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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

...There can be neither a first nor a last meaning; [anything that can be understood] always exists among other meanings as a link in the chain of meaning, which in it totality is the only thing that can be real. In historical life this chain continues infinitely, and therefore each individual link in it is renewed again and again, as though it were being reborn (M.M. Bakhtin, "From Notes Made in 1970-71"; 1986; p. 146).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The field of education is often seen as dichotomized into two areas, curriculum (what gets taught - theory) and instruction (how it gets taught - practice). As a result, much of the work in these two areas has gone on independently of each other. Few people in education (researchers, scholars, teachers) have negotiated the periphery of their disciplines to review and examine the relationships and intersections between them. Consequently, in education, there is a manifested gap between theory and practice.

As a result of dichotomized domains, research, theory, and practice are fragmented to the point where the field of curriculum is often kept out of the literature in
instruction, and vice versa. In the Handbook of Research on Teaching (1986), for example, less than one percent of the 2,334 cites refer to curriculum. We go so far as to even prepare college graduate students to be one type of scholar and not the other (Adler, 1982; Bloom, 1987; Boyer, 1983; Nation at Risk, 1983). This solitary preoccupation has manifested some unneeded and manufactured problems that have generated serious consequences for students, educators, and education.

One such manifestation is that curriculum has come to be seen as "what gets taught" (e.g., Adler, 1982; Beauchamp, 1975; McCutcheon, 1988), while instruction becomes "how to teach it" (e.g., Berliner, 1990; Good & Grouws, 1979; Rosenshine, 1983). In other words, curriculum has traditionally been seen as the document that prescribes the course of study that is to be taught in the classroom (Beauchamp, 1975), while instruction has provided the methods, techniques, and activities to be used in the teaching of that course of study. Thus, curriculum and instruction, through this dichotomization, lead to misunderstandings and neglect how lessons change, modify, alter, refine, and get interpreted and negotiated in the classroom setting due to teacher-student-material communicative interactions.

This limitation has generated a questioning of the traditional way of viewing curriculum and instruction.
Also, a linear transmission model is suggested in this dichotomization that shows delineation of tasks specific to each area (curriculum and instruction). This linear model assumes that "teachers teach" and "students learn" and receive the planned curriculum (Eisner, 1985).

In other words, the school district, state, and/or school mandate the course of study (skills, objectives) through development and approval of a document. The classroom teacher is then to teach this provided course of study to the students using appropriate methods, techniques, activities (instruction). The students, through this instruction, are expected to obtain that knowledge through the class instruction processes.

Interactions between students and teacher are typically not seen as having any effect on the outcomes of classroom learning. The outcome measure of this process then is the student achievement score obtained on the course of study objectives, or what was assumed to have been taught and learned (Brophy & Good, 1986; Block & Burns, 1976; Bloom, 1974, 1968; Gage, 1963; Fisher, & Berliner, et al., 1980).

Thus, as students have been perceived as getting lower test scores, curriculum reforms (i.e., objectives, accountability) have been initiated that attempt to insure fail-safe instructional methods (e.g., Becker, 1977; Distar). These methods of making sure that the planned curriculum gets taught have attempted to build in
accountability through regulating teaching methods, techniques, and activities (Beauchamp, 1975; Bobbitt, 1918; Harrap, 1928; Saylor, Alexander, & Lewis, 1981; Snedden, 1921; Taylor, 1970) while the interactional classroom processes remain largely ignored.

The problem with this logic has been captured by Eisner (1985) who states in regards to low test scores: "because the examinations that a school district employs purportedly reflect the intended [planned], rather than the operational [enacted] curriculum, the students do poorly" (p. 47). Another problem with accountability measurements is pointed out by Brown (1987), who states: "When it comes to schools, we get pretty much what we ask for; by holding schools accountable for minimal levels of achievement, we encourage them to deliver just that (p. 50)."

Eisner's statement, however, implies that to raise test scores one of two options can be taken: 1) reduce the discrepancy between the intended and the operationalized curriculum, or 2) institute a preferable evaluation system that reflects what is actually taught. The former calls for repair to that which is already in place, keeping the same linear approach - the typical effort (e.g., Nation at Risk, 1983; The Nation's Report Card, 1986-1990). Since the transmission model is still in place (i.e., the students are still perceived as receiving knowledge), the reforms fail because the linear approach remains the same, albeit under a
different name. The latter calls for a reconceptualization or reexamination of the classroom processes as they occur inside the classroom and building a new approach. Wise (1988), for example, points out that:

A teacher must make decisions based on knowledge of the student, of the subject matter, and of pedagogy in order to create the right conditions for learning. Appropriate instructional decisions must be made at the point of service delivery. Therefore, the quality of services delivered inevitably depends on the capacity of the teacher to make appropriate decisions (p. 332).

Also, Measor (1984) states that:

Both teachers and pupils have a role in defining the curriculum at the classroom level. Neither teachers nor pupils just receive and digest what is handed out from above. [Instead] they make space, they negotiate and they affect the realization of school subjects (p. 201).

This reconceptualization of classroom processes, then, assumes that content and instruction method differentiation will occur across periods.

While an examination of instructional interests (i.e., teacher effectiveness, teacher/student behavior), as in Eisner's first implication, does have worth in that it makes us more attentive and informed of instructional processes, it has also become necessary to examine the operationalized curriculum - that which occurs in the classroom setting. Eisner (1985) calls for this in the following statement:

There is no guarantee that a well-planned body of curriculum will be used effectively or with enthusiasm in the classroom. In knowing that, we then have a need for direct observation in the classroom using anthropologic or art criticism perspectives (p. 48).
Eisner calls for education, via methods more involved with the human sciences (i.e., ethnography, ethnomethodology, phenomenology) to acquire greater understanding of the classroom culture. Indeed, how can we attempt to design curriculum for the classroom when we do not yet understand the nature or culture of the classroom setting or the factors that influence the enacting of the planned curriculum?

Conversely, by excluding curriculum from instruction, we seem to do little more than measure behavior, time, and/or outcomes. While Eisner at least acknowledges the need for greater understanding of the operationalized curriculum, he does not go far enough. He does not have a model of classroom interaction processes between and among teachers, students, and materials that allow each setting to be unique.

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this inquiry was to answer these calls and supply the needed model. What is argued in this study is that:

* accountability measurements (test scores) do not reflect nor account for actual classroom practice;

* curriculum is context and content specific to the participants in a particular classroom setting;

* due to the unique interactions from class to class, curriculum becomes interpreted differently in each setting;
the discrepancy between the planned and the enacted curriculum within a period is due to the interpretations and the interactions of the participants;

* the discrepancy between the planned and the enacted curriculum across periods is also due to the unique interpretations and the interactions in each setting; and as a result,

* holding teachers accountable to/for instructional and student outcome objectives does not reflect understanding of dynamic classroom processes and practices that result from the interpretations and the interactions of the participants in the classroom.

In order to do so, this study explored how and what curriculum was defined and interpreted by student/s and teacher as they worked together to meet the goals of the course of study in three Reading classes taught by one teacher. By studying more than one class taught by the same teacher, the following factors that influenced the stability of how and what curriculum was defined and enacted in the classroom setting were identified and explored:

(1) How is curriculum defined in these classes?
   (1.1) How is curriculum defined by the teacher?
   (1.2) How is curriculum defined by the students?
   (1.3) What visual taxonomy can be constructed from these definitions?

(2) What is the enacted curriculum within and across these classes?
   (2.1) On what is time spent, in general, in each of the classes?
   (2.2) What is the nature of the event, Silent Reading Time, within and across each of the classes?
(2.3) What is the nature of the event, Assignment Explanation, within and across each of the classes?

(3) What is the planned curriculum?

(3.1) What is the nature of the planned events?

(4) What is the relationship between the planned curriculum and the enacted curriculum?

(4.1) What is the nature of the events that were planned but were not enacted?

(4.2) What is the nature of the events that were enacted but were not planned?

(4.3) What is the comparison of the planned and the enacted events?

A CONCEPTUALIZATION OF A MODEL

The traditional research on teaching has shown that teacher behaviors effect student outcomes in the classroom (i.e., Gage, 1963, 1986; Berliner, 1980; Doyle, 1986). In other words, through teacher behaviors such as time allocation for student engagement in an academic subject area (i.e., math, English, science), student outcomes are shown to be positively effected as indicated by scores on achievement tests (Fisher, Berliner, et.al, 1980).

The model underlying this approach is that the behaviors teachers use in the classroom directly influence student outcomes. What this approach fails to consider, however, is the student influence on teacher behaviors (Erickson & Mohatt, 1982), the influence of the classroom materials on the teacher and students (e.g., Golden, 1986;
Peterson, 1988) and the influence of teacher-student communicative interactions in the classroom setting (Green, 1983a, 1983b; Green & Harker, 1988; Wilkinson, 1982).

Likewise, curriculum scholars also note that curriculum affects student outcomes (i.e., Bestor, 1955; Bloom, 1987; Bobbitt, 1918; Boyer, 1983; Charters, 1921; Rickover, 1958; Rice, 1913; Snedden, 1921). The model underlying this approach is that through curriculum content, student outcomes can be controlled and/or improved.

Some curricular reforms have attempted to improve curriculum content by getting rid of the "frills" (i.e., vocational education, art, music, drama) (Rickover, 1958; Bestor, 1955; Bloom, 1987; Boyer, 1983; Hirsch, 1984), or institute more "scientific curriculum content" (Bobbitt, 1918; Charters, 1921; Snedden, 1921; NSBA, 1988) and eliminate wasteful content areas.

Other "curricularists" (Pinar, 1978) claim that through curriculum content, students are "trained" for only certain types of vocational opportunities, and are thus socialized into accepting blue-collar, less productive lives (Anyon, 1980; Apple, 1979a/b; Gordon & Collins, 1990). Either way, curriculum content is shown to have an effect on student outcomes. What this type of thinking leaves out, like the research on teaching area, is the impact of the teacher and students on the curriculum, the influence of the teacher's and students' prior histories on the curriculum, and the
effect of the total communicative environment (i.e., nonverbal, verbal) on the curriculum.

However, there is a newer direction that dissolves the forced dichotomies of the curriculum and instruction fields while addressing both the limitations of each perspective as well as Eisner's call for direct observation in the classroom using an anthropologic perspective. This approach is grounded in anthropology (cognitive and symbolic), the study of teaching, and constructivism under the guise of constructivist, interpretive, descriptive, or teaching as linguistic process research (Green, 1983). This work focuses on exploring a situated perspective (context bound) of the everyday lifeworld of the social participants in a classroom setting as they come to interpret meaning in the everyday interactions of classroom life (Gumperz, 1981, 1982; Green & Wallat, 1981; Green & Harker, 1982, 1988).

The problem with this work to date is that while it informs us of social demands and social participation requirements for learning and identifies factors that support and/or constrain access (Green & Harker, 1982), it has not considered the nature of curriculum as it gets interpreted through the interactions of the classroom setting, nor has it attempted to bridge the gap between curriculum and instruction.

An exception to this is the work done in England on ethnography of curriculum (Goodson & Ball, et al., 1984) and
some initial efforts in the United States (Weade, 1987; Weade & Green, 1985, 1989; Green & Marker, 1982). This work tends to join instruction and curriculum by looking at the process of curriculum in the classroom through an anthropological perspective. However, it has not yet developed a model and/or theory of how curriculum is interpreted in the classroom setting. In order to lay a foundation of the study of how and what curriculum is defined and interpreted in the classroom through the interactions of the participants in the classroom setting, it is necessary to lay the conceptualization of curriculum and instruction in the everyday settings that are underlying this study.

**Underlying Assumptions of Everyday Classroom Life**

There exists a notion that there is a history, or historicity (Bloome & Bailey, 1990), to any given event. What this means for classrooms is that the teacher, the students, and the materials all have prior histories before being integrated in the process of classroom life. The teacher, for example, enters with already preconceived expectations, beliefs, and attitudes. The teacher also enters with certain prior cognitive abilities, physical abilities, linguistic abilities, perception of situation abilities, and so forth.

The students, like the teacher, also enter with certain preconceived expectations, beliefs, and attitudes, as well
as with cognitive abilities, physical abilities, linguistic abilities, and perception of situation abilities, and so forth. Likewise, the materials that will be used in the class setting enter with certain features such as content, structure, language, and vocabulary.

In other words, students enter into a classroom with preconceived notions of what classroom life is like and what will be expected of them. The classroom, for example, will contain a bulletin board, a blackboard, and desks. The students will be expected to be on time, remain quiet when the teacher talks, and stay in their seats (Green & Marker, 1988).

Along with this notion is that everyday life also builds up socially over time. In other words, over time, norms and expectations, rights and obligations, and roles and relationships (i.e., Goodenough, 1971; Gumperz, 1981) of students and teacher get established (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990). Over time, expectations of how class begins will get established. Over time, the rights and obligations, and roles and relationships will become established. Over time, the ways in which time will be scheduled (the rituals and routines of life in classroom), the ways in which space will become organized, the types of events that can and will occur, and the types of outcomes that will be generated will get established (Spradley, 1980).
There is also another notion that there is a culture of a classroom (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990; Spindler, 1982). This can be called a culture due to that social participation structures, rights and obligations, norms and expectations, roles and relationships are placed on students and teacher. For example, the ways in which the teacher and students interact, what they use, how they use it, how they communicate, and what they communicate are all instances of life in a culture (Green & Wallat, 1979) that get learned and shared as in any other culture (Goodenough, 1971; Zaharlick & Green, 1990).

Cultures are learned and shared (Goodenough, 1971; Zaharlick & Green, 1990), and are also always changing and variable - not static (Heath, 1982; Hymes, 1982). Interpreting the occurrences within any given classroom requires an understanding of classroom as a separate, mini culture, within the context of a larger culture - school, with norms and expectations, rights and obligations, and roles and relationships for its group members. The central premise within this classroom culture is that everyday life is socially constructed over time by the members of the culture interacting with and building on each other's actions, intentions, and messages (Gumperz, 1981).

Therefore, teacher roles are constructed through interactions with students and materials. Likewise, student roles are constructed - not given. Also, the interactions
that occur with materials, such as reading, are constructed, not given. How each classroom plays out over time is established in the interactions of the group members but is never a given.

Relationships, for example, are built in the context of the classroom. Small groups may form, alter, grow, or reduce, but are not static or unchanging. This verbal and non-verbal participation in the classroom is also influenced not only by what students and teacher learn to expect and do in that setting, but also by the expectations they bring from other settings (Erickson & Mohatt, 1982; Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990; Philips, 1972; Shultz, Florio, & Erickson, 1982). As this small group changes over time, roles and relationships, right and obligations, and norms and expectations get constructed and reconstructed.

Consider the learning activity, reading. In the context of reading will be norms and expectations, rights and obligations, roles and relationships that will get constructed (i.e, Green & Meyer, 1990). There may be, for example, the student obligation of reading out-loud everyday. There may be a teacher expectation that students know where they are in the reading material. What these things suggest, then, is that what gets created and constructed by the group members interacting with each other and the materials within the classroom is the curriculum. A
constructed context, however, does not mean that there are no predictable patterns.

Classroom life is made up of a set of events which are linked together in some way (Green & Meyer, 1990; Barr, 1987). While some aspects of life in classrooms become stable over time, other aspects evolve in the doing. While participants cannot know what events will look specifically like or require until they occur, for example, there are general predictable elements of classroom life.

Everyday life, then, is not random and chaotic, but more or less patterned (Gumperz, 1986; Hymes, 1986). Some events of classroom life occur daily (i.e., announcements, roll-taking) while some may occur weekly (i.e., pep-rallies). What this perspective calls for then is a need to understand the kinds of events students have opportunities in which to engage. We need to understand how, over time, the norms and expectations, roles and relationships, and rights and obligations get interpreted, defined, and constructed in the classroom setting.

By looking at these roles and relationships, norms and expectations, and rights and obligations in the classroom setting, the elements that influence the stability of the planned curriculum can come to be understood. This is necessary so that we better understand why the operationalized (enacted) curriculum may differ from the planned curriculum.
APPROACH TO THE RESEARCH

This study explored how and what curriculum was defined and interpreted by the students and teacher as they worked together to meet the goals of the course of study in three Reading classes taught by the same teacher. The conceptualization of curriculum within this study is definitively an alternative one in that curriculum is seen as interpreted, over time, by the participants through the interactions and negotiations of daily classroom life. A research approach was thus needed that could accommodate for and lead to understanding the "mutually constitutive" (Mehan, 1978) nature of curriculum and classroom life; i.e., the curriculum is simultaneously influencing and influenced by the social setting.

A sustained (over time), observational, comparative, and interpretive study was thus used to explore and examine the curriculum within and across the three seventh-grade Reading classes. This anthropologic design was selected because the naturally occurring interactive-reactive nature of the design was seen as an important and necessary element for this study.

Through the interactive-reactive nature of ethnography (Zaharlick & Green, 1990), theories, inferences, approaches, questions, and hypotheses are all subject to self-correction (Hymes, 1982) as well as being revised, extended, and/or refined. An important element of the interactive-reactive
nature of ethnography, however, is that a sustained, over-time observation was essential (Michaels, in press) in order to better understand the nature of the classrooms and allow for self-correction (triangulation).

THE RESEARCH SETTING

The research for this study was conducted in three seventh-grade Reading classes in a large suburban school district in central Ohio. The students involved ranged in ages 12-14 years old and were predominantly white anglo-saxon American. The teacher in this study has taught for 11 years, all of which have been in this school district.

The study involved the data collection and data analysis of two separate observation periods. The first phase of observation covered the last quarter of a school year and data were collected across a period of three months from three seventh-grade Reading classes. These classes covered the first three periods of the school day.

The second phase of observation covered the first quarter of the next school year. Data were again collected across a period of three months from two seventh-grade Reading classes. These classes covered the first two periods of the school day. The teacher in the classrooms was the same throughout both phases.
SUMMARY

This study shows that due to the unique interactions and interpretations within and across these three classrooms, a discrepancy exists between the planned and the enacted curriculum. These interactions and interpretations thus cause a differentiating definition of curriculum (that which occurs) to occur in each class period. Critical to obtaining these definitions, however, was the research design itself. This design, then, has allowed for a greater contextualization of classroom life as well as a presentation of the participants within the setting (i.e., the emic view).

In order to accomplish these set-on tasks, then, this study is divided into five chapters, the first of which is the argument. Chapter II provides the theoretical and conceptual frameworks in which this study is grounded. Chapter III describes the way in which the data were obtained. Chapter IV describes the findings of the data analyses. And Chapter V is a discussion of implications and future work to be done.
CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUALIZATIONS AND PERSPECTIVES:
INFLUENCES ON THE DEFINITION OF CURRICULUM

Everything means, is understood, as a part of a greater whole - there is constant interaction between meanings, all of which have the potential of conditioning others. Which will affect the other, how it will do so and in what degree is what is actually settled at the moment of utterance. This dialogic imperative...insures that there can be no actual monologue (Bakhtin, 1986; 426)

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the theoretical and conceptual background of this study. In other words the theories and concepts motivating the questions and methods herein are given as a way in which to help better situate this study. While the bulk of the chapter is presented in text version, a chart is displayed at the end as a synopsis of the six areas reviewed in this chapter.

Since the focus of this dissertation is on classroom curriculum, six areas are reviewed that situate how curriculum is viewed within this study and what has influenced this perspective. These six areas are:

1. Cognitive and Symbolic Anthropology - for the purpose of situating research, classrooms, and curriculum:
(2) an historical overview of Curriculum - for the purpose of providing an overview of the ways in which curriculum has been viewed up to the present, thus giving a better sense of how this study is situated within the field of curriculum;

(3) Research on Teaching/Instruction - for the purpose of situating how the research foci within this area has been grounded, and how this does and does not link with curriculum theory and research;

(4) Curriculum Planning and Development Models - an overview of the models that have been employed, and what elements have been omitted within these models;

(5) Premises of the Social Constructivist Perspective - in order to provide the premises of the knowledge of social constructivism that is backgrounded in this study; and,

(6) Curriculum as an Interpretive Process - for the purpose of establishing the way in which curriculum is viewed within this study.

Each area presents an overview of the perspective/s held within the area, but not all the areas present an exhaustive review of the field. While often doing the typical presentation of issue "sides," the primary purpose of this chapter is to illustrate the influences each of these perspectives have had on the curriculum perspective held in this study. So, while some arguments are provided, the main intent is to explicate how these arguments have influenced the thinking, understanding, and perceptions in this study.
(1) Cognitive and Symbolic Anthropology

The purpose of this section is to provide an orientation into how research, classrooms, and curriculum is situated and examined within this perspective. In order to do so, two sections are provided: (A) an overview of Early Cognitive Anthropological foundations; and (B) an overview of Symbolic Anthropology.

A. Early Cognitive Anthropology: The development of the "emic" perspective.

Cognitive anthropology strives for the "native's" perspectives and definitions, or theories within a culture, in order to develop a universal system of categories, or theories across cultures. Put another way, cognitive anthropology tries to obtain adequate descriptions within a culture to get at adequate comparisons across cultures by gaining what is meaningful and significant to the participants within a culture (e.g., meaningful categories to the participants; meaningful perspectives to the participants) (Boas, 1889b; Goodenough, 1971; Spradley, 1980).

The roots of cognitive anthropology, however, begin in the late 1950s and early 1960s, with some anthropologists becoming concerned about the lack of meticulous and empirical ethnographic data (Malinowski, 1922; Nadel, 1957; Radcliffe-Brown, 1957). They were concerned about the status of anthropology as a science and as well as
validifying ethnographic data (Colby, 1973; Romney, Shepard, & Nerlove, 1972).

Units of study that were believed to be accessible and obtainable (e.g., language, kinship, technology, and political organization) were examined in order to provide descriptions that showed patterned ways of acting, perceiving, believing, and evaluating (Goodenough, 1971).

In other words, cognitive anthropologists searched for the rules of participation within a culture. Rules for participation within a culture are those that one has to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to a culture's membership, and do so in any role they accept for any one of themselves. The primary method adopted for doing this, however, was a linguistic structuralistic approach (i.e., Bloomfield) perspective that focused on methods that were believed replicable, such as phonology (voicing), lexeme, and semantic analysis.

In obtaining these rules for participating in a culture, it was believed that the data would be reliable. In other words, it was expected the results would be the same when different researchers/anthropologists wrote about the same people. This did not hold, however, and differences were found. Redfield (pre-cognitive), for example, had studied in the 1920s, life in the Mexican village of Tepoztlan. He described that the people lived in harmony with their surroundings, and little poverty,
violence, or suffering existed. Lewis, on the other hand, seventeen years later, studied the same village and found strong individualism, inner village tensions, and fear, envy, and distrust among each other (Pelto and Pelto, 1970).

Along with this problem, Naroll (1962) found that cross-cultural codings were related to observer effect variables such as length of time in the field setting. This was found in Murdock's work, which was an attempt to do an ethnological comparison using the data from systematic ethnographies that had been done by Boas', Malinowski's, and Radcliff-Brown's students.

Thus, Murdock's students (Conklin and Lounsbury) began the "new ethnography" (or ethnoscience) which incorporated descriptive linguistics (that which described language "in use" rather than language as "it ought to be") in order to provide a more scientific base of replicability and validity. This was believed to be so as linguistics provided elements that would allow cognitive anthropology to study cultures:

* as a scientific endeavor
* using analytical procedures
* using structure and rules behind actual language
* identifying language as a system
* identifying abstract structure
The concern for the emic perspective combined with this linguistic model thus led to a concern for ethnographic semantics (meanings).

The methodology used by cognitive anthropology to study cultures, then, incorporated such methods as: lexemes (words), domains/categories (emic categories - the meanings held by the participants), psychological validity, and inductive methods (collecting data base first and then generating hypotheses from the data) - or fieldwork. The main anthropologists within cognitive anthropology using these methods were Goodenough (1956a), Frake (1961), Conklin (1955, 1962), and Lounsbury (1956).

These cognitive anthropologists attempted to "get at" the meanings and perspectives of the participants within a culture. They did so through the use of domains by: (a) distinguishing one "object" from another within the culture, and (b) discovering how the people labeled "objects" within their culture. Conklin (1961, 1955, 1964), for example, looked at the native views of the natural and material world and their response to it, color categories within a culture, and religious behavior. Black and Metzger (1965) looked to terms for particular social domains of native interest, including legal terminology. Goodenough (1956a) looked at the rules and guides, rather than the behaviors, for participating within a culture. Metzger and Williams (1966) examined the categories of firewood in the Tzeltal culture.
There were, however, several criticisms of cognitive anthropology. First was that the use of the lexeme was too narrow in that it did not include sentences, was out of context, and, from the use of the lexeme, only generated dictionaries. Second was that the methods used were too technical and time consuming. Third, that the method should be deductive (generate hypothesis first and then test against the data) rather than inductive. And fourth, that domains were not the same for everyone within a culture.

Linguists of the time were also in a state of transition, however, moving from the Bloomfieldian structural linguistics to the transformational generative linguistics of Chomsky. Anthropologists, in their move to adopt linguistics as a model, thus began adopting a Chomskian perspective with the idea of competence (versus performance)(transformational grammar)(Chomsky, 1957).

This effort to adopt transformational generative grammar, however, did have its own problems. Chomsky, for example, wanted linguistics to be less descriptive, less comparative, and less concerned with foreign languages. This severely diminished the relevance, however, of and to anthropology (Bohannan, 1978).

Also during the late fifties, early sixties, Chomsky, and thus cognitive anthropology, became uninterested in semantic analysis. Semantic analysis, however, had been precisely that which allowed for gaining the participants'
meaning within a culture. With the loss of semantic analysis also came the loss of psychological validity (or that which made sense to the people within the culture studied).

Regardless of the diminished relevance, Lakoff (1978) began to show that several alternative approaches to transformational generative grammar had appeared (e.g., sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, developmental linguistics, and symbolic anthropology) and that Chomsky's work was no longer needed. With this adaptation, cognitive anthropology, while adopting a methodology from transformational generative grammar, also re-incorporated semantic analysis, or that which looked at the meanings held by the participants within a culture.

(B) Interpretive Theory (Symbolic Anthropology)

The beginning of symbolic approach lies in two areas: (1) psychoanalysis, and (2) the sociology of knowledge. Two original documents provided the base for symbolic anthropology. First, Freud's (1965 [1899]) "The Interpretation of Dreams" which emphasized individually generated symbolism, and second, Durkheim's (1961 [1905]) "The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life" which emphasized various social-cultural forms (e.g., religion, classificatory systems, motives) as collective (shared by members of society) representations (i.e., the human
condition; the way things are) of the social structure (Dolgin, et al., 1977). This relationship between collective (Durkheim) and personal realities (Freud), or between public and private symbols, has continued to be the main focus of symbolic anthropology (Leach 1976b).

Other influences on symbolic anthropology include the neo-Kantian emphasis on the created/constitutive (or made-up) nature of symbolism (Cassier, 1955[1923]; Langer, 1952), the emphasis on the constant construction and reconstruction of social reality and individual identity (G.H. Mead, 1934), and the emphasis on the objectification of social experiences (Blumer 1968). The objectification of social experiences presented here refers to Kant's argument of being aware of self assumes an objective world: "The mere consciousness of my own existence proves the existence of objects in space outside me (Flew, 1979; p. 191)."

From this, symbolic anthropology became a humanistic approach concerned with meaning, with the elements/symbols (i.e., objects, relationships, acts) through which people understand, communicate about, and act and interact within their worlds and with the created and interrelation of these elements. Geertz (1983) labels it the "understanding of understanding" (p. 5).

This focus on meaning/elements and/or symbols first assumes that there are ways of acting and being in the world (Colby, et al., 1981) that are observable and classifiable.
This also leads to the notion that if the social meaning of these actions involves using signs/symbols as standing for something in some way, then these signs and meanings can be observed (detected), distinguished, and classified.

Meaning and symbol, however, are definitionally problematic. To objectify them, for example, or make them objects, is to also reify them. Also, meaning and naming are not separate from experience, nor is experience and meaning without perception (Dolgin, et al., 1977). Rather, events, objects, and experiences are embedded in a set of meanings that are also embedded within a system of cultural symbols. While individuals do not necessarily have to agree with other members of society, for example, there is a point of consensus or becoming part of that which is beyond the control and which pre-existed the individual's entrance into the situation. From this, culture (individuals in a social context) becomes the meaningful way to objectify and classify, thus bringing to awareness, reality.

Symbolic anthropology also attempts to maintain the complexity of cultural experience (Colby, et al., 1981) and is interested in the constraints on the individual and collective behavior that is bound up in symbols. The problem is in finding the relevant meanings of particular symbols, or finding the primacy of meaning - that which is normatively proper for a particular context.
Studies in symbolic anthropology, for example, attempt to understand how and what social situations and life experiences are represented in ritual events, giving meaning to these experiences and providing orientation and commitment to social interaction. Example of general types of questions asked by symbolic anthropologists are: What are the conditions of existence? How is life defined? What is a human family? What is human nature?

The methods used for obtaining such data are:

* finding the metaphors as they occur in contexts of performance (Turner 1974; Herzfeld 1979);

* using qualitative symbolic expression methods such as phenomenological, intuitionist, or hermeneutical approaches (i.e., Geertz 1973; Ricoeur, 1967; Schutz 1932/67);

* "blurring the genres" in order to better think about our ways of thinking and better question the relationship of symbolic systems to what goes on in the world (Geertz, 1983); allegory (Clifford, 1986; Shostak, 1981); and,

* Geertz's (1983) "thick description."

The major advantage to these forms, in that they primarily use the essay form, is two-fold: (1) they can begin almost anywhere and take off in almost any direction (Geertz, 1983); and, (2) these "works are not finished, they are [simply] abandoned" (Valery in Geertz, 1983; p. 6).

Through this "blurring of genres," this brand of ethnography, then, is better able than the cognitive ethnographies to provide a description that better and more
easily allows for comparison between cultures. Geertz (1983) argues that:

To see ourselves as others see us can be eye-opening. To see others as sharing a nature with ourselves is the merest decency. But it is from the far more difficult achievement of seeing ourselves amongst others, as a local example of the forms human life has locally taken, a case among cases, a world among worlds, that the largeness of mind, without which objectivity is self-congratulation and tolerance a sham, comes. If interpretive anthropology has any general office in the world it is to keep reteaching this fugitive truth (p. 16).

An example of this transcendence of an individual account of an event within a culture to a larger, more global comparison lies in Shostak's (1981) interpretive ethnography about a !Kung childbirth. Her allegorical story tells about birth in the !Kung way. The account requires the reader to imagine childbirth in their own culture while also providing an account of the larger human experience.

What this section on anthropology has provided is a point of departure in order to better understand the domains and categorizations presented in the data as well as the "voicings" of the individual participants within the classroom culture. The conceptualization of cognitive anthropology guides the research process in this study as well as provides a foundational base for viewing classrooms as socially constructed cultures. The conceptualization of symbolic anthropology provides the base for ways of interpreting classroom life, understanding curricular
definitions, and using alternative ways of data presentation.

(2) An Historical Overview of Curriculum

The term "curriculum" connotates many things to many people. How people define the term influences the ways in which they view curriculum in particular settings. As a result, people who work in the field of curriculum have particular concerns which also influences the way in which they view curriculum in particular settings.

Since this study is on classroom curriculum, this section provides an overview of (1) the concerns of those working in curricular contexts, (2) the ways in which curriculum has been conceptualized, and thus defined, within education, and (3) the ways in which curricular purpose has been viewed, so that the reader may better understand the nature of curriculum, while the particular conceptualization of curriculum used in this study is discussed at the end of the chapter. The concerns are covered first so as to provide a frame in which to better understand the definitions and conceptualizations of curriculum.

Curricular Concerns

The focus of curriculum typically encompasses five general areas: (1) Knowledge for what purpose? (2) What knowledge is of most worth (Spencer, 1860) (or, Why this
knowledge rather than that)? (3) What is the purpose of education? (4) Whose knowledge is being taught (or, What and whose knowledge is occurring)? and (5) How is knowledge being reproduced in the classroom? With these in mind, the following adaptation from Peddiwell's *The Sabre-Tooth Curriculum* (1939) is provided so that the five concerns may be placed in context.

Once upon a time the animals had a school. The curriculum consisted of running, climbing, flying, and swimming, and all the animals took all the subjects.

The Duck was good in swimming, better in fact than her instructor; and she made passing grades in flying, but was practically hopeless in running. Because she was low in this subject, she was made to stay in after school and drop her swimming class in order to practice running. She kept this up until she was only average in swimming. But average is acceptable, so nobody worried about that except the Duck.

The Eagle was considered a problem pupil and was disciplined severely. He beat all the others to the top of the tree in climbing class, but he had used his own way of getting there.

The Rabbit started out at the top of his class in running, but he had a nervous breakdown and had to drop out of school on account of so much make-up work in swimming.

The squirrel led the climbing class but her flying teacher made her start her flying lessons from the ground up instead of from the top of the tree down, and she developed charley horses from over-exertion at the take-off and began getting C's in climbing and D's in running.

The practical Prairie Dogs apprenticed their offspring to a Badger when the school authorities refused to add digging to the curriculum.
At the end of the school year, an abnormal Eel that could swim well, run, climb, and fly a little was made valedictorian.

No matter how curriculum is conceptually viewed or defined, the five general concerns can be seen as influencing thinking about curriculum. While keeping these in mind, the following sections provide a summary of the conceptual views and definitions within curriculum since around the 1880s.

**Conceptualizations of Curriculum**

Traditionally, curriculum has been viewed as a document that guides what teachers do with and to students. In this context curriculum content is often seen as existing in the books, materials, and/or plans that are provided by school districts to meet the goals of the course of study (Beauchamp, 1975).

In contrast, curriculum is also seen as a set of planned learning activities. These activities act as a means to implement the curriculum (Beauchamp, 1975; Bobbitt, 1918; Harrap, 1928; Saylor, Alexander, and Lewis, 1981; Snedden, 1921; Taylor, 1970). Another view is that of curriculum as intended learning outcomes (Adler, 1982; Gagne, 1977; Johnson, 1967; Popham & Baker, 1970; Posner, 1982). This perspective, while still remaining as a written document or lesson plan, believes the focus of the curriculum should be directly on that of intended learning
outcomes. Thus, the focus is shifted from the means to the ends, or rather, to the specified, and often measured, ends.

Curriculum has also been viewed as **content** or **subject matter** (Aristotle, 384-322 B.C.; Boyer, 1983; Plato, 428-347 B.C.; Socrates, 469-399 B.C.; Smith, Stanley, & Shores, 1957). This is considered the most traditional image of curriculum and is equated with the subject matter to be taught, and is a form of the curriculum as document.

Other perspectives view curriculum as **content** or **activities** in order to achieve specified purposes. For example, there was a curriculum for **cultural reproduction**, or to **maintain the status quo** (Finney, 1928; Snedden, 1921; Charters, 1921; Bobbitt, 1918); curriculum as **evolving purposes**, or the **outcomes of the experiential** (Dewey, 1897; Tyler, 1949; Schwab, 1973), and along this line, curriculum for **expressive objectives** - activities without objectives or specified outcomes (Eisner, 1985); curriculum as an **agenda for social reconstruction/ameliorization**, or for the purpose of improving the society in which we live (Counts, 1932; Giroux, 1980).

Still other perspectives view curriculum as the "**substance of schooling**" (Klein, 1990; p. 3), and curriculum as **what students have an opportunity to learn** (McCutcheon, 1988). Only more recently, the communicative, interactive nature of learning in classrooms has also been discussed (Berman, 1987; King, 1986; Measor, 1984). This view of
The Purpose of the Curriculum

The purpose of education (that which seemingly is to guide the curriculum), and thus the agenda of the curriculum, is also composited into various perspectives. One purpose of education, for example, was to present a curriculum that would prepare individual students for the position they would assume as adults. This was labeled the social efficiency movement, or as some might prefer, social control or socialization in order to stabilize an ostensible out of control society during the beginning of the 1900s (Bobbitt, 1924; Ellwood, 1914; Finney, 1928; Ross, 1901; Snedden, 1921).

Snedden, Bobbitt, and Charters were also responsible for the accountability movement. More recently, Tyler (1949) and Goodlad (1978, 1979) have been added to those wanting more accountability and achievement from the schooling process. As a result, teachers are now held responsible for student outcomes, while student outcomes are measured by objective measurement tests (see the discussion below on Research on Teaching/Instruction for greater detail).
Around the 1930s, the purpose of education shifted to that of social reconstructionism (Kliebard, 1987), or providing students with an orientation to improve society (Counts, 1932b; Kandal, 1941) rather than maintaining the status quo. This was also known as a curriculum for social meliorism.

Broudy (1961) saw the purpose of education as a means to reproduce the culture: "Being educated means mastering and using the cultural heritage in the conduct of life" (p. 35). In this sense, cultural reproduction is also seen as another way to maintain the status quo. Another form of this was the purpose to produce the "general, liberally educated person." Since this, for the most part, encompassed Western European philosophical thought, the liberally educated person typically took "subject matter" courses that maintained society's status quo (Adler, 1982; Bloom, 1987; Boyer, 1983; Hirsch, 1984; Hutchins, 1936; Whitehead, 1929).

In contrast to this purpose of education, others, currently labeled the reconceptualists, feel that education curriculum should provide knowledge that helps liberate people in the society that attempts to maintain the status quo (Anyon, 1980; Apple, 1979a: Freire, 1970; Giroux, et al., 1981; Gordon, 1983; Gordon & Collins, 1990; MacDonald, 1988). Interestingly, this is analogous to Counts (1926) and social reconstructionism in that both looked at how
institutions, in maintaining the status quo, oppress people of minority and low socioeconomic status. Counts, for example, found that admittance to "secondary education was contingent on social and economic standing" (in Kliebard, 1987, p. 184).

Another purpose of education was that of personal growth. While this progressed under different labels, i.e., life-adjustment curriculum, humanistic education, open education (Schubert, 1986), Dewey is said to have begun the effort. This type of education was to nurture the individual in their needs and interests (Barth, 1972; Dewey, 1900; Douglass, 1949; Holt, 1964; Hopkins, 1937, 1954; Kohl, 1968; Kozol, 1967; Neill, 1960; Parker, 1894; Rogers, 1983; Silberman, 1973; Willis, 1977).

Vocational education/training was another purpose of the curriculum. While still an issue today, vocational education became highly praised in 1909 with the publication of Ayres' Laggards in Our Schools. Ayres' article pointed to the fact that "our courses of study as at present constituted are fitted not to the slow child or to the average child but to the unusually bright one (p. 5)." More recently, Ochs (1986) also pointed out that, through tracking, we really teach only to the top 10 percent of the students. Thus, the middle 80 percent stay tracked into mediocrity while the bottom 10 percent are often tracked into vocational education. This vocational education then
provides restricted opportunities, diminished outcomes, and ever-growing achievement differences between the lower and higher tracked.

(3) Research on Teaching/Instruction

Process-Product Approach

While not an apparent part of this study, the directions of the research on teaching/instruction have profound implications for curriculum policy and development as well as curriculum conceptualizations. Also, the research on teaching/instruction area has, like curriculum, multiple conceptualizations within the broader category. From this view, then, the research on teaching and instruction perspective has had major influences, albeit mostly negative ones with the exception of the later developments, on the curriculum perspective embedded in this study.

Traditionally, research on teaching (instruction) has looked at teacher effectiveness/behavior (i.e., Doyle, 1986; Brophy, 1983; Rosenshine, 1983; Evertson, Emmer, Sanford, & Clements, 1983; Soar & Soar, 1979; Gage, 1978; Kounin, 1970), time-on-task studies (i.e., Berliner, 1979; Fisher, Berliner, et al., 1980; Carroll, 1963), and student outcomes (i.e., Brophy & Good, 1986; Block & Burns, 1976; Bloom, 1953; Gage, 1963; Fisher, Berliner, et al., (1980). Teacher
behaviors were believed to directly relate to student outcome scores.

During the 1960s, for example, researchers examined the amount of teacher talk in regards to student outcomes, as well as many atheoretically driven ideas of what teacher properties (i.e., teaching skills, intelligence, motivations, personality traits) effected student outcomes (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974). Anderson and Burns (1989), however, summarized 50 years of research by offering 13 generalizations, two of which stated that "differences in individual teaching behaviors are not reliably associated with differences in student achievement" (p. 348) and "teacher characteristics do not impact directly on student achievement (p. 345)."

Besides focusing on teacher behaviors, there were many other factors that also contributed to the problems of this type of research. First, as mentioned, it was theoretically impoverished. Second, a new measure was developed for each new study. In so doing, the reliability and validity of each instrument was generally poor. Third, the general nature of the context of the classroom was ignored. Fourth, teacher behavioral change was not examined over time (Romberg, 1980).

Along with these failings and efforts to change teacher behavior in order to improve student outcome on test scores, Cuban (1984) found that teachers continue to teach in the
traditional manner, and were opposed to change. So, while the process-product paradigm (those researchers looking at how the process of teacher behaviors effected the student outcome/product) was trying to gain a better understanding of the general laws of teaching (cause-effect), they were ignoring content, context, the purpose for learning, and the student contributions and roles in process.

The time-on-task studies, for example, (i.e., Carroll, 1963) excluded the impact of the students on the teacher and classroom; and a 1977 (Armbruster, Stevens, and Rosenshine) and a 1983 (Freeman, et al.) study demonstrated a mismatch between what is taught in schools and what is measured on standardized tests. This also restates Eisner's (1985) statement that since tests reflect the intended curriculum (what is supposed to be taught) rather than what actually gets taught in the classroom, the students do poorly.

Classroom As a Communicative Environment Approach

Another field in instruction takes a different look at instruction. This work shows that instruction is effected by how teachers and students communicate with each other and what gets accomplished (e.g., Cazden, 1986; Green, 1983).

This communication is constructed by the students and teachers acting on and working with their own messages and behaviors and those of others to reach communicative goals (e.g., Edwards & Furlong, 1979; Green, 1977; Green & Harker,
1982; Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Collins, 1984). The messages get transmitted in more than one way (e.g., verbal, visual, nonverbal, written), often simultaneously, within a single conversation (Green, 1977; Knott, 1986; Gumperz, 1981; Green, Weade, & Graham, 1988; Green & Kantor, 1988). In addition, Green, Weade, & Graham (1988 have shown that students influence what occurs during instruction.

The influence of classroom communication has strong effects on instruction and what children learn in school (Puro & Bloome, 1987; Cazden, 1986; Green, 1983). For example, Bellack, et al. (1966) and Green (1977) demonstrated that the ways in which the teacher uses language in the classroom has been shown to affect student performance (Green) and student learning (Bellack). So, through classroom communication, segments of the inside-of-school curriculum get played out. What becomes communicated thus becomes the curriculum, whether it be overt, hidden, or otherwise.

As pointed out by Puro & Bloome (1987), classroom communication has a powerful effect on the nature of the instructional processes and that these ultimately effect what gets learned (Bellack, et al., 1966; Green, Weade, & Graham, 1988; Bloome & Theodorou, 1988; Morine-Dershimer, 1988). If we understand that classroom communication takes place between teachers and students, as well as among students (Bloome & Theodorou, 1988), then we can conclude
that students have an effect on what gets communicated and how the communication takes place (Spradberry, 1976).

While this approach differs remarkably from the previous process-product approach, and provides promise for looking at content within a classroom, this perspective still points to the level of student outcome and ignores the purpose of learning. It is this latter development, however, that helps integrate the social constructivist perspective into curricular matters — no small influence.

(4) Curriculum Planning and Development Models

This study is not overtly concerned with the more policy oriented implications of curriculum development. A discussion on curriculum planning and development models is discussed here, however, in order to provide a point of departure for further argument and implications of the curriculum manifested within this study. Thus, an overview of planning and development models is viewed as beneficial.

Curriculum design and planning is defined as the plan by which learning experiences are organized for effective instruction and progression through levels of schooling (Beauchamp, 1975; Tyler, 1949). Much of the literature on curriculum planning and development speaks to the types of areas that should be included in a curriculum plan and development. In other words, the plans take into consideration the elements that are thought to be of worth
in education - or what ends education should serve (Goldstein, 1988).

Tyler (1949), for example, states that in regards to curriculum planning and development, four questions guide the process: (1) What educational goals should the school seek to attain? (2) How can learning experiences be selected which are likely to be useful in attaining these objectives? (3) How can learning experiences be organized for effective instruction? and, (4) How can the effectiveness of learning experiences be evaluated?

Foshay (1987) suggests a "Curriculum Matrix" that has three main interactive components: (1) the substance of schooling or the entire offering - Mathematics, Science, History, Language and Literature, Writing and Composition, Foreign Language, the Arts, Vocational and Technical Fields and Skills, Co-curricular Activities/Athletics, and the School Culture; (2) the purpose of schools - Intellectual, Emotional, Social, Physical, Aesthetic, and Spiritual; and (3) the practice/instruction of schools - Who will be educated? What will be offered? Why will a school offering be made? When should an offering be made? How will students experience school offerings? Circumstances (i.e., time physical environment, equipment, material), Cost, Governance, and Evaluation.

If the curriculum planning development literature is not speaking about what to include, it is seemingly
providing flow diagrams on how best to implement a curriculum. These flow diagrams are to help illustrate ways to build curriculum and what elements to consider when building one. The term "flow diagram" implies directionality and these diagrams are typically linear, top-down sequencing models rather than interactive models.

McKeen and Fortune (1988), for example, provide such a flow diagram:

1. Examine beliefs & values about knowledge and learning
2. Design curriculum including plans for implementation and evaluation
3. Analyze and explicate underlying values and beliefs concerning the purpose of the curriculum/Audit the readiness of the curriculum and the setting for implementation and evaluation
4. Identify specific criteria and standards for these
5. Develop curriculum evaluation instruments
6. Prepare the implementation of the curriculum
7. Prepare the implementation of the management information support system and
8. Implement curriculum and management information process

Other plans offer sequential steps on how to organize intended learning outcomes through conceptual maps (Posner & Rudnitsky, 1978); conceptions (flow diagrams) on how to implement and manage strategies and skills leading to student learning (Leithwood, 1982); and, procedures for
stressing instructional conditions, methods, and outcomes 
(causal relationship plans stressing which action influences 
another)(Cronbach & Snow, 1977; Reigeluth & Merrill, 1979).
Along with this, some planners and developers see 
curriculum/instructional design as a prescriptive devise 
(Glaser, 1976; Reigeluth, Bunderson, & Merrill, 1978; Simon, 
1969; Snelbecker, 1974) in that its primary task is to 
 prescribe goal oriented methods of instruction.

Cooley & Lohnes (1976), however, have pointed out that 
plans and designs are usually very poorly implemented in 
school settings. In an evaluation study of a follow-through 
program, it was found that many experimental classrooms did 
not use individualized teaching methods even though they 
were suppose to (Cooley & Leinhardt, 1980). The suggestion 
is that, because teachers and administrative systems are 
accustomed to carrying out instruction in an habitual 
everyday fashion, instructional-design innovations that 
require substantial changes in the everyday way often are 
not implemented.

Seemingly in opposition to these prescriptive and 
linear models, other curriculum planners and developers have 
turned to more interactive designs more compatible to the 
conceptualization of curriculum in this study, such as:

* the teacher as curriculum developer (Carr & 
  Kemmis, 1986; Grundy, 1987; Nunan, 1988; 
  Stenhouse, 1975);
* the call for coverage of material versus in-depth coverage on a sustained study and/or topic in order to master topics (Newmann, 1988);
* the mutually-owned, jointly planned teacher-student curriculum (Boomer, 1987);
* the deliberative (non-linear), "naturalistic" approach which attempts to describe what actually occurs during curriculum development activities (Walker, 1971); and,
* the "curriculum development game" approach where elements vary from situation to situation but provides a list of things to consider (Purves, 1975).

(5) Premises of the Social Constructivist Perspective

A social constructivist focuses on the processes by which an act/event/symbol (i.e., curriculum, literacy, reality) is constructed in everyday life, through the interactions, negotiations, and interpretations of meanings occurring specific contexts (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Gregory, 1988). And we interact, negotiate, and interpret through language and communication. It is thus through language and communication that I turn to better explain the social construction of communicative environments, such as classrooms and schools.
As presented in the above section on "Classrooms as a Communicative Environment," meanings are influenced and constructed through the interaction of the participants and materials in the classroom setting (Cazden, 1986; Cochran-Smith, 1984; Green, 1983; Green & Wallat, 1981; Green & Harker, 1982; Kantor, 1988; Puro & Bloome, 1987). These meanings, then, can shape behaviors in the classroom setting.

Green & Wallat (1981), for example, found in a study on group membership that teacher and students construct instructional and social contexts through conversational and social action rules. From this they found that rules existed for group membership (i.e., group membership involves responsibility for: signalling cues for attentiveness; enacting different patterns of responses; for being a group member involves cooperative effort).

Kantor (1988), as another example, found that students learned about group language by using language in a study of how students became students in preschool. In this case, while believing that groups (i.e., circle time) looked similar across the preschool to K-1 level, circle time became constructed in each occurrence (i.e., teacher sitting on floor; teacher sitting on chair; beginning with singing; no singing), and thus the behaviors of the students changed in each instance.
In a study called "Where's the floor?," Shultz, Florio, and Erickson (1982) show that "differing expectations about communicative etiquette are a major reason for young children to be judged by teachers as misbehaving." The children involved in this study came from different cultural populations than the teacher, and thus their cultural actions were misinterpreted as misbehaving. In this case, the children had different interactional patterns in the home than what was called for at school, did not know or understand the behavioral expectations for classroom participation (i.e., raising hands), which then resulted in inappropriate participation structures in the school setting.

These three examples serve to indicate that through interactions/communication, classroom behavior gets socially constructed. And as classroom cultures have patterned ways of acting, perceiving, believing, and evaluating (Goodenough, 1971), the ways in which people perceive and act in situated situations are also constructed through the interactions occurring in a particular setting. These studies often entail using anthropological perspectives (i.e., sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication) and can thus be based in cognitive and symbolic anthropology (as a branch from cognitive anthropology) as presented in the first section of this chapter.
Over time, studies in these perspectives have provided foundational premises from which everyday life in schools and classrooms can be conceptualized within this social constructivist perspective. While the studies are not described in the presentation of these premises, provided is the foundational knowledge that each study has concluded. These premises are presented on the following three pages (Table 1; pp. 50-52), and lead to the assumptions with which I enter a study (Table 2; pp. 53-54).

(6) Curriculum as a Socially Interpreted Process

The areas explored in the above sections provide a foundation from which to view curriculum as conceptualized in and for this study. This viewpoint, however, yet while still emerging, is not without substantiation. Measor (1984), for example, in a study of student perception of subject status, asserts that teachers and students have a role in defining the curriculum in the classroom setting. The point she makes is that through interaction, neither teachers nor students "just receive and digest what is handed out from above (p.201)." Rather, they negotiate and affect the curriculum through interactions in the classroom setting.

Along this line, Berman (1987) states that the classroom setting integrates curriculum and instruction through dynamic and interactive constructed learning as
Table 1

PREMISES ON THE NOTION OF THE CONSTRUCTED LIFE IN SCHOOLS

* School is a social setting where people construct and conduct daily life together (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990).

* The nature of classrooms is a social system where we can locate the place, role, and influence of language on what occurs there and the outcomes or products of such life (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990).

* The classroom, before students and teachers enter, is simply a room in a place called "school." Knowing that it is a room in a school marks it in our culture as a room with special purposes (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990).

* This common cultural knowledge also leads to expectations about:
  * the types of materials that will be there (artifacts);
  * the roles and relationships, rights and obligations, and norms and expectations of the members of the classroom (the actors/participants);
  * the ways in which time will be scheduled (the rituals and routines) (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990);
  * the ways in which space will be organized (Spradley, 1980);
  * the types of events that can and will occur;
  * and the types of outcomes that will be generated (Spradley, 1980).

* To be able to interpret what occurs within any given classroom requires an understanding of that classroom as a mini society with norms and expectations, rights and obligations, and roles and relationships for its members (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990).

* A classroom must be conceived of as a social system in which life is constructed over time by members interacting with and building on each other's actions, intentions, and messages (Gumperz, 1981).
* Such life becomes patterned over time as routines and rituals develop, events recur, norms become established, and a common set of expectations and common language develops for doing life.

* Individuals within the classroom society are also simultaneously members of other social groups, each of which has its own ways of doing life (Erickson & Mohatt, 1982; Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990; Phillips, 1972; Shultz, Florio, & Erickson, 1982).

* Participation in classrooms, verbally and nonverbally, is influenced not only by what students learn to expect and do in that setting but also by the expectations they bring from other settings (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990).

* Schooling involves more than life in a single classroom. During their educational careers, students will be members of a variety of classrooms, each with its own norms and expectations, rights and obligations, and roles and relationships for participating and demonstrating knowledge in and through language and social actions (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990).

* Students bring to each new classroom sets of expectations for participating, demonstrating group membership, and interpreting life (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990).

* Culture in classrooms is not a predictable or given entity. It is a dynamic, unfolding, constructed product of the patterned ways of perceiving, believing, acting, and evaluating that develop over time (c.f., Goodenough, 1971) in that classroom (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990).

* Culture is created by people as part of their ordinary actions and is similar to language in that it is learned and constructed in the doing (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990).

* All classrooms have unique cultural characteristics as well as characteristics in common with other classrooms (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990; Kantor, 1988).

* Different patterned ways of life develop and along with them different requirements for participation that lead to differences in learning (Edwards & Furlong, 1978; Green, Weade, & Graham, 1988; Kantor, 1988; Marshall, 1987; Marshall & Weinstein, 1988; Phillips, 1972; Shultz, Florio, Erickson, 1982).
* In each classroom, language use will be elicited, supported, or constrained in different ways and that these ways influence what teachers and observers see as "language or communicative competence" (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990).

* Language that is produced in these contexts, then, reflects the social life that has been constructed and may not reflect the "competencies of individuals" (DeStefano, Pepinsky, & Sanders, 1982).

* Some aspects of life in classrooms become stable over time but other aspects evolve in the doing. In other words, participants cannot know what events will look like or require until they occur (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990).
Table 2
ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING A SOCIAL INTERACTION PERSPECTIVE
(adapted from Green, 1983a, 1983b)

CLASSROOMS ARE COMMUNICA'TIVE ENVIRONMENTS:
* Differentiation of roles exist between teachers and students
* Relationships between teachers and students are asymmetrical
* Differential perceptions of events exist between teachers and students
* Classrooms are differentiated communicative environments
* Communicative participation affects student achievement

CONTEXTS ARE CONSTRUCTED DURING INTERACTIONS:
* Activities have participation structures
* Contextualization cues signal meaning
* Rules for participation are implicit
* Behavior expectations are constructed as part of interaction

MEANING IS CONTEXT SPECIFIC:
* All instances of a behavior are not equal
* Meaning is signalled verbally and nonverbally
* Contexts constrain meaning
* Meaning is determined by and extracted from observed sequences of behavior
* Communicative competence is reflected in appropriate behavior

INFERENCING IS REQUIRED FOR CONVERSATIONAL COMPREHENSION:
* Frames of reference guide participation
* Frame clashes result from differences in perception
* Communication is a rule-governed activity
* Frames of reference are developed over time
* Form and function in speech used in conversations do not always match
TEACHERS ORCHESTRATE DIFFERENT PARTICIPATION LEVELS:

* Teachers evaluate student ability by observing performance during interactions
* Demands for participation co-occur with academic demands
* Teachers signal their theory of pedagogy by their behavior (verbal and nonverbal)
* Teacher's goals can be inferred from behaviors

STUDENTS HAVE AN ACTIVE ROLE IN KNOWLEDGE CONSTRUCTION:

* Students interpret academic and social requirements through observations of teacher-student, student-student, and student-group interactions (Collins, 1990)
* Students are simultaneously part of teacher-student culture and peer culture (Bloome & Theodorou, 1988)
* Students influence the direction of lesson
* The ways in which students participate depends on their standing in the peer culture as well as the teacher demands (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990; Bloome & Theodorou, 1988; Fernie & Kantor, 1990)
multilayered meanings are constantly being interpreted and reconstructed. Also, King (1986) states that all the aspects of the participants in the classroom setting interacting and engaging with the environment and each other become labeled as the resulting curriculum.

Interpretive, constructivist studies done in the area of curriculum has illustrated that the curriculum as well as the type of class itself holds particular meanings for the participants in the setting. Burgess (1984), for instance, illustrated that students in a non-academic class perceived the class as unimportant. As a result of their perceptions and interpretations that the class was unimportant, the students became discipline problems. Thus, the curriculum in this classroom was defined as unimportant and the students reacted accordingly.

While these studies are summative, they help illustrate what the above conceptions of cognitive and symbolic anthropology, curriculum, instruction, social construction, and curriculum planning and development can look like when combined. On a more visual level, however, Table 3 provides a synopsis of each perspective and illustrates more clearly how, when all the perspectives are combined and synthesized, curriculum becomes a socially interpreted process.

Table 3, for example, provides the primary purposes, assumptions, types of questions asked, methodology, and criticisms of each of the perspectives discussed in this
chapter. Upon reading the chart across, from left to right, and understanding the premises of each perspective, it becomes obvious that the "Curriculum as an Interpreted Process" section is constructed from many of these premises.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Anthropology</th>
<th>Symbolic Anthropology</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Research on Teaching</th>
<th>Classrooms As Communicative</th>
<th>Curr. Planning &amp; Development</th>
<th>Curr. as an Interpreted Pr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Meaning</td>
<td>* Develop Universal</td>
<td>* Purpose &amp; ends</td>
<td>* Teacher-</td>
<td>* Classrooms as</td>
<td>* Develop document to guide</td>
<td>* Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category Sys.</td>
<td>of Education</td>
<td>effectiveness</td>
<td>socially constructed</td>
<td>course of study</td>
<td>Combine theory and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Adequate description</td>
<td>* Equity issues</td>
<td>* Time-on-task</td>
<td>* Understand supports and/or</td>
<td>* Implementation &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>Classroom context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to get adequate</td>
<td>* Look at nature of</td>
<td>* Student</td>
<td>* constraints of learning</td>
<td>* Plans to organize learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comparisons</td>
<td>school on a</td>
<td>outcomes</td>
<td>* Understand</td>
<td>experiences &amp; sequencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>across culture</td>
<td>global level</td>
<td></td>
<td>class as lived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>* Meaning (culture) is in the head</td>
<td>* Learning occurs in all classrooms</td>
<td>* Teaching behavior effect st. outcomes</td>
<td>* Meanings and actions are socially constructed</td>
<td>* Learning occurs through transmission model</td>
<td>* Curr. is socially constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Culture is rules for participation</td>
<td>* Equity can be obtained</td>
<td>* Time spent on subject impact</td>
<td>* Rules for participation can be accessed through language</td>
<td>* Evaluation can show learning occurred</td>
<td>* Meaning (culture) is in the head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Questions Asked</td>
<td>* What are the meanings held by the participants?</td>
<td>* Knowledge for what purpose?</td>
<td>* How do kids get socialized?</td>
<td>* What Ed. goals should schools seek?</td>
<td>* What are the status, perception of subject status?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* What are the rules for participation?</td>
<td>* What knowledge is of most worth?</td>
<td>* Who does what with whom, when, where, under what conditions for what purpose, with what outcomes?</td>
<td>* How can learn, experiences be selected that are likely to obtain objectives?</td>
<td>* How is your constructed during classroom life?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Lexeme</td>
<td>* What is a human family?</td>
<td>* How do kids get socialized?</td>
<td>* What Ed. goals should schools seek?</td>
<td>* What are the status, perception of subject status?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Psychological validity</td>
<td>* What knowledge is most worth?</td>
<td>* How do kids get socialized?</td>
<td>* What Ed. goals should schools seek?</td>
<td>* What are the status, perception of subject status?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Inductive</td>
<td>* Whose know is being taught?</td>
<td>* How do kids get socialized?</td>
<td>* What Ed. goals should schools seek?</td>
<td>* What are the status, perception of subject status?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Emic view</td>
<td>* How is knowledge reproduced?</td>
<td>* How do kids get socialized?</td>
<td>* What Ed. goals should schools seek?</td>
<td>* What are the status, perception of subject status?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique</td>
<td>* Lexeme as too narrow</td>
<td>* Experimental models (flow diagrams)</td>
<td>* Ethnog. of Communication</td>
<td>* Instructional models (flow diagrams)</td>
<td>* Meaning (culture) is in the head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Method as too technical</td>
<td>* Comparative questions</td>
<td>* Discourse analysis</td>
<td>* Discourse analysis</td>
<td>* Curr. as an Interpreted Pr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Domains not the same for everyone in the culture</td>
<td>* Interpretive perspectives</td>
<td>* Applied linguistics</td>
<td>* Applied linguistics</td>
<td>* Curr. as an Interpreted Pr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Meaning and symbol are definitionally problematic</td>
<td>* Participant observation</td>
<td>* Experimental studies for evaluation</td>
<td>* Experimental studies for evaluation</td>
<td>* Curr. as an Interpreted Pr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Subsumes instruction</td>
<td>* Correlational studies</td>
<td>* Participant observation</td>
<td>* Correlational studies</td>
<td>* Curr. as an Interpreted Pr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Too narrow/ micro</td>
<td>* Experiment</td>
<td>* Participant observation</td>
<td>* Correlational studies</td>
<td>* Curr. as an Interpreted Pr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Method too labor-intensive</td>
<td>* Instructional models (flow diagrams)</td>
<td>* Ethnog. of Communication</td>
<td>* Instructional models (flow diagrams)</td>
<td>* Curr. as an Interpreted Pr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Underlying Conceptions of Curriculum as a Socially Interpreted Process
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In research, as in conversation, we meet ourselves (Morgan, 1983; p. 405).

The principal aim of this study was to explore and describe the discrepancy between the planned, or intended curriculum and that which gets operationalized (Eisner, 1985), or the enacted curriculum. In order to better understand the nature of classroom curriculum, both planned and enacted, it was considered important by this researcher to obtain the perspectives and meanings held by the classroom participants, the teacher and students. In so doing, two objectives were accomplished.

First, as Eisner (1985) calls for more anthropologic perspectives in classroom curriculum research, this study met that call. Second, while curriculum has typically been seen as that which is imposed onto the classroom participants, this study examined the curriculum as being enacted in the classroom setting by the involved participants, and what that meant to them.
Four research questions guided the research process:

(1) How is curriculum defined in these classes?
   (1.1) How is curriculum defined by the teacher?
   (1.2) How is curriculum defined by the students?
   (1.3) What visual taxonomy can be constructed from these definitions?

(2) What is the enacted curriculum within and across these classes?
   (2.1) On what is time spent, in general, in each of the classes?
   (2.2) What is the nature of the event, Silent Reading Time, within and across each of the classes?
   (2.3) What is the nature of the event, Assignment Explanation, within and across each of the classes?

(3) What is the planned curriculum?
   (3.1) What is the nature of the planned events?

(4) What is the relationship between the planned curriculum and the enacted curriculum?
   (4.1) What is the nature of the events that were planned but were not enacted?
   (4.2) What is the nature of the events that were enacted but were not planned?
   (4.3) What is the comparison of the planned and the enacted events?

This chapter discusses the methods and procedures involved in the study, as well as the setting itself. Specifically, the purpose of this chapter is eight-fold. First, the design of the research, or how the research was realized, is presented and described. Second, the selection
of the research question and site are discussed. Third, entry and access issues into the research setting are examined. Fourth, the approaches used for the collection of raw data are explained. Fifth, the setting, or where the study took place, is depicted. Sixth, how the data was interpreted and what procedures were used for analysis of the interpreted data is provided. Seventh, limitations of the study are provided. And eighth, the effect of the research on the participants is given, through their own voices.

I. DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH

The approach used for this study was a sustained, observational, comparative, and interpretive study across three seventh-grade Reading classes. While other approaches were considered (i.e., naturalistic, critical), the anthropologic design was used because the naturally occurring interactive-reactive nature of the design was seen as an essential component for this study.

Through the interactive-reactive ability of ethnography (Zaharlick & Green, 1990), questions, inferences, theories, hypotheses, and approaches are all subject to self-correction (Hymes, 1982) as well as being modified, changed, extended, and/or refined. In fact, one of the criteria listed for what makes an ethnography "good" is that questions and hypotheses emerge in the field (Spindler,
This study, for example, initially began with the question, "How is curriculum constructed in the classroom?" After having worked in the classroom, this question changed to a more appropriate question ("How is curriculum defined in these classrooms?"), while encompassing other questions that also changed, etc., and was refined for better understanding.

Research designs follow some type of sequencing. Accordingly, sensible decisions are made as to how the study begins, what comes next, and so on until the results of the study are reported. In an ethnographic study, however and as in this study, the research pattern is a cyclical pattern (Spradley, 1980) rather than a linear progression. This cyclical pattern was chosen for this study as it adjusts for the interactive-reactive nature of ethnography, and thus provides continual feedback to help the ethnographer make informed decisions about the direction in which the study should proceed. This research cycle is loosely adopted from Spradley (1980) and involves the selection of the research purpose and location, the entry into the field, the collection of the data, the analyzing of the data, and the writing of the ethnography.

II. SELECTION OF THE RESEARCH QUESTION AND SITE

The first step in this research cycle was the selecting of a research question and a location in which to explore
that question. The initial question and purpose, how is curriculum constructed in the classroom setting, was selected initially for a conference paper. Since the question and purpose were already in place, the next step involved the research site. This was a more involved process for many reasons.

As a researcher I maintain that research and the research process should be beneficial for all the participants concerned. Beneficial, from this perspective, means that both parties must be involved in the doing, understanding, and presenting of the research. From this perspective then, the teacher involved must also view this project as beneficial and agree to the effort of maintaining a collaborative project. This meant that there need be "authentic" reasons¹ for the doing of the research so that communication between myself and the teacher could also be "authentic."

From this the collaborative process could be enhanced and the research could be beneficial for both parties. After the initial meeting, the teacher agreed to the study. Dates of entry into the classroom, school calendar and times, types of data collection, research equipment, and expectations were then discussed, and it was agreed that the data would be shared equally between the teacher and myself.
III. ENTRY AND ACCESS INTO THE RESEARCH SETTING

The issues of entry and access are important ones and are, thus, worth an extended discussion. They are important because, referring back to Morgan's (1983) quote, "In research, as in conversation, we meet ourselves" (p. 405), when examining the issues of entry and access, we come face-to-face with our own values and ethics.

But more than that, the value-laden decisions we make, as researchers, can have profound effects on the participants in our research (Ellen, 1984; Jorgensen, 1989; Spradley, 1980). Through such examination we are more apt to reflect on our practices. And while knowledge acquisition is beneficial, reflection on ourselves and our practices increases the worth of that knowledge (Morgan, 1983).

Entry and access into any field setting are never completely gained (Chandler, 1989, 1990; Weade, 1989, 1990; Zaharlick & Green, 1990). Instead, it seems that entry and access must be continually made at many different levels. The following discussion is an examination of the multiple layers of gaining entry and access into the field setting.

Gaining entry: Many books, particularly those from the area of anthropology or those dealing with qualitative research, that offer advice on how to enter the field (gain entry) and what types of adjustments will need to be made, do so from the perspective of researcher as researching in a
culture other than their own (i.e., Agar, 1980; Ellen, 1984; Pelto & Pelto, 1973; Spradley, 1979). These books also typically offer the advice that the researcher should research, to the extent possible, the available literature on the people that they are going to study, was well as learn the native language (i.e., Agar, 1980; Malinowski, 1922). Birdwhistell (1977), for example, states that a researcher "needs, insofar as it is available, knowledge of the cultural area to be studied and its surround, social and geographic" (p. 106).

Educational research can be considered as research "in our own backyard" in that one does not need to learn a "new" language, set up a tent, or embrace new customs in order to gain entry. Yet there is a language to/of education (its jargon), and there is certainly a unique way in which things are expected to get accomplished in the culture (i.e., Who should be first approached for entry into the field setting? Who should be formally approached for entry into the site?).

But here lies the danger. Since education in this country is mandated for every child, we have all, for the most part, attended school. We can, therefore, too easily believe that we are already "natives" to this culture of schooling and assume the insiders' perspectives.

I have spent some twenty years being a student in various school settings. I have also spent some fourteen years, both separate and simultaneous from studenting, as a
teacher in the public school system. When considering these years of experience, I initially considered myself a rather informed person of classroom culture when going to do research in a classroom setting. Even as informed as I was, however, and a "native" in many ways, difficulties in gaining entry still abounded:

* Who do I ask first for entry?
* Do I first ask a teacher?
* Do I go to the school district first?
* Do I try to find a friend who is a teacher that will let me in the back door?
* What about my ethics?
* What if the teacher says yes and the school district says no?
* What if the school district says yes and the teacher says no?
* When do I talk to the principal?

So, while it is easy to agree with those who state that we should know as much as possible in order to gain entry, the issue of access and gaining entry is vastly entwined with social values. And since educational researchers enter a social system (i.e., school, district, classroom) where individual people are involved in interrelationships, with individual histories and prior context that cannot be known until the researcher runs up against them (Chandler, 1989,
1990; Zaharlick & Green, 1990), what can be known \textit{a priori} will be limited.

\textbf{Access:} Gaining entry, however, is only one issue; access is another. Chagnon (1974), for example, lived with and studied the Yanamamo of South America for at least six months when he suddenly discovered that the "natives" were deliberately lying to him when answering his questions. So while he had formally "gained entry" into the field setting in that he was allowed to live among and observe the natives, he had not gained "access" to the knowledge of the individuals in that culture.

Wax (1971) speaks of the issue of access in two ways: (1) that of \textit{immersion} (p. 42) into a culture, and/or (2) that of \textit{becoming a member} (p. 42) of a culture. Wax also distinctly separates the notions of access and entry:

Perhaps, illusion though it is, the conviction that fieldworkers [are] "in" may serve as a crutch and comfort during the initial period when [they] must sometimes live in an almost total social limbo. Later, when [they] become more genuinely "involved," [they] can dispense with illusions and accept the fact that [they] [are] and will always remain a non-native.

But [they] cannot, by [their] own will and determination alone, immerse [themselves] in another living group or society. If [they] manage to squeeze, step, or even dip into a group of living people, it is because the people who are already there invite or let [them] in or, at least, move over and give [them] a place to stand. Immersion or stepping into, or becoming a member of, a society or culture of living people is always a \textit{joint} process, involving numerous accommodations and adjustments by both the fieldworkers and the people who "accept" [them] (pp. 42-43).
So while entry may have been gained into a classroom, for example, access may not have been granted to the teacher's gradebook, curriculum guide, or lesson plans. Even if entry has been gained into a teacher's gradebook, however, without the teacher's explanation of what the grading symbols mean, access will be limited.

But a researcher does not just gain entry into a field setting and then access the local knowledge. Entry and access, rather, are continual and evolving issues at every step and phase of a research project (Weade, 1990a, 1990b). To further illustrate these concerns, Figure 1 (p. 68) displays a taxonomy of entry and access issues as viewed from the concerns of those represented in the literature. The remainder of this discussion considers the complexity of entry and access issues, decisions made for gaining entry and access, and the consequences of those decisions in the field setting used for this particular study.

Gaining formal approval: While the teacher in this study had consented to the research, for example, formal approval had to be obtained from the school district. A proposal was thus submitted to the school district. I had been told that proposals took approximately three weeks to approve. After two months of waiting, I asked the reason for the delay. The answer was a surprise.

The teacher in this study worked in a school district in close proximity to the university in which both I and the
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teacher attended. As such, the university granted fee waivers to the school district in return for granting permission for research studies, placement of student teachers, etc., that took place in the district. Fee waivers were then given to the school district's teachers and administrators to pursue graduate education, tuition-free. While my proposal had been approved by the school district board of directors five weeks prior, the school district was waiting for their fee waivers from the university.

After two months of waiting, approval was granted (the fee waivers had been granted), and entry into the school setting was formally obtained. Entry, in this case, had little to do with the formal proposal. While I had thought that my proposal had been subject to close scrutiny and split votes, the actuality was entirely different.

**Entering the classroom setting:** Formal entry then had to be made into the classroom setting. In this case, neither the teacher nor the students involved in the study were accustomed to having a researcher or any of the research equipment in the classroom. The first few days of the data collection consequently created disruptions. The teacher, for example, took time out of the schedule to talk about the equipment, myself, and the study. The students were naturally curious about "being on camera," and asked to
see the video of themselves, waved into the camera, and tripped over the electrical cord.

**Gaining permission for interviewing:** Entry also had to be made at the time of each interview. The students, for example, could not just be taken out of class to interview. Approval had to be given by the teacher for each interview and students had to be selected. Due to ever-changing factors such as one student being absent too much or another having too low of grades, a decision was made to let the teacher choose the student/s to be interviewed.

**Accessing student knowledge:** After many days in the field, and after many interviews, it was easy to think that gaining entry was no longer an issue. However, this was not the case. As was my procedure with concluding an interview, I asked the students if they had any questions. One student asked me if the teacher and I liked each other or not. Since I was surprised at the question, I asked why this was a concern. I was told that since the class never saw us speaking with each other, they had concluded that we did not like each other, and therefore, the students were apprehensive in talking to me during the interviews.

Indeed, the teacher and I had agreed to not talk to each other during classes in order to create the least obtrusion possible; nor was there time. The depth of the interviews changed dramatically after this discovery, however, and the students became eager to participate in the
interviews. Also changed was that the teacher and I began to engage in some talk between periods and during class times so as to demonstrate acceptance.

Gaining access to the curriculum document: Since the study in this classroom was on curriculum (planned and enacted), I frequently asked for lesson plans, school documents related to curriculum, and the district's curriculum document that typically guides the teacher's planning across the school district. From the first meeting with the teacher, I was told that there was no such curriculum document, but that one would go into effect in the fall of 1991.

Since I had never experienced or heard of a school district that functioned without a curriculum document, I was stunned. After being in a few college classes with the teacher, and knowing her exactness for detail, I did not question the response. I did, however, keep asking about the curriculum document in following interviews only to get the same response.

Several months passed, the research observation ended, analysis was being completed, and one last meeting with the teacher was occurring before the field assignment was completed. This meeting was to serve as a findings-triangulation with the teacher. In other words, I showed her the findings and analysis and she agreed, disagreed, and so on. As I was explaining the differences between the
planned curriculum and the enacted curriculum, the teacher stated: "Wouldn't it be interesting to compare these against the curriculum document?" I responded that I thought there was no curriculum document. The teacher said, "Sure. But we call it a course of study." For nine months I did not gain access to the curriculum document because I had called it by a different name than the district. To further illustrate these entry and access issues as they occurred during the course of this study, Figure 2 (p. 73) displays a taxonomy of the issues involved within this study.

Entry and access in each of these cases is connected to the effect of the research study on the involved participants. Because this became such an issue on many different levels during the research process, a concern emerged as to the effect of the research on the involved participants, and was thus added to the study in the way of a discussion. This discussion occurs at the end of this chapter.
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IV. DATA COLLECTION

Multiple field methods were used in the collection of data for this study. The purpose of using multiple methods is so that: (1) multiple views and levels of classroom life can be obtained, (2) triangulation of methods can occur, and (3) researcher biases can be limited and contained. A data collection and analysis schedule is presented in Table 4 (p. 75).

Participant observation, in this study, served as the first level of data collection. Spradley (1980) states that participant observation in a social situation, such as classrooms, has two purposes: "(1) to engage in activities appropriate to the situation; and (2) to observe the activities, people, and physical aspects of the situation" (p. 54). In this study participant observation was an internal feature, and in place to guide the direction of the study and the use of the field methods.

Video and audio recordings were obtained at each visit to the classroom setting. The video camera was positioned in the left rear corner of the classroom, was operated by myself, and captured most of the classroom talk. The audio recorder, however, was the primary device used in this study.

Since the audio recorder was so important, the teacher involved agreed to carry the audio recorder around the classroom during each period. The purpose for this
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Data Collection and Analysis Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. - May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School site select.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings w/ Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining permission from S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part. Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA ANALYSIS (Phase I &amp; II)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event comparison across periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. - May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part. Obser.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1989</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEP</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHASE I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. - May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School site select.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings w/ Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining permission from S.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td>x-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part. Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA ANALYSIS (Phase I &amp; II)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event comparison across periods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. - May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part. Obser.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
procedure was three-fold: (1) it better helped to obtain classroom talk as it occurred since the teacher walked around the classroom a great deal and the video-camera was stationary in the left rear corner of the classroom; (2) it helped to capture a different picture of classroom talk as it occurred in the classroom - a different view than the video camera, and especially when the teacher talked on a one-to-one basis with students; and (3) to back-up the video camera in case of malfunction. Duplicate copies of each audio and video recording were given to the teacher.

Interviews were conducted often, but with no formally set schedule. Students were interviewed formally and informally in groups of three, in groups of two, and singularly. On an informal basis, the students were asked questions while working in small groups or by themselves. The students were selected by the teacher for all interviews. On a formal basis, students were interviewed in a vacant classroom or office in the school. The teacher was also interviewed often, both informally, during and between class periods, and formally.

Fieldnotes were another method of collecting data. In this study, fieldnotes were used to keep a running record of events in the classroom, maps of the physical structure, seating charts of the class, and clock-time when noticeable events occurred in each class.
The only documents obtained for this study were the assignment handouts that the students received, a copy of the teacher's year-end grade record, and a copy of the curriculum guide (course of study).

V. FOCUS OF THE OBSERVATION

Units of observation

If you want to understand what a science is, you should look in the first instance not at theories or its findings...; you should look at what the practitioners of it do (Geertz, 1973; p. 5).

This study involved the data collection and data analysis of two separate observation periods. The first phase of observation covered the last quarter of a school year. In this phase data were collected across a period of three months from three seventh-grade Reading classes taught by the same teacher. These classes covered the first three periods of the school day.

The second phase of observation covered the first quarter of the next school year. In this phase data were again collected across a period of three months from two seventh-grade Reading classes taught by the same teacher, who was also the teacher for the first phase of the research. These classes covered the first two periods of the school day.
Setting

The research for this dissertation was conducted in three seventh-grade classrooms in a large suburban school district in central Ohio. The school district is in an upper-middle class socioeconomic community, and the population is predominately white anglo-saxon American; very few minorities live in the community. This school district was financially solvent during the 88-89 school year. Yet, while school district levies were passed during the summer, this school district is currently $700,000 in debt with a $3.4 million debt proposed for the 90-91 school year.

The junior high in which the research was conducted is one of three junior high schools in the district. This particular junior high was the second one in the district and was built in the early 1960s. Currently, 1400 students attend this school. There are also two high schools and 13 elementary schools in the district, including one alternative elementary school specializing in computers and language arts for gifted students.

Population involved in the study

The students involved in this study ranged in ages 12-14 years old. Classes in both phases of the study were heterogenous in make-up and consisted of no more than 30 students per class, as specified by union contract. Names
have been withheld for those students who were interviewed for this study.

The teacher involved in this study has taught for 11 years, all of which have been in this school district. The first five years of the teacher's experience was at the high school level teaching such courses as journalism, reading, Junior and Senior advanced composition, American literature, sophomore and freshman English. For the past six years, the teacher in this study has taught 7th grade Reading in the junior high in which this study took place.

VI. DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

The analysis procedures adopted for this study can best be described as an analysis process in search of patterns. While this is true in all research analysis, the theoretical framework that guides the finding of those patterns is what differs across perspectives. For this comparative study, the theoretical frame was an anthropological framework that was guided by Spradley's (1980) cultural domains and dimensions of a social situation. The more specific description of the analysis procedures is best described within each research question.

Question 1: How is curriculum defined in these classes?

Question 1.1: How is curriculum defined by the teacher?
Question 1.2: How is curriculum defined by the students?

Question 1.3: What visual taxonomy of curriculum can be constructed from these definitions?

Since from my perspective contextualization and understanding, or a sense of "being there," are highly important and critical elements of any study, "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) is used in the first two sections of this question. This means, simply, that interview transcripts are provided in an interpretive format to illustrate and contextualize better the participants and their activities into this particular setting and study.

Emic, or insider, perspectives from the teacher and the students were gained from formal (scheduled, private sessions) and informal (candid, in class questions) interviews. These interviews occurred across the six months of classroom observation and encompassed a minimum of seven formal interviews with the teacher, and included a minimum of 45 formal student interviews. All the interviews were audio recorded, and transcriptions of the talk were made from the recordings. After the transcriptions were made from the audio recordings, a taxonomy was constructed from the domain analysis of the definitions supplied by the teacher and students.

Domain analysis, adopted from Spradley (1980), involves the exploring of relationships. Since these research questions are primarily definitive ones, using a domain
analysis helps to illustrate the multiple layers of curriculum definition within these classes. In the doing of the domain analysis, raw data was used from the transcribed teacher and student interviews and involved exploring the following types of relationships:

Table 5
Domain Analysis:
An Example of Types of Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X is a kind of Y</th>
<th>Lesson 1 is a type of curriculum event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X takes place in Y space</td>
<td>Silent Reading Time occurred at the students' desks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X occurred in Y time</td>
<td>Silent Reading Time took 20 minutes at the start of class period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X is composed of Y participants</td>
<td>Nine students took part in this lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X took place for Y purpose</td>
<td>Lesson 1 is a small group discussion about the structure of a short story</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data and analysis triangulation was then conducted with the teacher in order to fill in any discrepancies and/or find any divergences from the definition. At this level, triangulation was not done with the students. This was so because the students, at the point of data analysis, were then in eighth grade and no longer available for questioning or triangulation.
Question 2: What is the enacted curriculum within and across these classes?

Question 2.1: On what is time spent, in general, in each of the classes?

Question 2.2: What is the nature of the event, Silent Reading Time, within and across each of the classes?

Question 2.3: What is the nature of the event, Assignment Explanation, within and across each of the classes?

Event maps (Erickson & Shultz, 1981; Green & Meyer, 1990) provide a way of examining how time was spent in each class and across classes (see Figure 3 & Figure 4; pp. 84-85). The purpose of the event maps is to provide a macro structure framework that delineates the classroom events by time segments. Through viewing the classroom events when broken down by time spent on each, the following types of questions can be explored and examined:

* when did class begin?
* when did class end?
* when did event begin?
* When did event end?
* what was time spent on within and across each class?
* what events did students have an opportunity to engage in within and across each class?
* through length of time spent on activity, what became important (on what was more time spent)?

The event maps are taken from video tapes, audio tapes, and fieldnotes. Fifty-one video tapes (and thus, 51 class
periods) were watched in order to gain a sense of such things as when events occurred, when events changed, and what events occurred. Audio tapes were used as a back-up source when the video tapes had not succeeded in acquiring classroom talk or activity. Fieldnotes were extremely important in this part of the analysis, for they provided actual classroom "clock-time" (i.e., the actual time the school bells rang, when announcements began and ended, when the teacher began and ended class). Figure 3 (p. 84) illustrates how the event maps were drawn up for use in this study. Figure 4 (p. 85) illustrates how one event map appears when completed.

From this level a researcher can then make a decision on what next to explore for a more in-depth view, and thus examine more closely the "nature" of the event. The nature of the event, in this study, is defined as a more in-depth examination of a particular phenomenon in order to provide a more detailed picture of what the event actually looks like, or display what is actually occurring.

In this study, for example, a decision was made to further explore two events: "Silent Reading Time" and "Assignment Explanation." These particular events were selected for a more in-depth exploration because they were the two more frequently occurring events both across time and in the amount of time spent on these events within classroom periods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHART:</th>
<th>DAY:</th>
<th>CLASS LENGTH:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clock Time</td>
<td>Lapse Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3

Event Map: Blank Form
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clock Time</th>
<th>Lapse Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Time %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:35a.</td>
<td>2 min.</td>
<td>Handing out workbooks</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:37a.</td>
<td>18 min.</td>
<td>Silent Reading Time Disasters Reading Time</td>
<td>(39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:55a</td>
<td>2 min.</td>
<td>Log update/explanation</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:57a</td>
<td>3 min.</td>
<td>Returning Assignments #3 &amp; #4</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00a</td>
<td>7 min.</td>
<td>Grade Explanation of Assignment</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:07a</td>
<td>8 min.</td>
<td>Small Group Directions</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15a</td>
<td>4 min.</td>
<td>Small Group work</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:19a</td>
<td>2 min.</td>
<td>Clean-up</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4
Event Map
Question 3: What is the planned curriculum?

Question 3.1: What is the nature of the planned events (daily class schedule)?

In this question, the daily class schedule and the planned events are illustrated in terms of: (1) types of activities planned (i.e., academic, procedural, graded), (2) content and presentation of the daily class schedule (i.e., what it consisted of and how it was presented to the students), and (3) a comparison of the relationships between the types of planned events.

In order to examine the types of activities planned, the teacher's lesson plans, or the daily class schedule was used. This was easily accessed as the teacher placed this schedule/plan on the front blackboard everyday. The following is an example of the daily schedule/lesson plan:

Table 6
Daily Class Schedule: An Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Selection: Step I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Topic Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Time/Reading Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The daily schedules from 49 class periods were examined. This was done by first categorizing the schedules into two types of event areas: academic and procedural (see question 1 for further definition). In Table 6, for example, six events were planned of which three were academic (Reading Time, Work Time/Reading Time, and Additional Topic Info) and three were procedural (Log update, Return papers, Topic Selection: Step I). Each of the events listed on the daily schedules was categorized according to the teacher's definition of academic and procedural. The planned events were then examined across the entire 49 periods (over time) and within periods (a comparison of periods 1, 2, and 3).

Question 4: What is the relationship between the planned curriculum and the enacted curriculum?

Question 4.1: What is the nature of the events that were planned but were not enacted?

Question 4.2: What is the nature of the events that were enacted but were not planned?

Question 4.3: What is the comparison of the planned and the enacted events?

This question examines the nature of the planned curriculum (as provided in question 3) in contrast to the nature of the enacted curriculum. This question also explores the types of events (i.e., academic, graded, procedural) that had been planned but did not get enacted,
the **types** of events that got enacted but were not planned, and a comparison of the nature of each.

While the planned curriculum was taken from the teacher's daily schedule, the enacted curriculum was taken directly from the event maps (see question 2 for greater detail). These were then placed side by side according to matching classroom periods and dates. Each of the events taken from the enacted curriculum were then categorized in the same fashion the planned curricular events were categorized in question 3. In other words, each of the enacted events were categorized into academic or procedural areas. An example of the contrasting curricula is as follows:

Table 7

Contrasting the Planned and the Enacted Curricula:
An Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period 1</th>
<th>(4-12-89)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned Curriculum</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enacted Curriculum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Schedule</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chart 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Time</td>
<td>Handing out Workbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disasters</strong> #2 Turned-in?</td>
<td>SRT &amp; Disasters Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, Review &amp; Answer ?s</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log update</td>
<td>Log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect Homework</td>
<td>Returning Assigns. #3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return papers</td>
<td>Assign. grade explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>Small group directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read <strong>Ship</strong> Chap. 3</td>
<td>Small group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From such a layout of events an examination was then done of those events that were planned but did not get enacted. An example of this is evident in Table 7. "Read Ship Chap. 3," for example, is an illustration of a planned event that did not get enacted - in other words, it does not occur under the enacted column ("Chart 4" refers to those events that were enacted). This is also true in reverse. From this layout, for example, those events that were enacted but were not planned can be seen. An illustration of this is also evident in Table 7. Under the enacted events, for example ("Chart 4"), it can be seen that "Small group directions" occurred but were not planned.

VII. LIMITATIONS OF THE DESIGN

As an ethnographic study being enacted in three consecutive school periods of a reading class taught by one teacher, there are certain limitations to the types of questions that can be examined and/or answered. First, the study is topic centered. Thus, the study must be situated in the local group of the three reading classes. Hence, this study cannot cross into other subject areas in terms of curriculum. For example, as the specific nature of each of the three classrooms is seen, the general elements that can cross the three classrooms will emerge. However, these general elements that become the generic across the three classrooms can only remain as the generic across other
reading classrooms. Thus, the first limitation is one of situational and discipline (Reading in the seventh grade) specific issues. Erickson (1977), however, states that in the specific can be seen the generic.

Second, since the study occurs only inside the three classrooms, and is a topic-centered ethnography rather than in a broader context of school-wide, there can be no identification of outside factors that might influence the day-to-day life of the classroom setting, students, and/or teacher. In other words, the prior contexts of each of the participants in the study cannot be examined in this study. The only historicity that can occur will be that of the classroom setting itself.

Third, ethnography explores what happens as people interact in everyday life. It does not provide a view of what occurs in-the-head. Therefore, cognition or the cognitive processes involved in learning cannot be explained.

VIII. THE EFFECT OF THE RESEARCH ON THE PARTICIPANTS

Classroom research, even under the best of conditions, seems to be distracting, disruptive, and perplexive. The beginning days of this study, for example, certainly were pensive ones. And while the teacher and the students involved in this study seemed, over time and across the research process, to come to accept as normal, everyday
procedure, myself and the research equipment, a concern emerged as to the impact of the research on the involved participants. The concern, however, was not that of the teacher's or students'. It was, rather, a concern of mine, and indeed, one in which I was directly responsible since I had initiated the research in the first place.

Rather than discuss this concern solely from the researcher's perspective, the following description provides a space for the teacher's and students' voices and concerns to be heard on how the research effected them. These "voices" occurred over time during the entire research process through single or group interviews (formal and informal). The purpose of this discussion is to illustrate, through the participants' voices, how and what effects of the research occurred and changed across the research process. One interesting frame for the reader to consider is the teacher's growing acceptance, if not celebration of the research by the end of the process. [T = Teacher's voice; St = Student's voice; R = Researcher's voice.]

Week One - Informing the students

At the onset of the research, the teacher and I had agreed to be available to all student questions about the research. Also planned were: (1) that the teacher introduce the researcher and the reason for the research in general, and (2) to answer any student questions that
subsequently arose. For reasons of time constraints, the teacher was unable to introduce me (researcher) or the research itself to the class. The teacher did, however, discuss the research and researcher with the students on the first day the researcher was not in the classroom. Since the equipment was also not in use that day, the description of the research and researcher to the students, as well as the students' responses, are told through the teacher's voice.

T: I figured that they needed to know what was going on and they needed to know how I felt about it. It was better to just tell them, "Look guys, I don't want to talk about it because it makes me really nervous. And I know the first day, boy, it was really, really getting to me."

It was really fascinating to see the different questions in the different classes and to see how much they believed me when I said to them things like, "Look guys, if I really want to use this to get you I have better ways. I can have your parents come in and watch you." And at that point they all howled [laughter]. And they asked a lot of questions like, "What was I studying?" "Why was I taking courses?" "Why did I want to do this?" And I reintroduced you even though you weren't here and talked about why you were here. There were
people in third period who said they didn't know the video was on and I said, "Well, would you have acted any differently if you had?" And they said, "Yeah, we would have waved in the camera more."

Effect of the Research Process on the Students

Throughout the research, students were often interviewed. In these interviews, the students were always given an opportunity to ask questions about the research. While they had been told about the research at the beginning of it, the question most typically asked by the students was: "What is the purpose of this whole thing?" Except for occasions that caused the interviews to end early (when the bell rang), all but seven of the students interviewed (out of 52) asked that same question in similar forms (i.e., "Why are you doing this?" "What is this for?"). So, the effect of the research on the students seemed to remain on of confusion over not understanding the purpose of the research.

Effect of the Video camera on the Participants

After being in the classroom for seven days, the teacher stated that due to the positioning of the camera (left-rear corner of the classroom):

T: I purposefully avoid that part of the room [where the camera is located]. And, because I don't want
to overtly discipline students in front of the
camera, the students are chewing gum and getting
away with it.

Seven weeks later, the teacher looked back on this incident
and stated the following:

T: There were whole areas of the classroom I didn't
even use, and so I wonder what that meant to the
kids. I mean I don't think I got over to this area
[referring to camera area] near them to talk to
them. I didn't do any of that stuff. I think
there were areas of kids that I just didn't even
get near. I probably did bookchecks from the other
side of the room: "You got a book [said as if
talking to someone across the room]?" "Yeah, you
sure do (laughing)."

It is evident in the video tapes that this is indeed
the case - the teacher did, in fact, avoid that area of the
classroom. After the teacher brought this to both our
attention, however, according to her, she began to include
that part of the room back into her usual teaching patterns.

The video camera was also a source of much distraction
for the students, but usually only in-between periods, when
they were changing classes. At these times they would
typically wave into the camera, say "Hi Mom," and make
faces. At least this was my impression of the situation.
The teacher had another:
T: I saw young girls who would duck underneath [the camera] so that they wouldn't come face to face with being on camera while there were guys who would do just anything to get on the camera.

After being confronted with such a different notion of how the students were accepting the video camera, I referred back to the fieldnotes and found that the teacher had been correct. While several such notations were made, this entry is typical in its representation of students being distracted by the camera:

R: Sara is very distracted by the camera today. She keeps looking back at it as if trying to determine if it is focused on her.

This student, in fact, never seemed to have accepted the camera easily. Her attentions were often on the camera throughout the entire research process. In phase II of the data collection, however, and when the camera was in the room from the first day of the school year, the teacher commented that reactions to the camera were much less than in phase I, when the camera had been introduced during the last quarter of the school year.

Effect of the Audio Recorder on the Participants

While the teacher had agreed to carry the audio recorder, it also seemed to be obtrusive to her. At one point in the fieldnotes, for example, I ask:
R: How can I get the teacher to hold the audio recorder in front of her while she is talking to a student?

This referred to the occurrence that whenever the teacher approached students at their desks, she would typically hold the recorder in back of her with both hands, and none of the conversation could be obtained.

Once this was brought to the attention of the teacher, she made an effort to hold the audio recorder in front of her, between her and the student. This was not to be the end of the audio recorder problems, however. Once she became aware of this problem, she began to carry the audio recorder on top of a grade book, held in one arm. This positioning of the audio recorder often, and unknowingly, meant that the recorder's microphone (built-in) was rubbing against her clothing as she moved and breathed. As a result, little audio was obtained these times.

However, I stated in the fieldnotes:

R: The teacher is getting better at carrying recorder properly, but sometimes forgets to position the microphone correctly. But then, how much can I ask of a busy teacher?

While this situation improved over time, it is interesting to note that in the fieldnotes, on day seven, I mention:

R: The audio recorder seems to be less noticed now than the video. Students tend to ignore it.
But while I believed this to be true, the teacher had spoken with the class two days earlier and obtained this information:

T: This bothers them a lot [audio recorder]. A lot of people [students] ask about this. "Is that so you can hear what we're saying."

Effect of the Research on the Teacher

Towards the end of the data collection, the teacher and I had an interview session in which the effect of the research was discussed. In this section of transcript, the teacher is responding to a question asking how she felt/thought/believed/reacted about or to the research process:

T: I started to say something about it being mandatory in that it seems to me that it's very valuable for a practicing teacher. It let me refocus some of my own energy and I think I now do class somewhat different. I don't know that the general structure is different but I think I expect more of students and I think I ask them to be more responsible as opposed to getting answers from me or the text; to come up with answers for each other.

Research. Was it an intrusion? Whoooo, yes at first. Yeah, I think it was like a big intrusion. I even dressed better too for awhile because I was
real concerned about how I looked. I wanted to make sure I looked nice. So I would worry about prints and things. There were all sorts of things going on the first few weeks. The first few times I watched the tapes I was so focused on me that I wasn't seeing what was going on with the kids. And then when I started looking what was going on with the kids I almost got to the point I didn't even pay attention [to me] except when I was with a kid. I didn't pay attention so much with myself.

While the research had been initially intrusive to the teacher, as well as the students, the teacher, over time, came to accept the research as beneficial and found her own uses for the video tapes:

R: Do you think this research has helped you reflect more?

T: What I think I see a big difference in is the realization of how important student interaction is because I can see that on the tape. I can see kids. I can see their response differently. And I think that's made me then want to encourage that more. And so my activities are different and so the research has done a change in my teaching, I'm sure.

While I had concerns over issues of effects of the equipment, length of the research, or teacher change, the
teacher had transcended mere acceptance of the research and moved to a level of using it to help her to see her own classroom practice in action.
ENDNOTES

1. "Authentic" reasons for doing research call for relating theory to practice, understanding the relationships of practice and theory, and considering the influences of each for the other (Chandler, 1990).

2. Triangulation is a term typically used by sociologists indicating the use of multiple methods (Denzin, 1989; Polkinghorne, 1983). The purpose of using triangulation in this study is so that the data collected in one way (i.e., interview, video tape, audio tape) can be used to cross check the accuracy of data gathered in another way. Triangulation can also be done with the theories, data, investigators of a study, as well as the use of multiple methods (Denzin, 1989; Polkinghorne, 1983).

The word triangulation originates from the Greeks and continues on into our modern mathematics, as well as from geological survey and navigational methods of finding an unknown point by forming a triangle that has the two known points and the one unknown point as vertices (Denzin, 1989; Polkinghorne, 1983).

Triangulation allows for assessing the accuracy of conclusions drawn by triangulation with several sources of data, and assists in correcting observer biases that result when the observer and/or ethnographer is the only observer of the phenomenon under investigation.

3. The actual numbers of students across and within these three classes varied considerably due to factors such as a student's change in schedule (they either switched periods or teachers), a student moving out of the school area, or a student moving into the school area.

4. The names of all the students involved in this study have been changed for the sake of anonymity. The teacher's name has been excluded altogether.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

It seems to me that doing ethnography and reporting its results assumes some sort of organization or structuring of knowledge, however implicit or disguised that structure might be (Agar, 1980: p. 193).

Introduction

The general purpose of this study was to better understand the nature of classroom curriculum and how the curriculum came to be defined. This was done from the perspectives and meanings held by the classroom participants, the teacher and students. Since curriculum has typically been imposed on classroom participants in the form of objectives or accountability, the aim of this study was to examine the divergence of the planned and the enacted curriculum in order to help uncover reasons for this divergence.

The preceding chapters have provided a framework from which the rationale for and the conceptualization of: (1) curriculum as embedded in the activities that students have an opportunity to engage in, and (2) classroom curriculum as needing more research done from anthropological
perspectives. Four research questions guided the data collection and data analysis:

(1) How is curriculum defined in these classes?
   (1.1) How is curriculum defined by the teacher?
   (1.2) How is curriculum defined by the students?
   (1.3) What visual taxonomy can be constructed from these definitions?

(2) What is the enacted curriculum within and across these classes?
   (2.1) On what is time spent, in general, in each of the classes?
   (2.2) What is the nature of the event, Silent Reading Time, within and across each of the classes?
   (2.3) What is the nature of the event, Assignment Explanation, within and across each of the classes?

(3) What is the planned curriculum?
   (3.1) What is the nature of the planned events?

(4) What is the relationship between the planned curriculum and the enacted curriculum?
   (4.1) What is the nature of the events that were planned but were not enacted?
   (4.2) What is the nature of the events that were enacted but were not planned?
   (4.3) What is the comparison of the planned and the enacted events?

This chapter provides the findings from the data analysis relative to the questions presented. In order to make the presentation logical, the results will be presented in a question by question format and will incorporate some,
but not an exhaustive, discussion. An extended discussion of these findings and results is presented in chapter five.

Research Question 1

How is curriculum defined in these classes?

(1.1) How is curriculum defined by the teacher?

(1.2) How is curriculum defined by the students?

(1.3) What visual taxonomy can be constructed from these definitions?

The primary purpose of this study was to examine curriculum in the classroom setting. This first question, then, was to establish what the term "curriculum" meant and how it was perceived by the participants of the classroom setting. In other words, for this research question, an emic definition was gained.

In order to acquire the meanings and definitions held by the participants involved in this classroom study, transcripts were explored from four formal teacher interviews and 52 formal student interviews. This section of the presentation of results for research question one thus provides three levels of findings: (1) actual accounts of the teacher's and students' definitions, taken from the transcripts of the interviews, (2) a presentation of the domain analysis constructed from the definitions of the teacher's and students' accounts, and (3) a taxonomy of the curriculum assembled from the domain analyses.
The Teacher's and Students' Definition of the Curriculum

While the teacher knew and understood the term, "curriculum" was a new term to the students:

R: What is the curriculum in your classroom?
St: I don't know. What does curriculum mean?

So, in order to get the students' voices, then, the teacher's meaning of curriculum was first obtained, and then, from the teacher's terminology, the students were asked to elucidate on those events. Following are accounts of what the curriculum meant to the students and the teacher, within and across the classrooms, taken from interview transcripts [T = Teacher; ST = Student; R = Researcher].

These accounts are provided for two reasons: (1) that the reader may better see from what the domains were built, and (2) to place the three classrooms in a more "real" context. In other words, this section of transcript is to help provide the reader with what it means to be in these classrooms, from the meanings held by the teacher and students.

The voices are presented in a way as to portray a related whole, rather than fragmented pieces of conversation. All of the voices are presented as equal (i.e., no one voice is capitalized) so as not to dichotomize, delegitimate, or reify any one element. The
text provided is also done so as an aggregate, equal voice rather than a particular (other than a generic student and teacher/researcher differentiation). Thus, the transcriptions provide context into classroom life and some of the theories inherent within.

Reading Related Events:

R: Can you tell me, from these pages [referring to event maps] what you would classify as reading?

T: Okay. Silent reading time, hopefully, is reading.

R: What's the difference between reading in order to copy down the log - what's on the board and putting it in my notebook - as opposed to the kind of reading in silent reading?

T: Reading needs to be meaningful for it to be reading. You hope there's some understanding about the character's changes and their progress and what's happening to them.

Silent Reading Time:

R: But how do you know reading is going on. I can look at a paper; I can even move my eyes to look like I'm reading. How do you know?

T: There are times when I'm sitting in the room and I look up and you just know. You just feel. I mean people are actually turning pages. People actually have their eyes in their books. The more opportunity that I provide for students to interact, I think that we're going to be a lot better off. [So], I have silent reading time and which I really do think is valuable...interaction.

R: Does everybody read during Silent Reading Time?

ST: You can pretend to read but then you wouldn't, if you didn't have to answer the questions and then you'd have to go back and answer them and you might not get it done and then you won't get the points.
Reading Preparation:

R: Here you defined slide presentation as a form of reading in that it's the preparation of reading, is that right?

T: It's the necessary in this case. I think almost necessary foregrounding, comprehension building. The one thing that I find so exciting is handing out new books. The days I do book talks or read short selections from books. That's reading preparation, I guess, but they get so excited there's electricity in the air, and everybody wants a book. So that's the part that tells you that they're getting ready to read. There's an interactive thing, an understanding of additional identity. You might even have this epiphany where you go, "Oh wow, I understand that. I would have acted like that, too." I know what that character must feel like." Those kinds of things. So that's why with preparation things, or prereading things where we're going to do stuff as a class, you try to build some of those things in, "What would it be like to be Alan and be in that situation?"

Classwork:

ST: Classwork becomes homework if we don't finish it.

R: Do you have time to finish it?

ST: Yeah, you can finish in class if you don't talk much. She gives you time, we don't have that much written stuff.

ST: You can get through vocabulary, that's what she usually assigns.

Teacher Reading Aloud:

R: Why does your teacher read to you?

ST: I don't know, we read along in the book.

ST: To teach us good reading habits, I guess. I like it when she reads out loud.

R: How would her reading to you create good reading habits?

ST: You understand what she's reading.
R: Does she ask questions during it?

ST: Yeah, and she makes expressions during the reading, to make sure you remember the book.

Review:

ST: Vocabulary quizzes are easy cause she goes over them a lot - she reviews them. I don't know how many times, but it's a lot so she makes sure we learn it; and we do, so it works.

Graded Events

Homework:

T: copying down something from the board is following directions - is practicing organizational skills because then you have your logs organized and you have a list of your assignments that you check into your notebook sections.

ST: She explains the homework and how to do it. It's not hard if you listen and copy what's on the board. They're pretty easy, but she helps you along with them. She explains them. I'd say 96 percent you can figure out by yourself.

Quizzes/Tests:

ST: She gives us unit tests. She gives us question sheets everyday and she'll give us a big test on the whole thing when we're done.

ST: We have log quizzes over the log entry to make sure that we've copied it down.

T: The log is a school-wide phenomena. We have to do it, it's required by all teachers.

Reports:

ST: We give reports on the books that we read. They can be oral or written reports.

R: Which is harder, oral or written?

ST: It depends on the person. If you're shy you want to do a written. I just don't enjoy doing the orals, I get nervous during them. It's like the same thing. The only difference is written you have to write things in paragraph form, 5
paragraphs, and notecards you just have to write 5 notecards and you just have to read it off of them.

ST: We do time capsule reports. You're putting things in a shoe box about the people you're reading about. About that character - stuff about him you just put in the box. Important events from the story and then, you have to explain what each thing represents.

Housekeeping Events

Rules:

T: Directions for vocabulary - direction giving - that's another kind of housekeeping. I would assume because you can't get on to the stuff that needs to be done until people understand how to do it.

Paper Shuffle:

T: Housekeeping is an explanation of the day's schedule, and I collected notecards. Another housekeeping is log - that's not reading, that is definitely housekeeping - "Let's turn to your assignment sheet and write down the entries that are on the board so that you have a scheduled and you know what homework you're suppose to do and your parents can check and it's a school wide practice.

Announcements:

ST: We have to listen to all office announcements and we can't talk. When announcements come on, we have to listen and be quiet.

ST: It's important stuff, though.

Log:

R: What is a log?

ST: It's your assignment sheet and you write down the assignment she gives you by the date and how many points the assignment is worth and the assignment number. It's supposedly for your protection of your grade.
ST: She gives us a log, and you have to update it with everything she puts on the board because she has log checks to see if we're organized.

(2) Domain Analysis of Classroom Curricular Events

From the conversations and interviews conducted with the teacher and the students, domains were constructed that showed the relationships of events. In this question, two main domains were constructed: (A) the domain on Classroom Documents, and (B) the domain on Classroom Curriculum.

(A) The Classroom Documents

Figure 5 (p. 110) illustrates all the items that the teacher and students indicated were part of the Classroom Documents. This figure indicates that Classroom Documents were divided into three types: Text, the Course of Study, and the Curriculum Guide. While the students participated in the constructing of the Text domain, they were not able to contribute to the Course of Study or the Curriculum Guide domains. Text, in these classrooms, can be a written or an oral text.

The teacher in this classroom sees a difference in the Course of Study as compared to the Curriculum Guide, which is not yet in effect in this school district. As can be seen in the figure, the Course of Study divisions are the measurable events - the "skills to be taught using whatever activities." The Curriculum Guide, however, tells the
Figure 5

Domain of Classroom Documents
teacher which activities to use in order to accomplish the Course of Study.

(B) The Classroom Curriculum

Figure 6 (p. 112) shows the domains taken from the enacted curriculum, or those events that were accomplished within and across these classrooms. With the exception of "Teacher Reading Aloud," the terms used in these domains were the pre-labeled terms used within the classroom context by the teacher and the students to refer to events. "Teacher Reading Aloud" is a constructed term as it was never directly referred in the classes. As can be seen in this figure, the Classroom Curriculum was divided into 11 major categories from which many sub-divisions become included.

Each of the following figures, then, is a presentation of three of the major domain divisions, Silent Reading Time (Figure 7; p. 113), Reading Preparation (Figure 8; p. 114), and Housekeeping Events (Figure 9; p. 115), showing the sub-divisions within each. The terms used in the sub-divisions were not terms used in the classroom context, but are, rather, terms constructed to indicate types of event, to show what was occurring.
CLASSROOM CURRICULUM

Silent Reading Time
- Roll
- Books
- Bookcheck
- T. sitting to read
- T. talking w/ student
- T. writing on board
- T. reminding sts. to read
- Individual paper shuffle
- T. disciplining student/s
- Interruptions

Library Visit

Reading Preparation
- Reports
- Slides
- Vocabulary
- Discussion
- Handing out new books

Teacher Reading Aloud

Directions
- Rules
- Reviewing expectations

Class Work
- Small group work
- Whole group work
- Individual work

Review

Assignment Explanation

Quiz/Test

Oral Reports

Books
- Projects

Housekeeping Events
- Log
- Choosing report order
- Explaining day's schedule
- Paper shuffle
- Clean-up

Figure 6

Domain of Classroom Curriculum
Figure 7

Domain of Silent Reading Time
Figure 8

Domain of Reading Preparation
Figure 9

Domain of Housekeeping Events
(3) A Curriculum Taxonomy

From the constructed domains in the above question, a general taxonomy was constructed on the Classroom Curriculum. This taxonomy, then, serves as a guide from which the curriculum within and across these three classrooms can be described and referred. Figure 10 (p. 117) is thus the taxonomy from which the remainder of this chapter is referred, described, and defined.

This figure illustrates that, within and across these three classrooms, the classroom curriculum is divided into two major categories: Academic Events and Housekeeping, or Procedural Events. From this division, the Academic Events are further divided into two categories: Reading Related Events and Graded Events.

Housekeeping, or Procedural Events are then sub-divided into four major categories: Rules, Interruptions, Paper Shuffle, and Announcements. The Graded Events are sub-divided into three categories: Homework, Quizzes/Tests, and Reports. And the Reading Related Events are sub-divided into Silent Reading Time (SRT), Classwork, Review, Reports, Teacher Reads Aloud, and Reading Preparation. Thus, for example, whenever an Academic Event is referred to, it will include all the sub-categories under Reading Related Events and Graded Events.
Figure 10

A Taxonomy of the Classroom Curriculum
Summary of Question 1

In the question, "How is curriculum defined in these classes," the nature of classroom curriculum was examined. This question helped to provide a definition of classroom curriculum within these three classrooms; this definition, then, is context bound and specific. For example, this question explored what the lived reality of the activities and events meant to the participants in these three classrooms, and thus how they defined their classroom curriculum.

This question also helped to illustrate what life was like in these three classrooms, what events and activities occurred, and what these activities and events meant to the participants. This question also provided, from these meanings and definitions held by the participants within and across the three classrooms, a visual taxonomy of activities and events. This classroom curriculum taxonomy thus provides a point of departure from which ensuing discussion is made easier.
Research Question 2

What is the enacted curriculum within and across these classes?

(2.1) On what is time spent, in general, in each of the classes?

(2.2) What is the nature of the event, Silent Reading Time, within and across each of the classes?

(2.3) What is the nature of the event, Assignment Explanation, within and across each of the classes?

One of the aims of this study was to examine the divergence between the planned and the enacted curriculum. This question, then, explores the nature of the enacted curriculum within and across the periods and days. This exploration occurred at two levels: (1) a macro-level analysis of events within and across classes, and (2) a more in-depth exploration of the two events that occurred most frequently within and across classes (Silent Reading Time and Assignment Explanation).

The first level of analysis (Question 2.1) obtained a macro-level view of events that occurred within and across periods. Fifty-one class periods were examined, and fifty-one event maps were constructed. These event maps provided a macro structure framework that delineated the classroom events by time segments (Erickson & Shultz, 1977; Green & Meyer, 1990). In so doing, the following questions were examined:

A. When did class begin?/When did class end?
B. What was time spent on within and across each class?/When did event begin?/When did event end?/What events did students have an opportunity to engage in within and across each class?

C. Through length of time spent on an activity, what became important (on what was more time spent)?

A. When did class begin?/When did class end?

The purpose of this question was to determine the length of the class periods within and across classrooms. Since class did not typically begin or end with the ringing of the bell, but rather began and ended when the teacher stated the class as begun or ended, it was necessary to mark those times as the beginning and end of class. So, while classes in this school, according to the bell system, typically last 44 minutes, the class periods within and across these three classes varied according to when the teacher began and ended class.

Table 8 (p. 121) illustrates the mean, medium, and mode within and across periods. Since, by the bell, school periods lasted 44 minutes, as shown, period 1 lasted five percent (2 minutes) longer, and period 2 was two percent longer (1 minute) than the typical class length (44 minutes), while period 3 used the same amount of time as the bell schedule. Overall, across the three periods, the difference in time spent in the three classes is only one minute, or two percent difference from the scheduled class time of 44 minutes.
Table 8

Number of Minutes Per Class Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per. 1</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average/ Mean</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While these differences are minimal, first and second period may be minutely longer due to the homeroom period occurring between first and second periods, tacked on to the end of first period, allowing for some "give" time in the schedule, while third period has no such give time. So, while the differences between the periods are minimal, these differences may be explained by the addition of homeroom period (10 minutes) between first and second periods.

B. What was time spent on within and across each class?/When did event begin?/When did event end?/What events did students have an opportunity to engage in within and across each class?

This question examined the types of events occurring within and across the three periods, thus the activities students had opportunities to engage in, and the percentage of time each event took. Events were taken from the event maps (refer to question 1 for a more extended explanation),
and percentage of time spent on each event was determined by the length of each event, also taken from the event maps.

Similar to the findings in question 2A, the findings for percentage of time spent on class events (Table 9, "Activities Students had Opportunities to Engage In"; page 123) show a consistency of time spent on individual events across the periods, with minimal differences. Difference, however minutely, did occur. In period 3, for example (and as also illustrated in Table 13 in Question 2C), four percent more time than the mean was spent on Housekeeping Events than in the other two periods, five percent less time than the mean is spent on Graded Events, while only one percent more time than the mean is spent on Reading Related Events.

C. Through length of time spent on an activity, what became important (on what was more time spent)?

One way to view what type of events become important when they are enacted in the classroom is to explore the time and percentage of time spent on each event within and across classes. This question thus illustrates what events, and what type of events (the broader definition) time was spent on, within and across the three class periods.

Tables 10, 11, and 12 (pp. 124-125) illustrate how time was spent within types of events (Reading Related, Graded, Housekeeping). Upon viewing these charts, what becomes evident is how time is spent on individual events. Thus,
Table 9

Activities Students had Opportunities to Engage In
Percentage (%) of Class Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>Pd.1*</th>
<th>Pd.2</th>
<th>Pd.3</th>
<th>Mean/ Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading Related Events:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Reading Time</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Preparation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+T. Reads Aloud</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Visit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading Related Events &amp; Graded Events:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Seat Work-Individual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Reports</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graded Events:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Update</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz/Test</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Group Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housekeeping Events:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Gives Announcements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions/Rules</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean-up</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handing Out Papers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handing In Papers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment Explanation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ T. = Teacher
* Pd. = class period
within the bounded type of events, which events became important is illustrated by which events had more time spent on them. Silent Reading Time, for example, takes up more than half the time spent on Reading Related Events, Homework and Reports take up the majority of the time spent on Graded Events - with Homework taking up the most time, and Rules clearly take up the majority of the time spent on Housekeeping Events.

Table 10

Reading Related Events
Percentage (%) of Time Spent Within Reading Related Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Per. 1 %</th>
<th>Per. 2 %</th>
<th>Per. 3 %</th>
<th>Overall %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silent Reading Time</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classwork</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Preparation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+T. Reads Aloud</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ T. = Teacher

Table 11

Graded Events
Percentage (%) of Time Spent Within Graded Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Per. 1 %</th>
<th>Per. 2 %</th>
<th>Per. 3 %</th>
<th>Overall %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz/Test</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12
Housekeeping Events
Percentage (%) of Time Spent Within Housekeeping Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Per. 1</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Shuffle</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 (below) illustrates how time was spent within and across the classrooms. In each of the classrooms, for example, the majority of the class time was spent on Reading Related Events, while across the class periods an equal amount of time (overall) was spent on Graded and Housekeeping Events. These tables thus show that, through the length of time spent on an activity, Reading Related Events became the most important events within and across these classrooms.

Table 13
Percentage of Time Spent on Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Per. 1</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Related</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded Events</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is also supported in the teacher's definition of the importance of Reading Practice and Reading Preparation, illustrated in the following segments of interview transcript:

T: One thing I think is real important, aside from kids talking about what they're reading, I think it's real important to give them time to practice what it is we are suppose to be doing. I mean if it's in math, you do math practice, but if it's in reading hopefully we're either reading or talking about what we're reading most of the time and I think that Silent Reading is obviously practice, and talking about what we're reading is Reading Preparation.

While differences across the classes seem relatively small at this level, and while the time each period uses also varies minutely, these minute differences can create much diversity across classes by the amount of time available for an activity. This will be shown in more detail in section 2.3.
The two events that occurred most frequently within and across classes, Silent Reading Time and Assignment Explanation, were also examined for a more in-depth look (Questions 2.2 and 2.3). This more in-depth examination of the two most frequently occurring events assists in obtaining a clearer understanding of what it is like to "do" Silent Reading Time and Assignment Explanation in these classrooms, and thus helps in gaining a visual image of the nature of the event.

**Question 2.2: What is the nature of the event, Silent Reading Time, within and across each of the classes?**

Out of 51 class periods, Silent Reading Time occurred 47 times, or 92 percent of the time. In other words, Silent Reading Time occurred almost every class day and period. But what is Silent Reading Time, and what happens during this time? This examination of Silent Reading Time answers these questions and provides an in-depth look at what occurs during Silent Reading Time. The first part of this question provides a picture of what Silent Reading Time is like from the perspective of the teacher's and students', presented in their voices. [T = Teacher; S = Student].

**T:** I see Silent Reading Time as an opportunity for the students to interact with the text. I have Silent Reading Time [in class] and which I really do think is valuable...interaction. This is leisure reading stuff, anything but textbook, and hopefully something they provide.

**S:** Silent Reading lasts about 15 minutes. You need to read a novel that you choose. You have a book and
you have to read it during the time she says you have to read and it has to be a novel, it can't be a magazine. It has to be something with a story to it. The purpose [of Silent Reading Time] is to finish your novel in class so you don't have to read at home, and to put books in your reading record for extra credit. Right now we're reading the *Iceberg Hermit* in class - historical fiction. [So, in our Silent Reading Time], we're reading those kinds of books.

T: I do bookchecks to make sure that they bring in their reading books for Silent Reading Time.

S: If you didn't bring your book, she can loan you one. Like if I didn't bring my [silent reading] book in, *Gentle Ben*, she has extra *Gentle Bens* that I can read. But if she does a book check and you borrowed a book from her, she'll take off points, and you don't know when she'll give a book check. She just comes around and sees if you brought your book and if you didn't you lose 5 points.

T: I try to do silent reading with them. I try to sit in the student desk area and read while they are reading, but it doesn't always work out.

S: Usually like during reading time she either grades papers or does some work while we're reading or she reads too.

In order to understand what occurred (what roles were enacted) during the event Silent Reading Time (SRT), sub-events engaged in within the larger event (SRT) were established. Table 14 (p. 129), for example, displays the events that occurred during the larger SRT event. According to the teacher's definition, all sub-events are defined as Housekeeping Events.
### Table 14
Events Engaged In During Silent Reading Time (SRT)

* Teacher hands out books/Loaners
* Teacher checks out new books
* Teacher checks in books
* Teacher calls student to desk
* Teacher takes roll
* Book check
* Teacher sits to read
* Teacher answers student questions at Teacher's desk
* Teacher walks around class
* Teacher walks to student desk to talk with student
* Teacher writing on blackboard
* Teacher answers student question at student's desk
* Teacher reminds students to read
* Selection of report topics
* Individual collection of homework by teacher
* Teacher overtly disciplines student
* Class interruption

An observation of 51 video tapes was done in order to ascertain three questions: (A) What percentage of the total sub-event occurrences (within and across periods) did an individual sub-event occur?, (B) Of the days examined and within an individual sub-event (i.e., Teacher hands out loaner books), what is the percentage of occurrence across days?, and (C) Within and across periods, how many sub-events occurred per day?
There were a total of 46 periods examined for these questions. Five periods did not "do" Silent Reading Time so were not included in the analysis. Sixteen periods were examined for both periods 1 and periods 2, and 14 periods were examined for Period 3. Figure 15 (p. 131), for example, shows the percentage of the time a sub-event occurred across time in relation to the other occurring sub-events. In other words, Figure 15 shows which sub-event occurred most frequently (Teacher hands out loaners - 14%) across sub-events and which sub-event occurred the least across the sub-events (Selection of report topics - 1%).

This table illustrates that the sub-event "Teacher reminds students to read" occurs more frequently as the sub-event "Teacher calls student to Teacher's desk" also increases. Also, as the sub-event "Teacher calls student to Teacher's desk" increases, the sub-event "Teacher answers student's question at Teacher's desk" decreases. What these incidents show is that as the teacher calls a student to her desk and she is engaged with talking to that student, two things occur: (1) the students in the class become disruptive so the teacher must remind them of the task, and (2) students are either not able or not willing to ask a teacher a question at her desk while the teacher is engaged with a particular student.

Of key importance in this table, however, is that this in-depth look at a particular event begins to illustrate the
Table 15
Percentage of Occurrence
Within Total Number of Sub-Events (233)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pd.1</th>
<th>Pd.2</th>
<th>Pd.3</th>
<th>Mean/Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+T. hands out loaners</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. checks out new books</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. checks in books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. calls ^st. to T. desk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. takes roll</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book check</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. sits to read</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. answers student's question at T's desk</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. walks around class</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. walks to student's desk to talk w/st.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. writing on blackboard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. answers student's question at st's desk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. reminds sts. to read</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of report topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual collection of homework</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. overtly disciplines St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class interruption</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The total number of sub-event occurrences was 233 across 46 periods and 17 sub-events
+ T. = Teacher
^ st/s. = student/s
divergence between periods. This divergence between periods was not necessarily displayed in the more macro-level analysis involving time spent on events.

Table 16 (p. 133) illustrates that within a sub-event (i.e., Teacher checks in books) and across periods, what is the percentage of occurrence. In other words, Table 16 illustrates how much of the time (given in percentages) a sub-event occurs, within and across periods, over time. For example, this figure shows that during 1st period and over time, a book check occurred in 44 percent of the 16 periods.

What this figure does not illustrate is the frequency of occurrence within a period. For example, this figure does not provide how many times in one period the teacher called a student to her desk. This is one limitation of using video and audio tapes to obtain this type of data - not all this information was, nor could have been, captured.

Thus, this figure examines that a sub-event occurred in a given period, rather than how many times per period, and thus, which type of sub-events occurred more frequently and consistently over time, in relation to each other. The importance of this lies in the picture that is presented in the contrast and comparison, or types of sub-events in relationship to each other, within and across the periods, and over time.

Table 16 illustrates the amount of divergence of sub-event occurrence across periods, as also noted in the
Table 16
Percentage (Frequency) of Occurrences Within Sub-Event (Within & Across Periods) Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Across # of Periods</th>
<th>Pd.1 (16)</th>
<th>Pd.2 (16)</th>
<th>Pd.3 (14)</th>
<th>Mean/Average (46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*T. hands out loaners</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. checks out new books</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. checks in books</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. calls +st. to T. desk</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. takes roll</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book check</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. sits to read</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. answers student's question at T's desk</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. walks around class</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. walks to student's desk to talk w/st.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. writing on blackboard</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. answers student's question at st's desk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. reminds Sts. to read</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of report topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual collection of homework</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. overtly disciplines st.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class interruption</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T. = Teacher
+ st/s. = student/s
discussion for Table 15 above. In the sub-event Book check, for example, book checks occurred more than twice as much in Period 1 than in Period 3. This may be a result of the sub-event, Teacher calls student to Teacher's desk, in that the teacher is more engaged in one sub-event, so has less time for the other.

Table 17 (below) illustrates the number of type of sub-events that occurred per day. For example, an average of five sub-events occurred daily, within and across the three class periods. This figure is important in that it clearly illustrates, within the Silent Reading Time event, that other sub-events also occurred. As seen in all these tables (15, 16, and 17) and while Silent Reading Time is occurring, many types of sub-events are also occurring that may or may not relate to Silent Reading Time and/or Reading Practice.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Type of Silent Reading Time Sub-Events Per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean/Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2.3: What is the nature of the event, Assignment Explanation, within and across each of the classes?

Out of 51 class periods, Assignment Explanation occurred 31 times, or 61 percent of the time. In other words, Assignment Explanation occurred approximately two-thirds of the time. As in the above analysis of Silent Reading Time, this question also provides an in-depth look at what occurs during the event, Assignment Explanation. It is this analysis and question, however, that further illustrates the nature of curriculum divergences, showing when, where, and how they occur.

Twenty-three Assignment Explanations were analyzed in order to determine, on a general level, what occurred. With only one exception, no student talk occurred during the event, Assignment Explanation, except to ask or answer questions. Table 18 (p. 136) illustrates the types of topics explained to the students. On the whole, every assignment explanation was an explanation on procedure, or how-to-do the task assigned. From these Assignment Explanations, four separate days and 10 periods across the days, were examined:

(1) Assignment Explanation of Visual Aids for Oral Presentation

(2) Assignment Explanation of Vocabulary Assignment

(3) Assignment Explanation of Research Topic Selection

(4) Assignment Explanation of Story Assignment.
## Table 18
### Assignment Explanation
#### Types and Occurrences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Types of Assignment Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4-17</td>
<td>Explanation of Research Topic selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4-17</td>
<td>Explanation of Research Topic selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4-18</td>
<td>How-to prepare bibliography notecards/Topic questions and categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4-18</td>
<td>Research project steps/Topic questions and categories/How-to prepare bibliography notecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4-18</td>
<td>Research project steps/How-to prepare bibliography notecards/Topic questions and categories/Assignment purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4-27</td>
<td>Vocabulary - Word parts/instructions and example - how-to-do assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4-27</td>
<td>Vocabulary - Word parts/instructions and example - how-to-do assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4-27</td>
<td>Vocabulary - Word parts/instructions and example - how-to-do assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>In-class Reading Assignment instructions/Written report order/How-to-do title page &amp; body of paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>In-class Reading Assignment instructions/Written report order/How-to-do title page &amp; body of paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>Instructions on how-to prepare bibliography/Instructions on bibliography punctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>Instructions on how-to prepare bibliography/Instructions on bibliography punctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>Instructions on how-to prepare bibliography/Instructions on bibliography punctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5-3</td>
<td>How-to-do Reading Assignment sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>Visual aid tips - Instructions on how-to-do visual aids for oral report presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>Visual aid tips - Instructions on how-to-do visual aids for oral report presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>Visual aid tips - Instructions on how-to-do visual aids for oral report presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>9-5</td>
<td>Rules for taking the Nelson test - how-to-do the test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>9-5</td>
<td>Rules for taking the Nelson test - how-to-do the test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>9-7</td>
<td>Instructions for assignment sequencing/How-to fill out assignment sheet/Rules for small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>9-7</td>
<td>How-to fill out assignment sheet/Rules for small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>9-8</td>
<td>Rules for taking quiz - how-to-do quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>9-8</td>
<td>Rules for taking quiz - how-to-do quiz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/ = change in topic
Tables 19, 21, 23, and 25 illustrate what topics were and were not discussed across the periods in a given day, thus showing divergence among the periods. Table 19 (on page 138) illustrates the topics that were or were not discussed across the periods on day 5-4. The students were involved in an extensive research project and were approaching the time for their oral presentation of their topics. In this presentation, they were required to use visual aids. Thus, the teacher focused this visual aid explanation on how-to-do appropriate and interesting visual aids. Table 19, "Assignment Explanation of Visual Aids for Oral Presentation," illustrates that:

* the use of correct spelling was mentioned in period 3, but not in periods 1 or 2;
* the visual aids as needing to be understandable in terms of relating to topic was mentioned only in period 1, and not in periods 2 or 3;
* the visual aids as to help people understand the topic better, and to be understandable so that people can look and read them easily were discussed in period 2, but not in periods 1 or 3;
* the example shown to the class was related to several of the required criteria in period 1, but only minutely in periods 2 and 3;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per. 1</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visibility:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size/large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounting of pictures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorful</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use borders</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention-getting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye-appealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understandable:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to topic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People can look &amp; read it</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps people to understand topic</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spelling:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wording</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lists</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Aides:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talk about in report-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not at the end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* the discussion on when to talk about the visual aide (during the presentation - not at the conclusion) was discussed only during period 1; the other two periods did not get this information at this time; and,

* the visibility criteria were more fully discussed in period 1 than the other two periods.

Also in regards to this table, 20 separate topics were discussed across the periods. Of the 20 total topics, 1st period accomplished 12 (60%), and periods 2 and 3 both accomplished eight (40%). The differentiation across periods, however, is further illustrated in that (shown in Table 20) 1st period, for example, accomplished 8 different topics than period 2, and 9 different topics than period 3.

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st #/%</th>
<th>2nd #/%</th>
<th>3rd #/%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>differs from 1st:</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/20%</td>
<td>5/25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differs from 2nd:</td>
<td>8/40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differs from 3rd:</td>
<td>9/45%</td>
<td>4/20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The curricular divergence across periods, however, does not end here. What these charts show is that in all three
periods, the size of the visual aid was discussed. Yet, the discussion itself varied considerably across the periods (the voice of the teacher is provided in each instance):

**Period 1:** "As you make your own visual aids, you're going to be real concerned about how visible - can people in the back of the room see it. Is it a large enough size that people can see it? You want them to be large enough so that we can see them."

**Period 2:** "With visible, you want to make sure that it's large enough that people can see it. You want to talk about the size, the size of pictures. If they're real tiny, we can't see them and they're not effective. It could be the best picture in the whole world. However, if we can't see it, if they can't see it [pointing to students in the back of the room], then, we're in trouble, because then it looses the point of the picture."

**Period 3:** "You want to make sure that they're visible, that they're large enough size."
(2) Assignment Explanation of Vocabulary Assignment

Table 21 (next page), while not showing the amount of diversity between the periods as Table 19, illustrates that:

* pronunciation of words was important in periods 2 and 3, but not in periods 1;
* the usage of mankind vs. humankind was discussed in period 2, but not in periods 1 or 3;
* the explanation of combining word parts was discussed in period 2, but not in periods 1 or 3;
* period 2 was told to "write your definition differently than the dictionary's," but periods 1 and 3 were told to "use your own words in the definition;" and,
* period 3 was told to "put your name on the vocabulary sheet, while periods 1 and 2 never received that information.

In regards to this table, 17 separate topics were discussed across the periods. Of the 17 total topics, 1st period and 3rd period accomplished 12 (71%) topics each, and 2nd period accomplished 15 (88%) topics. In regards to differentiation in terms of what topics were covered within and across the three periods, Table 22 (on page 143) illustrates, for example, that 1st period accomplished only one topic different (6%) from that of periods 2 and 3.
Table 21

Comparison of Event Across Periods:
Assignment Explanation of Vocabulary Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation:</th>
<th>Per. 1</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word part meaning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling error on sheet</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word definitions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word parts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation of word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mankind vs. humankind</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining word parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directions:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include part of speech</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underline word part</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write definition differently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than in dictionary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include meaning of word</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part in definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use own words in definition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put name on vocabulary sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining one word together</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking word part meaning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with word definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Checking students' understanding:

| Having students find word parts    | X      | X      | X      |
| Having students check word parts   | X      | X      | X      |
| parts with word definition         |        |        |        |
Table 22

Number of Topics Covered During Assignment Explanation of Vocabulary Assignment: Differentiation Across Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st #/%</th>
<th>2nd #/%</th>
<th>3rd #/%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differs from 1st:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/18%</td>
<td>2/12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differs from 2nd:</td>
<td>1/6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differs from 3rd:</td>
<td>1/6%</td>
<td>3/18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, as in the assignment explanation above, while word parts are explained in each of the three periods, the explanation varies considerably across the periods [the teacher's voice is in quotes]:

**Period 1:** "In the middle of the page is a list of the word parts we're going to be studying. There are five of them for this unit. They each have several words that are on the word list. There are four math words. They're not always at the beginning of the word. In fact with these, none of them are - someplace sandwiched in between everything else."

**Period 2:** "We're going to be looking at the word parts that are in the middle of the word."

**Period 3:** "As we're talking about the words, this gets a little more complicated because a lot, several of the words have more than one word part in them. The word part is not always at the beginning. Sometimes it's sandwiched in between others."
(3) **Assignment Explanation of Research Topic Selection**

While only two periods on day 4-17 were analyzed in regards to the event, Assignment Explanation, instead of three (as period 1 data was not available on this day), Table 23 (page 145) still illustrates diversity among the two periods, periods 2 and 3. In this assignment explanation, the explanation focused on how the students were going to select their research topics (from a prearranged list of topics) by first selecting numbers from which topics were later selected. Table 23 illustrates that:

* the purpose of selecting the numbers was discussed in period 3, but not in period 2. This was evident under the section, "Student Questions," when the period 2 students were confused as to the purpose of selecting the numbers.

* the procedure for how the selection of numbers was going to occur was discussed in period 3, but not in period 2;

* the students in period 2 were told what they may not get their desired topic selection, while period 3 did not;

* the students in period 2 were confused about the purpose of selecting numbers, while the students in period 3 were confused about the procedure itself.

This can be accounted for in that the teacher, while
Table 23

Comparison on Event Across Periods:
Assignment Explanation of Research Topic Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of selection #s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Topics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not getting desired selection</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Questions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner topics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion of purpose</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion on procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is going to occur</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example of procedure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example given from selection</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in another period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say name when selecting #</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check students' understanding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having students repeat procedure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking students questions on procedure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
not discussing the procedure to period 2, provided period 2 an example from another period on how the selection took place; this example never occurred in period 3, which may have been the reason for the students' confusion on procedure for selecting number, even though there had been a discussion on procedure in period 3, but with no examples;

* the teacher checked for understanding of the procedure for selecting numbers in period 3, but not in period 2. This can also be accounted for in the fact that period 3 students were the ones that were confused, and thus asked questions, about the procedure.

In regards to this table, 15 separate topics were discussed across the two periods. Of the 15 total topics, 2nd period accomplished 10 topics (66%) while 3rd period accomplished 11 topics (73%). Table 24 (p.147) illustrates, for example, that 2nd period accomplished 4 (27%) different topics than 3rd period, while period 3 accomplished 5 (33%) different topics than period 2.
Table 24

Number of Topics Covered During Assignment Explanation of Research Topic Selection: Differentiation Across Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#/%</td>
<td>#/%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differs from 2nd:</td>
<td>5/33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differs from 3rd:</td>
<td>4/27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the assignment explanations above, while an explanation was provided by the teacher on how numbers were going to be selected so that research topics could be chosen later, divergence occurred across the two periods. During period 2, for example, the teacher gave an example from period 1 on how the procedure worked in that period.

**Period 2:** "What we're going to do is, I have randomly listed numbers 1-30. Now we don't have 30 people in here so some numbers are going to be left over. This was period 1 for instance, and I listed the numbers in random order. Nineteen is the last number. One of the first numbers is two, for instance. So some people picked like their lucky number or whatever it was they wanted to choose. And after you've chosen a number, for instance, if Frank chose 27, Steve's going to cross out 27. It's going to be gone, and everybody else will know that you can't choose 27. That doesn't mean it's the 27th person to choose; 27 might be the first number."
Period 3: "What we're going to do is find out what sequence, what number we're going to use to choose topics. If Tyan chooses #16, for instance, then Renee is going to cross that off so everybody is aware that not to choose 16. I have on a legal pad, the numbers in a random order. For instance if #2 was the number you picked, that happens to be the last number [on the legal pad], then you would be the last person to actually choose. It's just an assorted order and you may be the first person, or you may be the 15th person to actually make a choice."

(4) Assignment Explanation of Story Assignment

Two periods were also analyzed for day 5-1 in regards to the event, Assignment Explanation. Table 25 (on next page), like Table 23, also displays much diversity between the two periods. In this Assignment Explanation event, the explanation focused on an in-class reading assignment. After the students finished the assigned reading, they were to then answer the questions on the assignment sheet.
Table 25

Comparison on Event Across Periods: Assignment Explanation of Story Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directions:</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begin on p. 58</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickup questions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer questions</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn in completed questions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read novel when done</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe characters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read story first</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate story to other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stories in same genre</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion:</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author's name</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story genre</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to read given by substitute</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author's biography</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions on the story</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character description</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarities and differences in same story genre</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 illustrates that:

* 3rd period contained much more discussion about the assignment than did 2nd period;
* 3rd period was told to relate the story to other stories the students had read in the same genre (historical fiction), while 2nd period was not;
* in period 3, the teacher discussed and previewed the questions on the assignment sheet that the students
were to answer after completing the reading, while this did not occur. From this, then,

* as the students in 3rd period were told to describe the characters in the story, a discussion ensued about criteria for character description;

* the students in period 2 received only different "Directions" than those in period 3, but that the students in period 3 were told more directions than those in period 2.

In regards to this table, 18 separate topics were discussed across the periods. Of the 18 total topics, 2nd period accomplished 8, or 44 percent of the topics, while 3rd periods accomplished 14, or 78 percent of the topics. Table 26 (below) illustrates, for example, that 2nd period accomplished only three different topics than period 3 (17%), while period 3 accomplished 9 (50%) different topics than period 2. This is quite a diversity in that the period 3 students received 33 percent more information than did the period 2 students.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differs from 2nd:</td>
<td>9/50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differs from 3rd:</td>
<td>3/17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As in the above examples, although a topic may occur across the periods, the way in which the topic is presented leads to curricular divergence. In this example of teacher presenting story assignment, which occurred in both periods that were examined, the teacher introduced the author and the story genre [teacher voice is provided in quotes]. The divergence, in this case, lies in the further elucidation of the topic.

**Period 2:** "Did anybody notice the author of this particular story? [student answers]. Sure enough. Supposedly it is, as with all these stories, supposedly it is based on a true incident."

**Period 3:** "The story that you're going to read is a, supposedly, actual account of an incident that occurred and if you notice, it's written by, you may notice the name, any of us observant souls. [student answers]. Yes. Jeraldo supposedly wrote this, and this is before, this is when he was a journalist. He wrote articles. He did investigative reports and this is supposedly true." [The discussion continues on about the author.]
Summary of Question 2

Question 2, "What is the enacted curriculum within and across these classrooms," has provided a portrayal of the nature of the enacted curriculum and an in-depth look at two of the most frequently occurring events: Silent Reading Time and Assignment Explanation. The following was found in this question:

* The nature of life in these three classrooms:
  * The length of time across these three classes, on the average, was either shorter or longer than the school's set time of 44 minutes. Thus, divergences can occur across periods due to just the length of the class period.
  * The activities that students had an opportunity to engage in were activities related to, on a general level, Reading Related Events, Graded Events, and Housekeeping Events.
  * Through consideration of time spent on an activity, Silent Reading Time was identified as important in Reading Related Events; Homework Events became important in Graded Events; and Rules became important in Housekeeping Events. Overall, Reading Related Events took the majority of the classroom period.
The nature of Silent Reading Time:

* Over time and across periods, 17 different sub-events occurred within the larger event, Silent Reading Time.

* On the whole, about five different sub-events occurred per day during the Silent Reading Time event.

The nature of Assignment Explanation:

* While the same events can occur between and across periods, there is divergence in how they occur from period to period.
Research Question 3

What is the planned curriculum?

(3.1) What is the nature of the planned events?

One of the goals of this study was to examine the divergence between the planned and the enacted curriculum. This question, then, is a step towards examining the divergence between the planned and the enacted curriculum by providing a definition of what the planned curriculum was in these classrooms. For this portion of the analysis, the daily schedule from 49 class periods is examined, the planned curriculum is explained, and a comparison is provided between and across the periods.

In order to examine the types of activities planned, the teacher's lesson plans, or the daily class schedule (which are same) was used. Table 27 is an example of the daily schedule/lesson plan for day 5-4, period 1:

Table 27
Daily Schedule: An Example

Reading Time
Finish "Pompeii"
Log update
Collect reports
Attach evaluation sheet
Visual Aid Tips
Iceberg Hermit
Grade Reports
From this each of the planned events were categorized into two types of event areas: academic and procedural (see question 1 for further definition). In Table 27, for example, eight events were planned of which three were academic (Reading Time, Finish "Pompeii," and Iceberg Hermit) and six were procedural (Log update, Collect reports, Attach evaluation sheet, Visual Aid Tips, and grade reports). Each of these planned events were categorized according to the teacher's definition of academic and procedural, and triangulation of data and findings was done with the teacher in order to insure better internal accuracy.

Table 28 (page 156) illustrates the total number of events (academic or procedural) within and across periods, and the percentage within and across periods. In both period one and two, for example, there were 57 academic events and 49 procedural events planned. Of those planned events, academic events accounted for 54 percent of the total planned events, while the procedural events accounted for 46 percent of the total. Within and across the periods, there were more planned academic events than procedural.
Table 28

**Total Number of Academic and Procedural Events Within and Across Periods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Event</th>
<th>Per. 1</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#/%</td>
<td>#/%</td>
<td>#/%</td>
<td>#/%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>57/54%</td>
<td>57/54%</td>
<td>47/51%</td>
<td>161/53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>49/46%</td>
<td>49/46%</td>
<td>46/49%</td>
<td>144/47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = # of events that occurred/percentage of Academic/Procedural Events in and across periods

**Summary**

Question three explored the nature of the planned curriculum, or planned events. In this exploration, it was found that of the total Planned events within and across periods, 53 percent were Academic events and 47 percent were Procedural events.
Research Question 4

What is the relationship between the planned curriculum and the enacted curriculum?

(4.1) What is the nature of the events that were planned but were not enacted?

(4.2) What is the nature of the events that were enacted but were not planned?

(4.3) What is the comparison of the planned and the enacted events?

A primary goal of this study was to examine the relationship of and divergence between the planned and the enacted curriculum. This question, then, provides a comparison between the planned and the enacted curriculum so that the relationship of and divergence between the two curricula can be clearly seen.

This question examines the planned curriculum (as provided in Question 3) in contrast to the enacted curriculum. This question also explores the types of events (i.e., academic and procedural) that had been planned but did not get enacted, the types of events that got enacted but were not planned, and a comparison of the nature of each.

While the planned curriculum was taken from the teacher's daily schedule, the enacted curriculum was taken directly from the event maps. These were then placed side by side according to matching classroom periods and dates. Each of the events taken from the enacted curriculum were then categorized in the same fashion the planned curricular
events were categorized in Question 3. In other words, each of the enacted events were categorized into academic or procedural areas. An example of the contrasting curricula is given in Table 29:

Table 29
Planned vs. Enacted Curriculum
Period 3, Day 4-25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Curriculum</th>
<th>Enacted Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Schedule</td>
<td>Chart 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Time</td>
<td>Notecard Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect Notecards</td>
<td>Handing in Notecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book check</td>
<td>Silent Reading Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log update</td>
<td>Book check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctic Slides</td>
<td>Log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read &quot;Mighty Whales&quot;</td>
<td>Returning Assign. #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation of grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slide presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table indicates that there were six planned events (under "Daily Schedule") and nine enacted events (listed under "Chart 15"). "Read Mighty Whales," for example (in the left column) is an illustration of a planned event that did not get enacted. In other words, it never occurred during the class period. Under the enacted events, three events occurred that were not planned ("Notecard discussion," "Returning Assignment #3," "Explanation of grading").
(4.1) What is the nature of the events that were planned but were not enacted?

This question explores the types of events that were planned but did not get enacted, within and across periods. Table 30 (below) illustrates the total number of days, within and across periods, that all the events planned were also enacted. In 1st period, for example, out of 17 days examined, there were four (24%) days in which all the planned events were enacted, while 2nd period had three days and 3rd period had 2 days in which all the events planned were also enacted.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per. 1</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#/% Events Planned &amp; Enacted</td>
<td>4/24%</td>
<td>3/18%</td>
<td>2/13%</td>
<td>9/18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Days examined</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31 (p. 160) illustrates the type of event that was planned but not enacted. In period 1, for example, of the events planned but not enacted, 83 percent were academic events, while only 17 percent were procedural events. Thus, of the events planned that were not enacted (so, they were
not realized), 85 percent were academic and 15 percent were procedural.

Table 31
Percentage of Events Planned/Not Enacted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Per. 1</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4.2) What is the nature of the events that were enacted but were not planned?

This question explores the types of events that were enacted but were not planned, within and across periods. Table 32 (p. 161) illustrates the total number of days, within and across periods, that all the events enacted were also planned. In 1st period, for example, out of 17 days examined, there was one day in which all the enacted events were planned, while 2nd period had three days and 3rd period had no days in which all the enacted events were also planned.
### Table 32

Number of Days All Events Enacted Were Planned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per. 1</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#/%</td>
<td>1/6%</td>
<td>3/18%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4/8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Enacted &amp; Planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Days Examined</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33 (p. 162) illustrates the type of event that was enacted but not planned. In period 1, for example, of the events enacted but not planned, 70 percent were procedural, while only 30 percent were academic events. Thus, of the events enacted that were not planned across the periods, 69 percent were procedural events and 31 percent were academic events.

One possible explanation is possible for the fact that more procedural events were enacted than academic events (as indicated in interviews with the students). This is, as the students were necessarily concerned with their course grade, they wanted to make sure they understood the nature of the assigned task.
Table 33

Percentage of Events Enacted/Not Planned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Per. 1</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4.3) What is the comparison of the planned and the enacted events?

This question provides a comparison between: (1) the planned events and the enacted events, and (2) the academic events and the procedural events, within and across periods. Four areas are compared and contrasted: (A) the planned Academic events in contrast to the enacted Academic events, (B) the planned Procedural events in contrast to the enacted Procedural events, (C) the total number of Academic events in contrast to the total number of Procedural events, (D) the total number of Planned events in contrast to the total number of Enacted events.

(A) The planned Academic Events in contrast to the enacted Academic Events

Table 34 (p. 163) illustrates the comparison between the planned Academic events to the enacted Academic events. Period 1, for example, shows that 12 percent more Academic events were planned than got enacted; period 2 shows that 18
percent more Academic events were planned than got enacted; and period 3 shows that 14 percent more Academic events were planned than got enacted. Across the periods, then, there were 16 percent more Planned Academic events than those enacted.

Table 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Event</th>
<th>Per. 1 #/%</th>
<th>Per. 2 #/%</th>
<th>Per. 3 #/%</th>
<th>Overall #/%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>57/56%</td>
<td>57/59%</td>
<td>47/57%</td>
<td>161/58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted</td>
<td>45/44%</td>
<td>39/41%</td>
<td>35/43%</td>
<td>119/42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) The planned Procedural Events in contrast to the enacted Procedural Events.

Table 35 (p. 164) illustrates the comparison between the planned Procedural events in comparison to the enacted Procedural events. Table 35 also shows that 28 percent more Procedural events were enacted than those planned within and across all three periods, even though the actual number of events varies across.
Table 35

Procedural Events: Planned and Enacted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedural Events</th>
<th>Per. 1</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#/%</td>
<td>#/%</td>
<td>#/%</td>
<td>#/%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>49/36%</td>
<td>49/36%</td>
<td>46/36%</td>
<td>144/36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted</td>
<td>86/64%</td>
<td>86/64%</td>
<td>81/64%</td>
<td>253/64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) The total number of Academic Events in contrast to the total number of Procedural Events

Table 36 (p. 165) illustrates the comparison between the total number (planned and enacted) of Academic events in contrast to the total number of Procedural events (planned and enacted). Period 1, for example, shows that there were 14 percent more planned and enacted Procedural events than planned and enacted Academic events. Period 2 shows that there were 16 percent more planned and enacted Procedural events than planned and enacted Academic events. And period 3 shows that there were 22 percent more planned and enacted Procedural events than planned and enacted Academic events. Across the periods, then, Table 36 illustrates that there were 18 percent more planned and enacted Procedural events than planned and enacted Academic events.
Table 36

Total Number of Academic and Procedural Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Per. 1</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#/%</td>
<td>#/%</td>
<td>#/%</td>
<td>#/%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>102/43%</td>
<td>96/42%</td>
<td>82/39%</td>
<td>280/41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>135/57%</td>
<td>135/58%</td>
<td>127/61%</td>
<td>397/59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(D) The total number of Planned Events in contrast to the total number of Enacted Events

Table 37 (below) illustrates the comparison between the total number of Planned events (academic and procedural) to the total number of Enacted events (academic and procedural). Period 2, for example, shows that there were eight percent more Enacted events than Planned events. In periods 1 and 3, and overall across the periods, Table 37 shows that there were 10 percent more Enacted events than Planned events.

Table 37

Total Number of Planned and Enacted Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Per. 1</th>
<th>Per. 2</th>
<th>Per. 3</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#/%</td>
<td>#/%</td>
<td>#/%</td>
<td>#/%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>106/45%</td>
<td>106/46%</td>
<td>93/45%</td>
<td>305/45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted</td>
<td>131/55%</td>
<td>125/54%</td>
<td>116/55%</td>
<td>372/55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Question 4

This question has shown the relationship between the planned and the enacted curriculum and has provided a comparison within and across periods. A summation of the findings is as follows:

* All events planned were also enacted in nine class periods (9/49 = 18%).
* Of the events Planned but not enacted, 85 percent were Academic Events and 15% were Procedural Events.
* Four periods occurred across 49 periods, in which all the Events Enacted were also Planned.
* There were 31 percent Academic Event enacted that were not planned, and 69 percent Procedural Events enacted but not planned.
* Of the total number of Academic Events, 16 percent were planned but were not enacted.
* Of the total number of Procedural Events, 28 percent of the enacted Procedural Events were not planned.
* Of the total number of Academic and Procedural Events, 41 percent were Academic and 59 percent were Procedural.
* Of the total number of Planned and Enacted Events, 10 percent more events were enacted that had not been planned.
Summary of Findings

Chapter IV

The presentation of findings in Chapter IV has been discussed and considered as discrete pieces. This section, then, examines the interrelated nature of these findings in order to tie the parts together. One goal of this study was to examine curriculum as it occurred in the classroom setting. Another goal was to examine the relationship between the planned and the enacted curriculum. Within this latter goal was an examination of the divergence between the planned and the enacted curriculum. In regards to these goals and the above questions, the following was found:

* A definition of classroom curriculum within and across the three classrooms from the meanings held by the participants in this particular setting.

* The nature of life within and across these three classrooms, which showed: (1) how class length can differ from the scheduled length, (2) the activities and events the student had an opportunity to engage in, and (3) that through length of time spent on an activity, Silent Reading Time became important in Reading Related Events, Homework Events became important within Graded Events, Rules became important in Housekeeping Events; and Reading Related Events took the overall majority of classroom time, although there was divergence in
each of these in the actual amount of time spent between and across periods.

* The nature of Silent Reading Time wherein, on the average, five sub-events occurred per period during the SRT event itself, although these figures vary between and across periods.

* The nature of Assignment Explanation in which it was shown that, while the same events can occur between and across periods, there is divergence in the way in which they occur.

* The nature of the Planned curriculum wherein, of the events planned, 53 percent were Academic events and 47 percent were Procedural events. There is also divergence within these figures between and across periods and days.

* A comparison between the Planned and the Enacted Curriculum wherein the divergence was seen between and across periods and days in the:
  * events planned that were also enacted,
  * events planned but not enacted,
  * events enacted that were also planned,
  * Academic events enacted but not planned
  * Procedural events enacted but not planned
  * total number of Academic and Procedural events
  * total number of Planned and Enacted events.
ENDNOTES

1. Housekeeping Events and Procedural Events are synonymous terms and can be interchanged within this dissertation. This is because the term, Procedural, tends to illustrate a "how-to" rather than a Housekeeping term, such as "Clean up." Depending on the context, then, these terms can be interchanged.

2. Two illustrations of event maps are provided in chapter 3.

3. In this section of transcript, the student talk, while presented as one student, is a composite of all the students interviewed. While unidentified, the students' voices have been left in tact, but some transitions may have been added for easier reading. These transitions are marked with brackets. No attempt is made to distinguish a change in student voice.

4. The daily class schedules were used rather than a curriculum document as no curriculum document, as defined by the teacher, existed as yet in this school district. What the teacher did use, however, to help create the daily class schedule was the "Graded Course of Study" for the grades 6-8 Reading classes in this school district. This "Graded Course of Study" was not analyzed as part of the daily class schedule. This is so because the "Graded Course of Study" provides a list of skills that the school district expects will be taught in the classes through whatever means the teacher sees fit. Thus, while these skills can sometimes be seen as occurring within the curriculum, it might only be an inference for both teacher and researcher.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

There are five people in this room who still don't know what I'm saying. "What is she saying?" they're asking. "What is she doing here?"

It is not enough to be interminable; one must also be precise. (Walker, 1984; p. 46)

INTRODUCTION

The general purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of the nature of classroom curriculum and how curriculum came to be interpreted and defined by the participants in the classroom setting. This study also examined the relationship and the divergence of the planned to the enacted curriculum to better understand how this divergence occurs within and across classroom settings.

The analyses of the curriculum data in and across these three classrooms show that as the planned curriculum was being enacted, opportunities, content, and expectations were constructed through the participants' interpretations and interaction that were unique to each classroom. Each classroom, then, generated a curriculum specific to the particular contextualized setting.
This study of the curriculum within and across the three classroom settings is distinctive because it provides an extensive ethnographic data base that helps to illustrate, describe, and extend our knowledge about the nature and complexity of classroom life (i.e., how the participants in classroom settings define the curriculum; the activities students have an opportunity to engage in; the types of activities engaged in; the nature and relationship of the planned to the enacted curriculum). This increased understanding of the nature of classroom life helps lay a foundation from which we can expand and extend our thinking about classroom processes.

An argument was presented in Chapter I on why this study was significant enough in nature to undertake. In regards to that original argument, the findings presented in Chapter IV are discussed in the next section.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

(A) Accountability measurements (test scores) do not reflect nor account for actual classroom practice; and holding teachers accountable to and/or for instructional and student outcome objectives does not reflect understanding of dynamic classroom processes and practices that result from the interpretations and the interactions of the participants in the classroom.

If classrooms, in general, display the disparity between that which is planned and that which is enacted, as was shown in this study, then accountability measurements, in general, are inequitable not just in race, sex, and
cultural elements but also by ignoring dynamic, interactive, and context-specific classrooms.

This study demonstrated how an explanation of an assignment differed across three class periods, although the subject matter and content were, by teacher definition, identical. If a test on the assignment was given to the students, yet different explanations were provided across the periods, then the implications for standardized testing are clear - i.e., since there was differential knowledge across the periods, differential knowledge will appear on the test.

Wise (1988) has noted that teachers object to standardized achievement measurements as they do not reflect actual classroom practice which is complex in nature. Also in regards to standardized achievement measurements, Wise indicates that teachers believe that by enforcing these measurements in order to increase excellence, [student] equity was actually reduced by preventing teachers from accommodating differences among students. Along these lines, Hart (1989) states that: "Giving grades burdens teachers but has little to do with learning; it has much more to do with control and punishment (p. 242)."

Many studies have shown classroom life as constructed through the interactions of the participants in the setting (Berman, 1987; Cochran-Smith, 1984; Corsaro, 1985; Kantor, 1988; King, 1986; Measor, 1984). Other studies within this
perspective have shown that meaning is constructed through the communication that is constructed in classroom settings (Edwards & Furlong, 1979; Green, 1977; Green & Harker, 1982; Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Collins, 1984; Lemke, 1989; Measor, 1984). Given that life and meaning, and thus classroom curriculum, are constructed in classroom settings through the interpretations and interactions of the participants, then standardized testing makes no sense and acts only as a regression to the norm.

(B) Curriculum is context and content specific to the participants in a particular setting; and due to the unique interactions from class to class, curriculum becomes interpreted differently in each setting.

Some policy makers are decrying that during the 1980s, a wave of reforms was presented that began moving us to a centralized curriculum (Frymier, 1987; Futrell, 1989; Short, 1990; Wise, 1979; 1988). Such a move to further centralization, however, is a display of nescience in understanding the complexities of daily classroom life, and is what Short (1990) labels the "trivialization" of the curriculum and of teachers.

Classrooms, in other words, have situated natures in that they are context-specific (Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990; Goodenough, 1971; Edwards & Furlong, 1978; Kantor, 1988; Philips, 1972). Classrooms, for example, are situated within a certain school that has teachers, students, and
administrators who each bring their own situated life to bear on school life (Erickson & Mohatt, 1982; Green, Kantor, & Rogers, 1990; Philips, 1972; Shultz, Florio, & Erickson, 1982). The school, then, is context-specific to a community, with specific problems and needs specific to that setting that may or may not occur elsewhere.

The findings in this study indicated that each of the three classrooms was different from the other - sometimes in minute ways, other times in larger ways. On one day, for example, one period was given a quiz while the other two were not. Another period received the same quiz the next day. In this specific case, the third class never took the quiz.

Time spent on an event was also shown as differing (in larger ways) across the three periods. The classrooms also differed in: the amount of activities/events engaged in; the types of activities/events engaged in; the number of different topics covered in an assignment; the number of events planned that were not enacted. In other words, given that classrooms are context-specific in regards to the unique combination of each of the participants in the setting, the curriculum is also context-specific in regards to the actions, reactions, interactions, and interpretations of the participants.
The discrepancy between the planned and the enacted curriculum within and across class periods is due to the interpretations and the interactions of the participants in the setting.

This study illustrated that the planned curriculum in each classroom differed from curriculum that was presented and delivered, within and across classes. In other words, of the events the teacher had planned for the classes, the majority of the events planned (85%) were academic in nature. Yet, in contrast, only 31 percent of academic events were enacted, and the majority of the events enacted became the procedural events.

This occurred for three main reasons: (1) the students were concerned about grades, so they wanted to make sure they understood the nature of the assignment, and (2) the students did not understand the assignment so asked questions on how-to-do it, and (3) the teacher perceived that the students did not understand the assignment so elucidated on the procedures.

As indicated in the findings, students in period 2 were confused about "why" they were to do a certain assignment while a student in period 3 was confused about "how" to do the assignment. This is nothing new to classrooms, certainly, but it does serve to illustrate that each classroom will have unique questions, occurrences, activities, events, and outcomes. It also serves to show that, while these questions were not planned for, different
questions of differing natures, will occur across the class periods.

The primary importance of this illustration is to bring to the foreground one small, but representative aspect of how classrooms can differ from the planned curriculum. Given this interactive nature, how then can static curriculum models that require no difference between classes be expected to be successfully implemented?

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

While many implications of this study have already been explicited (i.e., curriculum development; student evaluation; teacher evaluation), there are some worth further discussion.

Curriculum Design/Policy

Like the one-way, teacher-to-student transmission models derived from the research on teaching, curriculum policy is typically seen as a one-way, top-down model (Frymier, 1987; Henley, 1987; Measor, 1984). This study argues against this top-down model for its lack of considering the interactive and dynamic nature of classroom settings.

Cuban (1988), for example, states that while schools have changed much over the last century, they still appear pretty much the same as they have always been, regardless of
the reform efforts. Cuban argues that, "if both policy
makers and practitioners understood the inherent dilemmas of
schooling ... a very different dialogue about the problems
that beset the schools would occur (p. 344)."

While he is calling for a different type of reform
model (i.e., one that reflects improvement, not just
change), Cuban does not move towards a policy document that
understands and accommodates for the dynamic and complex
nature of classroom life. A change is occurring, however.
Following curriculum researchers like Measor (1984), policy
makers and developers are beginning to understand that
curriculum reforms and models are not working because they
do not account for the situated natures of classrooms
(Rhodes, 1988).

Research on Teaching

Cuban (1988) states that "the most common goal of
school reform over the past century is changing teacher
behavior (p. 343)." This illustrates the point that
research on teaching is still using a process-product
approach in that the primary concern from this perspective
is teacher behavior as affecting student outcome. This
study argues this generic model of teaching, however in that
due to the situated, interactive-reactive nature of teaching
and classrooms, omissions and additions will occur across
periods.
Futrell (1989) stresses the importance of reexamining instructional and reform models:

Every attempt at reform that dilutes the authority of the classroom teacher dilutes the quality of instruction in our nation's classrooms. Teachers cannot hope to prepare students for a world of perpetual flux if they themselves are condemned to static, externally imposed conceptions of effective pedagogy (p. 11).

What this study also implies is that, while "static, externally imposed conceptions of effective pedagogy" may be imagined, what actually occurs in the classroom is in response to the interactions and interpretations of its members.

Student Learning

Student learning was not specifically examined in this study in terms of factors that supported and/or constrained student learning. One element of school life, however, needs consideration in regards to influences on learning situated within this study.

Third period, for example, was markedly different from the first and second school periods. One possible explanation for this contrast might lie in external forces of schooling. First and second period students, for example, may have been more prepared for classes because they had more time to prepare for class than did third period (2nd period would have had more time due to a 10 minute homeroom between 1st and 2nd periods).
(E) **Research Practices**

Jungck (in press) says that "what we know is linked to the way we come to know it." What this means is that we are bounded in our perspectives - the questions researchers can ask are limited by their theoretical frameworks. For these reasons, Eisner (1985) and Anderson & Burns (1989) call for anthropological research methods that can better help us to understand the nature of classroom life.

Henley (1987) states that everyone has an opinion on how to improve schools, everyone, that is, except the classroom teacher. As previously stated, Cuban (1988) argues that the goal of reform is to change teacher behavior. What Short (1990) labels "the trivialization of curriculum," Frymier (1987) indicates that the "neutering of teachers" is a result of increased centralization and bureaucratization - processes that take away teacher's right to make curricular and instructional decisions.

As complaints begin to emerge over the "trivialization" of teachers and the curriculum, researchers need to respond with research practices and models that move beyond correlations and causal-comparisons. Research models and practices are needed that have sound theoretical frameworks that are in agreement with classrooms as situated, dynamic, and complex elements constructed through the interactions and interpretations of its members.
Also, if classrooms are settings which have members from diverse ethnicities and/or cultures, then our research models must be able to accommodate and understand what that diversity means in terms of the implications for learning and teaching within those settings.

For too long our research models and practices have ignored the student in the classroom and for too long we have misrepresented the teacher as the bestower of knowledge. Research models and practices are needed that move beyond teacher-as-transmitter of knowledge and student-as-receiver. If our school policy and reform decisions are based on what we know, then what we need to know is what is actually occurring in the classroom. Thus, what we need are research models and practices that can describe and help us to understand life-as-lived in classroom settings and what it means to be a participant in those settings to better inform our decisions.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study examined the nature of classroom curriculum, and was thus a topic-centered focus. From this study, however, elements have emerged that call for further research. These recommendations for further research are:

* how the larger institutional elements of school life (i.e., homeroom; district curriculum guide; course
of study) influence (support and/or constrain) student learning;
* how classroom curriculum is influenced by outside factors (i.e., home life; parents; community)
* the relationship between the course objectives and the planned and enacted curriculum;
* how the perceived roles and relationships, rights and obligations, and norms and expectations of the classroom influence what students have an opportunity to engage in, and thus, what gets learned.
* exploring the factors that support and/or constrain the enactment of the planned curriculum

CONCLUSION

This study has provided a over-time view of classroom curriculum as it is planned and enacted in three seventh-grade Reading classes taught by the same teacher. This study has also provided a description, and thus a better understanding, of what life was like in these classrooms. From these descriptions we are thus better able to explain the complex nature of classrooms and what that means in terms of teaching, learning, and evaluating.
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