in those two elementary school classrooms were analyzed using a priori coding, including 'visible' (strong hierarchy; strong sequencing/pacing; strong criteria) and 'invisible' (weak hierarchy; weak sequencing/pacing; weak criteria) practice that were derived from the theory of

symbolic control (Bernstein, 1990). In the final analysis, therefore, this study gathered classroom data to link the concrete instructional processes of local schools with test score outcomes on Statewide standardized so-called high-stakes tests with a view to explaining the persistence of a test score gap between schools of pay and free/reduced-priced meals status respectively.

Lareau (2000) used empirical data to show that forms of family-school relations that increase student exposure to curriculum materials and therefore have the greatest impact on student achievement in elementary schooling are social class-based. Families' work-related social practices provide dispositions by which they recontextualize job-related discourses for use in family-school relations. As a result, middle class parents enhance the coordination of teaching between home and school by making teachers and schools answer to them personally for their individual child's education but also by bringing themselves into compliance with teachers' standards for parental relations with schools. Coordination, therefore, is the result of reciprocal recognition or trust among professional teachers and "professional" parents. In our assessment, however, the object that mediates this coordination was unspecified leaving the conversion of cultural capital into educational profits within the proverbial black box. Thanks to language-based conceptual framework, the conversion process was elucidated.

A distinctive feature of the analytical framework is that it links micro-social processes that occur within the core technical activities of schooling with practical activities that are related to macro-sociological structures of society, including social class, thereby connecting school activities with practices in the economy and society.

This allowed us to further clarify instructional theories as to how and why the new accountability is related with the social class-based achievement gap.

It will be remembered that instructional theories of why at best the new accountability maintains social class-based test score inequalities and why at worst it exacerbates those differences though variable rely on the construction of dysfunctional subjectivities of teachers and or students. For example, Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) propose the theoretical construct, “management pedagogies” in arguing that the new accountability deskills teachers, constraining them from functioning as critical intellectuals within class society who might seek to change poor and minority students’ disadvantaged educational status. In other words, management pedagogies force teachers to produce knowledge that reproduces oppressive structures or that at minimum do not challenge those structures. In implementing management pedagogies, the authors argue, teachers’ identity is changed from thinkers to technicians whose primary role is to implement curriculum designs that have been created by others. In turn, deskilling, the authors suggest, damages teacher morale (McNeil, 2000; Tye & O’Brien, 2002; Winkler,) by muzzling teachers. How pedagogy has those constraining effects on teachers that are ascribed to it within this theory is hardly explained or demonstrated empirically. However, the finding that accountability-related pedagogies may demoralize teachers is supported in Amrein and Berliner’s (2003) statistical analysis of the effects of accountability systems.

Meier’s (2002) assertion that standards represent policymakers’ distrust of teachers merely speculates about a purported social need for so-called management pedagogies. Again, the cultural object by which capitalists’ will is relayed through

standards or language-based regulations, is not specified. However, Meier's substantive claim that the new accountability promotes direct instruction joins Aronowitz and Giroux's (1985) thinking on determining the potential damaging effects of standards. Management pedagogies and direct instruction are forms of pedagogy that do not take the student socio-cultural context into consideration. It is worth repeating here that in none of these cases is a symbolic object created that has the effect of bracketing out the interaction between socio-cultural context of teaching and learning and teaching and learning practices in classrooms. The implication is that there are factors beyond the classroom that impact students' classroom performance but these factors and the pathways to their effects are not specified. A chain of events is merely proposed but many of its links are missing. McNeil (2000) has filled in some of this gap at least as it pertains to explaining the inequality under the new accountability.

McNeil (2000) brings empirical data to bear on the argument that not only does the new accountability standardize pedagogy and narrow curriculum, but also that poor and minority schools run a greater risk of suffering those negative outcomes and are also most vulnerable to their damaging effects. Specifically, McNeil asserts that standards-driven pedagogies deskill and demoralize culturally-relevant teachers and replace culturally relevant teaching and knowledge with forms of produced school knowledge that have no credibility with poor and minority students. Working class and minority students often have difficulty seeing the real-world translation, utility, and value of school knowledge. Credibility of knowledge is often defined for these groups in human capital terms, that is, for their sale value in the labor market. If not salable, the school knowledge that these groups receive may therefore lose its credibility. At base, therefore,

the new accountability damages poor and minority teachers and students' motivation for teaching and learning school knowledge (McNeil, 2000). How is this done? McNeil (2000) traces the problem to policy design. It is in the structure of the test, specifically machine-scorable multiple choice test and what in the language of the present conceptual framework could be categorized as the closed classification of knowledge. This closed form of classification disrupts teacher-student, student-curriculum and other necessary connections and damages the credibility of school knowledge on the part of acquirers. However, school knowledge is a production that enacts the control by policymakers.

In other words, Meier (2002) and McNeil (2000) identify what Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) refer to as management pedagogies to explain the social class-based distribution of test scores under the new accountability. What remains unspecified, however, in studies that assert the new accountability has differential effects on the subjectivities or consciousness of poor and middle class students is the object that creates those subjectivities. Devoid of such a reproductive device, such studies are hard pressed to show how pedagogy has differential effects within various social class contexts. What is in effect implied is some variation of the theory of false consciousness in which the purported interests of the business elite as encoded in the new accountability alienate such groups as the poor and minorities for whom unspecified forms of consciousness have been hypothesized. For McNeil (2000), accountability works by damaging instruction. It has been proposed that schools decouple the instructional core from symbolic changes in institutional activities that suggest school organizations are being responsive to external demands for change. Contrary to that proposition, McNeil portrays institutional activities as impinging on the technical core as a result of

educational accountability. Instruction is therefore damaged by increased bureaucratization of educational knowledge transmission. In bureaucratic knowledge, measurability is paramount, being produced by standardization of instructional processes as a result of the excessive control of the educational bureaucracy over teachers. Bureaucratic control of instruction is itself the result of the strong influence of big business on educational policymaking that results from the perceived need to regulate schools in order to respond to globalized economic competition. Bureaucratization of instruction results in knowledge products and processes that demoralize teachers and students but demoralize students and teachers in poor schools disproportionately.

In seeking to explain the social class-based achievement gap under the new accountability, the present study employs an approach that is similar to McNeil (2000). It focuses on the structure of pedagogy, on its sociology. It also does something afresh. This study's analytical framework posited no pre-existing forms of consciousness or dissonant messages but rather assumed that the medium or pedagogic practice itself was the message per se. In conformity with the assumption that learning is a social activity, that is, one learns by doing and by adopting the linguistic turn in cognitive studies according to which cognition is constructed through language, it was assumed that actors learned what they did. This introduced the notion of social practices as the starting point of the theory of inequality. Middle and working class students start off with differential facility with the language of schooling that is due to their social class-based childrearing practices in the family and in relation to the economy. Specifically, middle and working class students varied in their family-mediated access to a form of the pedagogic code that they would encounter at school. They also varied in their early reading abilities and the

forms of family-school relations through which coordination of learning is done between school and home. These variations translated into differences in adapting to instruction, pacing of instruction, and exposure to curriculum materials. However, that was just the start of the story of how educational inequality is constructed. This represents the student side of the story of the co-construction of educational inequality. There is, however, a reciprocal teacher side in this dialectical construction of pedagogy. When read by teachers acting under the influence of accountability policy, differences in adaptation, pacing, and coverage generate differences in pedagogical practice. What middle class students and working class students do in schools is construct different models of pedagogy. In turn, these pedagogies select who can acquire them where validity is translated into test scores.

In this chapter, first, a summary of the pedagogical practices of working class and middle class students respectively will be presented. It will then be argued that the new accountability promotes a visible pedagogy in classrooms. Next, it will be shown how pedagogic practice is selective. Finally, it will be argued that working and middle class settings generate two different types of texts and that these texts illustrate differentially validated forms of knowledge.

Construction of Pedagogical Discourse: New Accountability Promotes Visibility

The study concludes that the pedagogical discourse of working and middle class schools differ. It will be remembered what discourse, social language, and text mean and how they are interrelated in this study. Discourse is more than a way of describing the world. It is a phenomenon of social power. It is a particular specialist language and the ideas, and social outcomes that are associated with it. For example, language is a

communal resource, a socially established system of linguistic units and rules. Speech is socially produced language. This view places emphasis on the internal structural relations of language even though language is constantly changing through speech. Similarly, structuralism emphasizes structural explanations, sometimes to the exclusion of individual subject or agency and is the basis for the charge of being one-sided. Text refers to a specific product of language-in-use and may be in any form. For some, text is any written form of signification. Unlike speech it can have an independent existence beyond the writer and the context of its production. For structuralists, it is a system of differences that does not depend on an initiating individual subject (Jary & Jary, 1991). In this study, the concern is the relationship between language and non-linguistic structural arrangements, specifically class. Different forms of social relations generate different linguistic codes. Language is a model for social relations, the intersection being the structural rule-governed behavior of both.

The study concludes that the new accountability policy has consequences for the form of school knowledge. In the language of the analytical framework, the traditional format of policy tools that are associated with the new accountability, namely content standards, high-stakes testing, and the adoption of district-wide curricula that are aligned to state curriculum standards enact a collection type of code that promotes a visible model of pedagogic practice. This conclusion is arrived at from the finding that both schools enact strong hierarchical, pacing and sequencing, and criterial rules that together constitute a visible pedagogy. In spite of their different social class and geographic locations, the curriculum at Sunnyside Elementary School and at Fairweather Elementary School showed remarkable similarity in surface and deep structure, for example topical

categories, cognitive demand, and modes of presentation. The points of similarity between the surface structure of knowledge between the schools and between the schools and the policy tools were too many to be due to coincidence. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the curriculum that is the cumulative effect of accountability as a layered concept that is constructed by federal, State, and local regulatory agencies is transmitted in a visible format. Visibility or elaboration selects and advantages the middle class, by facilitating their strategic action, calling for cultural, social, and economic capital that by definition they have.

In spite of the different social class backgrounds of their schools, both teachers implemented the new accountability in their classrooms, that is, both teachers found the new accountability meaningful for their classrooms practices. Further, both teachers drew on the same policy tools that are made available by the new accountability in constructing their practice but the difference between the two is that each used those tools in a different way. In other words, each teacher made sense differently of the new accountability. The source of this difference in teachers' production of knowledge regarding the new accountability across the cases will be explored later in this section. The commonalities in both teachers' understandings of the new accountability that are above and beyond the influence of social class are discussed first.

The study concludes that the classification of knowledge in the evaluation message system of the new accountability, namely the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) exercises the most direct and powerful influence on the framing of criterial rules in teachers' practice during transmission in classrooms. In the language of the analytical model, the three message systems, curriculum, teaching, and evaluation, are distinct and

relatively independent. Classification refers to boundaries in both the curriculum and evaluation message systems whereas framing refers to boundaries in the teaching system. The value of classification of knowledge in the evaluation message system of the policy tools of MSA was determined to be strong/closed. When teachers drew on the Content Standards, Voluntary State Standards, and the county-wide Literary Reflections (College of William and Mary) curriculum to organize their daily enactment of assessed curriculum in the teaching message system, policy influence was direct. Direct influence of Content Standards, Voluntary State Standards and the county-wide Literary Reflections shaped the surface structure of the enacted curriculum. Teachers drew directly on the structure of the federal and State-mandated Maryland State Assessments (MSA), the Content Standards and the Voluntary State Curriculum from Maryland State, and Literary Reflections from the county in order to construct the surface structure of the curriculum, for example courses, units, and topics and enacted a visible practice of strong pacing, sequencing and pacing, and criteria. That is, direct influence could be traced to the criteria or basis of legitimate knowledge and sequencing and pacing of instruction. However, direct influence could not be established between the strong hierarchical rules of the enacted curriculum and the intended curriculum because these rules are not specified in the policy tools.

It will be remembered that the inner logic of the curriculum is generated by the nature of the three sets of rules. As stated above, a direct connection between the curriculum that was enacted in the classrooms and the curriculum that the new accountability intends to have teachers enact could not be established in all three sets of rules in teachers' pedagogic practice as conceptualized by the analytical framework. This

is because the tools of the new accountability do not guide the conduct of hierarchical relations in any direct way. We speculate, therefore, that the nature of the two sets of rules, namely criterial rules and sequencing and pacing rules has unanticipated consequences for the nature of the third set, hierarchical rules.

Whereas hierarchical rules are not specified by the policy, they are mediated by the teacher as a matter of necessity. Stated differently, the new accountability directly influences criterial and sequencing and pacing rules. In turn, hierarchical rules are constructed by the teacher who acts on the cues that he/she receives from students to do so.

The most direct influence on sequencing and pacing was from the standards. The tools of the new accountability influence directly what (selection and organization) will be transmitted, how fast (pacing) it will be transmitted, and the conditions or criteria for legitimate success (criteria) of the reception from the point of view of the teachers. The selection of knowledge and criteria are given by the policy. The organization of knowledge is mediated by schools. Pacing may be constructed through such curriculum planning practices as backwards mapping of the intended curriculum. Selection, organization, and pacing of knowledge in addition to the criteria for assessing legitimate knowledge determine the learning agenda. Hierarchical rules are constructed through teachers' understandings of the learning agenda.

How do sequencing, pacing, and criteria influence hierarchy? In order that the set learning agenda be met, the teacher must mediate instruction. Specifically, mediation occurs through hierarchical relations. Once the learning agenda is set, social control has to be established over students with whom the learning agenda is realized. It will be

remembered that control is established through hierarchical rules and that hierarchical rules do not only establish regulation of students but also drive the nature of the two sets of discursive rules, namely sequencing and pacing, and criterial rules. It was found that both teachers drew on the same tools of the new accountability but each teacher used them differently. Specifically, there are two differences. First, there were differences across visible practice by social class. That is, the visible practice in Mrs. Mason's class produced a more elaborated (syntactical) text whereas the visible practice in Mr. Randolph's class produced a more restricted (lexical) text. Second, Mrs. Mason enacted an invisible pedagogy also where there was none in Mr. Randolph's class. Specifically, invisible pedagogy was used to teach in areas that were not directly assessed on MSA. Therefore, two basic forms of hierarchical rules were established: explicit and implicit. Differentiation is by social class.

Enjoying relatively greater flexibility over practice or the implementation of policy in classrooms, the middle class school implemented both a visible and an invisible practice in reading. Invisible practice was used to implement the curriculum topics that are not assessed directly by MSA, specifically Writing, Speaking, and Listening. These areas do not lend themselves to efficient forms of large-scale assessment and therefore escape further bureaucratization. Visible pedagogy was used to transmit topic areas that were directly supported by MSA, specifically General Reading Processes, Comprehension of Informational Text, and Comprehension of Literary Text. These content areas lend themselves to large-scale assessments because of the tight classification of multiple-choice format. In order to compare results across schools, knowledge had to be made measurable. Strong classification is the basis of such

measurability. The nature of the curriculum is therefore related to its support on MSA. For economic and social reasons, recursive, context-tied knowledge is not supported by MSA. Context-free, atomized knowledge is supported by MSA. Therefore, the classification of knowledge in MSA is the most important policy factor in driving teachers' decisions in classrooms. Therefore, at the most general level, the study concludes that accountability has meaning for knowledge production in classrooms.

Effects of the New Accountability: Standardization

The study focused on the pursuit of the theoretical purpose of explaining possible relations among the social distribution of test scores, the new accountability policy, and social class through a determination of the connections between a school's local pedagogic practice and its social class location. The study heeded calls for Bernstein's analytical model to be applied to the educational proposals of the new accountability as a research strategy for providing data to educators and policymakers on salient critiques of accountability (Sadovnik, 1991). On the one hand, no critique of the new accountability has more resonance for policy and practice than assertions that the reform exacerbates test score disparities by social class. On the other, no justification for the policy is more passionate than the argument that the new accountability constitutes an effort to attain equitable educational outcomes on behalf of poor and racial/ethnic minority students. In other words, the new accountability does promote equality of learning opportunities.

In the search for pathways to educational inequality, the view that schooling is done through a specialized language decentered some forms of teacher and student knowledge and centered others in the explanation. Specifically, teachers' beliefs in their students' ability to learn the curriculum materials, the organizational environment of their

respective schools, teachers' efforts to involve parents, and teaching style may not be as critical in equalizing test scores as might be thought.

Teachers' Beliefs

This conceptual shift is illustrated by the findings that the two teachers in the study, Mrs. Mason of Sunnyside Elementary and Mr. Randolph of Fairweather Elementary share a lot in common. Specifically, they share comparable levels of commitment to the educational ends of their institutions regarding the educability of all children. From a historical and sociological perspective, these similarly high expectations are not an unimportant professional and policy achievement. In this country, inequality of educational opportunity has a documented history that is more than a hundred years long (Jencks & Phillips, 1998). However, this similarity between teachers' expectations for their students across social class is even more important in an era of continuous social and policy change when teaching practice may be characterized by confusion (Cossentino, 2004b). This means that across the various waves and reformulations of the new accountability policy the message that high expectations are to be directed to all social groups has been constant and received by those in the technical core. The teachers in this study therefore show evidence of being socialized into the new accountability's belief that, in the words of the so-called Sondheim Report that launched the new Maryland accountability, "All children can learn," further, that, "All children have the right to attend schools in which they can progress and learn," and moreover that, "All children shall have a real opportunity to learn equally rigorous content" (MSDE, 1989, p. 3). However important the achievement, it does not cause meaningful differences.

Organizational Factors

The two teachers are also similar in their experience of school-level leadership, serving as they do supportive principals who are aware of their skills and commitment. Once again, this level of leadership is not unrelated to the new accountability policy. Under principals who are instructional leaders, both are teaching to the new standards of Maryland State and both teachers have learned the new standards of accountability and both teachers have changed. Observing Mrs. Mason's effortless transitions from activity to activity, one might hardly notice that she is implementing a reform that is only now entering its second year in the Spring 2004. Mrs. Mason's practice is so self-assured that even her students underestimate the effort it takes: Mrs. Mason makes it look like she could do this in her sleep. Small wonder then she has to remind her students that this is as new to them as it is to her. The knowledge that she creates, she tells them, is not given. She has had to learn it. This means that her ability to draw on her vast stocks of experiential knowledge that have been developed over decades of classroom practice makes Mrs. Mason a quick study of MSAP instructional reform. By comparison with Mrs. Mason, Mr. Randolph's transitions might not appear as smooth. However, it may not be evident either that he is a novice teacher. He is helped by the policy tools of the new accountability. For all their achievements in being re-socialized by the new accountability, still teacher learning may not be what is central to their students' dissimilar classroom experiences.

Efforts to Engage Parents in Curriculum

In spite of the difference in the social class location of their schools, both teachers made an equally appreciable effort to engage parents in their children's learning. In spite

of their similar efforts to involve parents in their children learning of classroom materials, the middle class parents respond differently to Mrs. Mason's requests for participation than do the working class parents to Mr. Randolph's.

Teaching Styles

The above presentation of similarities in the teachers' practice is not meant to argue that the teachers are similar in every way. The teachers do have differences. For example, each teacher exhibits a distinctly different manner, that way of teaching that is unique to each and every teacher. Mrs. Sandra Mason, the reading/English Language arts teacher at Sunnyside Elementary School is middle-aged, Caucasian, and speaks softly, almost never raising her voice. Mr. Randolph, the reading Language Arts teacher at Fairweather Elementary School looks thirty, is also Caucasian, but is a disciplinarian who often speaks in the strong voice of a basketball coach, only occasionally enacting the voice of preacher and poet to sing the beauty of the open Midwestern landscapes and of the art forms by which he is touched and basic familiarity with which are aimed for in their prescribed curriculum content. While Mrs. Mason almost never raises her soft voice, she modulates her tone ever so subtly depending on the needs of the situation, by turns evoking the caring, concern, and playfulness of a self-assured expert. She often dispenses disciplinary knowledge directly but is rather indirect in discharging the obligatory pastoral duties of a teacher. By contrast, Mr. Randolph has a strong and authoritative voice that he pitches on a lofty monotone, using such classic social distancing techniques as the formal address, "ladies and gentlemen" to get his students' attention. When disarray threatens to break out in his class, he is also more likely to openly warn or directly appeal to authority in his efforts to manage his class of "ladies

and gentlemen,” for example relying on a discrete behavior management tool to regain control. However, although Mr. Randolph relies on the strength of his voice, scarcely modulating his tone, he is capable of short bursts of laughter that resonate with his students, occasionally infecting them in turn with chuckles. As such, he gives the impression of a man with a certain missionary zeal about his mission, which seems to be to bring enlightenment to students who so desperately need it. At the same time, on the other side of the county, Mrs. Mason may be found being characteristically calm in the knowledge that her students do not need a rousing speech on the value of a sound education and therefore always appearing to be wise in the ways of providing such an education. Still, for all their differences, it would be difficult to argue that these teachers’ individual manner plays a critical role in differentiating their students’ level of academic performance.

It was an understanding of these teachers’ student and policy contexts and of their place in it that was sought in this study of the influence of social class and policy on academic achievement. As argued above, the study concludes that both teachers were aware of the regulatory or normative nature of the tools that were brought to their classroom by the new accountability policy. Specifically, the new accountability defined equal aims for both schools’ student bodies even across their differing social class backgrounds. The policy provided the same tools for instruction, defining rigorous content and ensuring teachers’ training in effective practices. Moreover, not only were those policy-given tools objectively equal they were also subjectively understood in similar ways by each teacher and therefore were not found to constitute the critical factor in constructing differences in classrooms. The answer to the question of the source of

social class differences in test scores under the new accountability was therefore not to be found in any direct way in the new accountability policy. In other words, the new accountability was found to be a source of standardization in that aspect of teachers' identities that defines their expectation and in teachers' practice. However, standardization is just part of the story. In fact, standardization of pedagogical practice appears to be a precondition for differentiation in the distribution of test scores by social class rather than for its equalization.

In this study of the patterned activities of these two real teachers, the approach consisted of identifying the social resources that class made available to the student and by extension to teaching and the technical tools that new accountability made available to teachers and students in classrooms and the repercussions that these affordances had for academic performance. The study concludes that, in spite of the similarities that occurred in the teacher and the policy frames of the teaching nexus, these two teachers practice their craft in two very different student knowledge contexts and therefore it is the student frame that per force localizes and differentiates their otherwise standardized practice. In spite of the powerful similarities in these teachers as persons and professionals who subscribe to the new accountability's belief in the educability of all children and in the moral, economic, and personal imperative that all shall learn, and in spite of the similarities of the policy tools, these teachers' practical context varies. Specifically, their students' differentiated levels of mastery of the language of schooling call on these teachers to create and deploy appropriately differentiated forms of knowledge.

Effects of Social Class: Differentiation

It is the highly localized call from students and the equally differentiated response on the part of these teachers that are the unique province of this study and which are more fully described next.

Social Class Assumptions of Pedagogic Practice

The findings from Chapter IV validated the analytical framework's ability to explain the differentiation of students and teachers' experience of pedagogic discourse by social class. Middle class students were found to enjoy greater flexibility in constructing their local pedagogic practice as shown by their active construction of both visible and invisible models whereas the working class school enacted only a visible pedagogic practice. Through their experience of visible and invisible models, the middle class school had a wider range of experiences of social control, both experiencing and exercising control over pedagogic discourse whereas the working class school only experienced control.

Analysis of the social class assumptions of the models of pedagogic practice revealed that their essential difference was due to the fact that middle class students were better adapted to both models of pedagogic practice and were therefore advantaged by greater exposure to and increased coverage of curriculum materials. Further, while it is true that middle class teacher and students might have experienced similar forms of control as working class students, the middle class school distinguished itself from the working class school group by exercising control over pedagogic discourse where working class students did not.

Middle class students more fully and differentially meet the expectations of the new accountability, mastering the assessed curriculum of the Maryland School Assessments in reading as well as the intended curriculum that is not tested but is intended by Maryland Content Standards and Voluntary State Standards. Middle class students by being differentially controlled by the new accountability garner different experiences of pedagogy. Working class students strain to meet the expectations of the new accountability, specializing in covering mainly the assessed curriculum of the Maryland School Assessments in reading. Middle class students/schools meet the social class assumptions of visible as well as invisible pedagogies under the new accountability while working class students do not meet the social assumptions even of the sole form of pedagogy, the visible, that they enact.

Pedagogy creates social class assumptions of each pedagogic practice. Each practice therefore creates principles by which social groups that can implement them are selected. On the one hand, the new accountability generates visible and invisible pedagogic practices in the middle class student context whose social class assumptions they meet adequately because middle class students activate cultural, social, and economic capital that allow them to do so. Therefore, the interaction of accountability and social class has consequences for academic performance. On the other hand, the new accountability generates with and in the working class student context a visible pedagogy whose social class assumptions working class students do not meet because they are incapable of activating the cultural, social, and economic capital necessary.

This difference in pedagogical discourse is referred to as a Trojan Horse after the episode in Greek mythology in which a wooden horse was placed outside the gates of

Troy. Reading it as an omen from the gods, the Trojans took it within the gates of the city. After nightfall, the soldiers who had hidden within the horse got out and seized the city. The Trojan Horse therefore symbolizes a structure that looks like one thing on the outside but is on the inside quite something else. First, pedagogy has both a surface and a deep structure. Second, pedagogy has social assumptions. Third, a policy that is designed to standardize pedagogy spawns different varieties of pedagogy.

Three general pathways are presented in the theory of pedagogic practice by which visible pedagogies disadvantage the working class in learning school knowledge. The first is differentiated access to the collection code. The first consequence for differential access to the code is differential ability to activate the resources, skills, and dispositions that are used in active construction of pedagogical practice in classrooms. The first consequence was the subject of Chapter IV. It was found that whereas middle class students construct a visible model of pedagogic practice that contains an invisible practice, working class students construct a purely visible pedagogic practice. The second consequence is that since the form of the transmission shapes educational knowledge and sets up the social assumptions of its reception, the constructed pedagogy creates processes that select who can receive them. The assumption of a visible model of local pedagogic practice within families is explored next for the selective processes it may create.

Differentiated Access To the Underlying Code

Code denotes a transmission. The term ‘educational knowledge code,’ ‘code’ for short, refers to, “the underlying principles which shape curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation” (Bernstein, 1971, p. 203). Middle and working class students have unequal

access to the code because middle class families are more likely to have a local pedagogic practice in the home that is similar to that of the official pedagogic practice of the school. This unequal access to the code has consequences for acquiring school knowledge within visible pedagogic practice that are explored next.

Sequencing rules.

An initial consequence of social class is the resources, skills, and dispositions towards instruction that it provides to students. This may be seen in relation to public and explicit sequencing of instruction. It will be remembered that sequencing implies selection of curriculum materials. Given that some selected curriculum content is organized temporally in the enacted curriculum, students' learning opportunities may be influenced by their facility with the background that is necessary for building new knowledge. This means that the sequencing rules in early childhood education assume a certain student knowledge base. For example, a study of 8200 students entering kindergarten in Montgomery County, Maryland in 2001 confirmed that students who are poor and learning English had significantly weaker literacy skills than other students. On entry into kindergarten, one third of students participating in the Free and Reduced-Price Meals System (FARMS) knew only 11 letters of the alphabet and fifty per cent of students participating in FARMS and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) knew 11 letters or fewer (Bridges-Cline, 2001). If, however, the teacher's standard called for a more advanced knowledge of letters, not only would students who did not meet those standards be positioned as deficient, the structure of their interactions with the teacher might also be affected (Rist, 1970/2000).

Research shows that the test score gap persists across the educational career (Jencks & Phillips, 1998). The study assumes that sequencing rules could have equally deleterious effects in fifth grade. This is a study of the fifth grade, not of kindergarten or first grade. Therefore, it is not the kindergarten sequencing rules that the fifth graders fail to meet but rather fifth grade sequencing rules. It was shown that thanks to the new accountability, there were explicit sequencing rules for reading in Maryland fifth grades. Mrs. Mason's middle class students meet the sequencing rules of fifth grade reading which means that they construct pedagogy quite fluently. This does not mean that some students do not face difficulties in meeting the sequencing rules. On the contrary, students are baffled by the demands of doing analogies. However, cases like these are few in the database relating to Mrs. Mason's class. By contrast, Mr. Randolph's working class students' difficulties with the sequencing rules of visible pedagogies are evident. They appear not to know what a complete article is. Mr. Randolph's students do not rise to the expectation that they know the structure of informational materials, specifically newspapers. Therefore, Mr. Randolph's students need close supervision in order to manage students' frustration and to fill in the gaps in their background knowledge. Therefore, the study concludes that working class students tend not to meet the sequencing requirements of the new accountability whereas middle class students tend to.

Pacing rules.

Sequencing implies pacing because pacing is the time that is allotted for learning selected curriculum materials. As was stated above, Mrs. Mason's students largely meet the sequencing rules of visible pedagogies in the area of analogies. The study concludes that this allows them to enact a relatively rapid pace of instruction on account specifically

of their meeting the explicit sequencing rules of visible pedagogies. The items in the test were prescribed, that is strongly classified (evaluation, curriculum) and strongly framed (teaching). The criteria for valid answers were also equally rigid: students had no margin of error for answers were either right or wrong. The measurability of school knowledge here makes correcting and grading quick and easy and the students' facility with the materials speeds up their instruction.

As suggested in Chapter II, visible pedagogies' sequencing rules, by tightly regulating illustrations, examples, and questions that may facilitate understanding, and explanations help to create the disadvantaged status of the students. Students entered this period not meeting the pacing rules on the structure of print and exited falling behind on a reading assignment and preparation for homework possibly on account of time. Tight management of time regulates the interaction with students that might have alleviated their difficulty with this activity. Tight control on time therefore limits explanations. And the teacher's justification for moving on is that poetry has to be done. The teacher's judgment is not in question. The logic of bounding the structure of newspaper with the form of the limerick, however, seems to fall elsewhere, in the authority of the new accountability's Content Standards, Voluntary State Standards, and aligned county-wide curriculum.

Mr. Randolph knows that his students have difficulty with the structure of print and targets their knowledge of story structure for much needed improvement.

A student factor besides the pressure to use time well may explain Mr. Randolph's pacing and his regulation of explanations, illustrations, etc. Mr. Randolph has a keen eye for trouble. There are signs that resistance is already building as students

get frustrated with the activity. “You haven’t read it and you say it’s boring,” says Mr. Randolph. Therefore, not only does the premium on time regulate the use of explanations and illustrations, but so does the need to manage the classroom. Therefore, the study concludes that visible practice is functional to classroom management in working class learning environments.

The study concludes, therefore, that whereas visible practice has the strength of supporting classroom management in the working class context where it is needed, it contains the weakness of being inflexible regarding the teachers’ ability to respond to students’ inadequate background knowledge or otherwise customize their learning, which, as has been shown above is much needed. On the other hand, visible pedagogy in the middle class context, allows for rapid pacing of instruction especially where there is little need for providing illustrations, etc. In short, the study concludes that differentiated access to a visible local pedagogic practice at home helps middle class students to meet the sequencing rules and keep up with the pacing rules of the official school pedagogy but contributes to working class students’ inability to meet sequencing requirements and to fall behind on pacing of instruction. Since as has been shown in Chapter II, access to the code is regulated by social class-based practices, this difference amounts to a socially selective process. Students’ challenges and strengths are linked to another factor, reading ability, which will be discussed next.

Ability To Read

Middle class students are likely to read at an earlier age than do working class students. The implications of this relatively early literacy skill are discussed next with

regard to their implications for conferring advantage in acquiring the rules of pedagogical discourse.

Sequencing and pacing rules based on reading.

“Over the week-end,” asks Mrs. Mason, “can you finish reading Secret Garden (Burnett, 1987)?” Then she adds, “Let’s finish One-Eyed Cat (Fox, 1984) by Wednesday.” Mrs. Mason enacts the explicit sequencing and pacing rules of the visible practice based on her students’ reading ability. By contrast, Mr. Randolph’s students’ have difficulty reading and have difficulty organizing their own learning. Therefore, the strong pacing of visible pedagogy makes it easy to speed along the learning of students who need little personal attention.

Middle class advantage: Meeting rules, organizing discourse.

Since one is socialized into the rules of educational discourse, “Discipline then means accepting a given selection, organization, pacing, and timing of knowledge realized in the pedagogical frame” (Bernstein, 1971, p. 214). In asking her students to finish reading Secret Garden (Burnett, 1987) over the week-end, Mrs. Mason can count on students to organize their own reading, specifically its pacing. Visible practice therefore enhances middle class students’ advantage because by specifying the learning schedule it makes it possible to put to use for educational profit skills that are differentially distributed, namely ability to organize one’s own learning.

Middle class advantage: Exploring new realities.

The ultimate mystery of a subject is, “its potential for creating new realities,” (Bernstein, 1971, p. 213), which is the unknown. Education makes possible new possibilities, be they imagined or real, leisure or economic activity. Mrs. Mason coaches

students into seeing the possibilities that education offers for perceiving new realities. They eventually do see the truth in their teacher's assertion that analogies are a life skill. By contrast, Mr. Randolph's students have difficulty appreciating any new realities that education makes possible. Seeing new realities that are made possible by schooling enhances students' motivation to learn. Middle class students therefore seem to be more highly motivated than working class students. However, the pedagogic practice is not neutral regarding the construction of new realities. In fact, the closed frames of visible pedagogic practice create forms of academic knowledge that by their varying social practices, middle class students are more easily able to deploy in naming their social realities.

The study concludes that literacy helps middle class students to organize their own learning independently and to see applications of their learning. Independence in organizing their learning confers the advantage of being able to alter, specifically speed up pacing and therefore coverage of curriculum materials. Seeing applications of one's knowledge may confer the advantage of increasing one's motivation to learn. Since as has been shown in Chapter II, literacy is regulated by social class-based practices, this difference amounts to a socially selective process.

Two Sites of Acquisition

A significant factor in differentiating students' experience of visible pedagogy is the social assumption that learning is coordinated between home and school and therefore middle class homes that met this requirement of visible pedagogy subsidize school learning.

Knowledge of vocabulary and analogies under visible pedagogy.

The student recognizes that the skill of doing analogies is in use in the tour guide's practice and shares that knowledge with the class. This recognition may not only help confirm the identity of this student and the class as knowers of the applicability of analogies skills but may quite possibly increase the significance of this skill and by extension improve their motivation for doing it.

Academic knowledge subject to unequal distribution through home and school.

It will be remembered that Mrs. Mason outsources instruction to the home and can count on the family to coordinate learning with the school. It was also shown that there is a cultural and economic assumption behind Mrs. Mason's outsourcing of such school-family interaction. It is argued here that the new accountability by making the learning schedule visible further enhances the already existing middle class family's ability to coordinate learning with the school. In other words, now that the official pedagogy of the school has increased visibility, it facilitates the middle class family's ability to comply with the school's expectation that the family coordinates the child's learning activity with the school. It facilitates the middle class implementing an official pedagogy at home that has reciprocity for both home and school. This confers the advantage of increasing middle class students' exposure to curriculum materials. It could be argued that visibility is enhanced for both middle and working class families. In objective terms, this would be true: the learning schedule is made visible to facilitate action by all social groups. However, it must be recognized that the social phenomenon of a visible pedagogy has assumptions for who can act on it. Visible pedagogy being a phenomenon that requires certain skills, resources, and dispositions for acting means that

in practice the middle class are able to benefit from this reform in ways that are not possible for the working class. These are the power relations that penetrate the structure of knowledge.

Single exposure: Reliance on school for educational knowledge.

Homework traditionally mediates the coordination of learning between home and school. However, this coordination has social class assumptions. It will be remembered for example that such coordination depends on several factors, including, (1) the type of control that families exert over students' learning activities and the type of social resources (economic, social, cultural capital) that families can activate (which reflect the degree of labor integration or specialization in the home), (2) social assumptions about school, (3) boundary types of the school's local pedagogic practice such that the school may select influences from the home (Bernstein, 1990). Mr. Randolph is dissatisfied with his students' reading performance and designs an instructional unit on informational reading in order to strengthen their reading skills. However, the activity seems not to be going quite well to Mr. Randolph. Mr. Randolph tells his students, "Remember you need to read aloud to a parent or an older brother or sister." "In an effort to transfer the culture of newspaper reading into homes, Mr. Randolph advises, "You need two articles. Got to find one for home." When Mr. Randolph asks about parents' reactions to the reading journal. Isaac responds. "My mom likes the idea. She thinks I'll learn from it," Isaac says. Isaac says only that his mother sees the value of the idea. Does she participate in making the idea a reality? Isaac does not say so. However, Isaac's submission prompts a fellow student to comment on the local pedagogic practices in his family. That student provides a counterpoint to Isaac's contribution. "My mom thinks I read too much," he

says. Another student says, “I don’t like when my mom reads to me.” Even a casual observer might get the impression that Mr. Randolph is trying to get his students to read. “What I am trying to do is hear the fire without the reading. Bring the characters to life,” he says. But his efforts do not quite bear the fruits that he intends. Therefore, accountability, by promoting visible practice, facilitates the coordination of learning between home and school in ways that middle class families are able to exploit and working families are not. Moreover, families’ capacity for coordinating learning with schools is mediated by skills, resources, and dispositions that are associated with social class.

Invisible Pedagogies

The study concludes that the new accountability provides policy tools that construct an intended curriculum whose curriculum and evaluation message systems are strongly classified (highly insulated). In turn, the closed classification of those given message systems along with student and teacher identities promotes active construction of a strongly framed teaching message system. That is, the new accountability promotes a collection code of strongly bounded curriculum, testing, and teaching.

The strongly framed teaching message system comprises a visible model of pedagogy. Pedagogic practice is not given but is influenced by the new accountability policy. This highlights the activity of teachers and students. When the intended curriculum is recontextualized into an enacted curriculum in classrooms, the decision on whether to enact a visible or invisible pedagogic practice in classrooms is mediated by the teacher. However, construction of pedagogic practice depends in large measure on the social class make-up of the student body of the school. It is not so much a private

decision of a teacher that emerges from an individual or professional cosmology as a dialogical and continuously dialectical decision in which teacher and students participate to co-produce knowledge in classrooms. It is only private in the sense that it is not part of public policy enactment.

In poor as well as middle class schools a visible pedagogy may be enacted but for different reasons. Cultural considerations will drive the decisions by poor schools to enact visible pedagogies whereas middle class schools' decision to enact a visible pedagogy is driven by consideration of its advantages in terms of rapid pacing and greater coverage of curriculum material that it makes possible. In poor schools, the problematic nature of teacher-student relations and the need for efficient classroom management or order will require external control of students by teachers. The external control of visible pedagogies lends itself to classrooms in which students maintain difficult pedagogical interactions with teachers. Visible pedagogies may also offer another advantage: they are more efficient in terms of time.

Visible pedagogic practice is not inherently unequal. However, if students of one school have not acquired early reading and others have, the former will adapt more quickly to teaching; if students at one school have parents who increase their exposure to curriculum materials and others have parents who don't, then students in the former group may be able to keep pace with rapid rate of learning in visible pedagogies and not fall behind. The consequences of visible practice vary by social class. In rich schools, visible practice generates a syntactical text. In poor schools, visible practice generates a lexical text.

When at the level of the voice of the new accountability policy, that is when the intended curriculum message system and the intended evaluation system are strongly framed, then at the level of the message in classrooms, the social relationship between teacher and student will be hierarchical. Mr. Randolph illustrates that influence when in response to the student Gopal who wants to organize his own learning, the teacher essentially discourages it. Federal, State and local educational bureaucracies have strongly classified or specified the learning target. A strongly classified or pre-existing learning schedule therefore reinforces the hierarchical authority of a teacher who is not only aware of the existence of such a plan but who is also committed as a matter of policy and as civil servant to follow that schedule. The new accountability therefore has the unanticipated consequence of increasing the hierarchical authority of the teacher in relation to the student.

Therefore, schools that enact an invisible pedagogy will be economically richer (space, teachers; middle class, inner regulation), have more social capital (integrated families), and more cultural capital (school knowledge activated during parental intervention) because these schools that have an advantage under invisible pedagogy will be schools whose students have the requisite inner regulation to undertake the diffuse rules of invisible pedagogy. Whereas the visible pedagogy is the result of regulation or vertical accountability, invisible practice is the result of later accountability, that is, to community. This is because invisible practice may be driven by cultural capital and social capital. The availability of a pedagogically appropriate student knowledge base might influence teachers to pursue the knowledge that is not supported by MSA in spaces that open up as a result of excelling at the basics. That is, students may be able to read,

etc. and as such, it would be efficient to do so. However, cultural capital alone may not be sufficient to explain this. A social capital explanation for an invisible practice may have two advantages. Social capital would explain why middle class students would have more cultural capital by showing how they get it: through parental intervention in their classroom learning. It may explain how parents' direction of their students' learning is conducted through parent-teacher channels. In short, middle class families value the skills that oral presentations provide, understanding the range of uses that such invisible skills as oral presentations may be put to within public school and college teaching, management, sales and in other professional and executive settings. These skills are economically valuable, are valued citizenship skills, and are important in testing or meeting the gate-keeping requirements of good schools.

The knowledge and social resources that students have for carrying out their learning in classrooms vary by social class. In response to the differential funds of knowledge, and dispositions, etc. that students present to the instructional context and as a consequence of the decisions made by their teachers, the students in Mrs. Mason's and Mr. Randolph's respective classrooms have different learning experiences. The new accountability policy standardizes intended and assessed curriculum knowledge.

However, the economic, social, and cultural capital that classrooms, schools, families and communities have at their disposal with which to pursue those standardized goals remain outside the control of the policy and are therefore by definition disparate.

Different Experiences of Classrooms

Mrs. Mason's class experienced and exercised control whereas Mr. Randolph's class mainly experienced control. In Mrs. Mason's class, the dominant status of the

middle class was affirmed. In Mrs. Mason's class, students participated with a degree of independence that was not observed in Mr. Randolph's class. For example, students not taking the test selected reading materials and engaged in reading without prompting by the teacher. Not only is the activity self-initiated, it is also functional to classroom management (quiet for testing) and student learning. In the working class school, there is a visible pedagogy. The differences are several. Middle class students experience control but also exercise control. By contrast, working class students experience control. Further, it is based on parent's intervention and students' status.

It is shown that the students at Fairweather Elementary construct difficult pedagogical relations with their teacher whereas the students at Sunnyside Elementary School cultivate strong and cohesive social bonds with their teacher. Family-school relations bear directly on the nature of the coordination of learning in two sites, their homes and in the classroom that the analytical frame proposes is mediated by the pedagogical code. Family-school relations take two forms in this study. In the first, parents of students in Mrs. Mason's class are portrayed by their children as intervening to improve the learning of the curriculum at home. By contrast, parents of students in Mr. Randolph's class leave much of the curriculum work to the teacher. In the second, whereas in Mr. Randolph's class there is an outflow of cultural capital from the classroom into families in Mrs. Mason's class, there is an input of cultural capital from families into the classroom.

The planned learning agenda of both schools share similarities and differences. In the language of the analytical framework, the teacher and students at both Sunnyside Elementary School and Fairweather Elementary School co-create a visible pedagogy, that

is, their local pedagogic practice is characterized by strong or closed boundaries. However, on closer examination, it is found that in addition to sharing a visible pedagogy with Fairweather Elementary School, the teacher and students at Sunnyside Elementary School also co-create an invisible pedagogy comprising predominantly open or weak boundaries. At Sunnyside, visible and invisible pedagogy are related. Invisible pedagogy is contained inside the visible pedagogy.

One conceptual benefit to comparing social class-based practices is that since it is not one social class group's practice that makes sense but rather the whole system then a more general perspective of the work of social class in education may be realized (Anyon, 1981; Connell et al., 2000). This study reveals that learning is not only a dialogical interaction between teachers and students but more than that is a social activity in which policymakers set the learning agenda, administrators codify knowledge and regulate the means by which they are to be achieved, and teachers and students co-construct knowledge in conversation with policymakers and by extension the wider public, and administrators.

Discussion: Theory Goals

The study sought to systematically derive a model and test it for validity, specifically regarding a more transparent view of social class, and regarding a dialectical model of pedagogy that is capable of both a language of critique and of possibility.

Model

In this study, a bottom-up analytical model for investigating the influence of social class on academic achievement was successfully devised from the work of Basil

Bernstein (1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000). The model comprises three points of analysis, determination of linguistic practice, policy analysis, and a political analysis.

Discourse analysis.

In the first, field investigation captures discourse from the classroom regarding the nature of the teaching message system. Discourse analysis is done using a priori coding that is derived from the models of pedagogic practice to determine the structure of the teaching message system that transmits the enacted curriculum. Data are gathered regarding the schools' profiles. Indicators of social class location are gathered that relate to cultural, social, and economic capital distribution in the school and host society. Such demographic data as racial/ethnic, gender, are gathered. Micro-interactional data from pedagogical observations are linked to macro-social practices through the idea of the social class assumptions of the models of pedagogic practice. Data are analyzed and connections made in conformity with the theory of symbolic control.

Policy analysis.

Next, in the second point of analysis, the stage of content analysis of the intended curriculum, the policy product that emerges from the policy formulation phases of the stage of political decision-making is analyzed as a guide to implementation, that is curriculum that is expected to be implemented. Content analysis is carried out using a priori coding that is derived from the theory of pedagogic codes. Analysis is restricted to the intended curriculum and the planned assessed curriculum because the teaching message system can only be determined from classroom observation. Emphasis is therefore placed on the policy tools or ideal curriculum that are made available by the policy because the curriculum that is intended is different from the curriculum that is

enacted. Boundary types and strength of classification of planned evaluation and intended curriculum will be determined. The determination of a type of code cannot be done before analysis of the teaching message system, which can only be done from data that are gathered from field research.

Political analysis.

In the third point of analysis, the stage of political decision-making, a political analysis of a policy outcome was carried out. In the first phase of the political analysis, an analysis of the social structure is carried out. The political analysis uses a heuristic to organize the drivers of policy reform into four categories, imperatives emanating from changes in the classificatory structure of knowledge in higher education, from the changes in the concept of skill in the economy, from demands in society for an equity pedagogy, and from changes in the classification of message systems. Policy entrepreneurs representing various social class interests, use their control over disparate stocks of social resources in various political strategies to engage in a discursive struggle to fix the limits on what these changes mean and to influence political decision-makers to formulate policy to manage those changes. Legislation is initiated and is followed by formulation of a policy. Finally, the policy is turned over to administrative and professional staff for implementation.

Testing

The model successfully guided the formulation of a feasible and substantial research question, the preparation of an observation guide, collection of language data, analysis of data, formulation of propositions, and a conclusion. Therefore, Bernstein's (1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000) theory of symbolic control provided a meaningful

framework for understanding schools' production of knowledge as well as for understanding the social assumptions of their pedagogic practice. The theory's models of visible and invisible pedagogic practice offered conceptual lenses through which to make sense of practice. They also offered a basis for making cross-case comparison of the data and to determine the factors that constrain working class students' learning and those that enhance middle class students' learning in classrooms. The idea of social class assumptions of pedagogic practice made it possible to explain how and why social class influences academic achievement. A major contribution of this study is its role in integrating Bernstein's theories within a feasible theoretical model. As stated in Chapter I, although a growing number of studies have successfully tested Bernstein's key construct, code (Diaz, 2001; Hasan, 2001; Hudak, 1984; Moore & Maton, 2001; Muller, 2001; Singh, 2001; Tyler, 2001; Urevbu, 1980; Williams, 2001) they have applied those concepts in a piecemeal fashion. A review of the literature suggests that this is the first study to integrate the use of code theory within a larger social theory through which the construction of educational inequality was explained using empirical data.

Dialectics

Sadovnik (1991) recognizes that not only is the theory of symbolic control strong on explaining the effects of social class but that it is also particularly strong on explaining disparities between social groups, that is in constructing inequality. Sadovnik therefore recommends that Bernstein's work be focused on constructing a more systematic theory of educational transformation; one that acknowledges that pedagogic practices are capable of deep change. It was assumed that what was needed is a dialectical model that shows how the same processes of symbolic control that are reproductive of the social

order have the potential to create the possibility of change. This is conceivable if the message system that is produced by the system may be changed from the bottom, by students in association with their teachers. Until now, however, the pedagogical device that is the medium of classroom power relations has lacked a standard language of description therefore the instructional act has been under-theorized especially in progressive and critical pedagogies. Accountability policy, however, draws attention to the instructional act by locating the burden of its changes on teachers and students. As is argued next, the theory of symbolic control therefore holds promise for providing a standard language through which critical theorists and educators may tackle common challenges, inconsistencies, and aims across a wide spectrum of practice.

Theory of Social Class

As stated in Chapter I, Apple's (1992) critique of Bernstein's (1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000) theory of symbolic control recognizes the theory's strength in explaining the effects of social class in education but faulted the theory for several weaknesses. It was argued in this study that class is a culture of power that encompasses individuals, social groups, and social institutions and in which control is exercised over and through material, organizations, self, and practices. The analytical framework made it possible to conceptually show social class relations as embodied in actors. The respective teachers and their students were shown to enact linguistic practices that are related to their social class location. The theory of symbolic control (Bernstein, 1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 2000) may therefore enhance cultural capital theory's explanation of the middle class advantage by further centering a symbol system and activities of teaching and learning in the social construction of this advantage. This conceptual centering is made possible through the

Bernsteinian notion of visibility. Visibility enhances cultural capital's explanation of the middle class advantage in two ways. One, it shows that that parents and teachers are not dupes regarding the social functioning of schools but are rather agents. Two, as was argued by Weiler (1999), even as it widens the social processes that relate to schooling, it resorts to using one device through which all effects are attained, the code. Further, the formation of class is in evidence in the struggles over the classification of public educational knowledge through influence over the State. Social class relations in education are therefore mediated through symbolic systems and these symbolic systems undergo changes that have implications for who can participate in their creation.

Finally, this study shows that social class matters. Specifically, social resources are part of the conditions that influence academic achievement. Further, social class in education is a contextual notion. This means that in general, social class does influence academic behavior. However, the ways in which social class influence is exerted on behavior vary tremendously.

Education and Cultural Reproduction

This study provides a missing link in cultural reproduction theories that focus on family-school (Lareau, 2000) or community-school relations (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985; McNeil, 2000) in explaining the construction of educational inequality. In these theories, work, family, and schools are brought into interrelation. However, no integrative mechanism by which this interrelation is mediated is specified. Lareau (2000) locates modes of family-school relations that increase academic achievement in social class cultures at work, in families, and in schools in which teaching is coordinated by teachers' responsiveness to parents' requests and parents in turn bring themselves into

compliance with teachers' expectations for parenting because their class position affords them the possibility to. Open school organization and structure of pedagogy are implied as part of the explanation but not central to it: the explanation is focused on the larger structures of society.

By contrast, pedagogy-focused explanations of the construction of educational inequality under the new accountability stress the structure of pedagogy without utilizing a standard language of sociological description and stress the effects of an implied symbolic structure without explaining how those effects (teacher deskilling, curriculum narrowing) are realized.

The present study provides a means of integrating both classes of explanation through the notion of code. To pedagogy-focused explanations, the present study provides modes of pedagogic practice (visible and invisible), specifically the quality of boundaries. Boundaries may explain how the structure of teaching may deskill teachers, narrow curriculum, standardize pedagogy and generally disrupt various forms of connection, thereby mediating the constraining effects on teacher thinking that are ascribed to pedagogy by "management pedagogies" (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985). The use of boundary and modes of teaching practice have the advantage of mediating effects on consciousness without reference to pre-existing forms of consciousness by social class and instead showing that modes of pedagogy constitute ways of doing teaching and learning that construct forms of consciousness. An additional advantage to the use of modes of teaching practice is that it integrates the technical core of schooling with micro-foundations of practices that are constructed in the economy and reproduced within families. In this way, by virtue of the visible or invisible quality of modes of pedagogic

practice, schools as transmitters of cultural capital and as organizations may be brought into relationship with forms of social organization of work and family. In other words, Bernstein (1971, 1973, 1975, 1990, 200) provides a means by which Lareua (2000) and Aronowitz and Giroux (1985), McNeil (2000) and Meier (2002) may “talk” to each other. This is achieved in the present study especially in relating the structure of teaching in local schools in terms of visible and invisible practice with childrearing and other practices in family and location in the economy.

Production and Reproduction

What began as study of cultural reproduction ended up as a study of both cultural production and reproduction. The research question investigating the influence of social class on academic achievement and which organizes the study assumes reproduction but the study reveals a much more complicated reality. Specifically, it was shown that schools have a productive function, being involved in the production of new forms of culture. Teachers produce knowledge as do students as part of their evolution of a language of instruction. As shown in this study, this production is not given by policymakers but is dynamically produced in the context of application which is teaching. Further, forms of teacher and student knowledge may vary, particularly depending on the social class make-up of the school. Also, accountability itself is an ideological formation that is novel. The study concludes with a paradox. Schools reproduce existing formations by production of culture. Reproduction is therefore not a straightforward process. Rather, reproduction is related not only to the modes of cultural production but also the norms of cultural practice within the groups that engage in reproductive activities.

Implications For Practice

How should educators think about teaching and policymakers think of accountability policy in light of the findings of this study? The study has implications for teaching practice, policy and theory. The findings of this study of the interaction of accountability policy, social class, and knowledge production have implications for representations of teacher knowledge, accountability policy, and social class.

Teacher knowledge

The findings of this study add to a growing number of studies that argue that teacher knowledge is not context-free but is context-dependent, being developed in the context of application, in policy and social class. The view that teacher knowledge is local knowledge that in order to be appropriate is generated in social situations has implications for the modes by which it may be acquired. Specifically, teachers develop expertise in contact with students of specific characteristics. This may mean that as student characteristics vary so too does teacher expertise. The implications are that these highly specialized forms of expertise should be recognized and rewarded.

Associated with the argument for a reconceptualization of teacher knowledge is the implication that curriculum may be understood too narrowly when a definition focuses on content. Rather this study suggests that the nature of the relay or message system by which content is transmitted has important implications for what is known about teaching and learning. The effects of the form of the relay were shown through the use of the notion of assumptions of pedagogic practice. The notion of the mode of transmission may prove useful in thinking through teachers' work.

Specifically, in defining teacher control over their work, control may need to be measured not only over the selection and organization of knowledge but also in terms of its sequencing, assessment of its realization, and the mode of control that is established in relation to students. From that perspective, spaces for teacher autonomy are highlighted as in the case of Mrs. Mason who enacts a visible pedagogy to transmit contents that are assessed by high-stakes tests but who exercises greater autonomy in enacting an invisible practice over contents that are not supported by high-stakes tests.

Accountability

One implication of this study is that both proponents and critics of the new accountability must refine their language for discussing the policy's effects. They should reconsider whether it makes sense to talk about effects, beneficial or deleterious, of the new accountability as an aggregate. Rather, they should consider whether in speaking of the effects of the new accountability, it may enhance understanding to speak of the specific effects of the various message systems or tools of the policy. This study suggests that it would.

Teaching Practice

This study makes a substantive contribution to pedagogy in general by demonstrating that teaching implies certain social arrangements. Teaching is therefore a social activity that is done in social context. For illustrative purposes, therefore, the present section selects for scrutiny those approaches to teaching that are referred to as critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogies serve our illustrative purposes because whereas, philosophically, they have advanced the view that teaching is indeed a social activity, in reality, they have shied away from critical aspects of the practice of teaching as a social

activity. The study implies that so-called critical, liberatory, and emancipatory teachers have neglected the instructional act (Gore, 1993). Critical pedagogies have over-emphasized external social structures of the macro-sociological scale and the cost of this emphasis has been the neglect of the micro-level structures that teachers co-create with their students through language. In other words, critical teachers have tended to neglect the pedagogical in favor of the political: the instructional act has been neglected. Further, in neglecting the instructional act, critical teachers have lost sight of the specificity of the principal medium of their craft, namely language. By not attending to the linguistic structures through which they enact their pedagogical relations, critical teachers have suffered an even greater loss. They have lost the art of self-critique, disciplined appreciation of the dialectical nature of the social world, and a keen sense of irony. Although in the next section emphasis is placed on critical pedagogy in particular, the implications are relevant to all approaches to teaching that regard the transfer of knowledge as linear and unproblematic. In the era of the new accountability, with its elaboration of standards for everything, the appreciation that teaching is messy might have been lost, even to critical theorists and teachers.

Accountability posed an “unprecedented” challenge and threat to teachers (Giroux, p. 121) through “management pedagogies” whose theoretical assumption is that teachers’ behavior is to be controlled, made consistent, and predictable across schools and student groups. Consequently, school life centers on teachers who implement policy and who are removed from the social roles of reflection. ‘Teacher proof’ packages are a technology of management pedagogies, atomizing knowledge, standardizing it for easier management, and measuring it through pre-determined forms of assessment (Giroux,

1988, pp. 122-123). In reaction, the teacher as intellectual, embodies the challenge to teachers in what Carlson and Apple (1998) call “unsettling times,” by which is meant the era of the new accountability.

In rising to the challenge of the new accountability, Aronowitz and Giroux (1985), conceptualized a restructuring of teachers’ work by expanding to education the Italian intellectual, Antonio Gramsci’s idea that the distinctive feature of the intellectual is politics (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985). The notion that all humans are intellectuals and that some just function as such in society when extended to teaching integrates thinking and practice. Teachers, in this view, are thus able to think through all aspects of their work, including the purposes of education. The notion relates teachers to their work and to society, positioning schools as public spheres that aim for self and social empowerment. The ability, theorized by Aronowitz and Giroux, of teachers to integrate thinking and practice immediately draws attention to the boundaries by which teachers may be constrained from actually thinking through all aspects of their work. As was argued earlier, the present study makes available a standard language of sociological description for naming the technologies through which such constraints on teachers’ work may be enacted. Those constraints may be lifted, however, making intellectual work political work and placing the teacher-intellectual within class, culture, power, and politics. The teacher as transformative intellectual is the ethical high point of this framework.

Rigorous demands are made on the transformative intellectual, for example the critical teacher. In general, the transformative intellectual studies the dominant society’s material and ideological structures by which the issues of power and knowledge are

separated. Ultimately, in his/her practice, the language of critique unites with the language of possibility to show the conditions that call for new forms of culture, alternative social practices, new modes of communication, and a hopeful or practical vision for the future (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985). It is precisely in engendering alternative social practices and new modes of communication as regards classroom instruction that critical pedagogies have failed. The mission of such an educator, however, is not to be underestimated.

First, transformative intellectuals advance emancipatory interests inside and outside public spheres. Second, they explicate and relate critical pedagogy, explaining the foundations for a critical pedagogy by using the language of critique and the discourse of self-criticism while relating critical pedagogy to students and society. Finally and most importantly, they make the pedagogical more political and the political more pedagogical (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985).

To make the pedagogical more political is to place education into the political sphere by arguing that schooling represents a struggle for meaning and a struggle over power relations. To make the political pedagogical is to use pedagogical forms that treat students as critical agents, that problematize knowledge, that utilize dialogue, and that make knowledge meaningful, critical, and ultimately emancipatory. This means giving students an active voice in their learning and developing within classroom pedagogical practice a critical language for the problems of everyday life. Pedagogically, this starts with collective actors in their settings, for example females in gendered settings and the particularity of their diverse problems, hopes, and dreams. It is at this point that the language of critique unites with the language of possibility (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985).

As stated in Chapter I, it has long been recognized that schools regulate belief and behavior in the modern State (Bernstein, 1971; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1995; Foucault, 1995; Turner, 1973), that they connect power and knowledge through their, “corpus of knowledge, techniques, [and] ‘scientific discourses’” (Foucault, 1995, p. 185). Liston (as cited in Pinar et al., 1995/1996), however, has called for the more difficult work of explaining how power actually creates knowledge through curriculum. The tendency among critical theorists, however, has been to emphasize large structures that are external to the school neglecting the question of how power affects the structure of knowledge. Transformative teaching varies but as the following review will show, they share in common an emphasis on external power structures at the expense of the structure of educational knowledge.

Critical Pedagogies

Paulo Freire defines oppression as any situation in which one person exploits the other or hinders him/her in his/her pursuit as self-affirmation (p. 31). Freire explains that the oppressed can, “participate in developing the pedagogy of their liberation” (1986, p. 25) through educational projects that are carried out “with” the oppressed (p. 31) because the oppressed “know things” (p. 39). Those who commit themselves to the people must “re-examine themselves constantly” (p. 37). The struggle for liberation or education as “the practice of freedom” (p. 52) is not, “purely intellectual” (p. 41) but must involve “action” (p. 41), “critical and liberating dialogue” (p. 41), and “reflection” (p. 41) on “their concrete situation” (p. 41). Freire calls on the oppressed to “name” the world “p. 61) and cautions that dialogue needs “profound love for the world and for me” (p. 62), “trust” (p. 64), “hope” (p. 64), and that the starting point for the program content is the

“present, existential, concrete situation,” (p. 96). This method is reading the word preceded by reading of the world where the reading of the world that the learner brings to literacy programs is a social and class-determined reading which sends the reader back to the previous reading of the world, therefore, a rereading (Freire & Macedo, 2000, p. 235). In Freire, therefore, the nature of the linkage between the word and the world is unresolved as is the question of the nature of collaboration between teacher and student.

bell hooks (1994) writes of teaching as a sacred vocation that is aimed not merely at sharing information but at sharing in the intellectual and spiritual growth of students (1994, p. 13). To transgress is to break the boundaries which would constrain pupils to a “rote, assembly-line approach to learning” (1994, p. 13), against “compartmentalization” of body and mind (p. 16). hooks writes of confronting class in the classroom of how “the values of those from materially privileged classes are imposed upon everyone via biased pedagogical strategies” (p. 180), of “classroom dynamics” being conventional business-as-usual even in discussing perspectives of domination (p. 181). In hooks, too, the nature of the boundaries by which constraint and compartmentalization are enacted in classrooms is not addressed.

Ball (2000) advances Freire (1986) and hooks (1994) by proposing a mechanism by which power and knowledge are constructed. Ball explicates that it is not words but norms and processes by which authority is established and exercised (Ball, p. 1013) that are crucial. To Freire’s notion of education “with,” which Ball calls the norm of collaboration (Ball, 1013), Freire’s notion of dialogicality, which Ball calls (Ball, 1013), interactive discourse patterns (Ball, 1013), and Freire’s tenet that the oppressed “know things,” which Ball describes as opportunities for participants to view themselves as

knowledge sources and important members of a valued community (Ball, p. 1013), Ball adds the practice of negotiation, the idea of a continuum in critical pedagogical practice, students' choice in self concept, self efficacy, and decision-making. The idea of negotiating the practices of accountability thus take up liberatory potential as it makes possible not only the transformation of a potentially oppressive structure but also the enactment of positive subjectivities. Ball's idea is that there are as many critical pedagogies as there are critical pedagogy practitioners can also be liberating of the teaching self that engages the struggle over pedagogy. However, elements of instruction that integrate power and knowledge are still lacking here. Next, strategies of teachers who focus on culture are discussed.

Multicultural Teachings

In addition to the lifting of structural boundaries, Lipman (1996), proposes removing barriers between public and private domains of social life. To illustrate, culturally responsive teacher Paulette Washington showed caring and mentorship as hallmarks of all her relationships with students (Lipman, 1996, p. 45) and Samuel Thompson projected a sense of family in his space, keeping it up, sweeping, decorating, door rug (Lipman, 1996, p. 47), contributions to a critical pedagogy discussed so far. These teachers engage in culturally relevant teaching, using students' culture to help them achieve success (Lipman, 1996, p. 50), engaging them in intellectually challenging and personally and socially meaningful learning (Lipman, 1996, p. 50). They expressed cultural solidarity with African Americans and advocated for a curriculum that embodied African American culture (Lipman, 1996, p. 50). They connected classroom knowledge with students' experiences using family literacy tasks such as filling out job applications

(Lipman, 1996, p. 51). They showed a holistic concern for the human person adopting mentoring or parenting roles with them (Lipman, 1996, p. 51). However, the medium of students' engagement and connexion is not elucidated.

Hilliard (1984) explicates the possibility of knowledge as meaningful, even curative, in a proposal that school should repair the damaged identities of students of color, remedy falsehood about all people in the curriculum, and undo alienation from home, community, tradition. Undo labeling, undo categorizing, undo stigmatizing, and found public school on the political and cultural democracy in society is the only source of meaning of school, writes Hilliard, proposing practices that would certainly counter the effects of accountability's gathering and use of data to mark individuals. Similarly, Pine and Hilliard (1990) suggest that we should value diversity and use them as resources in teaching (Pine & Hilliard, 1990, p. 594). The first step is to understand the history and nature of racism and how it relates to prejudice and discrimination (Pine & Hilliard, 1990). Once more, the specificity of teaching as a relay of external cultural power is not explored.

Shujaa (1994/1995) suggestion that schooling is a process intended to perpetuate and maintain society's existing power relations and the institutional structures that support those arrangements could have been directed at accountability. He favors the demands of the African cultural orientation over those of the American nation-state and pushes for African Americans to take control of "our" education (Shujaa, 1994/1995, p. 32). However, the nature of such control remains unexplained. Next, teachers who practice in bilingual educational settings are discussed.

Bilingual Education

Weisman (2002) offers a critical understanding of the role of language in the construction of identity. Aware of how linguistic ideology can serve to contribute or to contest divisions of power that work to the detriment of subordinate groups therefore connect bicultural development, political consciousness, and linguistic attitudes, Weisman suggests that teachers should better understand their own bicultural identity and modify their own attitudes and create educational contexts that affirm the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of their students. How those contexts are constructed in actual schools is unexplored.

In a direct critique of accountability, Peter C. Murrell, Jr. (2001) argues that standards without understanding are a mistake, that the agenda to standardize teaching is “shortsighted and limited” if it is not placed in broader political, cultural, and historical contexts and if the needs of urban students are not acknowledged (p. 14). Like Hilliard, Murrell proposes the community teacher model to “reduce and then reverse racial vulnerability” (p. 91). Murrell focuses on an African-centered pedagogy based on a situated cognition perspective that is knowledge is acquired in a setting not just abstract knowledge. Murrell’s African-centered pedagogy has five distinct features, which are identity development, community integrity, engagement and participation, meaning-making, and inquiry and reappropriation (p. 91), none being features that are likely within accountability. Further, Murrell counters the epistemology and ethic of individual learning effort within accountability. Learning, according to the African American epistemological frame, writes Murrell, is not an individual activity but a social activity. Rather than meaning one’s freedom, helping others to escape slavery learning has

become a numerical grade-level score generated by a paper and pencil test (p. 92), laments Murrell. Instead he proposes that learning become total preparation of the spirit, identity, character, and intellect to participate fully in adult life (p. 92).

Bigelow suggests that teaching is partisan and invites students to critique the host society through their lives, probing the social factors that surround their lives. Bigelow emphasizes the “collective text,” the group portrayal of events, “fracturing” the teacher/student dichotomy, grounding his pedagogy in the life of schools. “Schools are the most prominent settings” (p. 296) in which students look at the intersection of race and class, language and culture, making school a site of struggle and social change. Bigelow presents a teacher-student dichotomy for fracturing but does not explain how such a dichotomy is constructed in the first place. The present conceptual framework sees educational labor, educational identity, self-concept, and self efficacy related to schools as the most concrete settings of student experience and should therefore be the setting of students’ struggles over meaning and power relations. This study suggests that the theory of symbolic control may provide a common language to critical educators, one that serves as both a language of critique and one of possibility, one in which possibility is expressed not only by reference to what goes on outside schools but also within schools. That is, the present study proposes a means for balancing inside and outside not only in critical pedagogies but in teaching in general.

Language of critique and of possibility.

In this study, it was possible to show the working of factors that widen and those that close the achievement gap. Factors that widen the achievement gap are related to social class. Factors that help to close the achievement gap are related to the tools of the

new accountability policy. Teachers shape the teaching message system as do students and the effects on the achievement gap are related both to pedagogical activity in classrooms and social class location.

Practice: Language and Structures

One of the strengths of the analytical framework is that its key concepts name activities that are carried out by individuals. While it is true that the picture of teaching that emerges is one that models instruction as a sort of conversation in which teachers, policymakers, and students participate, some of the elements of pedagogic practice are under the control of classroom teachers. The study links micro-linguistic structures to macro-level practices. It therefore implicates teachers in the construction of structures for which they should take responsibility. This especially applies to teachers who are committed to practices of so-called critical pedagogies. The study suggests that at minimum teachers should pay attention to the political dynamics they create by their decisions over such aspects of teaching as the hierarchical relations between teachers and students but also to time.

Teachers' classroom practice.

The study suggests that the transformative teacher might focus not on generalities but on the specifics of teaching, specifically on micro-practices, especially the micro-foundations of macro-practices that relate to the assumptions of pedagogy. There are many structures in society. However, pedagogical structures are the work setting of teacher and student. It might make sense for teachers to concentrate on pedagogical structures that are their own creation. This would focus struggle on what schooling could mean (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985). Accountability already makes the pedagogical

political by sharing grading criteria. This could become a site for further discussing the values behind high-stakes testing such as justice, merit, and power which otherwise can be abstract to students. Much thinking in transformative pedagogy ignores the fact that students' predominant mode of everyday life is in meaning-making as learners or producers of knowledge and not as workers who produce goods and services. A discussion of educational labor and rewards is just a developmentally and politically appropriate way of grounding students in otherwise abstract values.

In terms of the struggle over power relations, teachers may attempt to empower students both within formal academic work and within the conduct of non-academic or pastoral duties. Within academic work, teachers could encourage students to be active in their and each others' learning. For example, in order to help students grow in their ability to trust their own judgments, students could be involved in grading their own work as well as that of their peers as is done by Mrs. Mason. Teachers could also dissolve the false dichotomy between teachers and students (Bigelow, 1999) by turning over some teaching responsibilities to students. Mrs. Mason was shown to do just that. In so doing, Mrs. Mason is fully occupying a space that is not fully occupied by the policy. It was shown that some topics and themes in the reading curriculum, for example, Speaking, were not supported by high-stakes testing. This means that the policy had not defined and occupied that space in the curriculum as fully as it had others. Therefore, it was possible for Mrs. Mason to invest that space with her own professional presence.

To make the political pedagogical involves problematizing knowledge, making knowledge meaningful, critical, and emancipatory. Problematizing knowledge includes revealing knowledge to be a social construction, a reality that consequently is imbued

with the values and interests of its makers. To make knowledge meaningful is to encourage students to confront the conditions of their social existence with the meanings they create in class. Opportunities for doing so are enhanced when the content of educational knowledge is informed by community knowledge or community-level realities.

Effort should be concentrated on developing students' voice by discussing the nature and demands of what Basil Bernstein (1976) calls the integrated code. In a classic instance of making the pedagogical political and vice versa, Bernstein shows that the boundaries that separate teachers' control over knowledge and conduct of classes as well as the boundaries among disciplines and between educational knowledge and community knowledge are manifestations of power. In collection codes where disciplines are strongly bounded and students are not able to relate contents and in which students' knowledge is not allowed to enter the language of the conduct of the class, students are disempowered and alienated from knowledge. However, when subjects are integrated such that students can relate contents across boundaries and participate with teachers in the construction of lesson organization, pacing, and knowledge production, students feel that not only knowledge but also the world is malleable to their influence. In such situations, students are endowed with agency and empowered to shape the world to their advantage, which in light of this study, seems to be the high point of what it is to make knowledge critical and the beginning of an emancipatory journey.

The truly dialogical nature of Bernstein's integrated code is just one instance of a tightrope in critical pedagogies where one walks between emancipatory authority and controlling or authoritative authority. How does one lead others to their own liberation

without negating that liberation by the very practice of undemocratic modes of leadership? That is the question. Jennifer Gore (1993) has critiqued critical and feminist pedagogies on that paradox. Gore (1993) decries the apparent neglect of the instructional act within those radical pedagogical discourses. Reflecting Michel Foucault's saying that anything can be dangerous, Gore shows that even sitting in circles, and dialogue, both practices recommended by radical pedagogies can have dominating effects. The response is to be aware and self-critical in one's practice. On that point Gore meets Aronowitz and Giroux's (1985) call for the transformative intellectual to be self-critical. The utility of that call is that even with the best of intentions, teaching being a "messy" technology, recommendations for an emancipatory classroom practice can have unintended dominating effects. With genuine self-criticism and openness toward participants in the struggle over meaning who are my students, however, we can begin to carry out an effective struggle against domination of the sort that is masked by the ideological structure that is the new accountability. The study also has implications for policy, which are discussed next.

Policy

Implications from the study are that the new accountability policy should also attend to the policy tools and social resources that support pedagogy. Rethinking the policy tools and social resources that are involved in the new accountability may impact several aspects of schooling. First, by analyzing the practices by which the policy is implemented in classrooms and showing their substantive differences by social class, the analytical framework interrogates the meaning of the policy aim of closing the gap in achievement test scores. It suggests that even when there is a narrowing of the so-called

gap, a gulf remains between the quality of life of students from different social classes because of their differentiated involvement in pedagogic structures that define instruction. This is important because it is presumed that equalization of scores will translate into greater equity in students' life chances. However, the study suggests that in this case equal results would result from a particular brand of unequal treatment that may significantly impact students' ability to apply their educational achievements in the real world.

Second, the study suggests that teachers may need greater autonomy over instruction. Specifically, the influence of the new accountability policy on pacing of instruction may have to be reconsidered and alignment should be seen in different dimensions. It was shown that Mr. Randolph maintains a rapid pace in teaching, covering a number of topics. However, coverage remains at the surface level. It is possible that studying one topic more deeply, for example, writing or speaking may cover more topics more adequately. In that case less would truly mean more. To do so, however, would require a radical reconceptualization of the notion of curriculum alignment along the lines that were suggested in this study. Specifically, if alignment is a dimension of policy messages, teacher, and student knowledge, then each school or maybe even classroom should find an alignment that is appropriate. It is envisaged that instead of paying lip service to the topics that the policy intends to be taught, which is a possible perverse incentive of strong pacing, topics that are rich with resonance for students, rife with connections to other valued knowledge, may be selected for in depth study by teachers. This would impact the policy tools of the new accountability in the following way. Instead of topics or contents being prescribed with only two levels of

curriculum value on high-stakes tests, assessed or not assessed, a qualitative measure of the importance of topics may be arrived at by teachers in classrooms.

REFERENCES

- Aaron, K. F., & Clancy, C. M. (2003). Improving quality and reducing disparities: Toward a common pathway. The Journal of American Medical Association 289 (8) 1033-1034.
- Achievement Initiative for Maryland's Minority Students (AIMMS). (2001). Minority achievement in Maryland at the millennium: A special report. Baltimore, MD: Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) AIMMS Steering Committee.
- Advocates for Children and Youth. (2003). Bridge to excellence in public schools. Retrieved July 14, 2003 from www.acy.org
- Advocates For Children and Youth. (1999). Turning The Curve: An Analysis of School Improvement Plans For Reconstitution-Eligible Schools Submitted for the 1999-2000 School Year. Baltimore: Advocates for Children and Youth. Retrieved January 26, 200 from http://www.acy.org/turning_the_curve.htm
- Advocates For Children and Youth. (1998). Making Accountability Work: An Initial Assessment of Maryland's School Reconstitution Program. Baltimore: Advocates for Children And Youth. <http://www.acy.org/educorecontext.htm> [Retrieved 1/26/00.]
- Alexander, N. (1996). Race, poverty, and the student curriculum, 1975-1995: Implications for public policy. Developments in School Finance 1996, pp. 69-86. Retrieved February 20, 1999, from <http://nces.ed.gov>
- American Federation of Teachers. (2001). Making standards matter: A fifty-state progress report on efforts to raise academic standards. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Federation of Teachers. (1995). Making standards matter: A fifty-state progress report on efforts to raise academic standards. Washington, DC: Author.
- Amrein, A. L., & Berliner, D. C. (2003). The effects of high-stakes testing on student motivation and learning. Education Leadership, 60 (5), 32-46.
- Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. Curriculum Inquiry, 11(1), 3-42.
- Apple, M. W. (1986) "Series editor's introduction," in L. M. Mc. Neil, Contradictions of control. New York: Routledge.

- Apple, M. W. (2000a) "Series editor's introduction." In L. M. Mc. Neil, Contradictions of School Reform. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (1996). Cultural politics and education. New York and London: Teachers' College Press.
- Apple, M. W. (1992). Education, culture, and class power: Basil Bernstein and the neo-Marxist sociology of education. Educational Theory on the Web, Vol. 42, No. 2 Spring. Retrieved October 11, 2000, from <http://www.ed.uiuc.edu>
- Applebee, A. N. (1987). Curriculum as conversation: Transforming traditions of teaching and learning. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Archer, J. (June 9, 2004). Postcard from Independence, MO. Education Week. Retrieved June 06, 2004, from <http://www.edweek.org>
- Arnot, M. (2001). Bernstein's sociology of pedagogy: female dialogues and feminist elaborations. In K. Weiler. (Ed.). Feminist engagements: Reading, resisting and revisioning male theorists in education and cultural studies, pp. 60-83. New York: Routledge.
- Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. (1985). Education under siege: The conservative, liberal, and radical debate over schooling. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.
- Atkinson, P. (1985). Language, structure and reproduction: An introduction to the sociology of Basil Bernstein. London: Methuen.
- Baldrige, J. V. (1983). Organizational characteristics of colleges and universities. In J. V. Baldrige & T. Deal. (Eds.). The dynamics of organizational change in education. pp. 38-59. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Company.
- Ball, A. (2000). Empowering pedagogies that enhance the learning of multicultural students. Teachers College Record 102 (6), 1006-1034.
- Barton, P. E. (Ed.). (2003). Parsing the achievement gap: Baseline for charting progress. Princeton, NJ: Education Testing Service.
- Bedell, S. E, Graboys, T. B., Bedell, E., & Lown, B. (2004). Words that harm, words that heal. Archives of internal medicine 164, 1365-1367.
- Berg, B. L. (1998). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences, 3rd ed. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- Bernstein, B. (1971). Class, codes and control, Volume 1: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (Ed.). (1973). Class, codes and control, Volume 2: Applied studies towards a sociology of language. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1975). Class, codes and control, Volume 3: Towards a theory of educational transmissions. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1982). Codes, modalities, and cultural reproduction: A model. In M. W. Apple (Ed.). Cultural and economic reproduction: Essays on class, ideology, and the state (pp. 304-355). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). Class, codes and control, Volume 4: The structuring of pedagogic discourse (Rev. ed). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. & Solomon, J. (1999). Pedagogy, identity and the construction of a theory of symbolic control: Basil Bernstein questioned by Joseph Solomon. British Journal of the Sociology of Education, 20(2), 265-279.
- Bigelow, B. (1999). Inside the classroom: Social vision and critical pedagogy. In W. Ayers & P. Ford, (Eds.), City kids, city teachers, (pp.). New York: New Press.
- Bloom, H. (1994). The Western canon. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1988). Data analysis. In Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. (pp. 157-186). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). Language and symbolic power. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). An invitation to reflexive sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & J.-C. Passeron. (1995). Reproduction in education, society, and culture. London: Sage. (R. Nice, Trans.)
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). Outline of a theory of practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life. New York: Basic Books.
- Boyd, W. L. (1991). What makes ghetto schools succeed or fail? Teachers College record 92(3), 331-362.
- Bramblett, S. (2004). Teaching expertise as a culturally embedded phenomenon: A case study of one ESOL department. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of Maryland College Park.
- Bridges-Cline, F. (2001). Early reading skills of kindergarten children in the Montgomery County Public Schools. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools.
- Brink, C. R. (1973). Caddie Woodlawn. New York: MacMillan.
- Britzman, D. P. (1991). Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach. Albany: State University of New York.
- Burnett, F. H. (1987) Secret garden. D. R. Godine.
- Business Roundtable, The. Making standards work: Public attitudes about standards and testing. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Business Roundtable, The. No turning back: A progress report on the Business Roundtable Education Initiative. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Business Roundtable, The. (1999). Transforming education policy: Assessing 10 years of progress in the states. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Business Roundtable, The. (1995). The continuing commitment: Essential components of a successful education system. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Carlson, D., & Apple, M. W. (1998). Introduction: Critical educational theory in unsettling times. In (Eds.). Power/knowledge/pedagogy. Boulder, CO.: Westview.
- Castro, A., & Farmer, P. (2004). Understanding and addressing AIDS-related stigma: From anthropological theory to clinical practice. American journal of public health (95) 1, 53-59.
- Cazden, C. (1986). Classroom discourse. New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Center on Education Policy (CEP). (2004). From the capital to the classroom: Year 2 of the No Child Left Behind Act. Authors.

- Center for Policy Research in Education. (1992). Ten lessons about regulation and schooling. CPRE Policy Briefs.
- Cibulka, J. G. (2003). State and federal intervention to improve Baltimore and Washington, D.C.'s public schools. In Cibulka, J. G. & Boyd, W. L. (Eds.). The race against time: The crisis in urban schooling. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Cibulka, J. G. & Boyd, W. L. (Eds.). (2003). The race against time: The crisis in urban schooling. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Cochran-Smith, M. & Fries, M. K. (2001). Sticks, stones, and ideology: The discourse of reform in teacher education. Educational Researcher, 30(8), pp. 3-25.
- Cochran-Smith, M & Lytle, S. (1999). The teacher research movement: A decade later. Educational researcher, 28(7), pp. 15-25.
- Cohen, D. K. (1996). Standards-based school reform: Policy, practice, and performance. In Helen F. Ladd (Ed.). Holding schools accountable: Performance-based reform in education (pp. 99-127). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- College of William and Mary. Literary reflections. Williamsburg, VA: Author.
- Collins, R. (1979). The credential society: An historical sociology of education and stratification. New York: Academic Press.
- Connell, R. W., Dowsett, G. W., Kessler, S., & Ashenden, D. J. (2000). Class and gender dynamics in a ruling-class school. Schooling the symbolic animal: Social and cultural dimensions of education. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Cossentino, J. (2004a). Talking about a revolution: The languages of educational reform. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Cossentino, J. (2004b). Becoming a coach: reform, identity, and the pedagogy of negation. Teachers and teaching: Theory and practice 10(5), pp. 463-487.
- Cossentino, J. (2003). Curriculum under construction: Confronting the challenge of engagement in an era of reform. Journal of curriculum studies 35(3), pp. 281-302.
- Croninger, R. G. & Lee, V. E. (2001). Social capital and dropping out of high school: Benefits of At-risk students of teachers' support and guidance. Teachers College Record, vol. 103, no. 4, p. 548-581.
- Curtis, C. P. (1999). Bud, not Buddy. New York: Delacorte Press.

- Curtis, C. P. (1995). The Watsons Go To Birmingham - 1963. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Danzig, B. (1980). Basil Bernstein: An investigation of his theories and the contradictory ways they are interpreted. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, College park: University of Maryland.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- De Cock, A., Slegers, P., & Voeten, M. J. M. (2004). New learning and the classification of learning environments in secondary education. Review of educational research, 74(2), 141-170.
- DeWalt, D. A., Berkman, N. D., Sheridan, S., Lohr, K. N., & Pignone, M. P. (2004). Literacy and health outcomes: A systematic review of the literature. Journal of general internal medicine 19(12), 1228-1239.
- Diaz, M. (2001). Subject, power and pedagogic discourse. In A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies, & H. Daniels. (Eds.), Towards a sociology of pedagogy: The contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research. New York: Peter Lang.
- Dinkmeyer, D. & McKay, G. (1973). Raising a responsible child: How to prepare your child for today's complex world.
- Education Week. (2003). Quality Counts. [On-line]. Retrieved May 15, 2003 from, <http://www.edweek.org>
- Elmore, R. F., Abelman, C. H., & Fuhrman, S. H. (1996). The new accountability in state reform: From process to performance. In H. F. Ladd, (Ed.), Holding schools accountable: Performance-based reform in education. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Faia, M. A. (1986). Dynamic functionalism: Strategy and tactics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Finn, C. (Ed.). (2000). The state of state standards 2000. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Florio-Ruane, S. (2002). More light: An argument for complexity in studies of teaching and teacher education. Journal of Teacher education, 53(3), pp. 205-215.
- Foucault, M. (1995). Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison (2nd ed.). New York: Vintage. (A. Sheridan, Trans.).
- Fox, P. (1984). One-Eyed Cat. Bradbury Press.

- Freeman, D. (1996) To take them at their word: language data in the study of teachers' knowledge. Harvard Educational Review, 66, pp. 732-61.
- Freire, A. M. & Macedo, D. (Eds.). (2000). The Paulo Freire Reader. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1971). Pedagogy of the oppressed. London: Penguin.
- Fritz, J. (1967). Early Thunder. New York: Puffin Books.
- Fuhrman, S. F. (1999). The new accountability. CPRE Policy Briefs. CPRE.
- Gee, J. P. (1996). Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses. Philadelphia, PA: RoutledgeFarmer.
- Gee, J. (1991). The social mind: Language, ideology and social practice. New York: Bergen and Harvey.
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Scharzman, S., Scott, P. & Martin T. (1994). The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary sciences. London: Thousand Oaks.
- Giddens, A. (1984). The constitution of society. London: Polity.
- Giroux, H. A. & McLaren, P. (Eds.). (1989). Critical pedagogy, the state, and cultural struggle. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Gore, J. (1993). The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth. New York/London: Routledge.
- Governor's Press Office (1998). Maryland recognized for exemplary education progress report. Retrieved May 15, 2003, from <http://www.msde.state.md.us>
- Haertel, E. H. (1999). Performance assessment and education eform. Phi delta kappan 80(9), pp. 662-667.
- Hambleton, R. K., Impara, J., Mehrens, W. & Plake, B. S. (2000). Psychometric review Of the Maryland school Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP). Baltimore, MD: Abell Foundation.
- Hanushek, E. A. (1995). Interpreting recent research on schooling in developing countries. The World Bank Research Observer vol. 10, no 2, pp. 227-246.
- Hargreaves, A., & Evans, R. (Eds.). (1997). Beyond educational reform: Bringing teachers back in. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- Harker, R., & May, S. A. (1993). Code and habitus: comparing accounts of Bernstein and Bourdieu. British Journal of the sociology of education, 14(2), pp. 160-178.
- Harris, D. E., & Carr, J. F. (2001). Succeeding with standards: Linking curriculum, assessment, and action planning. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hasan, R. (2001). The ontogenesis of decontextualized language: Some achievements of classification and framing. In A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies, & H. Daniels (Eds.), Towards a sociology of pedagogy: The contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research. New York: Peter Lang.
- Hawkins, M. R. (2004). Researching English Language and literacy development in schools. Educational researcher, 33 (3), 14-25.
- Hawley, W., Schafer, W., Hultgren, F., Abrams, A., Lewis, E. & Ferrara, S. (1997). An outlier study of school effectiveness: Implications for public policy and school improvement. College Park: University of Maryland.
- Haycock, K. (2001). Closing the achievement gap. Educational Leadership 58(6), pp. 565-569.
- Heaton, R. M. (2000). Teaching mathematics to the new standards: relearning the dance. Reston, VA/London/New York: National Council of teachers of Mathematics/ Teachers' College Press.
- Henderson, J. G., & Hawthorne, R. D. (1995). Transformative curriculum leadership. Englewood Cliffs, CA: Merrill-Prentice Hall.
- Henry, A. (1998). Taking back control: African-Canadian women teachers' lives and practice. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Hess, G. A. (1999). Community participation or control?: from New York to Chicago. Theory into practice. 38(4), 217-224.
- Hilliard, A. (1984). Democratizing the common school in multicultural society. Education and urban society, 16(3), 262-273.
- Hirsch, E.D. Jr. (2000). You can always look it up—Or can you? EducationNews.org (Retrieved 03/30/2000).
- Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1998). The core knowledge series. New York: Doubleday.
- Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1998). The core sequence. Charlottesville, VA: Core Knowledge Foundation.

- Hirsch, E. D. Jr. (1987). Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hole, J. E. (2002). Buying homes, buying schools: School choice and social construction of quality. Harvard Educational review 72(2), 177-205.
- hooks, b. (1994). Teaching to transgress. New York: Routledge.
- Holton, G. An insider's view of 'A Nation at risk' and why it still matters. (2003, April 25). The chronicle of higher education, Section B, pp. B13-B15.
- Horvat, E. M, Weininger, E. B., & Lareau, A. (2003). From social ties to social capital: Class differences in the relations between schools and parent networks. American Educational research Journal 40(2), pp. 319-351.
- Hudak, G. (1985). Communicating, learning, and discourse production in the classroom: A case study of a media curriculum. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Izquierdo, H. M., & Minguéz, A. M. (2003). Sociological theory of education in the Dialectical perspective. In C. A. Torres, & A. Antikainen, (Eds.). The international handbook on the sociology of education: An international assessment of new research and theory (pp. 21-41). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Jary, D., & Jary, J. (1991). The HarperCollins dictionary of sociology. New York: HarperCollins.
- Jencks, C. & Phillips, M. (1998). The black-white test-score gap: An introduction. In authors. (Eds.). The black-white test score gap (pp. 1-54). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Jenq, G. Y., Zhenchaor, G., Drickamer, M., Marottoli, R. A., & Reid, C. (2004). Timing in the communication of pain among nursing home residents, nursing staff, and clinicians. Archives of internal medicine 164, 1508-1511.
- Jones, D. R., & Malen, B. (2001). Sources of victory, seeds of defeat: Linking Enactment politics and implementation developments. In W. Hoy, & C. G. Miskel, (Eds.) Theory and research in educational administration. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Jones, C. (1988). Parents are teachers, too: Enriching your child's first six years. Charlotte, VT: Williamson Publishing Company.

- Joseph, L. B. (2001). Introduction. In Author. Education policy for the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities in standards-based reform. pp. 1-21. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Kahlenburg, R. D. (2001). All together now: Creating middle-class schools through public school choice. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Kantor, H., & Brenzel, B. (1982). Urban education and the “truly disadvantaged”: the historical roots of the contemporary crisis. Teachers’ College record, 94(2), 278-314.
- Kaufman, J. (2004, March 24). Education as creative conversation. Education Week, Available from www.edweek.org
- Keddie, N. (1973). Introduction. In N. Keddie. (Ed.). The myth of cultural deprivation. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Kelderman, E. (20002, August 28). SAT scores up, but some minorities lag. Gazette.
- Kelley, J., McAllister, I., & Mughan, A. (1985). The decline of class revisited: Class and party in England, 1964-1979. The American political science review 9(3), 719-737.
- Kessler, R. (2000). The soul of education: Helping students find connection, compassion, and character at school. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Kohn, A. (1998). Only for my kid: How privileged parents undermine school reform. Phi Delta Kapan 6(11), 569-577.
- Labaree, D. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. American Educational Research Journal, 34, 39-81.
- Lally, K. (1996, February 18). Clash over fate of minds; City schools, state powers, on collision course. The Baltimore Sun, p. 1F.
- Lambert, L. (1998). Building leadership capacity in schools. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Lampert, M. (1985). How do teachers manage to teach? Harvard Educational Review, 55(2), 178-194.
- Lampert, M. (2001). Teaching problems and the problems of teaching. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lareau, A. (2000). Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention in elementary school. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

- Lawson, R. (1939). Mr. Reeves and I. New York: Little, Brown.
- Lessinger, L. (1970). Every kid a winner: Accountability in education. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Lewis, A. (1995). An overview of the standards movement. Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 76, no. 10, pp. 744-750.
- Lewin, T. (2003, April 26). Writing in schools is found both dismal and neglected. The New York Times. Available from www.nytimes.com
- Lipman, P. (1996). The missing voice of culturally relevant teachers in school restructuring. The Urban Review 28(1), pp. 41-62.
- Liston, D. (1986). On fact and values: An analysis of radical curriculum studies. Educational Theory, 36(2), p. 137-152.
- Loveless, T. (2004). Test-based accountability: The promise and the pitfalls. Paper presented to the 2004 Brookings Papers on Education Policy Conference, The Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.
- Lynch, K. S. & O'Neil, L. (1994). The colonization of the social in education. British Journal of the Sociology of Education, 15(3), p. 307-324.
- Lyons, L. (1973). Structuralism and linguistics. In Robey, D. (Ed.). Structuralism: An introduction. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1979). The postmodern condition: A Report on knowledge. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mabry, L. (1999). Writing to the rubric: Lingering effects of traditional standardized testing on direct writing assessment. Phi Delta Kappan 80(9), pp. 673-679.
- MacLennan, D. Sociocultural approaches to cognition: Implications for the sociology of education. In Torres, C. A & Antikainen, A. (Eds.). (2003). The international handbook on the sociology of education: An international assessment of new research and theory (pp. 101-124). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. (1995). Designing qualitative research, 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maryland State Department of Education. (1990). Maryland Learning Outcomes. Available from <http://www.msde.state.md.us>

- Maryland State Department of Education. (1998). Maryland school reform efforts win new federal funding. Author. Retrieved May 15, 2003 from <http://www.msde.state.md.us>
- Maryland State Department of Education. (1999). Maryland named one of six pilot states for coveted Baldrige in Education Initiative. Author. Retrieved May 15, 2003, from <http://www.msde.state.md.us>
- Maryland State Department of Education. (2000a). State superintendent says Maryland team deserves credit for national Award. Author. Retrieved May 15, 2003, from <http://www.msde.state.md.us>
- Maryland State Department of Education. (2000b) Maryland Content Standards. Available from <http://www.msde.state.md.us>
- Maryland State Department of Education. (2000c). State schools superintendent Nancy Grasmick to receive national special education Award. Author. Retrieved May 15, 2003, from <http://www.msde.state.md.us>
- Maryland State Department of Education. (2003a). What is the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program? MSDE Frequently Asked Questions. Author. Retrieved May 15, 2003, from <http://www.msde.state.md.us/faqs.html>
- Maryland State Department of Education. (2003b). Voluntary State Curriculum. Available from <http://www.msde.state.md.us>
- Maryland State Department of Education. (2004a). 2004 Maryland Report Card. Available from <http://mdreportcard.org>
- Maryland State Department of Education. (2004b). Voluntary State Curriculum. Available from <http://www.mdk12.org>
- Marzano, R. J. & Kendall, J. S. (1996). A comprehensive guide to designing standards-based districts, schools, and classrooms. Alexandria, VA & Aurora, CO: ASCD & McREL.
- Matthews, M. H., Airey, A. and Tacon, L. (1988). Catchments, schools, and characteristics of teachers. In Bondi, L and Matthews, M. H. (Eds). Education and society: Studies in the politics, sociology, and geography of education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1996). Qualitative research design: An interactive approach. London: Sage.
- McLaren, P. (1994). Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education, 2nd Ed. New York: Longman.

- McNeil, L. M. (2000). Contradictions of school reform: Educational costs of standardized testing. New York: Routledge.
- McNeil, L. M. (2000). Creating new inequalities. Phi Delta Kappan 81(10), 728-735.
- Mehan, H. (1992). Understanding inequality in schools: The contribution of interpretive studies. Sociology of education 65(1), 1-20.
- Meier, D. (2002). Standardization versus standards. Phi Delta Kappan 84(3), 190-198.
- Mertens, D. M. (1998). Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches. London/New Delhi: Sage.
- Michaels, S. (1985). Hearing the connections in children's oral and written discourse. Journal of education 167(1), pp. 37-56.
- Mintrop, H. (1999). Changing core beliefs and practices through systemic reform: The case of Germany after the fall of socialism. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 21 (3), 23-43.
- Mintrop, H. (1996). Teachers and changing authority patterns in eastern German schools. Comparative Education Review, 40 (4), p. 358-376.
- Morais, A. M., & Rocha, C. (1999). Development of social competences in the primary school—study of specific pedagogic practices. British educational research journal 26 (1), 91-119.
- Moore, R. & Maton, K. (2001). Founding the sociology of knowledge: Basil Bernstein, intellectual fields, and the epistemic device. In A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies, & H. Daniels (Eds.), Towards a sociology of pedagogy: The contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research. New York: Peter Lang.
- Muller, J. (2001). Imitations of boundlessness. In A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies, & H. Daniels (Eds.), Towards a sociology of pedagogy: The contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research. New York: Peter Lang.
- Muller, J. (1998). The well-tempered learner: Self-regulation, pedagogical models and teacher education policy. Comparative Education 34(2), 177-193.
- Murphy, P. K., & Alexander, P. A. (2002). The learner-centered principles: Their values for teachers and teaching. In W. D. Hawley, & D. L. Rolie, D. L. (Eds.), The keys to effective schools: Educational reform as continuous improvement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Murrell, P. C. (2001). The Community teacher: A teacher framework for effective urban teaching. New York: Teachers' College Press.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Navarro, M. S. & Natalico, D. S. (1999). Closing the achievement gap in El Paso: A collaboration for K-16 renewal. Phi Delta Kappan 80(8), pp. 597-601.
- Nidiffer, J., & Bouman, J. P. (2004). The university of the poor: The University of Michigan's transition from admitting impoverished students to studying poverty, 1870-1910. American Educational Research Journal, 1(41), pp. 35-67.
- Nieto, S. (1996). Affirming diversity: The socio-political context of multicultural education, 2nd edition. New York: Longman Publishers.
- Ogbu, J. (1992). Understanding cultural diversity and learning. Educational Researcher, 21(8), pp. 5-14.
- Orfield, G., & Eaton, S. (1996). Dismantling desegregation: the quiet reversal of Brown v. Board of Education. New York: New Press.
- Orr, M. (1999). Black social capital: The politics of school reform in Baltimore, 1986—1998. Kansas City: University of Kansas Press.
- Pallas, A., Natriello, G., & McDill, E. (1995). Changing students/Changing needs. In E. Flaxman, & A. Passow, A. (Eds.), Changing populations, changing schools. Chicago: NSSE.
- Peach, J. W. (1977). Accountability in education: A North American viewpoint. In P. R. Chippendale & P. V. Wilkes (Eds.). Accountability in education (pp. 25-42). Queensland: University of Queensland Press.
- Pedro, E. R. (1981). Social stratification and classroom discourse. Lund: Liber, Laromedal.
- Perlstein, L. (2004, January 18). Talking the edutalk. The Washington post. Available from www.washingtonpost.com
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995/1996). Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Pine, A., & Hilliard, A. G. (1990). Rx for racism: Imperatives for America's schools. Phi Delta Kappan 5(11), 593-600.

- Porter, A. C., & Smithson, J. L. (2001). Defining, developing, and using curriculum indicators. Center for Policy Research in Education.
- Raywid, M. A. (2001). Accountability: What's worth measuring? Phi Delta Kappan 83(6), pp. 433-439.
- Ravitch, D. (Ed.). (2001). Introduction. In Brookings papers in education policy: 2001. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Ravitch, D. (Ed.). (1999). Introduction. In Brookings papers in education policy: 1999. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Ravitch, D. (1997). Student performance today. Policy Brief #23. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution. Retrieved November 14, 1999, from www.brookings.org
- Reeves, T. A. (2000, November 30). Md. Exam scores hit new high. Available from Washigntonpost.com
- Reis, S. M., Westberg, K. L., Kulikowich, J. M, & Purcell, J. H. (2004). Curriculum compacting and achievement test scores: What does the research say? Gifted Child Quarterly, 42(4), pp. 23-35.
- Rist, R. (1970/2000). Student social class and teacher expectations: the self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. Harvard Educational Review. 40(3), pp. 266-301.
- Risley, T. R, & Hart, B. (1995). Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children. Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Ritzer, G. (1988). Sociological theory (2nd. ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Robelen, E. W. (2004, February 4). More school districts feeling the effects of 'No Child' law. Education week. Available from www.edweek.org
- Robelen, E. W. (2004, January 9). ESEA to boost federal role in education. Education week. Available from www.edweek.org
- Robinet, H. (1996). Washington City Is Burning. New York: Atheneum Books For Young Readers.
- Rosenbaum, J. E. (2001). Beyond college for all: Career paths for the forgotten half. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Rothstein, R. (2004). Must schools fail? The New York review of books 51(19) Available from <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/17598>

- Rowling, J. K. (1998). Harry Potter and the chamber of secrets. New York: Scholastic.
- Rowling, J. K. (1999). Harry Potter and the prisoner of Azkaban. New York: Scholastic.
- Rowling, J. K. (2000). Harry Potter and the goblet of fire. New York: Scholastic.
- Rusk, D. (1998). To improve poor children's test scores, move poor families. The Abell Report 11(2), pp. 1-3.
- Sacks, P. (July, 2003). Class rules: The fiction of egalitarian higher education. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. B&-10.
- Sadovnik, A. R. (2001). Basil Bernstein: (1924-2000). Prospects: The Quarterly Review of Comparative Education, 32 (4), pp. 687-703.
- Sadovnik, A. R. (1991). Basil Bernstein's theory of pedagogic practice: A structuralist approach. Sociology of Education 64 (1), pp. 48-63.
- Sadovnik, A. R. (Ed.). Knowledge and pedagogy: The sociology of Basil Bernstein. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Samoff, J. (1990). "Modernizing" a socialist vision: Education in Tanzania. In Carnoy, M & Samoff, J. (Eds.). Education and social transition in the Third World. (209-273). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sawyer, R. K. (2004). Creative teaching: Collaborative discussion as disciplined improvisation. Educational researcher, 33(2), pp. 12-20.
- Scheuer, J. (2003). Habitus as the principle for social practice: A proposal for critical discourse analysis. Language in society, 32, pp. 143-175.
- Schmoker, M. (1999). Results: The key to continuous improvement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Schon, D. A. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schulte, B. & Keating, D. (2001, September 2.) Pupils' poverty drives achievement gap. Washington Post.
- Schulte, B. & Keating, D. (2001, September 3.) Closing student gap opens door to conflict. Washington Post, A01.

- Schuster, E. H. (2004). National and state writing tests. Phi Delta Kappan 85(5), pp. 375-380.
- Sebring, P. B., & Bryk, A. A. (2000). School leadership and the bottom line in Chicago. Phi Delta Kappan., pp. 440-443
- Seghal, A. R. (2003). Impact of quality improvement efforts on race and sex disparities. The Journal of the American Medical Association 289(8), pp. 996-1000.
- Selden, S. (1999). Inheriting shame: The story of eugenics and racism in America. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Selden, S. (1988). Resistance in school and society: Public and pedagogical debates about eugenics, 1900-1947. Teachers College Record 90(1), pp. 61-84.
- Sennett, R., & Cobb, J. (1972). The hidden injuries of class. New York: WWW Norton and Company.
- Sewell, W. H. (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformation. American Journal of Sociology 98(1), pp. 1-29.
- Shujaa, M. J. (Ed.). (1994/1995). Too much schooling, too little education: A paradox of black life in white societies. Trenton: Africa World Press.
- Shulman, L.S. (1987) Knowledge and teaching: foundations of the new reform, Harvard Educational Review, 57, pp. 10-22.
- Singh, P. (2001). Pedagogic discourse and student resistance in Australian secondary schools. In A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies, & H. Daniels (Eds.), Towards a sociology of pedagogy: The contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research. New York: Peter Lang.
- Singh, P. (1999). Pedagogic work, social class and cultural difference. Retrieved October 23, 2000, from <http://www.sin.edu.au/aare/99pap/sin99206.htm>
- Skilton-Sylvester, P. (2003). Less like a robot: A comparison of change in an inner-city school and a Fortune 500 company. American Educational Research Journal, 40 (1), 3-41.
- Smith, M. E. & O'ay, J. (1991). Systemic school reform. In S. H. Fuhrmann, S. H & B. Malen, (Eds.), The politics of curriculum and testing, (233-267). New York: Falmer Press.
- Solarzano. D. G. (1975). The Chicano educational experience: empirical and theoretical perspectives. In S. K. Rothstein (Ed.), Class, culture and race in American schools: A Handbook. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- Spring, J. (2001). The American schoolhouse, 1642-2000, 5th Edition. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). The art of case study research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stigler, J. W., & Hiebert, J. (2004). Improving mathematics teaching. Educational leadership 61(5), pp. 12-17.
- Stone, D. (1997). Policy paradox: The art of political decision-making. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Thomas, W. B. (1985). Schooling as a political instrument of social control: School response to black migrant youth in Buffalo, New York, 1917-1970. Teachers College Record 86(4), pp. 579-592.
- Thomas-Lester, A. (2001, April 19). Author says parental involvement is vital to kids' academic success. The Washington Post, pp. PG16 Available from www.washingtonpost.com
- Thurow, L. (1996). The future of capitalism. New York: Penguin.
- TIMSS Video Mathematics Research Group. (2003). Understanding and improving mathematics teaching. Phi Delta Kappan 84(10), pp. 769-775.
- Torres, C. A., & Antikainen, A. (Eds.). (2003). The international handbook on the sociology of education: An international assessment of new research and theory. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Turner, J. H. (1997). The institutional order: Economy, kinship, religion, polity, law, and education in evolutionary and comparative perspective. New York: Longman.
- Traub, J. (2000, January 16). What no school can do. The New York Times Magazine, pp. 52-58.
- Tye, B. B., & O'Brien, L. (2002). Why are experienced teachers leaving the profession? Phi Delta Kappan 84(1), pp. 24-30.
- Tyler, R. W. (1969). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tyler, W. (1984). Organizational structure, factors and code: A methodological inquiry into Bernstein's theory of educational transmission. Dissertation, University of Kent.

- Tyler, W. (2001). Crosswired: Hypertext, critical theory, and pedagogic discourse. In A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies, & H. Daniels (Eds.), Towards a sociology of pedagogy: The contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research. New York: Peter Lang.
- Uchitelle, L. (August, 2003). Factories move abroad, as does U.S. power. New York Times.com Retrieved August 17, 2003, from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Urevbu, A. O. (1980). Curriculum Innovation in Nigeria: A Case Study Of The Actual Experience in Integrated Science. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- U. S. Census. (2001). The statistical abstract of the United States: 2002 (122nd Edition). Washington, DC: Authors.
- U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. (2004). Closing the achievement gap: The impact of standards-based education reform on student performance. Washington, DC: Authors.
- U. S. Congress. No Child Left Behind.
- Verkuyten, M. (2002). Making teachers accountable for students' disruptive classroom behavior. British journal of the sociology of education 23(1), 107-122.
- Walker, W. G. (1977). What on earth is accountability? In P. R. Chippendale & P. V. Wilkes. (Eds.), Accountability in education. Queensland: University of Queensland Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (1983). Historical capitalism. London: Verso.
- Walton, M. (1986). The Deming management method. New York: Perigree.
- Ward, & Anthony. (1992).
- Widmalm, S. (2001). The old production of knowledge: The academic system of science in Sweden, 1880-1950. In T. Frangsmyr, (Ed.), The structure of knowledge: Classifications of science and learning since the Renaissance. Berkeley: University of California.
- Weiler, K. (1999). Feminist engagements: Reading, resisting and revisioning male theorists in education and cultural studies. New York: Routledge.
- Weisman, J. (2002, Sept. 27). US incomes fell, poverty rose in 2002. The Washington Post, pp. A01. Available from www.washingtonpost.com

- Whitty, G., & Power, S. (2003). Making sense of education reform: Global and national influences. In C. A. Torres, & A. Antikainen, (Eds.), The international handbook on the sociology of education: An international assessment of new research and theory. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Whitty, G. (1985). Sociology and school knowledge. London: Methuen.
- Whitty, G., Power, S. & Halpin, D. (1998). Devolution and choice in education: the school, the state, and the market. Camberwell, Australia: ACER Press.
- Willis, P. (1977). Learning to labor: How working-class kids get working-class jobs. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Williams, G. (2001). Literacy pedagogy prior to schooling: Relations between social positioning and semantic variation. In A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies, & H. Daniels (Eds.), Towards a sociology of pedagogy: The contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research. New York: Peter Lang.
- Wood, L. A. & Kroger, R. O. (2000). Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Wrigley, J. (2000). Foreword. In A. Lareau. Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention in elementary school. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., pp. vii-xvi.
- Young, M. F. D. (Ed.). (1971). Knowledge and control: New directions for the sociology of education. London: Collier-MacMillan